

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COM-  
MISSION BILL—Contd.

**The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das):** Yesterday evening when the House rose I was in the midstream trying to explain to this hon. House the changes that have been proposed by the Joint Committee with regard to the University Grants Commission Bill.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Regarding the terms and conditions of service of the members of the Commission, two changes have been proposed by the University Grants Commission Joint Committee. By the first change, the Joint Committee proposes to take away from the hands of the Central Government the power to terminate the services of a member under the rules framed under the Act. The Committee considered this matter very carefully and felt that it would not be proper to leave in the hands of the Government the power to terminate the services of a member at their own discretion. According to the changes proposed by the Committee, the services of a member can only be terminated if the member concerned incurs some disqualification according to the rules framed under the Act. Secondly, a specific provision that the chairman should always be a whole-time officer has been omitted. Regarding the powers and functions of the Commission, that is clause 12, the Committee has proposed a number of changes. The most important of these changes makes it obligatory on the part of the Grants Commission to consult the university or the Inter-University Board, as the case may be, for taking any steps which they consider necessary for the promotion and co-ordination of university education and for the determination and maintenance of a standard. In the Bill that was introduced in the House originally, there was no provision for consultation with universities for taking any steps that the Commission thought proper, but the Joint Committee felt that it must be obligatory on the

Commission to consult the universities before they take any steps with regard to the universities. In clause 12, the Committee omitted two sub-clauses which occurred in the original Bill. These two sub-clauses are (e) and (g) of clause 12. Sub-clause (e) proposed that the Grants Commission may act as an expert body to advise the Central Government on problems connected with the co-ordination of facilities and the maintenance of standards in universities. Sub-clause (g) proposed that the Commission may advise the Central Government or the State Government in regard to the recognition of any degree, diploma or certificate conferred or granted by a university or other authority for the purpose of employment under the Central Government or the State Government or for any other purpose. Both these sub-clauses have been omitted by the Joint Committee. The Committee thought that these two sub-clauses, if retained, would give undue prominence and importance to the Grants Commission, which will be detrimental to the interests of our universities.

Coming to clause 14, the so-called notorious penalty clause, as I have stated before, this clause has been revised drastically. The clause, as it stands now, only authorises the Grants Commission to withhold its grants in case any university fails to implement the recommendations of the Grants Commission without reasonable grounds.

Then I come to clause 18. Important changes have been made in this clause. Originally it was proposed that the University Grants Commission should submit their report every six months to the Central Government and there was no provision in the original clause for submitting the reports to the House of Parliament. The Joint Committee felt that it would be better if the report of the University Grants Commission is prepared once a year and the Committee also directed that the report should be submitted to the Central Government, and the Central Government, in their turn, would

place it before both Houses of Parliament.

I now come to clause 20. This clause says that so far as matters of policy are concerned, the Central Government will have the authority to give directions to the University Grants Commission. The Joint Committee added three words after the word policy. They added 'for national purposes'. I do not think any material change has been effected by the addition of these words. In the original Bill the word was 'policy' but they have made it 'policy relating to national purposes'. The policy of any Government cannot be framed without any purpose; every policy framed by any Government must have a national purpose behind it. So, I think that no material change has been effected by the addition of these words.

I come to clause 26—power to make regulations. Sub-clause (2) is a new addition. By this sub-clause, the authority of the Central Government has been narrowed and reduced and the authority of the University Grants Commission has been extended and increased in certain important academic matters. This sub-clause empowers the Commission to make regulations without previous approval of the Central Government regarding three matters. These matters are: firstly qualifications of the teaching staff of the University, secondly minimum standards of instruction for the grant of any degree by the University and thirdly regulating the maintenance of standards and the co-ordination of work or facilities in Universities.

I have mentioned only the more important changes proposed by the Committee. There are other changes which have been suggested by them and which are of a comparatively less important character. A careful study of these changes suggested by them would convince hon. Members that the Bill had been improved to a great extent by Joint Committee. Protagonists of University autonomy will be happy to find that the Com-

mittee had given full guarantee of academic independence and autonomy to our Universities and there should no longer be any fear of violation of their autonomy. Therefore, I think that it will not be an extravagant hope on our part that this measure as it has come through the Joint Committee will receive the blessing of this hon. House in no time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** 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, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta—North-East): As a rise to speak on this very important measure, I am very ready and willing to concede that the Bill has emerged from the Joint Committee in very much better shape than when it went in there. But I fear that there are still some very serious lacunae in this measure and I would ask Parliament to consider the character of these lacunae remove them.

I think we are all agreed that what is wanted most of all in our country today is not only more education but also better education at every level including the highest. In this Bill which has higher education in view we find, however, a certain emphasis which is to be found even in its title which I consider to be rather wrong and dangerous. I say this because I have noticed pronouncements by people in Authority with a big 'A' which seem to indicate that there has come about in our country a very serious deterioration in the standards of university training and research and that therefore what is wanted to-day is merely a rectification of those deficiencies. I do not wish to deny for a moment that for certain reasons that we need not discuss at the present point of time there perhaps has happened a certain kind of deterioration. But when we find emphasis in

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

official pronouncements merely on this point of deterioration, when we find that Government's mind is working more in regard to the mere rectification of this deterioration, then I have a sense of apprehension. I do want to see that there is no deterioration in our standards, that there is an improvement in our standard of work; at the same time I do not want any narrowing of the opportunities of education even at the very highest level. What is necessary is to have more and better education at every level.

I find that in the Bill there is emphasis on its title on 'determination of standards'. This, I consider to be rather dangerous. I say so because as far as the determination of standards is concerned, I feel that such determination should normally be made by the Universities concerned or whenever necessary the determination of standards should be done by such agencies of inter-university consultation as the Inter-Universities Board. I want the determination of standards to be made at an academic level. I fear that this Commission as it is going to be constituted, in spite of the eminence of the members, who, I hope, are going to be chosen for it—inspite of all that, it will have a certain kind of official savour about it. And that is why I want that the determination of standards should be done by the Universities themselves and whenever necessary by such organisations as the Inter-Universities Board.

I do not say this because I happen to have a certain conception of university autonomy. I know that in an integrated society, there can never be anything like an absolute autonomy for Universities or for any organisation. I certainly would say it from the house-tops that there is no such thing as absolute university autonomy. But at the same time I am convinced that in practice this Commission is going to be endowed with powers so temptingly wide that in the context of bureaucratic function-

ing which persists in our country today, I have very serious apprehensions as to how this University Grants Commission as envisaged in this Bill is going to function.

I know that this kind of apprehension has been expressed by people who would be considered unexceptionable by even the Government of the day. For example I find in the report of the Sixth Congress of the Universities of the Commonwealth, published in 1948, a reference to the danger of political interference or interference ensuing out of a sense of "tidy-minded administration", the passion for standardisation and that kind of thing. This is something against which I wish this House to be on guard. There should not be the kind of standardisation which I fear is for all practical purposes envisaged by the terms of this Bill. In the name of co-ordination and determination of standards, there may be a kind of stereotyping of university courses and university policies. If that happens, that would be a very disastrous thing because our country has a multifarious character. In different regions it has a richness of culture which has got to be nurtured and developed and it is through the instrumentality of the universities that we are going to have that kind of cultural development.

I wish also to bring to the notice of the House the fact that this Bill envisages a body of 9 and they are to dole out at least Rs. 5 crores to some 35 universities. Therefore, I fear that in the present context of things, unless we expand the composition of the Commission, unless we change the manner of the constitution of the Commission, there would follow subservience to Government. I say this because in today's context subservience to Government would be most undesirable. I know that it shall be said in this House that today's context has changed entirely from what used to be the case before; but in certain regards I am not so very sure. For example, I find that this question

about standards is coming from Government sources a little too dangerously often. It was exactly on this question of deterioration of standards that in the British days governmental interference in the universities came about. I remember very vividly something which was said by the great Ashutosh Mukerjee when the autonomy of Calcutta University was in danger. On that occasion also the charge made against the University was that the standards were deteriorating. Ashutosh Mukerjee was the man who put India, so to speak, and universities in India particularly, on the research map of the world. That was his greatest title to eminence and at that time he was a Judge of a High Court; he had not even retired. He had made a speech some parts of which I remember even to this day. He said to a meeting of the Calcutta University Senate: "Forget the Government of India; forget the Government of Bengal; do your duty as senators of this University. Freedom first, freedom second, freedom always." He said that when he was a moderate of moderates on constitutional matters or political matters and when he was a Judge of a High Court.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** That was during the British rule.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Now, I know freedom has come to this country. I know the context has changed but in the same way there is a likelihood—I have that apprehension because our Government functions in the same way and has not changed in essentials—of interference in regard to university autonomy. Again, there is no reason why universities should be absolutely autonomous. Universities have to subserve the objectives of the nation; there is no doubt about it. But, at the same time, for purpose of determination of standards autonomy should be given to the universities. Why this emphasis on merely determination of standards? Why not on expansion of education? Why not on the improvement of the efficiency of our educational apparatus? I know there was an effort made in the Joint Committee as well as in the House

when it was discussed at the first stage to bring about a change in the long title of the Bill. But that change was resisted by the powers that be and that is why I suggest this is something which we have to look into very carefully.

Then, with regard to clause 2 relating to the question of affiliated colleges the Joint Committee has certainly made an improvement upon the original formulation of the Bill and it has been now made possible on the recommendation of the university concerned, to grant monies out of funds at the disposal of the Commission to affiliated colleges. But, as will be noticed by Members of the House from different minutes of dissent appended to the Report, many of us felt that this was not enough. Many of us felt that these affiliated colleges, which have been the Cinderella in the realm of education, have got to be looked after a lot more solicitously by Government particularly today. I say this because, if we look into the history of most of those affiliated colleges which were started by private agencies, by individuals or by small organisations, you will find that this is an example of educational idealism of which our country should be proud. These colleges have carried on far a long time somehow. It is a miracle how they have conducted themselves for so long. It is really a miracle how they have produced the alumni that have come out of them. These affiliated colleges prepare students for the basic factor in education namely the degree. In universities like Oxford and Cambridge it is the Honours Degree which is most important. You have to go through the grind in order to get your B.A. Honours Degree and generally speaking, in Oxford or Cambridge a good Honours Degree is considered a great deal more estimable than a doctorate in Philosophy or in any other subject because in order to get your Honours Degree you have to go through the grind of university education which is supposed to develop character and to engender in your mind a kind of idealism in regard to

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

the things of the spirit. Now, these private colleges which are in charge of Honours Education have done this type of work from year to year and they have been treated in a most step-motherly fashion by Government. Even today we find there is no provision for support to the affiliated colleges. We have been told: "There are 900 private colleges. How can we assist them? We have no money." Now, if I were to ask for money I may be considered to be a subversive character and therefore my appeal may be of no effect. But, the Radhakrishnan Commission has said that it is about time we shed this repetitive emphasis on the lack of monetary resources on the part of Government; it is about time we came forward and said that education at all levels, the lowest as well as the highest, has the first priority on the finances of the country. Therefore, at this present stage I shall certainly suggest that more is done in order to assist the affiliated colleges.

Now, in regard to the allocation of money so far made by the University Grants Commission I find certain indications which give rise to apprehensions. For myself I am certainly very happy that for scientific and technical education large sums of money, comparatively speaking, are allotted by the Commission. But, I find that as far as the humanities are concerned the expenditure is by no means satisfactory. So far as the figures supplied to us are concerned we find that the expenditure on humanities is very much lower than what it should be. It is a very good thing that we see in the notes of dissent a fairly well-known oriental scholar emphasising the desirability of spending more money on scientific and technical subjects and, perhaps, along with the kind of pleasure that we get from reading that particular note of dissent some of us might be happy that I, who am supposed, perhaps, to represent a very material and sordid point of view in regard to the things that are important in life, am championing the

cause of the humanities. I do not say that you beat down the amount of money which you have allotted for scientific and technical subjects. I only say that you spend more, but, at the same time, for humanities you spend a little more.

And, that reminds me of what is going on in the minds of many Members of this House and that is about the position of Sanskrit and all the classical languages. There was a question today also in regard to a conference of Sanskrit Scholars held somewhere in our country. I do feel that today the emphasis on classical learning is almost being forgotten. I feel that, if we really want the cultural development of our country there has to be a realisation that these things of the spirit have to be treasured and at least one classical language has to be learned fairly well by whoever is going in for university education. I know there is a move now to make Hindi the really effective State language of our country. I wish Godspeed to that effort. I hear the kind of Hindi spoken sometimes by Hindi enthusiasts; I see the kind of Hindi which is written in Government publications which have the objective of making Hindi understood in different parts of the country. I may have my own views in regard to how this kind of Hindi is going to help or hinder the development of Hindi as a literary medium. I am not in a position to pronounce on it, because I did not learn Hindi at my mother's knee; I learnt Bengali and I cannot talk about Hindi in that way. But I feel that if this kind of Sanskritic Hindi is really and truly considered to be acceptable more readily to the different parts of the country, then it is all the more reason that you also emphasise the study of Sanskrit for certain purposes. Without a knowledge, at least in a certain measure, of Sanskrit, you cannot understand many of the Hindi words which are now being sought to be made current. Quite apart from

that, there is the wonderful heritage of the Sanskrit literature and there is also the great Arabic and Persian literature which mingle in the common stream of Indian culture. I wish the Ministry of Education comes forward with a really well thought out plan regarding support to these classical languages. But Sanskrit is now almost being ignored. As for Arabic and Persian, I know certain universities where there is hardly any effort to teach Arabic and Persian, and now Sanskrit is going down the drain in more or less the same fashion. That would be a terrific damage to our cultural life and I feel that in regard to the humanities more money ought to be spent by the Government and the Commission's attention should be drawn towards it.

I shall now refer to clause 5 which refers to the composition of the Commission. I consider that the composition of the Commission as envisaged in this Bill is open to very serious objection.

**Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru):** I think Prof. Mukerjee has not followed the papers about the recent Sanskrit Parishad held in Tirupati. Therefore, Sanskrit is not going down the drain; it is coming up the stream.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittoor):** Perhaps Mr. Mukerjee does not know what the Education Ministry of the Government of India writes to the different States for developing Sanskrit study. (*Interruptions*)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Mr. Mukerjee is referring to the University Grants Commission, and not to a non-official organisation like the Parishad.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I shall turn to other aspects in this Bill which are very important. I find that clause 5 is rather objectionable and requires to be changed rather basically, because I do not wish that this body of nine controls so much finance and has

the means of calling the tune on the principle that it is paying the piper, and therefore there is a very serious danger to the entire academic life of our country. I consider that the number of members of this Commission should be expanded and we should have the elective principle introduced much more into this. I say, this because I feel that today we hear from time to time from high-up spokesmen of Government that big things are happening in the country; that there is a revolution from below and the common people are coming forward and sharing the resurgence of life, and so on and so forth. If there is going to be an educational reconstruction, it is necessary that educational experts, those who are in charge of teaching and research work in this country should themselves feel that they are participating in the direction of research, university teaching, and all that kind of thing. Therefore, it won't be too much trouble—and if it is trouble, we should not mind it—but there will not be too much trouble in having a kind of set-up where people engaged in teaching and research in the different regions have certain constituencies of their own and they elect some people. The vice-chancellors also can sit round the table and elect some of their number to go and work on the Commission. If, therefore, we enlarge the number of members of the Commission and if we provide for an apparatus of election of members of the Commission by different individuals and different agencies, by vice-chancellors or by those who are engaged in teaching and research in different universities, that would certainly be something which would give us a great deal of encouragement as far as the formation of the University Grants Commission is concerned.

**The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali):** The Radhakrishnan Commission did not favour elections in the university bodies. It had strongly suggested that as far as possible elections should be avoided in any university body.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I know that there is some objection on the part of some people to the whole idea of election; they hold the idea that nomination by Government would perhaps be in keeping with the dignity of the vice-chancellors and that sort of thing. But I am placing my feeling before the House and that is that it would redound very much better to efficiency and the purposes for which this Bill stands if we introduce the elective principle. I wish also to point out that the Radhakrishnan Commission had suggested the formation of regional commissions, because our country is so large that it is very much better if we get the work of this nature done through the instrumentality of the regional commissions, but there is no reference to regional commissions as far as the Bill is concerned.

I would refer again to clause 12. This has raised some misgivings in the minds of many Members of this House in regard to the position of regional languages in higher education. I wish to refer in particular to the minute of dissent given by my friend, Mr. Avinashalingam Chettiar where he says that the expression "national purposes" is rather vague; it is rather undefinable and it is necessary that there is in the statute itself some provision safeguarding the interests of regional languages. I support this idea, because I feel that what we need is the planned growth of our regional languages as well as of the State language. In the universities of the different regions, naturally the regional language would be the medium of instruction. Therefore, we shall want publications in different departments of knowledge. It is very difficult to bring out really good publications unless they are organised properly with adequate financial resources at the back of that effort; and it is only Government which can do it. Therefore, I feel that in regard to regional languages

there should be a very clear provision in the Bill, quite apart from whatever assurances Government may or may not give in this House. I wish Government at least repeats the assurance already hinted at in regard to the nurturing of regional languages. Apart from this assurance which I hope will be forthcoming, I wish there is some actual statutory provision regarding the safeguarding of the position of these regional languages. We want publications in different languages and unless Government comes forward with special assistance for the sake of publications in the different languages on different aspects of knowledge, we shall not get the kind of literature that we need for purposes of our higher education. I also feel that what is pointed out in some of the minutes of dissent is quite reasonable, namely, that block grants should be made to the universities for a specified period of time. If yearly grants are made and if there is a feeling that grants will be renewed on condition of good behaviour, and if good behaviour is to be defined by governmental agencies, then naturally the position would be rather undesirable. In this connection, I find from a brochure supplied to us by Government—brochure on "Financing and Control of University Education"—a reference to the position of universities in Latin America. It says:

"In Latin America, one comes across a method of financing universities by allotting to them automatically a certain percentage of the total revenues of the State and not demanding any account of how the money was spent."

In Latin America they do this. If we can be more generous in regard to the provision of money to the different universities, that would be a very good thing and perhaps block grants for a specified period of time would be extremely helpful to the cause for which this Bill stands.

I feel, therefore, that it is very important that we are passing this Bill, and it is very important, at the same time, that we pay attention to those very serious omissions in this Bill which are still there. And I assure the other Members of the Joint Committee, particularly those who have given notes of dissent, and other hon. Members of this House would make their contribution in order to make this Bill very much better than it is at present.

What we need is a thorough overhaul of education. And, as I said before, we want more and better education at every level. What I find is from time to time the Government trots out apparently impressive figures regarding expenditure on education and other things, but in effect little is done.

Last year a very eminent scientist, Professor Bernal came to this country on his way back from China and he gave talks, and he wrote in some periodicals in England, like the *New Statesman and Nation*. And he appeared to think, after his inspection of what was being done in China, that in China the quantity and quality of work that is being done for the encouragement of higher education was better than in our country. Now, why should we lag behind China? There is no reason why we should. I have not myself been to China. I cannot give my own impressions of what is happening there, but here is a scientist who went there and who also advised our country in regard to scientific education. He told us, for instance, about a geological university in Peking. Today there was a question about a geological map of India. I do not think we have yet got a geological map even of such a very rich region, as Dr. Saha once pointed out, like Orissa. We have not got that. In China I do not know what the actual position of their geological studies is at the moment, but Dr. Bernal wrote in the *New Statesman and Nation* that they have got a geological university. In Peking they have provision of an enormous uni-

versity town where students reside; there are residential institutions. They are there in tens of thousands. And the number of teachers is also very high. The proportion of teachers to students, the ratio, is very high compared to ours. That is the kind of thing being done in China.

But here in our country we find things are proceeding not only at a very slow pace but in a manner which is deleterious to the interests of higher education, to the interests of everything. We, therefore, do not want ding-dong doings; we want a purposive atmosphere, a basic understanding of the needs of the country and a plan to satisfy the needs of the country.

Therefore, it is very important that we improve upon the provisions of the Bill as it is and get to start to do whatever job we are capable of doing at this particular moment. I need not enlarge upon the importance of this measure, because it is very necessary that we throw open the spiritual wealth of our country—and not only of our country but the wealth that has ensued out of the intellectual achievements of other countries—it is necessary we throw open that spiritual wealth to as many of our people as we possibly can.

That is our objective, and it is with that objective in view that I have suggested certain very serious changes in the form of the Bill as it has been presented to us today. I, therefore, support this Bill; but I do wish that some basic alterations are made in this measure before Parliament passes it.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): When this Bill was first introduced in this House there was no difference of opinion on the point that it was one of the most important measures that this House was considering; not merely because it was dealing with certain difficulties with which educationists in the country are confronted but because it visualised and envisaged what ought to be the purpose and position of education in the country generally now and in future.



[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

The Bill, as introduced, admittedly fell short of the expectations not merely of the Members of this House or of those who were interested in educational matters; also of others who were generally interested in the welfare of the country. I have had occasions to talk over and discuss this matter with men interested in the public life of this country, and most of those with whom I discussed this felt disappointed at the way in which the Bill had been originally drafted and introduced. Feelings of that disappointment were voiced in this House almost from every corner, and in fact all parties in this House joined in suggesting that the Bill required a great deal of improvement. The Bill, as you know, was referred to a Joint Committee and, as a result, I must admit that it has undergone a great deal of improvement. No one perhaps will claim that this Bill is the last word on what should be the right legislation for the improvement of education in this country; but I suppose there could be no difference of opinion on the point that our representatives on the Joint Committee, the representatives of the Ministry and of the two Houses, did their very best at the committee stage to improve the Bill. And, if I am not disclosing any secrets of the Committee, I may say that the representatives of the Ministry were certainly amenable to all reasonable suggestions made by Members of the Committee: with the result that two serious apprehensions which were worrying the Members of this House when the Bill was introduced, namely in regard to the autonomy of the Universities and the directions in which the Central Government could direct the Commission, had been, in my opinion, very largely removed by amending the relevant provisions.

It would be difficult at this stage for any Member to pronounce that there is now no apprehension in this matter. In fact, it will be positively wrong to do so. But whatever the language of the amendments or of the Bill, it will be conceded that much in

this direction will depend upon how the provisions in the Bill are implemented by the Government and the University Grants Commission. In most pieces of legislation of this nature a certain amount of convention has to grow, and I hope that the Government and the Commission will act in such a manner that what little apprehension is left on this score may be completely removed.

1 P.M.

I have very carefully and attentively listened to the speech of my colleague Shri H. N. Mukerjee and I daresay his experience in the educational field entitles his points of view to a respectful hearing. There are two or three matters to which he has drawn attention—of course, he has drawn attention to many matters; but in my own opinion there are two or three important matters which require careful attention—of the Government and of this House. One of them relates to affiliated colleges. I have no doubt that Members of this House will remember that there was no room for any assistance to affiliated colleges in the Bill as introduced. Perhaps, the idea was to assist only colleges which are generally known as constituent colleges of a University. The Committee has certainly made an improvement on the old provision. The Bill now lays down that certain colleges by selection will also be entitled to financial assistance from the University Grants Commission through the University. It certainly gives room for some kind of discrimination, if I may use that term. But, under the circumstances, I hope that my friends in this House will concede that it was not possible at the very first stage for the Government, situated as we are financially both in the States and at the Centre, to lay down that all the 900 colleges would or could be assisted. But, this is a matter which deserves very serious attention. Because, if we consider the number of students that secure their degree and on whom the future of this country depends, we find that they come in a vast majority from these affiliated

colleges. The constituent colleges may certainly serve as sample colleges, in order to give to the rest of the colleges in the province a kind of a standard in quality. But, it cannot be denied that the vast bulk of the student population is served by these affiliated colleges and not by the constituent colleges. Therefore, in the larger interests of the country as a whole, it would be a suicidal policy not to provide for effecting improvements in the affiliated colleges.

Another point, in this connection, which was mentioned by Shri H. N. Mukerjee was that most of these affiliated colleges are running really on very slender financial resources. Only about two or three months ago, I was calculating what contribution the public had made towards the financing and starting of new colleges and what total amount the University had received from the State Government, and I found that even in these difficult days when we are proceeding fast in the direction of a socialistic pattern if not socialism itself, the actual amount contributed by the public was almost as much as if not even higher than the contribution by the Government. Therefore, it will be seen that while at the initial stages, for the starting of a college or for a building or for hostels or playgrounds, sometimes, it is possible to secure assistance from the public generally, the maintenance part of a college becomes exceedingly difficult. I would like this House and the Government to appreciate what sort of education can a teacher impart if he is not sure that in the first week of the next month he is going to get his salary. I am not at all exaggerating when I say that in many colleges, the position is that even till the third week of the next month, the teachers are not able to secure their salary in full. Deductions are made for provident fund; but they do not go to the provident fund account. They are sometimes spent to meet the normal needs of the college. Not merely the contributions from the college authorities,

but the deductions from the salary of the teachers towards provident fund also goes towards meeting normal expenses. Such a state of affairs, it will be conceded by all who are interested in the welfare of this country, cannot create that atmosphere necessary for proper educational advancement. I think this matter deserves very careful attention. It may not be possible for the Government at this stage of the consideration of the University Grants Commission Bill to lay down something positive and definite on this point, but, while we have the opportunity, we should like to impress on the Government the very great need of making substantial grants for the maintenance of these affiliated colleges, if we want to secure the standards that we lay down for higher education.

You, Sir, may have noticed, so must have other Members of this House, that almost everybody is now an expert in education. Whoever gets on to a public platform says that the present system of education is no good. Never have I had the privilege of seeing any alternative positive material suggestion being made. The real difficulty arises, in my opinion, not from the fact of the system of education, but from the fact that the teachers are not a contented lot. We ask them to make sacrifices. We say, look at the rishis of old who used to live in the forests. Why should the teachers alone become rishis of old, living in forests like *vanaprasthis* and not others?

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** The Ministers should first become *vanaprasthas*.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** I should think so; after a stage they should become *vanaprasthis*. Nobody is willing to take this advice.

**Shri S. S. More:** The Ministry itself should become *vanaprastha-shram*.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** It is essential to consider this matter very carefully. The University Grants Commission, I have no doubt, will vary the needs up to a point. It is good that we have made a beginning. After all, in all these matters, a beginning has to be made at some stage. I am not, therefore dissatisfied with the provisions in the Bill. Perhaps in a year or two, either the Government or members of this House will come forward with amendments. These are matters which deserve consideration. All that I would submit in this connection is, let not the Government or the Members of this House become complacent that as soon as this Bill is passed, everything about education will be set right.

Recently, you, Sir, may have yourself noticed everybody getting up and talking about the discipline and character of the students and all that kind of thing. Quite rightly too. They deserve our immediate and serious attention. But, will the Members of this House be surprised to hear that there is no provision for hostels for even 10 per cent of the students studying in the colleges? What they learn in 4 hours, in the college, they un-learn in the 20 hours which they spend outside, there being no provision for proper students' residences. They do not even live with proper guardians who may look after their welfare. The result is that while we teach them everything we can, and the Universities and colleges do their best, the students get guided or misguided by other considerations and agencies. The present environments are such that no tangible improvement seems to be possible. There is another aspect also. A college with about 1000 students has two football grounds where 44 students can play at a time. Does anybody think as to when will the turn of the thousandth student come to go play

in the football ground? I feel that it may be very difficult for the University Grants Commission to make provision for this all and all of a sudden too. These are matters which the Government must consider and make such arrangements that provision could be made for hostels, playgrounds, and extra-curricular activities. Keep the students employed in their classes or at the playgrounds must be our motto.

**An Hon. Member:** Politics.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** When I was last in England, I made it a point to stay in hostels. When I was asked where I would stay, in a private house or a hotel or a college hostel I always preferred to stay in a college hostel in order to have an opportunity to talk to the students and the teachers. I asked a student a question. It was this. Supposing you belonged to the Conservative Party—you may not, but your people may—, and supposing there was a Communist Party meeting organised near your college, will you go and disturb that meeting; will you try to break it up? He replied, where have I the time; I would rather go to the cricket ground than to that meeting; how am I concerned with that? The position is different here. The student has no playground to go to. There, almost every college has some cinema show held twice or thrice a week. Thus, all the time, the boy is engaged in his education in different spheres. He has his training of team work in the playground, he gets education in the colleges, and late in the evenings there are some educational films which enlarge his outlook. All the time, his character is being built. Here, we for four hours only and what we do in four hours is undone in the remaining 20 hours. So, this matter deserves, I think, very serious consideration at the hands of Government.

The hon. Minister is unfortunately not here, but I have no doubt that

the Deputy Minister will convey to the Minister and the Government the views that the Members have expressed in this connection.

There has been a real difficulty already pointed out about the constitution or the composition of this University Grants Commission. For a Vice-Chancellor to get up and say that he would much rather like to be nominated than elected, I suppose, would not be the correct thing to do, but situated as we are, there are various difficulties which, no doubt, men in the educational field like Shri Mukerjee will appreciate. The different regions, different kinds of universities, different troubles about regional languages, all these things have to be kept in view, and a mere election at this stage, at the first stage, would perhaps not serve all the purpose that we have in view. The method of election is undoubtedly vastly superior to any nomination, but in the present context of things and the manner in which education is being directed, I think it has to be kept in view that Vice-chancellors of different regions, from different universities catering for different needs may be able to find a place on this Commission to begin with. I have no doubt that if the system of election could replace the system of nomination, nothing could be better, but I felt myself when discussing this matter at the Select Committee stage that perhaps it may be difficult for perhaps a group of people from one part of the country may come in while other parts might remain unrepresented. It is not so much the question of Vice-Chancellors as different areas in the country. It is a vast country and therefore it is necessary that at the initial stages we may give a chance so that all parts of the country may be represented on this Commission.

I do not, however, agree with the suggestion that there should be more Members. It has been suggested that the number should be increased from nine to seventeen or even in bigger

number. With the experience I have had of committees I do not think that a large body of seventeen members will be better. I think, therefore, that in the present context of things we might have nine, but the official element need not be what has been proposed. It could certainly be reduced.

A difficulty was visualised that the University Grants Commission might, even in matters academic, lay down certain criteria or demand certain things to be done by the universities which may not be proper. The matter was discussed at great length and therefore it was provided that the University Grants Commission will act in these matters in consultation with the universities and other connected bodies. By other bodies we meant the Inter-University Board or any other body that may be constituted, I feel, therefore, that if the University Grants Commission follows correctly the implications of this provision, there should be no difficulty for the time being.

There was also serious apprehension with regard to the power of inspection. That provision also has been amended. Perhaps it might have been better if it had been amended in another way, but the Government are naturally anxious that they must have more detailed and fuller information about the utilisation of the funds. Perhaps in time when the universities by their conduct show that the money has been usefully utilised and perhaps even in a better way than what was intended, this provision may, at a later date, be dropped.

There was also, as you know, the penalty clause. That has been removed.

There is, I suppose, even now a great deal of apprehension about the Central Government's direction on questions of policy. We have added to questions of policy, the words:

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

"relating to national purposes". I suppose the greatest measure of apprehension in this connection arises from the point of view of regional languages, but from the recent statements of the Prime Minister, the Education Minister and other responsible officers of the Government of India in the department of Education, I think this matter is now well settled, if I may say so, that regional languages should not only not be discouraged, but positively encouraged, even though Hindi as the medium of communication among the citizens of this vast land should also be taught. Perhaps as time passes this apprehension of regional languages will disappear. At present the difficulty in my opinion arose from the fact that some of those who were enthusiastic about Hindi might have thought—I do not accuse them of thinking—that Hindi should be the medium of instruction and not the regional languages. That attitude of mind has changed even among those who are enthusiasts about Hindi, and I think by the conduct of those who are trying to act in this direction, by the conduct of the Government, it should be amply clear very soon that regional languages also have to be developed. It would have been difficult, however, for the Joint Committee to lay down specifically that the Commission should also contribute financially to the development of regional languages. As has been mentioned not only in the report of the Joint Committee but also in the different notes of dissent, the State Governments also must have some share of responsibility and the University Grants Commission should concentrate its attention on certain other objects. Whether it would have been right to lay this responsibility of the encouragement of regional languages on the University Grants Commission is, in my opinion, a matter still open for discussion, but that regional

languages should be developed, is I suppose, now a matter beyond doubt.

These are the different points which have been raised here. All that one can say at this stage is that we hope and prayerfully hope, hat the Bill as amended by the Joint Committee—and perhaps as amended later by this House—will be implemented faithfully in the spirit in which the Joint Committee reported and in the spirit in which it is the desire of the Members of this House that it should be worked.

There is just one word more which I will submit before I resume my seat, and that is with regard to standardisation. Some difficulties have been pointed out, some apprehensions have been expressed in this connection also. Perhaps I may have been mistaken, but when I read this word "standardisation" and when we discussed it at the Select Committee stage and other stages, I never thought it meant or was anywhere near the implications of the term "regimentation". Standardisation need not necessarily mean a particular standard from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas in any subject. Standardisation would be based on certain standards which may be different, for different areas, and different subjects, but generally I have no doubt that an educationist of the eminence of Shri Mukerjee will agree that in many matters standardisation is necessary. Leave aside other things. A second class M.A. from one university is one who secures 50 per cent marks or 55 per cent marks. In another university he who secures 45 per cent marks is placed on the II class. When applications are called for stating that second class M.As. are required, the one securing 45 per cent in a university where 55 per cent is required for a second class becomes a third class. So, some kind of all-round standardisation in such directions is certainly called for. But standardisation of education in the

sense of regimentation, I entirely agree with Shri H. N. Mukerjee, will be disastrous.

I hope the Bill will receive due consideration in this House, and those who will ultimately be responsible for implementing it will do so in the spirit in which it is being enacted.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I forgot to ascertain the wishes of the House regarding the time-limit. Ten hours have been allotted for this Bill.

**Shri Achuthan** (Crangannur): For all stages?

**Shri K. K. Basu** (Diamond Harbour): By whom?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** In the Order Paper before me, 10 hours have been noted, but that has not been formally accepted by the Business Advisory Committee because it has not been placed before them.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava** (Gurgaon): The Business Advisory Committee will be meeting today.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes, they will be meeting today, and they will fix the time.

I would like to know how much time hon. Members would like to take. Shall I confine their speeches, except in some cases, to fifteen minutes?

**Shri S. S. More:** Yes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** And to 20 minutes or 30 minutes in special cases?

**Shri S. S. More:** Twenty minutes will be more than enough for an hon. Member.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I find that a number of Members, about 30 from this House and about 15 from the other House have served on the Joint Committee. Hon. Members who served on the Joint Committee will be called later on, so that they may hear what others have to say and try to justify what they have said, or agree with them regarding their minutes of dissent.

395 L.S.D.

I shall give 15 minutes for each hon. Member, and in some cases 20 minutes.

**Shrimati Ila Palchoudhary** (Nabadwip): In 1945 the University Grants Committee was formed, and it dealt with the three Central Universities of Aligarh, Banaras and Delhi. In 1946-47, its membership was increased, and it was empowered to deal with all universities. Now, we have the University Grants Commission, which is very necessary; and we all welcome it. A body for allocating capital and recurring grants was urgently wanted, and I am sure all sections of the House feel that this has been a very good move.

Government must decide how much they will allocate in the budget each year for education. Education is such a vital subject that I am sure in the budget a generous slice must be given for it, because on that must rest all planning in the future, for once we get on to proper education, we get on to the right way of planning.

About the Bill itself, I have to say one or two points. I fully agree with the hon. Member opposite who said affiliated colleges should certainly come within the ambit of these grants because the affiliated colleges serve the greatest body of students, therefore they must find some sort of help. They have carried on so far under very difficult circumstances. More is the reason the University Grants Commission cannot leave them out of their ambit, though they have been rather more generous in the Bill that is before the House now. One must realise, however, that there are over 900 affiliated colleges in our country; and it is quite understandable that the grants might not be sufficient for all. But it must also be realised that all may not be needing the grant at the same time. So, I am sure they could be covered, if there is some planned way of coverage.

The University Grants Commission, when they look into education in India, must, I feel, give great stress to certain aspects. There are three

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury]

things which they must certainly find money for. Firstly, they should sponsor more teachers, so that the proportion between the number of professors and the number of students will be very much greater. Secondly, a certain amount must be earmarked for the universities to spend on the welfare and health schemes of students. The horrible condition of poor students in Universities has been surveyed, and everybody knows that that must be corrected before we can ever build up the nation. The grants for stipends to poor students must also find a very big place in the university grant's consideration. It must be realised that free studentships, stipends, and so forth have to be made available to poor students of merit, because the fact that their merit could not be utilised just because they have no money is a shameful thing in a free country. In the United Kingdom nearly 73 per cent. of the students have got some sort of help in one form or another, whereas only 10 per cent. of the total enrolment in India have got free studentships and grants. I think this is a matter where the University Grants Commission could give substantial help.

Then, I would like to emphasise that in India as it is expanding today on industrial lines, business colleges and business universities as such must be given great stress, and technical subjects also must be taught, for business itself has assumed a very different aspect from what it had before. It would be relevant in this connection to quote what the Dean of the Columbia University has said regarding this:

"That whole economy has changed, and our attitudes have changed. The administration of modern business is now concerned with the analysis of problems the making of decisions, the formulation of policies, and the management of daily operations" It draws upon all departments of knowledge, sponsors, research in

a prodigious scheme and is in itself an intellectual activity that calls for talents of the highest order.

Business must be treated as a profession in India. It used to be called so far the art of making individual profit. But it has completely reorganised its outlook now, and I am sure that we must have universities that will teach students to look at things in this new way, and also train them to take their place in the scheme of things as India is becoming more and more industrialised. In this way, we shall also be able to eliminate that bogey of all degree-searching students as to what will happen to their training after they go out of their universities, for the country will be getting ready to absorb them as they complete their studies. Thus we shall create the personnel of highly technically qualified students and staff.

I am very happy to see that regional languages are going to find great sympathy at the hands of the University Grants Commission. In this connection, I would say that surely Sanskrit must find a very good place, because if we are to save anything of our national heritage, it has to be through Sanskrit. The Sanskrit background is already there in places like Nabadwip and so forth, where it is fully alive still. The Shri Chaitanya University for Sanskrit will, I hope, be surely sponsored by the Commission.

I feel that the Commission must also lay great stress on rural universities. Wherever there are colleges in rural districts, we must see that they are able to expand to a rural university, because the art of developing the villages also must be treated as a university subject. If we have to develop our nation, we have to develop nearly 85 per cent. of our people in the villages; there are lots of technical subjects that the rural universities must tackle. Soil engineering, food processing and so on. Agriculture which is a vital rural necessity must also be taught at the

university level, and not merely as just some little courses, because the latter would no longer be adequate for a free India. Rural universities must be adequately helped to form themselves. If we have not got them so far, it is a shame. The University Grants Commission must make this possible.

Education is more and more a widening vision rather than just a standardised procedure. In this wider vision, although the modern universities cannot any more follow entirely the lines of the ancient universities of Nalanda and Taxila, yet they must sponsor that spirit. For, if anything has put India on the map of the world, actually it is our universities and colleges that have been doing wonderful work all along. I hope they will go on from strength to strength, and the University Grants Commission will act as their guide, philosopher and friend, and help where help is needed but refrain from interfering where interference will be harmful. The aim of education has to be, and always is, that it shows to the students the idea that:

"At the crest of the hill, I shall hail newer summits to climb".

**श्री एस० सी० सिधल** (ज़िला झली-गढ़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक बात का बड़ा दुःख है कि जब यह बिल पहली मंजूरी हाउस में पेश किया गया था तो हमारे माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री इस भवन के अन्दर उपस्थित नहीं थे और न उन्होंने इसे पेश ही किया; और जब कल यह बिल संयुक्त प्रवर्धमिति की रिपोर्ट के साथ फिर हाउस में पेश किया गया तब भी हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय वहाँ पर मौजूद नहीं थे। और, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बिल बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है और इस तरह से हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय का न घाना और उस पर चल रही डिबेट में न बैठना, इसकी अहमियत को कम कर देता है।

**श्री राज नारायण सिंह** (इचाराबाग पश्चिम) : बहुत ठीक।

**श्री एस० सी० सिधल** : "दी यूनि-वरसिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन बिल", इस नाम से मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ, क्योंकि इसका नाम तो कुछ है और इसके कर्तव्य कुछ और है। बिल की धारा १२ में, इस के कुछ काम बतलाये गये हैं। इसमें बतलाया गया है कि

"It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the Universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of University education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in Universities...."

इस बिल का कर्तव्य यह है कि जो कमिशन बनेगा वह यूनिवरसिटीज के लिए रुपये की ग्रांट जरूर देगा और वह उन चीजों को पढ़ाने और यूनिवरसिटीज को चलाने के लिए रुपये की सहायता देगा लेकिन इस बिल से यह भ्रम हो जाता है कि यूनिवरसिटीज को जो रुपया केन्द्रीय सरकार से या प्रान्तीय सरकारों से मिलता है वह बन्द हो जायगा और कमिशन रुपया दिया करेगा। सरकार से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस बिल का नाम बदल कर अगल ठीक तरह से लाया जाय तो ज्यादा मुनासिब होगा।

सप्ट २ में प्रखर समिति ने संशोधन किया है और मेरी समझ में सही संशोधन किया है लेकिन उसमें कुछ कमी रहने दी गई है। पहले तो जो बिल पेश किया गया था, उसमें कांस्टीट्यूट कालिजेज के लाभ के लिए ही यह कमीशन काम कर सकता था। लेकिन अब कमिशन की पावर को अधिक बढ़ा दिया गया है और अब यूनिवर-सिटीज से जो कालिजेज एफीलिटेटेड हैं उनके लिए भी कमीशन काम कर सकता है। उसमें जो शर्त रखी है वह यह है कि यूनि-वरसिटी अगल सिफारिश करेगी तभी कमिशन को अधिकार होगा कि उनमें अपना काम करे।



[श्री एस० सी० सिंघल]

लेकिन, मेरा कहना यह है कि सबके साथ एक सा बर्ताव होना चाहिए, चाहे वह कांस्टीट्यूट कालिज हो, चाहे एफ़ीलियेटेड कालिज, उनमें भेदभाव नहीं बर्ता जाना चाहिए। आजकल हर एक युनिवर्सिटी में पार्टीबन्दी है और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि युनिवर्सिटी में जो पार्टी पावर में है, वह उन्हीं कालिजेज को सिफ़ारिश करेगी जो उनके मुआफ़िक हैं, और जो कालिजेज उनको पार्टीबन्दी में नहीं हैं उनके लिए वह कभी सिफ़ारिश नहीं करेगी और उन कालिजेज को इस कमीशन से कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकेगा।

बिल की धारा ५ में यह बतलाया गया है कि कमिशन में ६ सदस्य हुआ करेंगे, जिनको सरकार मुकर्रर करेगी। मेरी उससे सहमति नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके कम्पोज़ीशन में कुछ तबदीली होनी चाहिए और एक सदस्य कम से कम इसका चुन कर आना चाहिए। इसमें आगे लिखा हुआ है कि इसके तीन सदस्य युनिवर्सिटीज के वाइस चांसलर्स में से हुआ करेंगे, लेकिन, मेरी समझ में जो वाइस चांसलर होते हैं उनमें शिक्षा के बारे में कोई खास जानकारी नहीं होती। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो रिसर्च के प्रोफ़ेसर हैं उनको कमिशन का सदस्यता के वास्ते चुनना चाहिए। और दूसरे, मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि आजकल जो शिक्षा दी जा रही है वह ज्यादा लाम की नहीं है और उस शिक्षा में टेकनिकल शिक्षा का सर्वथा अभाव पाया जाता है। आज जब हम देश को इंडस्ट्रियलाइज करने जा रहे हैं, अपने देश में बड़ी बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज खोलने जा रहे हैं, तो ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि हमारे नवयुवकों को इंडस्ट्रियल ट्रेनिंग देने का माफ़ूल इन्तज़ाम हो और कमीशन का एक सदस्य इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट हो। उस युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट कमीशन में हमें ऐसे लोगों को रखना चाहिए जो इंडस्ट्रीज के बारे में जानते हों, ताकि वह उसकी शिक्षा दिलवाने का इन्तज़ाम कर सकें।

इसके अतिरिक्त इसमें यह भी दिया हुआ है कि कमिशन के चेअरमैन को कुछ तनस्वाह मिलेंगे। लेकिन, इस के बारे में रिपोर्ट चुप है कि चेअरमैन होल टाईम वर्कर होगा या पार्ट टाईम। चेअरमैन का काम बहुत महत्वपूर्ण और बड़ा है और चेअरमैन ऐसा होना चाहिए जो होल टाईम वर्कर हो; उसको पार्ट टाईम नहीं होना चाहिए।

कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के पैरा २० में इस प्रकार लिखा है :—

“The Committee are of opinion that the directions of the Central Government to the University Grants Commission should be restricted to questions of policy relating to national purposes only”.

मैं मानता हूँ कि संयुक्त प्रवर समिति ने इसको कुछ साफ़ किया है लेकिन यह काफी नहीं है और सरकार को चाहिए कि शिक्षा के लिए कुछ उद्देश्य रखे और जब तक शिक्षा के लिए सरकार कोई उद्देश्य नहीं रखेगी तब तक शिक्षा का काम ठीक तरह से नहीं चलेगा। “नेशनल परपोज़ेज” यह बहुत बड़ा शब्द है और सरकार को इस वाइड टर्म को डिफ़ाइन कर देना चाहिए ताकि हमारे नवयुवक जो स्कूल और कालिजों से पढ़ कर निकलते हैं वे ऐसी उपयोगी शिक्षा प्राप्त करके निकलें जो उनके लिए, समाज के लिए और देश के लिए उपयोगी सिद्ध हो, ताकि हम जिस तरह के समाज का संगठन इस देश में स्थापित करना चाहते हैं उसको कायम करने में सफल हो सकें।

समाज के संगठन के बारे में भारतीय संविधान के डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स की धारा ३८ में यह दिया हुआ है :—

“The State shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may a social order in which justice, social, economic and political, shall inform all the institutions of the national life.”

हम एक ऐसे ही समाज की कल्पना कर रहे हैं। हम एक ऐसा ही समाज बनाना चाहते हैं और इसके लिए जरूरी है कि आपको शिक्षा के आबजैक्टिव्स रखने चाहियें कि हमारे विद्यार्थी इसी तरह की शिक्षा प्राप्त करें, ताकि जिस तरह का समाज संगठन हम इस देश में क्रायम करना चाहते हैं, वह बना सकें। आज हमारे बच्चों को जो शिक्षा मिल रही है वह न तो उनके लिए उपयोगी है और न देश के लिए उपयोगी है। आज विद्यार्थी पढ़ कर निकलते हैं और बेकार इधर से उधर मारे-मारे फिरते हैं। गलत ढंग की शिक्षा के कारण ही हमारे देश में बेकारी की समस्या ने उग्र रूप धारण कर रक्खा है। इसलिए यह चीज साफ़ कर देनी चाहिए। खाली "नेशनल परपोज़" यह शब्द काफ़ी नहीं है, इसको और साफ़ किया जाना चाहिए।

कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह भी सुझाव दिया है कि आज इस देश में जो बहुत से बोगस कालिजेज खुले हुए हैं और जो रुपया लेकर डिग्री दे दिया करते हैं, वे ऐसा न कर सकें और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसको बंद करने का सुझाव देकर कमेटी ने बहुत अच्छा काम किया है। हम जानते हैं कि यहां पर कुछ हिन्दी के कालिजेज बोगस तौर पर खुले हुए हैं और वे केवल नाम के कालिज हैं। वे १०० या २०० रुपये लेकर डिग्री दे दिया करते हैं और उन डिग्रियों को लेकर लोग दक्षिण में जाते हैं और उन के आधार पर बड़ी बड़ी नौकरियां हासिल कर लेते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह बहुत अच्छा सुझाव दिया है कि ऐसी बोगस डिग्रियां देना फौरन बन्द की जायें।

प्रवर-समिति के कुछ सदस्यों ने यह हल्का मचाया है कि युनिवर्सिटी कमिशन बन जायेगा तो युनिवर्सिटी की स्वायत्तता खत्म हो जायेगी। मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ। मैं देखता हूँ कि युनिवर्सिटी की स्वायत्तता से देश का कोई फायदा नहीं हो रहा है। हमारे विद्यार्थियों में इन्डिस्प्लिन बढ़ रही है।

हमशा शिकायत भ्राया करती है कि विद्यार्थी उपद्रव मचा रहे हैं, झगड़े मोल ले रहे हैं और लोगों को मारते-पीटते हैं। अभी छः महीने हुए, पटना के मामले में कितनी शिकायत आई थीं। वहां सब से बुरी बात यह हुई कि हमारा नेशनल प्लैग फाड़ा गया और उस में आग लगाई गई, और इतना झगड़ा फसाद किया गया। तो स्वायत्तता के नाम से यह चीज हम पसन्द नहीं कर सकते। हम ने देखा कि पार साल लखनऊ में एक हफ्ते के लिये बिल्कुल ला एंड आर्डर नहीं रहा, लड़कों का राज्य हो गया, वे जिस को चाहते थे पीटते थे, परेशान करते थे और रोक लेते थे। स्वायत्तता के नाम से यह चीज बर्दाश्त करना सब से बुरी बात है। मैं अलीगढ़ का जिक्र करता हूँ, वहां यहां तक हो रहा है कि एग्जामिनेशन्स होते हैं, लड़के नकल करते हैं लेकिन इनविजिलेटर्स की हिम्मत नहीं कि लड़कों को पकड़ सकें। तीन साल हुए, कुछ लड़के बी० ए० के थे। वे नकल करते हुए पाये गये। एक आदमी ने हिम्मत की और उस ने प्रिंसिपल से कहा। प्रिंसिपल को हिम्मत करनी पड़ी। उस ने एक लड़के को निकाल दिया। जिस वक्त प्रिंसिपल घर पर पहुंचता है, यंग मैन था, दस लड़के उस पर कूद पड़ते हैं और इतना मारते हैं कि वह मर जाता है। आखिरी एग्जामिनेशन्स में मैं क्या देखता हूँ कि एक लड़का टेन्थ क्लास का था। उस ने आ कर प्रिंसिपल से कहा कि मेरे हाथ में चोट लग रही है और मैं इन्तहान में हाथ से लिख नहीं सकता हूँ, मुझे कोई राइटर मिल जाय। प्रिंसिपल जानता था कि लड़का झूठ बोल रहा है, इस लिये उसने उस की भर्जी नामंजूर कर दी। नतीजा यह हुआ कि दस बारह लड़के प्रिंसिपल पर टूट पड़े और उस को बुरी तरह से मारा। अगर कुछ लड़के बचाने न आ जाते तो शायद वह मर जाता। स्वायत्तता के नाम से इस तरह की इन्डिस्प्लिन पैदा करवाना और उस को बर्दाश्त करना मैं बुरा समझता हूँ, और यह चीज देश के लिये हानिकारक है।

[श्री एस० सी० सिधल]

दूसरी चीज यह है कि आजकल एजुकेशन बहुत महंगी हो गई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत थोड़े आदमी शिक्षा प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। छोटे आदमियों को शिक्षा प्राप्त करने का ज्यादा मौका नहीं है। कमिशन का यह काम होना चाहिये कि शिक्षा जितनी सस्ती हो सके उस को उतनी सस्ती बनाने के उपाय सुझायें। दूसरे जो लोग अपने दामों से नहीं पढ़ सकते हैं उन के लिये सरकार को खुद कुछ इन्तजाम करना चाहिये ताकि बगैर रुपये के या गरीबी की वजह से कोई भी देश का आदमी अशिक्षित न रह सके।

एक और बात भी है। युनिवर्सिटीज में जो विद्यार्थी शिक्षा पाते हैं और डिग्रियां लेते हैं वह फर्स्ट, सेकेन्ड और थर्ड क्लास की डिग्रियां पाते हैं। आज कल जहाँ पर भी किसी की मांग है वहाँ फर्स्ट क्लास की मांग है। अगर कोई किसी टेकनिकल लाइन में जाता है तो फर्स्ट क्लास या और किसी लाइन में भी जाता है तो भी फर्स्ट क्लास होना चाहिये। फर्स्ट क्लास को लेने के बाद अगर कोई जगह बच जाती है तो सेकेन्ड क्लास लिया जाता है। बाकी थर्ड क्लास के लोगों को कोई जगह नहीं मिलती है। तो या तो थर्ड क्लास को तोड़ ही दिया जाय, और अगर उस को रखना है तो फिर थर्ड क्लास वालों के लिये भी कोई तरीका होना चाहिये, जिसमें वह अपनी आजीविका प्राप्त कर सकें।

कमेटी ने एक सिफारिश की है रीजनल लैंग्वेज को डेवलप करने के लिये। इन बातों को देख कर मुझे डर लगता है कि अगर रीजनल लैंग्वेज को भी रक्खा गया तो फॉरेन रीजन्स के लड़कों के साथ एकता रखन कठिन है। देश भर में अनेकता बढ़ती जायेगी और जो गुलामी पहले थी वह फिर आ सकती है। एकता किस प्रकार से रह सकती है? वह एक भाषण से हो सकती है। मैं नहीं कहता कि आप हिन्दी भाषा को ही मानिये। कोई भी भाषा आप के लीजिये। चाहे बाजब

इंडिया की या नार्थ इंडिया की, चाहे अंगरेजो ही रखिये। लेकिन, देश में एक भाषा होनी चाहिये। पहले भी भारत में पढ़े लिखों की एक भाषा संस्कृत थी। उसके कारण देश एकता में बंधा हुआ था। लेकिन जितनी ही भाषायें बढ़ती जायेंगी और उन का डेवलपमेंट बढ़ता जायेगा उतनी ही देश की एकता खत्म होती जायेगी। इस लिये, आज रीजनल लैंग्वेज पर अधिक जोर नहीं देना चाहिये। और, सरकार का रीजनल लैंग्वेज को पढ़ाने से सम्बन्ध नहीं होना चाहिये। अगर लोग पढ़न, चहें तो अपने पैसे से पढ़ें। रीजनल लैंग्वेज के बारे में सरकार को खामोश ही रहना चाहिये।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि सरकार मेरी बातों पर गौर करेगी।

श्री के० सी० सोषिया (सागर) : मैं ने अभी कई स्पीचें सुनीं इस युनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन के ऊपर, और इस बिल को भी पढ़ा। मैं सोचता हूँ कि यह बिल समय के कुछ बाद आ रहा है; इसको कुछ समय पेशत लाया गया होता तो अच्छा होता।

आजकल युनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन प्राप्त कर के जो विद्यार्थी निकलते हैं उनसे हम सब लोगों का थोड़ा बहुत सम्पर्क होता ही है और हम जानते हैं कि आज परीक्षाओं का और शिक्षा का स्तर कितना गिर गया है। इस के बारे में कोई सबूत देने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। इसलिये, यह तो दुस्त है कि जब शिक्षाविदों की जो विशेष संस्था है वह वाजिबी काम नहीं कर सकती है और देश को तथा समाज को जिस शिक्षा की आवश्यकता है और जितने दर्जे की शिक्षा की आवश्यकता है वह नहीं दे सकती है; तो सरकार का काम है कि वह इस में हस्तक्षेप करे। अगर सरकार ऐसा नहीं करती, तो वह अपने कर्तव्य से च्युत होती है। इसलिये, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह युनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन बिल सरकार ने बिल्कुल वाजिब काम किया है।

युनिवर्सिटी की स्वायत्तता को हम समझते हैं। युनिवर्सिटी स्वायत्तता का मतलब यह होना चाहिये कि शिक्षा के काम में देश की सरकार अथवा कोई पार्टी विभिन्न अपने राजनैतिक प्रोग्राम को या अपने राजनैतिक विभागों को जबर्दस्ती युनिवर्सिटी पर न लादे, और युनिवर्सिटी को मिलने वाली जो सहायता है और जो उस के हक है उन हकों को कोई न मारे। सिर्फ इतना ही मतलब युनिवर्सिटी की स्वायत्तता का होना चाहिये। लेकिन, स्वायत्तता के नाम पर अगर कोई विशेषज्ञ लोग यह चाहें कि उन को अपनी मनमानी धरजानी करने दी जाय और इस के लिए उन को रोका न जाय, तो यह बात बिल्कुल औरवाजिब है।

युनिवर्सिटी की स्वायत्तता के नाम पर आज हिन्दुस्तान की विश्वविद्यालयी शिक्षा का स्तर बहुत गिर गया है और यदि इस विषय में हम लोगों ने या हमारी सरकार ने ज्यादा धिंलाई की तो इस का परिणाम अच्छा नहीं होगा। इसलिये, मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ।

इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में अभी जो स्पष्ट हुई हैं उन को मैंने ध्यान से सुना, तो मुझे मालूम हुआ कि वह केवल शिक्षा कैसी होनी चाहिए इसी पर लेक्चर है। बिल में क्या लिखा हुआ है, बिल में युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के क्या क्या फंक्शन्स हैं और किस तरह से वह बनाया, जायेगा, या क्या उसका काम होगा, इस बात के बारे में ज्यादातर विचार नहीं किया गया। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय में जो बिल पहले पेश हुआ था सलैक्ट कमेटी में उसके जाने पर उसमें बहुत कुछ सुधार हो गया है स्टैण्डर्ड को मेनटेन करने और कोऑर्डिनेशन करने का मतलब मैं यह समझता हूँ कि मान लीजिये इलाहाबाद युनिवर्सिटी में परमाणु-शक्ति के सम्बन्ध में कोई परीक्षण हो रहा है या किसी किसम की न्यायर स्टैडी का इंतजाम है और किसी दूसरी युनिवर्सिटी में भी उसी किसम का काम हो रहा

हो तो युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन का काम होगा कि वह दूसरी युनिवर्सिटी को इस बात की सलाह दे कि भाई, चूँकि इलाहाबाद युनिवर्सिटी में ज्यादा ऊँचे दर्जे का काम हो रहा है इसलिए तुम अपने विद्यार्थियों को वहाँ ले जाओ। उनको वहाँ भेज दो। इसी तरह से हर युनिवर्सिटी के खास-खास कामों में और युनिवर्सिटियां भाग लें और अपने अपने स्पेशल डिपार्टमेंट रखें, यही मैं समझता हूँ कि कोऑर्डिनेशन का मतलब होगा। लेकिन मुझे इसके बारे में शक है कि यह सरकार या यह कमिशन सच्चे मानों में इस कोऑर्डिनेशन को कायम कर सकेगी। यह मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ क्योंकि मैं देखता हूँ कि सरकार के कामों में और मिनिस्टर्स के कामों में ही कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है, तो यहां पर कोऑर्डिनेशन कैसे हो सकता है। मैंने ब्यालम और भी मिनिस्टरीज कई दूसरी संस्थाओं को रिसर्च के काम के लिए, इंडस्ट्री के कामों में जो रुपया देगी वह अलग से देगी। इसके अलावा यदि आप देखें तो आप को पता चलेगा कि जो एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री है वह भी कई संस्थाओं को अलग से रुपया देगी। इसके पास इस काम के लिए अलग से ग्रांट होगी। हमें यह नहीं समझ लेना चाहिए कि जो कमिशन हम बनाने जा रहे हैं सिर्फ उसी के जिम्मे यह सारा काम होगा। यह बात नहीं है। शिक्षा विभाग अपने पास से और बहुत सी संस्थाओं को जैसे जामा मिलिया है और दक्षिण की ओर कई संस्थाएँ हैं उनको देने के लिए अपने पास पैसा अलग से रख लेगा। इसलिए यह सोचना कि यह कमिशन ही सबको रुपया देगा ठीक नहीं है।

इसके अलावा एक दूसरी चीज भी है यह बिल जो एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर साहब के नाम पर उनके पालियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी साहब ने रखा है इसके अधीन केन्द्र के जो बनाये हुए चार विश्व विद्यालय हैं उनका मेनटेनेंस ग्रांट का और डेवेलोपमेंट के वास्ते पैसा लेने का पहला इन्क होगा। उनको पहले हम

[श्री के० सी० सोषिया]

दिया जाएगा और बाकी की जो यूनिवर्सिटियां हैं, उनको खास-खास कामों के वास्ते कुछ रुपया दे दिया जायेगा। अब आप समझ लीजिये कि यह जो बिल है इसमें इस किस्म का भेदभाव बरता गया है। इसके बाद, यह कमिशन जिन यूनिवर्सिटियों को रुपया-पैसा देगा, उनके फाइनेंसिस वगैरह की जांच भी यही करेगा। इस में यह हक भी इसको दिया गया है कि वह इंस्पेक्शन भी कर सकेगा। अब यह इंस्पेक्शन कैसा होगा, इसका अंदाजा मैं नहीं कर सकता हूँ क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री के पास या इस कमिशन के पास जो अब बनने जा रहा है, कोई ऐसे विशेषज्ञ तो नहीं होंगे जो बाहर से आयें हों और इस काम के लिए खास तौर पर रखे गए हों। इन्हीं लोगों में कुछ लोग खड़े कर दिए जायेंगे और उन्हें कह दिया जाएगा कि वे जा कर इंस्पेक्शन करें। इंस्पेक्शन करने के बाद, कमिशन कुछ हिदायतें देगा और अगर वह हिदायतें मानी नहीं जायेंगी तो फिर उस विश्वविद्यालय को पैसा देना बन्द कर दिया जाएगा।

इस बिल में एक चीज और है और वह यह कि इसके नौ सदस्य होंगे। इसके बारे में अभी हमारे यूकर्जी साहब ने कहा कि यह नम्बर बहुत थोड़ा है। यह कम से कम १७ होना चाहिए। दूसरे साहिबान ने भी यही राय जाहिर की है कि इस कमिशन के सदस्यों की संख्या बढ़ाई जानी चाहिए। लेकिन, मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर में यह कमिशन एक एडमिनिस्ट्रिटिव बाडी होगा न कि एक डिसकशन करने वाली बाडी। यदि एडमिनिस्ट्रिटिव बाडी में सदस्यों की संख्या को ज्यादा बढ़ा दिया जाए तो कुछ होता नहीं है, सारे का सारा बक्त वाद-विवाद में ही चला जाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि नौ सदस्यों का ही रखा जाना वाजिब है। लेकिन, इसमें एक बात है और वह यह है कि इस में लिखा हुआ है कि जो वाइस चांसलर्ज लिए

जाएंगे उनकी संख्या तीन से कम नहीं होगी; यानी सरकार अगर चाहे तो वह उनकी संख्या पांच भी कर सकती है और अगर पांच कर दी जाए और उसमें वह दो अफसर जो कि गवर्नमेंट को रिप्रिजेंट करेंगे उनको मिला दिया जाए, तो यह संख्या सात हो जाती है, और फिर बाकी जो सदस्य लिए जाने हैं वह केवल दो ही रह जाते हैं। इसलिए, अगर हम चाहते हैं कि शिक्षित जनता के मत का कुछ असर यूनिवर्सिटियों के ऊपर पड़े और उनकी राय को भी देखा जाए, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनकी संख्या जो कि एजुकेशनलिस्ट चुने जाने हैं, चार से कम नहीं होनी चाहिये। इस चीज को देखते हुए, मैं ने एक एमेंडमेंट रखा है जिसका मकसद यह है कि आप जो वाइस चांसलर्ज रखें उनकी संख्या तीन से ज्यादा नहीं होनी चाहिये। यदि ऐसा नहीं किया गया और पांच वाइस चांसलर रख लिए गए और दो अफसर रख लिए गए तो इससे साधारण जनता को और शिक्षित जनता को शिक्षा के बारे में सोचने की जो प्रेरणा मिलती है वह नहीं मिलेगी। इसलिए, यह जरूरी है कि कमिशन उनके विचारों को जान सके और इसका एक तरीका यह है कि वाइस चांसलर्ज की संख्या को तीन से अधिक न किया जाए।

इसके अलावा, आपने धारा १२(ग) में लिखा है :—

“(c) recommend to any University the measures necessary for the improvement of University education and advise the University upon the action to be taken for the purpose of implementing such recommendation.”

इसमें ‘इम्प्रूवमेंट आफ यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन’ के लफ्जों को रखा है। आगे चल कर, यह कहा गया है कि कमिशन यूनिवर्सिटी के फाइनेंसिस को भी इन्स्पेक्ट कर सकता है। तो यहां पर यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन के साथ ही अगर

फाइनेंस का शब्द भी रख लिया जाए, यानी यनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन और फाइनेंस, इन दोनों के बारे में यह कमिशन जांच कर सकता है और सुधारने के लिए सिफारिशें कर सकता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक ही बात होगी। यहां.....

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I may mention to the hon. Member that the enquiry into the finances of the university has taken the first place. That is the first item.

**Shri K. C. Sodhia:** That is only an enquiry. You may make an enquiry or you may remain silent altogether. What is the use of your enquiry? After an enquiry there will be an allocation but where are the recommendations to be made to the universities? It is a question of making recommendations to them about their finances which they ought to take into consideration. Where is that? You may think that their finances require certain improvement and then you may allocate to them Rs. 25,000 or one lakh. But where is their recommendation which they should take into consideration. That is the point which I want to bring to the notice of this House.

आखिरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह बीगस डिग्रियों के बारे में है। इन के बारे में अभी एक साहब ने भी कहा कि यह इस देश में बहुत चली हुई है और....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There seems to be a recommendation here.

**Shri K. C. Sodhia:** That is a very good recommendation and I am in favour of it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I understood the hon. Member to mean that there was no clause here providing for this.

**Shri K. C. Sodhia:** I say that there is a clause: it is a very good clause and I entirely agree with it. That is what I wanted to submit. I have done.

**Shri S. S. More:** This question of education and particularly higher

education has assumed great importance and as we develop towards the goal of socialistic pattern and increased industrialisation, it is a question which will assume progressively expanding importance. In the past different enquiries have been undertaken even by the Britishers for the purpose of giving proper shape and form to the university education. Right from 1854 the year of Sir Charles Wood's Despatch to the time of the Sergeant Committee's report which was the last report of the regime of the Britisher, different proposals have been advanced for the purpose of improving the university education and for the purpose of giving it a progressively greater technical bias. And yet no improvement took place. But my difficulty, as far as this Bill is concerned, is: will this Bill and the University Grants Commission that we want to bring into existence help to achieve the object which we have in view? The object is great, noble and will receive support from every quarter of the country but the instrument that you are fashioning for serving that objective, whether that instrument is strong enough, potent enough to meet the objective or to canvass the objective is the real question that we will have to face in this country.

2 P.M.

The functions described in clauses 12 and 13 will necessarily force this Commission to practise a sort of tight rope dancing. It will at the outset invite opposition from the States because education is a State subject and they are very sensitive to their provincial autonomy. They will say that this University Grants Commission is likely to put their own finger in the pie of provincial subject and that is why they will react adversely.

There is another aspect also. What about the attitude of the universities? Even the universities will not look with favour, except when they receive a fat cheque from the Commission, at the activities of the Commission because, they in their own way, are

[Shri S. S. More]

also very much vigilant about their own autonomy and they do not want any interference particularly from the Government quarters. Now, it is quite open to argue that this University Grants Commission is a body independent of the executive government. But, the composition that the Joint Committee has recommended in clause 12—whether you designed it or not—makes the body entirely subordinate to the executive government. The composition is like this. Nine members are to be appointed on the Commission. The original Bill said: "Not more than nine" and the Joint Committee has effected the only change in that they have fixed nine as the final figure. The Radhakrishnan Commission recommended a Commission of five members. My friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee is in favour of expanding the number to 17. I am not in favour of expanding this number till we have some experience of how this Commission functions because merely multiplying jobs in the gift of Government is not a service to the country but only adding to the strength of the executive government, as far as distribution of patronage is concerned. Therefore, I would accept, as a matter of compromise, the number to be nine. But, how are you going to appoint them? Unfortunately, nomination has become a sort of craze with some of us though we were the most vociferous in condemning nomination. Now, why should we have nomination? Because it is argued in the holy precincts of education there should not be this ugly scramble for power through the method of election. But, this executive government itself has come to power and is made to remain in the saddle of power by the method of election. The doors which welcomed the executive government into power should not be closed as far as educational institutions are concerned. Election was one of the strong and potent weapons of political education and even the Vice-Chancellor should not be chary about, or should not feel it derogatory to their dignity, prestige

or position if they are required to fight certain elections.

Here all the nine persons are to be appointed by the Government. I would not blame the Government for this but from our past experience of how nomination was used by the Britishers we have developed a sort of opposition to nomination. Appointment by Government means that it is the sacred duty of the appointee to tow the line of Government whether it is right or wrong. That is the feeling that we have developed in this country. Unless we make it quite safe for nominated or appointed members to retain unaffected their original independence it is difficult to expect that such persons will be discharging in an independent manner their responsibility to the country and to the sacred cause of education. I would rather urge on the present Government that they change this composition and introduce the element of election. They have got their own representatives on this Grants Commission. By nominating everybody we should not be made a tool to carry out whatever the Government decides or orders.

Then, in addition to this feature of appointment there is clause 20 which also will give the Government a supreme hand as far as dictation of policy is concerned. Here it is said: "relating to national purposes". Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as a lawyer I would appeal to you to tell me, is it possible to define precisely the connotation of the expression "national purposes"? What is a national purpose? I, as a lawyer, fail to understand, but that may be due to my own deficiency and I would look to your superior knowledge, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, to give me some idea whether this expression "national purpose" is capable of carrying any legal connotation which is capable of being interpreted because there is likely to be conflict.

**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** Government desires.

**Shri S. S. More:** The whole path will be beset with so many conflicts: University Grants Commission *versus* State; University Grants Commission *versus* universities and now University Grants Commission *versus* the Central Government. When there is conflict between the University Grants Commission and the Central Government regarding what is "national purpose" then in such disputes, according to sub-clause (ii) of clause 20, it is the will or the order of the Central Government which is the deciding factor. My submission is, let the Government have the whip hand.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I may refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Radhakrishnan (University Education) Commission of 1948 which has thrown light upon this question as to what is a national purpose.

**Shri S. S. More:** I have the greatest respect for the recommendations of that Commission but I feel as a lawyer—and many lawyers will be prepared to agree with me—that in spite of what they have said, when the question of interpretation of the word "national" crops up it will be extremely difficult even for the Central Government to prescribe the definite bounds within which these purposes are to be placed.

**Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South):** You want deletion of these words?

**Shri S. S. More:** I would not ask for deletion but let them be substituted by more suitable words which are capable of proper interpretation. That is my submission.

Then, I would further say that the period of a Commission's member is six years and the Government have, so to say, surrendered, on the recommendation of the Joint Committee, the power of removing a member. Of course, they may prescribe disqualifications but disqualifications will have to be something definite unless a member incurs that sort of disqualification he will not be capable of being removed. If you want to have nomination then the necessary corollary to that is—I do not want you to have nomination—that

the Government also must be given the power of removing that member, if necessary, for reasons to be recorded. Otherwise, a member may go to the Grants Commission which is a body of nine members but he may not be to the satisfaction of either the Central Government or the different State Governments and the universities. All the same everybody will be impotent to remove him with the result that he will be a spoke in the wheel obstructing or putting some other impediment.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** Are we to interpret the hon. Member that he wants that members appointed by the Government to be at the mercy of the Government and the Government should have the authority to terminate their service at their own discretion?

**Shri S. S. More:** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary himself knows that under so many statutes the Government have power of appointment and the Government have the power of removal also. These two features are usual: the conferment of the power of appointing and the power of removing. If he is pleased to say that the members who are liable to be removed by Government are not placed at the mercy of the Government, then I am prepared to accept his interpretation. I would only make a request that in other statutes also the power of removal should be removed so as to give complete independence to the members concerned.

As far as the six-year period is concerned, I think it ought to be shortened. In view of the great responsibilities, it is quite possible that after the termination of say, three years, a member may offer himself for being appointed, if his services are good and valuable and deserve to be continued. To keep him at one stretch for a period of six years is more than what is necessary and to that extent I would request that the period of six years may be shortened.

Coming to clause 12, I feel that the functions of the Commission do need some precise and concretised formulation. As far as I am concerned, I do not find in this Bill any specific mention of rural education or rural uni-



[Shri S. S. More]  
 versities. All the 35 universities, I understand, belong to the urban areas and they are situated in the urban areas. All the constituent colleges and all the affiliated and other colleges together totalling 900 also come from urban areas. What is to happen to the rural problems?

**Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad):** Sir, I rise on a point of order. I want to ask before you vacate the Chair whether the person who occupies the Chair after you is bound by the list of speakers which is already with you, or whether any Member who rises and catches the eye of the Chair, is entitled to speak?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no point of order here, but all the same, I am bound to clear up some misunderstandings. No person who is sitting in the Chair for the time being is bound by any direction given by the person occupying the Chair earlier. I may tell the hon. Member that if I were here and should continue to be here, I shall try to balance things, by calling some from here, some from there, some who have spoken in the Joint Committee and some others who have not been on the Joint Committee and shall try to distribute as much as possible so as to maintain the level of the debate. Secondly, I would give opportunities to those who have not taken part, and thirdly, give opportunities to those who have already taken part in the Committee but who may wish to explain their position here and fourthly, I would choose the Members on other important considerations as well. If any particular Member says that he has particularly prepared for this discussion, I have absolutely no objection. All Members will be taken into consideration, but they must realise that there are 500 Members and so every Member cannot be called. There is no intention not to allow any Member to speak. I am always having an eye upon all those Members who have not spoken so far and to the best of my ability I am trying to distribute the time to all Members. No hon. Member who occupies the Chair

as Chairman or Speaker or Deputy-Speaker is bound by any directions, but normally, if I should continue in the Chair, I would follow the procedure which I mentioned just now. I have already noted whom I should call and in what particular order. Thereafter, others will be called. If in the meanwhile, a Member who sits on one side feels that he is an extraordinary Member, and that he ought to be called, he will certainly be called.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** I was obliged to ask this question because every time when we from this side rise to catch the eye of the Chair, according to the practice of democracy, we are told by the Chair or any other Member who is occupying the Chair that he has been given a list and that he is bound by that list of persons. It is not a question of any Member being an extraordinary Member, because every Member is entitled to speak and every Member is supposed to have extraordinary knowledge on every subject.

Secondly, it is our experience that every time it so happens that every person who occupies the Chair—it is no reflection on the person occupying the Chair—starts from the left side there and ends up here, at the front of the right side. They never see further outside this circle. We really do not know how Members on this side can exercise their right to speak.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is so good and he is on the right side and so he always catches my eye. But he has not risen nor has he sent a chit. He has not given me any indication to speak. For instance, the hon. Member next to Shri B. K. Das stood. He has not sent me a chit. I did not know his name. I sent the Marshal to ascertain his name and I have noted down his name here. If only the hon. Member had stood up once, I would have noted him. I have got 20 names on my list now. Nobody is missed. I have noted down the names of all hon. Members who have stood, and I am trying to apportion the time to them. You are on my right side. How can I ignore it?

**Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada):** I would like to point out a glaring fact that there is lack of quorum in the House.

**Shri N. Rachiab (Mysore—Reserved—Sch. Castes):** Only very few Members like Shri S. S. More are getting chances and they are getting repeated chances on all debates, whether they are on the Select Committee or not, whereas other Members who have not spoken are not given a chance to speak.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Occasionally it so happens that the Opposition gets more chances.

**Shri S. S. More:** Some get a chance to speak here; some others are getting a chance to go to foreign countries, which is more substantial.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am not concerned with the other aspect. Members will realise that occasionally Members of the Opposition get more chances, because they are smaller in number than the number on the other side. We will proceed with the debate. I am sure that within the time allotted, all hon. Members who have risen so far or who have indicated their desire to speak will have an opportunity to speak. That is my desire and I shall try to fulfil it.

**Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar):** Are we to conclude that only protestants will get chances or even mute Members will get a chance?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Invocations will also be heard in this House!

**Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad Dist.—North):** Will the Members who may rise hereafter get a chance to speak?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Up to the time when the Minister replies, provided there is time, whoever rises and catches the eye of the Chair will be given an opportunity to speak.

[**PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair**]

**Shri S. S. More:** Before I resume my speech, I would request you to take into account the time lost in the interruptions.

I was speaking about the functions of the University Grants Commission. I find that no specific mention regarding rural universities has been made. Unfortunately, there is hardly any university which can be said to be a rural university. The people living in the urban areas are getting all the chances to go to the apex of the educational pyramid with the result that all our activities,—educational, economic, social and other—are dominated by the urban complex. I feel that we must rescue the rural areas, particularly rural education, from this sort of incubus on it, and the best way for it is to develop a proper rural university. A rural university will chalk out a course of studies which will be in accord with the rural spirit and rural tradition and at the same time will be effective so as to take the rural areas to a modern, scientific plane. Imposing our urban conceptions and urban outlook and urban approach to life on rural areas is creating a sort of conflict in society, with the result that the rural people find themselves at sea and they have lost all interest in their lives. If the young people from the rural areas are to be properly educated and trained to shoulder their responsibilities, then the creation of a rural university is highly desirable and the University Grants Commission should be specially directed to strive for that purpose.

My further argument is that the mere distribution of grants should not be the objective of the Commission. The Commission should also see that consistently with its effort to raise the standard of education in the universities, it will at the same time achieve the purpose of lowering the cost of education. Otherwise, in their efforts to raise the standard of education, in their efforts to bring about a co-ordination of educational efforts in the country, it is quite possible that more emphasis will be given, more attention will be given, to raise the cost of educating a boy or a girl. My submission is that education should not, and particularly higher education should not become the luxury and the sole monopoly of the upper classes

[Shri S. S. More]

who are well placed. The under-dog has to be looked to also, and not only should there be economic parity, but even educational parity will have to be evolved. Only when we succeed in evolving educational parity, will we be successful in evolving economic parity. All these educated people are going to be our future rulers. It is the university from which our future administrators will be coming, and if education becomes the sole monopoly of the rich men, naturally since the administrators are selected from those who have the highest educational equipment, they will be mostly coming from the small but rich class and they will be a sort of ruling community. In 1833 an Act was passed for giving a Charter to the East India Company and Mr. Pitt who was in charge of it said, "We do not want to create a governing class or caste in this country". But, unfortunately, whatever his intentions might have been, our education has become the monopoly of the urban classes. It is the richer section of the community which can send their boys and girls for receiving the costly university education. I can cite an instance. There was a proposal to start a medical college in Sholapur city from which I have been returned and the organisers looking to the cost of education came to the conclusion that unless every boy or girl seeking entrance to this college deposited Rs. 3,000 which was not to be returned no admission should be given. Initially to deposit Rs. 3,000 is itself a sort of an impossible task for a man who belongs to the middle-class, leaving aside the persons coming from the rural areas. My submission is that if we want to industrialise our country and if we want to bring prosperity to our country as far as possible, we will have to undertake a huge reconstruction effort and for that technical personnel is absolutely necessary. We, Members of Parliament, may be technical experts in talking sharp and talking as much as possible and wasting the time of this House, but as far as the other technical personnel is concerned—doctors, engineers etc.—

we will have to cheapen the education by which we shall secure the number of such personnel.

**An Hon. Member:** Make it free.

**Shri S. S. More:** I do support that idea. I shall be very happy if our rulers are genuine about the socialistic pattern. In order to demonstrate that they are really genuine, they will have to make such technical education free and, if possible, compulsory for those who really come from the lower strata of society. I would make one request. Will the Members of this Commission be treated as holders of office of profit and as such disqualified to be Members of Parliament—for being chosen as or for continuing as Members of Parliament,—because they will have a whole-time job? They will be appointed by the Government. Hon. Members know that the Committee on Offices of Profit has submitted its report. It is difficult to decide whether a particular office is an office of profit. So, just as in the case of the State Bank, Government must come out with a clause saying that the membership of this Commission should be treated as an office of profit which should disqualify persons for remaining or being elected as Members of Parliament or State legislatures. Such a clause will put the matter beyond interpretation or doubt. If we have that sort of a clause, Members of Parliament will have to make it clear as to whether they want to remain as Members of Parliament and educate the people from this forum or whether they want to go to the University Grants Commission and distribute the grants for the purpose of raising the level and bringing about a uniform standard of education.

These are my suggestions and I hope that this University Grants Commission eventually as it progresses will be really strong enough and useful enough to serve the purposes which we have in view and which will be increasingly and urgently brought to our attention.

**Shri Aitekar (North Satara):** Knowledge and education have been held in very high esteem since time

immemorial, particularly in our country. It has been said:

“ज्ञानेन हीनाः पशुभिः समादाः ।”

One who is devoid of knowledge has been equated to low animals. It has been regarded from old times that when a man gets knowledge, he is called a regenerate; he gets a second birth as it were. But unfortunately, in our country education has not gone into the lower strata of society. What we want today is that education must be spread in the very lower strata and every person must have an opportunity for securing knowledge. Our Constitution has guaranteed equality of status and opportunity. It has also guaranteed social justice. Therefore, we must so devise our educational policy that knowledge will be available to every citizen in this land. It is true that according to the Directive Principles, primary education at any rate must be compulsory and introduced in ten years. Attempts are being made to achieve this, but even greater attempts are needed and I hope they will be made. This Bill deals with university education. We want to give knowledge to everyone; but at the same time, whoever is desirous of getting higher education must have facilities to get it. So far as the objects of this Bill are concerned, the Bill as originally introduced said that the object was that “such steps as it may think fit for the co-ordination and determination of standards of teaching and examination will be taken by this Commission.” But now this has been expanded. It is not only the determination of standards and co-ordination that is needed, but an expansion of university education and research in higher branches of knowledge. This has been provided by the amendments that have been made by the Joint Committee and it has been stated that “all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of university education and for determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities will be taken by the Commission.” So far as the promotion of university education is concerned,

there are about 30 universities in this country. My friend, Mr. More, just now pointed out that they are mainly urban universities. But out of the population of 360 millions in this country, only 46 millions live in cities and the rest live in rural areas. Therefore, higher education for these people is a matter of great concern and that has to be taken into account. The University Education Commission has laid great stress upon rural universities in the last chapter of its report. Though it is the last chapter, it is the most important. Rural education must be of such a type that it would be greatly helpful for the people in the villages, for carrying on their avocations and various occupations in a very efficient manner, and would, at the same time, make culture available to them. The present universities are in cities. If the villagers go there, they will hardly find anything which is of immediate use to them. When they are living in the villages carrying on agriculture and other rural industries, education that would be helpful in that respect must be made available to them. In this respect, the University Education Commission has pointed out the instance of the Danish Peoples' Universities. They have said that during the course of a few years in Denmark these Universities have worked wonders. A country which was backward in agriculture and other things was raised to a very high level and it attained a very high degree of efficiency on account of the education that was imparted by these Peoples' Universities. Universities on these lines, particularly as our great Father of the Nation has pointed out, must be made available to the rural areas. He had pointed out that while they are carrying on their avocations, they must get education. Teaching by doing, basic education, should be the type which we have to introduce in the villages. Even when these people are living in their own villages, in the rural environments, carrying on farming, building, carpentry, etc., the education that is necessary for doing these things in an up-to-date, modern

[Shri Altekar]

fashion with the highest efficiency should be made available to them. If it is so made available in the places where they are living, in their own vicinity at cheap cost—they have not to go far away to the towns—certainly, the conditions of these people will be improved greatly. Many elderly villagers came to me and complain that their boys who go to the schools in towns, when they come back, are good for nothing. They are not in a position to get good jobs because their education is not of a high standard and because they have not gone up to the college stage. When they come back, they think that they are educated and it is below their dignity to work in the fields and soil their clothes. As a matter of fact, they are good neither here nor there. That is the way in which they fare. They may have learnt some lessons in profit and loss accounting and have solved some examples well in the school. When they come back, it is all loss and no profit. This problem of giving higher education to the great population in the rural areas can only be solved by rural Universities as have been pointed out by the University Education Commission. I think that this subject comes within promotion of university education. If it is necessary, it should be made amply clear by specifically saying so in clause 12. At the same time, I would like to point out that in this way many talents that are lying hidden in these villages will come to light for the benefit of the educated urban population also. We know of Shri Tukaram Namdeo, Tulsidas and Narsi Mehta who have give knowledge not only to their own people, but to all generations, for ever. They are the greatest exponents of rural culture, which is as high as anything that can be pointed out in this world. Such talents are to be searched and their abilities availed of for the uplift of the nation. Such rural universities are absolutely necessary.

Another point that has been stressed upon in the Joint Committee is

in connection with research and science. That is the most important thing. Just as at one end we want rural universities, at the other end we must be in a position to attain the highest knowledge in different branches of science such as aero-engineering, nuclear physics, etc., and I may add, electronics and so on. Unless that is done, it will not be possible to complete our various schemes and programmes. Unless we get efficient persons from amongst our own people, who can do all these things? It will not otherwise, be possible for us to achieve the targets in the various projects planned. Therefore, I submit that it is desirable to lay great stress on research and science.

I would like to point out that there are the various National Laboratories, which have been recently established. They should be availed of. The Committee that was appointed to make suggestions in connection with these laboratories—the Egerton Committee—has suggested that there should be liaison between the laboratories and the Universities where scientific education is being given. The students that are receiving education in the Universities should have facilities for working in these laboratories and benefitting by that. This point should be taken into consideration by the Commission. They should be in a position to make recommendations in this respect as has been stated in clause 12(f). It is stated that when the Commission's advice is sought, it will be given. But, the Commission must be empowered to give advice whenever it thinks necessary that such steps are essential in the interests of the students and education. It should be able to make such a recommendation to the Government and to the Universities. That is one of the most important points so far as research is concerned.

It is also very important that research in our ancient culture should be carried on. We have a great heritage. We have got a fund of literature and a fund of knowledge in Sanskrit.

There are so many sciences which many amongst us do not know. We do not know to what heights we had reached. If we just look at the remarks made by Prof. Max Muller we shall see this. As regards principles of philology he has said that we have not gone a step farther than what Yaska said in his *Nirukta* 2,500 years ago, and that we are only applying what he was able to enunciate then. We have got the greatest exponents of grammar and other sciences. When this literature is available to us, we have to benefit out of that. We must make research into this. For this, knowledge of Sanskrit is essential. Sanskrit has all along been a great unifying influence for cultural and national unity in this land. Recently only at Tirupathy we had the Sanskrit Conference in which our President stressed the importance of Sanskrit. I would like to point out that we must preserve our heritage. We must understand it and hand it over to the next generation. This is a very great responsibility on us and we should properly discharge this. I hope the University Grants Commission will also pay attention to this and give an impetus to the study of and research in Sanskrit literature.

Another important thing, though it may not appear to be a very great one, is co-ordination and standardisation of education in the various Universities. We find in these days when admissions are sought in the medical colleges and engineering colleges, even first class students in Intermediate Science find it difficult to get admission. The various Universities are vying with one another, as it were, in turning out first class Intermediate students. We are, as a matter of fact, concerned to know whether the standard of knowledge is the same in all the Universities. That has to be taken into consideration. The University Grants Commission will have to pay attention to that. That is a very important thing. With so many universities working today, if they are going their own way and there is no uniformity of standard

with respect to education, we will be groping in the dark.

Not only at the higher level, but also at the lower level, in primary education and secondary education, standardisation is an important consideration. We find that in some States students who learn up to the tenth standard are matriculated, while in others the curriculum is for eleven years, so that in one State one passes at 14 while in another State at 16, and when they go for competitive examinations, those who pass matriculation at 16 are rather handicapped as to age-limit. So, there should be uniformity of time and curriculum with respect to primary and secondary education also so that the chances, the advantages and the disadvantages should be the same throughout the country. There are also some very insistent complaints that some sort of favouritism or influence is found in the results. That should not be the case and that also should be investigated.

This Commission is to have its own funds and once these funds are allotted, it should be free to use them for the purposes of higher education. There should be no interference. There should not be any sort of influence brought on them.

I am happy at the constitution of the Commission. Though it is not elected, it is mainly to consist of persons with distinguished and academic qualifications and those who are carrying on functions as independent Vice-Chancellors in universities. They will be in a position to do these things rightly.

I would like to point out that the most essential thing is the availability of funds. It has been pointed out by the Radhakrishnan Commission that the expenditure on university education in the country is hardly Rs. 9 crores. They have suggested that it should be at least Rs. 21.40 crores if proper and useful education is to be given. The scholarships awarded in universities in this country hardly go to one per cent., while in England it is 67 per cent., and in Oxford and Cambridge it is 82 per cent. Here I

[Shri Altekar]

may quote some figures. So far as Bombay is concerned, the grant to the Bombay University is Rs. 2,09,000, fees Rs. 19,41,000—total Rs. 24,36,000. Calcutta: grant Rs. 9,38,000, fees Rs. 25,60,000—total Rs. 41,02,000; Madras: grant Rs. 4,60,000, fees Rs. 9,69,000—total Rs. 19,66,000; Agra: grant Rs. 40,900, fees Rs. 3,18,000—total Rs. 4,01,000 for arriving at the total donations all have to be added. Leaving aside the central universities of Aligarh, Banaras and Delhi the others have got meagre grants. In England the fees income is 22 per cent. while it ranges from 62 to 80 per cent. in this country. The provision of adequate funds is therefore a great necessity. The Radhakrishnan Commission has pointed out that 60 per cent. must be the grant by the Government. It works out to about Rs. 13 crores—Rs. 8,69,00,000 by the Centre and Rs. 4,20,00,000 by the States. Only if this is done, will sufficient funds be available for university education.

They have also pointed out that there should be hostels in universities. In ancient times 2,000 years ago Nalanda alone had got accommodation for 10,000 university students. Even in the ruins we see accommodation for more than 4,000. Even so much accommodation is not available in any university in the country now. We have to pay attention to that.

The Commission must impress upon the Government the necessity of supplying funds, and we on our part must see that we make available to the universities such funds.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Chettiar.

Shri Bansthal (Jaipur) rose—

Mr. Chairman: I have called Shri Chettiar.

Shri Bansthal: May I know how a new Member can catch the eye of the hon. Speaker? I have been rising four times.

Mr. Chairman: A new Member like an old Member can catch the eye of the Chair in the same way; there is no difference, but at the same time

the new Member should learn to wait also like the old Members.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): This is indeed a very important Bill because this affects higher education in this country.

Of late, there has been a great deal of discussion, especially after this Bill had been introduced, about the independence of universities and the right of control upon the universities which the Government can exercise. Having some experience in administration, I agree with what the Radhakrishnan University Commission has pointed out, namely that self-restraint will be called for from both sides. While the university is entitled to a certain amount of independence, it may accept guidance from the State as to the large policies that it should follow. So, it is not a matter of the university *versus* the government, but is a matter of the universities and the government co-operating in this great task. In this matter rules cannot help, laws cannot be laid down, but a *via media* and a good sense as to which is best. The fears which people might have had before the Bill went to the Joint Committee must be surely allayed by the Bill which has come out of the Joint Select Committee, for the Joint Select Committee has considered all these views and on such consideration has cut down certain restrictions which might have been applicable to the universities. We have made a balanced contribution in this legislation.

The matter of improving standards is of very high importance. Money is one way by which we can provide equipment and improve standards. As one of our leading scientists, Dr. Saha, said one day what we want for the higher studies is proper equipment which is not available in the universities. Our laboratories are overcrowded. Many equipments which are absolutely essential are simply not available. One of the main grounds for this is want of finance. Though education is largely a matter for the States, the Government of India has seen the importance of furthering

university education and has come forward to pay large sums of money as grants to universities.

In this matter I must say that in addition to equipment which is necessary, personnel is also necessary, and due to various reasons which I need not discuss in this House, education today does not attract the best men in the country. In some countries where education does attract the best men, there is a much better atmosphere prevailing, because educational institutions are the repositories of our culture, they set the standards of our culture.

Today, there is indiscipline among the students. I am living amidst young men. I have been moving among them for the last 25 years. They are not bad. They have a great ideal before them. What is not really good is that we are not able to attract the best men who can guide the young men who come to our universities. At least in this respect the University Grants Commission will have to make a great contribution, and I hope that within the next few years the very best men and women in our country will be attracted to university service.

If this Bill is going to succeed, it can only be through the personal factor. While it is true that finance is necessary, and also equipment is necessary, yet more necessary than these is the proper type of men, who will man these schools and colleges, and who will guide these young men and women. These young men and women have a lot of energy in them. If only they can be guided properly, they can be made to develop tremendous strength, character and nobility. But if they cannot be guided properly, they will bring hell to this country. It is from this point of view I believe that the University Grants Commission, which is now on the anvil, will inaugurate a new period in education.

Much has been said about the falling of standards in the universities. I have had a talk with some members of the Union Public Service Commission as also the State Public Service Commis-

sions on this matter, and I find that this matter is intimately connected with the medium of instruction in the colleges. Once we have accepted the languages of our country to be the media of instruction, I think it has become a corollary that unless we strengthen our languages and develop our languages to express the highest thoughts, and for that purpose, if necessary, borrow also largely from the international terms, we shall not be able to create any understanding in the students who are being admitted into our universities today. Many of our boys and girls, when they go into the colleges, hear for the first time lectures in English, and let me tell you—I hope my experience coincides with that of others—they are at a loss; they are at sea, and they do not understand anything. When I was talking with some members of the Union Public Service Commission on this matter, one of them, an eminent educationist, said that we must either go back and have the medium of instruction as English in the I form itself, or we must make the media of instruction in the colleges the regional languages and at the same time strengthen English as a language though not as a medium of instruction. I hope the people who have in their hands the moulding of education will give thought to this idea. I have not put forward this idea in order that there may be a discussion on that very point, but it is certainly a matter which will contribute towards the heightening of standards, and which will make the students understand what they are studying. And this in turn requires a great deal of preparation. It cannot be done in a day. So, the sooner we prepare ourselves for this great task, the better will it be for us.

It is with this background that this matter was discussed in the Joint Committee. There is also an amendment to remind the people who are in charge of the University Grants Commission itself that one of the best ways of developing university education will be to develop our regional languages. I was told—I was not



[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

present in the House at that time—that one hon. Member of the House stood up and spoke, and had the temerity to say that none of the regional languages other than Hindi should be developed by the Centre. (*Interruption by Shri S. C. Singhal*). I do not hear the hon. Member. I say that that is sheer madness. I cannot understand a man saying like that, when here is Shri Jawaharlal Nehru crying hoarse that all these languages are national languages.

**Mr. Chairman:** Today, no hon. Member has taken that stand so far.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** I am sorry if I have misunderstood. If nobody has stated like that, then I am happy. I was not present in the House when that hon. Member spoke, and I only heard of it. I am sorry if I have misunderstood the point. If nobody has stated like that, then I shall drop the matter at this.

Let me now proceed to another matter, namely the spread of the culture and knowledge of this great country. It is not to be confined to just a few people, but it should filter down to the millions of our country. That can be done only by strengthening and developing the languages of our own people. The progress may be slower or faster, but that has to be done, and I hope this will be one of the objectives of the University Grants Commission also.

With the limited time at my disposal, let me not go very much farther into these general subjects, but let me say a few words about certain clauses of the Bill. You are aware that there are three types of universities in the world. The first is the category of universities which are completely independent of Government, and which are supported by private sources, by fees, by endowments and so on. The second type of universities consists of universities which are absolutely dependent upon Government, and which are wholly maintained by Government. The third type consists of universities such as

those in America, where they are left wholly to the States, and the Federal Government have got nothing to do with them. These are the three broad types which are described in the brochure that has been circulated to all of us in connection with this Bill. But all of them insist that freedom is of absolute importance. Academic freedom is of very great importance in the growth of our universities, in fact in the growth of knowledge itself.

We have chosen to take after the British pattern. In fact, the idea of a University Grants Commission itself is something that we have borrowed from the British pattern. But there are certain differences between the British University Grants Commission and the University Grants Commission, which we are seeking to constitute in our country.

In the British University Grants Commission, no vice-chancellor who is acting actually as the vice-chancellor of any university can find a place as a member; if anybody who is acting as a vice-chancellor is chosen as a member of the University Grants Commission, he will have to resign his vice-chancellorship in the University. This is perhaps with a view to ensuring that the man will be absolutely impartial in doling out funds. Secondly, the University Grants Commission in England is under the control of the Treasury and not the Education Ministry. This is because they feel that the Treasury will be more dispassionate and will not allow the Education Ministry to force on the Commission any of the pet theories that certain Education Ministers may have.

Thirdly, grants are given with condition or without condition; and it is open to the universities to accept the grants with condition or not to accept them, and there is no compulsion about it. But there is what is called public opinion which comes into play. If any university is foolish enough to refuse a grant for development in any particular sphere, public opinion will

come very strongly upon it, with the result that the university cannot afford to be recalcitrant any more.

The essence of university administration in England is the giving of block grants for the universities. The university authorities submit schemes extending over a period of four, five or six years, according to the purpose they have in view. Once the schemes are accepted, they would not only be sure of getting the money for the current year, but they will also be pretty sure that they would be getting the money for the subsequent years of the scheme also, with the result that they can proceed with their programmes unhampered by the thought whether they will have the money or not.

We have chosen to depart from the British pattern in certain respects. Clause 5 of the Bill which explains the composition of the Commission provides that nine persons will be nominated by the Central Government. I have seen people advocating elections for this purpose. But I am not enamoured of elections. Knowing universities as I do, I would not advocate elections. In the Madras University, there is election provided for to the Academic Council, and I know what an amount of schism and quarrel is there in every college. We are trying in Madras to bring an amendment to the University Act to avoid these elections and to have some sort of rotation. I am therefore happy that we have avoided election at least in this academic body.

Then, there will be three persons who would be vice-chancellors of universities; though in the British counterpart, we do not have any vice-chancellors yet we have chosen to have vice-chancellors in our University Grants Commission, because they are a body of persons whose friendship and understanding we must cultivate. Then, there will be some officers of the Central Government also, but their number has been limited to two only. There is also provision for having eminent educationists. So, there is a latitude given

to Government to see that people who have special experience or a special standing in education can be nominated to this body. To that extent, I believe that ours is a great improvement.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member's time is up.

3 P.M.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** Since I have very many points to deal with, I hope you will give me a little indulgence. I would now like to refer to a few other clauses. One particular clause has been referred to by others in detail already. So, I shall not refer to it in any great detail. That is clause 2(f). Previously, the scope of the bill was confined to constituent colleges. As you know, constituent colleges are few in this country; most of our Universities are affiliating Universities. There is a large body of colleges, 9000 and odd, in this country of which barely 500 or 400 will be constituent colleges. So the benefit of this University Grants Commission funds will not go to the large number of affiliated colleges. So the Joint Committee thought it fit to extend its area of application. Then it was said by the Ministry—and very rightly—that their funds are limited, they cannot give all these 9000 colleges funds, and so let us confine ourselves to a particular type of colleges. Then it was suggested that we might confine ourselves to post-graduate colleges. But that has not been specifically mentioned in the Bill, because it was considered that we might further extend the scope of the application of this Bill when more funds were available. I have tabled an amendment to the effect that the scope of the Bill may be extended to post-graduate colleges. I hope the Government will give us an assurance that at the first instance they will apply it to all post-graduate colleges which provide, second degrees honours courses, courses after graduation and other courses.

Now, I come to another matter—that is in relation to clause 12. Clause 12

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

defines the powers and functions of the Commission. In connection with this, I would like the Government to make an amendment. I have tabled an amendment and I do hope they will accept it. The development of higher education is not an isolated fact; it is a fact which goes along with the development of our own languages. By 'languages', I do not confine myself to any individual language; I refer to all the languages mentioned in the Constitution. They are all our national languages, and the development of this great country will depend upon the development of our languages, in expression in science, in arts, in every possible way. Possibly some of our educationists have become narrow-minded to this extent that while they respect knowledge in science, in humanities and so on, they have not yet understood—perhaps it is difficult for the previous generation to understand—that the development of languages itself is the instrument for the development of our knowledge. So I would like to incorporate an amendment in this clause that money be given for the development of our languages. I need not mention this language or that language; because all are our own national Indian languages. I only say that it must be possible for the University Grants Commission to allot funds, whenever any University demands it, asks for it, for the development of any of the Indian languages.

Now, I come to clause 20. This is a matter with which the Joint Committee had a lot of trouble, namely, that the Government of India can give directions as to what are questions of national policy. Some Universities have said that no Government can give them any direction. This is not the time for me to refer to that; I will do so at the time of the consideration of the clauses. Some Universities have had serious misgivings; opinions received from Universities and Vice-Chancellors expressed serious misgivings. But to my mind, it is absolutely necessary that

the Government of India—or for that matter, the government of any country—should have powers with them to say what is a national purpose. We cannot be actuated by narrow-mindedness on the part of anybody in any part of the country. While that power must be there, we should also see—and I hope that an assurance will be given in that direction—that these 'national purposes' will not be interpreted to mean something narrower than national purposes. For example, a distinguished Vice-Chancellor, for whom the Ministry, I am sure, has great respect, Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, in his note has posed certain questions. 'Is the medium of Hindi as a medium of instruction a national purpose?'—he asks. I am sure the Minister will categorically clear it up, that they do not mean by 'national purpose' any such things. This is the general discussion stage and when the clauses come up for discussion, I shall deal with it; but these are matters which it is good to clear up.

There is only one other matter to which I would refer before I sit down.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry I cannot allow the hon. Member any further time. He has already taken more than 20 minutes.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: All right. I will not take any more of your time. I will do it when the clauses are discussed.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North-West): I welcome this University Grants Commission Bill. It is nearly six years ago that the University Education Commission, of which I was a member, sent its recommendations to the Government of India for the creation of a University Grants Commission, and it is rather a pity that for six years no action was taken. Anyhow, better late than never.

I was a member of the Joint Committee and it was my duty to have

attended the sittings of the Committee. Unfortunately, as I was outside the country, I could not take any part in its deliberations. I sent in certain amendments; somehow, they were lost. I would move only that amendment of which I have given notice.

I feel that the Bill alone is not adequate. Simply a Bill cannot do any good. The Bill must be made effective. The manner of working of the University Grants Commission Act has to be very carefully scrutinised. If you look through the Bill, you will find that, as it stands, almost the whole power is in the hands of the Chairman of the Commission. He is the only whole-time member; the other members are all half-timers. Of the nine or ten men who will form the University Grants Commission itself, some will be Vice-Chancellors of Universities, some will be other educationists. They will come once in, say, one or two months and then they will have to decide very important questions. We know what is generally done in these cases. Whatever the Chairman has prepared or the staff has prepared is generally accepted, because these gentlemen, not being whole-time men, have very little time to give attention to the subjects. There was a University Grants Committee in 1948 of which I was a member.

**Mr. Chairman:** As the Joint Committee has reported, there is no provision for making the Chairman a whole-time man.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** Only the Chairman is a whole-time man.

**Mr. Chairman:** Not according to the Joint Committee.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** In the original Bill, there was a provision that the Chairman should be a whole-time officer, but the Joint Committee has omitted that provision.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** So it has made it worse. The whole thing will be managed by the office. So I am sorry for that. I am therefore moving an amendment of which I have given notice, to clause 3. I do not have the

copy of the amendment here.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member may move it when we discuss the clause.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** Clause 5 runs thus:

"The Commission shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the Central Government,

The members shall be chosen as follows:—

"not less than three members from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities;

two members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government;

and the remaining number from among persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinction....."

"(3) The Central Government shall nominate a member of the Commission, not being an officer of the Central Government or of any State Government, to be the Chairman thereof."

So, I find that the work of studying the condition of education in the universities under each heading, arts, science, engineering, technology and medicine, will devolve on the office alone and not on any responsible member of the Commission. I think this is a very undesirable state of affairs. I have, therefore, given notice of an amendment that the Commission shall consist of, first, an executive committee consisting of a whole-time chairman and four whole-time experts. These experts are to be specially chosen for their knowledge of science, knowledge of humanities, knowledge of medicine and knowledge of engineering and technology. These four are the faculties which are generally taught in the universities. They should be whole-time men and they should study their subjects. For example, if we take the man on medicine, he will study the standard

[Shri Meghnad Saha]

of medical teaching in every one of the universities and will present reports to the Grants Commission and suggest the measures necessary. We find that is not here, and without that, most of the money which the Government may be giving to the Commission will be mis-spent. In addition to the executive committee, I have suggested that there should be an advisory council which will consist of not less than nine members and not more than fifteen members, and they have to be appointed just as is given here. I have also indicated how they have to be appointed. This policy-making body will meet once in three months or six months and will take decisions on the recommendations which have been put forward before them by the members of the executive committee. That was the original intention of the Radhakrishnan Commission which recommended the University Grants Commission. I shall read to you some extracts from the report of that Commission. On page 408 it says:

"It will be an expert body—'It' means the University Grants Commission—The first and most essential change is that the Committee shall have power to allocate grants within total limits set by the Government instead of merely recommending their allocation to the Finance Ministry which may or may not agree."

On page 410, it says:

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

will have to take very unpopular decisions from time to time, decisions that are bound to disappoint particular universities and provinces.\* \* \* We regard their responsibility as similar to that of the Federal Public Service Commission."

Therefore, the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission are definite that there should be three full-time members and possibly it will be better if there are five full-time members. If my amendment is accepted, it will meet the recommendations as made by the Radhakrishnan Commission. I, therefore, request the hon. Minister to accept this amendment of mine.

I have some knowledge of the working of the University Grants Commission in England. At first, they started with only one chairman, full-time chairman, but they found that it would not work at all and they had to appoint four or five more men who were whole-time workers and who went on studying the courses of scientific education in the different universities. That is a man's whole-time job and he must have his staff and must devote his whole attention to that and then he prepares the agenda. He studies the requirements of each university and what new courses have to be opened, whether any department has to be strengthened, and so on. Where is the provision for that here? You have got nine men and one of them will be the Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University. He is a very busy man and he can give only a part of his time to this work. Probably he will see the agenda prepared by the office when he is in the train. Somebody will be coming from Madras and somebody from Calcutta and somebody doing some other work. I think in these respects this Bill is very defective. Generally you have recommended that there should be some Vice-Chancellors of universities and these Vice-chancellors will naturally try to get as much money for their universities as possible. Men are not

infallible and they have got their weaknesses. The man who will do the work, the men who will prepare the agenda, the men who will present it before the Commission, should be absolutely whole-time men, and unless you do it, I think most of the money will be mis-spent. I do not say anything further and in other respects this is a very salutary Bill and we have been expecting it for the past six years. Now that it has come, we shall try to make it as serviceable to the country as possible.

I am not very much afraid that the autonomy of the universities will be at all disturbed if we have this University Grants Commission. Formerly, about twenty years ago, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge did not accept any grants from Government as they thought that it would do away with their autonomy. After the University Grants Commission has come, about 70 per cent. of their budget comes from the Commission and from the talk which I had with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, I found that they did not think that there autonomy was jeopardised, but they all insist that the agenda of the Commission must be prepared by whole-time workers, men who are eminent in their own subjects, men who have got a deep knowledge of their subjects. I think unfortunately we have been rather seeing daggers in the air and I do not know why my friends in the Parliament think that the autonomy of the universities should be at all jeopardised. What the University Grants Commission in England does is that it goes to the universities, studies the subject there and then says that in the national interest or in the interests of the country, such and such courses should be opened in the University of Leeds and such and such in the University of Sheffield. They always have the interest of the country in their minds. I would not like to take much more time in details but I would most respectfully request the Minister of Education to accept my amendment. The recommendation of the Radha-

krishnan Commission is the result of a large amount of discussion which we had for days together; after studying the constitution of the university grants commissions in different countries we evolved that formula. If you do not accept this amendment but keep the Bill as it is, the working of the University Grants Commission will be very unsatisfactory and it will not yield us the result which many of us are expecting.

**Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah):** May I know from the hon. Members as to how many Vice-Chancellors are there in the U.K. Commission?

**Mr. Chairman:** Shri Chettiar just now said that there was not a single Vice-Chancellor. He has to resign his seat to accept a seat there.

**Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes):** May I have a further clarification from the hon. Member? His whole theme seems to be that, whether he is the Chairman or member, he should be a whole-time worker. Is he also agreed that the Vice-Chancellor should be a full-time worker? That argument continues backwards. If he insists on full-time members for this Commission, others also must be full-time workers.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** Vice-Chancellors are always full-time men. When they come in some advisory commission, they give only a part of their time, as for instance this University Grants Commission. I would not like any Vice-Chancellor to be on the University Grants Commission unless they resign their Vice-Chancellorships.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** Have Vice-Chancellors been full-time workers in universities?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes.

श्री बंसी लाल : जिस रूप में यह बिल जाइंट सिलेक्ट कमेटी से इस सभा में प्राया है उसकी उपयोगिता से कोई भी इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। मेरा इस बारे में केवल यही निवेदन है कि जिस मेहनत के साथ यह

[श्री बंसी लाल]

बिल तैयार किया गया है उतना ध्यान इसके व्यावहारिक पहलू की ओर नहीं दिया गया है। जब तक किसी बिल का जनता में ओर सम्बन्धित क्षेत्रों में स्वागत नहीं होता, तब तक उसकी कामयाबी में शक रहता है। इस बिल के बारे में जो कुछ इस सभा में हो रहा है उसको यूनिवर्सिटियां बड़ी दिलचस्पी के साथ देख रही हैं। मेरा ऐसा ख्याल है कि इस बिल पर विचार करते समय दो कठिनाइयां सामने आती हैं। एक तो यह है कि कमीशन का कंट्रोल किस प्रकार का होगा और किस तरह से यह बनायी जायेगी और दूसरी यह कि उसके फंड्स कैसे एकत्र होंगे। स्पष्ट है कि जब तक फंड्स नहीं होंगे तब तक कमीशन का कोई भ्रम नहीं हो सकता। फंड्स के बारे में यह व्यवस्था की गयी है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स उसमें कंट्रीब्यूशन देंगी। मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाऊंगा कि कमीशन के बनाने में इस बात का विशेष ध्यान रखा जाय कि उसमें स्टेट्स का रिप्रेजेंटेशन काफी हो। इस कमीशन में ६ आदमी होंगे, तीन वाइस-चांसलर दो सरकारी मुलाजिम और पांच विशेषज्ञ। लेकिन जब तक इस कमीशन में स्टेट्स का रिप्रेजेंटेशन नहीं होगा तब तक इसमें स्टेट्स का कंट्रीब्यूशन नहीं आयेगा और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि बहुत सी यूनिवर्सिटीज जिनको इस कमीशन के बनने से फायदा होना चाहिये उनको फायदा नहीं होगा। जहां तक इसके कम्पोजीशन का ताल्लुक है जैसा अभी मेरे एक मित्र ने कहा इसमें तीन वाइस-चांसलर होंगे और इन वाइस-चांसलरों की पसन्दगी भी सरकार के हाथ में होगी। यह अच्छा होता कि जहां तक वाइस-चांसलरों का ताल्लुक है, हमारी विभिन्न यूनिवर्सिटियों को और उनके वाइस चांसलरों को यह मौका दिया जाता कि वे अपने नुमाइंदे चुन कर भेजते क्योंकि हर एक यूनिवर्सिटी की अपनी

अपनी महमियत होती है और हर एक अलग अलग विषयों में दिलचस्पी लेती है। कुछ यूनिवर्सिटीज सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं और कुछ स्टेट्स की यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं और इन यूनिवर्सिटीज का पैसा किसी खास मद में खर्च होता है। केवल तीन वाइस चांसलर जो कि गवर्नमेंट की पसन्द पर इस कमीशन पर बैठेंगे वे बाकी यूनिवर्सिटीज की इच्छाओं और महत्वकांक्षाओं को पूरा नहीं कर सकेंगे।

जहां तक सेक्शन १६ का ताल्लुक है, फंड्स का, इस कमीशन का मकसद यह है कि जो पैसा कमीशन के पास हो उसको वह यूनिवर्सिटीज में बांट दें। इस पैसे को बांटने में, अगर इस कमीशन का कम्पोजीशन ठीक नहीं हुआ तो सरकार के सामने बहुत कठिनाइयां आयेंगी। जिस तरह से इत कमीशन का कम्पोजीशन है उसको तो कमीशन कहना ही गलत होगा। यह तो एक प्रकार की एडवाइजरी बाडी है, जिसको कि गवर्नमेंट बना रही है। मुझे इस सभा को यह बतलाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि एक जमाना था, जो कि बहुत दूर का नहीं है, जब कि इस देश में शिक्षा पर सरकार का किसी प्रकार का नियंत्रण नहीं होता था। शिक्षा बिल्कुल स्वतन्त्र थी। जब से हमारे देश में विदेशी शासन आया तब से धीरे-धीरे शिक्षा पर काफी नियंत्रण होता गया। आज यूनिवर्सिटीज के बारे में हमारे लोगों का जो मत है वह स्पष्ट है। आज हमारे देश के लोगों को जो आशायें इन यूनिवर्सिटीज से हैं वे पूरी नहीं हो रही हैं। और यह स्वाभाविक है कि जब कोई मामला यूनिवर्सिटीज के बारे में इस सभा में आता है तो लोगों को उसके बारे में बड़ी दिलचस्पी होती है।

मुझे सभा को यह भी बतलाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि जहां तक हमारी यूनिवर्सिटी-शिक्षा का ताल्लुक है उसके

बारे में हमारे देश के बड़े-बड़े शिक्षाशास्त्रियों ने, पंडितों ने, नेताओं ने और हमारे राष्ट्र-पति जी ने अनेकों बार यह कहा है कि इस शिक्षा में संशोधन होना चाहिये। जहां तक ब्रह्म बिल का ताल्लुक है यह बिल पास होना इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। इसको बनाने में हमारे बहुत से शिक्षा विशेषज्ञों का हाथ रहा है, लेकिन मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि यूनिवर्सिटीज की शिक्षा के सुधार के बारे में जितनी दिलचस्पी की भासा की जाती थी उतनी इस बिल से प्रकट नहीं होती है। उसके लिये इस बिल में उतना स्कोप नहीं है जितनी कि इससे भासा की जाती थी। इस बिल को बहुत मेहनत से तैयार किया गया है अच्छा होता यदि इसमें इस विषय की भी कुछ बात होती। इसका सिर्फ इतना सा मकसद है कि कमीशन के पास जो पैसा हो तो उसको वह यूनिवर्सिटीज में बांट दें। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि गवर्न-मेंट को इस कमीशन के कम्पोजीशन के बारे में अवश्य ही पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये और ऐसी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये कि इसमें स्टेट्स का ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रतिनिधित्व हो जिससे कि स्टेट्स को इसमें दिलचस्पी हो। कमीशन स्टेट्स को केवल राय दे सकता है कि वे इस कमीशन को फंड्स दें। ऐसा कोई कानून नहीं है कि स्टेट्स को पैसा देने के लिये मजबूर किया जा सके। हमारी यूनिवर्सिटीज प्रोटोनोमस बाडीज हैं। जैसा कि अभी एक मित्र ने कहा है कि कमीशन जो उनको पैसा देगा तो यूनिवर्सिटीज यह देखेंगी कि उनको कितना पैसा मिलता है और किस हद तक उनकी प्रोटोनोमी में फर्क पड़ता है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कमीशन के कम्पोजीशन के प्रश्न पर और उसके फंड्स को कंसालीडेट करने के प्रश्न पर सरकार को खास तौर से ध्यान देना चाहिये।

मैं एक बात की ओर भी ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ और वह है सेक्शन ३। सेक्शन २ एफ में यूनिवर्सिटी की परिभाषा

दी हुई है और सेक्शन ३ में सेफुल गवर्न-मेंट को यह अधिकार दिया गया है कि वह चाहे तो किसी और संस्था को भी यूनिवर्सिटी की परिभाषा में ले सकती है। इसमें दिया है :  
"that any institution for higher education, other than a University."

लेकिन इस बिल में कहीं भी हायर एजुकेशन की परिभाषा नहीं की गयी है। अभी मेरे मित्र चेट्टियार साहब ने इस बात को बताया कि हायर एजुकेशन की परिभाषा न की जाय और उसको खुला रखा जाय ताकि जैसा मौका हो गवर्नमेंट उसके अनुसार कार्य कर सके। लेकिन, जब हम किसी संस्था के रिकोगनीशन के लिये कानून बना रहे हैं तो इस बात की स्पष्ट तौर से परिभाषा दी जानी चाहिये कि हायर एजुकेशन क्या है, ताकि मालूम हो कि बिल बनाने वालों का हायर एजुकेशन से क्या मंशा है। अगर यह नहीं किया जायगा तो सरकार के सामने बहुत सी दिक्कतें आयेंगी। अनेकों संस्थाओं के आवेदन पत्र आवेंगे और उनके बारे में निर्णय करना कठिन होगा। यह ठीक है कि इस बिल में भागे एक धारा में यह कहा गया है कि वे संस्थाएँ ऐसी हों जो कि नेशनल परपज को सर्व करती हों। जैसा कि मैं ने पहले भी कहा है कि मैं फिर कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यदि सरकार चाहती है कि यह बिल कानून बनने के बाद सफल हो तो उसको सम्बन्धित लोगों में, आम जनता में और यूनिवर्सिटीज में ज्यादा से ज्यादा कानफिडेंस पैदा करना चाहिये क्योंकि इसी पर इसकी सफलता निर्भर करती है। जब तक वह नहीं होगा तब तक अनेकों कमीशन केवल बन कर रहे जाते हैं और उनको सफलता नहीं मिलती। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि हमारा यह पहला प्रयास है और साथ ही इसमें भी कोई सन्देह नहीं कि हमारी यूनिवर्सिटीज की अनेकों कठिनाइयाँ हैं वार्षिक कठिनाइयाँ भी स्पष्ट हैं। वे यूनिवर्सिटीज जो स्टेट्स में काम करती हैं उनकी कठिनाइयाँ



[श्री बंसो लाल]

तो और भी बढ़ी है और बिना फंड्स के उनका जो प्रोग्राम होता है, उसको वे चालू नहीं कर पाती हैं। आशा है कि इस कमीशन के कायम होने से उनकी कुछ कठिनाइयां हल होंगी और साथ ही यह बात भी ध्यान देने योग्य है कि यूनिवर्सिटीज को स्पेशलाइज्ड करना पड़ेगा। आज हम देखते हैं कि प्रत्येक यूनिवर्सिटी से ग्रेजुएट निकलते हैं और उनको काम नहीं मिलता है और बेकारी फैलने से देश में अशान्ति पैदा होती है। मैं केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ भी पैसा इस कमिशन के जरिये यूनिवर्सिटीज को दिया जाय उसमें विशेष ध्यान इस बात पर रखा जाय कि हर एक यूनिवर्सिटी जो हमारे देश में मौजूद है वह अलग-अलग क्षेत्र में विशेषज्ञ बने ताकि हमारे देश में जो टेकनिकल एजुकेशन की कमी है वह पूरी हो सके, चाहे मेडिसिन को ले लीजिये और चाहे किसी और प्रकार की एजुकेशन को ले लीजिये, ग्रान्ट्स देते समय कमीशन को इस बात का विशेष ध्यान देना पड़ेगा कि वे यूनिवर्सिटियां इस कमी को पूरा करती हैं कि नहीं; यह कमीशन को मेरा सुझाव है। यह आगे की बात है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं केवल इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कमीशन के कम्पोजीशन पर सरकार को विशेष ध्यान रखना चाहिये। स्पष्ट है कि तीन वाइस-चांसलर सरकार की पसन्द के होंगे, वाइस-चांसलर स्टेट्स से भी आते हैं और कई स्टेट्स ऐसी हैं कि जहां केवल एक यूनिवर्सिटी है। यू० पी० आदि में कई यूनिवर्सिटियां काम करती हैं। एक स्टेट में जहां केवल एक यूनिवर्सिटी है उस यूनिवर्सिटी की अपनी दिक्कतें हैं। तीन वाइस-चांसलर, दो गवर्नमेंट के कर्मचारी और चार-पांच विशेषज्ञ इस प्रकार का कम्पोजीशन मेरा ऐसा स्थाल है कि जिस आशा को लेकर यह कमीशन कायम किया है वह आशा सफल नहीं होगी और मेरा मेधा स्थाल है कि जिस आशा से सेलेक्ट

कमेटी ने इतनी मेहनत करके इस बिल को रखा है वह भी पूरी नहीं होगी। आखिर जैसा एक मित्र ने कहा कि खाली एक बिल का पेश हो जाना या उसका कानून बनाना काफी नहीं है, देखना तो यह है कि उस कानून के बारे में जनता का उत्साह किस प्रकार का होगा, सम्बन्धित लोगों का उत्साह होगा और कितनी हद तक सम्बन्धित लोग उस कानून को सफल बनाने में सहयोग देंगे। इसी पर सब कुछ निर्भर करता है। बस यही चन्द एक शब्द मुझे इस बारे में कहने थे।

**Shri Tek Chand (Ambala—Simla):**  
I rise to lend my qualified support to this Bill because I feel that the problem before the nation is so complex, the difficulties are of such varying character that a Commission like this will not be able to meet their requirements.

I am of the opinion that this Commission ought to have greater powers in order that it may not only be able to end the civil but it may also be in a position to launch proper scheme for proper education in this country and see that these schemes are implemented and given effect to. So far as this Commission goes I am *ad idem* but my fear is rather that this Commission does not go far enough. It is a notorious fact that the standard of education imparted by the universities is low and it is progressive; that is to say, it is going down still lower. I say so not as an carping critic but because I have had the advantage of university education not only in this country but also at Oxford. I have also been for several years a part-time lecturer in India. I have also been the examiner for some of the universities and when I just juxtapose the standard of one university and the other the hiatus between the standards of the two universities is very great; not that we are deficient in intelligence; not that we cannot understand or tackle the more complicated or difficult problems but be-

cause there is something really wrong—I am almost tempted to say 'rotten'—so far as the teaching staff in the country is concerned. All along it has been stated that teachers are ill paid. My fears are that the teachers in this country are unemployable. It is not that there is unemployment or there is not sufficient remuneration but the right type of teachers are not there. A large number of charlatans and mountebanks masquerade as educationists in this country. They ought not to be anywhere near the universities, near the senates or near other education institutions. If you want that education of the right type, and in the right manner should be imparted and should be made available to all, whether they live in urban areas or in rural areas, whether they happen to be children of the rich or the children of the poor, you have got to see, you have got to find the defects whether it is among the universities or among the university teachers.

I am not enamoured of the preservation of autonomy and independence of the universities. Is there a university or a senate where intrigues and cliques of the worst type do not flourish, where people do not manoeuvre and manipulate and jockey themselves into positions, where over text books, over examinership and over so many loaves and fishes of patronage people do not quarrel in a most undignified manner; where men ostensibly of education and of high standards do not seem to remember that they are men of education; where persons styling themselves as professors of this language or that language, claiming this authorship or that authorship and all they do is to borrow two dozen poems and say the book goes in their names as selections of so and so containing poems, short stories or essays—amass wealth because by dint of influence of their status or their cliques those text books must be prescribed? These things are going on—dreadful, painful things—and such people ought not to be anywhere near these educational

institutions, universities or senates. I want these evils to be eradicated. I wish this Commission had the power to eradicate them; power even to examine the abuses thoroughly and independently and then to suggest ways and means whereby these evils could be removed.

Therefore, my dissatisfaction with the Bill is not for what it is; but that is not what it ought to be. It has not gone far enough to see that all our educational ailments are remedied by this measure.

Now, take any subject. On one occasion I had a chance to compare the syllabus in Sanskrit of one of the Indian universities with the syllabus in Sanskrit of the Oxford University. I discovered to my amazement that the standard of teaching Sanskrit at the Oxford University was more intensive and of a much higher calibre than in most of the universities in my country. I had several occasions to closely compare the standard of legal education. There is no parity. The standards virtually in every branch of knowledge in our universities are at the best superficial. That being the position, the question is, not only we have got to think of a large variety of new subjects in which education of a most intensive character is to be imparted but we have also to raise the standard of teaching in the universities. There are so many problems associated with the universities that one cannot do justice to them except by making a passing reference.

Even the universities associated with great names of vice-chancellors, syndics and members of the senate have failed—I do not blame them entirely—even in inculcating ordinary discipline. I am not aware of a single strike, I am not aware of a single incident of beating of a teacher or insulting of a principal either at Oxford or Cambridge or at any other university in the West, whereas it is a painful fact that these happenings seem to be of everyday occurrence in our colleges and universities. That being so, we have got to see that those who man our teaching staff are men of sterling character who, by

[Shri Tek Chand]

virtue not only of precept but example, can lay the standards for their pupils to follow and look up to. Therefore, I will not be satisfied if this Commission is manned by the people of the same or similar ilk—call them vice-chancellors, call them educationists, call them what you will—and if the personnel is of the same pattern, my fears are that this Commission may not even be able to achieve the small expectations which are reposed in it.

Now, so far as the composition of the Commission is concerned, it does not interest me whether it is manned by officials or by non-officials. What interests me is: are those people of the requisite calibre—intellectual and otherwise—who can give the requisite, proper guidance to the nation? What you decide in your Bill, with which I am not happy, is that you are going to have one whole-time Chairman, a salaried chairman.

**An Hon. Member:** Not whole-time.

**Shri Tek Chand:** I hear a voice that it is not whole-time. If it is whole-time, it would be better. I do not want this Commission to consist of like the directors of a joint stock company, gentlemen who meet occasionally, have a little gossip and then take their T.A. and their cheques. If you think that nine members are too many, reduce their number, but you should see that they are real gems in education, who understand their subject and are in a position to give whole-time attention to this onerous work that they are called upon to do. It is not a job where gentlemen scattered all over the country come to a place, maybe once a month or once in two months, and sitting for a few hours or a couple of days and make some sort of suggestions here, there and elsewhere. It is a whole-time job. You may have half a dozen, or five or four men, but whatever the personnel may be, men of sterling worth who can devote to this most important subject their unstinted study and attention should be chosen. Therefore, my

feeling is that this Commission will be in a position to discharge its onerous duties far better if it were manned by people who can examine the problem without any consideration of time. It is a whole-time job and a whole day job.

Coming to the clauses of the Bill, you know that some emphasis has been no doubt laid by some of the hon. Members who have spoken, on the question of language. Will it surprise you to know that our languages have been neglected? Not only is the study of regional languages not being thoroughly examined and thoroughly appreciated, but even the study of foreign languages is neglected. I do not mind at all if you exclude from your subjects, the French and German languages. Do not teach those languages if you have not got the proper staff, but I have a serious objection as to how you can certify persons as having passed Intermediate or B.A., or whatever it is, in French language, when those pupils know next to nothing about it. Yet, they masquerade as graduates in French from an Indian university. What I say of French applies virtually to any other foreign language as well.

Apart from languages, there is one important matter to which I wish to invite the close attention of the House. Recently, there was a Royal Commission otherwise known as the Asquith Commission appointed in England. They made certain recommendations regarding the imparting of education in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. I certainly am surprised and I dare say most of us will also be surprised that they laid a special emphasis that all higher educational institutions in that country should make it a point that teaching in the following subjects should be imparted with a certain amount of thoroughness because they are new subjects. For instance, the subjects are: ballistics, meteorology, aerial flights, sound range, short wave study, non-linear equations, reactor engineering, medical appliances.

atomic energy, radiological physics, etc.—subjects virtually unknown to any of the universities in our country. With regard to rural universities or universities which should specialise in imparting education which should be of great advantage for people living in rural areas, the subjects suggested are: soil improvement engineering, water control engineering, food processing, rural arts and crafts mineral processing, etc. These are new subjects but they are very important subjects. Some sort of arrangements ought to be made at the earliest, to see that, if not in every university at least in some, these new subjects are introduced and taught.

With respect to certain aspects of the Bill, I shall make particular reference to clause 12. I find that the provisions of clause 12 are insufficient and far from being clear. For instance, in clause 12(c), what is stated is that the Commission may advise universities upon certain measures. Then, there is sub-clause (g) which empowers the Commission to collect information; but it does not seem that it can disseminate that information unless such information is asked for. I hope my hon. friend, the Parliamentary Secretary will examine the language of this sub-clause (g) which reads as follows:

“(g) collect information on all such matters relating to University education in India and other countries as it thinks fit and make the same available to any University, if such information is asked for;” etc.

That is to say, it is going to be a repository of information, but it cannot disseminate that information. Here is valuable information, but it must be disseminated, if it is to be useful.

Then again, you will find that the powers given are of an illusory character and the Commission will ultimately find that it cannot enforce its recommendations, because its capacity is advisory, and the only function is that in certain cases, it

can withhold the grant that is supposed to be given. That being the case, my fears are that there is going to be a three-cornered conflict as it were between the State Government, the Commission and the particular university. I wish that the Commission in a country like ours where the level of education is not what it ought to be, should have plenary powers, whereby it can examine matters as an expert. Also, whatever valuable information it gathers, it should be able to place it before all the universities and see that they follow it up. It is then and then alone that it will be able to act in an effective manner.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** I welcome this Bill. It is a step, a very small step and a very cautious and halting step. But all the same, it makes an improvement on the existing state of affairs. I want to ask one question of the Education Ministry: Why is it not that the Education Ministry takes charge of the education of the people of India at all levels? Why is it that in name it leaves education to the custodianship of State Governments, but in actual practice, it wants to have some kind of control over every level of education. If you look at the annual reports of the Education Ministry, you will find that there is a Committee for Basic Education, a Council for Rural Education, a Committee for Technical Education, an All-India Council for Secondary Education, Inter-University Board, Central Board of Education and so on. Why are you multiplying all these committees and councils? You are doing so only because you think that the State Governments need your advice, guidance and encouragement. They need money from also and that is why you are multiplying these committees and councils. I ask: Why do you exert this indirect pressure, this indirect control, over education? Why don't you take up the spread of education at all levels yourself? This is the question I want to ask of the Education Ministry.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

I have read histories of many countries. I have read histories of those countries which have undergone revolutions and I have also read the history of those countries which have undergone a kind of silent revolution. What does the history of those countries teach us? It teaches us that education is priority No. 1 in the shaping of the destiny of any country. Even when Hitler was bombarding England there was nothing which that Government did and that was to pass the (Butler) Education Act. Even then they thought that the most positive achievement of a nation was the system of education. What are we doing here? We are tinkering with education here and there; we are playing with it. We are not trying to be serious about it. That is something of which I cannot be proud. Here is this University Grants Commission Bill. What are these universities? Look at the educational map of India; there are some universities under the direct control of the Centre. I would say they are the "favoured nation universities"—I want to use another word, but I want to be parliamentary in my language. Then, there are unitary universities like the universities in Lucknow and Allahabad and then there are affiliating universities. I ask my friend, Dr. M. M. Das, who is piloting this Bill, "what hopes does this Bill give to the universities which are of the affiliating type?" There are 4 universities administered by the Centre and 2 universities which are unitary; the rest are affiliating universities. What will you give them? Most of the money will go to the Central universities; the remaining will go to unitary universities and whatever is left over will be doled out in a niggardly way to the affiliating universities, in the same way in which we dole out money to poor beggars. That is what is going to happen. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you also come from the State of Punjab. We have the honour to come from that State. There are so many colleges there which are running at

a deficit and they do not know what to do. These private bodies are the backbone of our universities and they do not have money. There is nothing like affiliated colleges in this Bill at all. After all, the affiliated colleges are by far the largest in number, but that name has been omitted. This Bill does not give any hope to the large number of colleges that are affiliated to the universities.

I now come to teachers. Of course, anybody can say anything about teachers. This Parliament is a floor for discussion; you can throw out any number of charges against teachers, forgetting that you are also a product of these teachers. I read this morning that a deputation of college teachers went to the Director of Public Instruction at Chandigarh. I have been in touch with the teachers in universities and also other teachers. I know there are some persons in the Education Ministry who are violently fighting for the cause of teachers—I do not want to mention their names. But I want to put one question: What hope are you giving by passing this University Grants Commission Bill to the university teachers and teachers in the affiliated colleges? They are looking forward to this Bill eagerly; they have been asking us about it. But no hope is there for them.

4 P.M.

Then, people talk about indiscipline of students and all that. I would not talk like that. If half a dozen students misbehave, it does not mean that all our students are bad.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

You cannot call all the students by the same name. If there are certain persons in the jails in the cities, we do not say that all the Indians are criminals. If certain students do not come up to our standards of rectitude and our discipline, it does not mean that all our students have gone wrong. Certainly not. While you are blaming the students about lack of discipline, while you are holding seminars for discussing indiscipline,

have you enquired into the causes of this indiscipline? My hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, who is an illustrious Vice-Chancellor of a University in India has told you that the students do not have playgrounds. But, he does not know that there are places where, not to speak of playgrounds, students cannot afford to buy books and exercise books. We are talking of Oxford and Cambridge. I have not been lucky enough to go to Oxford. Therefore, I can talk of Oxford with a greater detachment than the persons who have been there. At Oxford, you have the system of assisted students. I was told, I speak subject to correction, that about 80 per cent of the students at Oxford are assisted students. They get money from the State to prosecute their studies. Look at this Bill. There is no provision for any such thing. I wish to submit that you should have stated here, we shall give grants to the Universities, to their constituent colleges, to their affiliated colleges and to all these things. What does the word 'promotion' mean? Will my hon. friend Dr. M. M. Das go to a public meeting and tell them what 'promotion' means? Can I do so? You should have made this word as explicit as possible. That is why I say that this University Grants Commissions Bill, as was pointed out by my hon. friend over there who made a maiden speech, is, in some ways a misnomer. My hon. friend Dr. M. M. Das said yesterday that we have reduced the Commission to a Consultative Committee. I agree with him. Therefore I say, why call a good thing by a bad name? Why call it a Commission? Why do you give it such a honorific and dignified name when its functions are not commensurate with the high name that you have given it? Therefore I say, when the rules are being made—there is plenty of scope for rules in this Bill—the interests of the affiliated colleges and students should be looked into and something should be done for them.

Some persons have been talking about regional languages. That is

very good. We all want the development of regional languages. Who told you that we are not for the development of regional languages? Some persons have been talking about Sanskrit. Shri Tek Chand spoke about certain new subjects. I think the University Grants Commission should not follow the stereotyped pattern of education. The University Grants Commission should not give grants only for those subjects which are already there. They may need encouragement. It should give grants in consonance with the needs of India today and with the needs of India tomorrow. What are the needs of India? Of course, you will say, I am talking like a war-monger. Certainly not. We need to study thermodynamics, nuclear physics, etc. You need these things in the context of the modern age. I do not see any reason why, when you are allocating grants, you should not take into consideration these subjects. Give as much money as you like to humanities, to the development of languages, to regional languages. I say, you should not shut your eyes to the fact that we are living in the atomic age. The basis of the atomic age has to be laid in the study of certain departments of science which are very vital.

Much has been said about national purpose. I do not know why some people feel unhappy when it is said that all other things should be subordinated to a national purpose. People say, I do not understand what is meant by national purpose. Anybody understands what a national purpose is. I do not know what the people have in their minds when they say that the term 'national purpose' should be made more explicit. By national purposes we mean only one thing and it is this. Where there is a conflict between regionalism and national interests, our national interests will have precedence.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** How will you define national interests?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** You are sitting over there. If you are sitting nearer, I would be able to define with greater

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

advantage to you. Anyhow, you are not interested.

National purpose means, raising the knowledge potential of our nation, raising the judgment potential of our nation, raising the scientific potential of our nation, raising the research potential of our nation. This is what I mean by national purpose. I think that if anybody has any doubt, I cannot educate him more than I have done.

About the formation of this Commission, a friend of mine just now said that the Commission is going to be a departmental affair. I have not the slightest doubt about it. The Chairman need not be a whole-timer. The Vice-Chancellors will come and go and more often, they will find it very difficult to meet. These five distinguished persons who would be nominated will be members of 20 other committees. What will happen? I have no grouse against the department. The department is doing very good work. As has already been said, this Commission should consist of those persons who are persons of enlightenment, culture and learning, who have the national interests at heart and who can devote their whole time to this work as Shri Tek Chand pointed out. You cannot play with this important nation-building work. I would therefore say that this Commission should consist of a few whole-time workers. At the same time, I would say that this Commission should be assisted by a large number of persons who could be called a consultative body. There are so many subjects. After all, these persons will take only executive decisions. This Commission should have the benefit of specialised knowledge. That specialised knowledge should come from a panel of experts. Our Planning Commission has so many panels. In the same manner, this Commission should have a panel of experts in medicine, engineering, humanities, regional languages, Sanskrit and all that. Unless this is done, the Commission will only be an

executive body which will have very little time to discuss things and which will find it difficult to adjust things properly. Therefore, I would say that this is a welcome step.

I know this Bill will be passed as it is. All the same, I would say that by being a Member of this House I have come to believe in one thing. And it is this, that after we have passed one Bill, we bring in an amendment after three months, and that amendment is an improvement on the original Bill. I hope and I pray that this great Bill should have an amendment very, very soon, after six months or eight months, and that within the lifetime of this Parliament itself I should go home after seeing two amendments of this Bill so that this Bill can become as noteworthy, as comprehensive and as all-inclusive in the interests of our nation as possible.

**Shri Veeraswamy** (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of submission. In view of the importance of this Bill and the fact that only a few Members have spoken on this Bill, & several members who desire to speak have not got chances may I suggest that the time for general discussion may be extended? I have not had a chance to speak.

**Mr. Chairman:** That he may submit tomorrow when the Speaker will be here. That can be decided with the consent of the House.

**Shri Nand Lal Sharma:** Will you kindly direct your eye to the right side also?

**Mr. Chairman:** Members will wait patiently.

**Shrimati Jayashri** (Bombay—Suburban): I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee. The Bill aims to help universities in imparting the right type of education to our people.

The universities are meant to fulfil three objects—giving knowledge, research and character-building. I give

more importance to the third aspect, and for this I agree with the previous speaker, Shri Tek Chand, who complained about the calibre of our teachers. Even the other day, Dr. Zakir Hussain while he was presiding at one of the conferences pleaded for a higher salary for teachers and also said that respect should be shown to them as this is an important factor in the erection of a fine national edifice. We know that the universities at present, due to financial difficulties, are unable to maintain the high standards for which we have pleaded in this report. This is putting the cart before the horse. If we insist on higher standards, we should support these institutions, we should nurture these institutions. Some of these institutions are still in their childhood I should say, especially those which are trying to give a different kind of education that will benefit the women. Such institutions require to be helped. I know that in our five-year plan we have not definitely made any reference to a separate kind of education for women, but every one realises the significance of the problem of women's education in the special circumstances of our country today and the need for adopting special devices for solving that problem. The general purpose and objective of women's education cannot, of course, be different from the purpose and objective of men's education. In either case the aim ought to be to release the physical, intellectual and spiritual energies of those who are being educated. It is partly an end in itself because it is only then that there is full scope for the development of individual personalities and for each person to become the best that he is capable of becoming. It is also partly a means for the development of society as a whole as it will enable each individual man and woman to contribute the best which he or she can contribute for the all-round progress of the country. Here again I will support Shri Tek Chand when he said that in our report we have said nothing about launching a programme. We have mentioned

about the various functions of the Commission, but there should be a personnel, as he said, who should launch such programmes to suit the circumstances in our country.

We have said in clause 12(c) that one of the functions of the Commission will be to

"recommend to any University the measures necessary for the... improvement of University education and advise the University upon the action to be taken for the purpose of implementing such recommendation;"

I strongly appeal to the Minister that for this purpose at least we should include one woman as a member of the Commission. Under clause 5 there are to be nine members out of which I hope that at least one woman educationist would be included because, as I said before, though the problems of men's and women's education do not differ much, still in the present circumstances we require a different kind of education for women.

We have got a few colleges and universities which are trying to give this kind of education. For instance, there is here in Delhi the Lady Irwin College which is trying to give lessons in home science education to girls, as also on nutrition, child development, home management, food, clothing and other things which is useful to girls. Similarly, in the Baroda University also there is a home science institution. In Bombay we have got the Natubhai Damodar University specially meant for women which is trying to give this kind of education to women. But the difficulty with all these colleges is to have the proper kind of equipment, the proper kind of teachers who will fulfil the aims of giving this education. In the institution that I mentioned in Bombay we have tried to approach the Government. We said that we are trying to have this kind of curriculum. The difficulty we found was finance. We were short of funds for having proper professors for subjects as also space because we require for home



[Shrimati Jayashri]

management a small place where the girls can be taught how to manage their homes and also for child development we require a small institution of children where a woman can do practical work. All these difficulties come in the way of giving this kind of education. I know that at present the Government of India are trying to encourage home science. They require women to go round the villages and to help village women by giving guidance and education in home science. That is why I would request the hon. Minister to see that there is at least one woman on the Commission who will understand the problems of women and will be able to help in the work of guiding and inspecting the women's institutions. When the grants are given, you will be able to do more justice, if there is a woman member on the Commission. So, I sincerely hope that the hon. Minister will accept the amendment that I have tabled in this respect.

I have nothing more to say. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

**Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak):** In all these problems that we are discussing now and trying to solve, I expect that the University Grants Commission has a significant contribution to make. I therefore expect that this Bill has been brought forward with a specific purpose, and that purpose is this. We have got the First Five Year Plan; now nearly half or three-quarters of it are over; and we are on the eve of the Second Five Year Plan. Today, the social and economic needs of the country are totally different from what they were in 1948 when the University Education Commission sat and made their recommendations. Though it has not been mentioned in the Bill itself, yet, so far as I can make out, the purpose of this Bill is to have a group of people who will guide the universities and tell them what the top priorities are, what the needs are, what type of education is the crying and urgent need of the day, and what is the money available for the different purposes. That is

how I have been trying to understand it. It may be that I am wrong. I hope the hon. Minister will correct me here if I am wrong. Only two days ago, a man who should know something about university senates told me that the grants set apart for education in the Second Five Year have been slashed down from Rs. 1,600 crores to Rs. 1,400 crores.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** From Rs. 1,000 crores to Rs. 400 crores.

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** All right. I thought it was from Rs. 1,600 crores.

Thought it has not been put in so many words in the Bill itself, yet as I understand it, the aim and object of this Bill is to lay down the priorities in regard to education. Unfortunately, I have to confess that our university administrations are inherently and essentially conservative. They do not change or keep pace in their outlook as to organisation and the type of education, as rapidly as the social and economic conditions change. We saw that after the first world war in Europe, and we have seen that after the second world war also. These highly centralised, or shall we say, highly situated, and highly autonomous bodies do not understand the urgent needs of this country and do not perceive how they have changed. It is therefore for Government to draw their attention to it and tell them, "look here, this is what we need; our Second Five Year Plan requires so many thousand technicians", and so on. The funny part of it was that when certain States were discussing the targets for the Second Five Year Plan, they put down the targets for everything; but they completely forgot about the training of the necessary personnel. Somebody had to remind them, "gentlemen, you are going to have this, you are going to have that and so on, but what about the personnel?" Then, they said, "Oh, yes we had forgotten all about it". That is where the University Grants Commission comes in. And I hope that that is the idea behind your Commission.

If you look at the composition of the University Grants Commission in Britain, you will find that it has got nothing to do with the Education Department there. It is a wise thing that they have done. It deals directly with the Treasury. It is a sort of gentlemen's agreement between them. And their budgets are prepared for a period of five years, so that it gives the universities time to plan out their programme for a period of five years. Further, there is no Government audit there, as has been provided for in our country.

The composition of their Commission is also different from ours. There are no vice-chancellors in their Commission. Most of its members are active professors, who are working whole time. I do not understand the big idea that is always brought forward here saying that we should have part-time men. I say that part-time men would not do. The men on the Commission have plenty of work to do, and they have to hold full responsibility. I do not understand this miserliness of not spending a few rupees more and having more efficiency by that.

We have had the misfortune and tragedy already of the Industrial Finance Corporation where we had a part-time chairman with no responsibility whatsoever. We want for the University Grants Commission full-time men, who will be able to make a complete study of the whole problem. In England, there are about 16 members in the Commission. Shri H. N. Mukerjæ wanted to have one more. You can make it one more or two more. It makes no difference to me. But I say that there is a specific function which they have got to fulfil. They are supposed to be a body of experts in their respective fields. Our country is a big country, and it has got so many big problems before it. So, part-time men cannot face these things at all. If part-time men are appointed, then the whole thing will go into the hands of some silly bureaucrat, who will simply place the matter before them for signature at some quarterly or half-yearly meet-

ing. To my regret, I must say that the same malady is there in almost every department.

Every department here is so bureaucratized, that it does not see the changes in the situation. Of course, I can only speak about the faculty of medicine. There is such a lot of tomfoolery going on about the curriculum for medical education with the result that it is of no value to a person who wants to become a practical doctor, because it is all academic. We should find a sort of synthesis between academic ideals on the one side and the strict necessities of the situation on the other.

As far as I could make out, in China, they have been able to effect that synthesis. They have got there what they call the academic universities on the one side, to produce teachers for the specific purpose of further educating the people; and, on the other, they have got what they call the People's Universities to meet the urgent need for practical men. I feel that that is a very good ideal for us. It is for the University Grants Commission here to evolve what is urgently necessary. Academic ideals by themselves are wonderful things, but there is no use having learned idiots who do not know the urgent necessities of the situation.

For instance, I see no purpose in having a double graduate as a bus conductor or a bus driver. The difficulty today is that we are having a lot of educated unemployed, with the result that men who are first class men academically are forced to make a living, as in Travancore-Cochin, as bus conductors or as bus drivers. This sort of problem has not arisen in China.

It is for the University Grants Commission, as much as for the Planning Commission, to lay down what are the priorities, what are the things that we want, what is the technical know-how that we want and so on. These experts that we have, the university men, the technicians, the medical men, the engineers and so on can only tell

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

us the know-how but not the know-what. The know-what is what this Commission should tell us, and for this purpose, they should have overall powers in the matter. I have repeatedly stressed that the greatest tragedy of India is that we have got a Planning Commission which has no overall powers but only recommendatory powers. It is absurd. The time has gone now for having recommendatory powers. They should have full powers and they should take full responsibility. If the views of the administration are more antediluvian than those of the university gentlemen who are sitting in the ivory towers, then God help you, God help the university, and God help the country.

My complaint is that this bureaucratism is there not only in the university administration, but it is there to a greater extent in the Ministries, as far as I know them.

They do not seem to understand that elasticity is urgently needed for understanding our situation. They are tied up with British manuals of procedure, British concepts and British ideas. All that should have gone long ago. Only recently—a few days ago—a Universities delegation went to China and came back. Let the Ministry ask them what is their opinion, how we can apply this elasticity of thinking, elasticity of organisation. After all, the fate of India is to be decided in the next ten years, and in those ten years it is essential so that we know how to adapt ourselves. Academic ideals can remain. I too have a great desire for academic ideals, but I am not prepared to sacrifice the essential needs of the country now. And for that I am prepared to give the Commission full powers, to tell the Universities: 'We want this, we want that; we will give you money'. This is how I am looking at it. I do not make a big tapeworm of casuistry out of it. Let us look at the facts of this country today. Thousands of young men are wanting a job. Thousands of young men are not

trained for the job. And in the next three years you will require thousands of men for a new type of education, rural and technical, which today no University knows anything about. We have to tell the Commission: 'We want you to find out ways and means. We will give you money'. This is how I am looking at it. I am not worried about this talk about academic freedom. It is all relative. Today what the country wants is a definite plan, and if the Ministries cannot do it, then what are they there for? That is what I want. I am prepared to give my wholehearted support for a Commission composed entirely of full timers. Part-time members, part-time lecturers, part-time directors, part-time Vice-Chancellors—we do not want all that. They must be held responsible to deliver the goods within a specified time.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore):** What about part-time Ministers?

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** This is how I look at the situation. This is how I look at the problem, and I am not prepared to have long debates on nothing at all.

श्री नन्दलाल शर्मा :

शारदा शारदाम्भोज

वदनाम्बुजे ।

सर्वदा सर्वदाऽस्माकं

सन्धिषि सन्धिषि क्रियात् ॥

विश्वविद्यालय प्रनुदान आयोग के सम्बन्ध में यह विधेयक हमारे सामने उपस्थित है । मैं यह विश्वासपूर्वक कह सकता हूँ कि यह आयोग वही आयोग तो है नहीं जिस के लिये डा० राधाकृष्णन आयोग ने मांग की थी । उनका उद्देश्य जहाँ तक मेरे ध्यान में आता है और जहाँ तक मैं समझ पाया हूँ यह था कि ऐसा आयोग बनाया जाव जो देश के अन्दर से चुने हुये शिक्षा विशेषज्ञ जो कि देश की परिस्थितियों का अनुभव रखते हों देश की शिक्षा के आदर्शों को

अनुभव करते हों, ताकि वह प्रत्येक विश्व-विद्यालय के शिक्षा स्तर को उठाने का प्रयत्न कर सके और उस आयोग के पास पूर्ण बल हो, पूर्ण शक्ति हो ताकि वह सभी स्तरों को ऊंचा उठाने में प्रयत्नशील हो सके। जो भी भाषण यहां पर हुये हैं और जिस तरह के विचार यहां पर व्यक्त किये गये हैं और जैसा कि अभी हमारे जयसूर्य साहब कह भी चुके हैं उन से यही बात निकलती है कि समय समय पर और थोड़े काल के लिये केवल मीटिंग्स एटेंड करने (बैठकों में उपस्थित होने) और एलाउंस (भत्ता) अपनी जेब में डाल लेने वाले व्यक्ति कभी भी यह नहीं कर सकते हैं और देश की शिक्षा को एक और नहीं ले जा सकते हैं।

क्षमा करें, मैं देखता हूं कि यहां पर हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री मौलाना आजाद उपस्थित नहीं हैं और उन्होंने अपने पार्लियामेंटरी सचिव को हमारे सामने अवश्य ही खड़ा कर दिया है और—

डा० सुरेश चन्द्र : डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब भी तो हैं।

श्री नन्ध लाल शर्मा : मैं यह नहीं कहता कि वह नहीं है लेकिन मैं तो यह कहता हूं कि बिल जिन को सौंप दिया गया है वह डा० एम० एम० दास हैं। मुझे स्मरण है कि जब हम उन से बात करते हैं तो वह यह उत्तर देते हैं कि संसद् के सम्बन्ध में जो कार्रवाई होती है वही मैं कर देता हूं और किसी कार्य से मेरा सम्बन्ध नहीं है। मैं इस लिये निवेदन कर रहा हूं कि यूनिवर्सिटी (विश्वविद्यालय) अनुदान आयोग के सम्बन्ध में हम जो भी अपने विचार प्रकट करते हैं उन विचारों को कार्यरूप में परिणत करने का जो अधिकार रखते हैं, इसमें कोई परिवर्तन करने का या संशोधन करने का अधिकार रखते हैं और यह कहने का कि मैं इन इन संशोधनों को स्वीकार कर सकता

हूं और इन इन को मैं स्वीकार नहीं कर सकता, उन्हीं को है।

अभी प्रोफेसर डी० सी० शर्मा साहब ने संकेत किया था और मैं इस संकेत में तथ्य भी देखता हूं और वह था कि केन्द्र चाहता है कि किसी प्रकार से प्रान्त इस विषय पर अपना अधिकार जमाये। इस अधिकार के जमाने के अतिरिक्त और कोई उद्देश्य मुझे नहीं दीखता। लाभ का अग्र प्रश्न होता तब तो कितने ही प्रकार के सदस्य इस आयोग में लिये जा सकते थे और आयोग के जो अधिकार हैं, कर्तव्य हैं वह भी इस प्रकार के कर्तव्यों से भिन्न प्रकार के बनाये जा सकते थे, जिस से हमारे उद्देश्य को वास्तविक लाभ पहुंच सकता। अभी हमारे सामने यह विषय उपस्थित है कि वर्तमान युग के अन्दर जिन विषयों की आवश्यकता है वह हैं अणु बम, आणविक शिक्षा जो उत्पादन के कार्यों में हमारी उन्नति कर सके, उसके लिये उसका कैसे प्रयोग किया जाये, और वायुयानों के निर्माण के सम्बन्ध में क्या कुछ किया जाना चाहिये। मैं तो और कहता हूं कि जो हमारे मेडिकल (चिकित्सा) विषय हैं, जो चिकित्सा पद्धतियां हैं, उनमें आप आयुर्वेदिक पद्धति का गला घोट रहे हैं और लोगों के आसू पोंछने के लिये आप यह कहते हैं कि आयुर्वेदिक अनुसंधान शालायें खोली गई हैं लेकिन वास्तव में आप आयुर्वेद के ऊपर एलोपैथी को लाद रहे हैं। आप आयुर्वेद के काम को ऐसे व्यक्तियों के हाथ में देने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं जो इसके सिद्धान्तों को जानने वाले नहीं हैं। ऐसी परिस्थिति में . . . . .

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The scope of the Bill, as it has emerged from the Joint Committee, is very limited. The hon. Member can touch on the provisions as they have emerged from the Joint Committee. This is not in the nature of a general discussion. So far as the educational system in general is concerned, that is not a point of view which the hon.

[Mr. Chairman]

Member can press today. It is confined to the provisions of the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee.

**Shri Nand Lal Sharma:** I beg pardon of the Chair. I am referring to the powers and duties of the Commission, and I also request the House to take into consideration the fact that Ayurveda also requires encouragement at the hands of the University Grants Commission.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is that precluded by the Bill?

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** How is it relevant?

**श्री नन्द लाल शर्मा :** That ought to be included. मेरा आयुर्वेद के सम्बन्ध में भाषण देने का कोई प्रश्न नहीं है। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ आप और कई तरह के अनुसंधान कार्यों को अपने हाथ में ले रहे हैं आणविक शक्ति के सम्बन्ध में अनुसन्धान कर रहे हैं, वहाँ पर आपको आयुर्वेदिक अनुसन्धान को भी अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये था और उस पर विचार करना चाहिये था।

साथ साथ मेरा यह भी विश्वास है कि हमारे बड़े बड़े नेता कुछ ऐसे हैं जिन्होंने सौभाग्य से या दुर्भाग्य से विदेशों से अपनी राष्ट्र भक्ति सीखी है। यह तो ऐसी ही बात है कि जैसे कोई इंग्लैंड का व्यक्ति यदि कहे कि :

“England rules the air, England rules the waves.”

तो उनको भी ध्यान आता है कि हमें भी कहना चाहिये कि हम भी संसार के ऊपर शासन करेंगे। इसी प्रकार से यदि कोई रूस का नेता आकर हमको हिन्दी के प्रति प्रेम सिखावे तभी हमें अपनी राष्ट्र भाषा के प्रति प्रेम करने का आभास होता है। परन्तु स्वयं हम राष्ट्रभाषा का गला घोटने के लिये तैयार हैं। मेरा विश्वास है कि हिन्दी

और संस्कृत पढ़ाने की पद्धति भारत की वास्तविक राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा पद्धति है जिसको कि नेशनल परपज सर्व करने वाली पद्धति के नाम से पुकारा जा सकता है। यदि आपको नेशनल परपज को सर्व करना है तो आपको पूर्णतः संस्कृत और हिन्दी के लिये एक अलग मंत्रालय बनाना पड़ेगा, लेकिन यदि ऐसी ही प्रगति रही तो १५ वर्ष में तो क्या आप अगले ५० वर्ष में भी हिन्दी को राष्ट्र-भाषा के वास्तविक स्तर पर नहीं पहुँचा सकते।

आयोग के बारे में जो कुछ कहा गया है वह पर्याप्त है। मैं नहीं चाहता कि उस सम्बन्ध में और कुछ कहूँ। परन्तु मैं इतना चाहता हूँ कि इस आयोग का कार्य केवल विश्वविद्यालयों के स्वातन्त्र्य में और कार्य-प्रणाली में हस्तक्षेप करना मात्र ही न रहे। इसका यह कार्य हो कि वह उनको नये नये मार्ग खोजने के लिये प्रोत्साहित करता रहे और हिन्दी और संस्कृत को और दूसरे राष्ट्रीय विषयों की उन्नति करने में सहायक हो।

एक बात म और देखता हूँ। आपने नक्षत्र शास्त्र में यानी एस्ट्रानामी में अपने विश्वविद्यालयों की बहुत उन्नति की है। परन्तु आपने एस्ट्रालाजी यानी ज्योतिष शास्त्र की तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया है। आपके यहाँ इस विषय की कुछ वेधशालायें बनी हुई हैं। आपने उनके बारे में कोई अनुसंधान करने की चेष्टा नहीं करते बल्कि उनको निकम्मा समझ कर फेंक देने की चेष्टा करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह राष्ट्र के लिये सब से बड़ी घातक चीज होगी। इस पर भी आपको विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये।

इसी के साथ साथ एक चीज और ध्यान देने की है। आप भी यह अनुभव करते होंगे कि यह देश बहुत काल से धनवान नहीं रहा है। इसमें कुछ एक धनाढ्य लोग ऐसे जरूर थे जिन्होंने धार्मिक अथवा

पारमार्थिक बुद्धि से कुछ शिक्षण संस्थाएँ खोल रखी थीं उनको चलाते थे और उनको पूर्ण बल प्रदान करते थे। आज जब हम समाजवादी ढांचा बना रहे हैं तो सारे का सारा व्यापार और सारी की सारी शक्तियाँ सरकार के हाथ में केन्द्रित होती जा रही हैं। यदि इसका दलनीकरण नहीं है तो आपको संस्कृत शिक्षणालयों के लिये और हिन्दी शिक्षणालयों के लिये जो कि आपकी शुद्ध राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा पद्धति का ब्रह्मचर्य आश्रमों द्वारा अनुसरण कर रही है सहायता की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये। उनकी ओर आपने किसी प्रकार का ध्यान नहीं दिया है। मैंने इस विषय में दो एक बार शिक्षा मंत्रालय को प्रश्न भी भेजे पर कोई उत्तर नहीं मिला। आज आप यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन बिल (विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग विधेयक) के अनुसार उन संस्थाओं को जो साठ साठ और सौ सौ वर्षों से अपने स्नातकों को उपाधियाँ वितरित करती आयी हैं और जिनके स्नातक सारे राष्ट्र के सामने ही नहीं बल्कि विश्व के सामने अपनी क्षमता का प्रदर्शन कर सकते हैं और शास्त्रार्थ में किसी को भी परास्त कर सकते हैं आप उपाधियाँ देने का अधिकार नहीं दे रहे हैं क्योंकि वे आपके वरण चुम्बन नहीं कर सकती और बार बार आपके पास भिक्षा नहीं मांग सकती। इसी लिये उनको कोई अधिकार नहीं दिया गया है। ये संस्थाएँ पिछले साठ साठ और सौ सौ सालों से चली आ रही हैं और अपनी गोल्डन जूबिलियाँ (स्वर्ण जयन्तियाँ) मना चुकी हैं उनका आप गला घोट रहे हैं। आप इस बिल में एक प्राविजन रख कर राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा पद्धति को सर्वदा के लिये दबाना चाहते हैं। मुझे खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा पद्धति आज उन लोगों के हाथ में है जो कि हमारी राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा पद्धति के बारे में बहुत कम जानते हैं। यह तो मैं नहीं कहूँगा कि बिलकुल नहीं जानते। मेरा निवेदन है कि यदि आप

395 L.S.D.

हमारी राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा पद्धति को जीवित रखना चाहते हैं तो इस ओर ध्यान विशेष रूप से दें और हिन्दी और संस्कृत की जो शिक्षा प्रणाली है उस की रक्षा करें और जो ऐसी संस्थाएँ हैं जिन्होंने वास्तव में इस दिशा में देश की सेवा की है उनको मारने की चेष्टा न करें और हो सके तो उनको सहायता दें।

**Mr. Chairman:** Shri V. B. Gandhi.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** Before he begins his speech...

**Shri K. K. Basu:** His mind is in Bombay State perhaps.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** There is one genuine complaint that those Members who were on the Joint Committee have monopolised the whole show today. There must be some limit and out of the five hundred Members, if those Members of the Joint Committee are to express their views again here, then we will be left out.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South):** Yes, this is not fair, Sir.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** This is a very humble request which I make to you, Sir. You can look into the list. Shri D. C. Sharma has had his say, Shri V. B. Gandhi is going to have his say and he must be allowed to speak. They were on the Joint Committee.

**Mr. Chairman:** But Shri Nand Lal Sharma was not there.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** Shri Nand Lal Sharma is an exception.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North):** I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. The Bill before the House is a great improvement as reported by the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee has made many changes, some of them vital ones. It can be seen that the changes which the Joint Committee has made are invariably changes in favour of the universities. These changes have imposed limits on the powers of the University Grants Commission and

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

they have taken care to minimise all risk of interference in the affairs of the universities on the part of the University Grants Commission. When I say this, I do not want to give an impression that the original Bill was less than just to the universities or that it was unmindful of the rights and privileges of the universities. It was to be expected that in framing the original Bill, the Government was too occupied with making provisions for the University Grants Commission to function effectively in all contingencies. In fairness to the Government we must acknowledge that the Government has accepted all these changes made by the Joint Committee. Government has not moved any amendments which would try either to restore any of the original provisions of the Bill or to modify any of the decisions of the Joint Committee. The Education Ministry has been very graceful about it and our compliments are due to the Ministry. They have contented themselves with moving just one single amendment and that amendment too has to do with something other than any of the decisions of the Joint Committee. In all these facts there is for the universities enough assurance that their independence and their prestige are the concern not of theirs alone but of the Government as well as of this House. In the final analysis the relationship between the University Grants Commission and the universities cannot be based only on legislative provisions. There have to be other things on which to base this relationship. These other things must grow and they take time to grow. We must build up traditions and establish conventions to govern this relationship. The guarantee of university independence ultimately will come from the conviction—not that Government cannot interfere but will not interfere.

I will deal briefly with some of the important changes that the Joint Committee has made. I will refer only to two: clause (2) (f) dealing with

the definition of a university and clause (5) dealing with the composition of the Commission. The Joint Committee has widened the scope of the definition of the university and thereby a larger number of colleges have been brought in the list of colleges eligible for assistance and grants from the Commission. These colleges are going to be what are called recognised colleges—recognised on the recommendation of the universities concerned. So far, so good. But that does not complete the task of the Government or of the Commission. A very large number of affiliated colleges will still be outside that list. We all know from our experience that almost all these affiliated colleges deserve central assistance from the Commission. Their need is as great perhaps as the need of those few fortunate colleges which would be recommended by the universities as 'recognised' for receiving grants from the Commission. I only hope that the task will continue. Government will not forget these vast number of affiliated colleges.

Of course it can be said just at this time that the resources at the disposal of the Commission are not unlimited. We grant that; but, from the experience of the past few years there is every reason to hope that the resources at the disposal of the Commission will increase as they have increased in the past. In 1953-54 the Central grants amounted to Rs. 1.21 crores. The next year they amounted to Rs. 1.79 crores and in 1955-56 it is expected that they would amount to over Rs. 5 crores. I hope this progress will continue. Even at Rs. 5 crores we come to a proportion of only about 20 per cent. of the total amount of expenditure on universities in India which in 1952-53 was about Rs. 22 crores. In this connection it is interesting to remember that in the U.K., the U.K. Grants Commission disbursed an amount of assistance which forms a proportion of almost 64.5 per cent. of the total income of the U.K. universities. So, that should be our ideal.

The next change to which I would like to refer is the composition of the Commission. This composition is given in clause 5 and to my way of thinking it represents about the best solution of a difficult problem. Much criticism has been levelled against this clause on two grounds: firstly that the Commission is going to be of members appointed by Government and secondly that among the members are going to be included Government officials. It is necessary to examine these two grounds because a fear has been expressed on these two grounds that a Commission composed in this fashion will not be able to show any independence of judgment and that it is very liable to be subservient to the wishes of the Government. What are the facts?

So far as the question of nominating or appointing members by Government is concerned, I think it is not necessary for us to go further into this matter. It is enough here to state, as has been pointed out by Dr. Shrimali this morning, that the weighty support of the Radhakrishnan Commission is on the side of appointments by Government. So far as the other ground is concerned, we still seem to retain our old habit of mind in respect of what is called the official element and unofficial element in all these matters. In the context of independent India I believe we should now begin to recognise that these things have no meaning or relevancy. Take for instance, Shri Humayun Kabir. Supposing we are confronted with him as a representative on the official side, are we going to distrust him? (*Interruptions.*) Is it simply because he happens to represent the official side on the Commission? Are we going to forget that he was one of the stalwarts in the days of struggle for independence? Anyway let us examine what exactly is going to happen. Under the provision made in clause 5, at the maximum there can be only 4 official members on this Commission.

**An Hon. Member:** Where is that?

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** It is there. At the lowest it can be only two. In the case of the other two, it is clearly stated that the over-riding consideration in the selection of these two officers will be their qualifications as educationists of repute or men who have achieved high academic distinction. Here is then a Commission which is going to be presided over by a non-official Chairman. While dealing with the chairmanship, a good deal has been said about the Chairman not being a whole-timer but it should be pointed out here that even though that specific word 'whole-time' is not there, the Chairman is going to be a salaried Chairman. In all probability it is fair to expect that he will also be a whole-time Chairman. Another safeguard is there; when once they are appointed as members of the Commission, they are going to be irremovable by the Government for their full term of six years. This is an important change made by the Joint Committee. In clause 6 the wording in the original Bill was "every member shall, unless his appointment is terminated earlier by the Central Government", but the Joint Committee has changed it and said: "unless he becomes disqualified for continuing as a member"; in other words, unless he incurs one of the usual disqualifications which go with posts similar to this.

5 P.M.

Now, Sir, to imagine that a Commission of men of such high standing, either in the administrative field or in the educational field, will not be willing to exercise independent judgment or they will not have the courage of their convictions is to lose all faith in the goodness of man.

Before concluding I would just make a passing reference to sub-clause (iii) of clause 22 where....

**Mr. Chairman:** I think the hon. Member must conclude now.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** May I have some minutes tomorrow?



**Shri V. P. Nayar** (Chirayinkil):  
That he cannot say.

**Mr. Chairman:** It is better the hon. Member concludes today. He was a member of the Joint Committee. When the clauses are taken up he can have his say on the clauses. It is better that other Members are given a chance.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** I will take five minutes, Sir.

**Mr. Chairman:** In that case he may continue tomorrow.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 24th November, 1955.*