

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House now stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

MOTION RE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION FOR 1971-72—contd.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am glad that this report of the University Grants Commission is being discussed and the hon. Minister has brought this motion because last time we said that the discussions on the report should be up to date. I know how deeply he is interested in giving new shape to education in the country. I know how deeply he looked at the whole question immediately after taking over. The Minister drafted a plan for Rs. 3200 crores for education. If we want really to develop education, the education of the common man has also to be uplifted so that it becomes a vehicle for development in a new society. I will come later to what his efforts are bringing forth, how the Planning Commission and the Government is looking at the problem but now I will like to start with what the Education Commission had said while submitting its report:

"The destiny of India is now being shaped in her classrooms. This, we believe, is no mere rhetoric. In a world based on science and technology, it is education that determines the level of prosperity, welfare and security of the people. On the quality and number of persons coming out of our schools and colleges will depend our success in the great enterprise of national reconstruction whose principal objective is to raise the standard of living of our people".

Here, I would like—because we are discussing the University Grants Commission—to quote Jawaharlal Nehru who while addressing the University of Allahabad in 1947 had said. "What do the Universities do? A University stands for humanism, for tolerance, for reason, for the adventure of ideas and for the research of truth. It stands for the onward march of human race. If the Universities

discharge their duties adequately, then it is well with the nation and well with the people".

Sir, we are discussing really in the 16th year about the working of the University Grants Commission. The law was passed in 1956 and now it is 1973. When Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao was the Minister of Education, I had at that time mentioned: "It is time we see, evaluate and review the work of the University Grants Commission" and I think, as far as I remember, he seemed inclined to look at the whole problem of how the University Grants Commission has functioned. Is the University Grants Commission only a grant-giving body, recognizing Universities or those organizations which are deemed to be Universities or whether it has been able to create a new thought in the country? Whether students coming out of the Universities are fired with the idealism of a scientific spirit which is the requirement and the need of today. Sir, students go to the Universities and come out of the Universities but their future depends on what idealism, what inspiration fires them to build up a new nation or a new society. Are our students coming out with an inspiration to build up a society?

If I refer to a recent experience, I met a student in one of the mofussil towns and I asked—he was a students' union leader—"what do you want to do in life?" because he was criticizing so many things. He says: "I want to become an MLA and a Minister." "Why?" "Because it gives easy money. It gives you bungalow. It gives you car. It gives you opportunities". He was saying in the presence of the Minister, in the presence of the Collector of the district and in the presence of the officials. "Because then these officials will be obeying me and then following me in whatever I do good or bad". That was a student talking, coming out of college and he wanted to fight election for this purpose. Is this the idealism we have fired in him? Sir, this is a very serious question. I have spoken in this House. I have spoken earlier on not only the U.G.C. but while speaking on matters relating to Home or Finance. Sir, the question is this: Where are we going today? It is this University Grants Commission giving grants to Universities and these Universities are bringing out students which will build up a country and a nation.

I would like here to refer to what Gunner Myrdal said when he came to India recently. He has written a very good book "*Asian Drama*". We may agree with many things;

we may not agree with other things, what we have copied today in our whole political process. Now the process of education and social welfare in this country has been planned as the input and output ratio. When things were not going right, we said education is the most important thing. If we set right education everything in the country will be set right and so a process was started. Gunnar Myrdal says the method was the same input and output ratios. You build so many schools; you build so many Higher Secondary schools; you build so many colleges, Universities, technical colleges and students come out. But do they build up a society? No, because the basic thing is not the input and output; the basic thing is what are the ideals which are inspiring to build up a nation, to build up a society. What that student in the mofussil town told me, that is the basic thing, the motive force of the man whom we have neglected up till now.

Sir, the basic question today is, as I asked last time and I hope the Minister will kindly elaborate it in his reply, whether we are really prepared to face the situation. After 26 years we have not yet decided the type of society we want to create. I will immediately refer to your method of teaching. You teach economics in the Universities. What economics do you teach? What principles do you teach? There is economics being taught in the West, in America, Britain and France. And there is economics taught in the Soviet Union. Both are economics developed in their countries in the traditions that they have. They have their own philosophy behind economics, behind sociology, behind the political system. The Soviet Union, the socialist countries have their own philosophy. Here we talk of socialism without knowing, the type of socialism that we want to build in this country. All that our students are fired with while trying to build socialism is the idea of becoming M.L.A's, M.P.'s and Ministers and becoming corrupt people to have easy life and easy money. That is the basic question today. The basic question is: What do we want to do? What value inspires you? There it is not merely the question of money inputs and outputs as our planning and the whole process envisages. When Gandhiji aroused the nation, when the political leaders aroused the nation, they did not invest any money into the whole process. What they invested was idealism, the inspiration to build a free India and to build a society based on our traditions, on our values. That

was the basic thing. So merely investment, production of inputs and outputs do not solve the problem. What Gandhiji said in 1909 while writing in *Hind Swaraj* holds good even today that the struggle was not merely for freedom but the struggle was for the revival of Indian civilisation. I do not agree with those who say that Gandhiji was saying against industrialisation. Certainly, he was against the spirit of industrialism. It was a fight for civilisation. Now the question is whether we want to copy the West or we want to build a society based on the Indian traditions, Indian history and the Indian way of thinking. That was then the real fight. After independence, I am sorry, we have completely forgotten that advice. That is why there is chaos today. What we have done here is, copying the West. But the strong western system of democratic functioning has not come in India. Instead of evolving our own socialist system we have copied the bureaucratic system of the socialist countries, but not the party idealism, the strong party structure based on the philosophy of Marxism and Leninism which inspires a student, which has inspired their professionals.

Sir, as I said, many times, there is a lot of talk about professional and vocational training in the Universities. There is the professional in America and Britain and the professional of a socialist society. There is the professional in Russia and China. A professional in U.S. or Britain builds up a capitalist society. A professional in Russia and China builds up a socialist society. But what does our professionals want to do? He does not know what is socialism. He is just interested in producing a paper on socialism. Mere publication of a paper on socialism is not enough. A mere talk about socialism is not enough. Do you think that socialism means food take-over. Food take-over has been done in Japan and Canada. Actually it is the ideology, the type of society you want to build that should inspire the professional and not just *ad hoc* programmes.

Yesterday Mr. Ram Sahai was talking of indiscipline in the examinations, copying etc. We have reports on indiscipline and examine reform. But how does indiscipline come in? The University Grants Commission in the concluding paragraph says:

"In recent years there have been serious disturbances in some institutions involving

[Shri Krishan Kant]

violence, clashes with the police, burning of buses and cinema houses, walk out from classrooms and examination halls. . . "

These are due to a variety of causes. Discipline comes out of inspiration, out of ideology and out of motivation. When there is no motivation, when there is no inspiration, all these acts take place in society. I would like to say that in under-developed countries or in the developing countries of Asia and Africa, the crucial factor is the political system. The political parties control the functioning of the Government, the ideology and the behaviour pattern of the political leaders. The political system inspires the students to do what they like. Unless a challenge is thrown up to the political system in India to set things right, no amount of education can set things right. I would like the hon. Minister to have an evaluation and survey conducted in the various universities. Ask the students there as to what they think is the real malady. They should bring it out in the form of a brochure. Get the honest replies of students in the mofussil towns and give them to the political leadership of the country. The malaise and malady today is not merely the responsibility of the University Grants Commission and the Minister of Education. I know he is himself inspired by idealism. He himself wants to be a teacher, can he himself solve the problem? We can think of an ideal society that we want to build out of it comes economics. Out of it comes ecology. Out of it will come the social structure and out of it will come the behaviour pattern of the student. Here in the last paragraph of the Report of the Commission, they have quoted from the Report of the Educational Commission and it says —

"... the responsibility for the situation is not unilateral—it is not merely that all the students or parents or teachers or State Governments or the political parties—but multilateral. All of them share it, together with many factors in the objective situation and no effective solution is possible unless each agency responsible for the malaise does its own duty. Some of the remedies for student unrest, therefore, go beyond the educational system."

So, when we talk about the malaise in the educational system in Parliament, in Rajya Sabha, I think we should go beyond education. The remedies lie beyond the educational system. Now, university elections are held. In Delhi

University elections were held and more than a lakh of rupees, black money was spent in the elections by the various political organisations supporting the various parties. You talk to them and they say, You spend for elections to Assemblies and Parliament and we spend it here. They copy what the political leaders do in their social and political life today. As I warned him in my letter to the Congress President, this money—politics will lead to the politics of murder. It happened in Delhi University. In the last University elections two murders took place. Those candidates who were thrown out of a running car were injured. So, what we see happening in the political system is happening in the educational system. I would like the hon. Minister not only to deal with the facts and figures relating to enrolments, etc., but also deal with the overall problem. If he cannot do it, I would request that a person like him should conduct a real survey of university students. Talk to them and get the real picture and tell the political leadership of the country what the students feel about the political system, about the political leadership and about the political parties. Wherever I have gone I have heard them saying that there is the vicious circle, viz., corrupt politicians, corrupt administration and corrupt businessmen.

That is what the students tell me. And I tell them that if they have to break this vicious circle the youth power, the student power of the country has to be galvanised. But, Sir, I am afraid the student power, as constituted today, is not in a position to throw up a political challenge to these political parties. I would like him to create a situation where the students can become a challenge to the political leaders of this country, to change their method of working, to change the mode of behaviour. And that can be done. In Thailand students did it. In Europe students did it. Students have always been in the vanguard of change in society because the future belongs to them.

Sir, may I know whether the Education Minister has discussed this thing with the various educationists? Here I have an article by Prof. V.V. John. Under the caption "The Road Not Taken" he tells a sad story of a Forgotten Revolution. When we had good relations with China an Indian delegation went to China and the Chinese Minister told our Indian delegation led by Mr. Chalapathy Rao that what Gandhiji had talked about, productive education, you have not done in India.

but they have done that in China. We have hobnobbed with the idea of basic education. We have not dived deeper in it but we are too much allured by the fascination of the West. We have forgotten the real fight of civilisations. Now the educational system is completely based on copying the Western system. Here he refers to a very interesting thing. He says that we have toyed with the idea of Janta colleges of Gandhiji. Mr. V.V. John says:

"Extending the principles of the basic programme, namely, "the close learning of the curriculum with life, the method of learning by doing, the encouragement of individual initiative and the cultivation of a sense of social responsibility" to more adult group of learners, we started what were known as janta colleges of which there are no traces left today. These were designed to train young workers in ways of improving the rural economy and the quality of life in the villages."

I would like the hon'ble Minister to tell us what happened to the janata colleges which wanted to co-ordinate the life of the student with the rural life of the people?

Sir, not only that, the U.N.E.S.C.O. in one of their booklets says that the city is the best teacher. There is no question of merely copying the old Athens. The student as he goes out the world should not be a stranger but should have the attitude of becoming one with the job and the society. Even Agricultural graduates want jobs. They do not like to take to agriculture. Should they not be really fired with the idea to build up agriculture in the society so that they can join as agricultural engineers, scientists, mechanical engineers, electrical engineers and so on? They could themselves take up a nucleus of, say, 50 villages and make agriculture modern in the area.

I was very happy when one of our Members—he is not there—Mr. Balachandra Menon, said that something can be done if we take up the challenge of building up small units of industry with cooperatives of engineers as they have done in Kerala. What is being done to inspire confidence in the student, that initiative in him and not merely produce Babus as Lord Macaulay wanted?

Sir, as I said last time, time has come when you must review the working of the University Grants Commission, whether it has been able

to build up the value system, the scientific spirit, build up a civilisation based upon ancient culture, science and technology. Let us examine whether we have been able to do that. If not, what are the basic things that are required to be brought in. While replying I would request the hon'ble Minister to touch on these points because they form part of university standards. Standards are going down. I think he himself has been very much speaking about the E.P.R., Education, Productivity and Research. Are you trying to co-ordinate the activities of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Industrial Development so that the productivity part of the education is also inculcated, that dignity of labour is infused and there is application of Gandhi's ideas? That is what you have been saying and the Education Commission has been saying.

Sir, only one point more before I end, and that is about the Birla Institute of Technology and Science. To-day's paper has published a report as to what is happening there. Here the malaise has been there for a number of years. There is no good relationship between the Director and the students because these days Directors are appointed on the advice of the I.G. of Police or of the Secretaries of Departments, not on the advice of educationists. Or they bring in educationists who have no sense of fearlessness. I do not want to go into the Education Commission's Report. They say that our educational leaders to-day do not have such fearlessness that they can say openly to the administrators or political leaders in the country what needs to be said as educationists or as economists. Such people have been made Directors. Here is this Institute, the students have lost so much faith in the Director that they wanted to talk to him only with a tape-recorder because the Director and the teachers have been making mischief. Sir, this matter was raised by Mr. Chandra Shekhar and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta yesterday. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us, when he replies, why so many good teachers are running away from there. Is it not possible for the Chairman of the UGC to go there, bring both the parties together—the Director and the management and the students—and bring about a solution there? Why should they go on a hunger strike? I hope the hon. Minister will reply to this point.

Lastly, I would like to say about the investment in education. We consider investment in education as the most important thing. The

[Shri Krishan Kant.]

hon. Minister prepared a plan of Rs. 3,200 crores. The Planning Commission slashed it down to Rs. 2,200 crores. I am afraid not much funds are being given for the development of education. I am afraid in the Fifth Plan it may be slashed down further. I would plead with the Planning Commission and the Education Minister that proper investment needs to be made not only in higher education but also in primary education and secondary education. Unless this investment is made, you cannot have a proper educational system. I hope the Minister, when he replies, will reply to all these points because this is a question of life and blood for our country. If the future of India is to be built up in the class-rooms and if the desks are broken, panes are broken and buses are burnt, the future of India will be broken to smithereens.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA (Bihar): Sir, the University Grants Commission Report shows that numerically colleges, universities, students and grants to them have been increasing, but at the same time, this numerical increase is in sharp contrast to the qualitative deterioration. I need not tell you, Sir, what is happening in the various educational campuses. That is known fairly well. It seems the UGC is satisfied with distributing grants to various colleges and universities and most probably its functions end there. I wish the UGC undertakes something more than that.

It has been recognised that the educational system is a very important instrument of bringing about socio-economic changes. It is also admitted that our old society which has been, due to various historical reasons, stagnant and backward, needs radical socio-economic changes. If this is universally admitted, that our society needs radical socio-economic changes, then should not the UGC and our Education Ministry give thought to this problem as to how the educational system should become an effective instrument to bring about the desired socio-economic changes?

Our country has accepted the aims and objects of socio-economic changes. Of course, they are very general and are, therefore, likely to be interpreted in any way and as a result of that we find chaos and confusion. But I am clear that socio-economic changes have to be in the direction of secularism, socialism and democracy. Has the UGC or the Education Ministry gone into this problem and found out how far our present educational system

serves the purpose of bringing about socio-economic changes? Unless and until our youths are ideologically prepared for secularism, socialism and democracy, how are you going to bring about the desired changes in the socio-economic system? It is here that we have some complaint to make against UGC and the Education Ministry. Are they just satisfied with distribution of grants? Even in the distribution of grants, there may be complaints that backward regions and backward or weaker sections of our society are not given as much help as they need or deserve. But that apart, the basic problem is that the whole educational system has no direction; it has no leadership and it has no orientation. That is the crux of the problem. It is going without direction; it is going without leadership and it has no proper orientation. When I talk of leadership, direction and orientation, I very clearly mean that it should be socialism, secularism and democracy. But what is happening? I shall give you some examples. There are Missionary schools. What do they teach our children? What are the books prescribed in those schools? In one of the books on Guidance Series—St. Xavier—II, page 28, there are two paragraphs. One paragraph says—here is the American society and here are American schools which serve American society and free men. Second paragraph says—here is the Soviet society and here are Soviet schools which serve the State. This is the type of propaganda—the American propaganda—being carried out through the text books taught in our schools, from where students come to colleges and universities. And to these institutions you give grants and after receiving the grants they propagate such things which go against our accepted policies and principles. Who is to look after that? Are you only distributing agencies giving grants to everybody and anything? What is the meaning of it? Have you any objectives and ideals? Not only that. You will find in many of the text books ideas contradictory to socialism, secularism and democracy. They are propagating worst type of communalism. Can't we do at least this much that unless and until those colleges and universities where such books are taught give them up, they should not be given grants?

Why can't you do some of these things? If you cannot do these things, then what is the meaning of saying that you are building a new society through out the country? You will say that the colleges are autonomous, that the universities are autonomous. Of course, they

are autonomous. But even these autonomous institutions should have some common objective. Or, should they not? I think they should have. Unless and until they fulfill these requirements, why should the UGC give them the grants? Just now, Sir, our friend referred to the case of the Piloni Institute, the BIT. It is now closed and the students are on a hunger-strike. That only shows what is happening in our educational institutions. At the moment I am not going into the merits or demerits of the case. Is it or is it not a fact that during the last two years or so the students have been demanding certain democratisation in the Institute? And, Sir, for two long years not even a reply to their various memoranda has been given by the authorities! If the authorities of the colleges and the authorities of the universities behave worse than the bureaucrats, then what will happen? Only such things will happen. Is it not a fact that our young people having acquired higher degrees in our universities do not get jobs? Now, this Institute is engaging two Americans in the name of experts. What do they do? Their work is to allot accommodation! So, for allotting accommodation in the Institute Americans are brought. This Institute serves the purpose of the Birlas in evading the Income-Tax, because it is run in the name of some Educational Foundation. These students have no voice in the matters of the Institute and when they raise their voice, only police methods are resorted to and the Government and the UGC sit tight. Even though the Institute has an autonomous status, its rules provide for the intervention of the Education Ministry. But it seems they are satisfied with distributing grants only. I hope the honourable Minister will see that steps are taken to ensure that problems are solved and the institutions are democratised and this Institute is not used as a cover for evading the Income-Tax and for having some links with some foreign agencies for any purpose whatsoever. I have my own doubts about them because they do other things also and they do espionage also.

Then, Sir, here are private colleges. It seems a new thing has started now. Private colleges are opened, especially medical colleges and a high capitation fee, twenty thousand or twenty-five thousand or third thousand rupees, is realised from those students who are admitted there. I know of two cases. One is the Pataliputra Medical College case and the other is the Ghaziabad Medical College case. Such

things are happening. Even the authorities of the Government are involved in establishing such colleges. Then what happens? These institutions are opened for the purpose of doing some other business and not for the purpose of imparting education. So the careers of these students are spoiled. Then why are you giving grants to such institutions? If you are giving grants to such institutions, then it means that you are encouraging such things, that you are encouraging profiteering and that you are encouraging commercialism in education. Then what will happen to our idealism, to our aims and objects if such things are allowed to flourish?

Then, Sir, there is a general complaint that the management in the private colleges has been turned into an instrument for furthering private interests.

And if you allow the colleges to be turned into institutions to serve group interests, then what will happen? Can you re-mould the youth in order to bring about socio-economic changes in the country? So, at least you should heed the voice of teachers and professors working in these institutions that their managements should be taken over. Why can't you do this? Of course, minority institutions will have to be exempted. They have got their constitutional safeguards. Why can't you take them over? Why can't you take over the management of these private colleges, so that colleges serve the needs of the nation and the centralised national objective, rather than serving the needs of some individuals or some sections of the society that we wish to build.

Then, Sir, there is a talk about reforming the examination system. Of course, this should be reformed. But what kinds of reforms? I hear that a system of internal assessment is being introduced. In principle, there should be a system of internal assessment. But when this principle is introduced, then in the majority of the colleges and universities, what about the teachers who are divided on communal basis, on caste basis, on preferences, like and dislikes, which will mar the careers of students? So when we try to introduce this system of internal assessment, this fact must be borne in mind, otherwise the whole purpose will be defeated—not only defeated, but particularly those tendencies you want to avoid and eradicate will flourish.

Then, Sir, in our colleges there are categories of teachers as in other administrative

[Shri Yogendra Sharma.]

departments. So in our colleges and universities also, there are various categories of teachers. The U.G.C. has done something in this respect. But the teachers are not satisfied. And rightly not satisfied.

First take the case of Demonstrators. Now, the Demonstrators have the same qualifications as Lecturers. Why should there be two categories? If both have the same qualifications, if both are appointed on the basis of same qualifications and if both of them have to do the same job—rather the Demonstrators have to do more job—why should Demonstrators be put in an inferior category? Our learned and forward-looking Prof. Nurul Hasan carries on the 'Chatur Varn' system...

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, my name has been referred to. I think the hon. Member is not aware of the fact that the U.G.C. has not recommended the existence of a fourth system and existence of Demonstrators at all—specifically about Demonstrators.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : Is it the recommendation of the U.G.C. that Demonstrators and Lecturers should be in one category?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: UGC does not want the category of Demonstrators at all.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: I want that both these should be brought into one category. Do they recommend?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: If they are qualified. The U.G.C. has from the third Plan period been saying that they were not in favour of having the category of Demonstrators.

SHRI UMASHANKER JOSHI (Nominated): Perhaps the hon. Member is referring to Demonstrators in Undergraduate colleges. Demonstrator's post in the Post-graduate departments has been abolished.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: I do not think that they have been abolished. Most probably, the University Grants Commission has recommended something. But my point is that in practice, demonstrators and teachers as two categories do exist in many of the colleges and Universities. Demonstrators, having the same qualifications and working more than the teachers are treated as an inferior category.

Why should it continue? And despite your recommendation, if it is so, why cannot you use your grantpower?

Then, Sir, something has been done to utilise the students and their training for the service of the society. For this purpose, in many Universities, a system of National Social Service has been introduced. The purpose is that the capacity and the creative power of the students should be utilised for constructive purposes. It is very good. But, I know that in the Patna University this National Social Service has been turned into communal social service. And the University Administrator of this N.S.S. is a confirmed and renowned communalist. Even then, he is continuing there, and the Central and the State Governments are giving them grants and financing them.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi): Is he a confirmed Communist or a communalist.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: He is a Jan Sanghi. He was a Jan Sangh candidate in Assembly elections.

डा० भाई महावीर: तभी आप को तकलीफ है।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा: मैं आप को बताना नहीं चाहता था, लेकिन आप ने नाम खुलवा दिया तो खोल देता हूँ। Dr. Srivastava has been appointed the University Administrator of N.S.S. Is this the purpose of N.S.S.? And in violation of all the rules, such appointments are made and nobody looks into them. (Time bell rings) I do not want to take much time. My contention is that the U.G.C. should, of course, try to distribute more grants but it should take upon itself the responsibility of giving some centralized orientation and some leadership in the direction of socialism, secularism and democracy. If it does not do that, then anybody can distribute the grants and what is the use of having such paraphernalia for distributing this grant? Thank you, sir.

SHRI P. N. BISI (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, two speakers, have spoken, especially Mr. Krishan Kant, wisely and with eloquence. Having nothing of his wisdom and eloquence I shall refer to certain insignificant, rather small matters in the functioning of the U.G.C. And another reason is that I admit that I have lost faith in big words. I have lost faith in idealism. The only faith which I still retain is on realism and I shall come to that later.

Sir, there is a scheme in the U G C called utilising the services of retired teachers. Certain categories of teachers are given, I think a sum of Rs 500 per month for a certain number of years. I think the maximum is for five years. I am a teacher. I have enjoyed that scheme. That is taken as a sort of pension.

There are certain stipulations that he should take six periods in a week, he should do some research work himself, he should conduct advanced students and so on. Practically, many of them do not do it. University does not bother. He comes at the end of the month, takes the cheque and goes merrily to his house.

There are teachers whom I should call foolish and I was one of them, who observe all the stipulations. Then there are teachers who don't deserve these scholarships or whatever it is called. Some people write U G C. Professor U G C once warned them that they are not U G C Professors. They did not deserve it. They had nothing to their credit, nothing in print to their credit. Still they enjoy the money given by the U G C.

What is the logic behind this stipulation for a period of five years? I admit that there should be a limit to this scheme but after some time knowledge ripens into wisdom and wisdom should not be barred by time. There should be some difference to select those who have done really good work, substantial work and those who have earned the reputation for scholarship should be given additional years to enjoy it. They should also be given more money. In old days one requires certain medicines, certain attendance and Rs 500 is nothing these days. I should like to ask the hon Minister to kindly take note of it.

Another thing is that the scheme for uplifting certain percentages of teachers in Universities and Colleges is unfair. Simply because one happens to be in University or College for a longer duration he should not get an advantage over others who are far more brilliant. According to the proposals all the grades should be running grades and if there are running grades, these things do not occur.

The next thing is about the recommendation of the Kothari Commission that teachers are the best persons to be Vice-Chancellors. After ten years I think this theory has been thoroughly exploded. Teachers are supposed to be scholars. I use the word "supposed". All teachers are not scholars and all scholars are not teachers.

They are not administrators. Vice-Chancellor's post is an administrative post.

Most of the teachers do not know how to administer an institution. I do not say that all these troubles in the university are because of the Vice-Chancellors, but they must take their share. It is time to reconsider whether an able administrator should not be appointed Vice-Chancellor. Once a teacher is appointed Vice-Chancellor, there is heartburning, there is house burning, there is all sorts of burning, jostling and pushing just to throw him away and to place oneself there. All these things are utterly wrong and very foolish but that is a fact.

My friend there spoke quite sensibly. I see the place of Mr Krishan Kant vacant—he is not here to receive my compliments. They have spoken nobly, wisely. But nobody knows what is the real way out. I think I know it. It may be tall talk, may be a big claim. I suggested somewhere that a bold, imaginative experiment should be made, a scheme for an experimental university run only by students. Students have a grievance that they have nothing to do with the university administration, have no voice in the university, in the syndicate, although their destiny is moulded there. So, why not throw the onus on them saying "Here is the money, here are your Letters Patent, run your own university". It was said, of course that they will appoint a non-matriculate Vice-Chancellor, just a nobody a Registrar. But, students as a community are not foolish. I have been with them all these 40 years and found that as a community they are not foolish. Just take them into confidence and throw the onus on them. That is the only way. And they will select the most competent man to be the Vice-Chancellor. Perhaps they may want our hon Education Minister to be their Chancellor and Mr Dutt to be the Vice-Chancellor. They will not ask a man like me to be their Vice-Chancellor. They will select the best teachers. At least have an experiment. You will say that it will end in a fiasco.

What is being enacted in all these universities? There are murders, stabbing, looting, arson and worse are being perpetrated. Can there be anything worse than that? There is nothing worse than the worst. So it is time to make this courageous, imaginative experiment. Let one university be run on this pattern and if it fails we can tell the students "Well, we gave you an opportunity and here is the miserable result".

[Shri P N Bis1.]

I refer to it specially I have lost faith in big words I am myself a corner of big words—that I confess. The only thing is realism. Take courage. No limited courage will do, Sir. Reckless courage must be applied. Then, perhaps, there may be a way out. Otherwise we will all be groping in the dark, coining big phrases and all these hollow ideals. (Time-bell rings) Thank you, Sir.

3 P.M.

डा० भाई महावीर श्रीमन्, यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन की रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा करते समय स्वाभाविक रूप से दो बातें हमारे सामने आती हैं। एक तो इस रिपोर्ट में आकड़े दिये गए हैं—यूनीवर्सिटीयों की बढ़ती हुई तादात, कालेजों की बढ़ती हुई संख्या और उनमें विद्या प्राप्त करने वाले छात्रों की बढ़ती हुई तादाद। स्वाभाविक रूप से उच्चतर शिक्षा के कुछ क्षेत्र हैं, जिनका जिक्र भी इस रिपोर्ट के अन्दर आया है। अनुसंधान और शिक्षा क्षेत्र में दूसरी महत्वपूर्ण बातों की ओर जो ध्यान दिया गया है, उनका भी उल्लेख रिपोर्ट में यथास्थान पर मिलता है।

हमें पता लगता है कि 10 साल के अन्दर जहाँ पहिले 1961-62 में 46 विश्वविद्यालय थे और तीन संस्थान थे, जो विश्वविद्यालय माने जाते थे (डिम्ड टू बी यूनीवर्सिटीज) मैं इसके लिए क्षमा चाहूंगा कि मैं इस बारीकी के महत्व को समझ नहीं सका। यूनीवर्सिटीज जब हैं तो फिर इस तरह के संस्थानों को रखने की क्यों जरूरत हुई, जिनको यूनीवर्सिटीज तो नहीं कहा जायेगा, लेकिन उन्हें डिम्ड टू बी यूनीवर्सिटी माना जायेगा। हो सकता है इसके लिए कोई तकनीकी कारण होगा, लेकिन मैं इस विषय में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) कौन सी है ?

डा० भाई महावीर 1971-72 में 4 ऐसी संस्थाएँ थी जिनको यूनीवर्सिटी माना गया, डिम्ड टू बी यूनीवर्सिटी माना गया।

यू० जी० सी० ऐक्ट के सेक्शन 3 के अन्दर इस तरह की व्यवस्था है और यह इस रिपोर्ट में लिखा है। महोदय, हम दौरान जब यूनिवर्सिटियों की तादाद 46 से 79 हुई, विद्यार्थियों की तादाद लगभग 10 गुना बढ़ी, तो यह मानना पड़ेगा कि प्रत्येक यूनीवर्सिटी के अधीन छात्रों की तादाद ज्यादा हो गई। रिपोर्ट में यह भी जिक्र है कि 1970-71 और 1971-72 में छात्रों की बढ़ती हुई तादाद की जो दर थी उसमें कमी आई और कमी इसलिए आई क्योंकि प्राइवेट तौर पर कैंडीडेट्स को परीक्षा देने की इजाजत कई यूनीवर्सिटीज ने देनी शुरू कर दी। इससे एक संकेत मिलता है कि बहुत से छात्र यूनीवर्सिटी शिक्षा इसलिए पाना जरूरी समझते हैं कि उनको नौकरी के लिए यूनीवर्सिटी की मनद चाहिए, यूनीवर्सिटी की डिग्री चाहिए। और अगर यूनीवर्सिटी की डिग्री न मिले, तो सरकारी और दूसरी नौकरियों

को ढूँढ़ने में वे अपने को असमर्थ पाते हैं। जहाँ पर विद्यार्थियों को परीक्षा देकर मनद प्राप्त करने का रास्ता दिखाई देता है वहाँ स्वाभाविक रूप से वे निजी तौर पर परीक्षा देने के लिए खुश हो जाते हैं।

महोदय, क्या सचमुच में शिक्षा का यही उद्देश्य है ? क्या रोटी कमाने के लिए जो नौकरी चाहता है वह नौकरी का प्रमाणपत्र अपने हाथ में लेकर दफतरो और निजी तथा सरकारी फर्मों में स्थान स्थान पर जाकर, जहाँ पर रोजगार मिलता है, उन जगहों के चक्कर काटना शुरू कर दे। यह भी एक लोभ हो सकता है कि शिक्षा प्राप्त करके आदमी उसके द्वारा अपना रोजगार प्राप्त कर सकता है लेकिन, मैं यह बात मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ इसी चीज को सबसे बड़ा उद्देश्य बनाकर किसी देश की शिक्षा प्रणाली सफल हो सकती है, या फिर हम किसी उद्देश्य को प्राप्त कर सकते हैं जिसको इस देश की सरकार ने इस देश की जनता के सामने रखा हो।

शिक्षा के और भी ऊँचे उद्देश्य हैं और जब हम उन ऊँचे उद्देश्यों को देखते हैं तब हमें लगता है कि यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन, विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग का काम केवल कुछ यूनीवर्सिटीयों की स्थापना, केवल उनको ग्रान्ट्स देना, केवल कुछ कालेजों की बढ़ती हुई तादाद का ब्यौरा रखना, हिसाब देना और फिर कुछ ऐसे सिद्धान्त तय कर लेना एकाउंटिंग के, एकाउन्टेबिलिटी के या ब्राडिट के जिनके अनुसार पैसा दिया जायेगा, इसी तक विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग का काम सीमित है यह न वह कहेंगे और न ही कोई और स्वीकार करेगा।

कुदरती तौर पर यह सवाल उठता है कि आज देश के अन्दर शिक्षा का दृश्य क्या है। मैं सोच रहा था और देख रहा था, लेकिन मुझे इसमें इस तरह का हिस्सा दिखाई नहीं दिया रिपोर्ट में जहाँ से यह मालूम हो सकता कि इस वर्ष के दौरान शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में किस तरह की परिस्थिति रही है, कितनी यूनीवर्सिटीया चली हैं, कितनी बन्द हुई हैं या यूनीवर्सिटीयों में औसत कितने दिन पढ़ाई के ऊपर खर्च हुए हैं और कितने दिन हड़तालों के अन्दर, नाकेबन्दियों के अन्दर, घरने के अन्दर, नारेबाजियों के अन्दर और किसी ब किसी तरह की राजनीतिक खींचतान के अन्दर खर्च हुए हैं, इस बात का भी कोई हिसाब हम रखते हैं या नहीं ? राजनीति से यूनिवर्सिटियों को बचाने की बात हम जरूर करते हैं, लेकिन हमारे कदम ऐसे हैं जिनके कारण राजनीति से बचने के बजाय यूनीवर्सिटीज के हर पहलू के अन्दर राजनीति बेतहाशा घुसती चली जा रही है और उसको रोकने का शायद कोई उपाय हमें दिखाई नहीं देता, चाहे वह छात्रों का क्षेत्र है, चाहे वह अध्यापकों का क्षेत्र है, चाहे वह यूनीवर्सिटीयों की एकेडेमिक संस्थाओं का क्षेत्र है। मैं कोई आलोचना की दृष्टि से नहीं कह रहा हूँ, मैं यह प्रश्न आपके सामने रख रहा हूँ।

[डा० भाई महावीर]

विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग में बहुत बड़े शिक्षा शास्त्री रहे हैं। इस देश के जो उज्ज्वलतम मस्तिष्क रहे हैं उस तरह के लोगो ने विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग की सीट्स को सुशाभित किया है। मैं आलाचना नहीं कर रहा हूँ, मैं मन्त्री जी के सामने और विवृत जनो के सामने यह प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमने इस बात का विचार किया है कि शिक्षा में जो आज स्थिति अपने देश के अन्दर हो रही है उसे दूर करने का, पूर्णतया अष्ट हो जाने से उसकी रक्षा करने का कोई उपाय है या नहीं और यदि है तो उसके लिए कोई प्रयत्न हुआ है ऐसा दिखाई नहीं देता। ठीक है हम सस्थाएँ बना रहे हैं, बिल्डिंगें बना रहे हैं, बड़े बड़े कैम्पस बन रहे हैं, लेकिन जितनी ऊँची बिल्डिंग होती जाती है, बिल्डिंग के अन्दर बैठने वाला भादमी उतना छोटा होता जाता है, जितना आकार बड़ा है, उतनी ही हृदय की भावना धुंध होती जा रही है और हम हर चीज की मापतौल छोटे, गण, महत्वहीन और निकम्मी कसौटियों के ऊपर करने लग जाते हैं कि वास्तव में किसी भी प्रगतिशील या किसी भी उन्नति की इच्छा करने वाले देश के लिए वह न केवल चिन्ता का बल्कि शर्म का भी विषय बन जाता है।

महोदय, पिछले वर्ष यूनीवर्सिटियों में जो वाइस चांसलर रहे हैं उनकी फाइल थोड़ी देर पहले देखने के लिए मैंने मगवाई। मैं सोचता था कि किसी एक-आध यूनीवर्सिटी में यह स्थिति होगी, पर किसकी बात की जाये, किसकी न की जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी यूनीवर्सिटियाँ जो इस चीज से वचो हैं वह शायद कुछ गिनती में होंगी। अब तो हालत यह है कि यूनीवर्सिटी में वाइस चांसलर का पद जहाँ पहले गौरव की बात होती थी और बहुत बड़े बड़े बुद्धिमान लोग यह समझते थे कि इससे बड़ी सम्मान की बात नहीं हो सकती, वहाँ अब यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस चांसलर के पद एबीनिंग जा रहे हैं, कोई वाइस चांसलर बनने के लिए तैयार नहीं होता। क्या यह वह स्थिति है जिसके लिए यह देश इतना रुपया खर्च कर रहा है और गरीबों की कमाई में से प्राप्त की हुई राशि को शिक्षा के ऊपर खर्च कर रहा है क्या यह स्थिति प्राप्त करने के लिए, जहाँ अधिकांश दिन पुलिस के पहरे में यूनीवर्सिटीज को चलाना पड़ा, परीक्षाएँ लेनी पड़ी और उन परीक्षाओं के अन्दर यह दृश्य हो कि नकल करना मौलिक अधिकार छात्र समझें और वहाँ उस नकल करने वाले को अगर कोई रोकता है तो यह समझा जाये कि यह रोकने वाला ऐसी सजा का मुस्तहक है, उसको ऐसा दंड मिलना चाहिए कि उसकी आने वाली पीढ़ी भी याद रखे?

यह स्थिति जो अपने शिक्षा के क्षेत्र की दिखाई देती है और मैं दुर्भाग्य से देश के ऊँचे से ऊँचे पदाधिकारियों और ऐसे ही व्यक्तियों के मुख से यह सुनता हूँ कि शिक्षा पद्धति निकम्मी है, शिक्षा पद्धति बदलनी चाहिए। जब से अंग्रेज गए, तब से हमने अपनी शिक्षा पद्धति में उचित परिवर्तन नहीं किया। प्रधान मन्त्री भी कहती हैं, शिक्षा मन्त्री भी

कहते हैं, दूसरे मन्त्री भी कहते हैं। बहुत सारे मन्त्री तो इसलिए कहते हैं क्योंकि प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने कहा है। जो उन्होंने कहा है उसको दोहराना उनका परम धर्म है। लेकिन जो ये सब बातें दोहराते हैं वे यह पूछ सकते हैं प्रधान मन्त्री से कि यह शिक्षा पद्धति बदलनी है तो कौन बदलेगा इसे, क्या विराधी दलों के लोगो से आशा रखत है कि वह इसके अन्दर परिवर्तन करेंगे या छात्रों से उम्मीद रखते हैं कि वह हाथ हाथ, मुदाबाद के तारे लगायें, तब आप उसे बदलने की सोचेंगे? कहा से प्रारम्भ होगा, कौन प्रारम्भ करेगा किस दिशा में प्रारम्भ होगा, ये प्रश्न हैं जिनका उत्तर मुझे इस रिपोर्ट में नहीं मिलता। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि रिपोर्ट अपने आप में बड़ी उचित, बड़ी मही होते हुए भी आखिर ये जो नाम हैं उनकी सज्जनता, उनकी योग्यता और उनकी विद्वता के बारे में दो मत नहीं हो सकते हैं, डा० कोठारी जैसे नाम हैं, और भी दूसरे लोग हैं, मैं भी व्यक्तिगत रूप से साचता हूँ कि बड़े योग्य लोग हैं, लेकिन वे इतनी परिस्थितियाँ के अन्दर बंधे हुए हैं, नो कहना पड़ेगा कि सचमुच सारे मामले को सुधारने के लिए कहीं न कहीं कोई कमी है और उस कमी को, उस लूप होल को, उन कसर को हम पकड़ नहीं पाये, इस तरफ ध्यान नहीं दे पाये।

मैं दो तीन बातों की तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मेरे मित्र चले गए, सांप्रदायिकता के खिलाफ झंडा बुलन्द करके। लेकिन सांप्रदायिकता का उनको उदाहरण कहा मिला? पटना में कहीं एक व्यक्ति की नियुक्ति में। इनको यह नहीं दिखाई दिया कि अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी में सुधार के वास्ते जो एक माननीय नुरुल हसन लाये थे उसका क्या हुआ। अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी में उनको भी कड़वा घूट पीकर यह कहना पड़ा कि उनमें मुस्लिम मेजारिटी कम नहीं की जाएगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर शिक्षा मन्त्री यह आश्वासन देकर वहाँ की किसी समस्या को हल करने की कोशिश करते हैं तो वह चुनाव के लिए भले ही कुछ वोट प्राप्त करने में सफल हो जायें—उसमें भी मुझे सन्देह है क्योंकि मुस्लिम समाज के अन्दर भी ऐसे लोग हैं जो इस तरह की चिकनी चुपड़ी, लीपापोती की तह में जाकर उनके वक्तावे में आ जायें—लेकिन एथीरस देकर वह किसी सवाल का हल करने वाले हैं तो सेक्यूलरिज्म जिसके लिए मेरे मित्र बहुत ऊँचे ऊँचे स्तर से मांग कर रहे थे, वह क्या करने वाले हैं इस समस्या के हल के लिए?

श्री नवल किशोर (उत्तर प्रदेश) आ गए हैं।

डा० भाई महावीर आ गए हैं तो बहुत अच्छा है। उनके लिए मैं दो चार शब्द कह रहा था वह सुन लेंगे।

क्या सेक्यूलरिज्म का यह मतलब रहेगा कि मुस्लिम सस्था में उनकी ही मेजारिटी हो और सेक्यूलरिज्म का झंडा फिर भी बुलन्द रहेगा? हम किसका धोखा दे रहे हैं, कौन हमारे धाबे में आयेगा? इन सब बातों को छोड़ कर हमारी दृष्टि में सिर्फ एक बात की तरफ उनकी नजर है कि वोटो

[डा० भाई महावीर]

की जो नकदी है वह किस तरह ज्यादा निकलती है। जिसके नाम पर ज्यादा भ्रति होती है वह देना चाहिए। हम अपनी दृष्टि को लाना चाहते हैं तो ठीक है नहीं तो मेरे मित्र श्रीर उमकी पार्टी जितने जोरों से श्रीलीगड मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी के मुस्लिम करेक्टर के संरक्षण के लिए परेशान थी, घबराई हुई थी, उसके बाद उनका यहां पर खड़े होकर सेक्यूलरिज्म की दुहाई देना, मुझे लगता है कि ये अपने डाइलेक्टिकल मीटीरियलिज्म में दो एक्सट्रीम्स को मिला सकेंगे, लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि कोई श्रीर भादमी ऐसा कर सकेगा।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा आप की पार्टी किस मीटीरियलिज्म के लिए श्रीलीगड मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी में गई थी ?

डा० भाई महावीर श्रीलीगड मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी के लिए हमारा कहना शुरू से ही यह रहा है कि आप उसको भ्रलग कसोटियों पर रखकर जब इस तरह का पक्षपात करेंगे कि सबकी की एक तरफ भ्रगर उसको दिखाई देता है कि मैं मा का सौतेला बेटा हूँ, दूसरे का यह दिखाई देता है कि मैं सोने और चादी का चम्मच लेकर पैदा हुआ हूँ तो युनीवर्सिटी ग्राट्स कमीशन श्रीलीगड मुस्लिम युनीवर्सिटी के भ्रन्दर पढ़ने वाले छात्रों के लिए ज्यादा खर्च करे और उसके सामने जो कालेज हैं उसको भ्रपेक्षित दृष्टि से देखे, यह किसी न्याय के सिद्धान्त पर आधारित नहीं है। आप इसके लिए युफेमिस्टिक कारण कुछ भी बताइये आप इसके लिए बहानेबाजी कुछ भी कीजिए, दिन के भ्रन्दर आप भी जानते हैं कि आप वहां के स्थानीय कालेजों को सम्बद्ध होने से इसलिए रोक रहे हैं ताकि श्रीलीगड युनिवर्सिटी के भ्रन्दर जो मुस्लिम बहुमत है वह बना रहे।

श्री महावीर त्यागी एलेक्शन के वास्ते ये चीजें की गई हैं, उसके बाद फिर वैसा ही हो जायेगा।

डा० भाई महावीर त्यागी जी ने जो कहा उसको मैं हमन साहब की तरफ से जवाब मानूँ या वे भ्रलग जवाब देंगे, यह मुझे पता नहीं, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद हसन साहब अपने जवाब में इस पर कुछ रोशनी डालेंगे।

महोदय, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि श्रीलीगड युनिवर्सिटी के प्रश्न पर सरकार ने बहुत कोशिश करने के बाद थोड़ी सी सुधार करने की कोशिश की थी, लेकिन वह थोड़ी सी सुधार करने की जो कोशिश थी उसमें भी दो कदम पीछे हटने में उनको मजबूर होना पड़ा। यह एक ऐसी परिस्थिति है जिसके लिए मुझे कोई श्रीचित्य नजर नहीं आता। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके लिए हसन साहब कोई बहुत खुश नहीं हैं। यहा पर तो उनको मुसकराना ही पड़ेगा और भरोसे से जवाब देना पड़ेगा, लेकिन मैं यह मानता हूँ कि उन्होंने ये जो भ्राश्वसन दिये हैं, बहुत ही दबाव में भ्रा कर के दिये हैं। यह सरकार जो झुकी है उसको पत्रों में और दूसरी जगहों में सरेडर का नाम दिया गया है। कुछ फ्यूबेस्टिक चीफटेन्स के सामने

सरकार ने किस तरह से घुटने टेके हैं, यह बात श्रीलीगड युनिवर्सिटी के सम्बन्ध में सरकार के हाल के निर्णय के कारण सिद्ध हुई है।

महोदय, बनारस युनिवर्सिटी की बात कुछ भ्रलग किस्म की है। वहा पर वाइस चांसलर साहब जिस जोर शोर से चल रहे हैं कि ऐसा लगता है कि एक स्टीम रोलर, एक बुल डोजर उनको केन्द्रीय सरकार ने दे दिया है और उनको किसी की परवाह नहीं है। वह जो आप का वादा था कि बनारस युनिवर्सिटी भ्रमेडमेंट ऐक्ट भ्रायेगा उस वादे का क्या हुआ यहा पर हम चिल्ला चिल्ला कर पूछ पूछ कर थक गए और वे भ्राश्वसन दे दे कर नहीं थके।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा आप से डरे हुए हैं।

डा० भाई महावीर हम से तो नहीं डरने। आप उनकी जड़ भ्रन्दर में कुतरते हैं और ऊपर से मीठे भी रहते हैं, इसलिए आप से भले ही डरे हों। बनारस युनिवर्सिटी के भ्रन्दर वहा के वाइस चांसलर के साभ्राज्य में कितने लड़कों को निकाला गया, कितनी गलतियाँ की गई, कितनी धाधलियाँ की गई, कहा पर एक एक नौकरी के वास्ते तीन तीन लोगों को नियुक्त किया गया, जिम का रिजल्ट नहीं निकाला था, जो पास नहीं हुआ था, उमका नियुक्त किया गया, यह कोई देखने वाला नहीं है। पता नहीं वहा रुपये की कैंसी धाधली हुई। मैं नहीं जानता कि कितनी बड़ी रकम वहा के वाइस चांसलर को ऐसी दी गई है जिस का कोई भ्रकाउन्ट देने की जरूरत नहीं, कोई हिसाब रखने की जरूरत नहीं। पता नहीं यू०जी०सी० के ग्राडीटर जा करके कभी पूछते हैं या नहीं कि उस रुपए का इस्तेमाल किस प्रकार से हुआ है, कौन उस रुपए का इस्तेमाल करता है, कैसे करता है। गलत काम भी हुए और उन गलत कामों में हमारी मित्र की पार्टी के चुने हुए गुणों जो हैं उनके पालने के वास्ते, किसी के पिता के ट्रीटमेंट के वास्ते वाइस चांसलर के स्पेशल फंड में से हजारों रुपए खर्च किये जाते हैं। यह क्या हमारे देश में लूट मची हुई है। क्या इस तरह की लूट हमारे शिक्षा मन्त्री और हमारी सरकार और हमारा युनिवर्सिटी ग्राट्स कमीशन चलने देंगे। मैं इसके पूरे तथ्य भी मौका भ्राने पर रख सकता हूँ, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि युनिवर्सिटी ग्राट्स कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर होने वाली बहस पर इस सारे मवाल का उपयुक्त मौका नहीं है। ये एक दो बातें इस वक्त मेरे ध्यान में आई थी और जो मुझे महत्वपूर्ण लगी और इस वास्ते मैं चाहूँगा कि मन्त्री जी भ्राश्वसन दें कि बनारस युनिवर्सिटी के भ्रन्दर जो एक व्यक्ति का राज्य चल रहा है और जिस व्यक्ति के राज्य के भ्रन्दर शायद सैकड़ों की तादाद में छात्रों को निकाला जा चुका है बिना कारण, बिना किसी बात के, और जिसके कारण वहा के छात्रों के भ्रन्दर भ्रसतोष भी है, उसको समाप्त किया जायेगा। आज जिस प्राध्यापक को चाहें, जिस टीचर को चाहें, जिस लेक्चरर को चाहें, वे हैड बना दें, जिस को वे चाहें डीन बना दें और जिस के अधिकारों को वे चाहें

हनन कर लें। परिणाम यह है कि यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा के एक महान केन्द्र के अन्दर ऐसा डिमारेलाइजेशन, ऐसी हतोत्साहित की स्थिति पैदा हुई है कि वास्तव में जो वहाँ कार्य होना चाहिए, वह हो नहीं सकता।

(Time bell rings)

महोदय, एक दो मिनट में मैं अपनी बात खत्म कर दूंगा।

एक बात आप ने कही अमरीकन स्कूल के बारे में या किसी और स्कूल के बारे में कि किस तरह से वहाँ दूसरे देशों का प्रचार होता है। यदि वही इस प्रकार का प्रचार करने वाली टेक्स्ट बुक चलती हैं तो उन के बारे में आप को जाब करनी चाहिए। लेकिन मेरे सामने लखनऊ के आई० टी० कालेज के प्रास्पेक्ट्स की कापी आयी जिसमें कि साफ लिखा हुआ था कि होस्टल में सिवाय क्रिश्चियन वरशिप किसी और तरह की वरशिप की इजाजत नहीं होगी। मैं नहीं जानता कि देश के अन्दर इस तरह के बन्धन लगा कर बच्चों को उन होस्टल्स में दाखिल करना क्या हम उचित समझते हैं और क्या यह हमारी सेकुलरिज्म की परिभाषा में आता है या नहीं।

श्री महावीर त्यागी यह कौन सा कालेज है ?

श्री० भाई० महावीर यह आई०टी० कालेज है लखनऊ का। यह मिशन का कालेज है और एक महत्वपूर्ण कालेज है।

महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश में शिक्षा में जिस तरह के सुधार की जरूरत है उसमें वहाँ के जो इंटर कालेज हैं उनमें अध्यापकों को तनख्वाह कम देकर रसीद ज्यादा की लेने का एक स्कैण्डल भी चलता है और इस बारे में एक मित्र मुझे बतलाने लगे। मैं कहने लगे कि मैंने अपने यहाँ एक व्यक्ति को अध्यापक नियुक्त किया और जैसे ही उसने ड्यूटी जवायन की वह कहने लगा कि कहिए तो मैं अपना इस्तीफा लिख दूँ। मेरे मित्र ने पूछा कि क्यों ? अब इसकी क्या जरूरत है तो उसने कहा कि मैं पहले भी नौकरी कर चुका हूँ और जहाँ भी मैंने नौकरी की है वह लोग पहले ही इस्तीफा बिना डेट के लिखा लेते थे ताकि जिस प्रकार वे चाहें उसको इस्तेमाल कर सकें और किसी भी दिन उस को कह सकें कि तुम्हारी नौकरी पूरी हो गई, अब तुम्हारी जरूरत नहीं है। यह स्थिति अगर अभी भी वहाँ है तो वह चिन्ता की बात है।

दिल्ली के बारे में मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता, लेकिन एक बात जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ। यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन में शायद इस तरह की एक राय बन रही है कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी ने बहुत सा पैसा खा लिया है। वह पैसा कहीं न कहीं इस्तेमाल हुआ होगा, किन्तु शब्द 'खा' लिया इस्तेमाल हुआ है। लेकिन वह पैसा दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी के किसी प्रादमी ने खाया या वाइस चांसलर ने, खाया या प्रो-वाइस-चांसलर ने खाया, जो यहाँ बैठे भी है तो यह बात उनसे पूछी जा सकती है, लेकिन दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी अगर फैलती है, बढ़ती है, इस विशाल देश की राजधानी में अच्छी शिक्षा

देने के लिए और उच्च विद्या के केन्द्र के रूप में अगर उस को कोई ग्रांट मिलती है तो वह यू०जी०सी० के नियमों को पूरा करने के बाद ही मिलती है फिर यह शिकायत क्यों कि उसने पैसा खा लिया, उस से बदला लेना चाहिए और बदला देने के लिए

प्रो० एस० नूरुस हसन यह किस ने कहा अगर यह मालूम हो जाये तो मुझे बात समझने में बड़ी आसानी होगी।

श्री० भाई० महावीर मैं आप को बता दूंगा, लेकिन यहाँ बताना अच्छा नहीं होगा। ये जो कुछ मुझे पता है वह मैं आप को जरूर बता दूंगा, परन्तु दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी और यू०जी०सी० के दरम्यान एक दीवार सी खड़ी होती नजर आ रही है और मैं नहीं समझ पाता कि ऐसी दीवार क्यों है ? यह बात सही है कि आज यू०जी०सी० में कोई खास वाइस चांसलर नहीं हैं। मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार एक या दो या तीन वाइस चांसलर यू०जी०सी० के मेम्बर होते थे, लेकिन अब शायद स्थिति ऐसी है कि कमीशन का कोई सदस्य किसी यूनिवर्सिटी का वर्किंग वाइस चांसलर नहीं है। तो क्या इसके कारण ही यह खाई पैदा होती जा रही है। लेकिन जैसी भी स्थिति हो, मैं चाहता हूँ कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी और यू०जी०सी० जिन के बीच में शायद कुछ मील का ही फासला है, अगर उनमें ताल मेल ठीक नहीं हो सकता और वास्तव में जो बहुत सी समस्याएँ हैं उनके बारे में श्री दत्त बतलायेंगे क्योंकि मैं एक मिनट में ही खत्म करना चाहता हूँ, मुझे ज्यादा इस बारे में नहीं कहना है, तो मैं नहीं जानता कि जवाहर लाल नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी के नाम की वजह से नेहरू जी का नाम इतिहास में अमर रहने वाला है या इंदिरा जी ने जो कैपसूल खड़ी की है उसके कारण उनका नाम इतिहास में अमर रहने वाला है, लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की किसी चीज के कारण किसी को अमर बनाया जा सकता है, परन्तु मुझे यह कहना है कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी की समस्या को यू०जी०सी० समझे। मुझे खेद है कि कभी कभी ऐसा मौका भी आया है कि एक बार किसी फैसले को मान लेने के बाद जवाब कुछ उल्टा, विपरीत दिया गया, फैसले के विपरीत रखा गया। तो मुझे दुर्भाग्य से कहना पड़ता है कि कभी कभी तो कमीशन के कुछ लोगों की तरफ से ऐसा रवैया दिखाई पड़ता है कि जो समस्या का हल करने वाला नहीं होता, वह समस्या को बढ़ाने वाला दिखाई देता है। यह स्थिति यदि होगी तो वह बड़ी दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण होगी क्योंकि इस स्थिति में से एक यह नतीजा निकलेगा कि हम किसी सवाल को खुद नहीं हल करते, बल्कि हम सवाल को टालते हैं या उसको उलझा देते हैं तब तक जब तक कि परिस्थिति और बिगड़ न जाय या छात्र या जनता का कोई और समुदाय उठ कर हाथ में झंडा ले कर तोड़ फोड़ न शुरू कर दे या गड़बड़ न मचाने लगे। ऐसा होने पर ही हमें लगता है कि कहीं न कहीं कोई गड़बड़ हो गयी और फिर हम उनको बुझा कर कहते हैं कि आप धरमार्थ मत, परेशानी क्या है, यह समस्या तो हल

[डा० भाई महावीर]

हो सकती है, यह हो सकती है, यह हो सकती है, लेकिन जब तक वह गरमी नहीं पैदा होती वह समस्या हल नहीं होती जब तक वह हालात पैदा नहीं किये जाते हम ऐसी इकोनामिक और टेक्निकल हालात और ऐसी इकावटें पैदा करते रहते हैं कि मानों ऐसा लगता है कि कुछ भी सुधार होने से स्पष्ट पलट आयेगी, धरती उथल पुथल हो जायेगी अगर इस तरह का कोई फैसला पहले कर दिया गया।

महोदय, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यूनिवर्सिटी के कार्य क्षेत्र में यह राय बन गई है कि अगर हम 10 बिटठ्यां भेजते हैं, 10 सिफारिशों की मांग करते हैं, 10 बातों की मांग करते हैं तो 10 में से 9 का यह जवाब आता है कि यह नहीं हो सकता, यह नहीं किया जा सकता, यह नहीं माना जा सकता। क्यों नहीं, इसका कारण बताने की कोई खास जरूरत नहीं होती। कारण मांगने की घुष्टता कर नहीं सकते कहा जाता है कि यह काम तुम्हारा नहीं, यह दुःसाहम करने की जरूरत नहीं। इसलिए महोदय, मैं चाहूंगा कि इस तरह की छोटी-छोटी गलतफहमी की दीवारों के कारण जो हमारे केन्द्र के अन्दर, दिल्ली के अन्दर, भी शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में समस्याएं पैदा कर सकती हैं उन समस्याओं को दूर करें। वास्तव में विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग का उद्देश्य है कि सारे देश में शिक्षा को शोभा प्रदान करे, उसको परिमार्जित करे, उसको सुधारे। आज हालत यह है कि कन्वोकेशन कई यूनिवर्सिटीज करती नहीं और जो करती हैं उसमें डिग्रियां लेकर फाड़ डाली जाती हैं और कह दिया जाता है कि हम इन कागज के पुजों का क्या करें। हमें नहीं चाहिए। स्थिति को बदलना होगा। यू०जी०सी० को बदल सकते हैं तो बदलें। अगर यू०जी०सी० को नहीं बदल सकते तो बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात होगी। और यह जरूर सोचना होगा कि क्या इसके बदले में कोई और संस्था की व्यवस्था की जाये। इसके बदले अगर इस दश का कल्याण नहीं हो सकता। धन्यवाद।

DR VIDYA PARKASH DUTT (Nominated): Mr Deputy Chairman, I should like to begin by acknowledging the good work done by the University Grants Commission in many ways. The University Grants Commission stepped into a situation of expanding needs and expanding demands of education from our people and from the society. It fills many needs and many gaps. It has helped provide opportunities for education, for research, for training and for various other things and it was coming forth with much needed financial assistance. The University Grants Commission has given Rs. 56.3 crores to institutes of higher education for the period 1966-74. I know that many distinguished scholars in this country have been associated with the work of the University Grants Commission and also the Univer-

sity Grants Commission has a hard working staff which has tried to do its best with the rush of developments in recent years.

[The Vice-Chairman

(Shri Yogendra Sharma) in the Chair]

But I submit to the Minister with all the humility at my command that the time has come for a pause to take stock of the situation, to take a close look at the work of the University Grants Commission so that it can get out of the stagnation with which is threatened—and I might also add stagnation which threatens many other institutions in many other places in this country. The question that I would like to ask the hon. Minister is this. We have to carefully consider whether in the change conditions in this country in the changed conditions of education and so on, the University Grants Commission is fulfilling the objectives for which it was set up. If my understanding is correct and I shall stand corrected if I am wrong—the central objectives before the University Grants Commission were to uplift our education, to provide educational leadership, to help restructure the educational system, to co-ordinate higher education in this country, to bring about uniformity or at least approximation and to set the tone and quality of education in this country. The question is: Are these objectives being well served at the present time despite all the efforts and all the very laudable efforts of the University Grants Commission?

If the University Grants Commission becomes only an agency, as there is every chance or mischance of its becoming so, of doling out only grants, assistance, money, etc., then, Sir, I am afraid, the very purpose for which we want the University Grants Commission to help these universities would be frustrated. I am afraid the University Grants Commission is getting stuck in a rut which is unfortunately the fate of so many other institutions in this country and, therefore, it is not only the University Grants Commission which needs to review its own work, but many other institutions in this country have to review their work. But certainly today, when we are discussing the Annual Report of the University Grants Commission, I should like to say that I have this misgiving and I know that my misgiving is shared perhaps even by the Members of the University Grants Commission and the misgiving is that the University Grants Commission is not acting as a pace-setter. It was meant to act as a pace-setter in our higher education

and that purpose at present is not being fulfilled despite all the work that has been done by the University Grants Commission. That was why I said that if the University Grants Commission gets bogged down merely on where to create a post of a lecturer here or of a clerk there or an academic post in some other place or of a peon at still another place and if the entire of the work the University Grants Commission starts revolving round this kind of an exercise, the University Grants Commission will then be hurting, grievously hurting itself and in the process, I am afraid, the university autonomy also would be seriously eroded. In fact, it would become a myth. I know that the university autonomy is more talked of than practised. I suggest very seriously—and I do not want merely to cavil at, to carp at, to criticise the work—to the University Grants Commission through the honourable Minister of Education that the UGC should review rigorously its own work, should rigorously review the working of the universities, should rigorously review its own programmes and the programmes of the universities. I would also suggest that the University Grants Commission should adopt a policy of giving grants to the universities and also letting the universities have discretion and freedom and autonomy to decide what they are to do within a certain broad framework, within certain limits. Certainly I think that the axe must fall there heavily and that is where the UGC must assess whether the money that is being spent by the universities, whether it is the Delhi University or the Nehru University or the Aligarh Muslim University or the Benaras University, is spent on those programmes for which the money was allotted and that money is spent in a worthwhile manner in order to have the objectives fulfilled for which the sanction was made. But even in this process do not grievously hurt the autonomy of the university. You give the grants to the universities, but let the universities have their own discretion to decide within a broad framework as to how they want to organise their own programmes and their work. Also, the University Grants Commission must give primary attention to giving a new direction to them, a point my friend, Dr Bhai Mahavir, raised, to give a new direction to education in the new situation, to bring about structural changes in our educational system in keeping with the needs of our society, not unrelated to what we want here and not unrelated to the hopes and aspirations of our society. In this connection, Mr.

Vice-Chairman, Sir I have to refer to you and I am sorry I have to mention you. You mentioned very correctly that one of the objectives of our higher education should be the establishment of a democratic, secular and progressive education and it is the function of the University Grants Commission to do some creative thinking about it, to take whatever steps are necessary, to go into this question deeply and to seek ways and means of establishing such a system of education. Therefore, Sir, the University Grants Commission must reorient its work. I want seriously to suggest something to the honourable Minister. I do not know whether the University Grants Commission has any programme or any plan or any intention of reviewing its own work.

I suggest that the University Grants Commission must seriously appraise its own work and that the entire effort now of the University Grants Commission must be to bring about a new direction to our education, keeping abreast with times, but at the same time rigorously correlating our educational needs and our educational system to the needs of our society.

I say that the University Grants Commission should concentrate on four areas which I would submit to the hon. Members.

One, I have mentioned, is the restructuring of our education. The University Grants Commission must think of new programmes, must chart out a new course for the establishment of democratic, secular, progressive education, which is related to the needs of production of work and to the needs and aspiration of our society. That is one area to which the University Grants Commission must pay attention. The University Grants Commission must reappraise and reform its own work and must ruthlessly assess the programmes that it has so far launched, many of which are very good programmes, many of which have helped the University. But the time has come now to take a new look and to embark upon new programmes which will be more in keeping with the needs of our society.

The second area to which the University Grants Commission must pay attention is the question of research and Ph.D. programmes. I know that the University Grants Commission has done a great deal of work in promoting research. But I should like to point out two or three dangerously disturbing tendencies that are developing in the country as I see it from the Report of the UGC itself. The first

[Shri Vidya Parkash Dutt]

is the question of relevance of our research to the needs of our society. Sir, I saw a news-item in one of the news-papers today about corruption in the Delhi University's laboratories. It was a very sensational kind of news. When I read through it I found that towards the end the gentleman who had written this report, the Reporter of the paper, was not really talking about corruption but he was talking about the relevance of the research that was being done to the needs of our society. That was an important point. If you do not mix it up with sensational headlines, this is a very very important point to consider. What is the purpose of the research we are taking up? What is its relation to our society? Also, what is the academic level of our Ph.D. programme? It is not a question of the Delhi University alone. I know—I have said this at many forums that the Ph.D. programmes of this country have rapidly deteriorated. It is a scandal in many Universities all over the world. And, therefore it is the function of the University Grants Commission to help establish the standards, worthwhile standards for research programme for Ph. D.,

DR BHAI MAHAVIR : I think you have had occasion to notice the report in the Times of India of today...

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : He was talking of that.

DR. VIDYA PRAKASH DUTT : In fact, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have said it at another place that the higher education of this country must not be treated on the same level as under graduate education. Unfortunately, the trend is that they are both being treated on the same level. I may also say that in the Delhi University a very small group has been working quietly on how to make research more relevant and at the same time raise the standards of our Ph. D. programme.

I hope that the Report of this Committee will come very soon and that action will be taken on it. But I should like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister and this hon. House to certain very disturbing tendencies that I see in the Report of the University Grants Commission. For instance, there is a decline in admissions in science, technology and professional subjects. And there is a growing tendency towards general education and humanities, in other words, towards an education of a kind which is not immediately relevant to our needs.

Sir, I may be permitted to mention just a couple of figures of what is happening. In 1969-70, 43.6 per cent of the total admission was in Arts; 44.3 per cent in 1970-71, and 45.2 per cent in 1971-72. And in 1969-70, 32.8 per cent of the total admission was in sciences. It has dropped down to 31.6 per cent in 1970-71 and 30.3 per cent in 1971-72. It was similar in other professional subjects. Therefore, what is happening is just the opposite of that we have been asking for, and this is a matter which the U.G.C. must attend to.

The second disturbing factor which I find in the Report of the U.G.C. is that the Commission seems to take comfort in the fact that the expenditure on staff has risen very sharply. It has risen very sharply and I think it is inevitable that it should rise. On the other hand, it is disturbing to note that the tools by which the education develops are being reduced from year to year. The UGC's expenditure on libraries, books and journals is being slashed very sharply and very appreciably. Again, Sir, I am giving some figures from the UGC Report. The UGC spent Rs. 74 lakhs in 1969-70 on books and journals for science subjects. It was Rs. 59.53 lakhs in 1970-71 and Rs. 40 lakhs in 1971-72. In arts, humanities and social sciences, the UGC gave Rs. 62.21 lakhs in 1969-70. It was cut down to Rs. 54 lakhs in 1970-71 and to Rs. 39 lakhs in 1971-72. In other words, while the UGC has necessarily spent a lot of money on additional staff, on the other hand, it has slashed down heavily the expenditure on books, journals and equipment.

Sir, I mention only two points in conclusion. I have already mentioned the three areas which the UGC must immediately address itself to. The fourth area which I would like the UGC address itself to is the question of affiliated colleges. The UGC itself has mentioned in its Report that 97 per cent of our students in Pre-University, 92 per cent in Intermediate, 96 per cent in pre-professional, 90 per cent in graduate, 49 per cent in post-graduate and 11 per cent in research courses are students of the affiliated colleges. And yet, I am not sure as to how much attention has been given to the problem of affiliated colleges. The University Grants Commission says that we should have autonomous colleges. I have no objection to it. But you cannot have autonomous colleges just because the autonomous college is producing good results. It must

be equipped physically and intellectually in order to be able to stand on its own legs

Therefore, if you want to have autonomous colleges lease create posts of high academic level. Create posts of Readers and Professors in the affiliated colleges and ensure that the selections to these posts are made in such a way that the best people are taken. Only then would you enable these colleges to stand on their own feet. Other people also have mentioned this point and I must say that the University Grants Commission itself has acknowledged the difficulties that our education is facing. One of the difficulties mentioned is extraneous factors, extraneous influences. In fact extraneous influences are now working to such an extent that practically every hon. Member of this House has raised the question as to where our education is going, where our universities are going and what is going to happen to our education. Whatever may be the demands of the various sections of the society, whatever may be the difficulties, whatever may be the solutions, the basic function of a university is that it must give, impart, good education and that the students must study and the teachers must teach. Now, if the students are not going to be allowed to study and the teachers are not going to be allowed to teach or if the students are not going to study and the teachers are not going to teach, then what is the use of spending so much national money, national funds, which could more usefully be spent in other areas? What is the use of spending all that money? Some times I am obsessed with these misgivings so much that I feel that perhaps it may be better to close down all universities for one year and then reopen the universities on some kind of a restructured basis on which there is a national consensus. I want that a national consensus should be produced and then the universities should be opened on that new basis so that we could give relevant education to our children. I know that this is not a very feasible proposition. I am also not saying that this should necessarily be done. I do believe that it is the function not only of educationists but it is a function of our leaders also, as has been pointed out by some friends. They should give their attention to this problem and see what is going to happen to our education. I certainly agree with my friend here who said that the Vice-Chancellor is as much to blame as the student leader who again is as much to blame as the teacher-politician, but

the national leaders in the final analysis have to take the responsibility for establishing certain norms by which the university would be run. Let them establish those norms and let them tell the universities and the country that this has to be done. This is how the universities have to be run and the educationists should help in the process of restructuring of the system of education.

Sir, with these words I commend to the hon. Minister and to the University Grants Commission all the work that it has done. The time has come when it must seriously reappraise its own work, embark upon new programmes, do not get into the rut which is the fate of most institutions in this country and to see that our education is related to our needs and has some relevance in the present situation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA): There are many speakers who want to speak. So, unless and until the speakers restrain themselves, it will be very difficult for everybody to speak. And, I don't want to ring the bell so often. Therefore, I will request the hon. Members to be brief.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu). Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR. We wanted to finish by 5 p.m. today. When shall we expect the reply?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA): It depends on when the debate is finished. Later the Minister will reply. Tomorrow there is a discussion on the price-rise and on petroleum and petroleum products. If tomorrow we take the whole day in the debate of petroleum and petroleum products, the reply can be day-after. It depends upon what the House decides, we have no objection. If today we are not in a position to conclude all the speakers up to 5 p.m., the discussion can be carried on today after tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA): We shall continue the proceedings till 5 P.M. and then we shall see what can be done. If it is not concluded then it will be taken up day after tomorrow.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI. Petrol discussion might catch fire and take time.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have to keep fire brigade ready

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in this report, in almost every annual report of the University Grants Commission reference is made to the same old problems that universities are facing and the whole problem of our universities is created by the enormous numbers in our universities. In the University colleges all the deterioration in standard of teaching and learning, all the indiscipline, violence, all the discontent among our students are traceable to this one fact, the fact of the enormous number in our universities. These numbers are certainly impressive—87 universities with about 2 million students, with about one lakh of teachers. They do make a great impression. But there are people who complain that for such a large country as this and for such a large population, the number of universities is small. As it is, the numbers in our universities are serious. They are a great problem and that problem has not been attacked by the University Grants Commission in an effective manner. Off and on, spokesmen on behalf of the U.G.C. have said that the number of admissions to universities, colleges, must be limited but neither the university authorities nor the University Grants Commission have done anything, have proposed any measures to limit the admissions to the universities. Large numbers have been knocking at the doors of our universities and if they are not admitted what will happen to them is the question raised. Of course, other countries have solved this problem of numbers by increasing the number of teachers, by increasing the number of hostels, by increasing the number of lecture halls, by giving other facilities and more than all these things, by opening to students who flock to these universities avenues of other kinds of technical education. At the school leaving stage there are, in other countries, like the United States of America, thousands of junior and senior technical schools, not the university engineering colleges, not the university technological institutions, but junior and senior technical schools to which those students who are not fit academically, by showing aptitude for university education, are sent. But this device, this strategy has not been followed in our country either at the state or central level. Until and unless you open these small technical schools, which will turn the millions of our unskilled labour into skilled labour, which will

provide the foremen and the chargemen that are required in our factories, you cannot solve this problem of numbers in our universities.

And so we are faced with all the problems that numbers bring about, the deterioration in education, the deterioration in the standards of teaching. There are not enough teachers for students. The ratio between teacher and students is very low in our country running up to one teacher for 15 to 20 students, so that no individual attention is possible. And faced by this problem of numbers and by the other difficulties in our Universities, the University Grants Commission has only two methods one, a negative method and the other, a positive method. The negative method consists in refusing or declining grant of money to colleges and Universities which do not observe a certain standard, which admit numbers more than they can cope with. But even this negative device of the University Grants Commission is not pursued effectively, rigorously. The University Grants Commission has all kinds of pressure put upon it to apply this negative method of controlling the admission of students to the Universities. There is a kind of prestige attached to the foundation of a University. Universities have become a State symbol like steel mills have become a State symbol in the industrial field. The ideal now in every State is to have a University in every district, one district one University. The University Grants Commission feels helpless in this matter. For instance, in the period 1947 to 1966, after 47 new Universities were established, they objected to seven of them being established. But that was only an initial objection. In course of time, the objection of the University Grants Commission was weaned out and even those seven Universities were after all established.

Then there is a positive method, *viz.*, persuasion. Persuasion has its limits. As I said, against this irresistible tendency of the students to flock, to Universities and University colleges, all the persuasion of the University Grants Commission is of no avail in prevailing upon the University colleges and the Universities to improve the standards of admission, to make the standard of admission more strict, more rigorous and to improve the standards of the libraries, laboratories, teaching equipments and so on. So, in the face of all this failure of the University Grants Commission, I am surprised at the task that has been suggested by certain Members who preceded me. One

wants the ideals of secularism, socialism and democracy to be inculcated in our colleges and in our Universities apart from the fact that socialism and secularism is not mentioned in that fundamental document, known as the Constitution of India. These things are to be preached and inculcated not in the colleges and Universities but in the country at large. Secularism and socialism may be adopted by a party no doubt, a very large party, a prestigious party but it is not the ideal of the country as a whole and, therefore, it is futile to call upon Universities and University colleges to teach them these ideals. The ideal of a University is to teach the students to learn to think, to learn to study, mental discipline, discipline of the mind, play of mind upon mind, so that all aspects of a question, may be put before the University, pros and cons of every question on socialism, on democracy and secularism and so on, so that the students should learn to think by himself, may learn to criticize, may learn to select which of these objectives he can adopt

4 P M

So it is no business of a college or a university to inculcate any ideal except the ideal of study, of devotion to work, of disciplining the mind, of training the mind so that when he comes a citizen he may be an independent impartial citizen choosing, between the different parties, choosing between the different policies that are laid before him

With regard to the working of the University Grants Commission, with regard to the improvement of its working, I have more than once suggested that the portfolio system should be introduced among the members of the University Grants Commission. Each member should be allotted a special task, finance to one man, hostels and amenities to another and so on. No doubt the University Grants Commission sends periodical visiting committees to colleges and universities to find out what the problems are but a singleman a single enquirer is much more effective and is able to study the situation much better than the visiting committees. Committees are all very well for studying data and facts that are brought before them but for enquiry and real work in the colleges and universities it is better to send a single person. If a single member of the University Grants Commission were appointed in charge of hostels and students' amenities he will be able to meet the students himself, listen to their view of their problems, listen to their grievances, listen to the statement of

their needs and then go and report to the University Grants Commission, and shape its policy in the proper direction

The University Grants Commission records the starting of correspondence courses in many Universities. There again you are producing more B.A.s in a cheap and probably less satisfactory way. Evening classes and correspondence courses were started in England, it is not with a view to increasing the number of unemployed and unemployable graduates but for teaching them useful subjects. In England commercial courses, technical courses were started, they had the famous Mechanics Institute. They had all this with the object of teaching useful subjects and giving training which would find them employment whereas admission in large numbers to universities and colleges, as I said, breeds only a large number of un-employed and unemployable graduates

Another suggestion that I have often made is that a scientific enquiry should be made into the discontents of our students. Why are our students so discontented and why is there this discontent raised to the point of violence? It is not on account of any original sin among the students that tempts them to violence, that tempts them to discontent, it is because they suffer from a lack of amenities. Hostels are not enough. One single room meant for one student is packed with three or four students. These mass admissions, these vast numbers produce a mass mentality, a mob mentality. That is why we have all this discontent. I hope at least now the Ministry of Education or the University Grants Commission will see that a high-powered enquiry as it is called is set up in order to probe into the discontents of our students, to probe into their grievances and find out what is wrong with them and how all their grievances may be remedied. Until and unless that is done we shall never have any contentment among the students, we shall have a recurrence of these student troubles. No doubt politics and party politics are one of the causes of these disturbances among students, but why do students take to politics? Why do students take to political action? It is because they have no outlets in their colleges and in their universities for healthy student activities. Extra-curricular work and extra-curricular facilities are few and far between. So, all these grievances of students must be enquired into and it is only then the University Grants Commission and the Minis-

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy]

ter of Education will be able to feel satisfied that student discontents have come to an end. The University Grants Commission has work cut out for it and it must work within its competence. A solution to the problem of numbers, as I have said, does not rest merely on regulating the admission of students to universities or in limiting the number of students to universities, but in finding outlets, different outlets for their education, different avenues for their education, technical, professional and commercial. It is only by placing before students such alternative avenues that the University Grants Commission can limit the admission of students to universities, can solve this wretched problem of numbers and carve out a new career, a new opening for our students in universities and university colleges.

SHRI B.T. KEMPARAJ (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, many hon. Members have given their valuable suggestions about the working of the UGC. From the name of the Commission itself we can see that it is a body that has to give grants to Universities. We can see that during the period 1961-62 to 1971-72 the number of universities increased from 49 to 95. Here a very important point for consideration is whether the Commission should go on creating any number of universities or as has already been suggested by many hon. Members, should the Commission find out what kind of education, at least hereafter, we should impart to students? It is admitted in the Report that it is due to frustration there are agitations and other commotions in universities. It is also a fact that those students and graduates who come out of the university and who do not find a way for eking out their livelihood, feel frustrated. The coming generation is also feeling the intensity of unemployment. After getting frustrated, they are bound to go in for agitations and other things. One question is how to bring in discipline among students and the other question is how to prevent the frustration that is lurking in the minds of students after they become graduates. What will be their means of livelihood?

These are the two conflicting factors that have been predominantly working in the minds of the students. Therefore, the U.G.C. might have taken this aspect of the matter for serious consideration to find what are the basic reasons for these agitations.

Secondly, Sir, they might take up the issue as to how to improve upon the system of educa-

tion that we are having so as to make the students feel comfortable and also able to earn after their education. Sir, we feel that the western system of education has been producing good results among the students for the last 100 years and more. But, as hon'ble Members mentioned, it is the production of graduates which is a mechanical process which has been followed for the last several years but it is the way of change-over that is required now according to the changing circumstances.

Sir, it is also suggested that admissions to the colleges should be restricted. I do not contribute to such a suggestion because every one wants that he should get education. Every one is very much interested in getting more and more education. When there is lure for education, when there is ambition in every one to become educated, how can then we shut out admission to such an enthusiasm? The remedy lies in finding out the way as to how we should be able to give a reorientation to our education system. This has been urged by many experts. Many expert committees have been working on these lines but we have not found any practical way of changing over education.

Sir, what we have been carrying in our minds is exactly the opposite of what has been working in the minds of the students. I have got regular contacts and friendship with many students. Sir, if you know the mind of the student studying in a college you will be able to understand their feeling. They want easy award of degrees. They do not want any strict code of discipline to be enforced on them. They want that a democratic way of thinking, working and carrying on their affairs in their own circle should be allowed to them. This is the psychology that has been working in the minds of the students. Sir, we leaders, have been brought up in a disciplined way in our educational career and we want to impose our way of thinking on them. But there is a revolutionary opposition to our way of thinking and our way of trying to bring them into our own choice. That is why these agitations, burning of buses, breaking of windows and doors of the college buildings and also gheraoing the Vice-Chancellors etc. are there. Therefore, it is high time for us to think and study the psychological change-over from the previous circumstances to the present circumstances.

Our system of education must be so changing as to suit the conditions and ambitions of

the younger generation. That is why Mahatma-ji has also given so many suggestions for changing our educational system. But we have not given thought to them. Even to-day we are not thinking as to how decentralisation of the educational system that has been suggested by many of the experienced persons should be done. I feel we are only trying to increase the number of educational institutions and universities. I suggest that we should also try to think seriously about changing our educational system itself so that the students get encouragement and feel comfortable and realise that the educational system that is there is for their benefit and for their easy working and earning of livelihood. The UGC has to take this very important issue also into consideration. No doubt research work has been increasing and activities in every educational field have been increasing and more and more funds have been allotted for the educational progress. That is a good thing. But they have also to consider seriously how discipline should be brought into the student population. What they should do and how they should try to bring the students to think in line with the changing circumstances of the time, has also to be considered. I hope whatever suggestions we have given here will be taken into consideration by the University Grants Commission and at least hereafter they will try to see that the educational system is encouraging to the students and it also serves for the betterment and good life of the students in coming generations. Thank you.

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA (Bihar). Sir, if we go into the history of education in India, it were philanthropists who started the institutions which produced our great leaders, like Gokhale and Malaviya. Now the University Grants Commission has come in which, to me, is just like an accountant. It is procedure based and not result-based. We are told that universities are autonomous bodies. After granting money for the running of the university, the University Grants Commission has no say in the matters of the university. Some friends have mentioned about the Delhi University. Dr Dutt has also mentioned about it. Now, if we go back 50 years, or even now, more than 50 per cent of the institutions had been started by philanthropic people or societies.

It was only during the last 8, 9 years that more and more curbs had been placed on the trusts and the donors and that is why they did

not come forward in great numbers with the result that the Government or the UGC have to find more funds for the running of the colleges. If we take the all-India figures, according to the UGC report, the honourable Minister will bear me out, the total expenditure comes to Rs 34 crores and the total number of students on all-India basis is 29 lakhs which works out at Rs. 111 per student per year while in Delhi University alone we are spending .

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN. May I correct the honourable Member? The figures here, the honourable Member may kindly see, relate to developmental expenditure. They do not relate to the maintenance expenditure or the share of the State Governments towards development expenditure.

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA. On page 64 Plan and non-Plan projects expenditure. Where is the other expenditure? Nowhere is it mentioned. What is the total budget of the UGC?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN. This is what I have been trying to submit through you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to the honourable Member that what the UGC gives is development grant in the case of State universities and colleges affiliated to State universities. Now, the development grant mentioned in this figure is the share of the UGC in the development plan grant. In addition to it there is the plan grant share of the State Governments over and above which is the maintenance grant given by the State Government to the colleges. Therefore, this general calculation as per head of expenditure is not perhaps the most correct way of comparing.

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA. I tried to get the figures from your Ministry but I failed unfortunately. Anyway, if we do not take into consideration the all-India figures, let us take the figures of Delhi University. We have spent about Rs. 5 crores and 29 lakhs on a student population of about 64000 which is Rs 900 per student. But if we go to Jawaharlal Nehru University on 505 students we have spent more than Rs 2 crores which comes to Rs 40,000 per student.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN. I am sorry, I do not like intervening when honourable Members are speaking. But then if the honourable Member is putting the figures like that, then he must take into consideration all the money that has been invested in the past by

[Prof S Nurul Hasan.]

way of building grants, by way of all the non-recurring expenditure that has been given. Here is a University which is just being established. The figures are not comparable. I would appeal to the honourable Member not to worry about figures but to make the point that he wishes to do, because it could create a misunderstanding.

SHRI SHYAMLAL GUPTA Here you have stated "On the basis of the recommendations of these committees, the Commission allocated grants amounting to Rs 256 crore to 66 universities for period ending 73-74. In addition, a grant of Rs 6½ crores was allocated for Jawaharlal Nehru University for the period ending 73-74."

That is, for three years. Then, per student we shall be spending, Rs 40,000 per year, but what is that in relation to other Universities? Do you think that the education imparted in that University is in any way better than the institutions which our forefathers built? Coming back to Delhi University, students' careers are formed by the teachers. We have all the unions. Our Education Minister has added a statute to curb the governing bodies.

If it is a sick institution, they can appoint 50 per cent more of Governing Body members according to the wishes of the Vice Chancellor. And which is a sick institution? It depends on the whims and fancies of the university authorities. And what is the result? Everywhere the members of the Governing bodies have no say in the matter. All the students belong either to one Party or another. It may be irrelevant to cite one particular incident. Still, I would like to refer to it. On the 1st of this month, there was a selection of a teacher of Political Science in my College, namely, the Shyamlal College. What had happened? I was told by the DUTA executives "You must select one of the three candidates." They had come for the interview. Otherwise they will say "You have always been partial and therefore you must select one of the three persons displaced from other colleges." If such a thing were to happen in the Delhi University which is considered to be a pioneer university among all the universities in India and which had a very good name up-till now, what will happen in other places? If a society wishes to start a college, it has to pay Rs 12 lakhs or more. What are the powers of governing bodies in appointing teachers or prescribing the curricula or time-table? Even the

Principal becomes a non-entity. I would request our hon Education Minister to kindly go through these things dispassionately and try to solve these problems. Even if the teachers belong to unions, they should behave well. They should not spoil the reputation of an institution. In Delhi university, if I am right, not more than 200 periods are being taught by teachers. If you go across the border to UP or Haryana or Punjab, you will find much more labour is being put in by the teachers. Here everything is in the hands of the Staff Council. I do not object to it. Let there be healthy competition as in politics. There are two Parties in all the Colleges which spoil the character of the Colleges and which are detrimental to the interests of those institutions.

The University Grants Commission should have some hold on the money that it allocates, may be through the Ministry of Education, so that there is somebody as a watch dog to watch that the money they allocate for the institutions is well spent. The money, after all, comes from the tax-payer and it should, therefore, be well spent. What has the University Grants Commission done all these years to help to bring out or publish Indian books for the students and encourage Indian scholarships? This year they have not given the figures of expenditure in the report. Last year I had mentioned it. And the hon Minister was very kind to look into it. But so far nothing has been done.

I would request the honourable Minister of Education to consider seriously the many points raised by the other honourable Members and also my self and to see that something is done and nothing is done to retard the progress of education in our country, particularly in Delhi. Thank you, Sir.

श्री गोलाप बरबोरा (आसाम) उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन का संपर्क देश की उच्चतर शिक्षा के साथ है, लेकिन युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को पढ़ने से और उसके कामकाज का देखने से ऐसा लगता है कि देश में जैसे और कारपोरेशन और कमीशन हैं, वैसे ही यह भी है। सीमेंट कारपोरेशन या फटिलाइजर कारपोरेशन की तरह यह कमीशन भी है क्योंकि रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है बहुत कम और छिपाने की कोशिश है बहुत ज्यादा। युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन से जो पैसा युनिवर्सिटीज का बांटा गया है उसके बारे में कहीं से आप कि निकाल नहीं पायेंगे किस युनिवर्सिटी को कितना दिया गया है। अभी शिक्षा मंत्री नरूल हसन जी ने श्याम लाल गुप्त जी को बताया कि

कौन सोस है। शिक्षा मन्त्रालय में जहा तक सुनाई मे आया है 92, 93 शाखा और प्रशाखा हैं। उन 92, 93 शाखा प्रशाखा को कहा से पानी मिलता है इसकी जानकारी करने की कोशिश हम वरें तो हमें सुबह का अखबार पढ़ने का समय नहीं रहे। कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में यह बताने की कोशिश जरूर होनी चाहिए कि किस को क्या दिया गया है। ऐसा न करने से ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि दान में कुछ गड़बड़ी है। अभी 56 करोड़ रुपया आपने 79 यूनिवर्सिटीज को देश भर में बाटा। कुछ सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं और उनके प्रति आप की ज़िम्मेदारी ज्यादा है। यह भी मैं मानता हूँ कि कुछ रिसर्च सेंटर्स वगैरह आप रखे हुए है और उनके प्रति आप की ज़िम्मेदारी ज्यादा है, एवरेज से कुछ ज्यादा है। आप की रिपोर्ट में नहीं बल्कि और लोगों से पूछने से मालूम पड़ा कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी को 7 करोड़ रुपया मिला, एक सदस्य ने बोला कि 5 करोड़ मिला। यहा जवाहरलाल नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी में लगभग 500 विद्यार्थी हैं, 6.5 करोड़ मिला।

श्री महावीर त्यागी: उसमें ज्यादातर रिसर्च करने वाले कालेजेज के प्रोफेसर हैं जो वहा से तनखावा पाते हैं।

श्री गोलाप बरबोरा जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी मान्य नेता थे और उनकी स्मृति में कुछ बनाना जरूरी है। यहा शांति वन है, तीनमूर्ति भवन है। तीनमूर्ति भवन में विद्यार्थियों को दिखाने के लिए लाया जाता है। उनके नाम की कोई यूनिवर्सिटी बने इसमें भी मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है, लेकिन यह तो वैसे ही है जैसा कि दो तीन साल पहले बंगाल के एक सदस्य ने यह सवाल उठाया था कि विश्वभारती में बारह मी मे ज्यादा विद्यार्थी नहीं है और आज विश्वभारती वह विश्वभारती नहीं है जो रवि बाबू के जिन्दा रहने के समय थी। वहा के उत्तरायण में, छोटे से स्थान में जो शिक्षा उस जमाने में मिलती थी, आज वैसी शिक्षा नहीं मिलती है। आज वहा के उत्तरायण की जगह आप नार्थ ब्लाक बना दिये होंगे। लेकिन वहा वह इमान नहीं बनता जो कि रवि बाबू के जमाने में बनता था। तो उस लिए मैंने शुरू में ही कहा था कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन का करेक्टर और फटिलाइजर या फूड कारपोरेशन का करेक्टर अलग अलग तरह का नहीं है, लेकिन वह अलग होना चाहिए। साथ ही इस रिपोर्ट में कोई चीज डिस्टिक्टली साफ साफ मालूम नहीं होती। 56 करोड़ रुपए मे से 12 करोड़ रुपया दिल्ली मे आप ने बाट दिया, नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी के नाम से हो या दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी के नाम से हो, 12 करोड़ रुपया उन को दिया गया और देश मे बाकी 79 यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं, सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज में ज्यादा विद्यार्थी शायद दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी में ही हैं जिन की तादाद 64 हजार है, गौहाटी यूनिवर्सिटी में 65 हजार विद्यार्थी हैं, लेकिन आप बतलायें कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी के कॉरिजिन में गौहाटी यूनिवर्सिटी का कितना पैसा मिला आज तक? इसके साथ ही सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज का एक

करेक्टर होना चाहिए ताकि देश भर के विद्यार्थी वहा आ सकें और उन सब को उन में एडमिशन का मौका मिलना चाहिए ताकि सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज से कुछ राष्ट्रीय करेक्टर के लोग निकल। बनारस विश्वविद्यालय की बात और अलीगढ़ विश्वविद्यालय की बात हसन साहब आप जानते हैं। वहा से काफी लोग निकले जो कि हमारे राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के नेता थे, जो कि समाजवादी आन्दोलन के नेता थे। लेकिन आज आप की सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज से हम को क्या मिल रहा है? साथ ही, मेरा तो एक एप्लोमेशन है कि सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी में दिल्ली के लोगों को रखने का ही एक क्लिक चल रहा है। मैं जिस शहर से आता हूँ, वहा का, गौहाटी यूनिवर्सिटी का एक विद्यार्थी यहा आया था। उसने बी०एस०सी० फर्स्ट डिवीजन में पास किया था, बहुत बढ़िया मार्क्स थे उसके। यहा वह एडमिशन के लिए आया। क्योंकि वहा जब रिजल्ट निकलता है उस समय तक यहा एक एक टर्म खत्म हो जाता है तो इसलिए उसने एक साल ड्राप किया। और यहा आने के बाद उसने काफी दरवाजे खटखटाए। तो उसको एक जगह जवाब मिला कि 'Why do you come to Delhi University? Why did you not take admission in Gauhati University?' इस पर उसको कहना पड़ा कि "Because the Delhi University is a Central University, so I have come here" अगर यही चलता रहे तो दिल्ली को या किसी और यूनिवर्सिटी सेंट्रल को यूनिवर्सिटी का नाम दे कर उस पर ज्यादा रुपया बर्बाद करने मे फायदा क्या। आप उस को तो रीजनल यूनिवर्सिटी ही रहने दीजिए। साथ ही शिक्षा की व्यवस्था में सुधार करने के लिए यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की तरफ से कोई बात नहीं हुई है। यही होता है कि इतना रुपया आया, इतना बाट दिया गया। मेडिकल एजुकेशन की बात ही आप ले लीजिए। मेडिकल कालेजेज को आप पैसा बांटते हैं लेकिन आज देश मे क्या हो रहा है। किसी लड़के को एम०बी०बी०एस० बनाने के लिए गार्डियन्स को उस पर 50 हजार रुपया खर्च करना पड़ता है। ब्रिटिश जमाने में जो तरीका था उसमें एम०बी०बी०एस० कम बनते थे। उस समय मेडिकल स्कूल भी कही कही रहे। लेकिन क्योंकि ब्रिटिश जमाने में सब कुछ खराब रहा इसलिए उसको बदलना है और इसलिए तय कर दिया गया कि सिर्फ मेडिकल कालेज ही रहेंगे। अब देश मे एक डाक्टर पर गार्डियंस को 50 हजार रुपए खर्च करना पड़ता है और देश के गांव मे, हास्पिटल्स में और डिस्पेंसरीज मे डाक्टरों नहीं है इस सदन मे और हर कही रोज इस बात की चर्चा होती है। लोग चाहते हैं कि डाक्टर आदर्शवादी बनें। जब आज देश में लोग आदर्शवादी नहीं हैं तो आप चाहते हैं कि कोई लड़का एम०बी०बी०एस० पास कर के गांवों में डाक्टरी करने जाये। नेता गांवों में नहीं जाते हैं, सिवाय चुनाव के समय को छोड़ कर और आप चाहते हैं कि जिस लड़के ने 50 हजार रुपया अपनी पढ़ाई पर खर्च किया है वह गांव में डाई सौ या तीन सौ रुपए मासिक की तनखाह पर काम करने जाय। डाक्टर

[श्री गोलाप बरबोरा]

आप बताते हैं और आज ब्रिटेन में 50 परसेंट डाक्टर या तो हिन्दुस्तानी हैं या पाकिस्तानी। अमरीका में और दूसरे देशों में जाते हैं यहां के डाक्टर्स बैकवर्ड कंट्रीज में तो कट्टर बेसिस पर ज्यादातर डाक्टर्स यहां से जाते हैं। इसमें सोचना पड़ेगा इसलिए जो इस्टीम्यूसन शिक्षा के नाम से चलते हैं उनसे गरीब देश का भला होने वाला है नहीं। आज चाइना में क्या हो रहा है? कुछ दिनों पहले अखबारों में पढ़ा था कि चाइनीज लोग 6 महीने में डाक्टर बनाते हैं। हंसने लगा कि कैसे चाइनीज लोग 6 महीने में डाक्टर बनाते हैं। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ आप को कि गांव में जितने गरीब लोग बीमार होते हैं, ज्यादातर मामूली डिजीज से उनको मामूली दवा देने के लिए, फर्स्ट-एड देने के लिए एम०बी०बी०एस० डाक्टरों की जरूरत नहीं होती? वैसे 90 परसेंट लोगों को इसी कारण डाक्टरों का और मामली दवा का मौका नहीं मिल पाता तो इसके लिए ऐसी व्यवस्था हो सकती है कि कोई भी साइंस स्टूडेंट के लिए हायर सेकेंडरी पास करने के बाद कहीं एक-दो साल का कोर्स आप बनाएं और उनको बुनियादी मेडिकल का कुछ ज्ञान देने की कोशिश की जाय तब जाकर आप को 200, 300 रुपए में गांवों में डाक्टर मिलना आसान हो जायेगा। वहां पर फर्स्ट-एड की व्यवस्था हो और मोबाइल डाक्टरों की भी व्यवस्था हो तथा जो गरीब पेशेंट हो उनको बाहर बड़े अस्पतालों में ले जाने की भी व्यवस्था हो।

जैसे डाक्टरों की व्यवस्था हो उसी प्रकार की व्यवस्था साइंस, टेक्नोलॉजी की भी हो। हम देखते हैं या तो लोग इस लाइन में जाते नहीं हैं और जो जाते हैं वे हजारों रुपया खर्च करते हैं। उसको आप इस गरीब हिन्दुस्तान में रख नहीं सकते। क्योंकि यहां पर आप उनको 500, 700, 1000 या 1200 रुपए देंगे। वह उसके लिए कम है इसलिए वह अमरीका, फ्रांस, वैस्ट जर्मनी, चाइना, न्यूली इंडोपेण्डेंट कंट्री में चला जाता है क्योंकि उसको वहां ज्यादा पैसा मिल जाता है। यहां हम देखते हैं कि यहां आदेश दिया जाता है कि गांव में जाएँ।

युनिवर्सिटीज में डिमिपलिन के सबाल को लेकर, आदर्श को लेकर काफी चर्चा हम करते हैं। लेकिन इस देश की व्यवस्था में कहीं भी आदर्शवाद आज है नहीं। यहां सिर्फ कुछ विद्यार्थियों में, दो-चार लैक्चररों से, दो-चार प्रोफेसरों के आदर्शवाद होने से आप को कुछ मिलेगा नहीं। मुझे याद है कलकत्ते में पढ़ने के समय विद्यार्थियों के जुलूस में फायरिंग के सामने खड़े रहे श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी, जो वाइस चांसलर रहे हैं कलकत्ता युनिवर्सिटी के। उनकी जो राजनीतिक विचारधारा थी उनके साथ हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था लेकिन जब गोली चली तो वे विद्यार्थियों की तरह रात भर वहां खड़े रहे। बड़े-बड़े नेता, राष्ट्र के जिनको बुलाया गया था सच भाग नष्ट थे परन्तु श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी रात भर वहां

खड़े रहे। ऐसा साहस श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी जो कि वाइस चांसलर रहे, उनमें था। और एक वाइस चांसलर देखा आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव। जो बीमार पड़े थे। बीमार होते हुए भी विद्यार्थियों के सामने आकर परामर्श देते थे। वे जहां भी रहते थे वहां गड़बड़ नहीं होती थी। लेकिन आज क्या होता है? आप वाइस चांसलर अपाएट करते हैं पालिटिकल। कोई बुरा आदमी हो लेकिन आप का पिटू हो तो उसको अपाएटमेंट मिल जाती है। ऐसे ही लोग कहीं रजिस्ट्रार बन जाते हैं। आप विद्यार्थियों से आदर्शवाद चाहते हैं और खुद आप आदर्श से घट्ट हैं। अगर आप आदर्श विद्यार्थियों के सामने रख देंगे तो विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासन आप कैसे रख सकेंगे।

इसीलिए बाहर के समाज में, अपने समाज में, अपने नेतृत्व में, आदर्शवाद ले आने की कोशिश सब कोई करे, देश का वर्तमान राजनीतिज्ञ, सभी पार्टियों के और खास कर के सरकारी दल के, करें तो हो सकता है कि विश्वविद्यालय भी सुधरेगा, विद्यार्थी भी सुधरेगा और प्रोफेसरों और वाइस चांसलर सब सुधरेंगे। यही मेरा कहना है। और मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह जो शिक्षा में जिस तरह की व्यवस्था चल रही है वह बदले। बड़ी बड़ी इमारत को ले कर के और बहुत कुछ इंस्ट्रुमेंट्स के होने से ही कुछ शिक्षा हम देश में दे पायेंगे यह जो विचार-धारा देश में चल रही है इसको आप खत्म कीजिये, गरीब हिन्दुस्तान की हालत को देख कर, यहां की प्रायरीटरी को समझ कर शिक्षा मन्त्रालय अपनी पालिसीज तय करे।

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala) : Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, the discussion on the working of the University Grants Commission will naturally lead us to a discussion of University education itself. Now, education is not a neutral agent in the social set-up. It is an active agent in the set-up of a class ridden society. Education has like many other activities of humanity helped to perpetuate the class distinctions and the class rule. But it can also be used to abolish those class distinctions. Naturally, in a society like ours where the big capitalists and the landlords rule, education is used to perpetuate the rule of the landlords and bourgeois. It is essential to understand this point here as some people talk about education being given according to social needs. I ask, whose social needs? Social needs are different for different people. Here you have got the social needs of the black-marketeer, the adulterator, or the smuggler, the landlords and the big bourgeois and you have got an educational system built upon that basis. Therefore, you cannot set it right just by tinkering here and there. Take, for example, what is the composition of our university population. You will be surprised

to know that recently N.C.E.R.T. conducted a survey "The Sociology of Education in India" in which it points out that 80 per cent of those who come from the colleges are from the top 20 per cent of the population. Precisely the people who live on the blood of the rest of the 80 per cent of the population dominate the college life. What social outlook can they have when their fathers are mixing argemone oil with mustard oil and selling it? What social outlook will their sons have? Therefore what happens is that you have got a corrupt system from top to bottom. You promote that corrupt system by the sort of education you give so that you have a privileged society. These 80 per cent who come from the top 20 per cent of the population control 90 per cent of the services in the country, the I.A.S., the I.P.S., Company Executives, lawyers, doctors etc. You have a system of control over the whole apparatus of the society by the top 20 per cent of the people who live on the blood of the 80 per cent of the people. What education is this? As long as you cannot change this system of class education in this country, there is no solace for the people. All talk of socialism is bogus. It is just hoodwinking the people. You are perpetuating the system, the rule of this top 20 per cent of the people. That is the whole thing. Then, you say what is the way out. You have a way. Select some people from the poorer classes. Give them higher education. About 120 years ago Carl Marx pointed out—and this is an interesting thing—that the more a ruling class is able to assimilate the more prominent men of the ruled classes, the more solid and dangerous is this rule and that is precisely what is happening. You have got Shri Jagjivan Ram, who has been a Minister for 25 years. You have got the few I.A.S. people. But, has the lot of the Harijans, the tribals improved?

Not only that it has not improved, it has worsened. But precisely, the notion that if a few of those most promising of the poor people have been assimilated into the system of the class rule, the class rule becomes stronger, creates more illusions among the poorer sections, among the poor people. This is how even Prof Hasan, who knows more about this sociological fact, selects a few. The point is, it cannot be abolished unless you abolish the extra privileges of the upper classes. The equality of opportunity in a class society cannot be brought about unless you abolish the privileges of the oppressing classes and that is

the only way, not by selecting the most prominent people from the oppressed classes and elevating them to the upper echelons. The poorer people will only lose their most natural leaders. The most natural leaders of the oppressed classes will be plucked from their natural environments and set up in the upper echelons and they may be assimilated there. Therefore, Sir, the whole system has to be seen as part of the socio-economic system. The University Grants Commission cannot change the socio-economic system and, therefore, it cannot change the educational system. It can only improve—improve means strengthen—the hand of the oppressors. It can make much better oppressors, more intelligent people, but it cannot change the whole system, it cannot bring socialism. This is a fact of life.

Then what are we getting out of this system? We are getting people who are unemployed, who cannot be employed. Now, here is an article by Mr. M. S. Adisesiah. What does it say? What sort of products come out of of this? I will quote:

"More and more employers want a clean slate on which they can write what they want. The other day a bank manager, after interviewing B. Coms. and M. Coms. for the posts of officers, said that he finally selected a few high school graduates and B.As. for these posts because he could train them in one year to become bank officers. With the others, he would have to spend one year making them unlearn the wrong banking concepts they had learnt and then a second year training them for the job."

This is the point. You have a society in which you produce all sorts of rotten things, which are sold in blackmarket, the cars which will not run, the medicines which will not be effective. You also produce education which is of no use and that is the moves of the society, that is the ethos of the society that you should not be able to give to the society back what you take out of it, try to extract as much from the social environment as much as you can. This is the ethos of the society. Therefore, in education also you produce people who cannot be employed, who are not educated at all. Thus you waste your money. Then the article says:

"The question of relevance of our universities arises when foreign policy issues are posed, or opportunities of self employ-

[Shri K. P. Subramania Menon]

ment open up, or when our B.As. and B.Sc.s. are treated as the equivalent of matriculates, and M.As. and M.Sc.s. as B.As and B.Sc.s. in European and American universities, or when the understanding and synthesis of the plurality of our cultures are involved. The simplest and most obvious expression of the non-fitness and irrelevance of our university is the fact that the 1971 census showed us that on April 1 of that year, 3,85,000 university graduates plus 1,62,000 scientists, engineers and medical personnel were unemployed. This is very close to the figures of the live registers of our employment exchanges which on December 31, 1971 showed 3,93,000 graduates who had registered seeking employment."

This is the point. What we have got we cannot employ. Just like you have got the Indian shaving blades or the bulbs—nothing of the sort works. Similarly, the products of our education system form part of the profiteering system of the Indian bourgeois—that also does not work, none of these things function.

Therefore, Sir, the whole concept, the whole approach is vitiated by the ruling class itself. They want everything cheap; they take much more from the people than what they give. The whole immorality of the education system in our country has to be done away with and that cannot be done away with without changing the whole approach.

Again a UNESCO Study on the Development of Education points out that facilities for education being both scarce and expensive higher education probably is almost the monopoly of the privileged classes at the top who naturally desire to maintain their privilege and power. They know this. Even our administrators understand these problems. For example, Mr. J.P. Naik, Educational Adviser to Government, in one of his books has pointed out that it is a vicious and dual system and this becomes all the more terrible because the average or below-average children of the haves get access to the core institutions while the talented among the have-nots are often denied. Again why is it that so patent and unjust a system is allowed to thrive and persist in our midst? Why is it even its victims, the have-nots seem to defend its existence and demand its continuance? Here I think he is misunderstanding the poor people. What can they do?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA): Please conclude; it is time.

SHRI K.P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: I am putting in new points.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA): But the time is against you.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: Therefore the point is here we have a system of education which is bornout of the socio-economic system and if you are serious about changing the socio-economic system then naturally you have also to change the education system.

Then what is the contribution of our intellectuals? I should say that our intellectuals are a sort of scholarly slaves to monopoly capitalists. They are scholarly but all the same slaves. Does any of them dare to teach the university students to protest against injustice, to protest against blackmarketing, to protest against social oppression? No; none of them will do it. They do not have to teach Marxism. Will they dare to teach elementary human behaviour towards their own fellow-beings? They do not and this is the whole trouble because the professors, the teachers, the scholars, all of them have become part of the system and they are interested in perpetuating the system.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to point out about the BITS, the Birla Institute of Technology and Science. I do not know what Birla has got to do with technology and science. The only technology he knows is tax-dodging technology. Poor fellow, he has got a lot of money as a result of this tax-dodging technology and he has set up an Institute. And the University Grants Commission, the CSIR, everyone goes to his rescue and gives him a lot of money. Now, what is happening there? The students are denied even the most elementary democratic rights. There is a corrupt Director who was already hauled up in some Kanpur case. He has been oppressing the students and this Government sits here helpless without doing anything.

Sir, I would also like to bring to the attention of the Education Minister and the University Grants Commission a point about the research students. Their allowance is fixed at Rs. 300 per month but this was fixed about 6 or 10 years back. Conditions have changed and today they are finding it very difficult.

And that is one of the reasons why many of the research students today have to do part-time jobs outside. If you want to have research then you should increase the allowance to the research students.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA): We shall continue this discussion day after tomorrow but before that Shri Shahi would like to speak for five minutes and then the hon. Minister will make a statement.

S P. M.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद साहो (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, शिक्षा राज्य का विषय है, परन्तु शिक्षा की पद्धति निर्धारित करना यह केन्द्रीय सरकार का ही कार्य है और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ही शिक्षा की नीति का निर्धारण करना पड़ता है। हमें देखना है कि पिछले 26 सालों में शिक्षा की जो वर्तमान नीति रही है उसका क्या फल सामने आया है। श्रीमन् हमारा लक्ष्य समाजवादी समाज का है, हमारा लक्ष्य असाम्प्रदायिक समाज के निर्माण का है, हमारा लक्ष्य शोषण रहित समाज के निर्माण का है। उसके लिए हम कैसे नागरिक पैदा करें यह शिक्षा पद्धति पर निर्भर करता है। क्या हमारी शिक्षा की पद्धति ने वैसे नागरिक पैदा किये हैं जो समाजवादी समाज की रचना कर सकें, जो असाम्प्रदायिक समाज की रचना कर सकें। जो पद्धति शिक्षा की हमने अपना रखी है और हमारी शिक्षा की नीति ने जिस तरह के विद्यार्थियों का निर्माण किया है वह आज हमारे सामने आ रहा है। काश्मीर में पिछले एक हफ्ते से कालेज के विद्यार्थी एक महिला कालेज का नाम बदलने के ऊपर जो जलूस निकाल रहे हैं उसमें प्रो-पाकिस्तानी नारे लगा रहे हैं। कालेज का नाम बदलने के विषय से प्रो-पाकिस्तानी नारे से क्या सम्बन्ध है। यह बात यह प्रगट करती है कि देश में शिक्षा की जो पद्धति है वह कितनी दूषित है कि हम अपने विद्यार्थियों को राष्ट्रीय भावना से भी प्रेरित नहीं कर सके, पिछले 26 सालों में अपने विद्यार्थियों में राष्ट्रीय भावना भी नहीं ला सके और देश के विद्यार्थी जब कोई आन्दोलन करते हैं तो प्रो-पाकिस्तानी नारे गाते हैं। दूसरी घटना जो आज की शिक्षा पद्धति ने पेश की है वह है लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालय की। विद्यार्थियों ने विश्वविद्यालय को चला डाला और कितने लाख का नुकसान किया उसकी कोई सीमा नहीं। इस तरह के विद्यार्थियों को हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति ने पैदा किया है।

श्रीमन् मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन तमाम चीजों के लिए किसी व्यक्ति को दोष नहीं दिया जा सकता। जो हमारी गलत नीति है, जो हमन अंग्रेजों से विरासत पाई है और जिसके बारे में सोचन विचारने और बदलने की शक्ति हमारे मस्तिष्क में नहीं है उसी का यह फल है कि जिस समय उत्तर प्रदेश में केन्द्रीय सरकार का शासन था और प्रोफेसर नूरुल हसन साहब वहाँ की शिक्षा के इतबाराम के लिए जिम्मेदार

थे उस समय उर्दू एकेडेमी को एक कान्फ्रेंस बुलाने के लिए पैसे की इमदाद दी। श्रीमन्, उस कान्फ्रेंस का नाम गौर करें—हिन्दू-उर्दू-राइट्स कान्फ्रेंस। श्रीमन् आप गौर करें प्रोफेसर साहब सरकार की पालिसी के द्वारा सैक्युलर समाज बनाना चाहते हैं—सैक्युलर समाज बनाना चाहते हैं, जबकि सरकारी रूप से हिन्दू-उर्दू कान्फ्रेंस और मुस्लिम उर्दू कान्फ्रेंस की जा रही है। हमें तरम आता है अपने ईमानदार प्रोफेसर के ऊपर। मैं जानता हूँ कि उनकी बात बहुत हद तक नहीं चलती और इसीलिए तरस आता है। श्रीमन्, मैं जानता हूँ कि इस सैक्युलर नीति के अन्दर हमारे इस ईमानदार प्रोफेसर को, शिक्षा मन्त्री को यह हिम्मत नहीं है कि काशी विश्वविद्यालय में मुसलमान बाइस चांसलर नियुक्त कर दें या अपनी अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी में किसी हिन्दू बाइस चांसलर को नियुक्त कर दें। यह सैक्युलर इज्जत है? (Time bell rings) मैं केवल सैक्युलर इज्जत का नक्शा पेश करूँगा, ज्यादा नहीं कहूँगा।

श्रीमन् अभी हाल में अलीगढ़ विश्वविद्यालय के विधान में कुछ संशोधन हुआ।

जिस समय वह बिल के रूप में इस हाउस में आया था, मैंने एतराज किया था कि प्रोफेसर साहब आप इसका सरकारी-करण किये दें रहें हैं, लेकिन प्रोफेसर नहीं माने। और सब बातें अच्छी थी, लेकिन जो सरकारीकरण लिया गया वह बुरा था। लेकिन फिर अवसरवादी विरोधी दलों के दबाव और प्रतिक्रियावादी साम्प्रदायिक मुस्लिम संगठनों के दबाव के कारण प्रोफेसर नूरुल हसन न चाहते हुए भी ऐसे संशोधन वहाँ पीछे के रास्ते से लाये हैं, जो सदन में नहीं लाए गए, एग्जीक्यूटिव कमिटी से रिकमेंड करारकर विजिटर से एप्रूव करा दिया ताकि सदन के सामने न आवे। ऐसे संशोधन बे लाए हैं जो बहुत ही प्रतिक्रियावादी हैं और अलीगढ़ विश्व-विद्यालय तथा देश के लिए भी खतरनाक हैं। श्रीमन्, जब वे यह संशोधन लाए जिसके माध्यम से इन्होंने कोर्ट में डोनर्स को प्रतिनिधित्व दिया उसी समय प्रोफेसर साहब ने यू०पी० यूनिवर्सिटी एक्ट को भी प्रेसिडेंट साहब से पास कराया और उसमें डोनर्स को प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं दिया। कौन सा औचित्य है इसका, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय? केन्द्रीय यूनिवर्सिटी में, अलीगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी में, संशोधन के माध्यम से आप डोनर्स को प्रतिनिधित्व देते हैं, जिनको पहले बिल के अन्दर निकाल दिया था और यू० पी० यूनिवर्सिटीज एक्ट के अन्दर जो ठीक उसी समय पास किया उसमें से डोनर्स को निकाल दिया। कोई जस्टीफिकेशन होना चाहिए। क्या पोलिसी है आपकी?

दूसरी बात, श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब यू०पी०सी० बनी थी तो केवल अनुदानों के, ग्रांट्स के बटवारे का ही उसका काम नहीं समझा गया था, बल्कि उसका लक्ष्य यह भी था कि यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा का डेवलपमेंटल वर्क भी वह करेगी, पाठ्यक्रम भी निर्धारित करेगी विद्यार्थियों

को कैसे अच्छा बनाया जाय इस पर भी ध्यान देनी। श्रीमन्, मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि यू०जी०सी० ने विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासन लाने और बढ़ाने की प्रक्रिया पर कतई ध्यान नहीं दिया है, और विद्यार्थियों को छोड़ दें, वाइस चांसलर के और प्रोफेसरों के अनुशासन पर भी कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। आज, श्रीमन् हालत यह है कि रिटायर्ड आई०सी०एम० आफीसर्स रिटायर्ड पुलिस सुपरि-टेण्डेंट, रिटायर्ड कलेक्टर यूनिवर्सिटीज में वाइस-चांसलर बनाए जा रहे हैं।

उसका नतीजा यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में इतिहास बन रहा है। लखनऊ यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस चांसलर को मुप्रतिल किया गया है। मैंने दो महीने पहले यही कहा था कि इस व्यक्ति को राजनीति के आधार पर वाइस चांसलर बनाया गया है जिस की जगह जेल में होनी चाहिए थी। केवल राजनैतिक आधार पर उसको बनाया गया और आज वह व्यक्ति वाइस चांसलर होते हुए चांसलर के बुलाने पर आता नहीं, चांसलर से भेंट नहीं करता और चांसलर उसे मुप्रतिल करता है। आज यह हालत है।

श्रीमन्, आखिरी बान कह कर खत्म करूंगा कि शाय भी प्रोफेसर साहब, शिक्षा मन्त्री जी यह नीति निर्धारित करें कि केवल शिक्षा से सम्बन्धित व्यक्ति ही वाइस चांसलर नियुक्त किये जाए। आप शिक्षा शास्त्रियों का पैना रखें और केवल उस पैना से वाइस चांसलर नियुक्त होते रहे। आप का एक आल इंडिया पैनाल हो और उस आल इंडिया पैनाल से सख्या क्रम के अनुसार वाइस चांसलर विभिन्न विश्वविद्यालयों में नियुक्त किये जाए, अन्यथा वही नतीजा होगा जो लखनऊ यूनिवर्सिटी में हुआ ? धन्यवाद।

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE STUDENTS' STRIKE IN BIRLA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE, PILANI

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, hon. Members will recall that yesterday the question of the strike by the students in the Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani, was raised here and again this afternoon several hon. Members have referred to it. I have a statement on the present situation. If you like, I will read it or place it on the Table of the House.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): You can lay it on the Table.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Sir, I beg to place on the Table of the House a statement regarding the students' strike in the Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5686/73].

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twelve minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 14th November, 1973.