

(b) if so, where will be its head quarters?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

TRAIN ROBBERIES

179. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for RAILWAYS be pleased to state.

(a) the number of train robberies which occurred in each railway zone in 1954-55; and

(b) the number of persons prosecuted for those robberies?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN): (a) and (b). The particulars are under collection and will be placed on the Table of the House when available.

EXPORT OF RICE TO CEYLON

180. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for FOOD AND AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether any rice is to be exported to Ceylon in 1955-56; and

(b) if so, how much and through which agencies?

THE MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. P. JAIN): (a) and (b). The Government of India have not so far entered into any agreement for supply of rice to Ceylon on Government to Government basis. There is, however, no ban on export of rice from India to Ceylon on trade account. To facilitate exports the export duty on rice has recently been reduced from 20 per cent, *ad valorem* to the nominal amount of Re. -2/3 per maund, but it is too early as yet to say what quantity of rice will be exported to Ceylon during 1955-56.

12 NOON

RESIGNATION OF SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform hon. Members that Shri P. Sundarayya has resigned his membership of the Rajya Sabha with effect from today.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT DELEGATION TO THE 37TH SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE HELD IN GENEVA IN JUNE, 1954.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Sir I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Indian Government Delegation to the 37th Session of the International Labour Conference held in Geneva in June, 1954. [Placed in Library, *see* No. S-92/55.]

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL, 1954—continued

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Sir, I made a submission to you on Wednesday last with regard to the presence of the Education Minister when you stated that he was going to attend the House that very day but we did not find him come to the House either that day or on the non-official day when two important Resolutions were discussed in the House. We find that he has not come in today also.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Mr. Chairman, I think the objection raised by the hon. Member is quite unreasonable. The Parliamentary Secretary is here to represent the Education Minister and he is doing his business.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): He has not visited this House for nearly a year, Sir. He is not here to

answer the questions even. Even the Prime Minister is here all the time; he has got Parliamentary Secretaries as well as other assistants to attend to this. We wish, Sir, that the views of this House are conveyed to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The wishes expressed here have been communicated. You have also to take into account the condition of his health. We must be considerate.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: We want to be very respectful; we want to take into account all these things. We never wanted to force the issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have conveyed to him the wishes expressed.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: But when this question is being answered in this manner, we have to take into consideration this fact that he has not come here probably for a year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All that I wish to say is that your wishes have been conveyed to the Minister for Education and you may be sure that whenever it is possible, he will be here.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It may be the view of a few Members, Sir, but not of the whole House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI ABID ALI: It cannot be the view of the whole House, Sir.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: I want to know whether the duties of the Parliamentary Secretaries have been defined anywhere.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, I rise to resume the thread of my speech on the University Grants Commission Bill, left unfinished on the 16th instant.

Now, I invite your attention, Sir, to the wording of the Bill. The University

Grants Commission Bill, 1954—a Bill to make further provision for the coordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission. In my opinion, this simple object could have been better achieved by a direct relationship between the heads of the various Universities and the Government, that is the Ministry for Education. This is a matter which has very much of human relationship in it. The Universities deal with young, irrepressible and impressionable elements. Anything connected with Universities can be dealt with best by direct relationship between the Head of the University and the head of the Ministry of Education, I mean the Central Minister of Education. Fortunately or unfortunately this subject is in the Concurrent List and much of the trouble and indiscipline even that we amongst the students today is due to that factor. It is a portfolio which nobody seems to own; the State Governments say that it is the responsibility of the Centre and the Centre says that education is in the Concurrent List and, therefore, the States are responsible. In between, there is a flood of indiscipline. There is no affectionate relationship between the teachers and the students as it used to be in my student days and the matters are growing from bad to worse. My hon. friend Shri Nanabhai Bhatt put it very succinctly when he said, a Commission for Secondary Education is appointed, it presents a Report and then there is a fullstop. A Commission for University Education is appointed under very able and eminent leadership and it presents a Report and then again there is a fullstop. Nothing comes out of any Commission or any Report and I wonder whether the University Grants Commission Bill is going to achieve any better results.

One thing about which I am distinctly and clearly positive is this that this is going to curb the autonomy that the Universities have enjoyed up till now. I find an attempt—it may be veiled, it may be hidden but the effort is there—

[Shri H. P. Saksena.] at putting several handicaps, curbs and impediments in the succeeding years on the Universities which have functioned as autonomous bodies so far, so much so that I may invite your attention to clause 14 of the Bill which goes even to the extent of being penal, if the Universities do not conform to such and such conditions; if they do not carry out such and such conditions, they will have their grant withheld. The autonomy which the Universities up [MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.] till now had enjoyed will, after some time, have come to an end. Sir, these Universities have been trying to be as useful as possible; it is these Universities that produced national leaders who struggled, struggled and struggled very positively from the year 1885 up to 1947. They were all drawn from the Universities, whether it was a Ranade, a Gokhale, a Tilak, a C. R. Das, a Motilal Nehru, a Jawaharlal or any one of these national leaders, they have had something to do with the Universities. These Universities in the present day, when our independence has got to be defended and maintained, have got greater and more responsible duties to perform and unless these Universities are taken very great care of, the hard earned independence itself will be put to jeopardy.

Sir, it is very rightly said that Universities are not political co«kpits; they have no politics of their own. As a matter of fact they do not and should not indulge in politics and yet the students whom they coach cannot but have something to do with politics because politics is a subject which cannot be separated and eradicated from education, because it is in our education period in the University that we read about countries which acquired their independence, about persons who helped in the acquisition of independence and so on and so forth. So politics cannot absolutely and entirely be divorced from University portals. Sir, I am of the opinion that a University

should be responsive to public opinion and reverberate the needs of the people. By applying this test to our present-day Universities I am not satisfied that they are doing their functions properly.

Now so far as the Central Ministry of Education is concerned, all that it does at the present moment is to take care of four Universities. It is the Banaras University, the Aligarh University, the Delhi University and the Santiniketan University. They have added another institution which is not a University but is still placed under the endearing and fondling care of the Ministry of Education and that is the Jamia Millia. Now, Sir, this amount of work, this magnitude of work is too small for a big Central Ministry like that of Education. Beyond that I do not see what else the Ministry of Education does excepting of course sending a delegation here or a delegation there to study the culture that obtains to-day in the Middle-East, while imperative and important needs at home are crying aloud for proper attention. We are wasting our time as well as money in studying the culture of those countries which have got many things to learn from us rather than impart any ideas about culture to us.

Now, Sir, I again invite your attention to clause 3 "Application of Act to institutions for higher studies other than universities". Now "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." This clause although pregnant with a powerful idea is and would be a cause of serious trouble, because institutions after institutions will try to be placed under that category in order to obtain financial assistance from this Commission. Now the wording used is so vague that it may mean anything. I hope the Select Com-

mittee will pay specific attention to the wording of this clause and make it as clear as possible so that there may remain no ground for any doubt.

Sir, turning to clause 5, sub-clause (b), it is stated that "not less than two members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government". I do not see any necessity of including any Government official on this University Grants Commission, which is after all to integrate and determine the standards of education. No official members need have been taken on this Commission. But yet if there are some considerations which weighed with the drafters of this Bill to include official members on this Commission, the wording should be "not more than two members" etc. and not "not less than two members" etc. Two should be the maximum.

Then Sir, with regard to sub-clause (c), "the remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions", I suggest that the sub-clause should stop here and the subsequent portion "or who have experience in administrative or financial matters" should be deleted, because what has been said in the preceding words of the subclause is quite sufficient for the purposes of the Bill.

Now, Sir, I may invite your kind attention to the fact that I am speaking not to the Government but to myself because even the Parliamentary Secretary for Education—I emphasise the words 'for education'—has thought it fit to retire.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Government is one and undivided.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I also belong to the Government Party and I can also claim to be representing the Government so far as that representation is concerned.

Now, Sir, I also suggest a change in clause 9: "*Temporary association of persons with the Commission for particular purposes.*—The Commission may associate with itself in such manner and for such purposes as may be determined by regulations made under this Act, any person whose assistance or advice it may desire in carrying out any of the provisions of this Act." Now where the words "any person" occur, I would like to add after them "other than an officer of the Central Government." "Any person" may cover any person whatsoever, but I would like the words "other than an officer of the Central Government" to be added.

The hon. the Parliamentary Secretary for Education, who unfortunately for myself is not here, while referring in his opening speech about the blessings that this draft Bill would confer on all concerned said that it will create a healthy partnership between the various elements that go to constitute the Education Ministry. Now he perhaps forgot that the very fact that a healthy partnership is going to be established now, implies that no healthy partnership is existing between these various factors up till now. This is, Sir, a sad commentary on the working of the Education Ministry that up till now it has not even succeeded in establishing a healthy partnership between the various factors with which it is connected.

Now, I was telling you that clause 14 is very reprehensible and should be deleted altogether because it is penal. Where does the much-boasted autonomy of the Universities remain if they are going to be punished and their grants are withdrawn just for a little omission here or a little omission there. I can understand the Universities being directed by the Government to act most vigilantly and most cautiously but no Government satisfies its own needs of prestige nor of the university when

[Shri H. P. Saksena.] it makes it penal, if the Universities omit to do certain acts.

Now, I would invite your attention to sub-clause (2) of clause 16 which says that "all moneys belonging to the Fund shall be deposited in such banks or invested in such manner as may, subject to the approval of the Central Government, be decided by *he Commission." This clearly means that if the University Commission tries to open a bank account for the sake of custody of its funds, it has got to obtain the permission of the Central Government. This is what we are going to have so far as the autonomy of Universities is concerned. It is a very painful thing for a man like myself who has had much to do with Universities, University Education, spread of education and all that for more than half a century. This is happening in a State which is democratic, under a Government which is run by independent people for independent people. As has been very aptly put, trust begets trust; and distrust or mistrust begets distrust or mistrust. I should have thought that the healthy partnership between the University and other elements and the Government so eloquently spoken of by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary should not begin under such inauspicious auspices that you cannot trust the University even with the liberty of opening an account for keeping its funds in a bank in which it has got implicit faith and confidence but you want them to obtain firstly your approval for opening an account.

SHRI J ASP AT ROY KAPOOR: Clause 16 refers to the Commission and not to the University.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am dealing with the Commission that is being appointed for the Universities and the University and the Commission for the purpose of my point here are interchangeable.

Now, I wish there was some more clarification with regard to clause 20.

That relates to Central Government directions and it says: "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." To me it appears that something has been kept unwritten under this clause. It is not only on questions of policy that guidance will be given by the Central Government but the inducement and temptation will gradually grow to interfere even with the day to day actions of the Universities and that will be a very bad day indeed if as contained in the clause, guidance is not confined to only matters of policy. Of course, so far as policy is concerned, it must necessarily and obviously be enunciated and dictated by the Central Government. On that score there should be no difficulty.

Sir, may I, with your permission, make a present of the fine and noble sentiments expressed by a very great and eminent philosopher statesman which may be introduced in the Department of Education? For, I am not tired of repeating that the Department of Education is a Department which is more sacred and more worthy of being taken meticulous care of by the Central Government than any other Department. The present is this. "If you wish to reform the State—(educationally of course)—reform the family; if you wish to reform the family, cultivate the individual. (I would humbly ask whether individuals in the Universities are being properly cultivated). If you want to make the individual grow sensitive to culture, develop innate courtesy and refinement of art." These are the fine and noble sentiments which I make a present of to the Central Ministry of Education through its able representative, the Parliamentary Secretary for Education. In place of these fine and noble sentiments, what do we find today in our educational sphere? I am not talking of any particular University but I am giving my

personal impression of what I see, of what I hear and of what I read about the Central Ministry of Education. In place of these noble sentiments I find there is isolation—though I use these words I am using them in the most harmless sense—there is vanity, there is pride and there are outmoded and outworn views, with JIO modernity, no urbanity and no Catholicism. This is my personal reading of the structure of the present day Central Education Ministry. I wish I was wrong. I hope that the submission I have made and the fine sentiments contained in the present that I have offered will be covetously taken in hand and applied in the Ministry of Education.

There is an idea running in my mind that this University Grants Commission may do one good. In my opinion, the work entrusted to the care of the Central Ministry of Education was up till now so small that this Commission will have to refer matters almost daily to the Ministry of Education and that this Bill, when passed, will provide more material for work to the Central Ministry of Education. Because, as I submitted earlier, if this relationship instead of being indirect—through the agency of this University Grants Commission—had been completely direct, then there would have been day to day work for the Ministry of Education, for the Minister, for his assistants, for his advisers, for his Parliamentary Secretary and all that. Because these Vice-Chancellors of the various Universities—there are 31 of them—would have to come to Delhi for guidance, for advice, for funds, and so on and so forth. But then a better method, perhaps, an easier method which will provide more rest to the Central Ministry of Education is going to be adopted by this University Grants Commission. Now, at this stage, Sir, what we require to do is this: we may permit this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee which will go through its various provisions and make its recommendations. I only hope and

trust that some such fool-proof step will be taken which will place the University education of our country on a sound, permanent footing, so that this hotch-potch work which has been carried on up till now may come to a stop.

Thanking you, Sir.

SHRI SATYENDRANATH BOSK (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the speeches made on this Bill and I rise to welcome this measure, the first of its kind which the Central Government had taken to help the Universities. I think at this stage, it is necessary to very carefully consider the question in all its aspects, because we are now going to take a new step, that is to say, help the Universities in carrying out its duties. Much has been said about the present low standard attained by our students in the Universities and some examples have been adduced to support this contention. I venture to say that one has to separate carefully the task of primary and secondary education from the needs of the Universities. The criticisms that have been directed here against the University's standards may more properly be urged against the system that prevails in our country of imparting primary and secondary education. At the present moment the primary and secondary schools are directly under the control of the State, of the various States, and I think the States should take necessary and proper steps to improve the standard of primary and secondary education in our country. We have to remember that the Universities everywhere and also in this country serve a two-fold function. Of course, the way in which they may fulfil it depends to a large extent upon the material that they are supplied with, in the form of entrants to these Universities. The students come to the Universities after they have gone through a course of study, at a certain age, and the Universities take them afterwards under their care* for a period of about six years or

[Shri Satyendranath Bose.] perhaps a little more. Therefore, the results that we achieve' in these Universities will depend not only upon the standard of teaching that is imparted in the Universities, but also upon the standard that has been attained by these entrants in the pre-University stage. This is a point which we have to remember. I welcome this Bill mainly for this reason that in clause 12, there are the two sub-clauses (a) and (b) which say that this Commission will inquire into the financial needs of Universities; and allocate and disburse funds for any general or specified purpose. I think it is practically the most important thing that has to be considered at the present moment; that our Universities have not at their disposal funds sufficient to provide for a healthy growth in all directions.

So far as maintaining the standards of Universities is concerned, or about the reform and the improvement of University education, I would venture to say this much, that this country has now got about 31 Universities and in each of these Universities there are efficient groups of teachers who take care of education. There are also different faculties and Boards of studies in these Universities and I think they are the best persons in whose care we can entrust the cause of education. In all the Universities at the present moment there exist not only Boards of Studies but also Academic Councils and Senates where we have not only the officers of the University but also distinguished persons who are educationists or who have got high distinctions in various spheres. There are also at the same time representative leaders of public opinion in many of the controlling authorities of these Universities. Therefore, the tasks of maintaining the ideals of University Education, I think, are in safe hands. I think that the Central Ministry of Education also is largely convinced that this particular task is being done by the Universities properly. The Universities have to serve

a two-fold purpose. First, they will have to train men who will take up the affairs of the State. They will also be training persons who will be training the future generation of students. They have also to be at the same time centres of creative effort in our country. Now, all these attempted things are in all Universities. In our country the ancient practice had been that the torch of learning was kept lit by the teacher. I think, even when we have this modern paraphernalia, we will have ultimately to go to the teacher to have the inspiration and the necessary guidance in all matters concerning education. I do not think that the problem of education is a problem of simply setting up of standards. It is not a problem of regimentation. It is not merely by saying that the boys should attain such and such a standard that you will be able to achieve your end, and solve the problem. The most important agents here are the people who serve you in the colleges, in the universities, in the laboratories, and in the different research institutes. Ultimately, they are the persons—who have been working there all the time—who have got the experience and who will be able to tell you exactly what is needed, if you want to improve the standards of education in our land. I feel that it will be a terrible task for any Commission, if you simply say that they will have to recommend to the universities the measures necessary for the reform and the improvement of university education. I do not think, Sir, that you will be able to find in this land persons who will be ready to take upon themselves this terrible responsibility of guiding the course of education through the various mazes of subjects which the different universities now teach. Therefore, Sir, I think that the aim of this Bill should be a modest one. It is only necessary to co-ordinate the standards of teaching and examinations. I think, at the present

moment, there is an inter-University

Board, where we have discussions about these subjects, but these discussions have been mostly ineffective. The setting up of this Commission is thus very welcome. Very often, the universities themselves have felt the need for reforms, for introducing modern methods to attain a higher standard of efficiency, but they have not been able to do much in this direction for want of funds. I am not going to repeat, Sir, the various figures that have been quoted by the various speakers who have pointed out the extreme paucity of the grants that we have been allocating up to the present moment to the universities, and to the cause of education generally. I think, therefore, that we should ask the Select Committee, which will go into the provisions of this Bill, to see that the task of this Commission is circumscribed* and limited to mainly solving the question of co-ordination and determination of standards of teaching in the different universities, and also to the question of studying carefully and sympathetically the demands of the various universities about grants, giving due consideration to the developments in those particular universities. I, therefore, feel, Sir, that sub-clause (c) of clause 12 of this Bill should be omitted, or at any rate, should be reworded as follows:

"recommend to any university the measures necessary for the maintenance of standards of teaching and examination."

That is all that is necessary. I feel, Sir, that any step that you are going to take about improvement of education will bear fruit only when you are able to inspire a spirit of co-operation among all the teachers in the different universities of India.

It has, of course, been suggested that this particular Commission would be able to solve the problem of education in this country. I may, however, point out that in this task we

will ultimately have to depend upon the responsible people that are in charge of education inside the Universities. I also know, Sir, that every teacher in our country is alive to his responsibility, and the corporate bodies that we have set up in our land are also serious about their tasks. I do not feel, Sir, that the standard of our universities has gone down to a very ludicrous level. I do not feel so, because I remember the long list of persons that have been turned out by these universities who had served the national cause, and who have been and who still continue to be the leaders of thought in our country. We also remember, Sir, that in many of these universities, there are young people and workers who have achieved fame and distinction, who have contributed substantially to the cause of learning, and who have made the name of India respected in different lands. Therefore, Sir, you need not have any misgivings about the way in which, work is being done in our universities. All that is wanted is that you should be generous, and you should set up an efficient machinery which should be able to get in touch with the people who work at different centres, and should find out what they need. And you should be able to supply those needs in the form of grants, which may either be given out of the Consolidated Fund of the Government or out of the fund which is set apart for this purpose, and which would be administered by the Commission.

Secondly, Sir, about the composition of the Commission, I feel you may have some representatives from the Government services in order just to tell the Commission about the particular needs—of the public services—or of your army, or of your defence etc. But still, Sir, the number should not be such as to outweigh other considerations in this particular field. I think the best advisers can be only those persons who have been working for the cause of education, or even our Vice-

[Shri Satyendranath Bose.]
-Chancellors. I am not sure, Sir, whether a very large number of Members of this Commission is really needed for that particular purpose—to lay down the rules in a non-interfering spirit, etc. I am afraid, Sir, that some of the clauses that have been incorporated in this Bill may be read in a way which may suggest that the Central Government will be interfering with the normal working of these universities. I think this question should be gone into by the Select Committee and the provisions amended to remove this impression. About the terms and conditions of appointment I suggest that all appointments should be at least for a period of six years. You cannot really hope for any results in a lesser number of years, and any member of the Commission cannot have that particular sense of responsibility, if you say that he may have to go out after a year or two. From the way things move in our country we may presume that at least a year will elapse before the members of the Commission are able to understand the problems and the needs of the different universities in India. And if you ask them to go out after two or three years, I do not think that they will feel themselves responsible enough, and the whole burden of working out the aims of this Bill will shift upon the perpetual members, who will be Government servants, or perhaps on only the Chairman.

Therefore, I suggest this as an alternative: Let the number of the members be limited to about five as originally suggested by the University Commission, but let them be responsible people and let them be entrusted with the task of looking to the needs of the different Universities and let this work be left with them for a certain number of years. We have been talking about planning and it has become customary to talk about a term of five years; why not think of the University Commission enquiring into the needs

of the Universities in the same way and allot a period of five or six years *LOT* its work? Choose your commissioners and entrust them with this particular task. Let them be sympathetic persons who understand these problems, who will go to and consult the different Universities, find out their needs and see what particular subjects can be fostered or nourished in any particular place. India is a vast country and it need not be that all the Universities should grow up according to the same pattern. What is really wanted is that the standard should be kept more or less at a certain degree of efficiency so that the persons that we want, the workers that the State may require have got the requisite amount of general education. At the same time you should allow the different Universities to specialise in particular subjects for which the teachers in that particular corner of the country may be famous. Formerly, it was customary for the student to go to the teacher. Now also there should be some way found by means of which students from one part of the country may travel easily to another part where they can find teachers who are famous for the particular subject in which they are interested. Such a custom prevails in Germany, and I think it would not be difficult for this country also to bring about a similar arrangement by which students from one part of our country may go over to another part and finish their education at a third University if necessary. I suggest this from a certain point of view. I am not only thinking of the efficient teachers who will be working at a certain corner of our country; but this custom if allowed to grow will bring about a healthy interchange of students among different parts of the country. We all want India to grow as one indivisible country. We want all parochial ideas to disappear. We want that the future Indian should feel that he is an Indian and nothing else, and such a thing can be brought about quickly in our country by suitable interchange of

students. The future generation of Indians who will be able to travel abroad and see the country for themselves will be able to understand the aspirations of the different sections in our country. I think the University Grants Commission should also consider the feasibility of introducing this practice in our Universities and I request the Select Committee to take into their consideration this suggestion that I have made.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): Sir, in the first place, I must confess that I am not an educational expert, nor do I consider myself a person who can give advice on such an important matter, but as a man who knows where the shoe pinches, as a man who can observe and see things for himself, I should like to give my experiences here so that the persons who can judge better may take into account even the experience of a humble man who cannot be said to be an expert in the matter. In the first place, what I have been able to find out from this Bill is that on account of the growing demand for education and the growing demand for the allocation of more money for purposes of education, the Government found it necessary to find out some means by which they might allocate money in a just and equitable way. The very name of this Bill denotes it. From the Education budget and from the papers that are circulated from time to time, we find that the Government of India spends money very lavishly on education, and in spite of that there is a cry that education is being starved. So much money is being spent on education not only by the Centre but also by the States. Crores and crores of rupees are being spent on education. By comparing their budget figures now and their budget figures previously, we come to the conclusion that in the case of some of the States, the total money they used to budget for all the departments is now being spent on education |

alone. So far as the amount is concerned, Government has not been niggardly in spending money on education, but in spite of this, there is a cry that education is being starved, that even the teachers are not properly paid and that the standard of education has gone down. It seems that there is an all-round cry for reform in the matter of education. I think perhaps that this has weighed with the Government, and they have thought about appointing Commissions and Committees with the result that we have voluminous reports of thousands and thousands of pages on the subject of education. Commissions and Committees might be appointed, reports may be prepared, money may even be spent on propaganda to show that so much is being done for education. Even in some of the papers that are now supplied, I find that there is this spirit of propaganda that we do so much for the sake of education. No body denies that we are doing so much or that our Government is doing so much but I don't know whether the claim that we are inaugurating a new scheme, a new era and a new set-up is being justified by our spending money or by our taking up the schemes. I tried to find out what is the new scheme from these papers, that is always spoken of or for which we are going to spend so much money.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may continue in the afternoon, Mr. Lall.

The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

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

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: Sir, before the recess, I was speaking

[Shri Kailash Bihari Lall.] about the Government's scheme, of the pattern of education that they want to introduce and about which they speak in all the papers. I have here a paper—with me, which was circulated by the Education Ministry in which it is said that a Commission was appointed for reporting on the present position of Secondary Education in India and that the recommendations of this Commission were generally approved by the Central Advisory Board of Education. And then it is also said that the general pattern of education envisaged by that Commission in its report consists of the following: eight years of integrated elementary education, three to four years of secondary education and.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with elementary or secondary education.

SHEU KAILASH BIHARI LALL:and then the University Education after the Higher Secondary Stage leading to the first degree. That is the pattern about which we hear so much. Sir, I thought you would give me time at least to complete my sentence.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take your full time on this Bill, but not on elementary or secondary education.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: Sir, I was coming to the University Education part of it, when you interrupted me. Very well, Sir, that is my fate.

I was pointing out the pattern of education which the Government say they are envisaging, and about which we hear so much. This pattern of education envisaged in this programme covers the educational period of the student's life—14 or 15 years—and for obtaining the first degree you require three years of University Education. Sir, when I tried to analyse that period, I found that

even before, even when we were students and under the Calcutta University and when there was the entrance examination, even before the matriculation examination was introduced by Sir Asutosh Mukerjee this sort of a calculation was there, starting from the First class and through six or seven years going up to the secondary stage. Of course then we had four years for the higher education and if a child started from the age of, say five years, then it used to take some 8 years and that plus five, it was 13 years old, before, starting higher education. In this scheme it is calculated to be 14 years, and perhaps they have put some limit to the age before which in the Delhi University no student can pass the Secondary Education Examination. He should be 16 years when he passes that examination, or something like that, or that he will not be admitted into the college before he is 16 years old. Even taking it as 16 years, I do not think there is any change in the pattern of education, excepting some tinkering here and there with regard to the age and the time of the student's study period. There is no change in the general pattern of the education. In ancient days, as we all know, there was a different pattern of education. There was then the *Gurukul* system of education or the *Rishikul* system where various students used to go to the *Rishis* for their education and there was no restriction of age or any time limit and they used to get their education and they used to finish their education in a different way, and they were granted certificates of efficiency and that sort of pattern of education existed in the old days. At the present time, if we mean to have any real change in the pattern of our education, I do not understand how tinkering with the period of study can bring about that sort of a change. Everything that was there some fifty years is being retained. The same brick and mortar policy is being followed today also. You must have buildings, 66 per cent, of the cost will be contributed by the

State, 33 per cent, by private agencies or the State Government and such things are still there, so much recurring grants from the State and so on and so forth. It may be that during the British period they might have had a different proportion of contribution by the private agency and the State agency. But that does not change the pattern of our education, Sir, I do not mean to criticise and also I do not mean to say that everything that existed before was bad. Of course, it may be said that it has become a fashion to decry whatever there was in the past. I am not going to decry whatever was there in the past. I was going through an article the other day, written by Shri Humayun Kabir where the first sentence was to the effect that it has become the fashion of the day to decry the present system of education or the system that has come down to our times. I am not one of those who decry like that. I even run the risk of being called a conservative in regard to that. I believe that although whatever education was being given till now was not cent, per cent, right, still we cannot say that it was altogether bad and what we are trying to put in its place is all good. I am of opinion that if we are not going to replace that system by anything that is really good, then we should not tinker and we should not thus try to impose something and thus make a mess of everything. Today, what I am afraid of is, that we are doing things like that. For instance, there is an all-round cry that we should have text-books revised and things like that. Of course, there is no doubt that the text-books that were being taught during the time of the British contained some objectionable things, especially in the matter of history. They had got a history prepared for their own purpose. They had decried all the heroes of our history and they had painted in quite different colours others and given to some a prominence which should not have been given. For instance, I may say that

the history which we read said that Akbar was a haughty-headed monarch and when his haughtiness reached the highest pitch, he declared himself to be the Prophet of a religion called Din-i-Ilahi. That was the history written by A. C. Mookerji.

I read that in my matriculation class, when I was a teacher in the National High School, I used to tell my students that Akbar was the greatest Monarch, the greatest nationalist India had produced and they used to say, "What do you say, Master Sahib; this Akbar was such and such a fellow; he used to do such and such things" and they made such kind of allegations against Akbar. We do not know anything about Man Singh; not a single word is written about him.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDI (Orissa): News about Man Singh is being published in the papers every day.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I do not know what he is saying because I am a little bit hard of hearing.

Nothing is said about Man Singh whereas I would, at the risk of being abused by some people, say that Rana Pratap was given so much importance, much more than what he deserved and Man Singh was decried; perhaps, Man Singh was the nationalist of that time. He showed the way by giving his sister in marriage to Akbar and his sister retained the religion which she professed and you can even now, find in Agra Fort the temple in which she used to worship Lord Krishna and take her bath in the Jamuna. If you want to change history, I can understand, but then it would not come under a pattern of education that we speak of today. I am only saying that we require changes in our text-books.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nor does it come under this Bill.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I was told by my Whip that I would not be interfered with and I do not think that if I make suggestions for the University Grants Commission to give recognition to Universities which take up these questions, I will be irrelevant. Why should I not give suggestions to the Joint Committee to think of making provisions for the University Grants Commission to give recognition to Universities which take up these things? People are talking about revising and bringing about a new pattern which would bring education in line with our needs. If I make suggestions towards that end, I think I am within my rights.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are right in that.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: But these interruptions disturb me and the thread goes away they take away some time of the House also.

I was saying that if we want to bring about some change in the pattern of education, we should bring about some changes in the textbooks. That will be something understandable but the Universities and the people responsible for bringing about reform think about these problems in a haphazard manner; they say that they must have their own textbooks without thinking whether they are going to do any good to the people or not. Books are published which are not even worth using as toilet paper and such books are prescribed for the students. Advance contracts are given to the publishers and the authors and books are not brought out till half the year is over as a result of which the students are put to lot of trouble. I do not think that such books can render any good service so far as character building is concerned nor do they give any benefit to the students so much so that today we are so much obsessed and so much trouble with this problem that we are for ap-

pointing Commissions and Committees. I am asking them to produce Reports so as to be satisfied with all these Reports. Perhaps I need not have said all that; I need not have gone into these things but because of the interruption I had to explain the position so as to make my points relevant. If the University Grants Commission is going to take charge of education then it must look to these things in the right perspective so that we need not be under the impression that we are going to usher in a new pattern by merely saying so.

With regard to the Bill itself, Sir, I would like to say that I welcome this measure because it holds out some hope that it will set things right so far as the educational sphere is concerned. We have to hope and we have to see how far it can do that because I do not understand how the very people who have had their education in this system and with which they are dissatisfied will be able to give a new pattern so far as education is concerned. But, hoping against hope, I want to place a few suggestions before the House.

When grants are made, the Commission should see how far the Universities can accommodate the old system of education that was prevalent in our country. I am not very hopeful with the present provisions of this Bill; I find that one of the clauses tries to stop people who may like to experiment in education from doing so; it says that the use of the 'university' is prohibited in certain cases. I have not been able to understand this prohibition; there may be some sense in that but I have not been able to understand it, I confess. If there are some people like Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Munshi Ram, who founded Universities—which are working well—I do not see any reason why they should be stopped from founding such places. I do not think

any harm will be done if such efforts are made by some persons. If there is no scope within the Governmental frame-work, they should be free to found Universities independently. It is from that point of view that I am making these suggestions. The Select Committee has, of course, to see whether any real harm would be done by allowing people to found educational institutions and systems, equal to or even superior to what the present Universities are. If some scope is left in the hands of private individuals, they can bring about something useful for the society and so, I am suggesting that the Joint Committee should see whether such people can evolve a really good pattern of education, different from the present pattern with which all of us are dissatisfied, including the students who are also not on the right path. If the Committee feels that such people can help in evolving a pattern, then Government should not stand in the way of people who try to evolve such a new pattern. For instance, as Mr. Bose, who preceded me, said, there should be no restriction put on the students going from one University to the other; on the other hand, there should be provision for students to go and study in different Universities and gain knowledge that way. What I am suggesting is not very much different from the system which was prevalent in the old days where under the *Gurukul* system the students used to go to the *Rishis* and take their lessons at their feet and they could very well go to such institutions of good repute and they could learn there. Of course I do not say that we should revert in all respects to that old system of education in the jung-leg. I know the times are changed and we must have science laboratories also. We must have the buildings also. We must have good accommodation as in towns also. We cannot shut ourselves down and go to village and stay under the foot of the mountains and on the bank of the river to have our education in *Gurukul*. We have

to accommodate ourselves in the present circumstances to town life also and so we must have buildings also. But then what I am suggesting is that we should not apply all over attention to the brick and mortar policy which is now the guiding policy and principle of the present system of education. Whenever you think of education you must have a big building to accommodate the institution and you must have all kinds of paraphernalia for giving education and if there is no such thing you will not be allowed to impart education; your institution will not get recognition and you will not get any help. So this kind of handicap should not remain there and if at all we mean to have a different pattern of education we must rather leave scope for the development of such system in¹ which our ancient India took pride and on the basis of which we always say that we can deliver a message to the world. But we cannot deliver the message only by aping the systems that are prevalent in other countries, and today in the matter of education we are surely copying the systems of other people. We are not evolving any new pattern and so we say that we cannot do that unless we keep our mind open for opening such institutions and give some scope for the coming into existence of such institutions as Rabindranath Tagore's. If Rabindranath Tagore was not hampered in his efforts and he succeeded in establishing his institution it was because he had the means to start a new type of education in an institution of his own and he could do it. But all persons cannot do that. The late Lokmanya Tilak thought of devoting his whole time to the cause of education, but perhaps the poor man could not do that because he had no means like Rabindranath Tagore. Rabindranath Tagore was a rich man, a man of means; so he evolved that thing. As Rabindranath Tagore did we must leave such scope for such *Rishis* even at the present time to start institutions and impart education and then of course we can

[Shri Kailash Bihari Lall.] say that we have evolved a new pattern of education where really we would have all the brilliant men who could devote their time to education and give best in them to the world and that can be said to be a pattern of education that we may aim at. Today we have got only one pattern that has been brought into vogue by the Britishers and which we are still carrying on. We may make some changes like putting a comma or a full stop or cross the 't' and dot the 'i', but we cannot say that we have brought a new pattern of education in our society today. Education is becoming more and more costly day by day and that is another problem. We hear that in Burma or Ceylon primary education has been very much the charge of monks and they go about and they maintain primary schools, and primary education has become so easy for these people. But in our country we have never thought of that pattern where we encourage a class of persons to take charge of primary education, in the same way to take charge of secondary and higher education where the Government should come to the help of such outstanding educated persons to maintain an *Ashram*, to maintain an institution where people may go and learn at the feet of their *guru*. There you will find really the germ of inspiration in the students, where the students are really inspired by such system and where you will not find that indiscipline in the students which we find these days where the students do not care for the teachers or for the parents or for anybody in the society and their hooliganism has become a proverb of the day. So if you want that the student should be so influenced or inspired by the teachers then it is the problem of the teachers today that we should first tackle though nothing is spoken of it in the present day pattern which we are evolving by our commissions and their reports. Today we have got so many teachers; we have to prepare the State Budget and we have

to provide for so many teachers. You have got in vogue the same education code and the teachers are regarded as servants and the code of the servants still regulates them. They are more or less servant-like to other people and so they cannot be expected to inspire the students in the present pattern of education that we have got. So if you want to get rid of that mentality and if you want that there should be a different pattern of education, then our universities should be just like the old *Ashrams* of the *Rishis* where the students used to get education in the old way. Of course we have got an example here in Munshi Ram who founded a university under his guidance. Rabindranath Tagore was one.....

Mn. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are repeating yourself, Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall; please finish by 3 o'clock. You have taken half an hour already. There are six more speakers. I want to call on the Parliamentary Secretary to reply by 4 o'clock.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: So far as I know, regarding this Bill there is no restriction of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot go on repeating like that.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I will bow to you if I am repeating but then

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what you are doing.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: But you cannot say that I should not propose new points.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You just mention your points and be done with them.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I will do that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please j close by 3 o'clock.

SHRI KAIL ASH BIHARI LALL: Yes, by 3 o'clock if a time limit has been fixed in respect of this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may tell you, I am to call on the Parliamentary Secretary to reply at 4 o'clock. There are six more speakers. You must give them also some time. You have taken already 30 minutes. Also you will have another opportunity.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: Now in the Bill, clause 5 (2) (a) says "not less than one-third of the number of members shall be chosen from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities and heads of institutions deemed to be Universities under section 3." And 5 (2) (b) says "not less than two members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government." Now out of the nine members, of course two will be perpetually Government servants.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have referred to that also in your earlier speech.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: No, no. I think I have not spoken up till now about that; up till now I have not mentioned the composition of the Commission.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have done that.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: So far as I remember, I have not.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I say you have referred to the two officials.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: No, no, perhaps you might be remembering somebody else's speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I have never spoken. 8 R.S.D.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, please proceed.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: But I am sorry that I am so much interfered with.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because you are repeating yourself.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: My speech is reported and it will show that I have never spoken about this before.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I shall bet for it and you can find from the reporter if I have spoken before about this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish your speech.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: Yes, I am speaking, but the more you interrupt me. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry you are casting reflection on the Chair.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I am not casting reflection on the Chair. I have said already that the Chair is reflecting on me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, I am here for it.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: The Chair is reflecting on me that I am doing this; I am doing that. After all a Member also has got self* respect.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But you should not repeat.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: Yes, I submit most respectfully that a Member has got as much self-respect as any man.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Certainly, I agree, I fully agree.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I am here always to respect the Chair, but that does not mean that I should always be the target of

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you don't repeat yourself nobody will disturb you.

3 p. M.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: So I was suggesting that there should not be anybody from the Government because that many not have a good influence so far as education is concerned. This is what I feel about it. Of course it is for the Joint Committee to think about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is that all?

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: I am trying to And out important things. I do not want to go into details on unimportant things, I thought I will have sufficient time and I was even assured by the Whip. Anyway, although I have got a good many points to urge, I think I would leave them at that and bow to your decision that I should close my speech.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, after the speech of my learned friend, Shri Kailash Bihari Lall, there is very little left to be spoken. Still as you have called upon me to speak, I will say a few things. I have great pleasure in welcoming this Bill. I feel it is a very delayed measure. We expected it much earlier but I am glad that after all it has come. I think the very fact that this Commission was recommended by the University Commission presided over by the learned Chairman of the House is itself a very strong recommendation for the necessity of appointing this Commission. I feel that there are two or three things which at this stage when we are considering the general principles of the Bill will have to be taken into account.

The first is that notwithstanding the fact that our Universities have done good work—as has been referred to by some of the speakers that they have produced eminent people—I feel that the Universities that were established by the British Government had an entirely different purpose and object. And if they had produced eminent people including people who are in this House also, I say it is on account of their natural gift and ability and it was in spite of certain difficulties and disadvantages that we have in our Universities. I feel that the appointment of this Commission will help to create first of all that atmosphere of education and search for truth which is the essence of the University education. Somehow Or other the students who have gone to the Universities are mostly those who have the idea to just equip themselves with a degree and to get some job. In the changed context it is necessary that we should emphasise the real object of university education and the persons who go to Universities should devotedly feel the need and urge for finding out truth, for contributing to the knowledge of the world and higher pursuits of education which develop moral and spiritual personalities. That is the first consideration which the Select Committee should bear in mind in the discussion of this Bill

The second consideration is that somehow or other provincialism and such other narrow thoughts have penetrated even in the holy citadels of the Universities. And that has actuated students to consider things from a narrow and limited angle viz., the State or provincial point of view, it is high time that we see that this Commission makes a serious effort to create a national outlook which is most essential to the progress and well-being of our country, I feel that should be the first step in the direction of internationalism because the Universities are the places where they should support and advocate humanitarian ideals. That is the place where a broad outlook should be created. I am sure that

in considering this Bill the Joint Committee will see that these ideals and these objectives are best attained by the co-ordination that is contemplated in this Bill and effective measures as interchange of students and lectures will be adopted to achieve this end.

The third thing that I would like to emphasize is this. There have been Universities which have developed the Arts side, there have been Universities which have developed the Science side. Now, in order to see that the progress of the country goes on on proper lines we have to specialise in different scientific and technical subjects and it is not possible for any one University to have specialisation in all important subjects—so there is a great necessity for a well thought out planning—in view of our needs and requirements. I am sure one of the objectives of this Commission should be to see that all these different branches of learning are so co-ordinated and that with the minimum expense, the maximum advantage is obtained—to the country and to the world at large. That is "the objective and if it can be achieved by this co-ordination, then the appointment of this Commission and the passing of this Bill will be a boon and will be of great benefit to our country as it will go a long way to help the solution of educated unemployment.

I welcome this co-ordination but at the same time I must caution that it should not go to the extent of regimentation because after all the Universities must have a certain measure of autonomy. I have a feeling, as I have had the privilege of working as a member of the Senate and the University Council of Osmania University, that in the State as in other States and possibly in the Centre there is a tendency to think that because they are paying a certain amount of money, they have a right to dictate. That is a very dangerous tendency and that must be stopped and put under strict control. I submit, Sir, that so far as academic

matters are concerned, the Universities should have complete autonomy and freedom, especially as far as basic principles of education are concerned to which I have already referred. But in matters of classification of subjects for specialisation, the fundamental policy of creating urge for truth and knowledge and creation of national and international outlook, the Centre should have its say. But if this co-ordination goes to the length of limiting the autonomy in other directions it would do a great disservice. So I am sure the members of the Joint Committee will bear this in mind in their deliberations of this important piece of legislation. Now, Sir, only one word more and in that connection I may go a little out of the way. So far as the Osmania University is concerned, for the last Ave or so*, years no definite policy has been adopted regarding that University. I mean, it was a declaration of very important people of the Union Government that from Urdu it would be changed to Hindi. And there is no doubt that there is a section which thinks that the change over should be to Telugu. But what I feel is that some decision should be taken at the earliest date in this matter. After all, there is no use keeping this matter hanging like this. I feel that changing over from Urdu to Hindi was much easier or to any vernacular for that matter, but to our surprise it has been suddenly changed again into English. We have any number of Universities where classes are being conducted in English. So, I do not see, if the policy was to change it to either a vernacular like Telugu or an all-India language like Hindi, what the object was in changing it to English and then again bringing it back to some other language. It is a great waste of time and energy. This is a matter which requires careful consideration by the Education Ministry and I hope early decision will be taken in this important matter.

With these few observations, Sir, I welcome the ideas underlying the Bill.

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी० बँदा (मध्य भारत): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल का मैं हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ। इस दृश की जो शिक्षा व्यवस्था है वह वास्तव में स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद एक विचारणीय विषय बन रही है और सार्व दृश की यह मांग रही है कि शिक्षा के विषय में हमारी सरकार की ओर से जल्दी से जल्दी एक ऐसी नीति निर्धारित होनी चाहिए जिससे हमारा दृश की शिक्षा व्यवस्था ठीक हो सके। हमारा दृश के सामने जो समस्याएँ थीं उनको हल करने के लिए हमारी सरकार ने वास्तव में कुछ प्रयत्न किए हैं। इस दिशा में भी एक कमीशन एप्पाइंट कर के इस बात की चेष्टा की गई कि किसी प्रकार हमारा दृश के विश्वविद्यालयों का सुधार किया जा सके। इस सदन के अध्यक्ष माननीय डा० राधा-कृष्णन की अध्यक्षता में उस कमीशन द्वारा जो रिपोर्ट एक बड़ी लम्बी जांच के बाद बनाई गई है, उसमें हमें कुछ निर्णयों पर पहुँचने लायक सामग्री मिलती है। इस विषय पर पिछले दिनों श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन ने काफी प्रकाश डाला था। इसीलिए अब उस पर अधिक चर्चा करना मैं उपयुक्त नहीं समझता। उनकी सब बातों से पूर्वथा सहमत होते हुए मैं यह कहूँगा कि इस बिल को दृश कर वह दुख होता है कि उस रिपोर्ट में जो सिफारिशें की गई थीं उनकी पूर्ति पूर्णतः इस बिल में नहीं की गई है।

प्राचीन शिक्षा के विषय में इस दृश का इतिहास बड़ा ही महान और उज्ज्वल इतिहास रहा है। इस दृश में तक्षशिला और नालंदा के शिक्षा केन्द्र एक समय में अपने शिखर पर पहुँचे हुए थे। इसके अतिरिक्त यहाँ ऐसे ऋषियों के आश्रम चलते थे जहाँ भगवान् कृष्ण तक उज्जैन के महर्षि सन्दीपन के आश्रम में शिक्षा लेने आए थे। शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में ऐसी स्थिति हमारा दृश की रही है और इसको सार्व संसार ने माना है।

आज हमारा दृश के विश्वविद्यालयों में ऐसी शिक्षा की पद्धति चल रही है कि यदि हम उस पर समय समय पर विचार करें तो हम विश्वविद्यालयों में नीतिवृत्ता का अभाव पाते हैं, अनुशासन का अभाव पाते हैं और वे एक प्रकार से राजनीतिक

अखाड़वाजी का केन्द्र बनते चले जा रहे हैं। ऐसी चीजों से हम कल्पना कर सकते हैं कि विश्वविद्यालयों में आजकल कैसी व्यवस्था चल रही है। इस दिशा में भी सिलेक्ट कमेटी को विचार करने की आवश्यकता है और हमें कमीशन को ऐसे व्यापक अधिकार देने चाहिए जिनके द्वारा हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों के लिए ऐसी पद्धति निर्धारित कर सकें जिससे हमारे विद्यार्थियों का नैतिक स्तर ऊँचा उठ सके और उनमें अनुशासन आ सके। यदि हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा दृश की उन्नति कायम रहे तो हमारा दृश में शिक्षा की ऐसी नीति होनी चाहिए कि जब हमारे युवक विश्वविद्यालयों से निवृत्त ताँ वे अनुशासनहीनता, अनैतिकता और राजनीतिक अखाड़वाजी का दृष्टिकोण ले करके न निकलें। इस दृश के अन्दर इधर तीन चार वर्षों में कई स्थानों पर ऐसी घटनाएँ देखने में आई हैं जिनके कारण वहाँ के विश्वविद्यालयों को एक लज्जाजनक स्थिति में रहना पड़ा है। जहाँ जहाँ ताँ विश्वविद्यालयों का कुछ समय के लिए बन्द तक कर देना पड़ा है। ऐसी दृशा में यदि हम इस प्रश्न पर गम्भीरता से विचार नहीं करेंगे तो मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि इस दृश में शिक्षा का भविष्य क्या होगा।

इन सुझावों को रखते हुए मैं आशा करता हूँ कि शिक्षा मंत्रालय इन बातों पर विचार करेगा। हमारे माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री, मौलाना साहब, इस सदन में नहीं हैं। ऐसा मालूम हुआ है कि वे स्वस्थ नहीं रहते, इसलिए वे इस सदन में नहीं आ सके हैं। कुछ लोगों ने इस विषय पर यहाँ चर्चा की है। लेकिन मैं आशा करता हूँ कि वे सदन में नहीं हैं फिर भी वे तमाम बातें जो इस सदन में रखी जा रही हैं उन पर वे पूर्णतः ध्यान देंगे और इस कमीशन को इतने व्यापक अधिकार दिए जाएंगे कि उन अधिकारों के अन्तर्गत हमारे शिक्षा विद्यालयों का माध्यम सुधारने में पूरी चेष्टा की जा सके। मैं कुछ ही दिन पूर्व एक कांफ्रेंस के सिलसिले में जगदलपुर गया था। वहाँ उसमानिया यूनिवर्सिटी के एक जिम्मेदार प्रोफेसर आए हुए थे। उनसे मेरी बातें हुई। हम एक हाई स्कूल के

कमर में ठहर रहे थे और उसमें राजनीतिक नेताओं के चित्र लगे हुए थे। उनको देख करके उन्होंने कहा कि वास्तव में ये शिक्षा के स्थान राष्ट्रीयता के वातावरण में चल रहे हैं। फिर उन्होंने बड़े दुःख के साथ कहा कि उसमानिया यूनिवर्सिटी में आज भी निजाम साहब के फोटो टंगे हुए हैं, सात साल की स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद भी वहां राष्ट्रीय नेताओं के चित्र टांगने का प्रश्न नहीं उठता।

श्री अकबर अली खां : महात्मा गांधी और पंडित जी के फोटो भी हैं।

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी० बेंद्य : होंगे। लेकिन मैं जो कह रहा हूँ वह केवल हफ्ता भर पहले की बात कह रहा हूँ और जिन्होंने मुझ से कहा वे एक जिम्मेदार प्रोफेसर हैं। इससे आप कल्पना कर सकते हैं कि किस प्रकार की स्थितियाँ में आज हमारे विश्वविद्यालय चल रहे हैं। आज इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि हम अपने विद्यार्थियों को, अपने नौजवानों को यह अनुभव कराएँ कि हमारा देश स्वतंत्र हो गया है और एक स्वतंत्र देश के नागरिक होने के नाते हमारे महान कर्तव्य हैं ताकि जब वे विश्वविद्यालयों से निकलें तो देश जो उनसे अपेक्षा करता है उसकी वे पूर्ति कर सकें। अनुशासन और नैतिकता शिक्षा के मूल स्रोत हैं और उनके ऊपर सारी शिक्षा और देश की सारी चीजों का स्तम्भ खड़ा किया जाता है। प्राचीन भारत में हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों का जो उज्ज्वल इतिहास रहा है उसका केवलमात्र यही कारण रहा है कि उस समय विद्यार्थियों में यह भावना रहती थी कि वे जब तक अध्ययन करते हैं तब तक उनका यह कर्तव्य है कि वे अपने शिक्षकों के अनुशासन में रहें। उस समय न अनुशासनहीनता के प्रदर्शन किए जाते थे और न विश्वविद्यालय राजनीतिक अखाड़ेबाजी के केन्द्र बनाए जाते थे। इसलिए आज इस चीज पर विशेष ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है कि हमारे देश की शिक्षा पद्धति में ऐसा परिवर्तन किया जाए जिससे सारी बातें ठीक हो जाएं। समय समय पर जब देश के सामने और इस सदन के सामने

शिक्षा का प्रश्न आता है तब शिक्षा देने वालों की जो आर्थिक स्थिति हमें देखने को मिलती है वह असन्तोषजनक मालूम होती है। हमारे जो शिक्षा देने वाले शिक्षक और गुरु हैं उनके दिमाग में हर वक्त आर्थिक उथल पुथल का वातावरण रहता है, ऐसी अवस्था में हम अंदाज़ा कर सकते हैं कि उनके शिक्षण देने का तरीका कहां तक संतोषप्रद होता होगा और उसका विद्यार्थियों पर कैसा प्रभाव पड़ता होगा। तो इस प्रकार की स्थिति में हमें सभी पहलुओं पर जाने की जरूरत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रवर समिति, शिक्षा मंत्रालय और मंत्री महोदय, आज़ाद साहब भी उन तमाम सुझावों पर जो कि सदन के सामने रखे गए हैं, गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करेंगे और इस कमीशन के द्वारा इस प्रकार की स्थिति का निर्माण करेंगे जिसकी वास्तव में देश की शिक्षा पद्धति को आवश्यकता है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ।

श्री आँकार नाथ (दिल्ली) : उपसभापति जी, जब यह बिल मैंने देखा तो मेरे दिल में दो विरोधी भावनाएं पैदा हुईं। एक तरफ मुझे यह देखकर खुशी हुई है कि ऐसा कदम उठाया जाने वाला है जिससे हमारे देश का एकीकरण होगा और हमारे देश के जुदा जुदा हिस्सों में यह शिक्षा में एकता पैदा करने वाली चीज होगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे राष्ट्र निर्माण और कौमी तरक्की के लिए इस बिल को लाने की जरूरत थी और इसके जरिए से हमारे मुस्लिम स्कोलों में, प्रदर्शनों में एक तरह के स्कूल और एक तरह का स्टैंडर्ड कायम करने की जो कोशिश की गई उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। आज एक आम दिक्कत यह पाई जाती है कि बंगाल का स्टैंडर्ड जब दिल्ली में आता है या दिल्ली का स्टैंडर्ड मद्रास जाता है तो हर जगह भिन्न भिन्न कोसँज होने की वजह से वह अपने को परदर्शी सा पाता है। आज यू० पी० की तरफ के ऐसे मॉड्रक भी आपको मिलेंगे जो अंग्रेजी बिलकुल नहीं जानते हैं क्योंकि यू० पी० में अंग्रेजी कंपलसरी नहीं है। इस तरह से वहां का मॉड्रक यहां आ

[श्री ओंकार नाथ]

कर बंकार हो जाता है। इसीलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके द्वारा सब जगह के कोर्स को स्टैंडर्डाइज करने का जो आइडिया है वह बहुत अच्छा है और उससे देश में शिक्षा का भला होने वाला है।

अब मैं बिल के दूसरे पहलू पर आता हूँ। इससे यह महसूस होता है कि सारा देश की शिक्षा पर गवर्नमेंट का पूरा पूरा कंट्रोल हो जाएगा और लोगों का initiative जाता रहेगा। मैं समझता हूँ हमारा देश में शिक्षा की बहुत सी संस्थाएँ, स्कूल और कालेज हैं और यूनिवर्सिटीयाँ हैं, जैसे बंगाल में विश्व-भारती, अहमदाबाद में गांधी जी की विद्यापीठ, दिल्ली में जामिया मिलिया वर्गो है जिनका कॉन्ट्रिब्यूशन हमारा देश की शिक्षा में किसी सरकारी यूनिवर्सिटी से कम नहीं है और ये अपने बल पर बनी हैं। दूसरे देशों में आप देखेंगे कि यूनिवर्सिटीयाँ और विश्वविद्यालयों पर गवर्नमेंट का कम से कम अधिकार और नियंत्रण होता है, वह उन में बहुत कम देखल देती हैं। तो यहां पर जो अख्तियार दिया गया है कि यूनिवर्सिटीयाँ पर जो अख्तियार कमीशन का होगा और कमीशन पर गवर्नमेंट का होगा, गवर्नमेंट बहुधा सदस्यों को नॉमिनेट करेगी, ६ मੈम्बरों को जिसमें से २ तो यूनिवर्सिटीयाँ से होंगे, दो गवर्नमेंट के आफिसर होंगे और बाकी ४ गवर्नमेंट के नॉमिनेटड रहेंगे, इसका मतलब यह है कि तीन वाइस चांसलर्स को छोड़कर, बाकी जो मॅम्बर होंगे वे गवर्नमेंट के लोग होंगे और उसका चैयरमैन भी एक पेंड सर्वेन्ट ही होगा। ये चीजें गौर सन्नब हैं और मुझे उम्मीद है कि जॉइंट कमेटी उन पर विचार करेगी।

इस समय हमारी शिक्षा की जो हालत है उसे आप देखें तो मालूम होगा कि जो तालीम लड़कियों को दी जाती है वह भी ठीक उसी तरह की है जो लड़कों को दी जाती है, वही एलजेबरा है, वही ज्यामेट्री है, साइंस है। वही तालीम एक गांव से किसान का लड़का आता है उसको भी दी जा रही है यानी कि जो उस तालीम को लेता है उसका बिगाड़ा जा रहा है क्योंकि वह अपने काम का नहीं रहता। जो गांव से दिल्ली यूनि-

वर्सिटी पढ़ने के लिए आता है वह शायद ही फिर गांव जाना पसंद करे और खेती करे। इसी तरह से घरों से औरतों को निकाल कर उन्हें बंकार किया जा रहा है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम अपने नौजवानों को बढ़ाई की, लोहार की और दूसरे पेशों की तालीम दें जिससे वे हाथ से काम करना सीखें। आज आप देखिए हाऊर्सिंग के काम के लिए राज, बेलदार, लुहार, बढ़ई और कारीगरों की कितनी जरूरत है। लेकिन जिस देखिए एम० ए० एल० एल० बी० बना जा रहा है। जितने लोग लाँ पास करते हैं उनमें से एक बहुत बड़ी तादाद नौकरी करती है। ६ हजार एप्लिकेशंस आती हैं तो उसमें कई हजार लॉयर्स की होती हैं। इसीलिए जिस चीज की हमारा देश को जरूरत नहीं है वह क्यों बढ़ाई जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि आजादी से, रेशनली कमीशन सोचे तो ये तमाम ला कालेजेंज जो हैं वे पांच सात साल के लिए बन्द कर दिए जाएँ क्योंकि जितने पुराने लॉयर्स हैं वे शायद मुल्क के लिए जरूरत से ज्यादा हैं। इस तरह से हम देखते हैं कि मुल्क में जिस ढंग से एजुकेशन चल रही है वह चारों तरफ से आजाद है। गुलामी के जमाने के लिए ये चीज ठीक रही होगी क्योंकि उस समय की हुकूमत को क्लर्क बनाने थे, गवर्नमेंट और पब्लिक के बीच में एक मीडियम बनाना था और उसको हम लोगों के खिलाफ यूज किया जाना था, मगर आज हमें उसकी जरूरत नहीं रही। हमें देश को आगे ले जाना है। आज मकै-निकल इंजीनियरिंग के लिए, इलेक्ट्रिकल इंजीनियरिंग के लिए पांच सौ, हजार, दो हजार वर्क्सिप्स आती हैं और लिए दस या पांच जाते हैं। हमको अपने देश में जैसे प्लानिंग द्वारा एग्रीकल्चर और इंडस्ट्री में तरक्की करने की जरूरत है। एजुकेशन के मुताबिलक प्लानिंग की भी उतनी ही जरूरत है। यह ऐसी चीज है जिस पर अच्छी तरह से विचार करना चाहिए।

देश भर में दो या तीन संस्थाएँ हैं जो चमड़े का काम सिखलाती हैं। ऊँचे दर्जे का लेंदर का काम सिखाने वाली कोई संस्था नहीं है। नतीजा यह है कि जूतों को बनाने वाले ट्रैंड और पढ़ लिखे आदमी नहीं मिलते। अनपढ़ लोग ही इस काम

का करते हैं। यदि हम सही मानों में तालीम के जरिए लोगों को उपभागी दखना चाहते हैं तो यह नहीं कि हम लोगों को बड़ी बड़ी डिग्रीयों के लिए तैयार करें, बल्कि जरूरत है कि हम हाथ का काम सब को सिखाएं। इसके लिए तरीका यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि एक आदमी जो एम० ए० पास कर के निकलता है उसको ५०० रु० तनखाह दें और एक चमार का काम करने वाले को २५, ३०, ४० रुपया। जब हम तनखाह के इस फर्क को मिटा देंगे तब आप देखेंगे कि एम० ए० पास करने की जगह लोग वही चीज सीखने लगेंगे, यह नहीं कि रट रटा के इम्तहान पास कर लिया, नौकरी कर ली। ६० प्रति शत से ज्यादा ऐसे एम० ए० पास लोग आपको मिलेंगे जो कि ६०, ७० रु० का भी क्लेरिकल जॉब अगर उनको मिल जाए तो खुशी से उसको करने के लिए तैयार हो जाएंगे, मगर उनसे दूसरा कोई काम करने को कहा जाएगा तो नहीं करेंगे। एक दफा एक तजवीज आई थी कि किसी शख्स को बी० ए० का सर्टिफिकेट न दिया जाएगा जब तक वह गांव में कुछ समय तक सेवा न कर ले। मेरी तजवीज यह है कि जब तक वह हाथ का कोई काम, ३, ४ या ५ साल तक न कर ले किसी इंडस्ट्री में या कारखाने में, या चाहे वह खेती बाड़ी से सम्बन्ध रखता हो, तब तक उसे सर्टिफिकेट न दिया जाए। आखिर बीसक एजुकेशन का भी मतलब यही है कि तालीम, जो बुनियाद है देश की तरक्की की, वह बेकार नहीं, लाभदायक हो।

हमारे देश के जो विद्यार्थी कालेजों या यूनिवर्सिटियों से निकलते हैं उनकी जेनरल नॉलेंज बहुत पुअर होती है। उन्हें विदेशों के बड़े बड़े आदमियों के बारे में शायद कुछ पता होगा लेकिन अपने देश के रामकृष्ण परमहंस, स्वामी राम तीर्थ, विवेकानन्द, आदि कौन थे उनके बारे में कुछ नहीं मालूम होता। यह इसलिए है क्योंकि उन्हें अपने देश की संस्कृति से, अपनी भाषा से वाकिफ्यत नहीं है। फ्रेंच, जर्मन, लैटिन का उनको ज्ञान होगा लेकिन गुजराती, मराठी या बंगला के बारे में कुछ नहीं जानेंगे। उनमें अपने

देश के प्रति प्रेम तो तब हो जब उनको उसकी कुछ वाकिफ्यत हो। महाकवि कालिदास के बारे में वे क्या जानें जब तक उन्हें संस्कृत भाषा का ज्ञान न हो। अक्सर आप देखते होंगे कि जेनरल नॉलेंज में वे लोग इतने पीछे होंगे कि अगर उनसे आप जवाहरलाल जी या अन्य नेताओं के बारे में कोई प्रश्न पूछेंगे तो ऊटपटांग जवाब दें देंगे, मैजिस्ट्री आफ कैंसेज में आप उलटा सीधा जवाब पाएंगे। अपने देश के बारे में जेनरल नॉलेंज का होना हर स्टूडेंट के लिए जरूरी है।

चूंकि हमने राष्ट्रभाषा हिंदी को माना है इस लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि अब हमें लैंग्वेज पॉलिसी पर ध्यान देना है। देश के किसी हिस्से का विद्यार्थी सबसे पहले अपने प्रदेश की भाषा तो जानें ही, मगर जब दूसरी और कोई भाषा सीखने की बात आए वहां उसको पहले हिन्दी सीखना चाहिए। जैसे कि कोई बंगाल में रहता है तो वह पहले तो अपनी भाषा बंगला सीखे ही, मगर उसके बाद जब वह कोई विदेशी भाषा सीखना चाहे तो उस से पहले राष्ट्रभाषा हिंदी अवश्य सीखनी चाहिए। अगर वह सारी जिदगी बंगला सीखे तो कोई हर्ज नहीं, लेकिन अगर वह फ्रेंच या जर्मन या और कोई विदेशी भाषा सीखना चाहे तो उससे पहले उसके लिए यह लाजिमी हो कि वह हिन्दी सीखे यानी कि रीजनल लैंग्वेज को सीखने के बाद देश का कोई आदमी पहले हिन्दी सीखे फिर उसके बाद कोई दूसरी भाषा।

तीसरी चीज यह है कि गवर्नमेन्ट आफ इंडिया के जितने महकमे हैं जो सेंट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट से ताल्लुक रखते हैं, जिस प्रकार डाक तार या रेलवे विभाग हैं इन सर्विसेज के लिए राष्ट्रभाषा का ज्ञान होना जरूरी होना चाहिए। उसी प्रकार के अन्य महकमों में भी हिन्दी का ज्ञान अनिवार्य कर दिया जाना चाहिए। यह चीज एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री में भी अभी तक नहीं है, जो ऑल इंडिया सर्विसेज हैं उनमें भी नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि इधर उधर कुछ साईन बोर्ड, तस्ते आदि में हिन्दी का प्रयोग हो रहा है,

[श्री ओंकार नाथ]

कुछ रिपोर्टें भी हिन्दी में आती हैं, लेकिन सर्विसों के जो इम्तहान होते हैं उनके लिए हिन्दी अभी तक कंपलसरी नहीं हुई है। इसलिए हमारी यूनिवर्सिटीयों में और एजुकेशन इंस्टीट्यूट्स में जो लोग पढ़ने जाते हैं उनके लिए पहले हिन्दी अनिवार्य कर दी जाय।

इस एक्ट की धारा दो में यह बन्धन लगा दिया गया है कि कोई यूनिवर्सिटी तब तक नहीं बन सकती है जब तक कि उसे पार्लियामेंट के एक्ट द्वारा प्रोविडियल या स्टेट एक्ट द्वारा स्थापित अथवा इंकॉर्पोरेट न किया जाए। यहाँ तक मुझे मालूम है दूसरे देशों में इस तरह का बन्धन नहीं है। अगर हमने इस तरह का बन्धन लगा दिया तो हमारे देश में जामिया मिलिया और गुरुकुल कांगड़ी की तरह यूनिवर्सिटीज भविष्य में नहीं बन सकेंगी। इस तरह की दस बीस मिसालें तो मैं आपके सामने दे ही सकता हूँ। देश में जो भी अभी तक यूनिवर्सिटीयाँ बनी हैं, पहले उनके लिए रुपया जमा किया गया है तब उनका काम आगे हुआ है। हाल ही में संस्कृत यूनिवर्सिटी बनाने की कोशिश की जा रही है। इस तरह की देश में अलग अलग यूनिवर्सिटीयाँ बनेंगी मगर आपने जो बन्धन लगा दिया है उससे वे पैदा ही नहीं हो सकेंगी। अगर देश में आप ज्यादा शिक्षा चाहते हैं और यह चाहते हैं कि लोग अपने प्रयत्नों से यूनिवर्सिटी खोलें तो इस एक्ट में जो बन्धन लगा दिया गया है उसको हटाना होगा और मेरे ख्याल में यह बन्धन नामुनासिब है। इस बन्धन का एक नतीजा यह भी होगा कि नई संस्थाएँ नए प्रयोग व अनुसंधान नहीं कर सकेंगी। जैसे वर्धा से "वर्धा प्रणाली" में शिक्षा दी जाती है, अगर हमने इस तरह का कोई बन्धन लगा दिया तो यह देश के लिए अच्छी चीज नहीं होगी। इस बारे में सिलेक्ट कमेटी को जरूर कुछ न कुछ इंतजाम करना चाहिए।

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सब निहायत काम-काज होगा अगर हम देश की तालीम को महीनरी के पर ढाल सकें। हमें ऐसी शिक्षा प्रणाली

पर गौर करना होगा जिससे हमारे देश में जो बेकारी बढ़ रही है वह रुके। आज देश में आता है कि बेकारी ज्यादातर पढ़े लिखे लोगों में हो गई है जो कि कोट पेंट पहन कर घूमने निकलते हैं, जो लोग पढ़े लिखे नहीं हैं, उनमें बेकारी कम है। आज शहरों में ही ज्यादातर पढ़े लिखे लोग बेकार मिलेंगे। इसका कारण यह है कि हमारे देश में जो शिक्षा दी जा रही है, जिस तरह से बी० ए० और एम० ए० पास करके निकल रहे हैं, उनमें इतनी लियकत नहीं होती है कि वे व्यवहारी दुनिया का भी कोई काम कर सकें। अभी थोड़ा ही असें की बात है, एक लड़का जो कि बी० ए० पास था और साथ ही ला का विद्यार्थी था, जब उससे किसी आदमी को टेलीफोन करने के लिए कहा गया तो उसे तार छूने में भी डर मालूम हुआ और कहने लगा कि इस तार में करंट तो नहीं है। इस तरह की शिक्षा आजकल हमारे देश में दी जा रही है। आजकल इम्तहान पास करना एक मजाक सा हो गया है। इम्तहान के दिन में हिस्ट्री, जागरफी और दूसरी चीज रट ली, नोट्स पढ़ लिए या दूसरे जरिए से डिग्री हासिल कर ली। अगर कोई लड़का पढ़ता भी है तो वह इम्तहान ही तक उस चीज को याद रखता है, उसके बाद भूल जाता है। आप किसी बी० ए० वाले से कोई खत लिखने को कहिए तो एक खत लिखने में वह १० गर्लियाँ करेगा। इसके मुकाबले में एक पुराना विज्ञान-भंडन अच्छा खत लिख लेगा।

यह सब हमारी तालीम का नतीजा है जो हमारे मुल्क में दी जा रही है। आज बहुत सा रुपया हायर तालीम में खर्च किया जा रहा है। बी० ए० और एम० ए० या पी० एच० डी० करके दूसरे मुल्कों में भेजा जाता है, इस तरह से लाखों रुपया खर्च किया जाता है। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि एक तरफ तो राजस्थान में २५ प्रतिशत लोग बेपढ़ हैं और दूसरी ओर आप लाखों रुपया हायर एजुकेशन में खर्च कर रहे हैं। पहले आप एक तरह की तालीम सब को दे दीजिए फिर बाद में आप हायर तालीम दे सकते हैं। जितना रुपया आप इस तरह लोगों को बाहर भेजने में खर्च कर रहे हैं, वह रुपया आप यहाँ के लोगों को

बेहतर तालीम देने में लगाने, जिससे कि आज जो बेकारी देश के लिए खतरा बन रही है, वह न रहे। अगर हमने ऐसा किया तो हम असली मानों में अपने देश के लोगों को तालीम दे सकेंगे और बेकारी की समस्या को हमेशा के लिए खत्म कर सकेंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसकी ताईद करता हूँ।

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE
(Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to mention just a few points and I hope I am not repeating what others have said, although I would like to emphasise some of the points again. Certainly, the whole idea of this Commission is excellent, because it is absolutely necessary to have some co-ordination between the different Universities and an understanding by which there could be a common policy for India and a common principle for Indian education. This policy being excellent, it has to be helped first not only by understanding what is education, what is university education, but also by understanding the educationists. It is important to know what educationists think, what educationists have experienced and also to recognise the real educationists, because an educationist is not necessarily one who has passed through a University and then, stage by stage, attained a high position. The point is that there is no difference between that person and a man or a girl who has passed B.A. or M.A. A real educationist is an idealist who has a vision of India as a whole, of the needs of the nation, of what is necessary for the young men or young women, and who has a very clear idea of the result of education, not only of the method of education. We are always thinking about methods of education, but very few people are able to define what they finally want, what sort of young man they want. Can anyone describe an ideal youth? Can anyone give a picture of that youth when he is a finished product from a University? Therefore there must be pioneers who have not only great love for education but even more, love for

the person who is being educated. If I may say so, one of the unfortunate things that happens today is not so much the hooliganism in the Universities and colleges but the real cause of that hooliganism. What is the cause of it? I think the fundamental cause is lack of understanding between the taught and the teacher. I see that amongst many people there is no real love for the young people or any real understanding of the aspirations and the feelings of youth, so that they may be helped to become true citizens. Therefore a real educationist is one who loves the cause. Today unfortunately there are many teachers and professors who take up this job not because they love it but because it is a way of earning money and because very often they cannot find jobs elsewhere. This is most unfortunate. So national policy must not merely include the teaching of the student but also the teaching of the teacher. I would therefore like to submit that there should be a clear policy with regard to education. What is our principle? Who is an educated person? Is he one who is educated in a University, who is literate or has a degree? Very often it happens that the illiterate as well as the literate are uneducated persons. I would like to have as motto this that the cultured individual alone is the educated individual.

If there is culture, then there is education. So we have to work for culture which is the highest form of education and in that connection I would like to mention that I am especially glad about the second clause where there is provision for recognition of special places of studies other than Universities in the ordinary accepted term. Surely it is important that that particular clause should have a great deal of attention. We are having plenty of attention given to ordinary Universities as they exist today but we do want much more of special types of educational institutions which are based on culture and

[Shrimati Rukmini Arundale.] even more, which are based upon the Indian way of life. It is unfortunate that in a way today we are really carrying on much of the British education which we, at one time, decried. We said at one time that British education was wrong for India but I am afraid we are carrying it on because the students of the schools and colleges are completely western individuals, western in their ways of living, western in their outlook, western in their thought, western even in their culture or shall I say, trying to be western in their culture because usually they have neither the culture of the East nor the culture of the West. So the result is, we are producing the type of citizen of whom we are afraid—of whom I personally am afraid—because these students are certainly going to be one day Ministers of Education or other Ministers and I fear to think of what is going to happen to India when they are old enough to rule our country. Where is the Indian ideal of education? How many times did Gandhiji speak about the Indian ideal of education? What was it that was established by Dr. Rabindranath Tagore? Was Dr. Rabindranath Tagore not an example to us? Was he educated in the ordinary way or did he educate himself? Because he was a pioneer, he could think for himself and so he understood the spirit of India and realized what India's needs are. In the Bill, I find there is a clause where it seems to be laid down that the Government is going to direct the policy of education, and the Government will have a complete voice in everything. If that is the case, where is going to be the place for the pioneer? where is the place for the person who wants to experiment? The one who wants to experiment is bound to be an individual who is not approved of in the beginning until the world recognizes him. If the world recognizes him, then we shall recognise him. In other words, he has to struggle and he has to live in that struggle and he has to pass away and after he has passed away,

then we begin to appreciate him when we don't even have the advantage of that individual's presence. Even Dr. Tagore did say at one time that after he got the Nobel Prize, he was more appreciated in India than he was before he got it. We have no eyes to see, we have no ears to hear and we don't understand. I think the Government need not have so much control. If they give more place for educationists and Vice-Chancellors and others, if they would give more freedom to those who want to experiment in education may be, we shall have some geniuses who will rise in our country and we may be able to establish a great Indian University like the University of Taxila and so on.

I should like to see the real Indian spirit fostered. We may have an idea that we are Indian but we don't have the Indian spirit. We have become completely un-Indianized in every way. In fact, if I may say so, the modern individual does not even know any more how to sit on the floor. He has European furniture in his home and our homes have become completely westernised. I hope I will not be considered rude if I say that my first shock when I came to Delhi was when I saw all the homes which are so completely Western. We have so lost the use of our muscles, that we don't any more know how to sit on the floor even, and as such, how can we change the thought of the people? We speak about educating the villagers. Don't we realize that we have a tremendous amount to learn from the villagers? Their beauty, their simplicity and their outlook is something very outstanding. We want to give literacy to them but in many things they are our inspiration. The village is the greatest centre of education, it is a great centre where there are beautiful places, where there are trees, there are lakes, there are mountains but now we have our Universities in cities where the buildings are ugly, in environments which are completely uninspiring. The village is naturally a very important place because it inspires us towards character.

We find that inspiration in the villages particularly in the field of art. Surely in order to be a cultured individual, art must have a very strong place in education. Every University must be a place of high art but not art taught as an extra subject but art as part of the educational curriculum, art permeating the whole spirit of education, beauty permeating the spirit of education, and simplicity permeating the spirit of education. This is the real Indian spirit and I should like to see here and there and everywhere a number of Indian institutions growing up in that spirit. In this connection I would like to mention particularly the education of women. There should be certainly a tremendous change in the way that our women are educated. It is unfortunate to see that today girls are really going to boys' institutions. They are not going to girls' institutions. When I say girls' education, I am not saying that the place of the women is just only to sit in the home and that she must cook and sew only. She must cook, she must sew but she must do other things as well. I should like to see a University which has the picture of the ideal Indian womanhood. Surely there is no floubt about it that our so-called uneducated women were—I can say from personal experience—some of the most cultured people of our country. How often we find that if we go into many Indian homes, the early education was due to the inspiration of the mothers and grand-mothers. You go to Malabar and you will see that the Ramayana or Mahabharata, the learning of Sanskrit—all these came from the mothers and from the grandmothers and the sons and grand-sons have never forgotten the early inspiration that they derived from those great women who are still living today—thank God—because from them we can get the inspiration to evolve a new system of education. But I don't understand our modern girls at all because they are getting more and more westernised but it seems to me not westernised in a cultured sense but more and more

so, according to their ideal which is the ideal of a cinema star. This is what we find in our modern education. If girls go to school and learn cooking, they don't know how to cook when they come home because they don't have all the modern equipment, because they look down upon their grandmothers who are very very old-fashioned. Simplicity has no place in our modern education. We must have equipment, we must have experts, we must have machines and we must have so many other things. Why must we not go back to our simplicity even though we may be able to improve certain things by using these techniques? I am not saying that we should not travel to many countries or that we should not appreciate what is in other countries or that we should not even borrow from other countries but wherever we go, we must remain ourselves. I am afraid our Indian young people don't remain themselves. We send them to learn things from the other countries but what do they learn from the other countries? They learn all the machinery of the other countries. They may learn all the wonderful things and the experiments others are making in education and other fields and they come home and then they want to put what they have learnt, into practice in India. They understand the country to which they have been but they don't understand the countries to which they come back. So what do they do? They want to teach Indians how to be new and how to be different, how to be modern and "to live according to our times" as the wonderful phrase goes. What is "according to our times" except a conglomeration of civilizations, a conglomeration of ideals which are not clear and which have no perception? Where is that integrity, where is the spirituality, where is the education for character? I would like to say with the greatest emphasis that as in our ancient times, service must be the motto of education; and if there is study, it is in order that we may serve better, not in order that we may earn better. Surely capacity is greater

[Shrimati Rukmini Arundale.] than degree. Capacity is the highest degree that you can have. And capacity is not merely knowing how to do things, but is the understanding of people.

We always get experts from other countries for various purposes and I am sorry to say that whenever I hear of experts coming, I am always afraid, for I feel we are going one step farther away from India, generally speaking. Let experts come. Let us listen to them. But we must have our clear ideas, our principles, and we must adopt only that which will not spoil our fundamental spirit, our religion and our jutlook, whatever this may be. But if the experts are going to ruin our outlook, then I feel it is a very great tragedy. There is no work that is greater than education. I say this because we are now making India, we are making the new India, we are creating the new India; and what we need today is not merely slow improvements, but a revolution in education, revolution in our ways, revolution in our hearts and what is even more, a revolution in our hearts to become truly Indian in the real sense of the word, to become truly spiritual. But we do not find this in modern life. Unfortunately, the most beautiful womanhood, if I may say so, the Indian woman, the Indian ideal of woman—why should she not have modern education and yet remain a beautiful Indian woman? But instead, we are setting bad examples. It is not enough to teach, it is necessary to set good examples, to teach by example. Why must she be an expert at conversation and cocktail parties?

SHRI P. T. LEUVA (Bombay): Elders spoil them.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE: Well, it is because elders are spoilt that the young ones also get spoilt. That is why I say we must set an example and we must, teach by example, not merely by words. It is just because our teaching is by mere words that the student's respect for the teacher is

vanishing, and we hear so many complaints. But I think in the Indian youth there is still the spirit of reverence. In the Indian youth there is still the tremendous respect towards the ideal. They are naturally idealistic but we are not doing anything for them, because our education is not built upon the evolution of character. If character is there, the desire to learn will be there and if the desire to learn is there, then learning will come. We hear of the ancient universities where the students used to go. They used to enjoy the discussions there. Their desire for knowledge was great. Knowledge was not imposed upon them, they sought it. We must not merely give degrees. We must stimulate the desire to have knowledge and the ideal university is that where this is done. I would like to see great emphasis laid on this type of university, the university which is Indian. Let us also have those very special institutions where Indian culture is the basis, special places where Indian philosophies, modern philosophies comparative religion and all these ideas are taught, where there is art, where there is beauty, where the Individual is not merely deemed educated because he can read or write, but where his manners, his speech, his way of life, the waj' h? moves with others, where everything together finally will go to produce the educated individual, the individual who is cultured. Then only will Indian culture come forward. We speak of the "*ashrams*" of the rishis of yore, of the great ideas that they taught. But we are always trying to borrow from other countries, as if we ourselves have nothing. If we study modern psychology, we think it is up-to-date. Is there anybody who studies psychology as has been expounded by our ancient people? Even in dancing, if you study the Shas-tra of dancing, there is a tremendous amount of study of psychology, the study of the emotions. In this connection, I would like to say that youth is emotional. Humanity is emotional and youth particularly, and we must give something for their emotions to develop properly. But we give them nothing

that they desire. Let us give them some thing constructive. Let us give them creative work. Let us give them art, which will refine their emotion. Let us give them ways of service so that there is outlet for their energy. If this is done, then that energy will surely become something greater, something spiritual, something wonderful. And after all, for what do we want degrees in our country? We want human-beings. We want human-beings who are human. We want human-beings who are spiritual; we want human-beings who are outstanding, and what is more, we want an atmosphere in which great human-beings can flourish. And that is the atmosphere that we must create in our educational institutions and in our universities.

Sir, this is all that I wanted to speak about and I would like very much that those who are considering the provisions of this Bill, will conceive a way of education in terms of the ideal of Indian citizenship. Let us give Indian education for India and when Indian education is there for India, then India shall not only be a country which shines in the political field, but a country that will be like a light-house for all other countries. Then surely the peace for which we are working will be a permanent and eternal peace, because it will not be merely a political peace but a peace that is the result of a change of heart.

SHRIMATI PUSHPALATA DAS (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, after Shrimati Rukmm: Devi's speech and the pictures she presented to us of ancient India and its *ashrams*, from all those pictures we must now turn into realities. I do not want to touch the idealistic plane, although we should all now try to reach that stage. I will now come to the Bill.

As far as the name of the Bill is concerned, I have nothing against it—it is called the University Grants Commission Bill, 1954. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is given:

"The Constitution of India vests Parliament with exclusive authority

in regard to co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions".

About this I have something to say It says further:

"It is obvious that neither coordination nor determination of standards is possible unless the Central Government has some voice in the determination of standards of teaching and examination in Universities".

Sir, if that is the object, then the title of the Bill, should, I feel, have been "Universities Bill" or University Control Bill or something like that. If it is to be a measure dealing with the grants, then the Bill must confine its activities only to the giving of grants. When we study the condition, of the other universities which we are following as our ideal, we find that there the Government is merely sanctioning the grants to the universities for higher education. On the raising of standard, and other matters, the Government does not have the final say. But here we see something of centralisation even in the field of education. Therefore, we feel that Government by the provisions of this Bill will be curtailing the autonomy of the Universities. Clause 12 conflicts with clause 13 of the Bill. As regards clause 5 of the Bill which deals with the composition of the Commission, I have to say this. One provision under this clause says.

"Not less than one-third of the number of members shall be chosen from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities and heads of institutions deemed to be Universities under section 3."

Sir, if we are going to have Vice-Chancellors on this Commission and if the Commission is also to have the power to direct inspection, then I wonder how that impartiality which we want to maintain, which even the hon. Parliamentary Secretary stressed in his speech can be had. It was said that the Commission should be out of the way.

[Shrimati Pushpalata Das.] these political infringements, all group politics and if it should be an impartial body, it would be how it can be an impartial body if some of the Vice-Chancellors are also there and they are also going to recommend about grants and other such things.

•4 P.M.

We are going to appoint a body which will make recommendations about the grants to be given. The university Commission under the Chairmanship of Dr. Radhakrishnan, appointed by the Government of India, recommended a body consisting of five members and also a panel of experts. I think that is a nice suggestion. The body should not be unwieldy. If we increase the number, the question of quorum also will arise. If we have a panel of six men, who should be salaried whole-time employees, then it will be very good; the members will have time to study the problems in regard to each University. We want the members in this body to be impartial, if we have men connected with the Universities, I do not know how they will be impartial. So, they must not be there, especially as regards the post of Chairman is concerned. Whether the Chairman will be nominated or selected is another question but it appears that the majority of the Members who have spoken are in favour of a nominated Chairman. Such a Chairman will be above politics. Whether the Chairman has any degrees or not is a different question. Shrimati Rukminidevi quoted something about Tagore and Mahatma. If we have got a personality of that calibre, and if that personality is nominated as chairman all that we do would be dignified but we do not know whether that type of man would be available or not. Whatever it may be, I think the Chairman must be nominated by the Government but the Central Government must not be the final authority. There might be occasions when there would be clashes between the Government and the Commission in regard to the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission

and so the Central Government should not have the final say in these matters. If the Central Government were to have the final say, then the Universities would lose their autonomy. As far as I have been able to gather, the underlying idea of this Bill is to effect uniformity in all Universities. If it were the idea that the Central Government could ask the Grants Commission to cancel certain grants, in my opinion, it would be too autocratic on the part of the Government as also on the part of the Commission. In this context, clauses 12 and 13 come into conflict with each other and the Joint Committee should think over this matter.

Another point that I wish to bring forward is this. If the Centre takes responsibility for graduate and postgraduate courses and leaves the field up to Secondary Education stage to the State Governments which is now to include up to the Intermediate stage—the conflict between the State and the Centre would be removed to a greater extent.

In the case of under-developed people and areas, the population should not be taken into consideration. If they are really backward, the Commission must give more grant to those areas. If we are to imitate the standards of the University Grants Committee of the U.K., we should follow in *toto*. The other day, the Parliamentary Secretary said that we wanted to imitate the University Grants Committee of the U.K. but there the Committee is responsible directly to the Treasury; it has no connection with the Education Ministry and the Government there cannot interfere with the University Grants Committee. Here also, I feel that the Government should not interfere with the working of this Commission. Of course, standards must be raised and we must have

uniform standards and the national ideal must be taught in all the Universities. The problem now is the indiscipline amongst the students; the students are misled and if the Vice-Chancellor

j—who has not the executive and the Court to help him—is given full autho-

erty to control the students, he might be able to do it; there should be no interference on that score. If such a power is vested in the Vice-Chancellors and if there is no interference, I think the position will be better; it will not be worse, in any case.

As Shrimati Rukminidevi said, the great Universities of old, Nalanda and Taxila, attracted pupils from all over the world; they were not controlled by the Government or any autocratic power; all the learned people, the geniuses of the country, controlled these Universities and they attracted pupils from all over the world. If India wants to go back to that ideal and height, an ideal and height which was hers once and from which she has fallen, the people have got to be given full freedom as we are having in Shantiniketan and Adyar, from where Shrimati Rukminidevi comes. When we enter Adyar, in the Kalakshetra, it looks as if it is a small University, giving training in arts and crafts and all that. There is freedom in the atmosphere; both the students and the teachers enjoy the spirit that prevailed in those old ashrams, the spirit that we used to have in the old days and which is lost now, due to what reason I do not know; the British domination was one and there were so many other factors. It will take a long time to attain that plane and so, let us not be too idealistic and lose sight of the practical things. We may go step by step; it may take many years but when we have introduced certain principles, we must stick to them. Let not this University Grants Commission Bill be confined to the giving of grants only; if we want and like to interfere with the standards and all that, then the title of the Bill should be changed to a Universities Control Bill or simply Universities Bill or something like that. As far as the title is concerned, if the Bill is only for the disbursement of grants, then there is no conflict between the title and the contents; let the Central Government give the grants to the Commission which, in its turn, can disburse the amounts to the different Universities. If the Centre is going to

interfere with the Commission, then, instead of developing our Universities into powerful and idealistic institutions, we are going to hamper them. I do not want to repeat all the points that have been made; even the point that I am stressing has been repeated by many of my friends but I strongly feel that Government interference must be less, that it should not be a centralised thing and that interference will only end in our not being able to make any progress.

With the placing before the House of the few points that were conflicting in my mind, I finish my speech.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to speak and I deem it a great privilege to speak on this subject because, Sir, education is a fundamental problem in our country in order to build up national character. But, Sir, the subject is so very vast that when I thought of speaking, I felt myself unequal to the task because my only qualification to participate in this debate is that I have come to hold a great ideal and secondly I go to the University in order to see my old masters. Apart from these, Sir, I do not possess any expert knowledge or experience to speak on the subject. As a layman, I would like to put forth certain view-points which I think must be incorporated in this Bill.

Now, Sir, as the Preamble suggests, the Bill is to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission. We have to consider this fundamental question of what is the standard of education which is to be established. I feel, Sir, that the Government should have incorporated in this Bill an educational policy of the Government, as to what should be the future set up of the students that would be sent out from the Universities. It is no use merely saying that the University Grants Commission should be established for the purpose only of giving grants to the various Universities. If you look at the educational history of India you will

[Shri P. T. Leuva.] find that the educational system which was established in our country during the British regime was not meant for the purpose of building up national character, not to give shape to the citizens of our country.

It was meant for the whole purpose which suited them. Now when we have become independent, when we have regained our glory, it was but natural that the Government of India should have come out with its distinct educational policy which is going to guide them in their building of the University education. Unfortunately, Sir, we do not find any thing in the Bill as to the University education which is in the view of the Government. What I feel, Sir, is that so far as University education is concerned, we have to establish a system of education which should have a common link, which should have a common culture for which every University must cater to the needs of the students. It may be true that every region, every State might have different needs, but our aim should be that the education must be based on this ideal that we want to build up a homogeneous culture, in this country. We should have standards laid down that the students who pass out of the University will pass out as genuine Indian citizens. Now-a-days we find a number of Universities in every State. But if you look at them, they are merely what we may call Universities for the purpose of manufacturing graduates. The Universities in India at present are not the seats of learning which they should be. It is for the Government of India to convert these Universities into seats of learning, then only will we be able to achieve the common aim by this Bill. But, Sir, I feel sorry to say that the Bill will not move in that direction at all. What is the function of the University Grants Commission laid down in this Bill? The functions of the Commission have been laid down in clause 12. Now, Sir, it is stated in that clause that "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 in Universities, and for the purpose of effectively discharging it; functions under this Act, the Commission may"

Now, Sir, it means that the standards might be determined by the Commission. Now what are going to be those standards nobody knows. Unless and until the Government of India have got a clear picture before them as to the standard of education or concept of education, until and unless we decide that question first, the University Grants Commission will not be able to do anything in the matter. What is the work that is going to be entrusted to the Commission? The work will be the disbursement of the grants that might be put at its disposal by the Government from time to time. Barring that, the Grants Commission cannot do anything else. It is therefore necessary that there must be a statement of educational policy incorporated in this Bill itself that this Parliament approves a particular line of education which is to be given to the children of this country. Now an argument will be raised that this would be an interference with the autonomy of the universities. Now, Sir, I would only humbly submit that there is no question of the autonomy of the Universities being displaced or interfered with at all because once you lay down a standard it would be for the University to function in such a manner as to carry the standard into effect. There would not be any interference with the day to day administration of the University at all. What we want is that the standard of education so far as the Universities are concerned, the minimum standard at least, must be laid down by the Government which must be followed by every University in our country. There are so many Universities in this country and some of them even are not governed by State Acts or Central Acts, but they have got their own standard of education which they think

suits the conditions in that particular area. What I say is that in order to bring about unity in this country it is necessary that certain basic minimum standards must be laid down by the Government as a matter of policy. Now if you read this Bill you will find that there is no mention regarding the University educational policy of the Government of India in it. Secondly, Sir, the University Grants Commission has been given the authority of making recommendations to the Universities concerned for the purpose of reforming or improving the standards of teaching or examinations. Now the recommendations might be made by the University Grants Commission but in case of breach, what is the authority vested in the University Grants Commission? There is only one power and that is that the University Grants Commission may refuse to give grants to the Universities concerned, or they may recommend to the Central Government and the State Governments to refuse to grant them any further assistance from the State coffers. Now, Sir, this would be a half-hearted measure. If you want really to have an educational policy which must have a common aim suitable to the Indian culture, it is absolutely necessary that there must be uniformity and also power in the hands of the Government or the University Grants Commission to enforce the recommendations of the University Grants Commission. It is no use merely giving this power that in case they fail to act according to the recommendations given, the grants will not be given to them.

Now, Sir, the whole question before us is as to what should be the educational policy of our country. If we agree on that point, certainly, Sir, the Select Committee can have suitable provision made in the Bill itself. Now, as far as I can see, Sir, we must now stop the manufacture of these graduates indiscriminately. We have to produce citizens who are in a position to shoulder the responsibility of ideal citizens, and we must be remembering,

8 R.S.D.

Sir, our old motto, what the aim of education was, and it has been stated very pithily in one sentence and it is said what is the content of education

“सा विद्या या विमुक्तये” Education is that which gives power in the hands of men to attain salvation. That is the intention and content of our whole aim of education. At present, Sir, if I may say so, the Universities and the students of such Universities are not capable of attaining salvation. If I may say so, the present system of education does not lead to salvation but leads to starvation. The graduates that come out of the University do not gain any capacity to earn their livelihood or even to live as decent citizens. In order to change this position we have to change the whole standard of education. We have to strike at the very root of the education. We must build such citizens who will work for the benefit of the country, who will have dignity of labour as their aim.

Now, Sir, can we find this motto, can we find this idea anywhere in this Bill? Only we are making provision for placing certain grants at the disposal of the Commission.

Now, Sir, one thing to which I want to make a reference is regarding the Bill itself. In every Bill you will find, Sir, that in the Bill itself a provision is made regarding the territorial extent of the Bill. I find, Sir, in this Bill that there is no mention anywhere as to the territorial application of this Bill at all. No doubt, Sir, in clause 1(2) it says "It shall come into force on such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint."

But nowhere will you find mentioned anything as to the territorial application of this Bill. I hope this is due to oversight and not due to deliberate omission. If it was deliberate omission we would like to know the reasons which impelled the Gov-

[Shri P. T. Leuva.] ernment to make no mentioa fcbout it | in the Objects and Reasons.

There is another thing to which I would like to make a reference and that is regarding the power to make rules. Under sub-clause 2(c) of clause

26, the Central Government has been given powers to make rules regarding the terms and conditions of services of employees appointed by the Commission. I cannot understand why the same power should have been given to the Commission also under clause

27. There it is said that the Commission may, subject to the previous approval of the Central Government, make regulations consistent with this Act and the rules made thereunder.... specifying the terms and conditions of service of the employees appointed by the Commission. That power has already been taken by the Government and I do not understand why there should have been duplication in this matter. In case this power is given to two different authorities it is likely that there will be conflicts. Of course, the Commission has to make these rules in consultation with the Government but if the aim is to give this power to the Government then it should be withdrawn from the Commission or if the aim is to give it to the Commission, then it should be withdrawn from the Government.

Sir, much has been said regarding the appointment of the Commission itself. I feel that the Commission is too small a body to be of any service to the country. There are as many as 27 States in the country and there are a number of Universities and just nine persons to look after the work of this Commission would be too small a body. From clause 12 you will find that the Commission has to perform a number of duties and how can you expect such a small body to carry on all this work, to go round and inspect all the Universities and to submit their reports? Then there might be references from the Central Government and the State Governments to

which the Commission will have to attend.

Another thing to which I would like to make reference is that as far as possible the Commission should represent the various territorial interests in the country. Unless and until the Commission is broadbased it may be that the territorial needs of the country may not be satisfied in full. Every region has got its own special requirements and persons who are connected or who have experience and knowledge about the particular region would be in a much better position to judge the demand for grants made from that region and also regarding teaching and other problems. It would therefore be very necessary that the membership of this Commission should be increased. In the beginning probably the problem may not be very acute but as the work of the Commission increases perhaps you will be compelled to come forward again for getting this particular clause amended. So in order to err on the safe side it would be much better if the number is increased beyond what is laid down here. It is not necessary that the Government should appoint all the persons as laid down in the Bill or in the alternative you may say that the Commission, shall not have less than nine persons and not more than

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will not clause 9 satisfy your objection?

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: The Associate Members are only for the purpose of assisting the Commission. The whole idea is that the Commission being a permanent body there must be a permanent member to represent regional interests. The Associate Members will remain on the Commission only as and when a particular problem arises. Suppose there is a question relating to the Bombay University or to the Madras University; perhaps the Commission might associate a person from Madras or Bombay but that does not solve the problem. There is no

permanent member on the Commission. So what I say is that there must be as far as possible regional distribution of the membership of this Commission.

Then there is the question of the nomination of members by the Government. I do not see any reason to show that the present composition of the Commission will in any way be dominated by the Government policy. It is quite true that the Government of India will nominate all the members of the Commission. Two of the members will be chosen from among

the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government. I cannot understand how the Vice-Chancellors if they are nominated by the Government would cease to be independent merely because they have been appointed by the Government. In certain Universities the Vice-Chancellors themselves are nominated by the Government; in certain Universities they might be elected. But so far as Bombay State is concerned, the Vice-Chancellors of practically all the Universities are nominated by the Government. They are not elected by the Senate or the Court of the University. So merely because you take in Vice-Chancellors by means of an election to the University Grants Commission, it will not in any way alter their attitude towards the work of the Commission. So this fear that nomination by the Government will in any way reflect only the Government policy or they will be under the thumb of the Government has no value whatsoever. Then it is said that the remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions. This is rather very vague. There can be no machinery by which you can get such persons to the University Grants Commission. Necessarily you will have to give this power to the Government who can find suitable persons. So if you have any system of elections that will not work at all. Instead of having this power of nomination, the

Government can, in order to get the various interests represented, choose Members of Parliament to represent such interests. In so many Commissions we find Members of Parliament being appointed, but strangely enough in this University Grants Commission where money is going to be sanctioned and disbursed, Members of Parliament have not been given representation. I do not understand why it was not possible for the Government to give representation to Members of Parliament and I would submit that Members of Parliament should be given representation on this Commission.

Regarding Chairman, it has not been made clear whether he would be a full-time member or only a part-time member. Again, the Government must at least give their inclination as to the character of the person who is going to be appointed as Chairman. I would like to know whether it would be accepted by the Government as a matter of policy that the Chairman of the Commission shall not be one of those persons who are officers of the Government. If you really want anybody to function as Chairman of the University Grants Commission with independence, then he must not be a person who is already in Government service. The reason is that not only that officer will be burdened with other duties of the Department but that he will neither have the time nor that aptitude for work which will be necessary for carrying on the work of the Commission. I would therefore submit that in the Joint Committee it must be made definitely clear in the statute itself that the Chairman shall not be one of the persons chosen by the Government as officers of the Central Government.

Now, Sir, another thing to which I would like to make a reference is that our Universities should be so established that they become specialised institutions for particular subjects only. Every University at present has become an omnibus institution of teaching. Whenever you find a University, that University teaches all

[Shri P. T. Leuva.] subjects under the sun, whether they have got necessary talent or not becomes immaterial. But the moment there is a University, that University must give B.A. degree, B.Sc. degree, then Engineering degree, law degree, etc. and in this way the standard of those students who take such degrees has become very low. It is, therefore, necessary that the University Grants Commission should be charged with this duty that they must advise the Universities that they should specialise in certain subjects which might be convenient to their own atmosphere. Take for example a very highly industrialised city like Bombay. In such a city, there is an atmosphere for technological research or commerce. Now, if such Universities are burdened with teaching of all the subjects under the sun, I think the quality of education will suffer.

Another thing that should be borne in mind is this. When new Universities are established it is highly necessary that we should, as far as possible, encourage the establishment of residential Universities and not merely affiliating Universities. Residential and teaching Universities only, will create a suitable type of citizens in our country. In our country the students who go to colleges are as large in number as the students found in a European University. In our country a college might be having two thousand students, while in European countries you will find that the whole University has got two thousand students. This is because mostly those Universities are teaching and residential Universities and not merely affiliating and examining Universities. I submit that the University Grants Commission must make it a point that this trend towards affiliating Universities should be discouraged.

Another point is that only Universities can confer a degree upon a person. I feel this is another provision which should be made in this Bill. You will find in this country so many persons

who style themselves M.D.(H), M.B. (H), that is persons who have never visited a University, who have never studied in a University. But they go on parading in this country as if they are graduates of a University, especially these homeopathic doctors. They always write M.D.(H). I would, therefore, submit that unless and until a person has been granted a degree by an approved University, he should not be allowed to style himself as a graduate. And a specific provision must be made that a person who styles himself as having a degree from a University which is not approved by Government, will be liable to punishment. This is very necessary, because in this country so many persons without any academic qualification style themselves as graduates and deceive persons who are unwary. I would, therefore, submit that in addition to the right of the Universities to confer degrees, this also must be made penal under this Act.

With these words I support this measure.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am very grateful to hon. Members who have participated in this debate and who have made valuable suggestions. As the Bill is being referred to a Select Committee, I do not propose to go into the details of the Bill and the various suggestions which Members have made. I am very happy that on the whole there has been a general welcome of the measure that the Government have introduced. There are, however, one or two points which I think I should deal with at this stage. Most of the Members have expressed the fear that by introducing this legislation the autonomy of the Universities might be endangered.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Not by introducing the Bill, but by particular clauses.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Well, Sir, there are certain clauses, for example, clauses 13 and 20 to which objection has been taken. I was going to

come to those clauses. There is no reason why anybody should suspect the motive; of the Government. The main purpose which the Government have before them is to reorganise our University Education. The purpose is not to exercise control over the Universities. If we have to exercise limited control, it is only a means to achieve certain ends. Most of the Members have also expressed some sort of dissatisfaction with the type of education that is being imparted. Now, as I said, I am not one of those who would run down the Universities, but at the same time we should not have any sense of complacency. The Universities have to be reorganised, but we are anxious that the autonomy of the Universities should be preserved. Government have accepted a democratic Constitution and if we are to achieve those democratic Purposes, it can only be by practising democracy in our educational institutions. Universities are and can be the greatest bulwark of democracy. And I have no doubt, Sir, that the measure which we are introducing will safeguard the interests of the Universities, and will also assure the Government that the funds are being properly utilised.

Now, Sir, the question that the last speaker raised was that there is no mention of the policy of education. The policy of education cannot be different from the national policies. And national policies cannot be very different from the Constitution that a society or a State has accepted. And, therefore, broad policies, as far as I have been able to understand, are laid down in our Constitution. The report of the University Education Commission has made it very clear that the aims and objectives of University education are the aims and objectives of democracy. And I may assure the House that the Government are anxious to preserve the freedom of the Universities, so that we may be able to release creative energies among our young people. We are anxious to preserve the freedom of our Universities, because it is only in an atmosphere of

freedom that the professors and the teachers and the students can pursue truth and knowledge. It is only in an atmosphere of freedom that truth can be sought. And I may assure the House that the Government are most anxious to preserve those ideals of liberty and freedom not only in the Universities, but in the society as a whole.

Now, with this assurance, I would like to deal with the question of autonomy at some length. I would like to submit, Sir, that in no University, as far as I know, is autonomy absolute. There is nothing like absolute or unconditional autonomy for a University. There are various ways in which the State exercises supervision and control over the Universities. Take for example the grant of a charter itself. When a charter is granted to a University, the field in which that University exercises its autonomy is always restricted. It is restricted by the fundamental laws which the Charter lays down, and the Universities cannot alter those laws. It is true that within that framework which has been laid down for the Universities, they are free. The teachers have academic freedom, the students are free to learn. But there is that restriction which is imposed by the State. There is nothing like absolute freedom. Now, Sir, the State has some responsibility towards all its institutions, including universities. The State cannot just disburse funds and be completely indifferent to what is happening to those funds. It is the duty and the responsibility of the State to see that funds which are disbursed are utilised properly.

Now, Sir, an example has been given of England. It is true that English Universities have a tradition. They have a tradition of democracy, and they have developed their educational institutions in certain atmosphere of freedom. But even in England where State supervision is minimum, there have been Royal Commissions on the Universities of Oxford, Cam,

- [Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

bridge, Scotland, London, Wales and Durham. All the Universities did not welcome the appointment of these Commissions, but there were some which welcomed these Commissions, and these Commissions did a lot of good to these Universities. Then, Sir, in many countries, the State maintains its hold on the Universities through its control over major appointments. This practice is prevalent in Europe and in other places also. And then there is always the power of the purse which a State can exercise. Now, I have already said, Sir, that the Government are most anxious to maintain and preserve the autonomy of the Universities, because we feel that it is only in an atmosphere of freedom that we shall be able to train our citizens with a democratic ideal. But at the same time when we raise this question of autonomous Universities, we also have to ask ourselves whether the State has any responsibility or not. We have also to ask ourselves whether Universities, left to themselves, will change themselves to suit the needs and requirement; of our changing society. I do not, by any means, wish to suggest that Universities should change themselves with any change in a democratic party. But we are, Sir, living in a period of great change. I think it is the duty of a University to understand this change, and to interpret that change to its young graduates. They should understand the significance of what is happening in our society. Whether this change is good or bad, it is for the University to evaluate, but they must be aware of the changes that are taking place. They cannot be indifferent to them. Now, Sir, the question is: Should the Universities be left to themselves, and should they be allowed to go any way they like, regardless of the national policies? After all, when a University is established, it is a social institution. It is established by the society, and it should be in conformity with the ideals, with the culture of the people, which it serves. It cannot be comple-

tely indifferent to those basic ideals of life, which we all of us cherish.

Now, Sir, the example has also been given of the University Grants Committee of the United Kingdom. But there is a difference between the University Grants Commission and the University Grants Committee of England. And some things are in our favour, and some things are in their favour. Ours, Sir, will be a statutory-body, whereas the University Grants Committee of England is appointed by the Treasury. To my mind, Sir, the University Grants Commission will have a greater status and a greater prestige. The terms of reference of the University Grants Committee in England have been revised from time to time. And, if you look at the latest terms of reference, you will notice that they have introduced a very significant change. And may I say, Sir, that if we look at that clause, the purpose of our Bill is not very different from the purpose which the University Grants Committee has in view? I shall here, Sir, read out the terms of reference of the University Grants Committee. The present terms of reference are as follows:

"to enquire into the financial needs of University education in Great Britain;

to advise the Government as to the application of any grants made by Parliament towards meeting them;

to collect, examine and make available information relating to University education through the United Kingdom."

And this is the last clause that has been added, Sir:

"to assist in consultation with the Universities and other bodies concerned in the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of the Universities as may, from time to time, be required in

order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs."

Sir, I was suggesting that no University can be indifferent.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Where are the powers of inspection?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am coming to that.

I was suggesting that no University can be indifferent to the national needs and national requirements, and as I have already said, this is a Committee appointed by the Treasury. No detailed rules and regulations were framed except those which the Committee framed themselves for day to day working. Now, Sir we have to remember that we cannot adopt such institutions *in toto*. We have to consider our own tradition. I should like to read in this connection the speech which Sir Walter Moberly made at the Commonwealth Conference in 1948. He posed the question whether the idea of a University Grants Committee could be exported. This was the reply he gave:

"Obviously I cannot answer that question, but I should like to mention certain traditions which seem to me to help it in the United Kingdom. First, there is our national tradition, which abhors regimentation and favours the growth of guilds and voluntary societies.

Secondly, both in England and in Scotland the ancient Universities had for long enjoyed a high prestige before any grants were made on any considerable scale....."

He gives various arguments. I do not want to read all of them because my time is limited. Lastly, he says:

"Lastly, an important condition has been our national habit of not pushing theories to their logical conclusion. There has been little disposition to draw deductive inferences from the principles of either of autonomy or of the need for central planning."

We cannot forget the growth of democratic traditions in England. We have to develop the same traditions. And conventions which would make the University Grants Commission successful.

So far as the Government are concerned, they are most anxious to preserve the autonomy of the Universities. In a democratic society, we have on the one hand the laymen whose opinion is valuable and whose opinion is expressed either through Parliament or through Government. We have also to respect the opinion of the expert, and the closest co-operation has to be developed between the experts and the laymen. There must be mutual partnership between the experts and the laymen if a democratic society is to succeed. Sir, I wish to submit that the University Grants Commission that we are establishing will help in establishing that partnership between the State on the one hand and the Universities on the other. I would therefore like to suggest to hon. Members that they need have no fears on that account.

I should like to say a few words with regard to one or two points which were raised during the course of the debate. Criticism was made of the work of the present University Grants Commission. As soon as the Commission came into existence, the first thing which they did was to attend to the needs of the teachers. That, I think, is the most primary thing. We cannot have first rate Universities in our country and we cannot have a first-rate nation, unless we have first-rate teachers in our educational institutions, and therefore the University Grants Commission helped all the Universities to raise the salaries of their teachers, and I am glad to say that they have succeeded. The University Grants Commission decided to take up the question of the upgrading of the University teachers, and as a first step, the Commission decided to raise the scale of salaries in Universities to Rs. 800-40-1000-50-1250 for University

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.] Professors and Rs. 250-25-500 for Lecturers wherever their existing scales were lower and the difference between the salary actually drawn by the University Professor or Lecturer and the salary he would have drawn if he had been on the scale proposed by the Commission is being paid as a personal allowance to those teachers, with effect from the 1st July 1954. I may inform the House that the Government propose to continue this scheme till the end of the Five Year Plan period, and I hope that it will also be carried on till the end of the Second Five Year Plan. Sir, we would very much like to bring in the affiliated colleges under this scheme, but the task is colossal and the funds at the disposal of the Government are limited. This will have to be a gradual step.

Sir, objection was raised by some Members that the Vice-Chancellors should not be on the University Grants Commission because they will not be able to maintain impartiality, and when the Question of their University or of their province or State comes, they may adopt an attitude of partiality. Sir, if we cannot have impartial Vice-Chancellors in our country, then there is no future for this country. If we cannot even get a few leading educationists in the country, who can work with a sense of integrity, who can work with a sense of responsibility, I think that all our democratic institutions are in danger. I however believe that among the Vice-Chancellors we have men of talent, ability, character, and integrity, who would be able to serve on the Commission. It is they who understand the affairs of the Universities. They are the experts in the matter, and there is no reason why Vice-Chancellors should not be there.

There are other points but I do not propose to deal with them at this stage, because the Select Committee will go into all the details. I wish to

close my speech with the remark that hon. Members need not have any apprehensions with regard to the work of the University Grants Commission. It will be a guardian of the liberty of the Universities as it will be a guardian of the public funds.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, and resolves that the following Members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee:

Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati
Dr. M. D. D. Gilder
Dr. P. Subbarayan
Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji
Dr. Raghu Vira
Dr. P. V. Kane
Maulana M. Tayyebulla
Shrimati Mona Hensman
Shri T. V. Kamalaswamy
Shri Kishen Chand
Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao
Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar
Dr. Zakir Hussain
Shri C. C. Biswas and
Dr. K. L. Shrimali (the mover)."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House

adjourned till 11 A. M. tomorrow.

The house then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 22nd March 1955.