

have been tortured. Stories are appearing.

Let the calling attention notice be admitted for tomorrow. We could bring the matters to the notice of the Government and the Government should tell us how they are going to tackle this problem. Nothing short of national intervention by Parliament is called for in this matter. I would ask the Government to take this matter seriously, discuss it with us and evolve some method of dealing with it, if necessary by changing the law of the land, investigating procedures, and so on. Let the Government lay down certain rules as to how the people should be interrogated and how they should be dealt with in police custody. This is very very important. Five dozen people have been killed in the so-called encounters in Punjab. Sir, even the ladies had been tortured and they came and told me how it all happened. Where is the remedy now? I should like to know it. Sir, I have myself been tortured in my old days in 1933 in the British lock-up but there was some limit even in those days. Now, it seems, there is no limit. These things, Sir, should now be pinned down. Such crime should not be allowed to go on unaccounted for, without the police officers being called to book and punished. I know their names; I know the names of those police officers who were responsible for it in Calcutta, who were responsible for killings and torture. Their names are well-known; the Ministers know their names; the ex-Chief Minister knew them. Everybody knows. I would request you to take this matter up. It is not a question of individual matter here or there. Kerala Government has done a good thing by starting a judicial inquiry. Why is the Andhra Pradesh Government silent? I cannot understand. Why is the West Bengal Government, now under President's Rule, silent about it? I cannot understand. What about the Punjab Government which also was responsible

for killings, particularly when the Central Minister, Mr. Badal, was in charge of the State Government at that time as the Chief Minister? All these things we would like to know. I beg of you not to pass over this matter. Let the Parliament be seized of these matters. Let our collective wisdom be brought on the subject in order to see that such a thing never happens in the country again like tortures, the third-degree methods and so-called killings in the encounters. I just mentioned about the gentleman. He was one of the finest writers of West Bengal. So, I think, Sir, you will please look into this matter and admit it.

MOTION RE. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION FOR THE YEAR 1975-76— Contd.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the Government Motion.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the discussion on the Report of the U.G.C. has come at an appropriate time. It provides to this House an opportunity to discuss the problems of higher education, especially, in the context of the fact that the universities are going to re-open in July.

Before I discuss some of the pressing problems that institutions of higher learning are likely to face, and also before I emphasise the fact that the Government must in time formulate its attitude and approach towards those problems, I would like to point out that in the field of higher education, and, in fact, in the field of education as such, there is need for a liberal approach. And it is in that context that I would like to emphasise that in education, the attitude and the approach of the Government must be

[Shri Rishi Kumar Mishra]

that let a hundred flowers bloom and let thousand of schools of thoughts contend. It is in this context that I must note with regret that after the promulgation of emergency, especially in Delhi and in certain other centres of higher learning, a large number of teachers were arrested because they pursued a particular school of thought. I take this opportunity, Sir, to place on record my unreserved condemnation of the arrest of University teachers and other academicians during the period of emergency. Fortunately, Sir, in our State of Rajasthan, a liberal approach was pursued and not a single teacher was put behind the bars or detained because of either his political activities or for his political views. While I say this, Sir, I must draw the attention of the Education Minister that counter vendetta will also not be justified and will not nullify a wrong action at an earlier stage. Therefore, it would be very unfortunate if the Janata Government pursues a policy of political vindictiveness in regard to its attitude towards institutions of higher learning. I mention this because in newspapers sometime ago there was a report attributed to the Education Minister that he was trying to get the files of all the Vice-Chancellors, that he would go into those files and take decisions or actions. Later on, I was told that it was a statement wrongly attributed to him and I welcome this retraction. But, Sir, during the last few months a climate of uncertainty and, if I may say so, a climate of intense factional warfare, a climate of fear has been spreading in institutions of higher learning. Already we see signs of disturbances erupting. The Vice-Chancellor of the Kanpur University resigned and while resigning he said: "I feel now there is no place for any honourable man to continue in such an office in view of the student unrest and inadequate protection from authorities". You are aware, Sir, that the Vice-Chancellor of the Udaipur University was beaten and

hospitalised and, as reports in newspapers have stated, some of the over-zealous and over-enthusiastic workers of the Janata Party were in the vicinity when this unfortunate incident happened. We are also aware of the facts that in Jodhpur the Vice-Chancellor had to resign, that in the Banaras University riot police and the P.A.C. had to be called, that in Delhi the Principal of a College was beaten up and the University Teachers' Association has demanded a thorough probe in the affair, which has not yet been ordered, that the Jorhat University is closed. As we look at the academic map of India and at the seats of higher learning, during the last three months there has been a sudden eruption of disturbances and it appears that unless we take steps now and in time, when the session re-opens in July, we may see many of our seats of higher learning going up in flames. The first step in this context, therefore, is that the Government must be clear in its mind on issues which are likely to arise. The Government must not do or must not act in a manner which will encourage conflict and strife. It must try to pursue a policy which will establish harmony and which will bring about a situation in which academic activities can be pursued in a climate of harmony, in a climate of academic autonomy, in a climate of discipline, which does not mean repression, which does not mean denial of democratic freedom but which definitely means that the function of the institutions of higher learning is research and teaching and not the negative "extra curricular" activities.

The higher education in our country covers a very small part of our population. Even then, its problems are of great importance because education is a critical input, both in accelerating the process of development as well as the process of social change. Since 1954-55 there has been a tremendous expansion in higher education. There were 31 Universities and 912 colleges in 1954-55 and the total number of

students in these institutions at that time was 2,60,000. This number has increased manifold in 1975-76, the period which the UGC report covers. We had 102 Universities, 9 institutions deemed to be of the level of universities and 4508 colleges. As against 2,60,000, we had 24,26,109 students in these institutions of higher learning. The UGC has the constitutional and statutory obligation to maintain, co-ordinate and improve the standards of higher education in the country, but the Government must be clear whether they want the UGC merely to be a grant-giving agency or whether they want the UGC to perform a more positive and more constructive role. If there is a confusion on this, then the functioning of the UGC will undoubtedly suffer due to lack of direction.

Of late, Sir, there has been a great emphasis on research and field work and it has been emphasised that the research must have social relevance. You are aware, Sir, that the research and more especially field work, cannot be done merely by phrasemongering or lecturing. It needs material and financial inputs. Therefore, if you curtail the financial provision—I was told that there was a suggestion, or a decision has already been taken, to cut down the allocations for the University Grants Commission by 10 per cent—then how do you reconcile the aim of encouraging socially relevant research and giving greater emphasis to field work? Unfortunately, Sir, whenever there is financial stringency, as the hon'ble Education Minister pointed out, education is the first to be axed. This attitude must be opposed and I am sure that the Education Minister, who has been taking keen interest in the basic problems of education, would fight for it. I can assure him that he will have the support of the entire House in securing for this very important and critical input of building a new nation the right place and in his effort and endeavours to secure

adequate financial allocation for development, expansion and improvement of education.

But, Sir, there is a great imbalance in disbursement of funds. It is not enough that you provide adequate funds. It is also necessary to see that there are no imbalances and disparities in the disbursement of those funds. A very, very depressing picture which emerges from a study of the profile of disbursements of these funds would be clear to you if I point out that out of 4508 colleges in our country, only 10 per cent receive any sort of assistance from the University Grants Commission. These colleges are the backbone of our higher education. Eighty-nine per cent of our students are studying in these colleges and not in the universities. If only 10 per cent of these 4500 colleges get financial assistance from the University Grants Commission, the only comment that can be made is that the Commission is making only a very marginal contribution to improvement of higher education. Therefore, Sir, this disparity has to be removed and if norms come in the way, the norms have to be changed. If the principles of matching grants have to be changed, these should be changed. The principle of matching grants enables the richer and more affluent States to provide funds and thereby secure assistance from the University Grants Commission. The States which are backward and which do not have adequate financial resources continue to suffer. Therefore, in the field of education we are making the rich, richer and the poor, poorer. This policy has to be examined and changed completely if we want higher education to improve.

Sir, the University Grants Commission points out to the role of institutions of higher learning in the promotion of adult education and continuing education. I must say, Sir, that hon'ble Dr. Pratap Chandra Chunder has brought the problem of eradication of illiteracy from our

[Shri Rishi Kumar Mishra]

country to the centre of focus. But this problem cannot be tackled unless we make it obligatory on the part of institutions of higher learning which are getting so much of our resources, that their students and teachers will have to participate in this nation-wide battle for the eradication of illiteracy. We cannot allow India to remain a country where we have 50 per cent of the illiterate people of the whole world. We cannot allow India to remain a country where 70 per cent of our people, 99 per cent of women among the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and 94 per cent of the entire population of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes are illiterate. Unless illiteracy is eradicated and India is made a completely literate country we would have not only not fulfilled our constitutional commitment but also, fail to create the basic condition for democratisation and modernisation of our society. It is a matter of shame that the commitment of universalisation of primary education made in the Constitution has not been fulfilled all these years. Therefore, apart from expansion of other adult education promotion activities, recycling of human resources, recycling of knowledge and using our students and our educated youth and our teachers should be planned. Teachers in the institutions of higher learning should not be allowed to get away with the idea that imparting literacy is *infra dig*. This fundamental task in democracy will remain incomplete and unfulfilled, the process of development will remain distorted and obscurantism will continue to rule the society unless this ban of illiteracy is abolished and, therefore, the University Grants Commission, the institutions of higher learning and the entire educational policy must evolve a strategy to deal with this problem.

I am happy, Sir, that the Ministry has decided to launch an Adult Education Year from the 2nd of October. I welcome this idea. The 2nd of

October is Gandhiji's birthday and it is an appropriate thing to celebrate it in that way. But every day is important. Two-months of summer vacation have passed. There are 24 lakhs of students in the universities. If they were made to contribute two hours a day during the summer vacation, we would have had 48 lakh man-hours every day and in sixty days we would have mobilised this human power for intensifying this. This opportunity has been allowed to be missed, unfortunately, perhaps because everyone of us thought that elections are more important than these basic constructive activities which go to make the nation.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. I have a request to make to the Education Minister. There are views on the 42nd Constitution Amendment. Many of us also think that it is necessary to re-examine many of the provisions of the 42nd Constitution Amendment. But there is one important aspect, namely, the concurrency in the field of education. On this I would request the Government, all members of the Janata Party and the Education Minister to have an open mind. This concurrency in the field of education has been achieved after a long struggle. We want to build a nation which is integrated in outlook and education is most important factor in strengthening an integrated India. Therefore, a national approach to education is necessary. It has been our experience that States, irrespective of the political party that may be in power there, have shown sometime, frightening proportions to succumb to local and regional pressures not only in terms of management of finances but also in terms of attitudes. If we have to ensure that a national outlook develops, education must remain in the concurrent field.

In the field of education we must have a four-fold approach. The approach should be: There should be an integrated planning for the whole country. There should be decentrali-

sation as far as implementation is concerned. There should be autonomy and complete freedom as far as academic activities are concerned. There should be a strict discipline as far as financial matters are concerned. If we keep there four principles in view and if we evolve an educational policy which takes care of these four aspects, we would have made a breakthrough in regard to many problems which have bogged us down in this field.

Before I conclude, Sir, there are two or three important points which I would like to make. We know that apart from the Central Universities Act there are the States Acts and there is a tendency, with the change of every Education Minister, every Education Secretary and every Education Commissioner, to make changes in the Acts. Now we must evolve a national policy. There must be a national structure for institutions of higher learning. This should be done as early as possible. May be, if you want flexibility to be there you can provide two or three models and ask the States to opt for any model that they think suits their conditions.

But *ad hoc* changes before a national policy has been evolved, before guidelines at the national level have been evolved, before you have worked on the appropriate model, must be banned completely. I welcome, Sir, the Education Minister's announcement that for the students' unions in various universities elections will take place this year.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: But in that context also a national policy has to be evolved. Do we want a system of election to the students' unions which is very expensive, which acquires all the vulgarities of elections to the Lok Sabha or the State Assemblies where candidates have to spend so much money

that they cannot do without backing from vested interests? Or, do we evolve a structure where elections will be inexpensive and where academically good students, good sportsmen or those active in national service are able to get into the structure of the students' unions? I think the Education Minister should examine this question and should try and see that we evolve a system in which the basic objective of pursuit of knowledge is also encouraged and, at the same time, democratisation is also achieved.

Lastly, Sir, I would say that in every university, as we are aware, there are factions among teachers. It is a small closed community—I say this with great apologies to Prof. V. P. Dutt—where as we are aware, there are intense rivalries for promotions, for appointments, etc. etc. and every one tries to find some political supporter or the other, and there have been occasions of shifts in loyalties. I personally know that those who were lining up before the Congress and before all those who were running the emergency during the period of the emergency, have now suddenly become great votaries of the Janata Party. Now I would request the Education Minister to see that the educational policy is not allowed to be influenced by the internal factionalism of the academic community. Moreover, besides the teachers, it is the students, and community at large which has the right to know the likely results of any changes in educational policy and schemes. If you pursue a wrong policy or adopt a wrong approach in the field of education, the results, good or bad, will be known after 15 years when a whole generation will have been harmed when neither the teachers would be there; nor the education Minister would be there. Therefore, we have to move slowly and cautiously. I would request the Education Minister, in his reply, to tell us how much money the University Grants Commission gives only to Delhi. Now, Delhi is not India. No doubt, Delhi

[Shri Rishi Kumar Mishra]
is the capital of India, but that does not mean that out of the total money it should get a lion's share. I am inclined to agree with the criticism which Shri Shyamlal Gupta made the other day. After two eminent members of the academic community, who had some vested interest in the field of education, had spoken, he was speaking as a representative of the commerce and industry of education. I know that. But there was one point that he made, namely, that in the distribution of grants of the University Grants Commission, Delhi continued to get the lion's share. I think the honourable Minister owes it to the House to lay a statement regarding this. No doubt, there are some figures given. If you look into those figures, you will find that even in the allotment of funds for books, even in the allotment of grants for equipment, in any thing, Delhi continues to be the main beneficiary and gets the lion's share and those universities which are poor in finance continue to be neglected. This disparity must end. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, other Members have said earlier that education is a field which should be above politics—partisan politics. I hope it should be possible. In fact, in democracy, in most fields, it should be possible to evolve areas of agreement and areas of disagreement. But in the field of education, which concerns nation-building, it should be possible to have a wider area of agreement. While all of us welcome the emergence of youth power, while all of us are in favour of academic freedom, the one test of the functioning of the institutes of higher education will be whether examinations are held in time, whether results are declared in time, whether Vice-Chancellors are able to run the universities without being beaten up, whether the institutions of higher learning do not become centres of problems of law and order, because the taste of the pudding lies in its eating. Therefore, this is where the educational administration will be on test. I will suggest to the honourable

Education Minister to take steps to have in-depth discussion with the state Governments, representatives of the people including the Members of Parliament and with those who are associated in some way or the other with the field of higher education and to see that it is possible to evolve an approach on all these problems where an area of agreement is found amongst political parties, amongst youth organisations, the States and the Centre. It is possible to have a wide area of agreement and only then we will be able to have a climate of harmony in the campuses and it is this which will finally be the touchstone on which the success of the administration of education in our country will be judged.

SHRI KRISHNA KRIPLANI (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is very rarely that I waste the time of this House, knowing that I have little to contribute that is worthwhile and believing that they also serve who only listen and watch. But today I am tempted to say a few words because education in our country is a neglected orphan in which politicians in general have little interest. Fortunately, the present Minister of Education is genuinely concerned with its problems and has, moreover, ears to hear, a head that thinks for itself and a conscience that will prick until he acts. Certainly, the UGC has done commendable work in the limited area of its operations, but much of its well-intentioned endeavours are bound to prove fruitless for the simple reason that it is raising a huge edifice on weak and slippery foundations. Of what avail, Sir, are gradiose schemes of promoting higher learning when the teaching at primary and secondary levels is in such a sorry and pitiful state. By the time the half-starved, ill-fed child grows up, he has lost all taste and capacity for wholesome diet educationally. That, however, is not the fault of the UGC whose concern is limited. I hope that this matter of the frail foundation of our so-called higher education will receive

attention when the education budget is before the House and it will be seriously considered if the nation does not need a parallel Grants Commission to ensure a better quality and standard of primary and secondary education all over the country.

About the performance of the UGC, Sir, I have only two or three minor comments to offer in all humility, because I am no longer in the teaching profession. One is that the UGC's emphasis on the value of acquiring a Ph.D. degree for higher grade teachers is wholly misplaced and has no relevance to the teachers capacity to teach better which is what matters. A Ph.D., Sir, is a phoney doctor the honourable doctors in this House excepted. My own experience may have been particularly unfortunate, but I have known very few Ph.Ds. who were not phoney, who had anything more than mere feathers in their intellectual equipment. A teacher's capacity to teach is to be measured by his impact on his students and his learning by the books he has published, real books which add to the knowledge and not text books to be mugged up. A mule, Sir, does not become a good steed by merely wearing an expensive harness or an expensive saddle.

My second suggestion, Sir, is that we must curtail drastically the number of seminars that are regularly held in different places involving large expenditure on air travel and entertainment. Seminars are an American fad. An affluent society can indulge in this luxury. We cannot afford to do so. I have attended some seminars, and though I have enjoyed visiting new places at other's expense and have sometimes made interesting acquaintances, though one generally runs into the same crowd, consisting mostly of pompous bores, my attendance at these seminars has not added one little bit to my knowledge.

One more small suggestion, Sir, and I have done. Too much money and time are wasted on the teaching of

English literature in our colleges and universities—English literature, not English language. I am all for improving and strengthening the teaching of English language in our schools and colleges as a necessary tool of intercommunication and as a means of sharing the rapid advancement of knowledge all over the world. English is a language which we may be said to have made our own, and though a borrowed medium, it has become as much a part of our current national heritage as is parliamentary democracy. But English or, for that matter, American or any other foreign literature, can never be truly and wholesomely assimilated in our national heritage and, therefore, the teaching of English literature as an integral part of our university curriculum has little relevance to our life or value for our intellectual and moral development. This is not to belittle the greatness of English literature, which is a world heritage and to which the modern development of our Indian languages and literatures owes a debt. But that is a different matter. In the context of our present educational needs, the study of English literature as such should no longer form a regular part, even though optional, of undergraduate or postgraduate curriculum, but should be restricted to specialised centres where, alongwith French, German, Russian and other foreign literatures, it may be studied in depth as part of a comprehensive discipline of comparative literature. As things are, it is pathetic and not unoften comic to see a learned professor expatiate on the nuances of T. S. Eliot's verse or of James Joyce's prose to students who can hardly follow the language he speaks. I have often heard professors complain that they have to paraphrase their lectures in the student's mother tongue to enable him to get an easy degree. It is a shameful farce and a waste of national talent, resources and time. Thank you.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the discussion on this Report of the Uni-

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh]

University Grants Commission provides us an opportunity, in a sense, to review the entire state of higher education in our country. Now if we look at this Report and this opportunity from this angle, then probably it is time that we were rather clear about the concept of higher education because it appears that higher education so far has contented itself in what we call a kind of bookish equipment. And, therefore, we have problems of its relevance. The question is whether whatever little higher education that we are imparting to our young men and women in our country is useful to our national development, to our social reconstruction, to the development of new and higher goals and ideals of life. Higher education, if it is to be higher in real sense, should be higher not just in terms of the quantum of knowledge but higher in terms of values, higher in terms of ideals. From this angle I feel that a new perspective is needed to be given to the entire concept of higher education. If we look at the report from this angle, the report is no doubt very comprehensive—it provides a number of new ideas, new initiatives. From this report I find the University Grants Commission has done a commendable job, in initiating a number of ideas, a number of projects. There are very attractive initiatives. But I find also that these initiatives do not go to a point where they are effective in realising some of our basic national objectives. Now it is to be seen whether UGC itself, by its own effort, can do it or it needs further support or it needs a change in its total perspective. However, I welcome some of the initiatives, particularly the reports of the panels on different subjects, where several new ideas have emerged. Now, the whole question that concerns me and that should concern all of us interested in education is that higher education is failing because it has been linked up with the needs of the industrial society. This industrial society is now almost coming to an end. Let us all

be very clear about it. Unless we are very clear about it, we do not know where we want to go and it would be very difficult to achieve the desired results. Now, this report itself says, efforts have been made to bring education more close to the developmental needs of the country, to give special attention to the needs of the underprivileged sections of the society and to make higher education more responsive to the needs of the society pledged to the ideals of socialism, secularism and democracy. I attach great importance to this declaration, particularly the words "responsive to the needs of the society". When the Commission accepts its responsibility that it has to be responsive to the needs of the society, I want to know to which society it has to be responsive. This is the crucial question. And if that is not the question, then with all the efforts made in imparting higher education, nobody knows where we can go, in which direction we can go. There should be a definition of the direction, otherwise we will not be able even to identify as to where we are going. In spite of the Kothari Commission report, in spite of several other reports—I am not pleading for any further commissions; let me make it very clear—in spite of the excellent ideas and initiatives, it has not helped us to go any further than what we were in 1964 when the Commission was appointed. Therefore, an effort would be needed from the Ministry of Education, from educationists, from the UGC, now to define the perspective of higher education. This would be my first suggestion. I think it is very crucial and important to have some kind of a dialogue on this question, as to which society in India we are wedded to. Whenever we have spoken about the needs of the society, it is always the elitist society, a few limited sections of the affluent society, to which our needs are oriented—all our technical education, even our agricultural education. Have the agricultural universities produced any identification with the poor masses of our rural areas? Have

the IITs produced any identification with what we call the technological needs of the poor farmers, the peasants, the landless labourers and the working class? Why is this happening?

AN HON. MEMBER: Is agricultural university the culprit?

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I think the hon. Member must be knowing that the agricultural university is producing graduates who are opposed to doing any farming themselves. Even a farmer's son who has graduated in our agricultural university is opposed to farming. This is the kind of training they are given. I am quoting this just as an example. I am really concerned about it. The point here is, if the higher education is not properly oriented in its basic concept as to where we want to go and which type of society we want to serve, we will perhaps continue to feed the same affluent sections by giving them more and more facilities, more and more opportunities and more and more avenues of learning and the result will be the same aristocrats will continue to dominate this country not only in the educational field, but in our public life, cultural life and political life also. I would consider this as a central theme.

Then the question arises about the 10+2+3. This is already being widely debated in the country and I do not want to add to it. I simply want to point out one thing. It is said it is an integrated system of education. Then school education is moving in one direction. Higher education is moving in another direction while nobody notices whether primary education exists or not. This is a kind of imbalance. There are barriers between the three stages—now four stages—of education including the higher secondary stage which nobody knows what it is going to be and where it is going. There is thus a tremendous confusion. But what I want to urge upon the hon. Minister for Education is this. If you throw up an idea or initiate something for

the country and pass it on to the State Governments, the universities and schools to adopt, you just cannot say: "We have recommended it, now it is for you to solve the problem arising out of it." What is happening now? As a result of this 10 plus 2 plus 3 being sincerely implemented by some States like Gujarat and Maharashtra, thousands of teachers are now in surplus. In this House the previous Education Minister had assured that there would be no surplus teachers. But the fact is that teachers are in surplus. When the system was introduced it was said that there would be no surplus. But there are surplus teachers. How is this going to be solved? The Government of India is not concerned and the UGC is not concerned with it. You expect the State Governments to solve the problem which has arisen out of the implementation of 10 plus 2 plus 3. This is not the correct attitude. If the Government of India initiates a programme or a project, it is morally, constitutionally and technically bound also to look into the problems which have arisen as a result of implementation of that programme. You say you are not for vocationalisation. You introduced 10 plus 2 plus 3 for vocationalisation. Otherwise there was no justification whatsoever. There is no point in having uniformity for the sake of uniformity. There should be uniformity only if it serves some purpose. If it does not, why should we have it? Take the case of mobility. Only one per cent of the population is mobile. The majority—99 per cent—does not move out of their villages. Are their needs to be subjected to the needs of just one per cent? The needs of just one per cent of the population do not help 99 per cent of the population who have no occasion, no opportunity to move out of their villages, districts or States. Do you want the whole system of education to be subjected to the need of 1 per cent of the population who would move out? Therefore, the point is that there are surplus teachers and the States are solving this

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh]

problem by transferring them from colleges and universities to higher secondary schools—whether you call them colleges or schools. It is basically school education, whether you attach it to colleges or schools. It is school education. That was the concept. Now what is happening? These teachers who are not equipped pedagogically to impart school education are just imposed on the schools. And, Sir, it is because they have not been able to solve the unemployment problem which we must solve. Committed as it is—the Government is committed—to solving the unemployment of everyone, it cannot and should not make any reform which will result in further unemployment. We must do this in a systematic manner. You cannot throw the people who are born in one system into another system. If under this system the people who are almost born in one system are thrown into another system, then this is the most uneducational and unsound thing, unsound solution. It is not good to do so. If for solving the problems of one system you throw a part of the system into another system, it is not a good thing and this has been my strong contention all these years. You do not solve the problem of one system by throwing a part of that system into another system. It remains in the educational system as a whole.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of funds. I see that there is a very disturbing situation so far as funds are concerned because I find that the allocation of funds for education has only declined and it has declined from 7.5 per cent in the Third Five Year Plan to 5.2 per cent in the Fourth Five Year Plan and further to 3.3 per cent in the Fifth Five Year Plan. This causes concern. On the one hand we want to expand education because education provides the opportunity to elevate the people and to have greater access not only to knowledge, but also to the material benefits of knowledge. Then, Sir, this means that the decline in the allocation of funds for the purpose of edu-

cation must deprive the poorer sections of the people of the opportunity of having access to a better life. This is how I view it and I, therefore, feel that it is high time that we in this House and the educationists outside the House urged upon the Government and the Planning Commission that a certain minimum will have to be maintained if we do not want to deny the poorer sections of our people the opportunity to a better life. This is directly linked with the question of equality of opportunity and linked with the question of elevation to a better life. I, therefore, feel that the Minister of Education has a very onerous responsibility in securing greater funds for the purpose of education.

Then, Sir, I come to the next question and it is the question of the Central Universities. As has been said by many of the honourable Members, I also do not object to a particular university being given more funds on its merit because it is an academic matter. You cannot have the same amount of excellence and you cannot have the same amount of achievement and you cannot have the same amount of funds. But what I object to here is the Central Universities receiving a huge amount because that is something very disturbing. Take, for example, a scheme to be implemented, say, a health scheme. Now, if you do not have money for introducing a particular health scheme for the teachers in all the universities, but you introduce it in certain Central Universities because the Central Government has money and the State Governments do not have the money, it would not be right. If you have money, use it in a better way. But do not create higher privileges for the Central Universities or for their staff. If under the same pattern they receive higher or greater aid (*Time bell rings*)...it does not matter. But you should not create any greater or new privileges for the Central Universities. (*Time bell rings*) Sir you know, I have toiled in this field of activity for nearly 25 years and if

you give one minute per year, then I would need 25 minutes more.

Sir, I was saying that our approach to the Central Universities must be a little different and that no higher privileges should be created. Now, I come to the question of the colleges in Delhi. I think the University Grants Commission has been unnecessarily burdened with the Delhi colleges. You do not support all the colleges in all the Union territories. But why has this been done in Delhi alone I can understand this thing for the Delhi University, but not for all the Delhi colleges. I would, therefore, suggest that they should be separated from the UGC and somebody else should look after them. Otherwise, Sir, it can very well happen that a third-rate college in Delhi would get a greater support than a first-rate college in Ahmedabad and this is a very important thing. We have now reached a stage when we must put a total moratorium on opening new colleges and we must enforce it very strictly. I do not think we need a Constitutional amendment to make Education a Concurrent Subject and even after having it, if you do not have the will to enforce your decision, you will not be able to achieve anything.

1 P.M.

I think that making education a concurrent subject is not at all a good thing. You have not done a good thing by it. On the contrary, you have created higher expectations from the State Governments. Whenever I discuss the problems of education with my State Government, they say: Education is a concurrent subject, ask the Centre. This is the meaning in the mind of the State Government. And you are not going to improve any further if you do not have a consensus, agreement and adjustment. That you can bring about whether this subject is concurrent or it is a State subject. The Kothari Commission has considered it thoroughly and said that it was not

necessary to make education a concurrent subject. I do not think it is a wise decision.

Then, there is the question about students. Sir, students problems must be attended to very carefully. And here also I feel the same way that most of the recommendations of the Kothari Commission have not been implemented. There was a particular procedure suggested by the Kothari Commission. Students' unions must be democratically elected. Their rights should not be suspended. Their suspended rights must be restored. There is a certain procedure which is conducive to the educational system which must be followed, and we should not just copy the procedures elsewhere.

Coming to the faculty improvement programmes, I differ from my respected colleague, Dr. Krishna Kripalani, that Ph.D. is an unnecessary qualification. I think that it is a necessary qualification. Here again there is a wrong concept that the teacher is meant to teach the class. It is fundamentally wrong. He is not there only to teach. He is the teacher, the researcher and an extension worker. All these three are combined. Then only it comes nearer to the teacher. It is a misleading concept that the teacher is there only to teach in the class room. It is a wrong idea that Ph.D. is not necessary. I think Ph.D. is necessary. Both for training and for extension of knowledge, I commend very strongly the Commission for having said that Ph.D. is the minimum qualification. You should not withdraw it. It is very, very important and very desirable and a very helpful measure. It will not, no doubt, change the teaching community overnight, but this measure is in the right direction. I think we should enforce it in our....

DR V. P. DUTT (Nominated): Do you want every Lecturer to have Ph.D.?

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I would say so.

DR. V. P. DUTT: I won't interrupt you. But what is the difference between a Reader, Professor and Lecturer, if everybody is Ph.D.? There must be some difference in quality.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: That would be the quality of their work and the quality of their research. That is very necessary. You are a Professor without Ph.D. That is a different thing. But that is exceptional. But Ph.D. is an instrument, an occasion and an opportunity to improve one's own knowledge and I wish strongly that we should stand by it.

Then, Sir, I do commend some of the programmes of improvement suggested by the Commission, particularly concerning libraries. I think it is an outstanding contribution of the University Grants Commission that our libraries have been enriched which, but for the U.G.C., would not have been enriched to the extent to which they are enriched today. It is the greatest contribution.

Its effort to re-structure courses with rural orientation is an effort in the right direction. But here I think it has moved very slowly. We could have moved fast. And here my contention is that it would be futile to ask the urban boys to go to the rural areas. These institutions should have experience of rural education. Rural education is not geographically rural. It is an education for rural society, an agricultural, non-industrial society and an agro society. It has to be re-structured from that point of view. It is not a question of geography. An institution in a rural area may be more urbanised than any institution in urban area if it does not have the motivation and the ideal of a rural society before it. What we need is an education wedded to a rural society. In this connection, I think that the time has come when some special forums should be created. It was a

great folly to have dissolved the National Council of Rural Higher Education. Even the limited number of 11 or 12 Institutes were doing good work. They were brought within the university system just to liquidate them. It has been a great tragedy that we do not allow some innovative institutions to exist separately. We bring them within the universities and liquidate them. Sir, I would say that we have done a great sin by liquidating these rural institutions. This is being done in the name of standards. Everybody talks about standards. I do agree that we must have the highest excellence as our goal. We cannot be satisfied with lesser things. But the excellence has to be defined not only in terms of quantitative study of books, but in terms of higher values, higher efforts of life and higher moral commitment. If all these things are not embedded in our higher education, then even the standards would be isolated and it would not lead us anywhere. There are some 4 or 5 points which I would just mention and then wind up.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Can you hold it till two o'clock?

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I will finish within 5 minutes. There are some points particularly about the developmental needs of the universities. Recently, the University Grants Commission adopted a procedure whereby only one committee was to be appointed for one State. I think it is not a correct approach. Each university has to have its own indigenous character. Otherwise it would not be a university. You can have one university being run from Delhi and all the institutions affiliated to it if there is no indigenous need and need for a single committee to appreciate the needs of universities. The earlier procedure which the University Grants Commission was following was good. Each university was having a separate visiting committee

manned by people who could understand its traditions, its indigenous character and its regional needs. I think that this has been a retrograde step. I hope the Commission would review this procedure which they have adopted, perhaps for good reasons, for the sake of greater coordination. Well, while doing something good they have sacrificed something which was very good.

Then, Sir, the admission policy still continues to be very inflexible. In spite of repeated slogans of multi-entry multi-exit system, we want ready-made goods for the university. In the universities, we are not willing to rectify and to give remedial courses. We must have everything according to certain requirements. If a student opts for Mathematics or English or History or Science or some other subject and if he had no opportunity to do these subjects earlier for some reasons and he wants to do them latter after joining the university, he would be denied admission. This is a very very wrong policy. I would draw the attention of the hon. Education Minister to the Janata Party manifesto which commits itself to a multi-entry multi-exit system. It is time that we should define this and see that this is applied everywhere.

Then, Sir, there is the question of Gandhi Bhavans. I am one who would like the Gandhian Studies to be promoted. But I would never be in agreement with anyone who would like anybody to be compelled to study it. Gandhian studies cannot be promoted by any compulsion. There are about 12 or 14 Gandhi Bhavans. The U.G.C. was good enough or generous enough to support them. But what has happened? The U.G.C. supported the Gandhi Bhavans in creating buildings and then it was left over to the universities to do whatever they liked. Gandhi Bhavans are there as empty buildings. If we create a project, we must follow it right up to the end or we should not create it. We cannot have the Central Government

say that here is one part and the rest is your responsibility. This is something which would not help us in developing education. Then, in terms of colleges, it has been said that only 10 per cent received funds. Funds are extremely limited. I am myself surprised with such limited funds, so many programmes and activities are being handled. I would not say that because you want to have more funds for other schemes we should draw from here and give there. That is a wrong approach. By cutting something and by putting somewhere, you do not grow. If we need more funds for primary and secondary education, we must find independently and not by curtailing the funds of higher education.

Then, Sir, about the rural colleges, we must pick up some of the rural colleges even, those with lesser numbers. They may be economically non-viable for the present. By giving special support to them, say about 100 colleges in the whole country, build them up for serving the rural people. It is very important to stop the exodus of the rural people to the urban areas. If we cannot do it then we will never be able to remove the frustration of the young people. The other problems that have arisen in the field of higher education....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They can be left for some other time.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I am completing, Sir. I am sorry. I am too much involved in the subject and, therefore, I need a little more time. I am sorry for the delayed lunch. I will compensate it some day.

AN HON. MEMBER: How?

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: Sir, in terms of problems, the teachers, the students and the management, all the three are at logger-heads today. When the problem of one section is

[Prof. Ramial Parikh]

attempted, the problem erupts in the other section. So, let us have a round table of all those who are concerned with education and have a solution which is acceptable to all of them. You solve the problem of pay scales of teachers, and the colleges begin to close down. We ought to take everybody together and bring about harmony in the system. And this cannot be done if you take the problems one by one. Just as teachers are important the management is important and the students are equally important, and all the three must be brought together.

Then, Sir, a word was said by our hon. Member, Dr. Z. A. Ahmad about the smaller technology. I am sorry that such an experienced man ridiculed the idea of gobar gas plant. It is only through gobar gas plant that you are going to solve your energy crisis, your fertilizer crisis. And I can say this and can bring the testimony of higher scientists if he wants that gobar gas plant is something which is the most modern and the most progressive technology. Whatever remains, after the gas, is one of the best fertilizers. I was rather very sorry that he ridiculed the idea of gobar gas plant. We have our own experience in our institutions, and gobar gas plant is not only useful in providing fuel but it also provides fertilizers and a number of other services. Then, Sir, there is one more question and it is about vacations and holidays. We must now come to a determined conclusion about these vacations and holidays. We cannot allow the time of our teachers and students just for loitering around as a matter of leisure time. It is time when we linked the vacations with the farming season so that they can work in the farms. Now, we want to have a work-oriented education, we want to have a production-oriented education. How are you going to do that? When the farming season is on, our students are brought into classes. That we must stop.

Then, Sir, the last point is that we have been trying to devote enough attention for teaching and research but paying very little attention to the extension work. It is very important that knowledge that is generated is simultaneously disseminated to the people. Otherwise, an upper Brahmin caste is bound to be generated by our educational system. It is already generating and it is dominating also. Therefore, higher education also cannot be separated from adult education, from literacy work, from rural extension service or from slum area work. And we must bring out certain integration. As regards the NSS, I find the Ministry of Education moving in one direction and the UGC unconcerned about it. There is no co-ordination between them. The UGC are, perhaps, not sure whether it is a part of higher education and they are not sure whether it is their concern. The colleges and universities consider it an extra-curricular activity to be done at sweet will with no evaluation. So, this also must be looked into.

Lastly, Sir, I would say that the Central Government should have leadership and higher initiative. The UGC must continue to play a vital role. It has come to stay now as a very crucial and important institution in our national life and we must support it fully. But we must ensure that it should not be a super university and, therefore in the name of grants or in the name of any higher initiative it should not interfere with the autonomy of the universities. From my experience the U.G.C. has been conscious of this need and this is good that it does not want to interfere in the normal working of the universities and nor does it want to act as a super body but we must ensure that it persists in this effort for all times to come because without the autonomy of the universities you will never be able to develop free education and education of a society which cherishes values of freedom.

Then, if we view the whole Report from this angle, while, on the one side, I feel that we should commend the working of the U.G.C., on the other side, I feel that there are some areas where it is finding itself inadequate and we should find ways to remove those inadequacies and see that higher education becomes really higher, really important and really becomes the centre of our development and the centre of our national planning. Thank you, Sir.

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS AND EXTENSION OF THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 13th June, 1977 allocated time as follows for Government Legislative and other Business to be taken up during the current Session of the Rajya Sabha:

Business	Time allotted
1. Consideration and passing of—	
(a) The Additional Emoluments (Compulsory Deposit) Amendment Bill, 1977 (To replace Ordinance No. 7 of 1977)	2 hours
(b) The Yoga Undertakings (Taking over of Management) Bill, 1977 (to replace Ordinance No. 8 of 1977)	1 hour
2. Discussion on the Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1975-76	Today, i.e., 13-6-1977 in addition to the time already taken.
3. General Discussion on the Railway Budget for 1977-78	3 days, 14th, 15th and 16th June 1977.
4. General Discussion on the General Budget for 1977-78	4 days, 21st, 22nd, 23rd and 24th June, 1977.
5. Consideration and return of the Appropriation Bill relating to the Demands for Grants (Railways) for 1977-78, after it has been passed by the Lok Sabha	3 hours
6. Discussion on the Resolution regarding increase in the export duty on tea and coffee.	2 hours

In order to complete the Government Business the Committee recommended that House should sit on Monday and Tuesday, the 27th and 28th June, 1977. There will be Question Hour on these two days.

The Committee also recommended that the House should sit upto 6.00 p.m. daily and beyond 6.00 p.m. as and when necessary for the transaction of Government Business.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned to meet at 2.00 p.m. today.

338 RS—5.

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

2 P.M.

The House reassembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

REFERENCE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF COMPLETE TEAM OF COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I have a submission to make. You were good enough to postpone, at the instance of our friend,