

[Shri L. B. Shastri.]

period in the history of Indian Railways and they performed their duties creditably. The Board has been reconstituted with an additional member and more powers to the Chairman, who has been vested with the functions and powers of the former Chief Commissioner of Railways. I take this opportunity to welcome the new members of the Board, who have already taken to their new duties with zeal and earnestness.

Howsoever well equipped the Railways may otherwise be, their efficient working depends mainly on those who actually run them. If they are not up to the required standard, if they have not caught the spirit of the times and if they do not basically believe in the democratic approach, Railways would lose dynamism and not have served their full purpose. I need not therefore remind railwaymen, officers and workers alike, of their continued obligation to maintain and foster the development of the highest ideals of service to their countrymen in the performance of their duties.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL—*contd.*

Mr. Chairman: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the motion moved by Dr. Mono Mohon Das on the 18th December 1954 relating to the University Grants Commission Bill.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): During the last Session I moved a motion for referring the University Grants Commission Bill to a Joint Select Committee of both Houses. As the time at my disposal was not much, I could not complete my speech.

There was a time when Universities were regarded as places of cultural luxury catering for a small privileged class. This conception of Universities has passed away and will never return. Momentous changes have taken place in the social and political sphere and today there is an

increasing awareness and an increasing consciousness in the country of the importance and necessity of university education.

Even before our Independence in 1947 the demand for higher university education was great. After Independence it has become greater. This urge for higher education has been reflected not only in the phenomenal increase in the number of students studying in the Universities but also in the number of Universities that have sprung up during the post-Independence period. As many as 12 new Universities have come into existence after 1947 to make the total Universities in India today 31.

In the year 1948-49 the total number of students in our Universities was 2,23,081. In the next year, that is 1949-50, this number became 3,66,986, an increase of about 65 per cent. In 1952-53 the number of students was 4,43,061. It is needless to say that this rate of increase in the number of our University students has been maintained up till now. This rapidly increasing number of students in our Universities has given rise to a persistent demand for the establishment of more Universities in the country. This phenomenal increase both in the number of students in our Universities and in the number of the Universities themselves has created two serious problems for the Government. The first problem is to maintain co-ordination among the activities of our Universities. The second problem is to maintain the standards in our Universities. The House knows that the Universities not only in this country but everywhere else in the world are not financially self-supporting bodies. Neither can they be made to be so. The fees that are realised from the students in our Universities form only a small portion of the total expenditure of the Universities. For every boy or girl studying in our Universities the public exchequer has to incur a considerable amount of expenditure. By an analysis of the total expenditure of

all the Universities in the year 1949-50 we find that 38 per cent. of the total expenditure incurred by Universities in this country has been contributed by Governments, the Central Government as well as the State Governments. In subsequent years this amount, that is the percentage of Government help, has gone up considerably. In spite of this substantial help from the public exchequer, the condition of our Universities is far from satisfactory. The University Commission has observed:

"In most cases the Universities are working under a deficit budget, and in all cases it is seen that the revenue from different sources is hardly sufficient to meet the average present needs of the Universities."

It is a well known fact that the condition of our Universities is precarious financially. On the one hand their incomes are not sufficient to meet their present needs. On the other hand the pressure upon them, namely the number of students, is continually increasing. The results under such circumstances are bound to be inadequate facilities for education, poorly paid teachers, ill-equipped laboratories and ill-equipped libraries, want of proper accommodation, lowering of the teachers-students ratio—all leading to the one, inevitable result, namely the lowering of standards in our Universities.

Maintenance of co-ordination in our Universities has been another headache for our Government. This is not a new problem that has cropped up recently. As early as the year 1924 the then Government of India felt the necessity of creating a body for co-ordinating the activities of our Universities. Accordingly the Inter-University Board was created. This Inter-University Board has been acting up till now as an advisory body. But it has not been able to exert upon our Universities that much influence which is really necessary. Our Universities have not always been inclined to follow the advice of this Board,

although this Board was mainly constituted of the Vice-Chancellors of our Universities. The result has been that there is very little co-ordination in our Universities today.

The makers of our Constitution were fully conscious of these difficulties regarding our Universities and in their wisdom they placed the entire responsibility of maintenance of co-ordination and maintenance of standards in our Universities exclusively upon the Central Government. According to entry No. 66 in the Union List of our Constitution "co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions" are exclusively the responsibility of the Central Government.

To discharge this responsibility enjoined by the Constitution of India, the Central Government in the year 1951 drafted a Bill, the University (Regulation of Standards) Bill, 1951. This Bill proposed to set up a statutory body, the Indian Council of University Education which would be entrusted with this work of maintenance of co-ordination and standard in our Universities. This Bill was circulated to the Universities and the State Governments.

The University Grants Commission was also revived in pursuance of the recommendations of the University Education Commission, by a resolution of the Central Government in November, 1952. The purpose of this University Grants Commission, as the name suggests, was to consider the financial difficulties of our Universities and to give them financial help from the Central exchequer wherever possible and necessary.

The House will remember that the Central Advisory Board of Education, in their report published in 1943, recommended the setting up of such a body for giving help from the Central exchequer to our Universities. Accordingly, in pursuance of this recommendation of the Central Advisory Board of Education, the University Grants Committee was established in 1945 by

[Dr. M. M. Das]

the then Government of India. This Grants Committee functioned till 1950 when its activities were suspended pending the consideration of the recommendations of the University Education Commission.

The University Education Commission recommended that a body similar to this, under the name of University Grants Commission, should come into existence immediately. This is what the University Education Commission said:

"Our universities are grossly underfinanced for the tasks they are attempting. More buildings, more staff, better-paid staff, more scholarships, more facilities for research, more books, more equipment—all these are clamant needs. We see no possibility of the Provinces providing the whole of the necessary expenditure, burdened as they will be with the no less acute needs of extending basic, secondary and technical schools. Generous grants from the Centre must be forthcoming; and these grants the Centre will not, and should not, allocate blindly or mechanically. A Central University Grants Commission working through the Ministry of Education must allocate the sums made available by the Central Government, in accordance with the special needs and merits of each university."

The Central Government accepted this recommendation of the University Education Commission and revived the University Grants Commission, by a resolution in the year 1952. Thus, there were two propositions before the Government of India. One was the University (Regulation of Standards) Bill which proposed the setting up of a statutory body, the Indian Council of University Education, for the maintenance of co-ordination and standards in our Universities. The other was the University Grants Commission for allocating funds from the Central exchequer to the Universities for their

development and improvement.

To consider these matters, a conference of the State Education Ministers and Vice-Chancellors of our Universities was called in Delhi. This Conference was held in April 1953 and it unanimously recommended that instead of setting up two separate bodies namely the University Grants Commission and the Indian Council of University Education as proposed in the University (Regulation of Standards) Bill, it would be more appropriate to set up a statutory University Grants Commission and give it the powers and functions proposed to be allotted to both these bodies. Accordingly, the present measure which is before the House today was drafted. This, in short, is the genesis, the history, of this Bill.

Regarding the different provisions of this Bill, I have not much to say at this stage of the debate. Hon. Members will judge these provisions for themselves. But, I like, most humbly to impress upon this House that the Government, in dealing with this measure, have not forgotten even for a moment that they are dealing with Universities, the supreme, the greatest educational organisations of our land, manned and managed by men of great learning, honesty, integrity and character, men who are universally respected in this country, the Vice-Chancellors and professors of our Universities. Government have given great care and consideration to each provision of this Bill, always bearing in mind the autonomous character of our Universities and the great role that our Universities have got to play in our national reconstruction. Universities are our national assets. The very nature of their functions and their work demands that our Universities should not be treated in a narrow, parochial or partisan manner. They have a great contribution to make in the national reconstruction of our country. The future of this country depends upon the success that is achieved in the continuous search for new know-

ledge in the fields of science and technology by our Universities. The future of our nation depends upon the character, integrity, initiative, directive capacity and leadership of our young graduates developed in our Universities. Our Universities should be the national centres where students and teachers from all over the country would gather and the true spirit and culture of India should brood over them. This is the ideal, this is the picture that the Government of India have before them while formulating the provisions of this Bill.

We circulated this Bill to the Vice-Chancellors of our Universities and we have received from them a few suggestions. Some of these suggestions deserve very careful consideration. We propose to place those suggestions before the Joint Select Committee.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Will they be available to other Members also?

Dr. M. M. Das: Yes; they will be placed before the Committee.

Shri S. S. More: I am asking whether they will be circulated to the other Members of this House.

Dr. M. M. Das: If hon. Members want that they should be circulated, I have no objection.

Shri S. S. More: It is not a question of wanting.

Mr. Chairman: Anyhow, if they are made available to the Members of the Select Committee and the report of the Select Committee comes here, it is advisable to circulate all these things to all the Members so that they may know what the views of the Vice-Chancellors are. It will be of great help to the Members.

Dr. M. M. Das: Government have an open mind so far as this Bill is concerned. We have been able to secure a great measure of agreement outside this House, amongst our Universities, amongst the Vice-Chancellors, and amongst the State Governments.

We fervently hope that we would be able to achieve the same amount of agreement within this House also. That is why I refer this Bill to a Joint Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, 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 N. Rachiah, Shri Diwan Chand Sharma, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Shri Radhelal Vyas, Mulla Abdullabhai Mulla Taherali, Shri Krishnacharya Joshi, Pandit Lingaraj Misra, Dr. Mono Mohon Das, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri Jaipal Singh, Shri Hirendra 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;

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

[Mr. Chairman]

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

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): This Bill should have come long ago. But, for some reason or other, of which the Government is aware, this was not taken up early. This is a very important Bill which would introduce many changes in the educational system, especially the University system, in India. Unfortunately, this Bill, instead of clearing the atmosphere, has only helped to create confusion in regard to the particular roles to be played by the Universities on the one hand and by the Government on the other. I do not say that there should not be any relationship between the Government and the Universities. In fact it is one of the essential functions of the Government to see that there is the right type of Universities and the right type of education. All of us are interested in setting up good standards of education. We also agree with the Constitution makers that there should be co-ordination and determination of standards in the University system. The Constitution rightly gives that power to Parliament. Unfortunately, here, the authors of the Bill have confused or misinterpreted the whole meaning of this particular provision in the Constitution. They seem to think that this particular provision in the Constitution, the power of co-ordination and determination of standards, would necessarily give power to the executive to interfere in the ordinary affairs of the University.

2 P.M.

Sir, to me the most important question is: what type of relationship should exist between the University and the Government? Is it a relationship on the basis of partnership or is it a relationship of one of subordi-

nation of the University to the Government?

I am a believer in the autonomy of the Universities. This autonomy does not mean complete independence of the educational or higher educational institutions from Government control and supervision. But, it means the autonomy should be such as to provide sufficient scope for the management to guide the day-to-day affairs of the Universities. But, here, on the plea of providing funds for the Universities, the Government is taking up other powers, powers of executive control. This control does not stop at the level of control only, but it goes beyond that. It tries to impose the will of the executive on the various Universities in matters such as standards of education. The standards of education have not been defined yet. So many Boards and Commissions have been set up so far to find out what should be the exact standards, but till today there is still confusion left in this matter. Now, we are asked to give power to the Central Government to fix up standards. Further, according to the Constitution the co-ordination and determination of standards are exclusively given to Parliament and Parliament cannot be equated with the Government. But this Bill if passed would confer powers to the Central Government to give directions and issue instructions through the Commission. The Central Government is also given the power to decide whether a particular institution of higher education should be treated as a University or not. The Constitution does not contemplate this alienation of power, or the delegation of power to the executive, but this Bill seems to do this. And, however, one may ask how the authority of Parliament has then to be exercised. I know it is a very important question. Parliament as such, the whole body of Members, cannot exercise this control over the Universities. They cannot sit together to fix up standards or to bring about co-ordination in

university education. So, there should be a smaller body, but that body must be different from the University Grants Commission. The function of the University Grants Commission has to be specific. Its function as its title indicates, should be mainly to allocate funds between the Universities. But, here, apart from this power, other functions also are tagged on to the University Grants Commission. Through the Commission and through the rule-making power the Centre will have enormous control over the future and even the daily activities of the various Universities. The provision in the Constitution, as I have pointed out, is not aimed at abridging the power of the University management. Education is a subject which mostly comes within the province of the States and if the Centre has to intervene, it can intervene only to a limited extent to ensure co-ordination and determinations of standards. But we must know what exactly is "co-ordination and determination of standards". Nobody knows. Even the hon. Mover of this Bill has not explained what it is.

Dr. M. M. Das: I request my hon. friend to speak on his own behalf, not on behalf of others.

Shri S. S. More: He is finding fault with you, not speaking for you.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I am not speaking on behalf of the hon. Minister. I am just saying that he has not been able to explain the words which are in the Constitution: "co-ordination and determination of standards".

I say it should be better in the present circumstances to separate the two functions; namely, the function of financial grants should be entrusted to the Grants Commission, and the other functions should be entrusted to, some other body. The sponsor of the Bill said in his speech that some time back this was contemplated. But I do not know what made the Government think that all these functions should be combined in one body. Also, it pains me to point out that this Bill

gives enormous rule-making power to the Executive, and in the Explanatory Memorandum it is said that these delegated powers are of a routine character. It is also said that for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of the Bill, the delegation has been considered necessary.

Sir, this delegation is not merely confined to procedural matters, but it has gone beyond that. For instance, clause 27 of the Bill states that the Commission may, subject to the previous approval of the Central Government, make regulations consistent with this Act. There are as many as five or six items given under this clause, and one of them states as follows:

"defining the qualifications that should ordinarily be required of any person to be appointed to the teaching staff of the University."

I wonder whether this power can be construed as procedural only.

In the same way, so many substantial matters are to be dealt with through the rule-making power. This is very unusual. Particularly in the case of University education too much power should not be given to the Government or to the executive organ of the Government. Already Government interference in the day-to-day administration of the University has spoiled instead of clearing the atmosphere. There has been too much of politics imported into the University affairs and if we give more powers of control to Government and if Parliament agrees to delegate its authority to the Executive, then you will be helping to import still more politics into the University affairs thereby spoiling the atmosphere. This would be a great disservice that we are doing to the citadels of learning.

So, I repeat that there should be first of all a separation of functions and they should be entrusted to two bodies and not to one body. The delegation of so many powers to the Executive in the name of rule-making power is absolutely wrong and it will not in any way help the Universities;

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

on the other hand, it will go against the fair administration of Universities.

Sir, if you go to the various States and see how the Universities are run to-day, how the staff are appointed and how the examinations are conducted, you will find that there is too much meddling by local politicians. There is too much of corruption. Instead of the enhancement in the standards of university education, the governmental control after Independence has brought them down. Today I am pained to see communalistic forces corroding the University atmosphere. Thus, instead of becoming great centres of teaching and culture, Universities have become places of worst communal politics. So, I feel that the autonomy of Universities should be retained and if at all there should be control by Government—I agree that there should be some sort of control—it should be very minimum and only to the extent that is necessary for co-ordination purposes. There has been already too much of interference and there is no autonomy left. What will happen if this Bill is passed? There will be a sort of diarchy; that is, there will be dual control—control at the State level and also at the Central level. It is not for the good of the University; Government may say it is all for establishing some high uniform standard in University education. But practically it will mean too much of subordination of the University's affairs and administration to the politicians. So I say that the autonomy will be taken away if this Bill is passed. I want that the Grants Commission should not be given power to enquire into any and every matter of the University. The main function of the Grants Commission should be to see how far and to what extent a University requires financial help in the form of grants; and it should stop there. But the Bill contemplates other things. The Grants Commission can go into the question of the University standard

and other administrative matters. The Central Government may ask the University Grants Commission to enquire into any matter in the University. All these things will make the whole problem more complex. You will be creating more and more difficulties. The purpose of this Bill will not be realised. So, I want that the rule-making power of the Government should be curtailed and also, the Grants Commission should only confine its task to making grants to the Universities and should not go into the business of co-ordination and establishing standards. Their business should be entirely different. It is to find out whether a particular institution wants money or not. This is separate from the problems of judging whether there are good standards maintained in the University. If the same body is entrusted with this double task, then there will be greater confusion and the same set of people will not be competent to fulfil the two important functions which are contemplated in this Bill. For two separate functions there should be two bodies. Further, parliamentary authority should not be delegated or alienated. It cannot be effectively exercised through the Executive. Let there be a Committee of Parliament for this purpose. The Executive should not come into the picture. If at all it has to come into the picture, it should be only for the purpose of finding out whether there is co-ordination and whether there is uniform standard maintained in the Universities. Now what is contemplated is direct interference by the Executive. This will take away the independence and autonomy of the Universities.

So, I would ask the hon. Minister to consider the whole question in this light. The Select Committee must also consider this question carefully. There is sufficient time for considering all these matters. I appeal to the House that this Bill should not be rushed through. This Bill should, not be taken as very unimportant. It requires greater thought and examina-

tion. So I hope that this matter may be considered by the Select Committee in all its details.

Mr. Chairman: The name of Shri D. C. Sharma is already there on the Select Committee and I am sorry I cannot call upon him to speak. The learned professor would not be able to enlighten us at this stage.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): This is a very important Bill, but not even one Minister is here. Only the Parliamentary Secretary has been left to follow the proceedings.

Mr. Chairman: The Deputy Minister is there.

Shri S. S. More: Under the Rules of Procedure, the Parliamentary Secretary comes under the definition of Minister. He can have that much of satisfaction.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry that the hon. Member should have made a remark of this nature which is uncalled for at this stage. We are considering whether he sufficiently represents the Government or not. He is the Deputy Minister and he is in charge of the Bill and thus he sufficiently represents the Government of India's Education Ministry.

Shri S. S. More: We speak subject to correction, because orders are being issued and we do not know who is who.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member does not know who is who, he has no right to contradict any statement to the contrary.

Dr. M. M. Das: I may assure my friends that I am speaking on behalf of Government and I am thoroughly conversant with the opinion of the Government, and I am having all the facts and figures at my disposal though my rank may not be very high.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): What is it?

Dr. M. M. Das: But I am in full possession of all the documents.

Mr. Chairman: The position or the status of the hon. Minister does not arise. All that the Members are desirous of is that for a measure like this, other Ministers of Government also should be present. And this is not a new demand at all. In fact, on every occasion, this demand is being made. Especially during the Budget discussions, it has always been demanded by the House that some Ministers must be here to hear the view-point of hon. Members. It is unfortunate that the Ministers do not take sufficient interest in the work of Parliament. I should have expected some Ministers to be here, but only one Minister is here and the entire Government block is empty.

An Hon. Member: No. He is not a Minister. What about the Minister in charge?

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): But he may be more competent than the Minister himself.

Mr. Chairman: For the purpose of representation, the hon. Minister or Secretary in charge of the Bill is quite sufficient but for the purpose of hearing the debate and formulating conclusions thereon, it is but natural that the Members should think that the other Ministers should also be here.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): My learned friend comes from the same part as I do, and his knowledge also may be high, but somebody must be there to send a chit to the Ministers because they must be here to express their opinions after hearing us.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister or Secretary who is here is quite sufficient for the purpose of representing the Ministry and conducting the proceedings in the House.

Shrimati Jayashri (Bombay—Suburban): The reorientation of the scheme of education has evoked great enthusiasm and public interest, and we are glad that Government are also planning the education system in the country from its very foundation to its higher University standards. It is necessary that education should be

[Shrimati Jayashri]

more realistic so that those who come out from the colleges and Universities after higher studies can fit in with life and community.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर—रचित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : कोई शैक्षक कास्ट का रिप्रेजेंटेटिव आया है ?

Shrimati Jayashri: It is, therefore, necessary that particular care should be taken to see that the education that is imparted is realistic, so that the students can take an active and intelligent part in social life, and help in building a new society. Also, it is very essential on the part of the teachers to see that there are friendly relations between the teachers and students, such as those that existed in the former big institutions like Takhsila and Nalanda Universities, where the teachers and students were living together, and where the most essential thing was considered to be the building up of the character of the students. I would insist that when we are going to see that the standard of education is going to be improved, there should be more stress laid on seeing that proper residential arrangements are made for the students. If students who have to go in for higher studies should live in their own homes, they will not get proper facilities there, and their knowledge is also curtailed by the disturbances at home. So, it is very necessary that for higher education, they should go and live in residential colleges. I would suggest that there should be more and more of unitary colleges and unitary Universities, for giving tuition to students, and thus the educational system can be improved to fulfil the aim that we have in view.

The chief idea of appointing this University Grants Commission is to improve the standard of education. I would suggest that the most important thing is to see that there are more unitary Universities. At present, we find that there are colleges in the country starting like mushrooms, where no proper standard at all is

kept, and the status of the teachers is also not properly taken into consideration. The Secondary Education Commission also have suggested in their report that in order to improve the standard of education, the status of the teachers has to be improved. I would request the University Grants Commission to see that the teachers get proper salaries, for unless they are given the proper status, we cannot hope that they will be able to exercise proper influence on the students. As I said earlier, the first thing is to improve the character of the students, and we cannot expect that from those teachers who have not got proper status in society. So, this is the first thing that I would request the Grants Commission to see to.

The second point which I would like to suggest is this. We all expect to have better results from our Universities; and in order to achieve that, we expect also that there should be more co-ordination between the various Universities. For this purpose, a certain amount of Central control is necessary. Though I would not like that we should interfere with the day to day working of the Universities, yet some sort of Central control is necessary for this purpose. There are various dangerous and fissiparous tendencies current in India today, and unless we are very vigilant, we may find that national unity is destroyed. From this point of view also, I would suggest that the Grants Commission can help in keeping these Universities together. There will be better co-ordination between the different Universities. From the financial point of view, again, there will be pooling of resources, which will help the proper Universities to work in their various and different subjects. We should also see that there is proper planning as between the various subjects. Some Universities may go in for different Subjects, while some others may be doing research work. In that way, we can help the universities taking to different subjects. If the resources

are all pooled together, then there would be proper planning, and thus, the unity of the country can also be kept up by the Grants Commission. We expect that our universities should produce big and educated people, and for that, it is necessary there should be unity in the country. We require people for the various works; the country is developing, and we are finding it difficult to get technicians in various subjects. If there is proper co-ordination as between the various universities, it would be easy to plan out the whole thing. In that, I would suggest, the Grants Commission can play a good role. So, it is not proper to say that the autonomy of the universities will be taken away by this. Some hon. Member had said that the autonomy of the universities should be kept up. I also feel that the university is an autonomous body, but some sort of Central control is necessary. The universities are expecting some financial help from the Centre,— and I know that unless that help is given, we cannot raise the standard of education—and when such help is given, it is quite essential that some Central control should be there to see that the finances are properly utilised.

For these reasons, I congratulate the Government on appointing this University Grants Commission, and I hope that they will help in improving the standard of education, and besides, the proper universities will also benefit. There are new universities which are still in their childhood, and require to be nursed. I hope that the Grants Commission will see that they get proper finances to develop themselves.

श्री बी० जी० दशपांड : यह विधेयक अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण विधेयक है और मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा भारत के महान् विद्वान् शिक्षा मंत्री आज उपस्थित होते और भारत के संविधान ने जो यह बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण अधिकार केंद्रीय सरकार को दिया है, उस का प्रयोग केंद्रीय सरकार किस प्रकार से कर रही है उस को विशद करने के लिये यहां आते, तो अच्छा होता। बारम्बार सदस्य यहां शिकायत करते हैं कि जब कोई

विधेयक सदन के सामने आता है तो उस के बारे में पूरी इन्फार्मेशन सदन के सामने रखी नहीं जाती। आज भी मैं दखता हूँ कि इस विधेयक में विद्यापीठों के कर्तव्यों में पर्याप्त हस्तक्षेप हो रहा है। जो विद्यापीठ हैं उन की शिक्षा का स्तर क्या होना चाहिये, उन को क्या मिलना चाहिये, जो परीक्षा होती है उस का परिमाण और स्तर क्या होना चाहिये, यह विधेयक जो विद्यापीठों का कार्यक्षेत्र है जब उस में हस्तक्षेप कर रहा है तब विद्यापीठों के जो उपकुलपति हैं उन का इस के बारे में क्या कहना है, यह सरकार के पास है परन्तु इस का श्वेतपत्रक सदस्यों को नहीं दिया गया है। यह कहा जाता है कि हमारा पार्लियामेन्टरी सेक्रेटरी के पास पूरी इन्फार्मेशन है और हमारा महान् शिक्षा मंत्री का यहां आना आवश्यक नहीं है, हमें व्यक्तिगतों में कोई भेद नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं यह मानने के लिये तैयार भी हूँ। विद्यापीठों के विषय में शायद पार्लियामेन्टरी सेक्रेटरी हमारा महान् विद्वान् महामंत्री से भी ज्यादा योग्य हो सकते हैं परन्तु हम यह मानते हैं कि जो पूरा मंत्रिमंडल है वह हमारा प्रति उत्तरदायी है और इस दृष्टि से जब प्रथम बार युनिवर्सिटी का विधेयक आज सदन के सामने आ रहा है—और मैं समझता हूँ कि विद्यापीठों की शिक्षा का प्रश्न बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण होने के कारण शिक्षा विभाग राज्य सरकारों के हाथ में होते हुए भी विद्यापीठों के समन्वयिकरण और उन को क्या आर्थिक मदद देनी है उस का कार्य केन्द्र ने अपने हाथ में रक्खा है—तब शिक्षा मंत्री महादय का यहां होना आवश्यक है।

मैं यह मानने वाला हूँ कि जिस प्रकार से प्राथमिक शिक्षा आवश्यक है उस से भी किसी सीमा तक ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण उच्च शिक्षा और विद्यापीठों का प्रश्न है। भारत सरीखा जो प्रगति की तरफ जाने वाला राष्ट्र है, उस में आज हम बड़े नये नये कदम उठा रहे हैं, नई नई कल्पनाएँ आज यहां आ रही हैं। बाकी दशों में हम ने दखा है कि जो विद्यापीठ होते हैं वह मूलस्रोत होते हैं जिन से देश का विकास

[श्री वी० जी० दशपांडे]

होता है और इस दृष्टि से अंग्रेजों के आने के पश्चात् भी यदि विद्यापीठों का नया विकास हुआ है तो भी मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सभी विद्यापीठ इस दश की आर्थिक, सामाजिक और विचारक प्रगति के लिये एक केन्द्र बनें और उन के प्रयत्न से दश में नये नये विचार प्रवाहों का निर्माण हो, दश का चरित्र निर्माण हो। इस दृष्टि से मैं इन विद्यापीठों को देख रहा हूँ और इसी दृष्टि से इस सदन को, इस संसद् को यह बड़ा महत्त्वपूर्ण अधिकार प्रदान किया गया है कि वह इस का निश्चय करे कि इस दश में शिक्षा का स्तर क्या हो, उस का परिमाण और स्टैण्डर्ड क्या हो। मैं अपने मित्र श्री गुरुपादस्वामी से पूर्ण सहमत हूँ कि यह जो दो कार्य हैं अर्थात् एक तो उन को आर्थिक मदद देना और जिस तरह का उन का परिमाण और स्तर हो उस का डिटेर्मिनेशन करना, उस का निश्चय करना यह दो भिन्न कार्य क्षेत्र हैं। यह तो मैं मानता हूँ कि यूनिवर्सिटी का जो कार्य चलता है उस में किसी का भी हस्तक्षेप होना बहुत अच्छा नहीं है। परन्तु जिस प्रकार से इस दश में विद्यापीठों का विकास हुआ है उस को देखते हुए भी मैं यह मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि जिस प्रकार से इंग्लैंड में आक्सफोर्ड यूनिवर्सिटी है या केंब्रिज यूनिवर्सिटी है, उहाँनें अपनी परम्पराओं का निर्माण किया है उस प्रकार की परम्परायें हमारे दश में निर्मित नहीं हुई हैं। इस दश में कलकत्ता यूनिवर्सिटी में आशुतोष मुकर्जी के नेतृत्व में, जिन्होंने निर्भीकता से सरकार के साथ युद्ध किया था, शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में कुछ परम्पराओं का निर्माण अवश्य हुआ है। कहीं कहीं बुरी परम्पराओं का निर्माण भी हुआ है। हमारे केन्द्र का संचालन होने के पश्चात् भी और आर्थिक सहायता देने के पश्चात् भी, मैं जानता हूँ, कई साम्प्रदायिक विद्यापीठों में उसी प्रकार से बुरा काम चल रहे हैं, उस के पहले से भी बुरा काम चल रहे हैं, इस के बारे में हमारा अनुभव कोई बड़ा सुखकारक नहीं है। लेकिन उस के पश्चात् भी मैं यह मानता हूँ कि थोड़ी

थोड़ी भिन्नता होते भी उन के परिमाण का निश्चय करके केन्द्र का काम होना चाहिये। लेकिन इस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि आप एक तृतीयांश यूनिवर्सिटी के उपकुलगुरुओं को लीजिये और दो तृतीयांश लोग सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त हों। उन के बारे में गवर्नमेन्ट का पहलू तो यह मालूम होता है कि दश में जो बड़े विद्वान हैं, विज्ञान शास्त्री हैं और अनुभवी लोग हैं उन को लिया जायेगा तब भी गलती हो सकती है इस लिये कोई आदमी अच्छा हो या बुरा हो, उस में अच्छे स्टैण्डर्ड का आदमी हो या बुरे स्टैण्डर्ड का लेकिन उस को फाइनैन्शियल और एडमिनिस्ट्रीटिव एक्स्पीरिएन्स जरूर होना चाहिये। लेकिन फाइनैन्शियल और एडमिनिस्ट्रीटिव एक्स्पीरिएन्स के बहुत से लोगों को रक्खा गया तो वह एक सरकारी बाड़ी बन जायेगी। जिस प्रकार का स्टैण्डर्ड हम बनाना चाहते हैं उस के लिये और जो ग्रान्ट्स हम देंगे उस के लिये, डिटेर्मिनेशन आफ स्टैण्डर्ड के लिये दोनों किस्मों के लोगों को एक जगह इस लिये किया गया है कि पैसे देने हैं लेकिन वहाँ पर फाइनैन्शियल और एडमिनिस्ट्रीटिव एक्स्पर्ट्स आने के पश्चात् और उन की मंजूरती होने के पश्चात् जिस तरह का डिटेर्मिनेशन आफ स्टैण्डर्ड हम चाहते हैं उस प्रकार का डिटेर्मिनेशन आफ स्टैण्डर्ड बनना नहीं। आप के संविधान को स्वीकृत हुए चार वर्ष हुए। अब तक हम अपेक्षा करते रहे कि सरकार की तरफ से कोई नई बात आयेगी। आप को याद होगा जब भारत में राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन प्रारम्भ हुआ और लोग दश में स्वातंत्र्ययुद्ध करने लगे तब पहला आक्षेप विदेशी सरकार पर यह किया गया कि इस दश की जो शिक्षा प्रणाली है उस का निर्माण अंग्रेज लोगों ने जान बूझ कर इस दश के लोगों को अराष्ट्रीय करने के लिये इस दश के लोगों का जो जीवन स्वत्व है उस को नष्ट करने के लिये, किया। और इसी के कारण सन् १९०५ ई० में और उस के पश्चात् राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा पर जोर दिया गया। अब हमारी

राष्ट्रीय सरकार बनी हैं, मैं शिक्षा प्रणाली के बारे में ख़ास कर उच्च शिक्षा प्रणाली के बारे में इस निर्दिष्ट मत का हूँ कि जब तक युनिवर्सिटी में आमूल परिवर्तन नहीं होता है, रिवाल्व्यूशनरी चेंज नहीं होता है, जब तक हम क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन की बात सामने ले कर नहीं आते हैं तब तक इस देश के जीवन स्तर की, इस देश की सामाजिक उन्नति, शैक्षणिक उन्नति नहीं हो सकती है और इस दृष्टि से डिटीर्मिनेशन आफ स्टैण्डर्ड के पूर्व हम आशा करते थे कि वह नई सरकार आई है, नया मंत्रिमंडल आया है, शिक्षा के बारे में नया मूल्य हमारे सामने रखा जायेगा और डिटीर्मिनेशन आफ स्टैण्डर्ड के लिये एक कमिशन पहले नियुक्त किया जायेगा। युनिवर्सिटी में किस प्रकार का स्टैण्डर्ड हो इस की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आयेगी और उस के स्वीकृत होने के पश्चात् उस स्टैण्डर्ड के अनुसार सब युनिवर्सिटीज और विद्यापीठ काम कर रहे हैं या नहीं इस के लिये देश के प्रतिष्ठित विद्वानों का एक कमिशन नियुक्त किया जायेगा। उस में एंडीमिनिस्ट्रीटिव और फाइनेंशियल एक्स्पिरिअन्स के नाम पर किन किन व्यक्तियों को उस में रखा जाता, इस का मुझे पता नहीं, शायद हमारे त्यागी साहब भी उस में चुस सकते, परन्तु हमें आशा है कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब इतनी ख़राब बात नहीं करेंगे, फिर भी यह मैं मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि इस प्रकार की बातें ही ख़राबी का कारण हो रही हैं। जैसा मेरे मित्र ने सुझाव दिया है उस के अनुसार पहले काम होना चाहिये। फाइनेंशियल एड आप किस प्रकार से देंगे साथ ही जब आप आर्थिक सहायता देना प्रारम्भ करेंगे तो उस के साथ ही साथ आप को यह भी देखना होगा कि कहां कितनी कितनी युनिवर्सिटीयाँ का निर्माण होता है। आज हम देख रहे हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश यहां पर पूरा छाया हुआ है। आज हमारे संविधान में भारत की व्याख्या इस प्रकार होनी चाहिये थी :

"India, that is Bharat, that is Uttar Pradesh.....".

आज हम देखते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में बहुत से विद्यापीठ हैं, मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के विद्यापीठों

को कम नहीं कराना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि मैं देखता हूँ परम्परागत भारत के स्वतंत्र विद्यापीठ उत्तर प्रदेश में काशी हैं और हालांकि चाहे सरकार ने उसे मान्यता न दी हो फिर भी इस विद्यापीठ में आप खूब पढ़ते हैं। इस प्रदेश में तो हम देखते हैं कि विद्यापीठ के बाद विद्यापीठ बन रहे हैं; दो नये विद्यापीठों का और भी निर्माण होना वाला है, परन्तु बहुत से ऐसे प्रान्त हैं जैसे कि मध्य भारत, जहां एक विद्यापीठ खोलने में भी केंद्र झगड़ा लगा रहा है और गवर्नमेंट इस ओर ध्यान नहीं दे रही है। मैं कहता हूँ कि भारत में प्राचीन काल से उज्जैन विद्या का महान् केंद्र रहा है और वहाँ एक विद्यापीठ बन सकता है। भारत सरकार को चाहिये कि वह अपना पैसा लगा कर वहाँ एक महान् विद्यापीठ का निर्माण करे। बहुत से प्रदेश हैं कि जहां विद्यापीठ नहीं हैं। और भी बहुत से छोटे मोटे राज्य हैं जिन राज्यों में विद्यापीठ नहीं हैं। नए नए विद्यापीठ खोलने शुरू हो गए हैं और अब प्रश्न यह उठता है कि उनको केंद्र की तरफ से सहायता किन तत्वों के अनुसार, किस नियमानुसार दी जानी चाहिए, इसका भी विचार यहां होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रवर समिति बहुत सी बातों पर विचार करेगी और इस बिल में कई चुटियां हैं जिन पर इस को विचार करना होगा। मैं इस बिल में एक बात देखता हूँ कि धारा ९८ का सम्बन्ध एक रिपोर्ट से है। इस में लिखा हुआ है :

"The Commission shall prepare, twice every year in such form and at such times as may be prescribed, a six-monthly report giving a true and full account of its activities during the previous six months, and copies thereof shall be forwarded to the Central Government."

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक नहीं है। जो कमिशन ने रिपोर्ट देनी है वह रिपोर्ट और प्रितवृत्त इस संदन के सामने स्वीकृत के लिए आना चाहिए। आप जब कोई युनिवर्सिटी निर्माण करतें हैं या वह स्टैण्डर्ड डिटीर्मिने

[श्री वी० जी० दशपांड']

करने वाली बाड़ी की बात करते हैं तो मैं चाहूंगा उस प्रकार से अकादमी का एक नाम हमारा मौलाना साहब देना चाहते हैं वही अकादमी न हो, कोई अच्छा संस्कृत नाम हो। या उसे हम अंग्रेजी का ही नाम दे सकते हैं क्योंकि कि हम ने १५ साल के लिए अंग्रेजी को रखने का फैसला कर रखा है। परन्तु अच्छे नाम की एक केंद्रीय संस्था का आप स्टैंडर्ड्स को डिस्टीनिश करने के लिए निर्माण कर सकते हैं।

डा० एम० एम० शस : कोई नाम बतलाइए।

श्री वी० जी० दशपांड' : आप इस का नाम भारतीय विद्या संगम, विद्या संगम या और कोई अच्छा नाम रख सकते हैं। विचार करने के बाद मैं कोई और सुन्दर नाम भी आप को बतला सकता हूँ।

तो आप बहुत अच्छी श्रेणी की संस्था जिस का काम स्टैंडर्ड डिस्टीनिश करना हो, बनाइए। बाकी जैसे देने के लिए एक जलह्लावाडी बननी चाहिए। मैं तो कहूंगा कि जैसे देने के लिए एक पार्लियामेन्टरी कमेटी होनी चाहिए क्योंकि जैसे देने के बारे में हम ने बहुत सी शिकायतें की हैं और देने में आया है कि आज के विद्यमान मंत्रिमंडल के अन्तर्गत जो जैसे दिए जाते हैं उस में साम्प्रदायिकता बर्ती जाती है, यह हमारा आक्षेप है। इस दृष्टि से उस पर संसद् का नियन्त्रण हो। बाकी रहा स्टैंडर्ड्स को डिस्टीनिश करने का सवाल, उस के लिए विद्वानों की आप एक कमेटी नियुक्त कर सकते हैं। स्वायत्त संस्था भी आप बना सकते हैं। यह दो सुझाव मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता था। बैठने के पूर्व मैं आप से एक प्रार्थना और करना चाहता हूँ। आप ने यह विधेयक एक समीचीन के सुपुर्ण करने का प्रस्ताव रखा है। मंत्रिमंडल के जो लोग यहां बैठे हैं उससे तो यह जान पड़ता है कि वे इस विधेयक को कोई खास महत्त्व नहीं देते। मेरा खयाल है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी यूनिवर्सिटियां हैं उनके जवाब इस बिल के बारे में आप के पास आए होंगे वे आप हमारे सामने रख सकते हैं

ताकि हम यह जान सकें कि उनकी प्रतिक्रिया इस बिल के बारे में क्या है और उनके दीनिक कारोबार में किस प्रकार का दखल दिया जाता है। यह सब देने के पश्चात् ही इस पर विचार किया जाए, इतनी मेरी प्रार्थना है।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The University Grants Commission actually forms a very important part of the recommendations made by the Education Commission, known as the Radhakrishnan Commission. It is fundamental to the proposal for improving and developing the Universities. The Parliamentary Secretary has already detailed to us the history of the various other Commissions that had been set up from time to time, both by the Central Government and the provincial Governments to investigate and suggest remedies for the management and instruction at Universities. It is well known that our Universities have in the past and at the present moment also suffered from various defects, but it is also well known that the recommendations of the Commissions and Committees could not be implemented because of the sad lack of funds, and the policy of trying to run the Universities without adequate financial support. Actually, even some of the very excellent recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission could not be implemented for the same reason. From this point of view, the intention of the Government to put adequate funds at the disposal of the Universities is a thing that everybody will support, and especially those of us who have been associated with Universities for some period. We do welcome it from that point of view, but at the same time there is a sneaking fear as to whether these funds will be really adequate. Will it be that just a small portion will be made available, or sometimes not even that, and with that the Government will try to dominate the Universities under the plea of standardisation and levelling up of education? If we really look at the financial state of affairs at the present moment, although the Parliamentary Secretary has told us that

38 per cent. of the expenditure on Universities is donated by the State and Central Governments, if we *minus* the amount that is raised by the Universities and also *minus* the amount that is paid by the State Government, then I am afraid the Central Grant is insignificant and in this position in spite of a number of Commissions that may be set up, nothing will improve. Not only that; we are afraid that governmental interference in educational matters and especially the universities, will lead to further deterioration. It is not correct to say that if we have a Government taking a "keener interest", things will improve. We have seen in our own University in Bengal that the secondary education Board chosen by Government has made things so bad with regard to examinations etc. that we have become the laughing stock of India, if not of the world. Therefore, it is a very fundamental question as to whether adequate funds will be made available for the universities. When we come to see the amount that is received by the Bombay University, the grand total of expenditure is Rs. 1,36,00,000, out of which about Rs. 75,00,000 comes from fees, Rs. 25,00,000 from the State Government and only Rs. 3,00,000 from the Central Government. In respect of the Calcutta University, out of the grand total of Rs. 1,96,00,000, Rs. 82,78,000 comes from fees, Rs. 43,39,000 from the State Government and only Rs. 8,54,000 from the Central Government. I could give more details in respect of other Universities. Therefore, out of this total of 38 per cent. donated by the State Governments and Central Government, the State Governments give much more than the Central Government and we have to see this in the proper perspective. I do not agree entirely with my friend Shri Gurupadaswamy that the job of the University Grants Commission is only the allocation of grants, because even for allocating grants certain other features of the Universities will have to be looked into. For the very fact that you have to look into the needs of a particular University, you

have to give more powers to the University Commission. Therefore, we recognise the need for planning, co-ordinating and expanding University education and correlating it to the aims and needs of the national objective. That is absolutely certain. But we also want to see from the very outset that good care is taken to see that the University education does not become an appendage of the Government.

As a matter of fact, there is clause 20. It is a pernicious clause, and we want to oppose that clause. It says that in the discharge of its functions under the Act, the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy as may be given to it by the Central Government. Now, the point is this. Certainly there must be co-ordination between the policy of the Education Ministry and the Commission, but the Commission must have the right of going against certain policies of the Education Ministry if it so thinks fit. Of course, it will naturally be guided by the directive principles of the Constitution and by the planning that has to be carried out, but certainly there may come occasions when the Commission, as the highest authority and guided by people of academic eminence, may vitally differ from a particular policy followed by the Ministry of Education; and as such, I think it is very important for us to consider, when we take into consideration this University Grants Commission, what will be the actual formation of this Commission; whether it will be really an independent body or merely an appendage of the Ministry of Education. That is a very important point. Our opinion is that the Commission must be completely independent of Government. Government may appoint two men from the Ministries of Education and Finance, but the majority must be men of letters and representatives of Universities and college teachers. We do feel that it is necessary that the majority of them should be determined on an elective principle. Two, for instance, could be men of letters

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

elected by Parliament and five, I feel, should be elected by college and university teachers, because, one of the things which the Radhakrishnan Commission said was that when such a Commission is set up, it is very important that Universities should not look upon this Commission with fear but with respect and it should be able to guide the policies not as a policeman but as somebody whom they feel is highly eminent to do so. They should have faith in the Commission. Therefore, I think it is very necessary to have an elected member, to have a very big weightage of academicians, of people of learning rather than officials, because, in the Bill itself, it is stated that:

"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 administrative or financial matters."

The first part is all right, but the later part may well come into operation and the Commission may become just an appendage of the Ministry of Education. That is exactly what we do not want to have. The Commission's status must be independent.

The other thing which we stress very much is that the Commission's report and recommendations for grants should be made available to Parliament. What has happened in the past is that the Commissions have made certain recommendations after having looked into the demands of the Universities. It is submitted to the Ministry and the Ministry, as well as the Finance Ministry, looks into it and the Government brush aside whatever they feel is not necessary and gives just the amount which they think, in their opinion, is enough. Since Parliament is given the right to co-ordinate and determine the standards in the Universities, for higher education, I think it is very essential and it is only right that such a Commission

should also submit its reports and recommendations to Parliament, so that Parliament may be in the know as to why a particular recommendation has been made and the reasons thereof, and why the Ministries have not been able to give the recommendations full weight. At least they will be on the record. That is a very good deterrent and I think will really help in the development of University education.

Now, the other thing which the people are rather afraid of is the restricted connotation of the word 'University'. An attempt is made, under the plea of improving standards—I am afraid our Parliamentary Secretary has also given us this impression—to restrict the amount of University education. He says that the big trouble that we are having is the fact that so many Universities are coming up. What is the total number? 31. Now, in a country like ours, I do not think 31 is a very abnormally big number. In a small country like England, I think we have 14 or 18 Universities. I am not sure.

Shri S. S. More: Nineteen.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: So, it is not a question of 31 being a big number or not, but it is a question of how to improve the standards for those 31 Universities. That is the thing which we have to consider. But what we have actually seen is that, whenever we have given this right of levelling up, as they call it, or determination of standards, to the authorities of Government in judging certain Universities who are suffering from want of proper equipment, who are fighting against poverty and financial duress, the Government complain that they have not got enough apparatus, charts, equipment, etc. and make it an excuse to plumb down upon them threatening cancellation of their recognition etc. Therefore, instead of helping financially, they try to restrict. Such a thing must not happen. What has actually happened in this Bill

itself is, the connotation of the word 'University' leaves out of its scope a large number of affiliating colleges which are today dominating University education. This is a very important point on which I should like to give facts and figures. For instance, in the University education in India, we have four distinct types of Universities. One is the unitary type; the second is the federated type; of course, the Delhi University is the only one of this type; then there is the teaching and affiliating type and lastly the purely affiliating type. Actually, what is the position? We find that the total number of people enrolled in the University stage is 3,96,745 out of which 3,03,213 study in affiliated colleges. I would not go into many details. In Bombay, there are three University teaching Departments and 22 affiliated colleges. In Calcutta, there are 35 University teaching Departments and 104 affiliated colleges. In Madras, there are 21 University teaching Departments and 20 constituent colleges and 58 affiliated colleges. Taking the whole country, there are 137 constituent colleges and 558 affiliated colleges or more. Out of the total number of those who are engaged in the University, namely, 3,96,745, the number of students studying in the affiliated colleges comes to 3,03,213. This is the position. The affiliated colleges are those that require the greatest amount of help, whether in the matter of apparatus, whether in the question of relieving overcrowding, whether in the matter of raising the salaries of staff or whether in the living conditions of teachers. They are the people who require the greatest amount of help. If we want to improve University education. And yet, by this Bill, we are, by the term by which we are going to call a University as a 'University', leaving out the affiliated colleges.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarur Central): In the Bill,

"University" means a University established or incorporated

by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act, and includes any institution recognised as a constituent college of a University under any such Act."

How are they debarred? I would like to know that. The principle we have enunciated is all right.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Constituent college. There is a separate category called constituent college.

Shri. Syamnandan Sahaya: The definition includes that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We want an answer from the Ministry. If only the Parliamentary Secretary can assure us that all the affiliated colleges come within the purview of this word, then certainly I have nothing to say. I would be very pleased if the Government would assure us that these affiliated colleges that form the bulk of those who are going to be educated in the Universities will come within the purview of this Bill—I am then at one with them and I will welcome such a move. But as far as I can make out, it is not so, I shall give you another example. Certain difficulties have already arisen by a resolution which was lately undertaken regarding the question of University teachers, their conditions of service and salaries. Now, what has happened? The two Universities, —those of Mysore and Travancore— according to the Radhakrishnan Commission, had professors and teachers who had the lowest scales of salaries. Now, they have been actually left outside the scope of this measure. Why? Because, they were told, "You are not autonomous". They were under the State Government, and they were formed at a time when those territories were princely States. Therefore, they have been left out of the scope of the resolution because they are not supposed to be 'autonomous'. Again, take the University of Delhi, a federated University. Those who are University appointed teachers and those who are college-appointed teachers—they have

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

absolutely the same status. But according to this resolution, they have been left outside the scope of this measure. So there is a great deal of confusion on this point. As far as I know, the bulk of the University students come from the various affiliated colleges.

3 P.M.

Shri S. S. More: Does the hon. Member mean to suggest that all these constituent colleges should have direct relationship with the University Grants Commission?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: As I have already said there are three or four types of Universities: one is of the federated type; the other unitary type; the third, teaching and affiliated Universities and the fourth purely affiliated Universities, as for example, the Agra, the Gujerat, and the Jammu and Kashmir and Karnatak Universities. The majority of the Universities are teaching and affiliating Universities. The word used here is "constituent" colleges. Therefore, we want to be clarified as to whether the affiliating colleges are also considered part of the Universities and as such eligible for grants. Under the plea of levelling up education, we are really giving the Government a whip hand in trying to restrict education. That is what we are really afraid of.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: If they are excluded, how would all-round standard be maintained?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I would request the hon. Member to address these questions to Government, not to me.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I am making your task easier.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: So, our request to the Select Committee is to go into the connotation of the word "University" and extend the term as to include these colleges, as well. If Government is really serious about planning, they should give due consideration to this suggestion.

There can be no development, unless the Universities are encouraged to turn out good students and the Professors are given the necessary encouragement to do research work. If the bulk of the institutions are excluded from the purview of this measure, I am afraid it will serve no useful purpose.

Mr. Chairman: Under clause 3, even institutions other than Universities are sought to be included.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That is only on the advice of the Commission. My plea is that the Commission must have jurisdiction over the affiliating colleges, because they form the bulk of the Universities, as they are constituted today. Of course, we would readily support the inclusion of other technological institutes also.

I have already spoken of the type of Commission we would like to have. It should be a high-powered one; it should be independent; it should be composed of representatives on an elected principle; the majority of them should be men of letters. There is also a very good recommendation made by the Radhakrishnan Commission, that the University Grants Commission should have a panel of experts to deal with various subjects which would require enquiry or research. We do not find any provision to that effect in the Bill.

Dr. M. M. Das: There is provision for association of experts.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Then it is all right. I referred to that point, because we consider it to be very important. If it is there, I welcome it.

Then within the four corners of rational objectives, the University Grants Commission should try to achieve co-ordination, planning and integration. But as I have already said, there is a feeling that this measure is likely to stifle the free atmosphere of the Universities. Of course, very few people today would support autonomy in the absolute, but

certainly autonomy for free scope for the development of University education, according to the needs and traditions of a particular University must not be interfered with. For instance, there are the words "determination of standards". This is a very vague term and it may even become dangerous. As a matter of fact, the Radhakrishnan Commission has mentioned this point also. For instance, the Lucknow University may say that it would like to specialise in sociology, or may decide to have a special type of education most suitable to women. The Calcutta University, for instance, may like to lay special stress on domestic science; or some other University may choose to specialise in some other subject. Standardisation must not lead to stereotyping. It is essential that a vague term should not be allowed in a statute, without concretisation of what is actually meant. We, therefore, feel that there is need for the Select Committee to go into the necessity of delimiting the exact scope of the functions of this Commission. I would like to concretise some of them. In the first place, the University Grants Commission must go into the question of expansion, not restriction: how to expand the Universities, how to help them to expand further, how to help a particular department to improve, with financial or other help, should be its first objection.

Secondly, co-ordination of University education and facilities for research should be taken up in earnest. With the limited resources at our disposal, there must be a certain amount of co-ordination of facilities for research. Particularly in a subject like nuclear physics, with limited resources avoiding of duplication and co-ordination should be there.

The third function should be to ensure minimum levels of attainment in examinations. That is very necessary. We actually see that the attainment of a graduate of the Agra University is different from that of a graduate from the Calcutta University

or Madras University. I do not think there should be the same syllabus; I do not say there should be the same books; but I do say that there should be a minimum level of attainment. For instance, I find that in certain Universities the women students are not taught even the rudiments of natural science. Along with ensuring common minimum standards of attainment, there should also be common minimum level of syllabus—of course not stereotyping of syllabus, but ensuring of a minimum common level. Then, of course, there is the ensuring of the minimum standard of living for teachers and staff. These are certain things which should be specified as the functions of the Commission. Otherwise the University teachers feel—I do not know what the Vice Chancellors do—and very rightly so, that this Bill may affect the autonomy of the Universities and may do more harm than good. Therefore, we must not arm the Commission with vague or sweeping powers without knowing exactly the scope and functions of the Commission.

Lastly, I would like to refer to clause 14, which I consider to be a punitive clause. Now what is the consequence if a University does not comply with the recommendations of the Commission? As far as possible, in education at least, we must avoid punitive measures. The relation between the Commission and the Universities must be on a friendly basis, each respecting the other. Their relation, as the Radhakrishnan Commission has very well put it, must be a relation of friendship and not of a policeman and a criminal. This can be achieved if the Commission earns the respect of the Universities. Clause 14, I think, must be liberalised. The University Grants Commission may, in the first instance, invite the attention of the Universities to any serious defects which may come to its notice, and if it is not satisfied with the reply of the University, the Commission may at a meeting attended by a representative of the University decide on inspection by a Committee. Even

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

that Committee should have some representative of the University on it. Finally, I feel that if any particular sanction has to be given, sanction involving control or application of punitive measures to a University, only the specific item for which the grant has been made only that can be suspended. But the sort of thing that is envisaged here is almost the starving of the University. It is said here that it could also "advise the Central Government or the State Government to withhold its grants from that University or to take such other action in respect of that University as the Government may deem proper". This, I think, is very wrong. We should avoid this attitude. I am sure that, with proper co-operation and with a feeling of respect towards each other and with our desire to see that University education really becomes something worth its name and actually helps our young men to become fit for the great national task facing them, there is no necessity for having such very stringent clauses in this Bill. The Joint Committee will, therefore, have to consider the financial aspects of the Commission and how to prevent unnecessary interference with the autonomy of the Universities. They should also consider how to constitute the Commission in a democratic way with the representatives of Universities, teachers, educationists and public men. I would like to stress again that we must see that this Commission is an independent one and more or less on the lines of the Union Public Service Commission so that it is not a replica of the Government. It must reflect the educationists in the country and therefore it must not be merely an appendage of the Government, with whom it can work in close co-operation without having such clauses as are added on here. For instance there are these clauses 20 and 21. It says that the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy as may be given to it by the Central Government, and if any dispute arises

as to whether a question is or is not a question of policy the decision of the Central Government shall be final. I think that this sort of a clause is rather dangerous. With these few words, I commend the motion to the Joint Select Committee.

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): I rise to give my general support to the Bill. While doing so, I cannot help making some observations on the system of education that is obtaining in the country generally. The House knows that the University education does not hang by itself; it is related to education from the primary stage upwards. Nothing is so unsettled in the country today as the system of education from the top to the bottom. Commissions and committees are appointed for the re-organisation of the University stage of education, the secondary scheme of education and the basic type of education. We have conferences and seminars without number. But still, I regret to say, we have not evolved a national pattern of education. In other words we do not have definite objectives. We do not have goals which will subserve the national ideals by developing what I call the national character in our young men.

We have launched the First Five Year Plan and are on the eve of initiating the Second Five Year Plan. We may achieve economic independence. If the system of education is not improved, all achievements of the Five Year Plans will be of no avail. That university education is anything but satisfactory can be seen not only from the low standard of education at all levels but also from student indiscipline and from the drifting that the students are having. It is most unfortunate that our young men and women having lost their moorings become a prey to every slogan not knowing their own national ideals, not knowing their place and the place of education in the scheme of things. The Commission may serve a limited purpose under the Bill. It may conserve funds from

various sources; it may even succeed in getting more funds from the Government; it may equitably allot these funds to various universities. But, unless it is a high power body, unless it functions as a sort of brains trust and unless it is highly independent and guides the system of education in the country, it will be only an extension of the Secretariat and the Education Ministry and nothing else.

[SARDAR HUKAM SINGH in the Chair]

Instead of having a Commission with this limited function it is better to add one or more Deputy Secretaries to the Education Ministry and carry on with the work. I consider this of the highest importance that the Commission should not only be independent but also be composed predominantly of academicians of the highest repute. Under clause 5 of this Bill not less than two members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government to represent the Government. The remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists of repute. I would be satisfied if that clause ended there but it goes on to say about people who have experience in administrative or financial matters. By including people who are experts in the administration or financial matters we may jeopardise the working of the Commission. We may create a Commission which will be more an administrative body than an academic body. I urge strongly that the Select Committee should look into this question and see that the majority of the members are university men of high repute.

I come next to the state of education in the secondary stage. It is common knowledge that our high schools—most of them—have improper equipment, inadequate accommodation and poor staff. We do not have trained men. The type of men that man our secondary schools is itself of a low order and even among them we do not have adequate trained men. The Secondary Education Commission has made far-reaching recommendations

and the Government is earnest about implementing those recommendations but the recommendations or the measure of Government's implementation of them do not touch the fringe of the problem.

University education has rightly to be related to improving the masses of the country. By producing a few brilliant graduates with high academic distinction the country is not going to become great. We should not make the country great at the expense of millions of men steeped in savagery. If the country is to advance, the condition of the masses has to be raised; not only by giving education, but by giving them culture. The Statement of Objects and Reasons to the Bill says, "It is also necessary to ensure that the available resources are utilised to the best possible effect". But what do we actually see in the Education Ministry? Grants sanctioned to all manner of things: yogic research institutes, All-India Women's Hockey Association, Indian art exhibitions in U.S.A and U.S.S.R.; we have tension projects and literary workshops, youth welfare schemes and an infinite variety of experiments. Our resources, I feel constrained to say, are frittered away. We cannot ask the nation to admire the glory of the sunset when millions do not know the three R's. It is necessary, therefore, before we concentrate, before we give the lion's share of our revenue to the Universities, to see that education is strengthened from the lower stages. Primary education is being tinkered with in several places. Even with regard to the secondary stage, each State appoints its own Commission, and there is no co-ordination between the primary stage and the secondary stage on the one hand and between the Centre and the State Governments on the other with regard to the reform of secondary education. Even in the State of Madras I find the Education Ministry disagreeing with the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission with regard to the duration of the higher secondary stage or the university stage.

[Shri N. M. Lingam]

Then, this Bill does not deal with the problem of language. We are committed to imparting instruction in the regional language up to the higher secondary stage. But in the University stage the instruction is in English in most of the Universities. We do not know what the future is going to be. So, unless there is continuity of instruction, the gulf between instruction in the higher secondary stage and the University stage will widen.

It is our desire to see our Universities restored to the glory that it was theirs once. We want them to be centres of encyclopaedic knowledge. We want them to inspire every individual in the country and also every educational institution in the country. But it is important that our limited national resources are conserved and that University education is built up not by pooling together certain grants and distributing them to Universities but by building education from below; by strengthening education from every stage, at all levels, so that our manpower may not be wasted, so that our young men may not face frustration after leaving the portals of the University, so that education may prove not only the panacea for our ills—because ultimately even the success of our democracy depends upon the proper type of education—but also it may guide our national policy in the interests of ourselves and of world peace.

Shr.mati Na Palchoudhury (Nabadwip): I have just a few remarks to make on this Bill which I heartily congratulate the Minister for having brought. When one reads the title of the Bill however, "University Grants Commission Bill", one is apt to think that it is only a Grants Commission and is not there to co-ordinate and determine the standards in institutions for higher education or help research in scientific and technical institutions! The whole dignified function is not envisaged in the title and one gets rather a wrong impression that it is only a financial outlook that is be-

ing presented. When a Commission such as this comes into being it is hoped that it will be a guide, philosopher and friend of all Universities and will have the position of a respected ally wherever Universities are concerned.

In India today we need more Universities that are residential in character, more full in their comprehension, like the ancient Universities of Takshasila and Nalanda where the relationship between the professors and students was something personal, intense and vital. Such a relationship cannot flower unless it is a residential University. The Commission must take into consideration funds for such things to come into being.

The youth of the country must be enthused over and over again and very intensely for the welfare of the country and for the advancement of India. On the youths depends the future of India, and they must learn that the country is theirs. They must be shown the path of self-sacrifice, they must be interested in social welfare and devotion of their time and energy to the bettering of the country. Such ideas must come from the teachers directly to the students. It cannot be imparted through books.

Secondly, Universities today must work in close co-ordination with jobs that can be offered in the next five years. That is one of the main points that I have to recommend. We must have Universities that will teach our students such subjects that will find their scope to be employed after they come out of the portals of the University. The frustration that faces students today is colossal. I wonder if the Ministry realises what is happening to youth in India today! They have no hope of a job or any kind of employment to maintain their families after they come out of the Universities. What they have learnt, to them seems useless, and often goes rusty in their minds. If you look into the middle class homes all over India, there is utter depression. Hence, it is essential

for Universities to develop on the lines of jobs that can be offered in the next five years.

The other submission I would like to make is this. The Parliamentary Secretary mentioned three points, namely, absence of co-ordination, want of funds and want of personnel. All these wants are caused by the fact that every University nowadays tries to be an omnibus University. That cannot really work. Universities must be specialised, and we must have specialised Universities for specialised subjects. We must have Universities for humanities, for scientific subjects, social sciences, medical sciences, and our own Indian system of medicines, namely, *ayurved* must not be forgotten—industrial Universities, and general Universities that will teach languages and any kind of cultural subjects. Unless that is done, the funds that are given are diffused and what is given for buildings and equipment goes to a varied number of subjects, whereas if it was given to specialised Universities for specialised subjects then the funds could be utilised to the full and the students would benefit thereby.

When we consider Universities we must not lose the background that stretches far back into the history of India, our old cultural heritage. I would recommend that the Commission takes into consideration the establishment of a Sri Chaitanya University as it was in Nabadwip. It is not a University that has to be made newly, but it is something that has only to be revived. If we lose the ancient traditions that we had, we lose much that was India, we lose much that can be future India. I strongly recommend that the Commission, and the Select Committee when they go into this Bill, take this matter into their direct consideration and do something about it.

I agree with the hon. lady Member opposite that the description of "University" in clause 2(f) should be more liberalised. The affiliating colleges not to be included in that description is really harmful to any good effect that

this Bill proposes to have. There are 558 affiliating colleges all over India, and if those are not going to come within the scope of the grants or help which is going to be given, we shall lose much of the benefit that this Bill could ever offer. These are the colleges that feed the Universities and a large number of students are in such colleges. This clause should certainly be liberalised so as to include all the affiliating colleges as far as possible.

Expansion should be the note; every branch of study should be able to be pursued in the Universities. This alone should be the guiding factor in any Bill that is passed as regards Universities. In the same way, no cultural aspect should be forgotten. Today, Santi Niketan embodies Tagore. That is the work of his own hand. There is no better memorial that we can have for Tagore than Santi Niketan. There is now a crying need that we should today immortalise Kalidasa in the Vikram University at Ujjain, because Kalidasa is the most beloved poet of India. When we read the lines the

"आषाढस्य प्रथम दिवसे....."

picture of the dark rain clouds that he brings to us touches the mind of every person in India, all separated lovers are carried on the wings of his poetry and fly towards Ujjain. Let there be a concrete proof of that love by having a University in the name of Kalidasa. I hope that the Select Committee will take this into their wholehearted consideration and recommend such a University to the Commission. I have every hope, that this Bill will surely be of benefit to the Universities and do everything towards improving education in India. Education is being re-orientated, this Commission has a large part to play in giving that stable character to education which will take the youth of India forward on the glorious path before them.

श्री नंभू लाल शर्मा (सीकर): यह जो यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट आयोग का विधेयक आया है वह मेरे मन में थोड़ी सी निराशा और थोड़ा सा हर्ष लाता

[श्री नंद लाल शर्मा]

हैं। खंड इसलिए एक सम्भवतः हमारा माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री मेरी भाषा को पूर्णतया नहीं समझ सकेंगे और बिना सचिव-महोदय ने इस विषयक को उपस्थित किया है वह भी हिन्दी से इतने परिचित न होने के कारण मेरी भाषा को समझने में कष्ट का अनुभव करेंगे।

Dr. M. M. Das: I may inform the hon. Member that I understand Hindi quite nicely; at least his Hindi I will understand.

Mr. Chairman: There should be no fear now.

श्री नंद लाल शर्मा: थोड़ा सा भय मुझे इस बात का भी है कि आजकल अधिकतर शिक्षा का अर्थ अंग्रेजी शिक्षा समझा जाता है। मैं इस विषय को इस सदन के सामने कुछ भारतीय दृष्टिकोण से उपस्थित करना चाहता हूँ। एक समय था कि पृथ्वी के सारे मनुष्य यहाँ के विद्वानों के पास बैठकर अपनी अपनी संस्कृति का अध्ययन करते थे।

एतद्दृशप्रसूतस्य सकासाद्गुञ्जन्मनः।

स्वं स्वं चरित्रं शिक्षेरन् पृथिव्यां सर्वमानवाः॥

परन्तु आज हम दूसरों के इतने मुखापेक्षी हो गये हैं कि जो काम भी लेते हैं उसमें दूसरों की नकल करने में अपना गौरव समझते हैं। हम यह नहीं समझते कि यह हमारी संस्कृति के ही कारण है कि आज विश्व हमारा सम्मान करता है। आज भारतवर्ष का सम्मान चाहे हमारा प्रधान मंत्री के नाम से होता हो चाहे श्री गांधी जी के नाम से होता हो, या चाहे किसी दूसरे के नाम से होता हो, लेकिन वह इसी कारण होता है कि वे किसी न किसी रूप में भारतीय संस्कृति का प्रतीक उपस्थित करते हैं। यदि वे भारतीय संस्कृति से विच्छेद जायें तो उनका अपना मूल्य नष्ट हो जाता है और वे दूसरे को किसी प्रकार से आकर्षित नहीं कर सकते। मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि भारतवर्ष में शिक्षा का क्या आदर्श रहा है। केवल रोटी पैंदा करना या कपड़ा पैंदा करना यहाँ की शिक्षा का ध्येय नहीं रहा। आजकल तो हमने मनुष्य

को कूत् की तरह केवल रोटी की शिक्षा देकर रोटी के पीछे उसे बांध दिया है। भारतवर्ष में शिक्षा का लक्ष्य केवल रोटी पैंदा करना ही नहीं रहा, बल्कि अपनी संस्कृति के स्वरूप को जानना और मात्र प्राप्त करना यहाँ की शिक्षा का मुख्य ध्येय रहा है। विद्या हि का? बृहमगीतप्रदा या।

श्री विभूति जिन्ना (सारन व चम्पारन): पंचतंत्र में क्या लिखा है?

श्री नंद लाल शर्मा: सुन लीजियें। आपको तो पंचतंत्र ही सब कुछ दिखायी देता है। वही आपको सबसे बड़ा आदर्श गन्थ दिखायी देता है।

रोटी केवल शरीर को बचाने के लिए है। इसके ऊपर उठ जाना भारत की शिक्षा सिखाती रही है। यहाँ के विश्वविद्यालयों में एक राजा का पुत्र और एक भिखारी एक जगह जाकर पढ़ते थे। न कृष्य को अपने पैसे के कारण कोई विशेष सुविधा थी और न सुदामा, को अपनी दरिद्रता के कारण कोई भय था। दोनों बराबर पढ़ते थे। उनको २५ वर्ष तक एक काँड़ी खर्च करने का कोई भाव नहीं था। आज आपकी शिक्षा पद्धति इतनी महंगी है कि एक गरीब आदमी किसी प्रकार से भी ऊँची शिक्षा नहीं प्राप्त कर सकता। मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि आप इस ओर ध्यान दें। जो मरने के बाद तब अनन्त काल तक आनन्द को देने वाली है और जो माँह को देने वाली है हमारा यहाँ उसको शिक्षा कहा गया है, उसको विद्या कहा गया है। यदि आप इस चींटियों से प्राप्त इकानामिक्स को और मकड़ी से प्राप्त इन्जिनियरिंग शास्त्र को लेकर इसी के ऊपर मनुष्य शास्त्र को समाप्त कर दें और रीढ़ियों से और सभाचार पत्र जैसे दूसरी चीजों से सम्बन्धित ज्ञान को विद्या मान लें तो यह पूर्ण विद्या नहीं होगी। बिना गुरु के वास्तविक विद्या प्राप्त नहीं हो सकती। और वह गुरु कौसा होना चाहिए? वह ऐसा होना चाहिए कि जो अपनी शिक्षा को स्वयं व्यवहार में लाकर दिखावे! हमारा यहाँ कमी शिक्षा को राज्य के आधीन

नहीं रखा गया। हो सकता है कि आज राम का राज्य हो, कल रावण का राज्य हो, परसों सिकन्दर का राज्य हो और उसके बाद औरंगजेब का राज्य हो। तो हम किस किस के विचार-के अनुसार अपनी शिक्षा पद्धति को बदलते फिरेंगे? इसलिए हमने कभी अपनी शिक्षा को राज्य के आधीन नहीं रखा। यदि शासन के आधीन शिक्षा को रखा जायगा तो जो शसक आवेगा वह उसको बदलगा, अपनी पुस्तकें बनावेगा और उनका प्रचार करेगा। यदि ऐसा होगा तो हमारी संस्कृति कहां रहेगी? वह कुछ ही वर्षों में नष्ट हो जायगी। इसी लिए मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि शिक्षा को शासन के आधीन न रखा जाय। आप आज इंजिनियरिंग की, मैट्रिकल साइंस की और वार मैट्रियल साइंस् कराने की विद्या शिक्षाते हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि संसद के सदस्यों को भी इस बात का खेद होता होगा कि हमारी संस्कृति के जितने भी शिक्षणालय हैं वे सार के सार नष्ट होते जाते हैं। इस युग में व्यक्तिगत सहायता देने वाले नहीं रहे। राजे महाराजे नहीं रहे, धनी मानियों का व्यापार नष्ट हो गया है। उनके द्वारा अकेली काशी में २५० शिक्षण संस्थायें चलती थीं वे आज नष्ट होती जाती हैं। डा० संगलद्वंद और दूसरे लोगों ने आज शिक्षा पद्धति में ऐसा डाइल्यूशन पैदा कर दिया है कि विद्यार्थी थोड़ी संस्कृत भी पढ़ें, थोड़ी अंग्रेजी भी पढ़ें, यानी जैक आफ आल ट्रेंड्स एंड मास्टर आफ नन हो जाय। इस प्रकार संस्कृत की किसी भी विद्या का कोई विद्वान नहीं बन सकता।

अभी हमारी बीहन नै नालन्दा और तच्चशिला के विश्वविद्यालयों का नाम लिया। परन्तु क्वल नालन्दा और तच्चशिला ही नहीं उनके पूर्व, पश्चात जितने भी विश्वविद्यालय भारत में रहे वे कभी भी राजा के मुखापेक्षी नहीं रहे। अगर कभी राजा भी विद्यार्थियों में जाता था तो अपने राज चिन्ह उतार कर जाता था, इस विचार से कि विद्यार्थियों पर उसकी तद्दक भड़क का प्रभाव न पड़े। आज आप कहते हैं कि विद्यार्थियों के चरित्र पर बुरा प्रभाव पड़ रहा

है, अनुशासन भंग हो रहा है। इसका कारण क्या है? इसका कारण यह है कि आज आपके प्राफेसर को इस बात का ध्यान नहीं है कि जो शब्द वह विद्यार्थियों को पढ़ा रहे हैं उनका उसके जीवन से भी कोई सम्बन्ध है या नहीं। वह आज एकेडेमिक रीति से फिलासफी पढ़ाते हैं। वह आज एरिस्टोटल, प्लेटो और सोक्रेटीज की एकेडेमी की शिक्षा व अथवा मायावाद में जगत के मिथ्यात्व की फिलासफी लड़कों को पढ़ाते हैं और एक मिनट बाद जाकर हॉस्टलों में मौजूद करते हैं। जो शिक्षा वे देते हैं उसका उनके जीवन से साथ कोई भी सम्बन्ध नहीं है। वे यह नहीं समझते कि इस शास्त्र के साथ मंग जीवन का कोई सम्बन्ध है या नहीं। उसका फल यह हुआ कि आज विद्यार्थियों पर उसका कोई प्रभाव नहीं है। जब अध्यापक पर विद्या का कोई प्रभाव दृष्टिगोचर नहीं होता तो भला विद्यार्थी के ऊपर विद्या का क्या प्रभाव हो सकता है। बुक्स लिखी जाती हैं, उन पर नोट्स लिखे जाते हैं और कुछ सेट क्वेश्चन दे दिये जाते हैं और विद्यार्थी परीक्षा में उत्तीर्ण हो जाता है। इस बिस्व की २२, २२ और २४ धाराओं में जो नियम दिये गये हैं और धारा २४ में जो पैनाल्टी का क्लॉज है और जिसमें कहा गया है कि जो धारा २२ और २३ का उल्लंघन करेगा उसको दंड दिया जायगा, इसमें दंड देने की व्यवस्था रखी गई है। इन धाराओं के अनुसार हम अपनी शिक्षण संस्थाओं को 'यूनिवर्सिटी' के नाम से नहीं बुकार सकते। आज हम लॉय जस्टिस-भारतीय धर्म संघ महा विद्यालय दिल्ली में चला रहे हैं, कलकत्ते में, काशी में, वृन्दावन में और नरवर में उसकी शाखायें हैं और मैं बड़े से बड़े विद्वान से कहता हूँ कि वहाँ जाकर देखें कि किस तरह शिक्षा का कार्य चल रहा है और मैं जानता हूँ कि उनके प्रति लोगों में कितनी श्रद्धा है। और कितने ऊंचे और विद्वत्तायुक्त स्नातक निकाले हैं और राष्ट्रीय-कुल ब्रह्मचर्य आश्रम, हरद्वार का निकला हुआ ब्रह्मचारी कितना योग्य और पीठित होता है, वह आप स्वयं उससे सामना होने पर अनुभव कर सकते हैं। अभी हमारे यहां एक ब्रह्मचारी

[श्री नंद लाल शर्मा]

शास्त्रीय द्वितीय खंड में पढ़ता था, उसने पंजाब से गोल्ड मंडल प्राप्त किया, फर्स्ट क्लास फर्स्ट आया, कलकत्ता यूनिवर्सिटी से फर्स्ट क्लाम लिया और काशी के वीन्स कॉलेज की परीक्षा में फर्स्ट क्लास रहा और आचार्य की परीक्षा में भी वह विद्यार्थी बैठा और वहां भी फर्स्ट क्लास जूनने प्राप्त किया। आज सरकार की ओर से हमारी इन शिक्षण संस्थाओं को कोई सहायता नहीं मिलती, उस परिस्थिति में भी हम लोग उन शिक्षण संस्थाओं को अपने ढंग और संस्कृति के आधार पर चला रहे हैं और बढ़िया से बढ़िया विद्यार्थी वहां से निकलते हैं। अब विद्या के अन्दर उसकी योग्यता के अन्दर यह जो आपने बंधन लगा दिया कि अगर ऐसा कोई इंस्टिट्यूशन होगा तो उसको इस नियम के उल्लंघन के लिए एक हजार रुपये का जुर्माना देना होगा, यह कहां तक ठीक और उचित है। आपको इस बात का सदैव ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा कि शिक्षा के स्वातंत्र्य को बिलकुल नष्ट न होने दें। मैं मौलाना साहब से कहूंगा कि वह इस बात को सोचें कि भारतवर्ष की शिक्षा-पद्धति एक बहुत गम्भीर चीज है और मैं यहां जो अपने विचार और सुझाव रख रहा हूँ, वह कोई शिक्षा देने के लिए नहीं रख रहा हूँ। यहां शिक्षा क्षेत्र के एक से एक बड़े विद्वान लोग बैठे हुए हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे मेरे सुझावों पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करें। मैं तो अपना खेद और दुःख प्रकट करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ कि आपने जो हमारे वास्तविक शिक्षणालय थे उनको मीनियामेंट कर दिया। और उसी का नतीजा है कि आज वाचस्पति मिश्र और शंकर का जन्म नहीं हो सकता, अब हम बच्चा भा और शिव कुमार शास्त्री को पैदा नहीं कर सकते और जिस तरह से निरन्तर हमारा शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में हास होता जा रहा है उससे तो मालूम पड़ता है कि कुछ दिनों के बाद मधुसूदन भा, गिरधर शर्मा, और अनन्त कृष्ण शास्त्री जैसे विद्वान आपको नहीं मिलेंगे। दिन पर दिन हमारा स्तर गिरता जा रहा है और कम होते होते एक दिन वह शीघ्र

ही आने वाला है जब वह जीरो हो जायगा। आप कृपा करके भारतवर्ष की शिक्षा पर दया करें, भारतवर्ष की संस्कृति पर दया करें। आज इस प्रश्न सीमित में जो बनेगी इसमें संस्कृति के कितने विद्वान हैं, मैं उनका इस कमेटी में सर्वथा अभाव पाता हूँ। आप अपनी संस्कृति और संस्कृति की डींग तो बहुत हांकते हैं लेकिन एक भी व्यक्ति इस कमेटी में ऐसा नहीं रक्खा जो संस्कृति का विद्वान हो और संस्कृति की दृष्टि से इस को देखने का प्रयत्न करने वाला हो। मैं कमेटी के सदस्यों से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस दृष्टि से इस समस्या को देखें और सर्वथा भारतीय शिक्षा पद्धति का नाश न होने पाये, इस का प्रयत्न करें। मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि हमारी उस यूनिवर्सिटी के विद्यार्थी जो गवर्नमेंट से रकगनाइज्ड नहीं हैं, महामहोपाध्याय की डिग्री ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट से प्राप्त कर चुके थे। इस समय वह पंजाब में जालन्धर में गवर्नमेंट संस्कृत कॉलेज में प्रिंसिपल के पद पर काम कर रहे हैं। हम जो इस सम्बन्ध में आपसे निवेदन कर रहे हैं उसका राजनीति से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, लेकिन हमारी अपनी संस्कृति और धर्म नीति तो अवश्य है। हम जानते हैं कि आप हम को किन किन बातों में रोकना चाहते हैं, किस किस रूप में हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति को बदलना चाहते हैं अतः मैं आपसे निवेदन करता हूँ कि हम अपने आप को किसी तरह से चुप करके अपने घर में भूखें प्यासे रह कर भी अपना जीवन चलाना चाहते हैं और इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि औरंगजेब के शासनकाल में भी जब कि हमारी संस्कृति पर कुठाराघात हो रहा था, हमारे लोगों ने अपने पेट फाड़ फाड़ कर वेदादि ग्रन्थों को अपने पेट में छिपा कर रक्खा था, तो आज जब कि हमारा देश स्वतंत्र है हम अपनी शिक्षा-पद्धति को जीवित न रख सके, इससे बढ़ कर दुःख और खेद की बात और क्या हो सकती है। ऐसा न हो कि एक दिन ऐसा आये जब हमें यह कहना पड़े कि भारतवर्ष का शिक्षा

मंत्रालय भारतवर्ष की अपनी संस्कृति और शिक्षा का गला घोटने में एक कारण बना था, निमित्त बना था। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि आप इन धाराओं को अच्छी तरह से देखें। यहां पर बड़े बड़े विद्वान बैठे हैं, विश्वविद्यालयों के संचालन करने वाले हमारे श्री श्यामनन्दन सहाय और शास्त्री जी सरीखे पीडित बैठे हुए हैं, मेरे समीप ही एक बड़े शिक्षा शास्त्री बैठे हुए हैं, मैं उन सब महानुभावों से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप लोग भली प्रकार से इस समस्या पर ध्यान दें। अगर हमारे पास ऐसा सुलभ हो तो हम बड़ी से बड़ी युनिवर्सिटीयां खड़ी कर दें, और यह भी आप को बतला दें कि भारतवर्ष के बाद अगर शिक्षा पद्धति को किसी ने ऊंचे से ऊंचे ढंग से चलाया है तो जर्मनी ने चलाया है, वैसे गण तो कोई भी हांक सकता है, विर्टन भी दावा कर सकता है और फ्रांस भी कर सकता है। जर्मनी में किसी समय अध्यापक अपनी सांसाइटी का एक दूरिद्वतम अंग माना जाता था, क्योंकि उसके पास ऐसा नहीं होता था, तब अध्यापक पैसे को मुख्य वस्तु नहीं मानते थे और आज भी हमारी अपनी शिक्षापद्धति में कहीं पढ़ाई की फीस या प्राइवेट ट्यूशन फीस का सवाल नहीं उठता। अध्यापक शिष्य को अपने पुत्र समान मान कर अपनी रोटी खिला कर उसको विद्या देता है और हमारा आदर्श यह रहा है :

शिष्यादिच्छत्य सत्रयम्

सारं जगत को विद्याबल से जीत कर और शिष्य से जो हार जाय वह अध्यापक ऊंचे दर्जे का अध्यापक है, यह आदर्श आपके यहां रहा नहीं और आप पाश्चात्य ढंग की जिस शिक्षापद्धति से चकाचाँध हो रहे हैं आपने उसके बल पर भारतीय शिक्षा पद्धति का नाश करना शुरू कर दिया है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि अब भी आप अपने ऊपर समाज और भारतीय संस्कृति के ऊपर दया करें और उसको जीवित रहने दें और इस विषय में इस तरह के जो गला घोटने वाले अंश हैं, वह उसमें से हटा

दें। शिक्षण संस्थाओं का नियमन करना और उनका भली भाँति संचालन करना ठीक है परन्तु यह कि सरकार के अधीन सब शिक्षा संस्थायें हो जायें और जैसे सरकार चाहे वैसे नाच नाचें, यह मुझे उचित नहीं जान पड़ता। सब दिन बराबर और एक समान नहीं होते, आज आपके पास गवर्नमेंट है हाँ सकता है कि कल किसी दूसरे के हाथ में शासन सत्ता हो और परसों किसी तीसरे के हाथ में हुकूमत की बागडोर चली जाय और निरन्तर इन संस्थाओं का बदलते जानी वाली हुकूमतों के इशारे पर उनका मनचाहा नाच नाचते जाना शिक्षा के हित में—और समाज के हित में नहीं होगा। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि अगर आपको भारत को जीवित रखना है तो आपको शिक्षा को बिलकुल स्वतंत्र छोड़ना होगा और सरकार को केवल एक सहायक के रूप में इस तरह से सलाह देना चाहिये ताकि किसी किस्म की उसमें खराबी न होने पायें और उसमें भारतीय दृष्टिकोण का विशेष ध्यान रक्खें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): Listening to the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary of Education I was very much impressed at the grandeur of the ideas that he presented before this House about university and education in general, but I regret to say that those high-flown ideas, dignified and grand, do not fit in with this Bill.

With regard to the university and its functioning we have two systems that apply to the Republic of India. If nationalisation of education is the object of the Government, then this Bill is the first step to start implementing the idea, but if nationalisation is not the object then I beg to submit that the system of education should be confined, as we confine industries, to a mixed economy. We have functions discharged by the private sector and functions of universities undertaken

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

by Government for the public sector. In a democratic country we have seen that the mixed system of education has been in vogue. Private institutions have fared very well and have advanced education to a great extent in Europe and America. We find that literacy is highest in my State, Travancore-Cochin, in the whole of India. There private bodies have been running the educational institutions. Not only Christian Missionaries but also Hindus have been running educational institutions in Travancore-Cochin. Trivandrum is called the City of Colleges and Travancore-Cochin is called the Temple of Learning.

How far can we reconcile the idea of a democratic educational institution with this Bill? That is the next point. We have an Education Ministry and the nation is spending a very big amount on the Education Ministry. We have a learned man at the top as Education Minister. I think the nation is spending enough for education and supervision. This University Grants Commission, in my view, is nothing but an elaboration of the machinery. The object to be reached is the same. By this elaboration of machinery, we are not going to do anything more towards stabilising education in universities and standardising the efficiency. I agree with sections 12 and 13 of this Bill, but from section 20 onwards, all the sections are contradictory to the nature of education in a democratic country like ours.

This Bill is calculated to stabilise education by a grant from the Centre. Nobody can object to it. We welcome financial help not only from the Centre but from anywhere as far as education is concerned. But the Bill wants to supervise the grant—not only to supervise the grant but to interfere with the curriculum, interfere with the granting of degrees, interfere with the appointment of officers and interfere in every respect. On the whole, the policy of education is the policy of the Gov-

ernment. How far can we reconcile this more or less totalitarian type of supervision with a democratic country? I quote an accredited authority on education from our own State who is now holding a very important position.

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur): Who is he?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Professor Radhakrishnan. He says that autonomy of universities is an essential condition for its efficient functioning. He says that we should not make inroads into the autonomy of the universities. Even additional grants can be made in such a way that the self-respect of the university is not injured. "Autonomy covers besides financial freedom, academic and administrative freedom as well." Considering this point, Sir, I wish to submit that the best results of university education had been contributed by autonomous universities like Madras, Bombay and universities abroad. To-day India owes much of its university education to this type of universities. Therefore, I beg to submit that this Bill, instead of doing good to universities, does more harm.

Sections 20 and 21 more or less dictate rules and regulations for the functioning of universities. The University Grants Commission consists of three members from Vice-Chancellors, two members from Government and four members from among accredited educational authorities. No doubt they form an efficient commission. But what about the principle of selection? Who are the three Vice-Chancellors you are going to have? I would rather prefer that all the Vice-Chancellors of India be summoned and asked to elect three members from among themselves. Again, on what principle is the question of Chairmanship based? There are two Government members. Who is going to be the Chairman?

There is one more point. Here is a Bill asking for sanction of Parliament for an amount to be spent on the University Grants Commission. I would

suggest a different method. We want some supervision of universities because too many colleges have arisen and education is almost running riot, especially after India became a Republic. Strikes, indiscipline, want of character and want of learning are the characteristics of modern education. These have to be supervised, I agree. But should you have an expensive University Grants Commission for that? Why can't we have an expert committee to sit in deliberation over the rules and regulations to be drawn up? Let the report of the committee be presented before this House; let the house consider it and pass it; and let the Central Government enforce it through the State Governments in their own respective universities. We can save so much money by this method. I feel that in this Bill the question of education has been looked at from the wrong angle. Mass literacy and free and compulsory education for the children of India are essential for our democratic population. To-day in every State literacy varies. We have to tackle the question at the very foundation. Unless we reform our secondary education system and provide for compulsory primary education, we cannot reform university education. It is futile to build the top structure and decorate it without strengthening the foundation, because, some day or other, the whole structure is bound to collapse.

Next comes centralisation. I have already dealt with it, but I wish to submit that this is foreign to the idea of democracy and I am surprised that this Government should have brought it. If you follow the whole Bill section by section, you will find that it is a typical example of a totalitarian system of education. I will congratulate Government if it is prepared to nationalise education, because education should be the first charge on the national income; education should be the first subject which a Republican Government will have to handle, if that Government is a progressive democratic Government.

650 LSD.

4 P.M.

This Bill could have been appreciated, if Government had set apart a good percentage of the national income for education. In U.S.S.R., they have set apart sixty per cent. of their national income for education. This is something which the education authorities there have told me in person. If you go there and look at the educational institutions they are having, you will feel that they spend much more than sixty per cent. Similarly, in America and England also, a good percentage of the national income is invested in education. But what have we invested in India? We have invested only about two per cent. or something more than two per cent. With these contributions to educational advancement, how can you bring forward a Bill for the setting up of a University Grants Commission with such an elaborate machinery, and involving an expenditure of more than a lakh of rupees? How can you justify it? I appreciate the intentions of Government. I appreciate their intentions to do something to solve a problem which is staring the nation in the face. I can understand that, but I am sorry that they have handled the question at the wrong end. It is just like crowning a leper patient with a diadem.

I would, therefore, request Government to consider before passing this Bill, schemes to re-organise primary and secondary education on a strong basis, and then to pass this Bill to crown it all, so that the future India may be an enlightened country.

श्री एस० एन० वास (दरभंगा—मध्य) : यह विधेयक जो संसदीय मंत्री जी ने इस सभा के सम्मुख रखा है, स्वागत करने की चीज है। लेकिन बहुत दुःख की बात है कि ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषय में जिस के सम्बन्ध में लगभग ५ वर्ष पहले जो यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन आज के हमारे उप राष्ट्रपति की अध्यक्षता में बनी थी और जिस ने अनेक सिफारिशों के साथ एक महत्वपूर्ण सिफारिश यह भी की थी कि एक यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन बनाया

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

जाए, यह विधेयक इतनी दूर से लाया गया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषय के सम्बन्ध में निर्णय करने में सरकार को इतने वर्ष क्यों लग गए। आज जो विधेयक अभी आया है उसे पढ़ने से सब मुच मुझे तो यह स्पष्ट नहीं होता कि क्या यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन को नियुक्त करने का बिल उसी धारणा पर बनाया गया है जैसे कि यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन ने सिफारिश की थी या उस से कुछ दूसरी चीज है। हमारा खयाल है कि यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन ने एक खास काम के लिए इस तरह के आयोग की नियुक्ति की सिफारिश की थी लेकिन आज जो विधेयक हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत किया गया है उसमें उसके क्षेत्र को बहुत व्यापक बना दिया गया है और मुझे शक होता है कि जो काम इस कमिशन के सुपुर्द किए जा रहे हैं और जैसी बनावट इस विधेयक के जरिये उस कमिशन की होने वाली है और जो जो अधिकार इस कमिशन को मिलने वाले हैं या जो जो कर्तव्य इस को सौंपे जाने वाले हैं उन सब का सम्पादन यह प्रस्तावित आयोग ठीक तरह से कर सकता है या नहीं कर सकता है। इस प्रस्ताव को रखते हुए ससंदीय मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि सरकार की इच्छा थी कि एक दूसरा विधेयक उन अतिरिक्त अधिकारों के सम्बन्ध में जो कि संविधान के जरिये केंद्रीय सरकार को मिले हैं, जैसे विश्वविद्यालयों की शिक्षा का स्तर ऊंचा करना और उनके कामों में समन्वय लाकर स्तर को कायम रखना, लाया जाय। इसके साथ साथ यह भी उसका काम है कि केंद्र से इन विश्वविद्यालयों को उनके विभिन्न कामों के लिए आर्थिक सहायता कैसे दी जाए। जैसा कि और माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा, और मेरा भी खयाल यही है, कि दो तरह की जिम्मेदारी केंद्रीय सरकार और इस सदन पर आती है। विश्वविद्यालयों का स्तर कैसे हां, उसको कैसे ऊंचा किया जाए, परीक्षा और शिक्षण की पद्धति ऊंचे दर्जे की हो, इस सम्बन्ध में विचार करने के लिए कैसे व्यक्ति

हों इन सब बातों की जांच करने के लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि विद्वानों और शिक्षा शास्त्रियों की जरूरत है। विश्वविद्यालयों के काम का समन्वय करने के लिए, कौन से विश्वविद्यालय में किस विशेष प्रकार की शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध हो, कहां कहां कौन कौन अनुसंधान काम हो और किस तरह हो, इन कामों का निर्णय करने का, उस विश्वविद्यालय के विकास के लिए, उसकी उन्नति के लिए प्रगति के लिए, किस तरह के वित्त की आवश्यकता है, इस का निर्णय करने के लिए दूसरी तरह के आदीमियों की जरूरत है। इयूटीजी आफ दी कमिशन के चार्ज में, यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के १६वें पंरा में कहा है :

"We have considered the pros and cons of prescribing additional duties for the Commission, besides the allocation of grants, and we have decided against it."

इसके मानी स्पष्ट है कि उसकी सिफारिश का अर्थ यह है कि उस के खयाल में एक ऐसा कमिशन बनाया जाए जो सिर्फ विश्वविद्यालयों को आर्थिक सहायता देने के सम्बन्ध में सरकारी विभागों की तरफ से जो दूर होती है और जिस के कारण उस विश्वविद्यालय का काम भली प्रकार नहीं चल सकता, उनका जल्दी निपटारा कर सके।

उदाहरण के लिए विश्वविद्यालयों को आर्थिक सहायता के लिए जांच पड़ताल करने के बाद शिक्षा मंत्रालय जो प्रस्ताव पेश करता है वह प्रस्ताव वित्त मंत्रालय के यहां जाता है और वह भी जांचने की कोशिश करता है कि उरअसल यह जो योजना पेश की गई है यह हर दृष्टि से ठीक है या नहीं। इस प्रकार वित्त मंत्रालय में भी उस के सम्बन्ध में निर्णय करने में बहुत वक्त लग जाता है और जो विश्वविद्यालय की स्कीम होती है उसको कार्यान्वयन करने में बहुत समय लग जाता है। इन चुटियों को दूर करने के लिए यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन ने यह निर्णय किया कि

एक एंसा कमिशन नियुक्त किया जाए जो आर्थिक सहायता या आर्थिक मदद या आर्थिक अनुदान विश्वविद्यालयों के विभिन्न कामों के लिए केंद्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिया जाता है उसका वह निपटारा जल्दी कर सके। परन्तु अभी जो बिल हमारे सामने पेश किया गया है उसके प्रामाण्य में उस के कार्य का क्षेत्र विस्तृत कर दिया गया है। वह यह है :—

“to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission”.

यहां पर यूनिवर्सिटीज को आर्थिक सहायता देने के बारे में कुछ नहीं लिखा गया है। यह ठीक है कि संविधान के आर्टिकल ६६ के अनुसार शिक्षा में सुधार आदि करने के सम्बन्ध में केंद्र को कानून बनाने का अधिकार है। परन्तु इस विषयक में बहुत सी बातें रख दी गई हैं। जहां तक हमारी कुछ बुद्धि काम करती है, हमारे ह्याल में संविधान के अनुसार स्तर निर्णय या स्तर कायम करने के लिए एक अलहदा कमिशन नियुक्त किया जाना चाहिए था और आर्थिक कार्य को करने के लिए एक अलहदा विश्वविद्यालयों की शिक्षा की पद्धति में परीक्षा की पद्धति में और विश्वविद्यालयों के विभिन्न विभागों के सम्बन्ध में, जिन का कि शिक्षा के सुधार के कामों से सम्बन्ध है, सुधार करने के लिए विद्वानों का एक अलग कमिशन बनाया जाता तो हमारे ह्याल से ज्यादा उचित होता। इसलिए मैं प्रवर समिति के सदस्यों से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे अब भी इस बात पर विचार करें कि विश्वविद्यालयों के लिये वित्त का प्रबन्ध और उन में प्रचलित शिक्षा स्तर के नियंत्रण के लिए प्रस्तावित एक आयोग रखना कहां तक ठीक होगा। आगे चल कर इसमें कठिनाई पैदा होगी।

इस आयोग के संगठन के लिए जो धारा दी गयी है उसको अगर आप देखेंगे तो आपको मालूम होगा कि वे मंत्री किस तरह के होंगे। उसमें दिया है :

“.....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.”

यह स्पष्ट है कि गांड्स कमिशन के कुछ सदस्यों का वाइस चांसलरों में से चुनाव होगा। मैं किसी व्यक्ति विशेष के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन जहां तक मेरा ह्याल है वाइस चांसलरों की नियुक्ति के सम्बन्ध में यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन की जो सिफारिश है उसको बहुत सी यूनिवर्सिटीयों ने अभी तक नहीं माना है। बहुत सी यूनिवर्सिटीयों में इस सिफारिश का विरोध चल रहा है। हो सकता है कि कुछ राज्य सरकारें इसलिए इस सिफारिश को मंजूर नहीं करतीं कि उनका हक चला जायगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि शिक्षा पद्धति का निर्णय करने के लिए और परीक्षा पद्धति का निर्माण करने के लिए जो शिक्षा शास्त्री हैं या मनोविज्ञान शास्त्री हैं वे अधिक उपयुक्त होंगे बनिस्वत उनके जो स्पर्धायुक्त विषयों का अनुभव स्वतः है।

इस धारा के दूसरे हिस्से में कहा गया है :

“.....not less than two members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government;”

इसका यह मतलब है चीफ सरकार जैसे दती हैं, इसलिये उसके दो प्रतिनिधि रहने चाहिए। तो इस आयोग में दो सरकार के प्रतिनिधि रहेंगे। इससे मालूम होता है कि जो संगठन आप बनाने जा रहे हैं उस पर सरकार को पूर्ण विश्वास नहीं है। इसमें यह नहीं दिया गया है कि इस आयोग में कैसे अफसर रहेंगे। सरकार को स्वतंत्रता है कि वह किसी भी अफसर को नियुक्त करे। हो सकता है कि उनका भीन्चरिटी के आधार पर रखा जाय। हो सकता है कि कोई अफसर भीन्चर हो पर योग्य न हो। इस तरह के मेम्बर बोर्ड के कर्तव्य का ठीक ठीक पालन नहीं कर सकेंगे।

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

तीसरी उपधारा में कहा गया है :

".....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 administrative or financial matters."

हमारा जहाँ तक ख्याल है जब मंत्रियों की नियुक्ति का समय आवेगा तो जो तीन उपकूलपति हैं वे शिक्षा के विशेषज्ञ समझे जायेंगे। जो सरकारी अफसर हैं, उनको किस आधार पर रखा जायगा यह इसमें नहीं दिया गया है। सरकार जिसको चाहे रख सकेगी। लेकिन तीसरे में कहा गया है कि ऐसे आदमी जिनको एडमिनिस्ट्रटिव और फाइनेन्शल मैटर्स का अनुभव हो। मैं यह समझ सकता हूँ कि जहाँ तक रुपया देने का सवाल है वहाँ तक तो ऐसे अफसरों की जरूरत हो सकती है, लेकिन यह निर्णय करने में कि यूनीवर्सिटी की शिक्षा पद्धति कैसी हो, या परीक्षा पद्धति कैसी हो, इसका निर्णय करने में प्रशासनिक अनुभव की कोई विशेष जरूरत नहीं होनी चाहिए। शिक्षा का नियमन करना दूसरी बात है और शासन चलाना दूसरी बात है। इसलिए मेरा ख्याल है कि इस कमीशन के दो अलग अलग विभाग होने चाहिए। अगर एक बिल से ही ये दोनों काम होने हैं तो इस कमीशन के दो विभिन्न तरीके के कामों को चलाने के लिये दो पृथक विभाग कर दिये जायें। एक विभाग आर्थिक अनुदान देने का संगठन होना चाहिए, और जहाँ तक शिक्षा के स्तर को कायम रखने का सम्बन्ध है इसका निर्णय करने के लिए दूसरा विभाग होना चाहिए। दोनों का काम अलग अलग बता देना चाहिए।

[SHRIMATI KHONGMEN in the Chair.]

एक बात और यहाँ कही गयी है कि विश्व-विद्यालय की शिक्षा में सरकार को हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिए। मैं भी इस बात को मानता हूँ। लेकिन इस विषय में दो दृष्टिकोण हैं। एक यह कि विश्वविद्यालय के शासन में सरकार

का हस्तक्षेप होना चाहिए और दूसरा है कि नहीं होना चाहिए। हमारे देश में जो शिक्षा पद्धति है उसको अंग्रेजों ने कायम किया था और आज तक हम उस विरासत को ठोकरें दे रहे हैं, और जैसा कि हमारे श्री लिंगम ने कहा कि बड़े बड़े विशेषज्ञों के भाषण होते हैं कि हमारे देश की शिक्षा पद्धति अच्छी नहीं है उसे बदलना चाहिए, लेकिन न तो केंद्रीय सरकार ने और न राज्य सरकारों ने और न किसी विश्वविद्यालय ने किसी नई शिक्षा पद्धति का निर्माण किया है। कोई ऐसी चीज सामने नहीं आई है कि जिसको कहा जाय कि यह हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति में आमूल परिवर्तन है। इस शिक्षा पद्धति की वजह से हमारा देश गुलाम रहा और हमें अपनी आजादी प्राप्त करने में भी इसके कारण बड़ी कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ा। इसलिए हमें दूसरी शिक्षा पद्धति तो चलानी ही है। अब अगर हमें अपनी शिक्षा का आदर्श कहीं ढूँढना है तो हमें उसको अपने संविधान में ढूँढना चाहिए। हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति ऐसी होनी चाहिए कि जो उस प्रकार के समाज के निर्माण में सहायक हो सके जिसकी कि हमने कल्पना की है। हमने अपने संविधान में जो मूलभूत सिद्धान्त रखे हैं उनके आधार पर हमको अपने समाज का निर्माण करना है। हमको यह शिक्षा पद्धति निर्माण करनी चाहिए जो कि हमको उस समाज के निर्माण में सहायता दे सके।

इसके अतिरिक्त मेरा यह सुझाव भी है कि हमारे देश के लिए जहाँ कि जलवायु की, रहन सहन की, और दूसरी चीजों की इतनी विभिन्नता है, केवल एक प्रकार की ही शिक्षा पद्धति सब के लिए उपयोगी नहीं हो सकती। इस देश में एक तरह की शिक्षा पद्धति तो वही चलावेगा जिसको मनाविज्ञान का या देश की दशा का ज्ञान न हो। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि किसी केंद्रीय संस्था द्वारा हिन्दुस्तान जैसे देश में शिक्षा पद्धति का नियंत्रण और नियमन ठीक नहीं होगा। इसका विरोध हर एक आदमी को करना चाहिए। हम लोगों ने शान्तिमय

क्रान्ति द्वारा इस दश की सरकार का स्थान लिया है, और हमने अपने सामने एक नये समाज का आदर्श रखा है। हमको अपनी शिक्षा पद्धति द्वारा उस आदर्श की पूर्ति करनी है। हमने अपने दश को सर्वसत्ता सम्पन्न प्रजातांत्रिक गणतंत्र घोषित किया है, और राजनीतिक सामाजिक एवं आर्थिक न्याय सब के लिये समान रूप से उपलब्ध करने का सफल किया है लेकिन दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज २६ करोड़ जनता में से हमारा दश में केवल ६ करोड़ ही ऐसे हैं जो लिख पढ़ सकते हैं। इतना बड़ा प्रयोग हम अपने दश में करते जा रहे हैं जिसमें हमें समता, स्वतंत्रता और भावभाव का प्रसार करना चाहिए। इतना ही नहीं, हम चाहते हैं कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमारा दश हिन्दुस्तान विश्व-बन्धुत्व कायम करने में अग्रसर रहे। हमने अपने दश की जनता के हाथों में सामान्य निर्विघ्न संस्थाओं के सदस्यों को चुनने का अधिकार रखा है। ऐसी दशा में अगर हम उनको अज्ञान के अन्धकार में रखें तो यह हमारा लिए बहुत लज्जा की बात होगी। इसलिए जहां हम आज विश्वविद्यालय की शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में विचार कर रहे हैं। हम इस बात को कभी अपने दिल से नहीं हटा सकते हैं कि करोड़ों जनता को शीघ्रतः शिक्षित कर उन्हें योग्य नागरिक बनाना है। राष्ट्र का निर्माण उम्र से नहीं हुआ करता है। राष्ट्र का निर्माण नीचे से होता है। नीचे नीचे अगर कमजोर है नीचे नहीं पकड़ी न हो और ऊपर बड़ा महल खड़ा किया जाय जिसमें नक्काशी और फूल पत्ती का काफी काम किया जाय तो ऐसी इमारत ज्यादा दिन तक चलने वाली नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में हम शिक्षा मंत्री का ध्यान और सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहेंगे कि यदि सचमुच में यह सरकार चाहती है कि जो प्रजातांत्रिक गणतंत्र हमने कायम किया है, वह सफल रहे और जो समाज व्यवस्था का आदर्श हमने अपने सामने रखा है वह जल्द से जल्द हमें प्राप्त हो तो यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा का नियमन और उनको आर्थिक सहायता देने के साथ साथ

हमें दश की जो करोड़ों जनता अभी भी अल्प कर्तव्य और अधिकार की भावनाओं से वंचित है उनको जल्द से जल्द उस योग्य बनाना है।

लेकिन अभी वह विषय नहीं है, अभी जो विषय हमारा सामने है उसके सम्बन्ध में मेरा कहना यह है कि विश्वविद्यालयों में जो दिन प्रति दिन के काम हैं, शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में, परीक्षा के सम्बन्ध में या विश्वविद्यालय के जो विभिन्न अंग होते हैं जैसे सीनेट, सिडीक्रेट और फैकल्टीज की जो अलग अलग कमेटीयां होती हैं उन सब कमेटीयां के काम में न तो राज्य की सरकार का हस्तक्षेप करना चाहिए और न केंद्र की सरकार का हस्तक्षेप करना चाहिये। जो हम नियमन करने जा रहे हैं इसे हम हस्तक्षेप नहीं कहते क्योंकि हमें एक नये समाज की रचना करनी है और राष्ट्र ने ऐसा समाज स्थापित करने की जिम्मेदारी ली है इसलिए अंग्रेजी राज्य के समय में जबतकी यूनिवर्सिटीयां की स्थापना हुई और अभी भी जो यूनिवर्सिटीयां की स्थापना हो रही है, उनके संचालकों के सामने हमको बराबर एक आदर्श रखना है कि हमारा इस राष्ट्र का क्या उद्देश्य है। किस तरह के समाज की हम रचना करना चाहते हैं और सभानेत्री महोदया, इस बात को मानना पड़ेगा कि चाहे किसी भी क्षेत्र में जाइये, विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में जाइये, टीचनकल विभाग में जाइये, प्रशासनिक विभाग में जाइये कहीं भी जाइये जब तक हमारा दश में ये करोड़ों भाई शिक्षित हैं और जब तक वह अपने प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार और कर्तव्यों के ज्ञान से वंचित हैं तब तक अगर कोई उन आदर्शों की रक्षा करने वाले हैं तो वह यही हमारा यूनिवर्सिटी के तरुण भाई हैं। उनकी शिक्षा दीक्षा अगर ठीक से न हो तो इस बात का पूरा खतरा है कि जब तक हमारा यह २६ करोड़ लोग कर्तव्य और अधिकार के ज्ञान से युक्त हो सकेंगे और जागृत होंगे तब तक हमारा प्रजातंत्र का जो ढांचा है वह ढह सकता है। इस दृष्टि से हम जरूरी समझते हैं कि हम यहां केंद्र में एक ऐसी समिति का निर्माण करें जो इस आदर्श को सामने रखते हुए विश्वविद्यालयों के काम में

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

कम से कम हस्तक्षेप करते हुए विश्वविद्यालय को रास्ता बतावे, उन के कार्यों में समन्वय लावे और तब आर्थिक सहायता देते हुए उनके सर्वांगीण विकास में सहायक हों। सभानेत्री जी, अभी इस आयोग की आवश्यकता पांच, छः वर्ष के बाद महसूस की गई है कि इस तरह का आयोग बनाना चाहिए। यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन की जो रिपोर्ट है उसको पढ़ने से मालूम होता है कि हमारा विश्वविद्यालयों की वर्तमान अवस्था क्या है। बहुत से विश्वविद्यालय बहुत अच्छे ढंग से चलाये जाते हैं, इसमें कुछ शक नहीं है और वह इसके लिए प्रशंसा के पात्र हैं, लेकिन उनमें से बहुत से ऐसे हैं जिनका न स्टैण्डर्ड अच्छा है, न जिनकी कार्य प्रणाली अच्छी है और न उनके अध्यापक अच्छे हैं और उनके यहां जो शिक्षा सम्बन्धी सामान इत्यादि है वह भी नीचे दर्जे का है, विद्यार्थियों का विकास मानसिक और शारीरिक दृष्टि से नहीं हो पाता है। इस सम्बन्ध में आवश्यकताएं जो बताई गई थीं कि विश्वविद्यालयों में क्या क्या कमी है, किस बजह से हमारा देश में उच्च शिक्षा का जो आदर्श है वह पूरा नहीं हो पाता है, उस उच्च शिक्षा के आदर्श को सहायता देने के लिए केंद्र की सरकार की सहायता की जरूरत है। यह बात सही है कि यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा का जो काम है वह राज्य सरकारों के अन्तर्गत है लेकिन राज्य सरकारों की आर्थिक अवस्था आप जानते हैं कि कैसी है। राज्य की सरकार के ऊपर जो यूनिवर्सिटी तालीम का काम है वह भी सब काम पूरा नहीं हो पाता है, तो फिर विश्वविद्यालय का सारा भार उन राज्यों पर छोड़ दिया जाय, तो यह काम होने वाला नहीं है।

इसलिए जरूरत इस बात की है कि इस तरह का आयोग बना कर जो आवश्यक चीजें हों उनकी पूर्ति के लिये काम किया जाय।

अब मैं कुछ सुझाव सदन के समक्ष रखना चाहता हूँ। विधेयक की क्लॉज तीन में बतलाया गया है कि केंद्रीय सरकार जो अभी आयोग

बनाने वाली है यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की राय से और गजट में नोटिफिकेशन करके किसी भी ऊंची शिक्षा की संस्था को यूनिवर्सिटी घोषित कर सकती है। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा ख्याल है कि यह ठीक है कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की सिफारिश पर केंद्रीय सरकार सिफारिश करे और यह काम अन्तिम रूप में पार्लियामेंट द्वारा पूरा किया जाय। सविधान के सातवें शेड्यूल के अन्दर जो सूची दी गयी है और जिन विषयों के सम्बन्ध में केंद्र को, संसद् को कानून बनाने का हक है, उस सूची में विश्वविद्यालयों के स्तर का निर्माण या उस की रक्षा एक है। यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में कानून बनाने का हक सम्बन्धित राज्य की सरकार को या इस संसद् को है, इसलिए मेरी राय है कि इसका इस तरह से संशोधन किया जाय ताकि अन्तिम निर्णय करने का अधिकार संसद् को हो...

श्री अलगू राव शास्त्री (जिला आजमगढ़—पूर्व व जिला बलिया—पश्चिम) : क्या करंगी सभा ?

श्री एस० एन० दास : सभा क्या करंगी। मैं आपको बताऊँ कि राष्ट्रीय स्मारक के सम्बन्ध में विधान में ही दिया गया है, जो राष्ट्रीय स्मारक सार्वंश में फैला हुआ है उसके बारे में कहा गया है कि राष्ट्रीय महत्त्व के जो स्मारक होंगे उनका निर्णय केंद्रीय पार्लियामेंट विधि द्वारा करंगी, केंद्र की सरकार आखिर हमसे कोई गिन्न नहीं है लेकिन एक बाजाला कानूनी मंजूरी के लिए अगर वह चीज संसद् में आये तो सार्व संसद् के सदस्य जिनके ऊपर यह जिम्मेदारी है, वे देख सकेंगे कि जो सिफारिश सरकार की ओर से की जा रही है वह सचमुच मंजूर करने योग्य है या नहीं।

दूसरा सुझाव मेरा यह है कि वाइस चांसलर जो इस आयोग के सदस्य होंगे उनका अन्तिम निर्णय करने का अधिकार सरकार पर हो, इसमें मुझे कोई उज्र नहीं है लेकिन हमारा ख्याल है कि विभिन्न विश्वविद्यालयों के जो वाइस चांसलर हैं या उनकी अगर कोई संगठित संस्था

हो तो उस संस्था की इस सम्बन्ध में राय ली जाय और उसके सम्बन्ध में उन से कुछ नाम मांगे जायें, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह मुनासिब होगा, इस तरह का समावेश इस विधेयक में होना चाहिए।

तीसरे क्लॉज ६ के सम्बन्ध में मेरा ख्याल है कि जो सेवा के नियम और शर्तें (टर्म्स एन्ड कंडीशंस आफ सर्विस आफ मेम्बर्स) रखी गयी हैं वे कुछ स्पष्ट नहीं मालूम होतीं और उस क्लॉज के सम्बन्ध में यह कहना चाहेंगा कि यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा कमिशन ने जो सुझाव रखे हैं उसकी तरफ मैं उस संयुक्त प्रवर समिति का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिसके सामने यह विधेयक जाना वाला है, कमिशन के सुझाव को मैं आपके सामने पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ। अपनी रिपोर्ट के पेज ४१० पर सत्रहवें पैरा में कमिशन ने इस प्रकार लिखा है :

"It is vitally important, therefore, that the appointed members should be chosen for the qualities mentioned above and for no political, regional or communal reason whatever. It is equally important that their position shall be as secure as is constitutionally possible. We regard their responsibility as similar to that of the Federal Public Service Commission: their position should be similarly safeguarded, and they should be under a similar restriction as to future employment—in this case they should be debarred from subsequent holding of any university office. They should be appointed for six years but of the first three to be appointed one should retire after two and another after four years."

इसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह कहना है कि जिस तरह की जिम्मेदारी इस आयोग को हम देने वाले हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि उस जिम्मेदारी के साथ साथ हमें इसका भी ध्यान रखना है कि हम उनकी टर्म्स एंड कंडीशन्स आफ सर्विस में इस तरह बदलाव करें जिससे समय समय पर हम उनके काम में अनूचित दखल न दें

सकें और वह अपना काम स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक निर्भयता के साथ कर सकें। इसलिये जो सुझाव यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के सम्बन्ध में यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा आयोग ने दिया है उन के सम्बन्ध में मैं चाहेंगा कि उस का इस बिन्दु में समावेश कर दिया जाय।

जहाँ तक मेरा ख्याल है यह जो धारा २० है उस में कहा गया है कि जहाँ तक नीति का ताल्लुक है उस पर सरकार का पूरा अधिकार होगा। लेकिन यह साफ नहीं मालूम होता है कि नीति में किस प्रकार की बात होगी। अगर आयोग में और सरकारी अधिकारियों में इस बात पर कोई मतभेद होगा कि कौन सा विषय नीति से सम्बन्ध रखता है तो उस के सम्बन्ध में यह कहा गया है कि इस सम्बन्ध में सरकारी निर्णय ठीक समझा जायेगा। अच्छा तो यह होगा कि कौन सी बातें ऐसी हैं जिन का शिक्षा पद्धति से ताल्लुक है इस का निर्धारण विद्यालय कर और सरकार को इस में कोई हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिये, परीक्षा पद्धति कौसी हो इस का निर्णय हो जाय तो इस में सरकार को हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिये। इस लिये इस का स्पष्टीकरण करना चाहिये कि कौन से विषय ऐसे हैं जिन का अधिकार सरकार अपने हाथ में रखना चाहती है। अगर यह स्पष्टीकरण कर दिया जाय तो बात समझ में आ सकती है।

एक धारा २२ है जिस में कहा गया है कि पदवी देने का या उपाधि देने का जो अधिकार है वह उसी यूनिवर्सिटी को रहेगा जिस की व्याख्या इस में दी गई है और उसी संस्था को रहेगा जिस संस्था को सरकार बाजान्सा यूनिवर्सिटी घोषित करेगी। अब इस में सवाल यह है कि अभी तक हमारा देश में बहुत सी ऐसी संस्थायें हैं जो सरकारी तौर पर नहीं बनी हुई हैं, उन के द्वारा स्वेच्छा से संगठन कर के और जिन को शिक्षा से प्रेम है और जिन में दानशीलता है उन के प्रयत्न से बहुत सी संस्थायें पुराने जमाने से शिक्षा प्रदान का विभिन्न प्रकार की पदवी और प्रमाणपत्र देती आ रही हैं। इस धारा को स्वीकार करने के बाव

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

इन संस्थाओं का क्या स्थान रहेगा, क्या वह किसी तरह की परीक्षा ले सकती हैं या कोई पदवी दे सकती हैं या नहीं, मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में थोड़ा शक है। जैसे हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन है, गुरुकुल कांगड़ी है, काशी विद्यापीठ है, यह स्वतंत्र संस्थायें सरकार से सहायता नहीं लेती हैं, यह पदवी दान करती हैं, यह अपनी शिक्षा पद्धति रखते हुए हैं, इन संस्थाओं का क्या होगा? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस पर पूरा विचार करके तब इस धारा को रखना चाहिये। यह नौ धारा है उस से स्पष्ट नहीं मालूम होता कि उस में सरकार का क्या उद्देश्य है। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि जैसी-जैसी संस्थाओं को जिन के कोई साधन नहीं हैं, जिन में कोई विद्वान आदमी नहीं हैं, जिन्हें शिक्षा से कोई प्रेम नहीं है, पदवी देने का अधिकार नहीं होना चाहिये। लेकिन साथ ही साथ जो अच्छी संस्थायें हैं वे सभी सरकारी नियंत्रण में आ जायें तभी वे पदवी दान कर सकें, यह उन के लिये अच्छा नहीं मालूम होता है। इस लिये इस धारा पर फिर से विचार करना चाहिये। और बदल बदल करना चाहिये जिसमें कि कुछ स्वतंत्र संस्थायें चलाने का अधिकार भी लोगों को रहे।

अन्त में मैं फिर इस विधेयक का, जो सभा के सामने हैं, समर्थन करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि जो दो प्रकार के काम मैंने बतलाये हैं उन दोनों प्रकार के कामों को अलग अलग विधेयकों द्वारा किया जाना चाहिये और उन के लिये अलग अलग आयोगों की स्थापना की जायें ताँ अति उत्तम हैं और विश्वविद्यालयों के सुधार के लिये जो जो सुझाव युनिवर्सिटी कमिशन ने दश के सामने रखे थे वह सब इन के द्वारा पूर्ण होने चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri S. S. More: I have been very keenly listening to the debate but I find that most of the speakers have emphasised the academic, educational

aspect of the matter. Is that outlook enough when we proceed to consider this present measure which is of the greatest importance? Now, I want to bring to the notice of this House that in looking at this educational matter we must also take into consideration the social aspect. What is our objective? According to the Prime Minister, the creation of a society which is of a socialist pattern is our objective. That is another way of saying, as had been said in the Constitution, that this Constitution shall try to create conditions where justice, social, political and economic, shall be assured to every citizen. So, what sort of society we want to create? Many people have emphatically asserted that economic inequalities shall be removed. First, they shall be narrowed down and then finally removed. The economic inequalities are not the only ulcer from which our society suffers. If we subject our economic inequality to a further analysis and make a further probing into it, we find that our society is cleaved into two broad aspects, the rich and the poor, and if we want to create a socialist pattern of society, then we must also, at the same time, try to remove the educational inequality which is one of the fruitful sources of economic inequalities. That ought to be the purpose. Of course, I do admit that it will be a long range purpose. We cannot create such a society overnight, and therefore our whole educational system, right from the bottom to the top, must be tuned, must be in accord with the social objective, and only then we can approach in the right direction.

Now, we are going to create a University Grants Commission. Most of the speakers have pointed out certain recommendations from the report of the University Education Commission which had submitted its report in August, 1949. But this report, which I have tried to peruse in my own way, has become a sort of antiquated document. After this report of 1949, we

have framed our Constitution and that Constitution has come as a final document on the statute-book and in the preamble of that Constitution all our social objectives have been mentioned. In the terms of reference to that Commission, there was no such term whether the educational system should be devised, planned or shaped for the purpose of giving concrete shape to the social objective which was mentioned in the preamble.

Dr. M. M. Das: The Commission has discussed it.

Shri S. S. More: My submission is that it is this preamble which must control all our action, all our declaration, and as far as this report is concerned, it looks to me at least, as being one in the tradition of those Commissions, dating from the wood-despatch of 1854 followed by the Hunter Commission, Raleigh Commission and the Sadler Commission, and all other Commissions appointed by the Britishers. It is on the same lines, a sort of bureaucratic, a sort of British outlook, prevailing to assert on our educational system. With the enactment of the Constitution, I think the British outlook has receded back and that this new social outlook must come to the forefront, and try to control and regulate all our actions.

Now, this University Grants Commission—I shall come to the constitutional aspect later on—is supposed to co-ordinate standards. The purpose is given: it is for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities. The Radhakrishnan Commission itself has stated that in our attempts at such measures for co-ordination, and determination of standards, we do not want to create a stereotyped uniformity. This country is a vast country. Different States have different difficulties, different problems, and the educational development of all States is not even: is uneven. Therefore, in assessing what should be the proper standard, or in their efforts to co-ordinate the work of the different Universities, the peculiarities of the States,

650 LSD.—5

the social conditions prevailing in all the States and the particular classes of society which are trying to take advantage of this University education must be the deciding factor, and some dead bureaucratic attempt to create uniformity which will yield to the same yardstick is not and could not be the objective of this University Grants Commission. I will take some concrete instances. I come from Poona. You know Poona is a place where so many institutions have been started, and the tradition of Maharashtra, as far as private effort in educational life is concerned, is very glorious, and I am proud of that tradition. The late Mr. Gokhale started his public career in a private institution. The late Mr. Tilak also started the same way and I can mention a host of names which have become as bright as the stars on the firmament, as far as the educational history of our State is concerned. Not only did they set up a standard for themselves, but they even set a standard for the Britisher to copy. Therein lay their greatness. Now, if we are going to prescribe some yardstick of standard and bring about some mechanical co-ordination, education will suffer. Education is not some dead material which could be lumped up and given some final shape according to the wishes of the Central Government or any other Government. It is a live thing, integrated with the lives of the people, integrated with the lives, aspirations and social conditions of the people. And, therefore, any attempt to create a dead uniformity, and stereotyped uniformity, will be an attempt to create a stuff which has no life, which cannot expand.

I shall give an instance. Now, all the educational institutions in Maharashtra or at any rate most of them—I am talking about the universities and colleges—are localised in urban areas. But what about the rural people? Some people were saying that there is an attempt on the part of some persons to get some communal preference. I am not a man given to communal pre-

[Shri S. S. More]

judices. But take for instance the peasant. The young peopole from the peasantry are taking to education; the young peopole from among the working classes are taking to education. They have not the finances. University education, at least in the Bombay State, has become the luxury of a few. The cost of education is going up and poor people, peopole belonging to the middle classes are forced to withdraw their girls first and then their boys from educational institutions. What is the effect? Social disparity is increased. On the top of economic inequality you are creating a social disparity; the existing gulf is widened, generating social discontent and rivalry. Most of our bureaucratic civil servants who are supposed to be ruling the destinies of this country come from the upper strata of our society. They want to keep the higher education as the monopoly of their sons and daughters so that when administrative posts are to be distributed, only their sons and daughters can have all preference, with the possible competitors coming from the peasantry and the lower middle classes eliminated in this economic struggle. I would, therefore, say that mere laying down of standards is not enough. The Commission must also look to the social composition of the people.

Let me give another instance. My hon. friend Mr. Khardekar, who is going to be one of the Members of the Select Committee, had a very good job. He was the Principal of a Government College. He kicked off that job and in a spirit of self-sacrifice started a private institution. He took his college to the rural areas. It was started for want of finances. The best of the intellectuals that he was successful in gathering around his mission had to starve; and the best qualified persons, who would have procured a fat job anywhere in the country, and who sacrificed their all, gave it up in dismal frustration. Therefore, the utility of such institutions is to be assessed not by

some standards forged at the Centre in Delhi, in the light of urban conditions, to suit the bloated purses of a few rich, but from the point of view of the lower strata of society, the toilers who are looking forward for a new life which we have promised them. Therefore, merely setting up of standards of a university would not do. We expect this Commission to look to the social composition of the majority of the people, look to the needs of the universities, look to the needs of the colleges, and these needs have to be assessed in terms of the social strata of the large number of children who enter them, or seek to enter them.

I am not suggesting any Utopian plan, but take the instance of Great Britain. Now, Great Britain is not a socialist country, in the sense we understand socialism. But there the administrators, the Conservatives, have realised that if they do not provide all the facilities for young people coming from the workers' ranks and the peasantry's ranks, there will be a revolution and there will be anarchy. So, what are they doing? They are diverting most of their funds for the education of such classes. How? I shall give the House certain figures.

In 1935-36 the endowments contributed 14.5 per cent. of the total earnings of the Universities; in 1949-50 it went down to 8.7 per cent. Donations and subscriptions were 2.5 in 1935-36; they went down to 1.7 per cent. in 1949-50, because the rich persons refused to shoulder any responsibility. Grants from local and educational authorities in 1935-36 were 8.7 per cent.; they went down to 4.6 per cent. The percentage of parliamentary grants—we are very vitally concerned with this—in 1935-36 was 34.3 per cent.; but it went up to 63.9 per cent. (that is nearly double) in 1949-50, within a period of ten years or so. In 1935-36 the fees collected was 32.5; it came down to 17.7. Other incomes were 7.5 in 1935-36; it came down to 6.5.

This was the percentage of the sources of income of the 6 million pounds spent in 1935-36. But in 1949-50 the total expenditure went up to 20 million pounds. From 6 millions to 20 millions. Government recognised their responsibility for removal of social inequalities.

I shall give this House some interesting figures so far as our country is concerned. The Radhakrishnan Commission said that 10 per cent. of the pupils enrolled are entitled to exemption from payment of tuition fees. A certain percentage has been laid down as an obligatory condition. They cannot exceed one-fifth or one-sixth of their expenditure. State Government and University scholarships are to the tune of one per cent. Now, let us see what is the position in England. I have these figures. In 1949-50 62,000 pupils out of a total pupil population of 85,000 (73 per cent.) were receiving either freeships or scholarships. And there primary education is free and compulsory. Not only primary education, but certain stages of secondary education also are free and compulsory. Naturally, the number of persons coming from the poorer sections going to the colleges and going in for university education is much larger than it could be imagined here.

Some of our State Governments are playing with the idea of free and compulsory education. They say that their objective is to attain universal education within a period of ten years. But, unfortunately, in my province, even primary education is being made difficult because fees have been raised. I am not trying to voice a grievance here, but that is the state of affairs. Now.—I am speaking subject to correction—in our State, Government lays down that before a college is affiliated to a university, it should fulfil certain conditions.

Shri Khardekar (Kolhapur *cum* Satara): It is the University that lays down the conditions.

Shri Syamanadan Sahaya: That was the position in certain Universities. But now it is the Universities.

Shri S. S. More: These Universities, in their own craving for a certain standard, are making the life of poor institutions which are catering for the poor people difficult. For instance, my friend Bhaurao Patil of Satara has rendered yeoman service to the cause of education, and particularly the education of the toilers, of the exploited. He is starting so many college institutions in rural areas. And the University says you must deposit forty thousand, sixty thousand rupees with us; without that we cannot grant you initial recognition.

Then the building standards are there. You know in this poor country sixty or seventy per cent. of people live in huts, and one Mr. Mehu who was the Director of Education in Madhya Pradesh has described the economic conditions and the educational conditions of our country in very bad terms. He said that students are made to sit in schools which are not fit even for stables according to British standards. Take living conditions into account. Most of them live in huts, mud huts. And when we start any college, then Government comes down with a condition "well, you must have a building of a particular pattern; you must have sitting accommodation of ten square feet" or fifteen square feet—I do not know exactly the latest requirement. Not only that. All the money collected by these educational enthusiasts in their enthusiasm to take the education to the toilers, all that money is taken away in bricks and cement. And when the question of equipment comes up, there is no money to fall back upon. Students are made to sit in palatial buildings, but with no apparatus.

Therefore, my fear is as to what will happen when this Grants Commission comes into existence. The educational experts imported from foreign countries and having Cambridge and Oxford dancing before their mental eyes will try to impose those conditions and restrictions on our educa-

[Shri S. S. More]

tional institutions. Mahatma Gandhi when he was speaking before the Federal Structure Committee of the Round Table Conference said: we cannot afford to have your standard. He said to the Britishers: financially you are giants while we are pigmies. But our so-called experts, coming to the world with a silver spoon in their mouth and trying to look more to the Oxford and Cambridge tradition than to the local requirements of the people floating in a cloud of richness and not realising the poverty which sprawls on the earth, lay down a standard which is beyond the competence of ordinary mortals in this country. And the result is that the flow of education is contracted, is lessened.

Therefore I would say in bringing out this sort of Commission we will have to take into consideration whether such a Commission with no proper instructions will be able to fulfil the objectives. I would expect the Education Minister who is an old guard of the Congress, to define the social objective of this Commission. Let him come out with a declaration that "this is our social objective".

Now, in Chapter III of this Bill the powers and functions of the Commission are mentioned. Why not describe the social purpose of this measure? It is highly necessary that such a description should be there. Take for instance the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Bill which has been referred to Select Committee. There is clause 13 which says that in making appointments or declaring guardians the welfare of minors shall be the prevailing objective. And even the Guardians and Wards Act lays down a similar objective—that welfare of the minors shall be the unavoidable and the only effective consideration of the courts. Why should we not have some clause here which will declare the social objective which this Grants Commission will have to take into consideration in

bringing about co-ordination or determination of standards in Universities? This is what I want to say about the social objective which the Grants Commission ought to bear in mind.

But there are some other points which also I want to bring to the notice of the House. I question the constitutional validity of this Bill. Let us go to Schedule Seven of the Constitution where the three Lists are given. According to entry 11 in List No. II, "education including universities" is the sole charge of the State Government "subject to the provisions of entries 63, 64, 65 and 66 of List I and entry 25 of List III." According to entry 63 in List I, "the institutions known at the commencement of this Constitution as the Benares Hindu University, the Aligarh Muslim University and the Delhi University, and any other institution declared by Parliament by law to be an institution of national importance" are covered by this entry 63. Entry 64 is regarding institutions for scientific or technical education with which we are not concerned here. Entry 65 is about Union agencies and institutions. Entry 66 says "co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions."

Now, in this Bill the purpose has been stated "to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards", and in clause 12, again, co-ordination and determination have been further emphasised. But what is the exact meaning that we are going to attach to the words "co-ordination and determination of standards"? What will be the exact import of this expression?

Why I am raising this question is this. There is going to be a conflict authority between the Central Government and the Provincial Governments. The question of legal validity will also be relevant. Suppose for the sake of argument, this Grants Commission has issued certain instructions which go

beyond the scope, the natural legal scope of co-ordination or setting up standards. Then what will happen? The State Governments will say: we refuse to accept the authority of the Commission. And the matter will have to be agitated, litigated in different Courts for the purpose of getting a final verdict till we reach the Supreme Court.

Dr. M. M. Das: Why does my hon. friend assume that the Commission will go beyond their jurisdiction?

Shri S. S. More: I do not know whether my hon. friend belongs to the legal profession. I know he belongs to the medical profession. As far as human heart is concerned he can be said to be an authority, but as far as legal ingenuity is concerned I do not think it lies within his province. We lawyers are there. And when two bodies come into conflict it is the interpretation of these expressions as given by the final authority in this country which will prevail. And it is bound to be a source of conflict.

Take for instance the different States. Different parties might come into power. This Government, with a particular ideology, might have one

conception about the social objective of education or their own responsibility. But a different party in power in a State and not sharing the political views of the party in power at the Centre might come to hold a different view-point and then the battle royal will start in right earnest. According to clause 20 of this Bill it is the Central Government's determination of policy which will prevail, and so the Commission will have to obey the directions of the Central Government, though it is competent to advise both the Central Government and the State Governments, as far as the State Governments are concerned they do not come into the picture. Therefore, as far as this clause 20 is concerned.....

Mr. Chairman: How much more time does the hon. Member require?

Shri S. S. More: I will take some more time because I want to develop one or two important points.

Mr. Chairman: Then he can continue his speech next time.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 23rd February, 1955.