

LOK SABHA

Monday, 28th February, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 Noon.

**MESSAGES FROM THE RAJYA
SABHA**

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following three messages received from the Secretary of the Rajya Sabha:

(i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill, 1955, which has been passed as amended by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th February, 1955."

(ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 1955, which has been passed as amended by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th February, 1955."

(iii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I

671 L.S.D.

am directed to enclose a copy of the Imports and Exports (Control) Amendment Bill, 1955, which has been passed as amended by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th February 1955."

**INDIAN RAILWAYS (AMENDMENT)
BILL, INSURANCE (AMEND-
MENT) BILL AND IMPORTS
AND EXPORTS (CONTROL)
AMENDMENT BILL.**

Secretary: Sir, I lay the following Bills, as passed by the Rajya Sabha, on the Table of the House:

- (i) The Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill, 1955.
- (ii) The Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 1955.
- (iii) The Imports and Exports (Control) Amendment Bill, 1955.

**UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
BILL.**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion on the motion for reference of the University Grants Commission Bill to a Joint Committee.

As the House is aware, six hours have been allotted for the discussion on this motion. Out of this, three hours and 25 minutes have already been taken on the 22nd February and only two hours and 35 minutes now remain. This would mean that the discussion on this motion will conclude at about 2-35 P.M. when the motion will be put to the vote of the House. Thereafter, the House will take up

[Mr. Speaker]

the consideration of the Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1954, for which 1½ hours have been allotted. After the disposal of this Bill, the Dentists (Amendment) Bill will be taken up.

At 5 P.M. today, the Minister of Finance will present the Budget.

What time will the hon. Parliamentary Secretary require for replying?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): I will take about 40 minutes. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: He has to be given some time after having heard for five hours all that the Members have to say. Perhaps he will try to reply to each and every point. I leave it to him; he will take as short a time as possible and try to curtail. When 40 minutes remain, he will be called upon to reply.

I think before the presentation of the Budget, the House would like to rise for some time. What time will suit?

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): 4-30 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: Originally the proposal was to rise for 15 minutes. I think that is too short a time. The House will rise at 4-30 and re-assemble at 5 P.M. That will leave enough time.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): On the last occasion when we dispersed, I was trying to make out the point that the constitutional propriety of this measure was open to very serious question. Under item 11 of the State List, all education, including university education, is to be within the competence of the States themselves. But there are some exceptions—some circumscribing exceptions—and I would say that entries Nos. 63, 64, 65 and 66 of List I have to be taken into consideration when the Central Gov-

ernment try to assume some control over this sort of education. Now entry No. 66 says that the Central Government can pass a measure for the purpose of prescribing standards or for the purpose of co-ordination, but the present measure, which appears to be a measure for the purpose of setting up standards, determining standards, and for the purpose of co-ordination is really meant to be a Bill coming under entry No. 63. According to entry No. 63, the three Central Universities are under the entire control of the Central Government, and in addition to these three Central Universities, other institutions which might be declared by Parliament to be of national importance may also come under the controlling influence of the Central Government, apart from the influence of the State Governments. But pretending to act or pretending to legislate under entry 66, an attempt is being made to circumvent the province of this Parliament to declare any institution as a national institution and control is being assumed on all the remaining Universities so that the remaining 28 Universities will be reduced to the position of the three Central Universities. That is my contention.

[SHRIMATI SUSHAMA SEN *in the Chair*]

If we take clause 14: consequences of failure of Universities to comply with recommendations of the Commission, this is the penal clause of the measure. Just as we have got preventive detention, now, as far as Universities are concerned, this clause is about preventive withdrawal of grants or withholding of grants, and therefore, to that extent, it is a sort of police clause in this measure. This clause, I fear, will be utilised by Government and the Central Commission for the purpose of tightening their grip over all Universities. All the Universities suffer from a sort of financial anaemia; they suffer from want of funds, and in their need to have more funds from the Central Government,

they will be forced with a bludgeon of uniformity to abide by directives which might be illegal as far as the Universities are concerned. To cut the argument short, I feel that this measure offends against provincial autonomy. Not only that; it goes further. Just as one can kill two birds with one stone, with this one measure Government are violating two kinds of autonomy—provincial autonomy as well as autonomy of Universities. Universities in this country have a long and glorious history. Private members and private academicians, without any strings, have done their best at tremendous cost to themselves to develop these Universities on right lines.

But now this Government, out to centralise all power, are trying to put their thumb in the pot of jam of Universities autonomy. My contention is that it is the business of this House and it is in the interest of the country that we should strive to safeguard the autonomy of Universities. I may say that even the Radhakrishnan Commission, which recommended that such a thing ought to be done, have referred to one of the resolutions of the Sixth Quinquennial Conference of the Inter-University Board—I am referring to page 450 of the Report of the University Education Commission. The concluding portion of the resolution which is given there reads:

“While appreciating the policy of the Government of India and the Provincial Governments to assist the growth and expansion of university education by financial grants, this conference places on records its emphatic opinion that the autonomy and independence of the universities receiving such grants should not in any way be interfered with.”

Putting its seal of approval, this is what the Commission says:

“We feel that the autonomy of the independent Universities in general is a matter which should be the concern not merely of the

Universities but of the Government and of the public in general. Universities can play a great role only if it is appreciated both by the public and the Government that they function as autonomous units and are free to develop along well-established standards uncontrolled and uninfluenced by the changing waves of democratic passion. At the same time, it must be emphasised that the autonomy claimed by the University should be understood as implying a greater amount of self-control and self-discipline and a sincere desire to work for the higher standards of intellectual integrity and morality.”

My submission is that this Bill is not conceived with a view to implementing faithfully and in all its spirit this particular observation of the Radhakrishnan Commission. On the contrary, I fear that this clause 14 has been put into this Bill for the sinister purpose of having a whip hand in this matter. This will be used as a sort of whip chord for the purpose of driving the Universities in a particular direction in which the Government—the Executive Government of this country—desire them to move. We should all resist that.

Then, another point that I want to make is this. Is there any necessity for any such statutory body? Take, for instance, the United Kingdom. There, the University Grants Committee is a non-statutory body. It is a completely advisory body and with all its advisory capacity that body is doing the greatest service for the purpose of education, because it is not central direction which is needed most, but is the central funds which are needed most for the purpose of taking the Universities to their proper destination. But, in spite of that fact, we are not importing British precedent here and we are trying to bring into existence a statutory body with Draconic powers. Is there any necessity for such an organisation? That is my relevant question.

[Shri S. S. More]

There are already in the field similar institutions. Take, for instance, the Inter-University Board. It is a non-official organisation in which all the Universities participate and this Board attends to all the common difficulties and tries to bring about in a non-official way some uniformity. In addition to that, there is the Central Advisory Board of Education. That also is a useful body, partly elected, and that Board also, in its different meetings, does give some useful guidance as far as University Education is concerned. In addition to these two bodies, there is already, another institution, the Universities Grants Commission, which was brought into existence by a Government Resolution in 1945 and its ambit was expanded by some orders in 1946 and 1947. When all these institutions are there, I do not see why there should be another statutory body called the Universities Grants Commission. This Government seems to have a very undesirable craving for multiplying bodies and creating different jobs for the purpose of distributing patronage. My submission is that such a body is not necessary. It will be giving a sort of control over the life and the doings of the Universities, which, in the name of uniformity, will kill their initiative, which will not take notice of the different stages of their developments, which will not take notice of the different stages or the different strata of society or their different needs in the vast country. Nobody should try to sit at Delhi with a bludgeon in his hand and try to induce everybody or force everybody to adopt certain standards which are conceived here, but which cannot be translated into reality if we go to the States and see the different conditions prevailing there.

What is the real need? If Government is really sincere in their desire to give some impetus to University education, what is needed is not apparent miserable co-ordination without

any funds from the Central Government. In the financial statement an allotment has been shown. At page 10 of this Bill, it has been stated that Rs. 1,50,000 will be required for the purpose of the University Grants Commission Establishment and only Rs. 1,79,62,000 are to be paid for the purpose of education. Will that be enough? If I can speak from memory, our Universities are spending more than Rs. 17 crores for the purpose of education, and in spite of that fact, what is the proportion which the Government bears of this educational expenditure? I am quoting from Education in India, 1950-51, page 136. The direct expenditure on Universities and Colleges of States has been shown and we find that though some of the B Class States are rising to their responsibilities, some of the A Class States are the worst sinners in this respect. Take, for instance, the Bombay State. Only 37.7 per cent. of the expenditure is given by them as State Grant or Central Grant. There are some other States. In Punjab it is 31.13. I am not finding the time to go through the whole table. But, you will find that in the Hyderabad State, 94.2 is the percentage of Government expenditure on this University and College education.

Dr. M. M. Das: In what year, please?

Shri S. S. More: In 1950-51; I was told that this is the latest report available to us. We are lagging in everything, in collecting up-to-date data also. That is the misfortune of our state of administration. This Government is trying to take up a more profitable pattern by operating with only Rs. 1,79,62,000. It is just like a bundle of grass dangled before the proverbial donkey. My submission is that the Government is not doing its duty. The Britisher in the past did make a sort of attempt to introduce uniformity. I have not the time to refer to other

reports. But, with your permission, I may quote from the Report of 1902. It was the Reilly Commission. The Commission was directed to enquire into the conditions and prospects of the Universities established in British India, to consider and report upon any proposals which have been or may be made for improving their constitution and working and to recommend to the Governor - General - in - Council such measures as may tend to lift the standard of university teaching and to promote the advancement of learning. This Commission went in detail into all the aspects of university education, the examiners, the professors, their standards, how examinations should be held, what books should be prescribed and every minute matter which pertains to the sphere of university education came under their very careful and exhaustive scrutiny. For anyone who is interested in this matter, this report will be a sort of mine of information and useful suggestions. But, this Commission also came to the conclusion.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member to take as little time as possible because there are many speakers who propose to speak.

Shri S. S. More: I propose to be as brief as possible and I do not want to stand in the way of others.

I am referring to a very important point. This Government seems to have that complacent idea that it has for the first time realised the necessity of co-ordination and setting up of standards. Let us go to the Report of 1902, that is more than half a century old, and in para. 194 on page 54 of the Report, it is stated:

"In concluding the section of our Report which deals with financial questions it seems necessary to point out that the acceptance of our recommendations must inevitably lead to increased expenditure in many directions. While we hope that in many parts of India they will furnish an opportunity to

public-spirited and generous benefactors of education, we trust that Government may not be unwilling to reconsider the scale on which it supports and aids the various colleges on which to so large an extent will depend the accomplishment of the reforms that have been sketched in this Report. We have laid down standards of college efficiency and equipment considerably in advance of those hitherto accepted and any such change in our college system will impose upon the Universities also corresponding duties in relation to examinations, control of colleges, and the provision of the means of post-graduate instruction in certain departments. These reforms, if they are to be carried out on the lines indicated in our Report, must mean an increase of both college and university expenditure."

This expenditure, even this Report visualised, must come mainly from the coffers of the Central Government or the State Governments and they realise that such useful suggestions for improving the standard cannot be given effect to simply if they rely on private bounty or the dwindling resources of fees with the growing poverty of the peasantry. Therefore, my submission is that Government do not seem to be very serious about their responsibility. The Radhakrishnan Commission, on page 455 of its Report, pointed out what will be the approximate expenditure if some of the recommendations were to be given effect to:

"For the next quinquennium the total annual expenditure on these heads will be"

and after enumerating the heads and the expenditure desired on each one of these heads, they came to the conclusion that a solid figure of Rs. 21,48,75,000 will be required. They further recommended:

"Of this roughly 60 per cent. will have to be provided by the

[Shri S. S. More]

Government (Central and Provincial) and this amounts to Rs. 8,69,25,000 recurring and Rs. 4,20,00,000 non-recurring."

Thus, Rs. 8,69,25,000 was the annual recurring expenditure to be provided by Government and Rs. 4,20,00,000 for the purpose of non-recurring grants for a period of five years. In the face of this recommendation, they pretend that they have brought in this Bill for the purpose of implementing the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission, but they are giving effect to half—the unimportant half—of what was recommended by the Radhakrishnan Commission, because in this very recommendation they have stated on page 455:

"that the State should recognise its responsibility for the financing of higher education;"

That part is absolutely ignored by Government, and out of these six recommendations, they only accept by putting in this Bill that the University Grants Commission be set up for allocating grants. Six particulars are given, and out of the six, five are safely ignored by Government and particularly that for financing education by the States and the Central Government, and only the last item, which refers to the appointment of the University Grants Commission, has been accepted. If the Commission's recommendation has to be accepted, it must be accepted in its full spirit. It is no use complying with some small part of the letter and telling the House "We are implementing it". This is not only distortion of the Commission's recommendations—gross distortion—but it is unfair to the Commission itself because you tear out only one part of their recommendation which has to be viewed in the perspective of the whole picture and then ignore the remaining part. For these reasons, I feel that we must oppose this Bill. I also feel that our university education stands to run into greater danger if this power is handed over to the executive government. The execu-

tive government during the past never struck any original path and it was left to private institutions to create new precedents and to lay down new principles. I will take only one instance. It is the sponsors of the national education who were fighting the Britishers and who were not supported by the Britishers because the national education could not be made to fit in with their bureaucratic pattern of education. It is the sponsors of the national education, it is the supporters and promoters of private institutions who have given not only their thought but even their blood for the purpose of giving a particular shape and form to the national education. In this country the people who go to the university are almost negligible in number because the rich are becoming negligible in number though their financial influence is becoming a major factor, and I would say that the peasantry and the toilers, though numerically, as far as counting of heads is concerned, they constitute the majority of the country, are the most ignored minorities from the point of education, from the point of social amenities and from the point of happiness, and if any weightage has to be given to any minority—we were talking about Jinnah's plan and other plans and we are very profuse with our plans to give weightage to minorities—it should be given to the minority of the toilers and the minority of the poor middle-class people, who have been really suffering under the dispensation of the present Government. This Government is out for a socialistic pattern. I intervened when the Prime Minister was giving us some idea of his socialistic pattern, and I asked him "What are your concrete steps"? He said "thinking". That is his first step and possibly "thinking" would be his last step also.

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South):
Correct thinking.

Shri S. S. More: Mere thinking is not sufficient; concrete steps are needed. Merely preparing a menu for a sumptuous dinner is not enough; you must prepare the dish. As far as this

measure is concerned, I humbly submit for the consideration of the House that it is not properly conceived; it will not be doing any useful service to the cause of university education; it might succeed in creating a sort of dead, wooden uniformity, which will not be in the lasting interests of the country, and, therefore, I would say that the attempt on the part of the executive to secure, at the cost of a very paltry sum, sweeping control over the lives of the younger generations of the country ought to be resisted with all the forces that we command.

Shri M. D. Joshi: I rise to welcome this measure.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member to be brief because there are many Members who wish to speak on this measure.

Shri M. D. Joshi: I shall be as brief as possible. This measure should have come long ago, but as the adage goes, it is better late than never. This Bill has been condemned by very many speakers on the opposite side, particularly my hon. friend, Shri More, who delivered his broadside—and he rejoices in delivering broadsides against whatever comes from this side of the House. He has characterised this Bill as a strangulating measure and he said about some of the clauses that they are foolish clauses.

Shri S. S. More: Not foolish, but police.

Shri M. D. Joshi: Whatever he chooses to call it; he will find, however, that the University Grants Commission or a body like this has been recommended by the University Education Commission, which has been quoted by him so copiously. The Radhakrishnan Commission has recommended already that a small body of five or at the most seven members be constituted to effect co-ordination and maintain standards for university education. This Bill seeks to implement what the Radhakrishnan Commission wanted, and therefore, I am at a loss to understand the very strong objection

taken by my hon. friend there. But I can understand the object of their objection, because the Opposition Members do not want any sort of control on the part of the Government over institutions. Only two days back, we had the spectacle of a resolution about the broadcasting corporation put forth by an hon. Member from the Opposition Benches. There it was said that there should be no control by Government on any of these institutions. Well, I am unable to appreciate this kind of reasoning. Our nation is engaged in the great task of rebuilding our society on a new pattern. Government must have in mind certain programmes. It has a Five Year Plan and therefore it has to proceed along certain lines. It is no use saying that formerly our institutions proceeded on private enterprise and that formerly they used to oppose the British imperialists. It is all very well. It was our business then, when there was foreign domination, to see that all our institutions and our younger generation had to grow in a spirit of revolt against foreign domination. It was all very well then to oppose Government, but now, when the Government is there established by the popular vote, it is understandable on anybody's part—be he from this side of the House or that side of the House—that the good measures of Government should be opposed even by educative bodies. We have this sight: on the one hand, all Opposition Members condemning outright any measure of Government, and we have the other specimen: in this morning's papers there is a report in which the Chief Minister of an important State—Mysore—has given vent to a feeling and to an idea with which it is difficult to express one's agreement. I shall, for the information of the House, read one or two lines. He said:

“The idea of giving autonomy to the Universities was a feudal one which originated in England at a time when Universities were more or less private enterprises conforming to a policy of *laissez*

[Shri M. D. Joshi]

faire. These are days of planning and socialism, and central control and direction are inevitable whether it is in the administrative or educational or economic field."

This is the other extreme. I do not like the extreme mentioned by my hon. friend, Shri S. S. More, and I do not also like this other extreme. I do not of course like a state or a condition in which the universities or educating institutions are bound hand and foot and have to look to Government at every step. This is a condition which I myself would not welcome.

Then there is another report in the same issue of the newspaper from which I quoted earlier, where the Education Minister of another important State has warned the university that if they do not take certain steps, they will have to take measures against that university. That is also not a very wholesome state of things.

Shri S. S. More: It is a politician's threat to an academic institution.

Shri M. D. Joshi: You are entitled to your opinion.

Then, I would mention the note of golden mean which has been struck by Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, which is a very welcome note. I crave your permission to read one or two lines from what he said:

"When we speak of university autonomy, let it be clearly understood that it is a type of freedom from unnecessary shackles and not a liberty which will degenerate into licence."

That is the only attitude which universities should take.

Now, I am of opinion that a certain kind of control on the part of Government is necessary over our universities in the present state of things. Why? Because, when we are engaged in this gigantic task of rebuilding our nation, it is but proper that all

our institutions, educational and others, should proceed along certain definite lines which are of a national character. Our pandits and learned men who are managing the universities have been brought up in a particular atmosphere. They were educated in the previous generation. Many of the professors do not even like the prospect of an introduction of Hindi in the universities. I have come across several of my friends who are teachers and professors in universities and colleges, who are struggling against the prospect that after all they have to give up the English language and have to take up Hindi as the medium of instruction. This is only one thing which I have mentioned. There are several other things; take for example, basic education. Basic education is a thing which is very bitterly disliked not only by the learned pandits but even by certain primary teachers. Government have got to control this sort of tendency. If Government is not courageous enough to control this sort of reactionary tendency, then Government ceases to function. Therefore, I am definitely of the opinion that Government must step in to exercise effective control on educational institutions which are of a refractory nature.

I will mention one more thing. The Bombay Government have set a certain limit or standard of age by which a student should enter the university. The age limit is 16. The idea is that boys of very immature age should not enter universities for higher education. It is all a good idea no doubt, but all the other universities must take measures and devise rules so that one age should be obtainable in all the universities for entrance into the university. The Bombay Government goes in one direction; the Bombay Government is rightly considered to have advanced views. But there are also other Governments which hold advanced views but they are pulling in other directions. There must be somebody, some agency, which effects co-ordination in all these

ideas and puts the universities on an equal footing. What happens is, for example, this: I shall take, for instance, the medium of instruction. There is a tussle going on at present in our country about the medium of instruction. Some people say that the medium of instruction should be the regional language. Some say it should be Hindi, and some cling to the hope that for several years English may be retained.

The number of such persons is dwindling. However, lovers of English there are in this country who cannot get reconciled to the idea that after all it is the regional language or the national language which has to be the medium of instruction.

About this medium of instruction there are different groups pulling in different directions in different Universities. It is high time that our Central Government took strong steps to effect some kind of control in order that all these Universities may go in one direction and proceed in the same pace.

Therefore I submit that this Bill has not come a day too soon. This Bill devises certain clauses which contemplate control in the matter of co-ordination of studies, co-ordination of educational programmes and also maintenance of certain standards in the Universities.

I shall not discuss the clauses in detail. About the constitution of the Commission what I have to say is this. There are three sub-clauses, (a), (b) and (c) in clause 5(2). Sub-clause (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". Sub-clause (b) says "not less than two members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government". And sub-clause (c) says "the remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions or who have experience in administra-

tive or financial matters". This part of the clause, that is, sub-clause 5(2-c) is, in my opinion, superfluous or unnecessary. Some might say it is objectionable. Because under clause 5(2)(b) not less than two members will be chosen from the Central Government. It will be the officers of the Central Government. In sub-clause (c) it is said that "the remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists of repute"—that is all right—"or who have obtained high academic distinctions"—that is also all right—"or who have experience in administrative or financial matters". That means they may be persons who may not have any kind of educational experience, who may not have any kind of educational qualification, who may have been merely administrators. Therefore I think that this portion of the clause should be omitted so that the composition of the Commission will be unobjectionable.

Then about clause 9 I have to say that the Commission is empowered to take associate members for its deliberations. The associate members will not have the power to vote but will have the power to deliver their opinion. That is unobjectionable. But nowhere in this Bill is the State Government considered as a necessary factor. It is the State Government which is giving the grants. It is the State Government which has created several Universities; each State Government has got several Universities. And it is the State Government which is managing those Universities and Education, from top to bottom. But the State Government as such is given no recognition whatsoever in this Bill. I think this is not very desirable. I think that each State Government should be associated, and therefore an obligatory clause should be put in by which it will be necessary for the Commission to have on its associate members' panel such members who will represent the State Government adequately.

I have to mention one subject of very great importance. I do not want

[Shri M. D. Joshi]

to take longer time than is absolutely necessary for my purpose, and therefore leaving aside smaller points I shall concentrate on one major point. And that is the necessity of establishment of a Sanskrit University. We know that Sanskrit was taken notice of by the former foreign government. But today the importance of Sanskrit has heightened manifold, ten times or a hundred times. Because, Hindi is the chosen national language, and the vocabulary of Hindi is drawn, in the main, from Sanskrit. Sanskrit is the source, the repository which the vocabulary of Hindi will draw upon. But unfortunately as regards imparting instruction in Sanskrit our various Governments have not made adequate provision. I do not know of a single Sanskrit University or a Sanskrit college which is receiving adequate help. There are over two thousand Sanskrit *patha-shalas* and about eleven Sanskrit colleges. But there is not a single University which can co-ordinate the studies in all these institutions, which can prepare a scheme of education from beginning to end. Each *patha-shala* or each college is going its own way, and there is no proper co-ordination or control over all these institutions. When India has come into its own and when India is boasting of her hoary past, is it not necessary that some kind of arrangement is made, some kind of measure is taken to preserve our very glorious ancient literature and to impart instruction in that literature to our younger generation who will be the future nation-builders? Therefore I very humbly submit to the attention of Government that a Sanskrit University may be created. Its seat may preferably be at Banaras or, if not, at Delhi or at any other centre which is known for its Sanskrit lore. That is the one suggestion which I have to press for the attention of Government.

As regards secondary education, my hon. friend Mr. N. M. Lingam dealt with it to some extent. Therefore I shall not take longer time of the House in dealing with that question

again. But while discussing this problem of secondary education with several of my friends who have experience of that branch, I found that there is serious discontent among teachers about the state of secondary education that obtains at least in my State. The discontent may be well-founded or may not be justified. I have nothing to do with that. But it is not a healthy state of things that the Central Government should be sitting with equanimity at this spectacle of various Universities pulling in various directions and various Governments either checking the Universities or not checking the Universities at all. Therefore, the State Government should evolve a scheme, as suggested by the University Commission, in the primary, secondary and higher branches of education. That is the purpose for which the establishment of a University Grants Commission is absolutely necessary.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): I welcome this Bill because I feel that an institution like the University Grants Commission can do a lot of good in this country. In this Bill, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is said that the University Grants Commission will co-ordinate the activities of the Universities, will determine the standards in the Universities, and also will see to the proper allocation of funds. There is enough scope for that kind of activity in this country. I think this Bill has come rather belatedly. As early as 1949, the University Commission recommended that such a Commission should be created. There is now greater need for such an institution, because, recently, in the last few years, many new Universities have come into existence. These Universities are struggling for funds. We have also to see that proper standards for higher education are maintained. There is another difficulty also. Since the attainment of Independence, there is a demand that the Universities should impart education in the regional languages. When the Uni-

versities gradually take over to the regional languages, various difficulties will be created. At that time, Government will have to co-ordinate their activities and see that standards are maintained. There is also the work of co-ordination between the Universities regarding the distribution of specialities. There are a number of activities which could come under the purview of such an organisation. But we have to see that such an organisation functions properly and that the composition is satisfactory.

As far as I can see, the University Grants Commission has been modelled on the University Grants Commission in the U.K. This organisation in England is working very well since 1919. It has played a very important role in co-ordinating the activities of the Universities, in developing the Universities and in giving proper funds to them. Unless this body functions properly, the whole object of creating such an institution will be frustrated. Let us, therefore, compare the composition and functions of the British University Grants Commission with the one that we are now envisaging. I shall first take up the composition of the British University Grants Commission. The British Commission has no official or bureaucratic element in it. It is composed of eminent academicians who have influence and command respect in learned and University circles. I would like to quote a few lines from this Book, Government Assistance to Universities in Great Britain. About composition, it says:

"These are all University men themselves. They are naturally interested in having the Universities of Great Britain adequately and intelligently supported. Hence their desire to have as members of the advisory bodies persons who will command the confidence of the recipient universities and of whatever public is interested."

Let us take the Chairman. There have been only two Chairmen. Both of them have been drawn from the

University ranks. The first Chairman was:

"...Sir Walter Moberly, a lecturer in political science, professor of Philosophy and Vice-Chancellor of Manchester."

After him came Dr. A. E. Trueman, F.R.S., a geologist at the universities of Wales, Bristol and Glasgow. What is the composition of the other members? This report says:

"It now includes a professor of German, a master of a Cambridge college, the principals of Ruskin and Somerville, a professor of the humanities from Aberdeen, the director of the Royal Botanical Gardens, a distinguished economist, and two prominent medical men. In the past a Nobel Prize winner and a president of the Advisory Council on Scientific policy each served for a number of years."

Such are the people who compose the University Grants Commission in England. Then, as to their functions, this body functions informally and in a very friendly and delicate manner. In 1946, when the terms of reference were widened, it was in these terms:

"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 on matters relating to university education at home and abroad; and to assist, in consultation with the Universities and other bodies concerned, the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of the universities as may from time to time be required in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs."

In these terms of reference, there are no words which would give you an idea that this is a body which would supervise and control. There

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

is no idea of control at all. It is one of help, assistance and advice.

How does it function? Like many other British institutions, it functions in a very delicate manner. They work; they do not show that they are working; they do not show that they are dominating. I shall again quote about the manner in which this institution has been functioning.

"The real way in which the University Grants Commission can get forward depends entirely upon a free, frank and informal standing contact, not bound by regulations or formalities."

Further, the report says:

"The University Grants Commission exercises great power although its hand is never shown publicly. It does not issue an annual report. It makes no public statements. It has no informal spokesman in the Press or elsewhere..."

"The University Grants Commission presents no materials for the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge other than a record of the number of students. Because of this, none of its financial tables gives a full picture of the university situation."

"It gives no breakdown by individual universities of earmarked grants. It does not tell in any detail the nature of the non-recurrent grants... etc."

In this very friendly way, the University Grants Commission in England functions. The report that it gives in regard to past operations and future needs is not given institution-wise, but field-wise. It is said in the report:

"...for there are no detailed data presented by the U.G.C. to make it possible to judge whether University 'A' is getting more or less than University 'B', or what the comparative costs of construction and equipment happen to be."

The result is this. The weaknesses

of the different Universities are not exposed. There is no unhealthy rivalry for securing Government grants between the different Universities. There is cordial relationship between the Grants Commission and the various Universities. Let us now see whether we are creating by this Bill such an institution and whether it will fulfil the same purpose as this institution. First of all, I shall take up the composition.

Clause 5 of the Bill says that there will be two Government representatives on the Board. In the British Commission, Government representatives are prominent by their absence. In the Bill, there, no mention is made as to who should be the Chairman. But, here, we have already an existing University Grants Commission. The Chairman of this body was, first, Dr. S. S. Bhatnagar and now, the present Secretary of the Education Ministry. We have nothing against these persons individually. But if the Secretary of the Ministry of Education becomes the Chairman of this Commission, I am afraid, the bureaucratic influence on the Commission will be very great. The Commission will not be able to function as an independent body, as it should if it is really to work for helping the universities and in developing higher education. As it is, in India, the danger exists of too much interference by the Government in the University affairs. I will not go into details because of shortage of time. I shall just give one extract from the Report of the University Education Commission. This is the evidence given by Shri P. M. Lad, who is now the Secretary of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, before the Commission. This evidence is about the Bombay University, which is supposed to be one of our most advanced Universities. This is what he says:

"Every proposal for affiliation of a college must go to the Government. I would suggest that the Government should not have the power to waive some of the

conditions laid down by the University. Governments may have power to order an enquiry in extreme cases, but Government should not impose its will on the University.

Please mark his words:

"Government should not impose its will on the University."

There is a genuine fear that there is already too much interference by the Government in the Universities' affairs, and that this body may further help in this tendency. Besides, we know that since the attainment of Independence, some politicians are unduly interfering in the Universities' affairs. I do not wish to quote many examples, but I shall only quote the example of a neighbouring university—the Lucknow University. It is a notorious fact that one important politician of the province dominates the university. If such a thing happens, it is very natural that the university cannot progress in the proper way.

1 P.M.

The University Education Commission is very alive to this danger and that has been expressed in page 450 of its report which has been already quoted by Mr. More. So, I will not take up the time of the House by quoting it again.

In this connection, the University Grants Commission of England has something to say. It is very essential for the proper development of higher education that there should not be any undue interference, and the autonomy of the university must not be interfered with in any way.

The University Grants Commission, England, after reviewing the development of Universities between 1937 and 1947 states in the Report:

"The relationship between the State and the Universities may be conceived as a form of partnership. On the side of the Universi-

ties there is every evidence of a progressive spirit and of a genuine desire to accommodate their policies to the various demands of public interests. On the side of the Government, there is recognition of the overriding duty of those who follow the academic path to ascertain truth and to proclaim it without respect to the convenience of the Government."

I emphasize the last sentence, *viz.* "that the overriding duty of those who follow the academic path is to ascertain the truth and to proclaim it without respect to the convenience of the Government". If this high ideal has to be maintained, we must be very careful when we establish such an institution.

Then, I come to the matter of the operation of funds, because one of the most important functions of such a body would be proper allocation of funds. How does the British Committee function in this matter? Their object being to help the University to plan and build and not to use the instrument of financial control for undue interference or exercise of control, they give grants in three ways. Firstly, they make block grants. While making block grants, the universities make an estimate of their normal requirements over a period of five years. The sums, after consultation and agreement, are sanctioned. It helps Universities to plan out with ease. Once a grant is made, the internal disposal is a matter for the University. When such a grant is given for five years, the University can plan in its own way. Every year they do not have to suffer from uncertainty. Suppose they start a plan this year, they know that next year they will have to take a few other steps and enough funds for that will be forthcoming.

The second is earmarked grants. These are annual grants for specific purposes. Here, of course, the Universities place before the Commission whatever they require, and after consultation and agreement, the amount is granted. Once the amount is sanc-

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

tioned, they cannot interfere in that matter.

Then also, there are non-recurring grants, annual grants mainly for capital and other outlay.

So, in this way the grants are made. They do not interfere with the affairs of the university or its internal working.

Secondly, very large funds are placed at the disposal of the Grants Commission, because, unless they can give adequate assistance, there is no meaning in creating such an important body.

The Bill in the Financial Memorandum says that the total amount for this year would be Rs. 1.81 crores. This is a very inadequate amount. If this is an indication of the future picture, then I should say that we have unnecessarily created this huge organisation for a very small purpose.

Shri S. S. More: We are purchasing control at that price.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: It is now recognised that for higher study and research, adequate public funds must be available. This is also recognised in India because in the Report of the University Education Commission this matter has been very thoroughly discussed. The Report of the University Education Commission says that in India the Government should meet 60 per cent. expenditure, 30 per cent. should come from fees and 10 per cent. from endowments. The total of this would be Rs. 8.69 crores from Central and Provincial Governments and Rs. 4.20 crores recurring for five years in the shape of annual grants. They say that if such an amount is made available, only then adequate tuition, library, scholarship and freeships, laboratories and hostel accommodation can be made available for the students. Then, they go further. They say that we need more professional educational institutions, that these institutions should be doubled in the next ten years, and

further that the Government should meet 60 per cent. of the recurring expenditure, and 75 per cent. of the capital expenditure. Further, even for affiliated institutions which now get very little help from the Government, they say that if these institutions are to have a proper academic atmosphere and to function properly, the Government should give grants to cover half the salaries of the sanctioned posts. All this requires a huge amount. If all that amount is made available, then only this Grants Commission can function properly in the matter of allocating funds to the Universities in order to help the Universities to develop on the right lines.

Now, I would like to compare the conditions obtaining in Britain I am trying to hurry as much as possible because of shortage of time, but some figures have to be quoted. Now, university income sources in Great Britain are these. I shall give you two years: 1935-36 and 1949-50. Through endowments in 1935-36, the Universities secured 14.5 per cent., and in 1949-50, 5.7 per cent. Through donations and subscriptions, in 1935-36 they secured 2.5 per cent. and in 1949-50, 1.7 per cent. Through grants from local educational authorities, they secured 8.7 per cent. and 4.6 per cent. respectively. And this is the most important thing. Through Parliamentary grants, in 1935-36 they got 34 per cent. and in the latter year they got 63.9 per cent.—practically 64 per cent. Then through fees, it was 32 per cent. in the earlier year and 17 per cent. in the latter year. So, now 64 per cent. of the needs of the Universities are met from Government funds in England.

Then, in the matter of scholarships and freeships, the Commission in the United Kingdom assists a large number of students through freeships and scholars' ships. In 1949-50, 62,000 students out of 85,000 students, i.e., 73 per cent. of the students got freeships and scholarships. In India, our University Educations Commission report says that the present position is that

about 10 per cent. of the total enrolment is entitled to exemption from payment of tuition fees. What does it amount to? Exemption from payment of tuition fees amounts to 1/6 or 1/5 of the total expenditure of the students. Then, as far as Government university scholarships are concerned, they do not generally exceed one per cent. That is the dismal picture of educational condition in India.

This report recommends that 12,500 scholarships of an average of Rs. 600 per year should be granted and 37,500 freeships of Rs. 250 per year should be granted. This alone would bring us to an expenditure of Rs. 1.68 crores a year. The University Education Commission recommends that Rs. 1.6 crores should be granted merely for freeships and scholarships, and the total amount provided here is Rs. 1.81 crores for the entire functioning of the Commission. That shows we are not really serious about it. We really do not want this big institution that we are creating to function in a proper way as it has functioned in England. If we give these scholarships 15 per cent. of the total enrolment will get free places and 5 per cent. will get some scholarship.

I will give you a few more figures. The total that we are spending on education in India is 5 per cent. In the United Kingdom it is 11 per cent. and in France 12 per cent. So, if we are really serious about the creation of the University Grants Commission and allowing it to function properly, much more funds than what has been made available should be made available to it.

Then, there is a small matter to which I would like to refer because we are discussing this in Delhi. In giving funds, the University Grants Commission must be very careful to see that it does not create new difficulties for the universities. Recently, in the Delhi University, the University Grants Commission gave some money and asked them to raise the pay of

the university staff. The Delhi University has federative character and it was the rule here that all the staff, whether of the constituent colleges or the University college, should get the same pay. By creating this invidious distinction, much confusion has been created in the ranks of the college staff. So, instead of this body helping the University, easing the difficulties of the University, it has created a new difficulty for the University. So, not only has the Government to be very careful to see that the composition of the Commission is proper, that it functions properly, but the Commission itself must be careful to see that it does not create new difficulties in the realm of education.

In conclusion, I would like to say that either we should not pass this Bill and should not create this institution—for as Shri S. S. More has said, there are already other bodies which are doing almost similar work—or if we create this institution, then we should see that it plays the rightful role that it should play and which a similar institution is playing today in England. I would urge the Members of the Select Committee to see that the composition of this Commission is not such that the bureaucratic element gets an opportunity to dominate over the institution, and through their domination, through their financial control, take away the autonomy of the Universities. It is the responsibility of all of us, of each one of us who have had the good fortune of receiving University education to see that the autonomy of the University is zealously safeguarded. I hope the Members of the Select Committee will see to it, because I feel that the intellectual life of no country can develop under the shadow of a domineering bureaucracy. Today, India is suffering from an over-dominant bureaucracy. Let this bureaucracy not spread its tentacles into the realm of University education.

Mr. Chairman: Next, I call upon Shri Barrow. As there is quite a good number of speakers, I would request the hon. Member to be very brief.

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I shall be as brief as possible. I start by welcoming the idea and the principle of establishing as a statutory body, the University Grants Commission. I am grateful to my hon. friend **Shri S. S. More** for focussing attention on the fact that this device for co-ordinating and—I would not like to use the word ‘controlling’—maintaining standards in our universities is patterned on the British model. I also thank him for drawing the attention of the Select Committee to the fact that when the resolution of the 6th Quinquennial Conference of the Inter-University Board was considered by the University Education Commission, the Commission took particular note of the latter part of the resolution, namely:

“the emphatic opinion that the autonomy and independence of the universities receiving such grants should not be interfered with.”

I want to focus attention on the atmosphere, the circumstances and the context in which the British University Grants Committee was created and established, and the atmosphere in which the Grants Commission here is being established.

I refer to this advisedly because it will be fundamental in determining the scope and extent of the powers delegated to the Commission, as I believe that we must not interfere with the autonomy of our Universities, nor must we interfere with their academic freedom. By academic freedom, I mean the right to teach what one believes to be true.

The hon. Member from **Ratnagiri**, who is not present now, used the word ‘control’. If all our universities are going to be controlled by the State, then I believe that the State will be guilty of the greatest tyranny, the tyranny of the mind. I believe also, that if we are to follow the advice—which was read out by my hon. friend from **Ratnagiri**—of the Chief Minister of **Mysore**, then we will be introducing

into our universities, into our University scheme, a kind of bed of Procrustes; we will lop off and stretch and bring about a dead uniformity. We must not control them. The hon. lady Member **Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani** has spoken of the subtle way in which the British University Grants Commission functions, and that is the ideal we should aim at.

I believe, that when the Grants Commission in Great Britain was inaugurated or established in 1919, it was done with a view to, “encouraging and facilitating limited improvements as the Universities could see their way to undertake”. There was no question of any control; it was only a limited function to encourage and to facilitate, and it was done in an atmosphere of reverence for British Universities as centres of learning, of respect for them as centres of free enquiry and freedom, and as centres of advanced research. It was in this atmosphere of respect and awe that this Grants Commission in the United Kingdom was established.

But what do we find in India? Every petty person, speaking on every petty occasion criticises our university system, criticises our system of education—whether they are fitted to do so or not is another matter. On any occasion, whether it is a prize-giving at a primary institution, or the Convocation of a University, some one will criticise our system of education, as if to say our Great Men of Learning, who are controlling the Universities, do not realise the shortcomings. It is in this atmosphere of suspicion and distrust that we are establishing a University Grants Commission. We must allay distrust, we must allay suspicion that we are trying to gain control of the Universities. We must encourage and facilitate; but we must not try to direct or control. I would ask the Select Committee to remember that in bringing the Bill in its final form to this House, they must be careful to avoid any suggestion whatsoever that the Central Government is

trying to control and direct the Universities.

How can we achieve this purpose? I would refer here to an article written on "State Aid to Britain's Universities", by the Editor of the *Times Education Supplement*. He says:

"The strongest evidence that the autonomy of universities is a reality and not merely a pious fiction is afforded by the facts that the Treasury Grants to them"—I emphasise this in particular—"is not subject to any form of government audit, and that they have the absolute right to select the students they will receive and to give them the courses they believe most appropriate."

I want to emphasise again the fact that when the grants are given, there is no question of a government audit. Those of us who are acquainted with Government audit know what a deadening influence it can be on any freedom or expansion.

I would ask the Select Committee to consider carefully sub-clause (j) of clause 26, where provision is made for framing rules:

"any other matter which has to be, or may be, prescribed."

I say that the Select Committee must make explicit and specific provision under this clause excluding any form of Government audit; otherwise, I believe the autonomy of our universities will be threatened and endangered.

I have referred to the atmosphere in which the British Grants Commission was created, and that in which the Indian Grants Commission is being created. I want also to refer to the context in which the Grants Committee is working in Britain and in which our Commission is going to work.

In Great Britain the Grants Committee is the dominant financial body. It provides, according to the 1951-52 figures, 66.5 per cent. of the income. and the Local Education Authority

provides 4.1 per cent. In India—**Shri S. S. More** has already given us the figures, and I do not want to go into them—the States are going to be, according to the University Education Commission's Report, the 'principal paymasters of all the Universities but three'. Now, we are going to introduce another financial factor, that is, grants from the Centre. In this tug of war, between the centre and the States, with the noose round the independence and autonomy of the universities, it is easy to visualise what will happen.

When the Select Committee is considering this Bill, they have to be very careful to specify the scope of this Grants Commission. I believe that that is absolutely essential, if the States on the one side and the Centre on the other are not going to toss the universities about.

The Radhakrishnan Commission suggested that the University Grants Commission should be responsible for post-graduate and research work, and that it should bear 50 per cent. of the cost, and should have—I would not like to say a major controlling influence—a major influence in post-graduate and research work.

I am going to differ, and do so with great humility from what has been suggested by the Radhakrishnan Commission. I suggest that the scope of the University Grants Commission should be limited to the first degree course. I say this advisedly because education at the school stage is a State subject. If there is to be any uniformity of standards in the secondary stage, it can be attained, I believe, by the first degree course helping to maintain those standards. I believe also that if there is a certain uniformity of standards in the first degree course, then the research work must necessarily be of a higher standard.

I believe again, that eventually, in the India to come, every boy or girl entering the University should know, and must know, three languages—the

[Shri Barrow]

mother tongue or the regional language, Hindi and English. If this Grants Commission is able to influence the first degree course, then it will be able to help and develop these three languages which will be absolutely essential for every student. I suggest emphatically that the scope of this Commission should be limited strictly to the first degree course.

I believe, also that it will give the Commission some experience—the Commission is going into this thing absolutely new—so that it can work out a pattern of partnership, which will give confidence to the Universities, and confidence to the States, that the Commission is going to work in co-operation with them. I end with these words: the problem of the Select Committee will be to reconcile two principles: the principle of planning—Central and State planning—and the principle of University autonomy.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): I believe that all sections in this House are agreed that there ought to be a University Grants Commission for allocating funds to different Universities on objective grounds. The questions that face us are: what should be the composition of the University Grants Commission, what is the degree of interference that the executive can be allowed in the constitution and the working of such a Commission. At the outset, let me refer to certain elementary details which have probably escaped the attention of my hon. friend, the Parliamentary Secretary, who is piloting this Bill. He has referred to 'co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions' being the main objective and the purpose of the proposed University Grants Commission. Parliament, according to the Constitution, has been clothed with exclusive authority to co-ordinate and determine standards in institutions for higher education or research and

scientific and technical institutions. The purpose of the Constitution-makers, I take it, is that Parliament should lay down general principles to be followed in constituting a Commission for achieving the objectives laid down in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. Such a Commission has necessarily to be autonomous in character. The nature of education, the cultural diversity of educational effort, the difficult problems that meet us in the higher reaches of education and the manner in which standards ought to be determined cannot, and should not, obviously be decided by the executive; these must be determined by an objective and independent body which should not be the handmaid of the executive. That, I take it, is the guiding purpose and the objective of this Bill. But, the manner in which we have departed from this objective is a matter for profound regret, which, I hope, the Joint Committee will take note, and rectify in time.

The point, however, which has to be borne in mind and which, I believe, is emphasised by all sections of this House is that the University Grants Commission must be a properly constituted Commission. Without its being a properly constituted Commission, it will not command the confidence, not only of Universities but also of educationists and all citizens who are interested in the cultural development of our country. Education cannot be regimented; educational development has to be considered carefully and has to be co-ordinated after taking account of the various aspects which go to determine the criteria of a full and purposeful culture. Especially as we intend giving vast powers to the University Grants Commission—and I refer hon. Members to clause 3 since that clause gives us a clear idea of what the University Grants Commission is intended to be—it is all the more necessary that the University Grants Commis-

sion should be a properly constituted body: Clause (3) reads as follows:

"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 purpose of this Act, and on such a declaration being made, all the provisions of this Act shall apply to such institution as if it were a University within the meaning of clause (f) of section 2."

I suggest that in order that the advice might be proper, in order that the advice might also be of such a type as to give a proper guidance to the Government for determining and allocating funds available to the various institutions and for bringing them up to a proper standard, the Commission should be so constituted as to be autonomous and independent of the executive. My learned friend, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, pointed out that the University Grants Commission in the United Kingdom was a purely advisory body and...

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): She is not so learned as he suggests.

Dr. Krishnaswami: At least, she is more learned than my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, who always intervenes when there is no necessity to intervene. But I should like to point out that in the United Kingdom the University Grants Commission is an advisory body. We are not to have an advisory body; we are to have a statutory body. Let us therefore have a purely statutory body instead of having a hybrid monster as in the Bill that has been introduced. What should be the constitution of the University Grants Commission? I do not have the time to go at length into the various aspects of the constitution of this body, but I should like to point out that one of the principles that would have to be accepted by this

House is that the constitution of the body should be, as far as possible, elective. If members are elected, they would be beholden to the Universities; but if they are nominated, they would be beholden to the nominating authority. That is the basic principle; that is the reason for my suggesting that, as far as possible, the University Grants Commission should be predominantly an elected body. But I agree that there are practical difficulties which should be taken into account and that occasionally we have to make reluctant concessions to the principle of nomination. I am willing to concede that if this body is constituted on the basis of election, some of the backward Universities might not be represented. Nomination, at any rate, gives the Government the power to provide for better regional representation of some of the Universities which might not find a place in the University Grants Commission. If this be the dominant consideration, and this is a rational justification for adopting the principle of nomination Government should be content with exercising the right of nomination instead of taking upon themselves a residuary power, the formidable power to eject, to throw out those Vice-Chancellors who might be considered obstreperous by them but who possibly are independent and are a source of inconvenience to the executive as all men with a conscience are. I have not been able to understand how any Government which takes the idea of university education seriously could ever give support to a proposal that every member shall, unless his appointment is terminated earlier by the Central Government, hold office for a period of six years. The roots of independence of a University Grants Commission are cut by this provision in this Bill. Why should the executive have the power, once it has exercised the right of nomination, to exercise at any moment the power of ejection of an inconvenient member from the Commission? Rather than allow the executive to exercise this power, I suggest to the House and the Joint Committee that the tenure of membership be re-

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

duced from six to three years so that the need for exercising this power may not arise at all. Remember, after all, that if the University Grants Commission is to be taken seriously, it must command the confidence of educationists. But if it is felt that at some stage or the other somebody from the Ministry of Education has the power to remove any inconvenient member, then it would be next to impossible to build that feeling of corporate respect, which we all have at heart and which the Minister desires to promote. This is an obnoxious provision which should not find a place in this Bill, and which I do hope the members of the Joint Committee would remove. It touches the vital question of the self-respect of those members who are to be nominated to that body. Even if we reluctantly accept the principle of nomination, as I have suggested, there can be no possibility of our accepting the other principle, namely, that of members being ejected if they do not happen to agree with the powers that be in the executive. I do not go into the question of the propriety of nominating officials of the Government of India on this body. But the very fact that Government will have two members on this body underlines the need for this provision being omitted altogether. The sword of Damocles held over the heads of the various members of the University Grants Commission is not fair and will not conduce to the production of those objective reports on the conditions of the University, to the evolving of those criteria which are important for determining standards, and which would help us to find out what the standards of University education are. Since Parliament has been given the fullest power in the Union List to determine the standards, we cannot choose to abrogate our powers to the executive. The executive is after all different from Parliament; it is Parliament that has the primary responsibility.

I have looked into the other provisions of this Bill and two provisions

of this Bill have struck me as rather odd. I refer to clause 12. It deals with the functions of the Commission and I hope I am not taking the time of the House in quoting one or two sub-clauses of this clause for the purpose of elucidating the point that I have in mind. Clause 12 reads as follows:

"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 its functions under this Act, the Commission may—

(a) inquire into the financial needs of Universities;

(b) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, grants to Universities for any general or specified purpose:

Provided that in making any such grant to a University, the Commission shall give due consideration to the development of the University concerned, its financial needs, the standard attained by it and the national purpose which it may be called upon to serve."

What are the national purposes that the framers of this Bill have in view? I should have thought that Universities are constituted under a Charter or under an enactment of the Legislature and once they have been so constituted under an enactment of the Legislature, the purposes which they are expected to fulfil are absolutely national. It is therefore unconstitutional, apart from its being improper on the part of an outside authority, to tell the Universities that there are national purposes other than those in enactments for them to fulfil. Such directives militate against the autonomy of States which are responsible for the creation of University. Besides, who is to determine these national purposes? It has been left delightfully

vague as to what national purposes they may be called upon to fulfil. In other words, it means that somebody from the executive, somebody from the Education Department would have the right to issue directions and tell the Universities that if these directives are not fulfilled because they are supposedly in the national interest, the University Grants Commission would withhold grants to Universities. Can anything more perverse be thought of? If this provision finds a place in the enactment, Universities may not stand to gain by having a University Grants Commission which is expected to apply the thumb-screws of torture. Is this going to be the function of the proposed University Grants Commission? Unfortunately, the powers that have been given to the University Grants Commission and the powers that have been reserved to the executive in this Bill give us the impression that what is envisaged by the framers of this Bill is that Universities are to be a poor image or an enlarged reflection of the bureaucratic mechanism in the Government of India. It may be that I am uncharitable in my estimate of the propensities of those in charge of the Education Department. They may, on the other hand, be well-intentioned men. But if such powers are given, they are liable to be abused. Today they may not be abused, but, tomorrow some other officer or some other Minister in charge of Education may think it his sacred duty to issue a directive to the Universities and tell them that if they do not fulfil it, which he or the executive envisages, then they will be subject to penalties. And, in this connection, clause 14 acquires significance. Clause 14 refers to the penalties to be imposed on the Universities that do not carry out these directives. Grants may be withheld and Universities might be put, as it were, on a black-list. The whole spirit and tenor of this Bill is opposed to the constitution, proper functioning and autonomy of Universities in our country. If I have spoken strongly it is because I feel that a great blow is sought to be inflicted on our Universities, many of which have contributed

not a little to the welfare and education of our people. I hope and trust that at least now wisdom will dawn on those who have sponsored this Bill, that our friends in the Joint Select Committee will put forth these points of view strongly and resolutely and carry conviction to those who have framed this Bill. Universities have a greater and a more vital part to play in our country and, to the best of our powers, it should be our aim and objective to encourage plurality of autonomous institutions, to encourage institutions which are corporate in character and to see that these Universities which are primarily responsible for raising the standards of education in our country are strengthened. If the University Grants Commission fulfils these objects, I venture to think that Maulana Azad, who occupies a great place in our political history, will go down as a great Minister of Education capable of rising superior to the environment—the bureaucratic environment in which he and all of us seem to be placed.

Mr. Chairman: Babu Ramnarayan Singh. There are only 15 or 20 minutes and there are two speakers left. So, I would request the hon. Member to be short.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह (हजारीबाग पीरचम):
क्योंकि १५ मिनट का समय है और दो सीन और मمبر बोलने के इच्छुक हैं, इस वास्ते में बहुत कम समय लूंगा।

इस विधेयक का मैं विरोध करता हूँ। इस सरकार के जितने कार्य हो रहे हैं, पता नहीं कि किस मतलब से यह कार्य हो रहे हैं, बहुत कानून बन रहे हैं, डिपार्टमेंट बहुत खुल रहे हैं और उसके साथ साथ पदों का भी निर्माण इतना हो रहा है जिसका कोई हिसाब किताब नहीं। [SARDAR HUKAM SINGH in the Chair] मैं यह कह रहा था कि सरकार के काम का कोई हिसाब किताब नहीं लग रहा है। यह तो सही बात है कि अंग्रेजी राज्य काल में जब कभी हम लोग अंग्रेजी शासन के सम्बन्ध में बोलते थे तो सबसे कड़ी आलोचना शिक्षा विभाग के

[बाबू रामनारायण सिंह]

बार में करतें थे। आज करीब सात वर्ष हो अधिक हो गए हैं कि अपना राज्य समझा जाता है लेकिन अभी तक सरकार ने शिक्षा विभाग में कुछ भी नहीं किया है। अब जो सरकार करने चली है वह यह है कि जो विश्वविद्यालय अब तक बहुत अंश में स्वतंत्र समझे जाते थे उन पर भी इसका आधिपत्य होना चाहिए, इसका कंट्रोल होना चाहिए। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि किसी देश में शिक्षा का राष्ट्र के जीवन में सबसे अधिक महत्व होता है, कारण यह कि हर देश में किस तरह की शिक्षा होनी चाहिए उसकी एक परम्परा रहती है। लेकिन हमारे देश के लिए दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हजारों वर्षों की गुलामी के कारण हमारी परंपरा एक तरह से टूट गई है। आज जो कार्य हमारे यहां होना होता है, उसके लिए विदेशों का नमूना लिया जाता है। अंग्रेजों का जो देश इंग्लैण्ड है वह तो हमें ऐसा मालूम होता है जैसे तीर्थस्थान है या वहीं गुरुद्वारा है। जो कुछ वहां होता है वह यहां होना ही चाहिए। अगर वहां भी ऐसा एक कमीशन है तो यहां भी होना चाहिए। लेकिन वहां जो कमीशन का निर्माण हुआ है उसमें सरकार का प्रतिनिधि अवश्य होना चाहिए सो तो नहीं है। यह जो यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन बन रहा है इसके नाम से ही मालूम होता है कि इसका काम यह होगा कि जो सरकार के रूप में उनका विश्वविद्यालयों में कैसे बंटवारा हो। इस देश में हमारे संविधान के मुताबिक शिक्षा तो राज्यों का विषय है, केंद्र का विषय नहीं है। लेकिन यहां भी तो एक शिक्षा मंत्रालय है। अगर यह शिक्षा मंत्रालय सरकार के रूप में विश्वविद्यालयों में बंटने का काम भी नहीं कर सकता है तो इस मंत्रालय की क्या जरूरत है। इतना काम शिक्षा मंत्रालय के रूप में कर सकता है। एक कमीशन की जरूरत एक दम नहीं है। लेकिन कहा जाता है कि जितने विश्वविद्यालय हैं उनका स्तर ठीक करने के लिए ताकि स्टैंडर्ड में बहुत भेदभाव न रहे, यह कमीशन होना चाहिए। तो यह तो बहुत बड़े बड़े विद्वानों का कार्य है। उसमें सरकार

की तरफ से जो प्रतिनिधि होंगे वे काहे को। जिस तरह से कि सरकार बनती है वह तो आप जानते हैं। सरकार तो कभी कभी शिवजी की बारात सी बनती है। यह जरूरत नहीं कि उसमें सब पढ़ लिखे पीठत हों। खास करके यह जो पार्टी सिस्टम आफ गवर्नमेंट है इसमें तो सरकार में कोई भी आ सकता है और अगर ऐसे ही आदमी यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन में जाएंगे तो क्या करेंगे यह तो कहना मुश्किल है। इन प्रतिनिधियों के जरिए जो सरकार अपना आधिपत्य कमीशन के ऊपर चाहती है यह बहुत बुरा होगा। यह कमी नहीं होना चाहिए। यह तो मैं जानता हूँ कि जो कुछ भी विरोधी दल की तरफ से कहा जाता है उसका असर सरकार पर नहीं होता है। यह विधेयक जरूर प्रवर समिति में जाएगा यह सही है। लेकिन मैं यह स्पष्ट कहूंगा कि सबसे पहला काम यह होना चाहिए कि विश्वविद्यालयों की स्वतंत्रता के सम्बन्ध में तनिक भी बाधा न पड़े। यह तो जरूर करना चाहिए। कहा जाता है कि हर देश में देश की जितनी आमदनी होती है उसका बहुत सा अंश शिक्षा में लगाना चाहिए, लेकिन अब तक जो सरकारी खर्च शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में हुआ है वह तो इतनी कृपणता के साथ किया जाता है कि जिसका कोई हिसाब किताब नहीं है। इसमें कोई बड़ी बात नहीं होगी कि जितनी आमदनी इस देश में होती है उसका चतुर्थांश शिक्षा में लगाया जाय। सरकार का काम देश की उन्नति करना है, देश को तरक्की पर लाना है, देश की सेवा करना है। अगर इस सरकार के सम्बन्ध में हर विषय में देखा जाए तो यह मालूम होता है कि इनका आधिपत्य होना चाहिए, इनका कंट्रोल होना चाहिए, इनका शासन होना चाहिए। लेकिन मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस तरह का जो तर्ज सरकार का है वह सर्वथा निन्दनीय है। सरकार का काम देश की उन्नति करना है, देश की सेवा करना है। न कि सब जगह उसका आधिपत्य हो, उसका कंट्रोल हो, उसका अधिकार हो। यह तो बिल्कुल निन्दा करने की चीज है। उदाहरण

साथ साथ इस बिल की धारा १४ में यह लिखा है कि सरकार का जो नोटिफिकेशन होगा, उसके प्रतिकूल अगर विश्वविद्यालय कोई काम कर दे तो उसको तुरन्त सजा होनी चाहिए। जिसके बारे में मोर साहब ने कहा था कि मालूम होता है कि यह संस्था पुलिस की तरह बनने जा रही है। तो एक महोदय ने कहा कि "फुलश" की तरह पर है। तो "पुलिस" कहिए या "फुलश" कहिए, दोनों का मतलब करीब करीब एक ही होता है। इस तरह की बातें तो नहीं होनी चाहिए। यह तो जानी हुई बात है कि जितने लोग विश्वविद्यालय में हैं वे तो मर्यादा भंग करने वाले लोग नहीं हैं, कानून तोड़ने वाले नहीं हैं। लेकिन जहां पर मतभेद हो तो यह क्या जरूरी है कि सरकार का जो कुछ उपदेश हो वह आंख मूंद कर मान लें। तो विश्वविद्यालय क्या रह गया वह तो सरकार का एक अंग हो जाएगा। समापित महोदय, यह जो पार्टी सिस्टम आफ गवर्नमेंट है इससे शिक्षा को जहां तक दूर रखा जाए उतना ही देश का कल्याण होगा।

लखनऊ में विद्यार्थियों को ले कर कोई आन्दोलन हो गया था। तो देश में झुल्ला हुआ था कि किसी दलबन्दी का काम है जो विद्यार्थियों को उभार दिया है। और वे ही लोग ऐसा कहते थे कि विद्यार्थियों के बीच में कोई दलबन्दी की बात नहीं आनी चाहिए। समापित जी, वाइस चांसलर बनेंगे पार्टी के विचार से, दलबन्दी के विचार से, प्रॉफेसर बहाल होंगे दलबन्दी के विचार से, जितने भी कार्य विश्वविद्यालयों में सरकार की ओर से होंगे वे दलबन्दी के विचार से होंगे, जो इसका असर विद्यार्थियों पर क्यों नहीं पड़ेगा। तो यह कहा जाता है कि विद्यार्थियों के बीच में दलबन्दी की बात नहीं आनी चाहिए, विश्वविद्यालयों में दलबन्दी की बात नहीं आनी चाहिए लेकिन सरकार की तरफ से कार्य होने से बिल्कुल दलबन्दी की ही बात रहेगी। यह बिल प्रवर समिति में जा रहा है। जो सरकार इस कमीशन के जरिए विश्वविद्यालयों की जितनी मदद कर सके वह तो प्रशंसनीय है, लेकिन प्रवर समिति में हरे तरह से यह पल्ल होना चाहिए कि सरकार

किसी तरह से विश्वविद्यालयों की स्वतंत्रता में बाधा न पहुंचावे और न किसी तरह से वहां पर अधिकार करे।

मुफ से कहा गया था कि समय कम है, और लोग बोलने वाले हैं, इसलिए मैं अधिक समय न लेता हुआ सबसे यह निवेदन करता हूँ कि शिक्षा बहुत महत्व का विषय है। इसके बिना देश की उन्नति नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिए जहां तक हो सके विश्वविद्यालय को स्वतंत्र रख कर इस संस्था को बनाना चाहिए। तभी हमारा देश का भला होगा।

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): While supporting the establishment of the University Grants Commission, we have to point out that there are certain provisions in the Bill which require to be changed radically, and these changes refer to the very definition of "university" as provided in the Bill, the composition of the Commission as well as the functions of the Commission. With regard to the definition, we have to point out that it is very narrow and it does not include within its ambit the affiliated colleges that form the vast majority of the colleges which provide for university education in our country. I shall give some details to show how it will affect such affiliated colleges. Taking certain universities,—in Andhra University, there are four constituent colleges and 31 affiliated colleges; in Bombay University, there are three teaching departments and 22 affiliated colleges; in Calcutta University, there are 38 constituent colleges and teaching departments and 104 affiliated colleges; in Madras University, there are 20 constituent colleges, 21 teaching departments and 58 affiliated colleges; in the Punjab University, there are 14 teaching departments, three constituent colleges and 57 affiliated colleges; in Travancore-Cochin University, there are nine constituent colleges, only one teaching department and 13 affiliated colleges. In whole country, are told that there are 137 constituent colleges and 558

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury]

affiliated colleges. If we exclude these affiliated colleges, then we are in doubt as to how far the Grants Commission will take into account the needs of such colleges. In regard to enrolment we find that out of about 3,96,000 students, about 3,03,000 students read in the affiliated colleges. If we come to the expenditure, that is, the cost of university education, say in the Calcutta University, out of an expenditure of about Rs. 1,81,00,000, in the university departments only Rs. 16,81,348 was spent, and for the affiliated colleges Rs. 1,64,77,314 was spent. So, from this it will be clear that, unless we take within this definition the affiliated colleges the vast majority of the colleges will be left untouched and the Radhakrishnan Commission has made specific recommendations with regard to this point.

Then there is another important point and it is about the provision which they have to make about the living conditions of teachers. We find in *Education in Universities in India*, a statistical survey published by the Ministry of Education, that:

"...from the pay scales of different categories of university teachers during 1950-51, as many as 13 universities had not found it possible to start their Lecturers on Rs. 300, as recommended by the University Education Commission;

The distribution of teachers, according to their monthly salaries, was as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Between Rs. 100 and 150 .. | 6,034 |
| Between Rs. 151 and 250 .. | 7,369 |
| Between Rs. 251 and 450 .. | 5,177 |
| Between Rs. 451 and 650 .. | 1,329 |
| Between Rs. 651 and 850 .. | 525" |

and so on. This shows on an average that (a) nearly 90 per cent. of the teachers received less than Rs. 450 per month and (b) two out of every three teachers were paid salaries

between Rs. 100 and Rs. 250. But it is said later on:

"The university teacher should be helped to live in comfort, if he is to devote himself to learning, teaching and research.....I hope the university services will become as attractive as All-India Services, for that is the only way to recruit and retain some of the ablest persons for the universities".

This is what Dr. Radhakrishnan has said and has been quoted in that book. But in spite of all these recommendations for the development of university education, nothing has been done so far. We are hearing about the new deal for labour, new deal for peasants, new deal for teachers also, and it has been said so in this survey from which I quoted, but nothing so far has been done. So, if we have to develop university education, we have to take special care of this aspect of the problem.

It has already been pointed out by Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani that with regard to Delhi University there are certain anomalies. After the establishment of the University Grants Commission, when some of the employees, clerks, peons, etc., and also librarians and similar employees of that university, represented their case to the University Grants Commission, the Commission wrote that this is an internal matter for the University and they have nothing to do with it. When the employees wrote to the university, they said that after the establishment of the University Grants Commission, they cannot decide this matter. When they wrote to the Ministry, they also evaded their responsibilities and said they had nothing to do. But, while they wanted to bring about a change in the salaries payable to the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar, they did it quite quickly. We are told that the Vice-Chancellor's salary was raised from Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 2,500, and

that of the Registrar, from Rs. 500-750 to Rs. 500-900, giving sometimes three special increments, etc. Such things could be done. While in Delhi, school teachers in recognised schools are getting such allowances as city allowance, house-rent allowance, etc., the Delhi university teachers are not at all getting this. This is the result of the establishment of the University Grants Commission. This is a thing which we must take serious note of.

Now, regarding the composition of the Commission. We want a really autonomous, independent Grants Commission, whose activities would not be interfered with by the Government. But we find from section 20 of the Bill that the Commission is going to be made the handmaid of the Government itself. It has been stated in the Bill thus:

"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.

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

So, from this, it is clear, as has been very severely criticised by some other hon. Members, that they are going to utilise the Grants Commission as a sort of big stick on the universities. This should not be so. Our universities, which have played a vital and important role in the development of higher education in this country should not be allowed to be hindered in this manner. The autonomous character of the universities, particularly with reference to their internal administration, the determination of standard, etc., should be preserved and there should be sufficient scope for the universities to decide their policies themselves.

Then, I shall come to another aspect of the problem which has been

referred to in the Bill itself. We find that according to the Constitution, power has been vested in Parliament to decide the type of higher education, university education, etc., and according to that provision, this University Grants Commission is going to be established. Although in clause 19 it has been stated that the annual accounts of the Commission along with the audit report thereon would be placed before Parliament, there is no provision in clause 18 that Parliament would also receive the reports about the activities of the Commission, about the standards and other particulars with regard to the universities for which the Commission may make any grants. So, we feel that they should submit not only the report on accounts etc., but the reports with regard to the standards, the determination of standards and such other particulars should be submitted to Parliament. If we do not do that, I doubt whether it would be quite proper for this House to give its consent to such a measure.

Mr. Chairman: I hope the hon. Member will conclude by two of the clock.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: I conclude, and resume my seat.

Mr. Chairman: I did not mean that the Member should sit down immediately. He can have another two minutes if he wants.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: Then, I want to point out one other matter, with regard to the determination of standards. Nowadays, we find that there is no consistency or conformity between the standard of the secondary education and the university education, and sometimes this inconsistency leads to difficulties for many students. I have seen in my state of West Bengal that such anomalies persist not only between primary education and secondary education but also between the standards of secondary education and higher education. Although here we are dealing with university education

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury].

only, since we have the power under this Bill to advise the universities with regard to the determination of the standards and have right to call for returns, information, etc., we should make it a point to see that consistency with regard to standards is maintained so far as the different levels of education are concerned.

Dr. M. M. Das: I have listened with great interest and attention to the discussion that followed my motion, and I am highly thankful to the hon. Members who have taken part in this debate for the support they have given to this Bill and to the motion for referring this Bill to the Select Committee. Regarding the provisions of this Bill, some dissentient voices were heard. Some hon. Members did not see eye to eye with the Government and they differed in their opinions from the Government about particular provisions of this Bill. Difference of opinion is the life of democracy and democratic legislatures. In a democratic Parliament 2 P.M.

like this difference of opinion is inevitable. Therefore, I am not at all sorry, on the contrary I am glad and I am highly thankful to the Members for the different view-points they have placed and for the criticisms they have made. The motion before the House seeks to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. Government is fully aware of the fact that there are different views, there are different opinions regarding the provisions of this Bill. Government is fully conscious of the fact that there may be even some real ground for criticisms. The intention of the Government in referring this Bill to a Select Committee is to discuss thoroughly, to examine minutely all these different views expressed by hon. Members and all the provisions that are contained in this Bill and then in the Select Committee to square them out and secure the greatest amount of agreement that is possible.

With the exception of a few extravagant remarks which betray gross lack of correct information on the part of a few hon. Members, the discussions on the whole have been very informative, helpful and constructive. In this connection I wish to convey my thanks to the hon. lady Member opposite, from Bengal—she is not here in the House at the moment. I am thankful to her, for at least on this occasion she tried to be as much considerate and constructive as was possible for her. I am referring to Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.

Mr. Chairman: Because the Mover was.

Dr. M. M. Das: My hon. friend Shri Gurupadaswamy who initiated this discussion, and many other friends, raised a very important issue, the question of autonomy of our Universities. This has been practically the main theme of the discussion, and many of the hon. Members have spoken upon this particular question. My hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy said that the Bill did not explain the relation between the Central Government and the University, that it did not explain what it means by 'standards' and he was afraid that our Universities will lose their autonomy and there will be dual control. The other Members who spoke upon this question practically took the same line: they were afraid that the Central Government, by enacting this measure, will take away the autonomy of the Universities. That was the main complaint made. This is perhaps the most important question that has been raised during the course of the discussion and I wish to deal with it in some detail.

This House is aware that the Government—not only the Central Government but the State Governments also—have accepted the University Education Commission's recommendations as their guide to formulate the future pattern of our Universities.

So this House is aware that the existing University Grants Commission, which has already been established about a year back by a resolution of the Government and which is now carrying on its work,—the existing University Grants Commission was created and the present Bill has been drafted, in pursuance of the recommendations of the University Education Commission. I am glad that hon. Members have quoted profusely from that great, authoritative and comprehensive document. But I beg to submit to you and to this House that this great comprehensive document has been mis-quoted to the greatest extent possible by hon. Members.

I request my hon. friend Mr. Guruswamy to refer to that great document, the University Education Commission's report, and he will find there the answers to his question. One full Chapter, Chapter IV, containing about thirty-four pages has been devoted to explaining what is meant by 'standards', the different aspects of this question, the standard of teaching and the standard of examination in our Universities.

Regarding the autonomy the constitution of our Universities and control, and the so-called dual control, over our Universities, I beg to refer to Chapter XIII of this report; and for the benefit of the hon. Members who have quoted from this report and for the benefit of the House I wish to place before the House a few relevant lines. In the Introduction to this great report of the University Education Commission of which Dr. Radhakrishnan was the Chairman, it is said:

"The marked deterioration of standards in teaching and examinations and increasing dissatisfaction with the conduct of university administration and elections to university authorities are matters of great concern. The universities as the makers of the

future cannot persist in the old patterns, however, valid they may have been in their own day. With the increasing complexity of society and its shifting pattern, universities have to change their objectives and methods, if they are to function effectively in our national life. A policy of drift in the vague hope that if the universities are granted full autonomy and are permitted to pursue their own ends with intelligence and imagination, higher education will take care of itself, will be dangerous. Automatic and spontaneous adjustment will not take us to the future we want. We must develop a comprehensive positive policy within the limits of which there should be ample scope for pioneering and experimentation."

Then again, on page 404 of the Report the Commission says:

"In some subjects there is felt to be the need, without impairing local initiative, for a co-ordinating power to be retained by the Centre—

(a) to ensure that all Provinces, States and Unions act within certain limits or observe certain minimum standards,

(b) to ensure that, where different units wish to develop different special activities, a coherent over-all national policy emerges, without glaring examples of unnecessary duplication on the one hand or un-filled gaps on the other, and

(c) to enable joint planning by Provinces, States and Unions where this is necessary."

My hon. friend Dr. Krishnaswami—I do not find him in his place—waxed eloquent and asked what does this Bill mean by national purpose. The national purpose has been explained in a masterly way in these three reasons, (a), (b) and (c) which I have just quoted. These are the

[Dr. M. M. Das]

national purposes meant by this Bill.

Then the Report says:

"With the central guidance of policy that the University Grants Commission can give them, we are confident that they (that is the Universities) will prove a unifying force in the nation. But unfortunately there is clear evidence that in some universities local control has already led to actions tending to disunion."

"There are Universities in India today..."

I want to draw your particular attention to this line—

"...whose administration is unsatisfactory. Even in purely academic matters such as the appointment of examiners and awarding of degree, their procedures and standards are suspect..."

I want to draw particular attention to the word 'suspect'.

Shri S. S. More: What is the quality of Government administration? It is also suspect.

Dr. M. M. Das: To you; not to the majority of the people.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: To the whole country.

Dr. M. M. Das: "The existence of such a state of things is immeasurably damaging to our national prestige. It is clear that under existing conditions, it has not been possible to effect much improvement."

I beg to submit to you that the University Education Commission recommended the inclusion of Universities in the Concurrent List of our Constitution: that is both under the Central Government as well as the State Governments, because nearly all the witnesses—they were all eminent men and organisations—expressed their opinion in favour of the in-

clusion of Universities in the Concurrent List. This is what the Commission says on this subject:

"Nearly all our witnesses have expressed their opinion as to the proper category for university education, Central, Concurrent or Provincial. A minority, but a minority including some important witnesses, think it should be Central. A very large majority, both of university spokesmen and of public men and women think it should be Concurrent. Practically the only witnesses who thought it should be provincial were the representatives of the Provincial Governments in one or two Provinces. The significant thing was that even among the representatives of Provincial Governments a substantial majority preferred Concurrence."

Again, the Commission says:

"We may say at once that we agree with the majority in thinking that the All-India aspects of university education, the repercussions and interchanges necessary and desirable between universities and the need for a national guarantee of minimum standards of efficiency make it impossible for university education to remain a purely provincial subject."

Although the University Education Commission wanted the Universities to be a Concurrent subject, the makers of our Constitution preferred to keep them a State subject, subject to item 66 of the Union List, that is, only the responsibility of maintenance of co-ordination and maintenance of standards were given in the hands of the Central Government. So far as the present measure is concerned, Government have not gone, nor are they permitted to go by our Constitution, beyond the limits of item 66 of the Union List. Under this Bill the Government seek to secure only that much of power

which will enable them to discharge the responsibilities that have been placed upon them by our Constitution, namely, the responsibility under item 66 of the Union List. Government want to take into their hands powers only to discharge two responsibilities. They want to ensure that the money that would be given to the Universities from the Central Exchequer should be properly spent, and secondly, they want that they should be able to discharge the constitutional responsibility, namely, maintenance of co-ordination and standards among our Universities. The University Education Commission, an expert body, which consisted of not only eminent men in the field of education in India like Dr. Radhakrishnan, Dr. A. L. Mudaliar and our eminent Professor, Professor Meghnad Saha and others from India, but also eminent educationists from foreign countries like England and America, proposed to give much more powers into the Centre over our Universities, than are provided in this Bill. I appeal to the hon. Members who have dwelt at length upon this particular point not to worry themselves, not to get agitated, not to get irritated at the idea that the Centre will have some power over our Universities.

Some hon. Members have raised the issue as to why two different functions, namely maintenance of co-ordination and standards and the allotment of funds, should be given to one single body, the University Grants Commission. As I have said in my opening remarks, moving the motion, the original proposal of the Central Government was to establish two different bodies for these two different purposes. One was an All India Council of University Education for the maintenance of standards and co-ordination in our Universities and the other was the University Grants Commission for allocating the grants from the Central exchequer. But, the Conference of State Education Ministers and Vice-Chancellors, held in April 1953 unanimously recommended that instead of two se-

parate bodies, there should be one body into whose hands both these functions should be given. Thus, the persons who are intimately concerned with our University education and administration, namely the Vice-Chancellors and State Education Ministers recommended that instead of two separate bodies there should be one. In pursuance of their recommendation, the University Regulation of Standards Bill was dropped and its provisions were incorporated in the present Bill.

My hon. friend from Bihar, Shri S. N. Das said, if I understood his Hindi correctly—I hope I have understood him correctly—that the University Education Commission does not propose to give into the hands of the University Grants Commission any functions other than the allocating of grants. He was not quite correct. I will draw his attention to page 406 where the University Education Commission says:

“The only solution is to give to the University Grants Commission the task of co-ordination, with the sanction of giving or withholding grants.”

I like to lay emphasis on the words “with the sanction of giving or withholding grants”.

Shri S. N. Das (Darbhanga Central): What about maintenance of standards? This is about co-ordination, not about maintenance of standards.

Dr. M. M. Das: Much has been made about this: withholding of grants. Here we find that the University Education Commission is in favour of giving this power of withholding grants to the Grants Commission, whenever they think necessary from the Universities. It is necessary to give into the hands of the University Grants Commission the power so that they may be entitled to withhold grants from Universities whenever they find it necessary to do so.

[Dr. M. M. Das]

Then, I go to the composition of the Commission and its functions. It has been said that the composition of this Commission as provided in this Bill is not the same as recommended by the University Education Commission. It is true that changes have been made. In the first place, the total number of members has been raised from 7 to 9. This was thought necessary because additional responsibilities have been proposed to be given in this Bill into the hands of the University Grants Commission, viz., the responsibilities of maintenance and co-ordination of standards.

Secondly, regarding the terms and conditions of service, it was not possible to adhere to the terms and conditions as recommended by the University Education Commission, because the University Education Commission imposes some restriction upon the future employment of the members who serve in this Grants Commission, and it is difficult to get suitable men commanding the confidence and respect of the universities as well as the public who will be prepared to serve under this Commission, as members of this Commission, with restrictions on their future employment. Doubts have been expressed as to the necessity and advisability of having in this Commission administrative and financial experts. Many of the Members today have spoken on that question. The House should realise that the administration of universities has got two different aspects. One is the educational aspect, concerning teaching and education, and another is the administrative aspect concerning finance and administration. The University Grants Commission is supposed to be an expert body regarding both these aspects, both the educational aspect of our universities and the administrative and financial aspect of our universities. So, the inclusion of such experts is essential and necessary in the Grants Commission.

Some of the hon. Members have expressed their opinion, and my hon. friend Dr. Krishnaswami is one of them, that the Vice-Chancellors to be appointed as members of the University Grants Commission should be elected by the Vice-Chancellors of all the universities of India. I beg to submit to this House that I do not think that this is a very commendable proposition. An election amongst our Vice-Chancellors for membership of the University Grants Commission will not be in keeping with the dignity of the Vice-Chancellors. In addition to that, such an election will tend to create narrowness and create factions. I may submit to this House that the University Education Commission was not in favour of election. They recommended that the non-official members of the University Grants Commission should be appointed by the Central Government. I am quoting what the University Education Commission says about this matter:

"We recommend that the Commission should consist of five members, three full-time members appointed by the Government of India who can also appoint one of the three as Chairman, together with the Secretary of the Ministry of Finance and the Secretary of the Ministry of Education. However, on account of the size of our country, the varying character of the different institutions and the large numbers of courses in our Universities involved, this number may be increased to seven, with five non-officials and two Secretaries."

The University Education Commission was totally against any important appointment in the field of education by election. They expressed their opinion rather very strongly while discussing the selection of Vice-chancellors of universities. This is what they say. I want hon. Members who are supporters of elections to

listen to me very carefully. The University Education Commission says:

"Open canvassing and voting for candidates may have been tolerable while the post was not much more than a compliment which the university could bestow, though, even so, it was undignified and led to the formation of factions..."

—this was said about the selection of Vice-chancellors of our universities—

"...but as a measure of securing a man of character and reputation for an arduous and highly skilled service, it is, to put it bluntly, disastrous folly."

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): Is it a democratic principle that it is a disastrous folly?

Shri S. S. More: Now, there will be canvassing at the centre.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West): That is the opinion of the Commission, not his.

Dr. M. M. Das: I do not think these lines require any comment.

Some Members do not like the idea that the Grants Commission should be under the policy control of the Central Government. Some of the Members said that clause 20 which makes this provision is a dangerous clause. They wanted complete independence, absolute freedom for the Grants Commission. At least a few crores of rupees will have to be spent by the University Grants Commission annually for distributing grants to our universities. The Government of India is responsible for this money to this House. If anything goes wrong, then, my hon. friends opposite will be the first persons to fly at the throat of the Government of India. The Government of India will be held fully responsible for every act of commission and omission of the Univer-

sity Grants Commission. Is it fair, is it just, I ask this august House, that the Government of India which will have the fullest responsibility will have not the remotest authority, the remotest control, the remotest right? There can be no responsibility at all without authority, without right, without control.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Quite, quite.

Dr. M. M. Das: Many Members do not like clause 14, the penal clause which authorises the Commission to withdraw the grant if they choose to do so. This power of withdrawing the grant whenever the Commission thinks it necessary is very essential. One hon. Member quoted from the University Education Commission's report to prove that this clause will stand in the way of friendship between the universities on the one hand and the Grants Commission on the other hand, and added that by this clause the universities will regard the Grants Commission as a policeman. For her benefit—she is not here unfortunately—and for the benefit of this House, I wish to read in some detail so that it will clarify her point.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member reads in detail, he might not be able to finish by 2:25. Would it be possible for him to do so?

Dr. M. M. Das: Yes, I will finish. There are 10 minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: Only seven.

Dr. M. M. Das: There is no end to this discussion. I can finish at any moment.

Mr. Chairman: He will have another opportunity.

Dr. M. M. Das: Some hon. Members quoted from this report. I want to show that this document has been misquoted to the greatest possible extent by hon. Members of the Opposition.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Scriptures are always liable to be misquoted.

Dr. M. M. Das: The Commission says that "they wish to see established with the universities a relation of friendship and not that of a policeman or even an inspector." This line has been quoted, but the next two lines have not been quoted. In the next two lines they say:

"In the last resort, if a university persists in faction fights at the expense of its proper task, the commission will be bound to divert the public money with which it is entrusted into more profitable channels. That is inherent in the situation and the mere knowledge that it is so should be a steadying influence."

I think my quotations will have a steadying influence upon the hon. Members opposite.

Shri S. S. More: You are hoping too much.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): They are incorrigible.

Dr. M. M. Das: There is another important question I would like to take up, and this is the question of taking away the right of conferring degrees from institutions like the Kashi Vidyapith and Gurukul Kangri etc. This power of taking away the power of conferring degrees from unauthorised institutions is essential for discharging the responsibility of maintenance of standards. No standards can be maintained if every one comes forward for conferring degrees. But we must admit that all private institutions cannot be and should not be measured by one and the same yardstick. There are private institutions in this country that command great respect and confidence of the public. Such institutions also receive annual grants from the Government. Such institutions of real merit have got nothing to be afraid of. They can be declared under clause 3 of this Bill to be universities entitled to confer degrees.

Shri S. N. Das: What about those who do not get any aid from Government, and who do not like to get any degree from Government?

Mr. Chairman: I think we should allow the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to conclude his speech.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): He should be allowed, for this is a very important point.

Dr. M. M. Das: My hon. friend, Shri N. M. Lingam, was expressing his great dissatisfaction and regret at the present educational conditions in our country. Shri N. M. Lingam said that we have not evolved a national pattern of education, and that we do not have any definite objectives. With all my respect to hon. friend, I must submit that the views he expressed betray gross—I should not say ignorance, but—lack of proper information.

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): How?

Dr. M. M. Das: It is not correct to say that we have no definite objectives before us. It is not correct to say that we have not developed any national pattern of education. So far as the results are concerned, I should like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to the different schemes that are being implemented today in conjunction with the Central Government by the State Governments all over the country, for the reconstruction of the educational system of our country. Crores of rupees are being spent today annually by the Central Government as well as the State Governments for this reconstruction or rejuvenation of the educational system of our country.

Shri N. M. Lingam: It is confusion worse confounded.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: What about the results?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let these things be decided subsequently.

Dr. M. M. Das: I have at my disposal the figures of the total number of students in our secondary and primary schools, and I would like to give them to my hon. friend Dr. Suresh Chandra. In 1947-48, the total number of students in our primary and secondary schools was 1.41 crores, while in 1952-53, the number was 2.53 crores, which means an increase of 1.12 crores. We have not received all the figures from all the State Governments, but the figures that have been received show that the present number of students in our secondary and primary schools has exceeded 3 crores. Considering our population, 3 crores out of 36 crores may not be a very impressive figure, but when one considers the rate at which the number of students has been increasing, and the number of new schools that are coming into existence, one is tempted to think that perhaps there is no just or justifiable ground for despair and regret.

I understand fully the difficulty of my hon. friend Shri N. M. Lingam and others. Their difficulty has been this. The achievement in the field of education is not something which automatically draws the notice of the public. When a big dam is constructed across a river, we see before our eyes some gigantic structure, some awe-inspiring structure raising its head in the skies; it is something located, it is something awe-inspiring, that one can go to the spot and see it. But the achievements in the field of education are scattered all over the whole country. It is not a localised thing; one cannot go to a particular place and see all the achievements of Government in the field of education. We have to go to the remotest village to see that a new primary school has sprung up; we have to go the farthest corner of a school building to find out that a few hundred books have been added to the library. Efforts have to be made, and troubles have to be taken to find out what has been done in the field of education. Unfortunately,

there is a dearth of people who are prepared to take this trouble, to make this effort.

I have taken much time of the House. I have tried my best to cover as many as possible of the relevant points that have been raised by hon. Members in the course of the discussion. I commend my motion to the House.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members, 30 from this House, namely, Shri Narhar Vishnu Gadgil, Shri V. B. Gandhi, Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi, Shri R. V. Dhulekar, Shri Birbal Singh, Pandit Algurai Shastri, Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar, Shri S. Sinha, Shri T. N. Vishwanatha Reddy, Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri Rachiah, Shri Diwan Chand Sharma, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Shri Radhelal Vyas, Mulla Abdullabhai, Mulla Taherali, Shri Krishnacharya Joshi, Pandit Lingraj Misra, Dr. Mono Mohon Das, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri Jaipal Singh, Shri Harendra Nath Mukerjee, Shri K. M. Vallatharas, Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi, H. H. Maharaja Rajendra Narayan Singh Deo, Shri B. H. Khardekar, Shri Meghnad Saha, Shri Sivamurthi Swami, Shri P. N. Rajabhoj and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad,

and 15 members from the Rajya Sabha;

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

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 30th day of April, 1955;

[Mr. Chairman]

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

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

The motion was adopted

DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Drugs Act, 1940, as passed by the Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

I have much pleasure in asking this House to take into consideration the Drugs (Amendment) Bill. I think I have been asked on more than one occasion on the floor of this House to do something in this matter. I took it up as early as I could when it came on the Concurrent List and after having received the opinions and suggestions of all the States the necessary amendments have now been incorporated in this Bill; and these amendments incorporate the greatest common measure of agreement between the Centre and the States.

The Drugs Act has been in force since April, 1947, but in the light of experience gained during these seven years, it is proposed to make a few amendments to the Act. I should like to enumerate them briefly.

The definition of 'drug' has been amplified. It came to our notice that a number of drugs which purported to be or which were claimed to be, contraceptives had come into the market and were doing a great deal of damage. It has been sought to cover drugs of this nature as well as insecticides in the definition and also

to take power to the Central Government to notify these from time to time in the official gazette, so that standards may be controlled wherever necessary.

Then, a definition of 'manufacture' has been given in this Bill for the first time; it was not defined in the Act previously. I might mention that a substantial portion of manufacturing activities in this country really consist of importing drugs in bulk, and re-bottling them, re-labelling them or re-packing them, and it has been considered necessary that to maintain control over such activities, we must include what is done here also in the term 'manufacture'.

The constitution of the Drugs Technical Advisory Board needed some alteration. At present the representation of the pharmaceutical profession on the Board consists of only one member but because of the increased activity of this profession, it is now proposed to enhance their representation to three. These representatives will now be elected by the Pharmacy Council of India which was set up under the Pharmacy Act of 1948.

There used to be Indian branches of the British Medical Association who were authorised to elect one member on the Board. It is no longer considered necessary to give this Association any special representation. So that provision has been omitted.

Then we feel very strongly that the Drugs Controller, who is the principal officer attached to the Centre in charge of the administration of the Act, should be made an *ex-officio* member of the Board.

One of the main amendments is the assumption by the Central Government of rule-making powers under chapter IV. I may say that the States are absolutely in agreement with us on this. Many of the important drugs in the country are imported and because they enter into inter-State commerce, it is essential that the rules