

Shrimati Renuka Ray (West Bengal : General): Mr. Vice-President, Sir, while supporting this Article, there are one or two points on which I should like some elucidation. Prof. K.T. Shah has brought forward a point which really needs to be cleared up. Part (1) of this Article says: "No religious instruction shall be provided in any educational institution wholly maintained out of state funds". There is likelihood of this being misinterpreted in the future, so as to nullify its very object. As he has pointed out even if a small donation is paid to a public school, it can be held that such a school is not wholly maintained out of State funds, and therefore denominational religious instruction may be given. I hope that when Dr. Ambedkar speaks, he will clear up this point because it is a very important one. If such interpretation can be given then it is necessary to have safeguards against it.

In this country we have seen the exploitation, and the prostitution of what we call religion and we have seen to our bitter cost what is done in the name of denominational religion. It has not only led to the dismemberment and division of our country, but it has also led to the worst horrors that could be perpetrated in the name of religion. Now, when we are building for the future, we must build in such a manner that we are able to do so untrammelled by the legacy of the past. The only real way in which this could be done is to see that the next generation are educated in such a manner that they are not actuated by motives that divide and disintegrate man from man, but that the religion of humanity is much greater to them than religious dissensions on a denominational religious basis. If that is to be so, we must be very careful, now that we are building up the Constitution for the future, that there shall not be in the fundamental rights any kind of confusion as to the kind of instruction that is to be given at least in those institution that are maintained out of public funds. If we use this word "wholly", there is likely to be this confusion that has been already pointed out and I would like to hear from Dr. Ambedkar if it is possible for him either to accept this amendment or at least to assure the House that no such interpretation will be possible in the future.

I would again urge that he should accept in particular the amendment for the deletion of Clause (3) which has been moved by Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor, because as he has pointed out there is no doubt that if this Clause remains, there is likelihood that in a certain area where there may be a small number of schools or only one school, a fight between the various denominations as to which particular type of religious instruction should be given out of school hours may ensue. Therefore, it is much better that Clause (3) be deleted from this Article.

I am sure that all those in this House and the country outside will agree with me that above all things, it is necessary that the instruction that is given to the citizens of the future shall be such that the idea of a Secular State in which all citizens are equal comes into being, and the provision for this adopted in our Constitution becomes a living reality. This can only be done if education which is the very basis on which we build our society is so imparted to the young that they do not learn to realise the distinctions which separate man and man, but rather to learn that the underlying unity of humanity is more fundamental and the basis of religion to which they must adhere.