

August, 1963, publishing certain amendments in the Second Schedule to the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957, under sub-section (1) of section 28 of the said Act. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1738/63.]

**THE COAL BEARING AREAS (ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT RULES, 1963**

**SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN:** Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Mines and Fuel Notification S.O. No. 2569, dated the 31st August, 1963, publishing the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Amendment Rules, 1963, under sub-section (3) of section 27 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1737/63.]

**THE ARMS (FOURTH AMENDMENT) RULES, 1963**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS):** Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 44 of the Arms Act, 1959, a copy of the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. 15-3-63-P.IV, dated the 9th August, 1963, publishing the Arms (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 1963. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1739/63.]

**FOURTEENTH REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (1963-64)**

**SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Maharashtra):** Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Fourteenth Report of the Public Accounts Committee (1963-64) on the Appropriation Accounts (Posts and Telegraphs) 1961-62 and Audit Report (Posts and Telegraphs), 1963.

**ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION RE REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I have to inform Members that under rule 153 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted 3½ hours for the consideration of Government motion regarding the Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1961-1962.

**MOTION RE REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION FOR 1961-62**

**THE MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR):** Sir, I beg to move the following Motion:—

"That the Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the period April, 1961 to March, 1962, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 20th August, 1963, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the report is before the House and therefore I do not propose to make any long speech on it but only to draw the attention of the House to certain aspects of development in university education during this year and in some of the previous years.

The number of universities during this year, I mean the year under review, 1961-62, was increased by 5, bringing the total to 51. Since then four more universities have been established, so that the total today is 55, and in addition a number of institutions have been given the status that they are to be deemed as universities.

I think the figures of enrolment of university students will be of interest to the House. As against 5 lakhs in 1951-52 on the eve of the First Plan, it was 8 lakhs in 1956-57 at the end of the First Plan. In 1961-62 it was 11.55

lakhs and in 1962-63 it is 12.73 lakhs. The number of women students has increased in a slightly higher proportion. In 1961-62 the number was about 1.85 lakhs giving 16 per cent. of the total university enrolment in that year. In 1962-63 this was 2.23 lakhs giving an enrolment of about 17.6 per cent. This is also not yet an adequate reflection of the population of the country, but I am sure my hon. friends in this House, particularly the women Members, will appreciate that in the last ten years considerable progress has been made. The almost "homeopathic" number of women students in the universities in former days has now reached a proportion of almost 17 per cent., and I am sure that the figure will go up.

It may also be of interest to the House to know that today the all-India average for the whole country in university enrolment is roughly 2.2 per cent which compares quite favourably with most advanced countries of the world. Even in a country like the U.K. it is not very different from this figure. I think the only two exceptions are the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. In the U.S.A. it is over 20 per cent., and in the U.S.S.R. it is about 8 per cent. With these two exceptions . . .

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM  
CHETTIAR (Madras): Per cent of what?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Of the population of the relevant age group. The U. K. is roughly the same as ours; 2.2 per cent of the population of the relevant age group. I am sorry it is enrolment per thousand of the population, 2.2 per thousand of population, not per cent. In West Bengal, it is the highest among the States with 3.7. It is the least, I regret to say, with 0.9 in Orissa. And so far as the Union Territories are concerned, Delhi is the highest with 7.8 but Delhi is not a State and that is why I left out Delhi at the first stage.

The number of those who have secured degrees has also increased

considerably from 1.4 lakhs in 1960 to 1.60 lakhs in 1961. These are certainly encouraging features. But the next point to which I come is not so encouraging, that is the question of teachers. The number of university and college teachers has increased from 63,128 in 1960-61 to well over 63,000 in 1961-62 and over 66,000 in 1962-63. But the teacher-pupil ratio has gone down. It was 1 to 15.3 in 1960-61 and 1 to 15.5 in 1961-62. It was 1 to 17.9, that is about 1 to 18, in 1962-63. This, I am sure the House will agree, is not a very encouraging feature and an effort should be made to attract more teachers, and what is even more important, the right quality of teachers and to retain them.

One of the disturbing features in University education has been the rapid turnover of teachers. Young men come to the universities, stay for a short period, look out for jobs elsewhere and very often they leave, so that there is a very rapid turnover in the first four or five years of their professional life. This is a feature which is disturbing and which we are considering how best to check. Of course, the major reason is the question of salary scales but that is not the only reason. The salary scale, I am glad to say, has been considerably improved, though not as well as we would like it to be. I may remind this House that as early as 1954, I had placed certain proposals before the Government, suggesting that the university teachers should be given a scale of Rs. 400 to Rs. 1,000 for lecturers. I am glad to say that even though that figure has not yet been reached, the University Grants Commission have now sanctioned a scale of Rs. 400 to Rs. 800, which is a considerable improvement on what it was in 1953-54—Rs. 250—500. An equally encouraging feature is that the University Grants Commission have now extended the scope of their activities beyond the universities proper and are offering assistance to affiliated colleges as well as Government colleges. Even then, we have to

[Shri Humayun Kabir.]

go a long way before fully satisfactory conditions are assured.

I am not offering this as the decision of the Government but I am just placing before the House one consideration, and I shall be very happy if hon. Members would express their views on this so that Government can, in the light of their opinion, take a decision in consultation with the University Grants Commission. I have for a long time felt that some of the reasons for the discontent among the teachers in the universities are partially the salary scales and partially the great disparity which exists between the different scales and grades. We have in this country too many types and classifications. We have too great disparities between the higher ranges of salaries and the lower ranges of salaries. Even today, after all the improvements which have been carried out by the University Grants Commission, we are still recruiting very young people as Assistant Lecturers or Instructors on a scale of Rs. 300—Rs. 400. The redeeming feature is that this is a short-term programme intended to take people temporarily to find out if they are interested in education, and provided they accept the profession, they go into the regular Lecturer's grade on Rs. 400—Rs. 800. But in the other ranges, we have fairly high salaries. For Vice-Chancellors, it is in some cases Rs. 2,500; in other cases it is Rs. 2,000. And even university Professors sometimes go up to Rs. 2,000 or more. These disparities do make for a difference. There are a large number of classifications, Assistant Lecturers, Lecturers, Readers, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors.

As I said a moment ago, I am not speaking on behalf of the Government but as one who is deeply interested in education and has been interested in education practically for the whole of his life. I would like to get the reaction of the House if we could have a simpler structure, perhaps a scale for

Lecturers of something like Rs. 400—Rs. 1,250 and for Professors a scale of about Rs. 1,000—Rs. 1,800. The actual figures may vary, but the main thing is that there should be only two scales instead of the many different scales obtaining today. And if Members of Parliament can express their views on that and if, there is general consensus on this point throughout the country, I have no doubt in my mind that the University Grants Commission would also sympathetically consider such a suggestion. I may mention that I have placed my personal point of view before the Chairman of the University Grants Commission. He also thinks that a move in this direction would not only lead to greater contentment among the teachers; what is even more important, it would create a more democratic atmosphere in the universities.

Today, with the many stratifications and many types of structures in the universities, to a certain extent teachers do not have that academic freedom which we want all universities to enjoy. I know that legally academic freedom is there in the universities but when there are these gross disparities of income and very great differences, and where very often the movement of a person from one scale to another depends on the goodwill of persons who are above, these gross disparities act as a kind of check or a bar to the genius and to the full development of the younger persons. But as I have said, this is an expression of a personal opinion, and I would welcome the opinions of other hon. Members of the House, so that this may be considered seriously both by the University Grants Commission and the Government.

Along with measures for improving the scales of teachers, special emphasis has been paid to the development of science and technology. Grants for science and technology have been increased and are continuing to be increased. I could give the figures but they are in the Report and as I do not

want to be long, I pass over these figures, and I would draw the attention of the hon. Members to the fact that this has taken place. Similarly, the University Grants Commission has taken steps to increase the amenities of students and teachers in the universities. Grants for the construction of hostels and staff quarters in universities have been given on a fairly generous scale. For hostels, the grant in 1960-61 was Rs. 21.27 lakhs; in 1961-62, it was 45.05 lakhs. Similarly, for staff quarters the grant in 1960-61 was Rs. 11.56 lakhs; in 1961-62 it was Rs. 37.22 lakhs. In the case of hostels in colleges also, the University Grants Commission have provided funds and the amount was Rs. 40.61 lakhs in 1960-61 and Rs. 35.02 lakhs in 1961-62. For staff quarters, nothing has been done so far for colleges but I understand that this matter also has been before the University Grants Commission and they will in due course take a decision in accordance with the needs of the situation.

Another happy development is the establishment of a number of centres of advanced studies. This is desirable, as with the great increase in the number of universities it is impossible, in the light of our available financial resources, that every university will provide the highest type of education and research in every subject. While every university is autonomous and has the right to develop, our financial resources compel, almost unwillingly, that we have to differentiate, and we have to see specialisation in certain areas. This will, of course, not apply to regular courses. Every university must provide regular courses at the graduate level, and maybe even at the M.A. level, but for advances beyond that, for advanced centres of study, some specialisation is necessary. 26 centres are proposed to be established of which four were established upto 1962-63. Since then, I understand, the University Grants Commission have gone further in this direction.

Another interesting—and I would say a happy—development in recent

years has been the institution of summer schools or seminars where teachers and young workers in different fields of studies, whether it be science or humanities, can get together and live together for a certain period, maybe two weeks, maybe three weeks, maybe four weeks, and attempt a survey of the advances made in their field of study. The summer schools have proved to be one of the most fruitful developments which we have had in recent times, and I have heard myself from the most distinguished scientists and others that their participation in those summer schools has brought to their notice many developments of which they were unaware. Here, I am happy to say that the two Ministries with which I am associated have both been co-operating and both have taken an initiative in the matter. Since 1959, the summer schools have been largely increasing, and the University Grants Commission during the current year is subsidising and helping a very large number of summer schools. Then there has been the very important question about the three-year degree course. This is a matter on which discussions have been going on in this country for over forty years and the consensus of opinion, without almost a single exception, has been that the three-year degree course is the only type of degree course which we should introduce at the under-graduate level. There have been differences as to whether this degree course should be introduced after eleven years of schooling or after twelve years of education or after ten years of education. There may be some difference on that point. But that the degree course as such, the structure of the course, should be three years is almost universally admitted. I will not go into the arguments that were given by the University Education Commission, not only the University Education Commission over which Dr. Radhakrishnan, our President today, presided and of which you were, Sir, a very distinguished member, but the University Grants

[Shri Humayun Kabir.]

Commission starting with the Saddler Commission in 1917-18 said that all over the world there is the tendency that the University's first degree should not be less than three years. In many countries, for example, in the United Kingdom today there is the move for making the Honours course a four-year degree course. I know that on the Continent and in certain of the Arab countries, like the U.A.R., they are planning in terms of a five-year degree course. But in any case three years seems to be the minimum.

Here I regret to say that the progress has not been as rapid as we would have wished. Only 590 colleges in 29 universities have changed to the three-year degree course during the Second Plan. And since then, even though two years have passed, the number has not increased very much. By the year under review, 1961-62, 692 colleges affiliated to 30 universities changed over to the three-year degree course, though for this the University Grants Commission has provided very generous assistance to the colleges and Universities. I only hope that whatever may be the decision about the duration of the secondary education course, the three-year degree course will not in any case be slowed down.

Here, if I may say so, to my mind, at times we have not, in approaching the problem, considered properly one of the most relevant considerations. That is the question of age. We debate about a ten-year secondary education, or eleven-year secondary education or a twelve-year secondary education, but unless we assure that only young men and women come to the universities and not children or people who are in their early adolescence, nothing can be done about standards. It is not an accident that throughout the world the age of entry in the universities is normally 18, and in many countries they are trying to raise it to 19. So far as the continent of Europe is concerned, in many cases it is 20 or over. In Germany it is very often 21. But I do not know of any country in the

world excepting India and the erstwhile part of undivided India, Pakistan, where the age of entry is 14, 15 or 16 years. It is true that the University Grants Commission have made a welcome move in that direction. In the field of technical education, about two or three years ago we took a decision that sixteen plus will be the minimum age of entry for institutions of University standing. In the universities also the University Grants Commission have now decided that sixteen plus should be the minimum age for entry into universities and they have made this recommendation to all universities of India. Till that point is decided, all discussions about a ten-year, eleven-year or a twelve-year course in school are, to my mind, unreal and artificial.

I remember on one occasion when this question was being discussed, a representative of a State Government said that no change in his State was necessary because it already had a twelve-year secondary school course. And when I asked him as to what was the average age at which pupils took the final school certificate examination, I was told that it varied between 14 and 15. My comment on that was that if we had a twelve-year course and the course ended at the age of 14 or 15, it means that the course must have started at the age of 2 or 3. I said why not go a step further and say that we should have a sixteen-year course and the course would start in the pre-natal period, when the child is still in the mother's womb?

Sir, we have fixed the point that people cannot come to the university till they are at least 16 or preferably 17. This age itself is early enough compared to the experience of all the countries of the world. Certainly it cannot be the case that all the countries in the world are wrong and we alone are right. There may be cases where this may happen but I am sure in this field that is not the case, and particularly so as in other countries, as a result of experience, they have gradually increased the age. Even in

the United Kingdom at one stage, some thirty, forty or may be fifty years ago, students were accepted in the university at the age of 16. If you go back 200 years or more, you find in the records of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge students coming at the unripe and immature age of 12 or 13. But all these are today things of the past. Through experience they have learnt that 17, 18 or 19 is about the earliest period when a person can join a University. If, therefore, we look at the period of duration of secondary education, from this point of view, I think the whole standard of university education will be raised.

Today there is a general complaint that while the numbers have increased, while facilities have increased, while laboratories have been improved, while libraries have been improved, while text books are very often offered to students through various kinds of loan schemes and lending libraries, still for a large number of students, not for all, I am happy to say, but for a large number of students the standard has not risen. In some cases it has fallen. It was low enough before and the essential need is to increase the standard, so that our university students can compete on equal terms with the university students elsewhere in the world. And if this is to be done, the first degree standard has to be considerably increased. If it is not increased, if it has remained only stationary, that would itself be a matter for concern and anxiety. Where in some cases there has been some fall, it is a matter for concern for all of us, especially for hon. Members of Parliament, of a House like this which represents all the States and which, as we very often say, is the House of Elders where the wisdom of the country is concentrated.

Sir, these are some of the broad features of the Report to which I would draw the attention of the House. I would now place the Report for the consideration of this House.

*The question was proposed.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon one of the hon. Members to speak I would like to say that I have a very long list of intending speakers. Unless the speeches are kept short, all of them will not have an opportunity to speak. So in the interest of other colleagues I hope the hon. Members who take part in this debate would confine their speeches, if possible, to ten minutes because even with ten minutes we will probably not be able to go through the whole list.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): We can dispense with the lunch hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid then there can be no budgeting of time.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Sir, while we congratulate the Minister of Education and the University Grants Commission on the work they have been able to produce during the year under report, 1961-62, there are certain points of criticism which are offered with a view to improving the working of the University Grants Commission. This year also I have to point out the impropriety of actual Vice-Chancellors being members of the University Grants Commission. I think the model of the English Commission might have been followed where no actual Vice-Chancellors are members of the Commission because it places these Vice-Chancellors in a compromising position because very often the request for grants for their universities may come up before the Commission, and they would be in rather an embarrassing position. Also I see that members of the Secretariat are included in the membership of the Commission. That action is a departure from the English practice.

With regard to the Committees in to which the University Grants Commission has resolved itself, there are Visiting Committees and Review Committees. They visited 39 universities in 1960-61 but this dropped to 28 out

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

of the 46 universities visited by one or other of these Committees. Either the work must have been very superficial or the work can be properly done only if the membership of the Review Committees at least is increased. These need not be composed altogether of Members of the U.G.C. but other educational experts may be co-opted for this temporary purpose of reviewing and setting up standards in the various universities. I do not know if the portfolio system is followed in the U.G.C. where members are given particular subjects to look after. For instance I think there should be a member concerned with the improvement of hostels and it would be his duty to go round hostels of the universities, as many as possible, and personally inspect the standard of hostel accommodation and the standard of hostel life.

Then I must deprecate the growing practice of giving all kinds of academic institutions, institutions of learning, the title 'university'. We have an Agricultural University, an Engineering University, etc. which is again against the whole tradition of university life. Universities are composed of different faculties, not one single faculty. The whole object of university education which is the influence of members of one faculty upon another, is really lost in these single faculty universities. There are respectable words like Institute, Institutions, like Academies, which may be adopted by the so-called Agricultural and Engineering Universities

I do not know again whether these visits of Committees allow for useful contacts between the visiting members and the members of the faculties of the universities they visit. In view of the large number of universities and in view of the small number of Committees and the small number of visiting members, I do not think there is any useful contact between members of the universities and members of the faculties so that the members of the

Committees may get into real and useful touch with the work of the universities.

With regard to the Schemes that have been sponsored by the U.G.C. I see a great disproportion. Library buildings get as much as Rs. 23 lakhs whereas the books which are to be accommodated in these libraries get only a grant of Rs. 11 lakhs, and the grants for hostel for nineteen universities in 1960-61 was Rs. 41 lakhs and I believe a similar amount is allotted for hostel buildings in the year under review. Affiliated colleges of course get another additional grant of Rs. 88 lakhs in 1961-62. In university life I place the greatest importance on hostel life. Last year I pointed out that in many universities and college hostels, rooms meant for a single under-graduate are occupied by three or four under-graduates. When I pointed out this to the former Minister of Education, he pooh-pooched the idea and said that my statement was not based upon actual experience. This year I came into very intimate contact with this fact because my grandson was admitted into the Guindy Engineering College and he elected to stay in the hostel and he was made to stay in a room intended for one now occupied by four students. How can any decent life be possible in such conditions? They had not even room to put their beds on, their cots on. This I think is a scandal and I think the U.G.C. by appointing a special member in charge of hostels may put an end to this.

Another important feature of hostel life is the common room. Every hostel should have a common room where students could meet each other, carry on conversations but that is the last thing thought of either by the engineer, by the architect or by the university responsible for the establishment of these hostels.

For building of teachers' residences in fifteen colleges only Rs. 4.78 lakhs have been given. That is another important feature of university life

that teachers' residences should be near their colleges, should be near the universities, so that the influence of teachers upon the students and of course incidentally the influence of students upon the teachers may be realised. The provision for teachers' residences is miserably poor.

Then there is a new development called Hobby Workshops. I do not know what these are and whether hobbies like children's hobbies are being provided for. I see some Hobby Workshops are provided for in the engineering colleges. I should have thought that the workshops in themselves gave enough scope for technical hobbies. Hobby Workshops as they should be, should be located in arts and ordinary science colleges where the students can be familiarised with the manual arts.

Again there is another strange development—rural universities. At a time when our literacy is about twenty-five per cent. in the most advanced States like Madras and about ten per cent. in the least advanced State like U.P., it is sheer mockery to speak of rural higher education. What we want is more primary schools in order to raise the level of literacy in our country. As if the production of unemployed and unemployable graduates was not enough, the Ministry and the U.G.C. have committed themselves to the policy and programme of establishing correspondence and evening colleges in arts and science subjects.

Tagore Lecturers—I suppose they are lecturers who are charged with the duty of spreading the popularity of Rabindranath Tagore's works or is it only the name that is given to these lecturers and they deal with other subjects?

One important work done by the U.G.C. is the financing of vocational education. It is not at the stage of university or college that we want vocational guidance. It is at an earlier stage, at the stage of high school that we want vocational guid-

ance so that the people who are not fit for university education may be diverted to technical courses. So I think every high school, as it is in England, should have a whole-time Career-Master, whose whole duty is to study the qualities, attributes or qualifications and previous experience of each student, keep a record of his intellectual development and advise the boy—and the parent—to devote himself to higher education in other spheres, in technical spheres if he has a technical aptitude and in higher academic university education if he has a flare for university education. Also, the U.G.C. should make a special grant for the training of these Career Masters so that in course of time every high school in this country would have the good fortune of having a Career Master on its staff. I see that the University Grants Commission, in order to make itself self-respecting, I suppose, is having an office building of its own. I do not object to it. But they seem to proliferate into local universities. A large portion of the University Buildings of the Madras University is occupied by the local officers of the University Grants Commission so that the Senate Building is not serving the University at all. There are lecturers without rooms for themselves and there are lecture-halls which are not enough and so the building of this Rs. 75 lakh structure which was possible on account of the Centenary Grant has not served the purposes of the University. I think in sheer self-respect, the University Grants Commission should find office accommodation of its own.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** Does the hon. Member mean to say that there is an office of the University Grants Commission in Madras?

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:** Yes, in the Madras University itself. It is located in the building of the Madras University. I have seen it myself.

**Mr. CHAIRMAN:** I hate to interrupt you, Prof. Ruthnaswamy, but you have already spoken for twelve minutes.



**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:** I have finished, Sir. I conclude by saying that while we must congratulate the University Grants Commission on the work it has done, it has to look forward to much better work and to concentrate upon essentials for achieving its great object, its main object, namely, the maintenance and raising of the standards of university education in the country.

**SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR:** Mr. Chairman, the University Grants Commission has indeed, made a difference in higher education all over India. Universities were lacking in funds for equipment. Colleges were lacking in funds for equipment. Post-graduate courses were famished for funds and the University Grants Commission has filled a very useful place in fulfilling the needs of these educational institutions.

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.]

While the University Grants Commission have done whatever they can with the funds that were provided to them, there are certain lacunae which we must understand. Recently, a few days back, in our Parliamentary Scientific Association, Dr. Bhagavantam, the Defence Scientific Adviser, gave us a talk on the subject of Research in India, and one thing which he said was very surprising indeed. He said that India spends about Rs. 200 crores for research in the Third Five Year Plan, and for this sum of Rs. 200 crores, the break-up given in the Third Plan is like this—

(Rs in crores)

Council of Scientific and Industrial Research	35.00
Atomic Energy	35.00
Agricultural Research	26.00
Medical Research	3.50
Research under other Central Ministries, and	30.89
Carried over from the Second Five Year Plan	75.00

Also, I think Prof. Mahalanobis recently on the 10th April 1963, has given us a break-up and said that the share of the non-governmental institutions, including universities is probably Rs. 50 lakhs; on a rough guess that sum of Rs. 50 lakhs is being sanctioned to non-governmental institutions, including universities. Madam Deputy Chairman, we think that our Universities are engaged in research, but if only Rs. 50 lakhs are being spent in these universities, then what is the kind of research that they can do in those universities? I think we are wasting and not utilising all these high-grade institutions for the service of the country in the field of research. If our universities are to take their proper place along with the universities of the world, they must raise the investment on research and I hope that this subject will have the attention of the Government and of the University Grants Commission.

The second matter which I would like to mention, Madam Deputy Chairman, is the increase in the number of our universities. The hon. Minister who moved the motion has said that the number of universities has increased. But one thing I am not very happy about. I am happy that the engineering and agricultural universities, in addition to engineering and agriculture, also have other sciences that are basic sciences. In some institutions they have also introduced the humanities so that the education can be rounded off. But I am not able to understand this about Rabindra Bharati. It is stated here:

"Rabindra Bharati has been established in the house in which Rabindranath Tagore was born and will be mainly concerned with music and the arts."

That will be regarded as a university. We have all great admiration for Poet Rabindranath Tagore. We

wish that his house must be acquired and must be kept as a museum or some such thing. We also like it to be developed as an institution for music, dancing and so on. But to consider it as a university, I think, is a step in the wrong direction. I do not think, even though the name "university" has been given to it, it will be regarded as a university by the people. It may be a matter of self-satisfaction to the devotees of the poet to think that they have established a university in his name. But I think it is a step in the wrong direction and the University Grants Commission must have the courage and the strength to say what they feel about this matter. I don't know whether in this matter the University Grants Commission was consulted, and if consulted whether they offered any opinion, and if they had agreed to have it as a university, then my respect goes down, because then I feel that the University Grants Commission also gets cowed down when proposals come from the State Governments or the Government of India. I want them to be independent even with the Government of India, even though they get money from the Government of India, and they must have the strength, the vitality and the courage to put forth their views and say whatever they think is right.

Madam Deputy Chairman, now I come to the expenditure part. Here I find there is some very gross difference between the treatment given to the Central universities and the State universities. Page 26 gives the amount of money that has been spent on the Central universities and the total comes to about Rs. 3.31 crores. And the Central universities are:

- The Aligarh Muslim University,
- The Banaras Hindu University,
- 5-4 Delhi University,
- Constituent Colleges of Delhi University,
- The Indian Institute of Science,

The Indian School of International Studies, and

Visva-Bharati.

About the Constituent Colleges of Delhi University, I have to say something and that I will do later.

Now, coming to the expenditure on State universities, the total in their case comes to Rs. 1.52 crores only, and their number is as much as 37. I say this is not proper. The University Grants Commission must treat equally the Central and the State universities. The State universities are not given the full grants. In the case of the Central universities, every pie is met by the University Grants Commission. The result is that the expenditure on the Central universities is not properly guided, because they get what they like. When people get everything that they are asking, then they have no financial responsibility.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh): The State universities are maintained by the States and it is only for the development of these universities that the University Grants Commission gives money.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I know. Let us then take a statistics of what money the Government of the States are giving to the various State universities, that money is but a pittance, Madam Deputy Chairman, compared to Rs. 60 lakhs and Rs. 70 lakhs that are given to the Central universities. I say this is neither fair nor right.

Coming to the Delhi Constituent Colleges, I find from the statement here:

"90 per cent of the approved recurring expenditure is met by the Commission and any special expenditure."

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: That is for the schools, not for the colleges.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: They give it to the colleges. I have got the reference here on page 6 of this Report of the university Grants Commission. There it is stated:

"in the case of the constituent colleges of Delhi University, 90 per cent of the approved recurring expenditure is met by the Commission and any special expenditure that may be necessitated by special schemes in the university (such as the transfer of science departments) is met wholly or partly by the Commission according to the circumstances of each case."

Sir, Delhi is the capital city and I do not mind a little more money being spent in Delhi. But compare what is happening in other parts of the country. In Delhi they get 90 per cent of the expenditure without taking into account the income from fees. I want the statistics to be placed before the House as to how many colleges have received fees which amount to more than the 10 per cent deficit they have to meet and how all this money is being utilised. (*Time bell rings.*)

It is not fifteen minutes, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, only ten minutes.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Madam, it is very hard.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has said that it will be ten minutes.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: But we said that it may be extended, that the time may be extended. I would request you to extend the time, Madam, because so many want to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't think it is possible to extend the time unless we cut down the lunch hour.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: We can cut down the lunch hour. You may put it to the House, Madam, and I am sure many will agree to cut down the lunch hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not the whole of it, may be half-an-hour.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): The Chairman had ruled it out.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: These matters can always be reconsidered. There is no *res judicata* in this matter.

Madam, I do not like to take much of the time of the House. I would like to say only this that this matter may be enquired into. I greatly approve this programme for a Centre for Advance Studies. It is a very good move but to have only twenty centres for all the five years seems to be a small number. The Seminars and Summer Schools are quite good.

I would refer to one other matter before I sit down and that is the matter of the affiliated colleges. If 86 per cent of those who undergo University education are enrolled in affiliated colleges, is it not necessary that we should give some attention to these affiliated colleges? What has the University Grants Commission done in this matter? All those people who had received aid in the Second Five Year Plan have been debarred from receiving aid during the Third Plan. This is not the way to help these affiliated colleges in which 86 per cent of our University-going population are studying and I say that the affiliated colleges deserve a much better treatment from the University Grants Commission than they have hitherto received.

I would now like to say a word on another matter, that of post-graduate studies. You know, Madam, that we need about fifty thousand post-graduates of whom twenty thousand are to be science graduates for our developmental purposes but at present,

all over India, we produce only twenty thousand post-graduates of whom six thousand are science graduates. This is not a very satisfactory state of affairs. Post-graduate courses must be encouraged. Unless you increase the post-graduate courses, how are you going to get the staff for your schools and colleges? Wherever there is good staff, you must be able to provide post-graduate courses and wherever there is good staff, you must be able to put up advanced centres of training.

As the hon. Member who spoke before me said, while the Commission have done good work, I hope they will be able to do better work in future.

**SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY** (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, while I agree with many of the sentiments and expressions expressed by the hon. Minister and Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar, one point which I would like the University Grants Commission to take up is how far the Universities are serving the purpose of developing a cadre of students for purposes of building socialism in this country. The curricula of the universities must be so organised as to include the principles of planning which constitute the introductory chapter of the Third Five Year Plan and also the Directive Principles of State Policy. Proper text-books must be prepared so that the students may be trained from this stage onwards to devote their attention and energy to this and become psychologically fit for the purpose of building up a socialist system in the country. Socialist consciousness is like a sense of morality and it is directed towards the social order and it could help us as a valuable arbitrator to decide our attitudes to various problems. In other words, the students must, in their learning and in their psychology, develop a vested interest in socialism. Otherwise, it is impossible to create a socialist order in this country without proper material to build upon.

The next point which I would like to mention is this. Under section 26(1)(e) of the University Grants Commission Act, the Commission sent up regulations prescribing the qualifications for the various posts in the teaching staff of the University. In the case of the Readers, the Commission had said, in addition to the academic qualifications, a person must have about five years' experience of teaching at a University or a College and some experience of guiding research. This is conveyed by the Commission's letter No. F.87-170/58. I take it, Madam, that when the University Grants Commission issued this regulation, it meant teaching experience in any University for purposes of construing this five years but this direction or the regulation has been wholly misunderstood, misconstrued and misapplied either by malice or otherwise by wanton misconstruction of the words by a certain Vice-Chancellor. In the case of the Andhra University, on the question of promotion of a lecturer who had worked for four years in various other Universities like the University of Gauhati, the University of Lucknow, etc., the Vice-Chancellor interpreted the University Grants Commission's regulation to mean teaching experience of five years in the said University, and a lecturer should have worked for five years in that University before he is promoted and whatever may be his experience gained previously in other Universities, that will not be taken into consideration. This he stated in a statement sworn to by him before the High Court of Andhra Pradesh. The Registrar of that University had brought it to his notice that such an interpretation was not contemplated by the rule or regulation of the University Grants Commission and yet the Vice-Chancellor had taken this view and he said as follows in a sworn statement before the High Court:

"I had the interpretation of the Registrar before me but I construed the resolution of this Syndicate meaning five years of teaching

[Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy.]

experience in this University and I acted on that interpretation which I submit is correct."

I do not for a moment think that the University Grants Commission in its wisdom could have made such a regulation, that they meant by teaching experience only as experience in a particular University. I can speak with twelve years of experience of the Annamalai University administration as a member of the Senate—and Mr. Ruthnaswamy would certify to that—that the words "teaching experience" mean teaching experience in any University. If this ruling of the Andhra University Vice-Chancellor is to be maintained, then it would be impossible for any person to be appointed either as a Professor or as a Reader, directly. This is an absurd construction of this clause and this Vice-Chancellor comes forward with a sworn statement of this character before a respectable court like the High Court. This is the way the regulations of the University Grants Commission are being misinterpreted. I hope the University Grants Commission—and Prof. Wadia is here—would take this into consideration and pull up the Vice-Chancellor in this regard.

The Andhra University Act is there. According to section 16 of the Andhra University Act, the Senate is empowered to pass statutes but in the entire history of the Andhra University—I want the Minister and the Member of the University Grants Commission to note—not a single statute has been passed by the Andhra University Senate and you know, Madam, that unless the Senate passes the statutes, there is no provision of law on which a person, who works in the University either as a Professor or as a Lecturer or in an administrative capacity, can rely upon for his service conditions. The Act enjoins upon the University Senate to pass statutes but ever since the University came into existence, even though the Act has been amended in 1958,

until today I can state without any fear of contradiction that no statute had been passed. On the contrary the University of Madras, the University of Annamalai, the University of Mysore, every other conceivable University has got statutes passed by the Senate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is one o'clock now. The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

The House adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past-two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I was referring to the absence of any statutory protection or any statute being enacted by the Senate under section 16 of the Andhra University Act so far. In other words there is absolutely no statutory protection or statutory direction or statutory guidance for the Syndicate to act. On the contrary the Syndicate runs the administration by only passing resolutions every week or every month which they can abrogate in the next meeting of the Syndicate if they chose to do so. It is just like running the Government by Cabinet resolutions without parliamentary legislation.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): I understand the Andhra Pradesh Government has appointed a Committee to enquire into the affairs of Andhra University.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Yes; a Committee had been appointed by the Andhra Government to enquire into the conduct of the Andhra University affairs but a hue and cry was raised that the autonomy of the University has been violated by the

Andhra Government and therefore with great magnanimity the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh has withdrawn that Committee with the hope that the Andhra University administrators would be able to see some sense and would be able to rectify all the mistakes which they have committed. For this purpose they appointed a Syndicate Committee to review their own working but unfortunately in this matter what is happening is this. The Syndicate has passed resolutions affecting other parties and when those other parties have to file appeals before them against their various orders it is impossible for the same Committee to review those orders because it is unthinkable that a Committee would revise their own orders when an appeal is made against their own orders. As Lord Cave has put it if there is the slightest bias, the Committee cannot go into a matter. In other words as Chief Justice Trevor Harris has said, "it is an appeal from Caesar to Caesar", and nothing else, in such case such a Committee is morally and legally incompetent to go into the matter.

Sir, I have been referring to some of the activities of the Andhra University and I would only bring one more matter to the hon. Minister's attention. A Committee with the Vice-Chancellor as Chairman had interviewed candidates for appointment as Lecturers where a first class student, a high second class student and a low second class student appeared for interview. The Vice-Chancellor selected the low second class student whereas the expert on the Committee recommended the first class student. When the matter came up before the court in a writ petition the Vice-Chancellor in a sworn statement filed as an affidavit in the court said that the candidate whom he had selected had got 59 per cent. It looks as if it is very attractive but on the contrary when the marks were obtained from the Saugor University the Saugor University says that the candidate in question got only 50.1 per cent and not 59 per cent. And since

the expert on the Committee differed from the Vice-Chancellor what the Vice-Chancellor did was to extend the Lecturer's probation to four years.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** But how can the University Grants Commission help you in this matter? It is after all a State University and it is the responsibility of the State to look into all these matters.

**SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** Well, I appreciate Shri Akbar Ali Khan's interruption. But while the autonomous character of a University has to be respected it cannot be allowed to run a violent course. It is the duty of this Parliament, as we are a reviewing body over the work of the University Grants Commission and since the University Grants Commission is giving grants to the universities, to look into these things. The University Grants Commission cannot distribute money to the various universities like a kind father distributing money to the prodigal sons. If there is a prodigal son it is the duty of the University Grants Commission to check such activities, appoint a Committee and go into the work of such universities so that the money given to them is properly spent instead of being wasted on unworthy people and undesirable candidates. That in my submission is an urgent task which the University Grants Commission should undertake.

I would conclude my speech by quoting in this connection the Prime Minister who has said this in one of his speeches about the task of the universities:

"A university stands for humanism, for tolerance, for reason, for progress, for the adventure of ideas and for the search for truth. It stands for the onward march of the human race towards even higher objectives. If the universities discharge their duty adequately, then it is well with the nation and the people. But if the temple of learn-

[Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy.]  
ing itself becomes a home of  
narrow bigotry and petty objectives,  
how then will the nation prosper or  
a people grow in stature?"

If that is the objective which the Prime Minister had and which the University Grants Commission should keep in mind, such of the universities where bigotry and narrow-mindedness are prevalent must be checked and the University Grants Commission must certainly look into these matters.

Thank you.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): The Minister this morning in his speech referred to the progress that has been made in university education in the country by several universities implicitly acknowledging the work that has been done by the University Grants Commission. In my opinion even by the tempo of life that you see around you in the country the progress would have been well achieved without the efforts that we have credited the University Grants Commission with. Somehow I cannot help feelings—as a matter of fact Mr. Raghunatha Reddy echoed the idea in my mind—that the University Grants Commission is someone like a good old man distributing gifts and benefits all round like a Christmas Father, expecting nothing in return or like the United States giving aid all round, making everyone all round envious or jealous, but not worrying how it is spent, ill or well.

According to the statute which created the University Grants Commission among the many other objects there were two, one to disburse moneys for providing greater facilities for education in order to reduce disparities in university education obtaining in different parts of the country and secondly to maintain and raise university education to adequate academic standards—two very laudable objectives. I shall take up the

first objective first, namely, providing greater facilities for university education in order to reduce disparities. Now the figures given in the Report of the University Grants Commission about the number of students per thousand of population in my opinion affords a very vivid picture of the disparities from State to State. Now, obviously a remedy might be suggested that there should be more universities and I should not be understood to be saying that there should not be more universities.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: There is one view that there should not be more universities?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: No; that is not my view. There should be more universities. But, the problem that needs to be tackled in this country arises out of a growing economy, of growing needs for education, of growing number of students at the universities, of growing knowledge all round the world, of growing standards of education in other countries and last but not the least, of growing inadequacy of the background and scholarship among lecturers, readers and professors. I must confess I feel a little disappointed when I meet some of the readers and professors of universities. It seems to me that the training and equipment that they have received for this kind of work is woefully short and the measure of their teaching is correspondingly lacking in what I would call the length, breadth and depth of knowledge. Secondly, I attach great value to libraries and books in university education. Money is given by the University Grants Commission for journals and periodicals to be bought but within the university itself there is no guidance to students how to use this library, when to use this library or books or which books are to be used. You will agree, Sir, that not all knowledge can be taught in classroom. A student has to be encouraged by his lecturer and professor to learn more outside the classroom and he does so by suggestions

to the student as to what books he can read and what source material he can refer to. I am quite sure that it is the fundamental principle of a university not so much to teach the students what they should be taught according to the curriculum as to find what knowledge where. And when the teachers themselves do not know where to find what knowledge, it is difficult to impart that awareness to the students themselves. Even to day the dictionary is not very popular in schools and colleges. Works of reference and source material have to be referred to constantly, but the teaching staff have no knowledge where the reference source material is. What we call the index is something very strange to them. They do not know how to refer to an index. I believe not only should there be good libraries and reference source materials in every college, but also there should be proper persons to secure good books, keep and arrange them and impart the knowledge to students, where they should get what information.

I am afraid I cannot go further into this question of providing greater educational facilities because I must go to the next objective which I mentioned a little while ago, namely, the maintaining and raising of adequate academic standards within a university. I know the University Grants Commission is seized of this matter, but I am afraid in an oblique manner, not quite squarely. It has sponsored, I am told according to the Reports, Seminars and study circles, but the results obtaining in the classrooms, after the teachers go back to their colleges, are not very encouraging. In the first place, I observe that standards are not similar or nearly similar in different colleges in the same university. This should be easy to rectify and in a short time, but this disparity continues to exist. Secondly, standards vary very greatly from university to university. I regard the Delhi University standards as probably the best in the country.

That is my personal opinion. But standards in the other universities are perceptibly going down. A First Class M.A. in a particular university is not the same as another First Class M.A. of another university. Not only the standards of teaching but also the valuation of examination papers, it seems to me, all over the country are begging for review and standardisation. In one university I was told by a Vice-Chancellor, there were 16 students in the M.A. Economics class. The results were 10 First Class 6 Second Class, no Third Class, no failures. In my days, it was very difficult to get even a Second Class in Economics or History. That depended upon valuation and the standards the examiners set before themselves. This is a very bad example: but portrays the problem very vividly.

Finally, I know that the universities are autonomous, but the very fact that they are autonomous seems to spell out, in my opinion, the need to watch their work. This brings me to the question of the University Grants Commission's role now and in future. The UGC is a statutory body. Universities are autonomous. How then is co-ordination between the two and much more implementation of certain suggestions that the University Grants Commission would make, to be carried out? The UGC doles out money to universities but how it is spent by the universities is none of its business. The universities spend it according to their best discretion. One recent example is this. I would not like to name the university. A certain university bought a car for Rs. 55,000, an air-conditioned car. Was it necessary? Would they not have been able to do with another cheaper type of car? Therefore, I am wondering whether the time has not come when we should think of revising the statute of the University Grants Commission to vest it with certain inspectorial facilities or powers, not with a view to robbing the universities of their autonomy . . .



THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Are they not already there?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: ...but to ensure that its present functions under the statute are effectively carried out. Thank you.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I see from the Report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1961-62 that a fairly commendable amount of work has been done by them under the scope it has been given to further the interests of education in this country. But there are one or two aspects about which I have not been able to persuade myself to feel very happy. The total expenditure during 1961-62, both under non-Plan projects and Plan projects, comes to Rs. 10.691 crores. It is really an enormous amount by any standard, especially taking into consideration the present economic condition of our country. The large amount of spending must necessarily reflect in the better performance in regard to the spread of education for which this money has been spent. I see from the Report that admissions have been fairly good and failures also have been very good indeed. Very good in the sense that proportionate to the admissions that have been made in the various colleges, failures also have been increasing, in the same magnitude at which admissions take place to the various colleges of engineering, humanities and sciences. Therefore, I am not very happy, nor is the Commission very happy. Writing under the heading "Examination Reform" they say:

"The report should stimulate administrators and teachers in our universities to take a serious look at our present examination system in which the failure rates are very high and the correlation between teaching and examining very unsatisfactory."

This is the observation which the University Grants Commission has made in its report, and I am sure

everyone of us also is equally unhappy and shares the concern which the Commission have expressed.

Then the yearly enrolment has been increasing, as was stated by the hon. Minister, by nearly one lakh. In 1960-61 the admissions were 10.48 lakhs; in 1961-62 the figure is 11.15 lakhs; in 1962-63 we are told that about 12.7 lakhs are admitted. The failures reveal a very sad state of affairs. The following are the figures for the year 1960-61:

	Per cent.
B.A. . . . .	57.0
B.Com. . . . .	50.8
B.Sc. . . . .	49.0
M.A. . . . .	23.1
M.Com. . . . .	16.9
B.Sc. (Engg). . . . .	30.1
	etc., etc.

So, the rate of failures has been far too high. I do not know how the other countries, especially the advanced countries, are faring with regard to failures. We see that the incidence of failures has been too great so far as our country is concerned.

Speaking of pre-university, the failures in pre-university have not been given. But I am sure that the failures are somewhere about 80 per cent. I would like to be corrected by the hon. Minister if I am wrong. The pre-university has become a very complex affair. For students especially in the South, when we compare their performance in the high school stage with the pre-university stage, it is completely a different world altogether for the high school students. When they go to the pre-university stage, the curriculum, etc., everything is different. They are so different, and hardly one year's time has been given to them, and they are not able to settle themselves. The colleges have been started on account of admission difficulties. The colleges are started very late. They get hardly eight months' coaching with the result that in the final examination

there is complete slaughter, and eighty per cent. of the students have failed.

I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister to a matter of very great concern to the people of the South. Only yesterday the "Hindu" was commenting on it. I would like everyone to kindly note that I am not speaking this with any parochial attitude towards this problem. It is really a national problem. What I mean is the great waste there is in the educational system that we have been pursuing. I would like to know why no uniformity has been fixed. So far as the Government of India is concerned, it has started some national technological institutions, and the performance of the students of the southern region is said to be surprisingly sad. For about 1800 seats only 70 students have been able to come out successful from the southern region. I was all along under the impression that it was the students of the southern region that were always scoring over the students of the northern region, but here to my mortification I find—I will read the comments of the "Hindu" of yesterday:

"That the Southern Zone was able to get only 70 places in the all-India merit list of the first 1000 this year should shock the university authorities in this region into some realistic reappraisal of the syllabus and teaching of these subjects. There has been some upgrading of the science courses this year, at least in the Madras University, stimulated by the Emergency, but it is still doubtful if the upgrading is adequate."

Then it goes on:

"The trouble has been aggravated by the need for sudden switchover to English medium in the P.U.C. after learning science in the regional language in school."

I am only reading this to show that a lot of disparities and difficulties have been created for the university

education with the result that there is a lot of wastage.

"The acceptance of that proposal would give students a little more time to get accustomed to the English medium."

Then the paper says:

"It is not a matter of parochial prestige but one of ending a waste of valuable human resources."

This is what the "Hindu", a reputed paper from Madras, says.

The same thing has been said by the "Indian Express" today. Under "Science in colleges" it says several things. Of course I would invite the attention of the hon. Minister to this aspect, and I would read only a sentence from this:

"The national institutes have been set up with great hopes and at much expense to provide for the teaching of technology and science on a national basis. If southern students are not admitted in due proportion, that purpose would be defeated."

This is the defeat that our educational system has suffered. Therefore, I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister and the University Grants Commission to this aspect.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am sure it is all done solely on merit.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Solely on merit. Then how it came about that merit was sacrificed in the southern region? Is it not a national waste? That is what I am inviting your attention to.

Finally, Sir, I come to another aspect, a very important aspect. Of course nobody will accuse me of parochial attitude. In the city of Bangalore there are 22 colleges. There are 16,000 students in the various university courses. Of course it is not for me to say much about that place. Only the other day the United States Ambassador, Mr. Chester Bowles,

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

visited Bangalore and said that if he could be permitted, he would shift his entire office from Delhi to Bangalore. That is the pre-eminence Bangalore has earned with regard to salubrious climate, importance, and everything. Bangalore has been agitating for a university of its own and a Central University at that. You have got four Central Universities, Visva-Bharati, Delhi, Aligarh and Banaras, but not a single one in the South. I want this disparity to be removed by the grant of a Central University to Bangalore. It is not my opinion only. It was the opinion of the Committee appointed by the University Grants Commission. I am only reading one sentence:

"In the case of Bangalore no formal request has been received by the University Grants Commission, but the Committee thought that this would be one of the most suitable places in the country for the establishment of a new university of the federal type. Bangalore fulfils practically every condition...."

Please note this:

"Bangalore fulfils practically every condition laid down in the earlier paragraphs as essential for such a federal university."

This is the observation of one of the Committees appointed by the Commission. Therefore, I very earnestly and sincerely commend the suggestion for the establishment of a Central University at Bangalore, for the acceptance of the Government.

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY** (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it would have been better if the report of the University Grants Commission for 1961-62 was placed before this House for discussion earlier. In fact it should have been the report of the Commission for 1962-63 which we should have been discussing today. It would be unrealistic if the report of the University Grants Commission or any other body is discussed after a

long lapse of time. I would first of all urge the Minister to see that the University Grants Commission's reports are submitted or placed before Parliament within three or four months after the year was over.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY) in the Chair.]

In this report it has been shown as to how money has been distributed to the different universities. The Central Universities no doubt get a huge share, but the State Universities get very little. I agree with Mr. Chettiar when he says that this abnormal thing should not have happened. The Committee has also stated that in the interests of national integration parochial things should not be brought in and that these Central Universities should admit students from all parts of the country. But unfortunately the Central Universities are situated in the North. So much so, many of the students from the South are denied admission into these universities. I therefore very strongly urge upon the Government to see that one or two Central Universities are located in the South, one at Bangalore and the other either at Hyderabad or at some other place in the South.

3 P.M.

The Minister has given us some figures regarding the number of students studying in the universities and the number of teachers in those universities. It is really staggering to learn that the number of students is increasing while the number of teachers is not increasing in consonance with the need of the situation. The teacher-student ratio was 1 to 15.3 in 1960-61, 1 to 15.5 in 1961-62 and it was 1 to 17.9 in 1962-63. This has got something to do with the standard of education. The large number of failures which was referred to by my predecessor and which has been given in this Report is really shocking. Something must be done to remove such a high rate of failures. It is a national waste. One way of doing it is by giving good incentives

to the teachers, by giving them good salaries so that they are contented and they give their best to the students. I welcome the Minister's statement that he would like to propose only two grades of scales for the teaching staff in the universities. There should not be so much of disparity between the scales of pay of a Lecturer, a Reader, a Professor and a Principal of a college. The revised scales of pay that the University Grants Commission has been implementing are given on page 4—

Rs.

Professor . .	1000—50—1500
Reader . . .	700—40—1100
Lecturer . .	400—30—640—40— 800

The Minister has suggested that there should be two scales of pay. I entirely agree with him, and the disparity between the scales of pay of a Lecturer and a Professor should not be very much. In the U.S.A., I understand the scales of pay of the Assistant Secretary, the Under Secretary and the Secretary of State are not so wide as to make the persons working in the administration feel that they are not paid properly. I welcome this suggestion and it should be implemented by all the universities. Only 22 universities have accepted these revised scales of pay. I do not know why the revised scales of pay have not been agreed to or implemented by the University of Mysore. Here I must bring to the notice of the Minister that there are too many temporary Lecturers there. It is a very sad thing. For years together they have served, they have put in three or four or five years of service and they are still treated as temporary Lecturers. There must be something radically wrong with the administration of the Mysore University. The Minister should see that such a thing does not happen.

Regarding the failure of the students, Shri Sri Rama Reddy has quoted extensively to show how it is going to affect national interests and

how the students are going to suffer. Here I would like to point out that some radical steps should be taken by the University Grants Commission to see that the failures are reduced.

I would also like to bring to the notice of the Minister that in the Mysore University, in 1963, the results of the M.B.B.S. examination were announced. Afterwards, it was found out that 26 persons who had passed in the examination were declared as failed and after an investigation was instituted by the Syndicate of the University, it was found out that those students who had failed had actually passed and those who had passed had obtained marks less than those required for passing. This is a very sad state of affairs and really a very shameful thing. I do not know why such a thing was allowed to happen in that university. An eye-wash committee was appointed but I understand that the person who was responsible for this has gone scot-free. Such things will not bring any credit to the university and I would therefore urge that the University Grants Commission should institute an enquiry into this affairs and see that such things do not occur again.

I am glad that hostel facilities are being given to the students but the number of hostels or the number of students that are now housed in these hostels is not very large. Only one student in five gets accommodation in the hostel, it should be more. At least 50 per cent of the students studying at the university should be given hostel accommodation. I am glad to learn that more funds are given for the construction of hostels for women students. It is a welcome move. More hostels are necessary for women students than for men students. In this connection, I would say that the Minister has said that the number of women students is increasing year after year. The position is, 16 per cent. of the women students were studying in 1961-62 and in 1962-63, 17.6 per cent. are studying. Women

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

are a weaker section according to the constitution and I would therefore urge that more facilities should be given to women students by way of reducing the fees that the women students have to pay. Formerly, in Mysore State 50 per cent. of the fee was allowed to be paid by women students. So much so, more encouragement was given to women's education.

Regarding professional colleges, I would like to say that more and more engineering and medical colleges are really needed. But unfortunately, more and more engineering and medical colleges are being started by private agencies. They have become commercial institutions. Poor students do not get admission, people with money can get admission into these colleges. Here I would like to ask the Minister whether the time has not come to revise this attitude with regard to education. When we are thinking of public undertakings for other purposes, particularly in the field of education we should not allow the private agencies to undertake this work. We might experience the same difficulties as were experienced in Kerala and are being experienced in other places. I would therefore urge upon the Ministry to look into this matter and revise their attitude. I would very strongly urge that engineering and medical colleges and technical institutions should be started by Government and Government alone, either the Central Government or the State Government. Mysore is known for engineering education and the late Sir M. Visvesvarayya, the engineer-statesman, was the product of the Engineering College at Bangalore. Therefore there is very good scope there for engineering. I would urge upon the Minister to transform the regional Engineering College at Suratgarh into an Institute of Technology.

Regarding the 3-year degree course, I am really not happy. It has not brought very good results. The pre-

university classes are attached to the Higher Secondary schools and the result is that these students are denied the academic atmosphere of a university and only one year after the Matriculation or S.S.L.C. they will be reading for the P.U.C. and they will have to appear for public examination, whereas the students studying for degree courses will study for three years and appear for public examination. Instead of that if there is a two-year course for Intermediate and two-year course for degree, it will be better. I would urge the Ministry to revise their attitude with regard to this and do something about it.

Lastly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, regarding the medium of instruction in the universities, the Commission has stated:

"In our opinion the transition from English to an Indian language should be brought about in as short a period as possible consistently with the maintenance of proper standards."

I really do not agree with the views expressed by the Commission. The time has not yet come to have our regional languages as the media of instruction in our universities. I would still feel that English should continue to be the medium of instruction in our universities. The transition should be very slow. For some time to come and later on too it should be the national language and if the regional language is the medium of instruction in all the universities, then innumerable troubles will arise. The question of integration, the question of services and so many other difficulties will arise. If there is any transition from English to any other language, it should be Hindi not immediately, but after a very, very long time.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You have to conclude.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Another thing I would like to urge is

that the study of Southern languages in the Northern universities should be encouraged and *vice versa*. The study of Hindi should be encouraged in the Southern universities.

Another point I would like to urge is that the other day I learned that the Aligarh University has introduced the Roman script for the Urdu and the Hindi languages. The same principle should be followed in other universities.

**Shri AKBAR ALI KHAN:** It is incorrect to say that it has introduced in general. They have introduced it in specific cases where they want to use it; they have permitted the use of the Roman script in specific cases. But generally speaking, they are following the policy of using the Devanagari script for Hindi and the Persian script for Urdu.

**Shri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:** My plea is that the use of the Roman script should be actively encouraged by the University Grants Commission and the Ministry. The Roman script will be very easy to learn and it will be one of the main sources of achieving national integration.

**Dr. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am sorry to disagree with my esteemed friend, Mr. Samuel, who said that like good, old, Christmas Father, the U.G.C. has only been distributing money to the impoverished and poor universities. This is a very uncharitable thing to say about an organisation which has been doing a very good job towards the universities. And being one of those connected with university work for the last thirty-one years, I know what the universities were before the University Grants Commission came into the picture and what after. Therefore, I must dissociate myself from any utterance of this kind.

The U.G.C. certainly deserves a better appreciation from us all, not just because it has presented us with

a very rounded report for the year 1961-62 but also because this report gives a good general idea of the state of our higher education, and it does one's heart good to see that there is in the land at least one organisation that is seized of almost all the major problems of our universities. I would not, therefore, go into general remarks of this kind any more but go straight into the contents of the report.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** You will appreciate the helplessness of the U.G.C. and I am sure you would very much like them to have more power.

**DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY:** As I see the problem in our country and as has been stressed by this report as well, everywhere, in respect of everything, there is that great problem, the problem of numbers. With higher education also in the universities it is mostly the problem of numbers. The report has brought out that there has been increasing enrolment in our colleges and universities. Our secondary education and our primary education have been expanding, and the hunger for higher education is becoming more and more acute. This is all very healthy. Certain social forces have been released after independence and it is only natural that we should be more and more hungry for education at various levels. The obvious answer to such a problem, so far as higher education is concerned, is the establishment of more and more colleges and more and more universities.

The year under report shows the establishment of five more universities and 246 new colleges. For a vast country like ours, certainly these numbers are not very big. But at the same time it must be realised that this increase in the number of universities and colleges has to be seen and studied against certain other things which are no less important. Of these five new universities, two were established in West Bengal. And I can speak with more intimate knowledge of the State I come from than

[Shri Nihar Ranjan Ray.]

in respect of other States. I had always a feeling that, since the U.G.C. came into existence and more and more universities and colleges are coming into existence, when we start a new university or a college, we do not give much thought to the requirements of the situation, about its location, its character, the wherewithal it can command, and so on and so forth. In the State of West Bengal today there are as many as seven universities and there is hardly any co-ordination amongst them. In any given State, I believe, the case is very similar. For instance, I come from the oldest university of West Bengal, and perhaps of India, the University of Calcutta. Even today, after the establishment of six more universities we have to carry at the Calcutta University the biggest burden of higher education of the State. Everybody looks up to us, which is very natural being the parent university; we do not grudge that. But the intake in the other universities, the planning of the courses and curricula of studies, all these were not done with very much thought. Even the location of the universities was not given the due consideration that it deserved. Take for instance this. In the very city of Calcutta we have a new University, the Rabindra Bharathi University. The report says that here was a university that specialised mainly in music and fine arts. I am afraid this is not wholly true, because this university is now aiming at taking up other subjects also. When all this is said and done and when you consider the general dearth of teachers at all levels not only for the undergraduate classes but also for the post-graduate classes, knowing all this, we go on merrily establishing more and more universities as we have been doing for the last few years, without giving it very much thought. I believe we are only aiming at quantitative expansion. Perhaps we are trying to solve what is basically a social problem by an academic solution. This hunger for more and more higher education has to be understood in its

proper extent and solved in a different manner. We must make up our minds whether at this stage we want more and more quantitative expansion or consolidation of the gains we have already made. I believe we have reached the time when we should consolidate our position.

We have been hearing a great deal about lowering of our standards. I do not deny that the average today is lower than it was yesterday but let me repeat—I said it on another occasion on the floor of this House—that the best of our students of today are perhaps better than the best of yesterday. I maintain it and am prepared to prove it. Only the average has gone down. Therefore let us not talk very loosely about the standards going down. There are indeed good reasons why the average is going down. Let us examine those reasons. Let us try to improve but let us make up our minds first whether we are going in for quantitative expansion only or qualitative achievement or both.

Then as it is, up to B.A. pass standard, I do not care so much but we must be sure about one thing. Our Honours and Post-Graduate standards must be of a kind, character and nature that can be compared with the best Honours and Post-Graduate standards anywhere in the world. I would plead that let us not do anything that would lower down our Honours and Post-Graduate standards. If Parliament or opinions outside clamour for admission of anybody and everybody to the Honours and Post-Graduate classes, then we must be able to say that these standards cannot be allowed to be run in a manner as can be endangered by just the problem of numbers. As a teacher of some experience, I know that we are now dealing with classes to which we cannot do justice. I teach a subject which cannot be taught conscientiously at a time to more than dozen

students. But now I am to take classes of fifty or sixty or more students. I know I cannot do justice in the context of the physical conditions in which I am placed.

Questions have been raised about the three-year degree courses. I for one, think that there is no going back to the old intermediate courses. Three years are the minimum that is necessary for the first degree in a university and we should not talk about reviving the intermediate course once more, or go back to the ten-year school system. As it is, the minimum age-limit is sixteen plus but for coming to the college, I agree with the Minister that it should not be less than seventeen plus. A boy or girl less than seventeen plus cannot take in what is being given in the first year of the three-year degree course. I am speaking from experience. It is a question of a certain age, certain kind of maturity of mind, that can take in what is being given in the first collegiate courses. Therefore even sixteen plus which is now recognised by the U.G.C., I think, is just a concession that has been made to the old pattern, to the old system. We have made an unhappy compromise between the Mudaliar Commission report and the then existing pattern of things. That compromise should not have been made. Schools should be twelve-year schools—five years plus twelve years, making seventeen years and then three years of degree course and two years for post-graduate course. That should complete the education of an average man.

Now I shall briefly touch upon one or two more points. A case has been made out for establishing a Central Federal University in the South. I have every sympathy with that. There should be a Central University somewhere in the South—be it at Hyderabad or Bangalore, I do not mind. Then so far as the Central Universities are concerned, the Viswa Bharati of Santiniketan has been allowed to introduce mathematics and chemistry honours courses, that is, they have

taken up for the first time teaching science at the Honours level. I am not against it. Gurudev, the Poet, himself was an ardent admirer of science. He wrote text-books on science. I am not therefore, against it, but I do not know what orientation can a university of the character and nature of the Viswa Bharati gain by the introduction of science teaching at the under-graduate level. Science being an integral part of the curricula of studies in the under-graduate course, I understand, but the Poet at any rate, did not want science to be adopted in the manner as it is being done in other colleges, I mean, in ordinary colleges and universities. He wanted it to be integrated into the general pattern of studies.

About Viswa Bharati I would say this. I do not know if the Departments of Sangeet Bhawan, Kala Bhavan, Chinese Studies, the Indological Studies and the Department of Comparative Religion and Philosophy which were the pride of the institution, would not suffer by a new orientation of the pattern of education at the Viswa Bharati.

One more point about the Central Universities. I would like the U.G.C. to take into account the question of per capita expenditure in the Central Universities *vis-a-vis* the per capita expenditure in the State Universities. There is a disparity, I am afraid, a very wide gap of the per capita expenditure between the two.

Then I do not understand the attitude taken up about general education. The U.G.C. I know, wanted general education to be an integral part of the curriculum. It has been introduced at least in two universities, but the aim and objective of the U.G.C. of general education being an integral part of the curriculum is not being followed, and I have seen general education books of literature being published by one particular university, and I am very sorry to say, they are even factually wrong. The standard of publications that have come



[Shri Nihar Ranjan Ray.]

out on general education does not encourage me to have very much faith in general education as we have been pleading for in this country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): I am afraid you will have to stop now, Dr. Ray.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Thank you very much. Just a minute I am finishing. The one last point I would like to make at the end is this. I don't know what is the right solution for the state of our higher education, for the problem that we are faced with. But I understand that the Education Ministry is setting up a committee to go into the question of higher education. To my mind, I have a feeling that the University Grants Commission, should be given a little more power by Parliament and higher education, at least university education—I am repeating the plea that I have been making year after year on the floor of this House—should be made a concurrent subject and unless universities are brought under at least partial control of the Centre, I believe, the University Grants Commission would not have the power which it should have, and there cannot be any uniformity in standard or any success in achieving the aims any objectives of higher education that we are aiming at. Thank you very much.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं अपनी प्रसन्नता इस बात पर प्रकट करना चाहती हूँ कि अब हमारी एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री तथा साइंटिफिक रिसर्च मिनिस्ट्री संयुक्त कर दी गई है। ये दो मिनिस्ट्री अलग-अलग होने से, मैं बहुत बड़ी कमी मानती थी। साइंटिफिक रिसर्च को एजुकेशन में कोई प्रधानता नहीं दी गई थी। खैर, यह भी कहना बहुत आगे बढ़ना तो नहीं होगा कि ये दोनों मिनिस्ट्री एक विद्वान्, अनुभवी तथा शिक्षा शास्त्री के हाथ में दी गई हैं। यद्यपि यह टेम्परेरी है मगर मेरी

इच्छा और आशा है कि यह प्रबंध परमानेंट हो जाय ताकि दोनों मिनिस्ट्री एक में हो जाय और सचमुच में एक ऐसे व्यक्ति के हाथ में रहे कि जिसने सारी जिन्दगी इन दोनों मिनिस्ट्रियों में काम करने में बितायी है।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहती हूँ वह यह है कि हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने अभी यह कहा कि अध्यापकों की तनख्वाहों में बहुत अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं इससे पूर्णतया सहमत हूँ। इतने सारे ग्रेड न रख कर, जैसा कि उन्होंने कहा ४०० से १,२५० और १,००० से १,८०० तक दो ग्रेड रहें, तो मैं इस से सहमत हूँ और मैं इस विचार के लिये उन्हें बहुत-बहुत बधाई देना चाहती हूँ। साथ ही, यू० जी० सी० की जो रिपोर्ट है उसे पढ़ने के बाद मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता हुई है। और मैं उनको भी बधाई देना चाहती हूँ, इसलिये कि अध्यापकों की जो शर्मनाक स्थिति थी उस की दूर करने में बहुत उन्नति हुई है क्योंकि मैं समझती हूँ कि शिक्षा राष्ट्र की जान है और अगर शिक्षकों की ओर पूरा ध्यान न दिया जाय, उनका वेतन कम हो और उनको अच्छी तरह से जीवन यापन करने का मौका न दिया जाय तो वे क्या शिक्षा दे सकते हैं यह सोचने की बात थी और मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री, या यों कहें कि वर्तमान एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर तथा यू० जी० सी० ने इस ओर जो सोचा है वह बहुत तारीफ की बात है। उसके लिये मैं उनको बधाई देना चाहती हूँ कि इसके द्वारा वे राष्ट्र की बहुत बड़ी सेवा करने जा रहे हैं।

अब यू० जी० सी० ने जो काम किया है, उसकी बहुत सी बातों से मैं सहमत हूँ मगर एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहती हूँ। वह यह है कि उन्होंने अध्यापकों के स्केल तो जरूर बढ़ा दिये हैं और यूनिवर्सिटियों को पैसा भी दे रहे हैं—और काफ़ी पैसा दे रहे हैं—जिसकी वजह से यूनिवर्सिटीज की माली हालत बहुत अच्छी हो गई है।

परन्तु मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहूंगी— मेरे पिछले वक्ता मुझे से शायद सहमत न हों— कि मैं यह समझती हूँ कि यू० जी० सी० को यह न सोचना चाहिये, केवल यह न देखना चाहिये कि जहां जहां जरूरी है पैसा देना है। बल्कि यह भी सोचना चाहिये और देखना चाहिये कि जो पैसा हम दे रहे हैं उसका उपयोग कितना हो रहा है, यानी जिस मद में दे रहे हैं या जिस काम के लिये दे रहे हैं, उस पर सही प्रकार से उपयोग हो रहा है कि नहीं। सबसे पहली बड़ी उपयोगिता पैसा देने के लिये यह है कि शिक्षा में उन्नति हो, अतः पहले यह जरूर देख लेना चाहिये कि उस पैसे के द्वारा सचमुच शिक्षा में उन्नति हो रही है कि नहीं। यह बात मुझे मालूम नहीं कि यू० जी० सी० के अधिकारों में क्या क्या हैं। जहां तक मैंने यू० जी० सी० का ऐक्ट पढ़ा है, उसके अनुसार तो मैं समझती हूँ कि उनको पूरा अधिकार है। जैसा कि Power and functions of the Commission. के अन्तर्गत पैरा ५ 'जे' में लिखा हुआ है :

"perform such other functions as may be prescribed or as may be deemed necessary by the Commission for advancing the cause of higher education in India or as may be incidental or conducive to the discharge of the above functions."

मैं समझती हूँ इसके अंदर उनको पूरे अधिकार हैं। मगर यदि अधिकार नहीं है तो मैं मानती हूँ कि खाली पैसा देने की मशीन इसको न बनाया जाय। यदि खाली पैसा देने की मशीन इसको बनाना था तो फिर शिक्षा शास्त्रियों की इसमें कोई जरूरत नहीं थी? अर्थ शास्त्री होते तो ज्यादा सही था। मगर मैं जानती हूँ कि इसमें बड़े बड़े शिक्षा शास्त्री हैं और जो चेयरमैन हैं वे भी

बड़े शिक्षा शास्त्री हैं। इसलिये मैं सोचती हूँ कि उनमें सब पावर होना चाहिये, उनको पूरे अधिकार होने चाहिये कि वे हर वक्त जिस यूनिवर्सिटी को वे पैसा देते हैं, उसमें यह देखें कि पैसे का उपयोग किस प्रकार से हो रहा है।

दूसरी बात मैं आपको अपनी राजस्थान यूनिवर्सिटी जो जयपुर में है उसके बारे में कहना चाहती हूँ। मैं उससे सोलह वर्ष से, जब से यह १९४७ से चली है, संबंधित रही हूँ और तभी से मैं उसके सीनेट की मेम्बर रही हूँ और हूँ और १९५२ से मैं इसके एक्जीक्यूटिव की मेम्बर हूँ इसलिये मेरे से इसकी कोई बात छिपी नहीं। मैं मानती हूँ, यूनिवर्सिटी ने तरक्की की है मगर मुझे साथ में दुख भी है कि पैसे का दुरुपयोग भी हुआ है, इसलिये नहीं कि पैसा गलत तरीके से उपयोग किया, मगर मैं आपको बताऊं कि वहां जो टीचर्स रखे जाते हैं, उसमें पक्षपात होता है। मैं आपको साफ साफ कहना चाहती हूँ कि राजस्थान यूनिवर्सिटी ऐक्ट की धारा २० में लिखा हुआ है :

"No person shall be appointed as University teacher except on the recommendation of the Committee of Selection constituted for the purpose. The Committee of Selection shall consist of the following members:

The Vice-Chancellor (Chairman)  
The Dean of the Faculty concerned;  
One Member of the Syndicate elected by the Syndicate;  
Two experts possessing special knowledge of the subject concerned appointed by the Chancellor on the recommendation of the Syndicate.

The Committee of Selection shall report to the Syndicate. If the Syndicate accepts the recommendation, it will make the appointment".

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव:]

मगर मैं आपको बताऊं कि ऐसा नहीं होता है। जब से हमारे नये व्हाइस चान्सलर साहब आए हैं—क्या मालूम इसलिये कि वे डिप्लोमेट रहें हैं या क्या मालूम इसलिये कि वे समझते हैं कि मेरे बराबर कोई योग्यता नहीं रखता है—उन्होंने इस रूल को ताक में रख दिया। उन्होंने पिछले साल जितने भी प्रोफेसर्स का सेलेक्शन किया, उन्होंने अपने आप कमेटी बनाई। दो मेम्बर जो एक्सपर्ट्स हैं उनको चान्सलर एरोइन्ट करेगा “आन दो रिकमन्डेशन आफ द: सिन्डिकेट”, मगर चूंकि कुछ लोगों को वे एरोइन्ट करना चाहते थे प्रोफेसर—दुखद बात है, पर कहना पड़ता है—तो उन्होंने क्या किया कि दो एक्सपर्ट अपनी मर्जी के रख दिए, सिन्डिकेट के मेम्बर को एक दिन टेलीफोन कर दिया :  
Will you be free tomorrow to attend the Committee?

(समय की घंटी) इस प्रकार से जो कमेटियों द्वारा सेलेक्शन हुए हैं वह आप जानते हैं और इसके अलावा जो प्रोफेसर्स... में तो आज पहली बार बोल रही हूँ। पांच मिनट और मांगूंगी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You see, there is a long list of speakers.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA: I know.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): If the Members confine themselves to ten minutes then it would be possible to cover.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA: I will try to be brief.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Please take a minute more and conclude.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव: तो यह जो इस तरह की धांधलेबाजी हो रही है, इस पर और बहुत सारी बातों पर मुझे कहना था लेकिन समय नहीं है इसलिये मैं नहीं कहूंगी तो धांधलेबाजी को रोकने के लिये यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन को जो पैसा देते हैं उनको पूरी पावर होनी चाहिये कि वे इन्क्वायरी करे और देखें कि क्या हो रहा है जिस से मनमाना न हो।

खैर इस प्वाइन्ट को छोड़कर एक प्वाइन्ट और मुझे कहना है। वह यह है कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन की जो बनावट है उसको देखने से मालूम होता है कि इसके सदस्य सब पुरुष ही पुरुष हैं कोई महिला भी इस में होनी चाहिये थी और यही नहीं कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन में ही पुरुष हैं बल्कि जो बाद में कमेटियां बनीं उन में भी मैंने देखा पेज २७ में—  
Statement showing the membership of some important committees appointed by the Commission. इस में गौर से मैंने देखा लेकिन किसी महिला का नाम नहीं दिखाई दिया। तो मैं समझती हूँ, जैसा कि श्री मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि लड़कियों ने एजुकेशन के क्षेत्र में उन्नति की है और वे बहुत काफी आगे बढ़ रही हैं। तो मैं समझती हूँ कि आपको महिलाएँ ऐसी भी मिल जायंगी जो उसके लिये योग्यता रखती हैं। इसलिये मेरी रिक्वेस्ट है कि आप थोड़ा सा महिलाओं को भी अन्तर दें कि वे आपके यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन या उनकी कमेटी में काम कर सकें।

समय कम है, कहता मुझे बहुत कुछ था मगर सभापति जी की आज्ञा से मैं इतना ही कहती हूँ।

श्री विमलकुमार मल्लालजी चौरडिया:  
(मध्य प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,

जो रिपोर्ट विचारार्थ प्रस्तुत है उस में सब से पहले मैं इस बात की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यू० जी० सो० द्वारा जो सहायता दी जाती है उसके नियमों में अक्सर परिवर्तन होता है और कई लोगों को इसके नियमों के बारे में जानकारी नहीं होती है। इसलिये सब से पहले अन्यन्त आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि यू० जी० सो० की सहायता के सम्बन्ध में जो भी नियम हों—क्योंकि उसका मुख्य काम सहायता देना ही है और भी कार्य हैं—उसकी एक हैन्डबुक बना देनी चाहिये जिससे युनिवर्सिटीज या उनके साथ जो और भी कालेज हैं, वे उनको देखकर लाभ उठा सकें।

दूसरी बात मैं इस सम्बन्ध में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह बात तय कर दी जानी चाहिये कि सत्र के समाप्त होने के समय तक अगले वर्ष के लिए जो भी नियम लागू होने वाले हैं वे तय हो जाने चाहियें और ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि उन में बराबर परिवर्तन होता रहे। यह बात देखने में आती है कि जिसका ज्यादा प्रेशर होता है, जो जितना ज्यादा प्रेशर कर सकता है, जो ज्यादा पोलिटिकल और पर्सनल प्रेशर डाल सकता है उसके आधार पर वह नियमों में परिवर्तन करा लेता है और इस तरह से किसी भी समय वह सहायता प्राप्त कर लेता है। इस तरह की जो व्यवस्था उन के नियमों में होती रहती है वह नहीं होनी चाहिये, बल्कि सत्र समाप्त होने के पहले ही ये नियम बन जाने चाहियें और अगले वर्ष के लिए लागू किये जाने चाहियें। अगर अपवाद स्वरूप कभी कोई परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता पड़ जाती है तो उच्चस्तर पर वे नियम में परिवर्तन किये जा सकते हैं।

तीसरी बात मैं शिक्षण संस्थाओं में अनुशासन के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज छात्र और छात्राओं में जो उच्छृंखलता

बढ़ती जा रही है और जिस अनुशासन की हम अपेक्षा करते हैं वह देखने में नहीं मिलती है। इतना ही नहीं पुराने जमाने की तरफ जब हम देखते हैं तो पाते हैं कि जहाँ एक छात्र अपने गुरु के लिये अपना जीवन अर्पण करने के लिए तैयार हो जाता था वहाँ आज हम यह देखते हैं कि एक छात्र अपना स्वार्थ प्राप्त करने के लिए गुरु जीवन तक लेने को तैयार हो जाता है। इसका दोष हम केवल विद्यार्थियों पर ही छोड़ दें तो गलत होगा। हम जिस तरह से विद्यार्थियों का निर्माण करेंगे वैसे वे बनेंगे। वे प्रारम्भ में तो विद्यार्थी होते हैं और एक मिट्टी के लोंदे के समान होते हैं। यदि एक सूंड बना दें तो गणपति वह बन जाता है मिट्टी का और अगर सूंड को हटा कर पीठ पर लगा दें तो बन्दर बन जाता है। तो यह सब बातें हमारे शिक्षा देने वालों पर निर्भर करती हैं कि उनको गणपति बनाया जाय या बन्दर बनाया जाय। आज हमारे विद्यार्थियों को जिस तरह की शिक्षा दी जा रही है उस से छात्र और छात्राओं की प्रवृत्ति कुछ ऐसी हो गई है जिस के परिणामस्वरूप उन में उच्छृंखलता बढ़ती ही चली जा रही है और हम उन में जिस प्रकार का अनुशासन चाहते हैं उसका अभाव है। इसकी सब से बड़ी जिम्मेदारी शिक्षण संस्थाओं पर है और शिक्षण व्यवस्था किस दिशा में जा रही है, उसका समाज के ऊपर कैसा असर पड़ रहा है, उसका दर्शन हमें "प्रोफेसर" नामक चित्र से हो सकता है जो निम्नमा पट पर दिखाया जा रहा है। उस चित्र को देखने से मालूम होता है कि हमारे समाज में किस तरह की व्यवस्था फैली हुई है और समाज का यह इशारा हमको चित्रपट द्वारा मिलता है कि हमारी शिक्षण संस्थाओं में किस तरह की व्यवस्था घर करती जा रही है जिस पर रोक लगाना बहुत ही आवश्यक हो गया है। यह चित्र हमें एक नमूना बतलता है और हमें इसको देख कर एक सबक लेना चाहिये। इसका

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चोरडिया]

एक प्रमुख कारण यह भी है कि हम सैक्यूलर स्टेट के नारे में इतने अधिक बह गये कि धार्मिक शिक्षा देना बिल्कुल बन्द कर दिया है। हम ने वैसे तो श्रीयुत् श्रीप्रकाश जी की रिपोर्ट मंगाई और माननोय डाक्टर राधा कृष्णन् की रिपोर्ट तैयार की और उस में सब कुछ बातें आईं लेकिन इस के बावजूद भी जो धार्मिक शिक्षा दी जानी चाहिये थी वह हमने नहीं दी। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप अमुक धर्म की शिक्षा दीजिये, इस्लाम की शिक्षा दीजिये जैन धर्म की शिक्षा दीजिये या सनातन धर्म की शिक्षा दीजिये। जो महापुरुष सब धर्मों में हो गये हैं, जो उनके कामन प्रिन्सिपल्स हैं, समाज में एक अच्छा स्तर बनाये रखने के लिये जो उन के उच्च सिद्धान्त हैं, उनकी ओर हमें विद्यार्थियों का ध्यान दिलाना चाहिये। जैसा कि डा० राधाकृष्णन् की रिपोर्ट के पेज ३०३ पर दिया हुआ है :

- (1) that all educational institutions start work with a few minutes for silent meditation.
- (2) that in the first year of the Degree course lives of the great religious leaders like Gautama the Buddha, Confucius; Zoraster, Socrates, Jesus, Samkara, Ramanuja, Madhava, Mohammad, Kabir, Nanak, Gandh., be taught.

जब तक हम इस दिशा में प्रयत्न नहीं करते तब तक हम यह अपेक्षा करें कि हमारे लोगों का आचरण ठीक हो, विद्यार्थियों में अच्छी भावना पैदा हो, वे वाँ कुछ हो नहीं पाता है। यह तो सन् १९४८-४९ की रिपोर्ट है, वह आज भी वैसे ही लाइब्रेरी की शोभा बढ़ा रही है। अगर उसका लाभ हमारी युनीवर्सिटीज़ लें, युनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट कमिशन ले या शिक्षा विभाग ले, तो उससे काफी लाभ हो सकता है।

जहां तक हिन्दी का सवाल है, य० जी० सी० के द्वारा उसकी अपेक्षा ही की जा रही है, यह मैं आरोप लगाता हूं। हम सब लोग यह मानते हैं कि हिन्दी हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा है और हमारे चोटी के नेता भी कहते हैं कि हिन्दी के अलावा और किसी दूसरी भाषा द्वारा हम अपनी शिक्षा ठीक तरह प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते हैं और यह स्वाभाविक बात भी लगती है। हम हिन्दी दिवस मनाते हैं, सब कुछ मनाने हैं और इतने वर्षों के बाद भी हमने हिन्दी शब्दों के टर्मिनोलोजी नहीं बनाई, टेक्नीकल शब्दों की और साइन्स के शब्दों की टर्मिनोलोजी अभी तक नहीं बना पाये। हम यह आशा करते थे कि इस तरह के शब्द हिन्दी में बन जाते मगर वे अभी तक नहीं बन पाये। डा० राधाकृष्णन् की रिपोर्ट जो १९४८-४९ में प्रकाशित हुई थी उसके पृष्ठ ३२७ में भी यह कहा गया है कि इस तरह की टर्मिनोलोजी शीघ्र बननी चाहिये और अंग्रेजी को शीघ्र हटाया जाना चाहिये। सन् १९४८-४९ में उन्होंने इसके बारे में रेफरेंस दिया था और उसके साथ यह भी सुझाव दिया था कि जो दूसरी भाषा आयेगी उनका स्क्रिप्ट क्या होगा? उसके बारे में उन्होंने बतलाया कि यह स्क्रिप्ट "देवनागरी लिपि" होनी चाहिये। परन्तु ऐसा लगता है कि हमारा शिक्षा विभाग या विश्वविद्यालय विभाग इस ओर दुर्लक्ष्य करता जा रहा है। अभी अलीगढ़ युनीवर्सिटी को इस बात की छूट दे दी गई कि वह उर्दू और हिन्दी को रोमन स्क्रिप्ट में लिख सकता है। मैंने अपने एक मित्र को रोमन स्क्रिप्ट में 'Dawat Chah'ye (दावत चाहिये)' लिख कर पूछा कि मैंने क्या लिखा है। तो उन्होंने बताया "दावत चाहिये"। मैं कहता हूं "दावत चाहिये", वे उसकी "दावत" पढ़ते हैं। तो इस तरह से जो हमारी भाषा का मूल तत्व है वह इस तरह की बातों से नष्टप्रायः हो सकता है। इस तरह की चीजों की पढ़ाई बिल्कुल बन्द

हो जानी चाहिये जहां "दावात" की जगह "दावत" पढ़ा जाय। अगर हमने इस तरह की बात को आगे चलने दिया तो हमारी हिन्दी भाषा के लिये एक और मुश्किल खड़ी हो जायेगी। यह बात बहुत आवश्यक है और मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं और आशा करता हूं कि इस तरह की बात अब आगे नहीं होने पावेगी।

आजादी के पूर्व हमारे यहां २१ युनिवर्सिटियां थीं और अब उनकी संख्या ५१ हो गई है किन्तु कालेजों का अभाव है। हमारे हजारों विद्यार्थी उनमें प्रवेश पाने में असमर्थ रहते हैं। हमारे विद्यार्थी और उनके पालक जैसे ही रिजल्ट निकलता है कालेजों और युनिवर्सिटियों में प्रवेश पाने के लिये, चक्कर लगाते रहते हैं, जितने उनके पास रिसोर्सज होते हैं उनको टैप करते हैं ताकि वे वहां पर एडमिशन पा सकें। हम बड़ी धूमधाम से कहते हैं कि हम सब को पढ़ाना चाहते हैं मगर हम में इतनी शक्ति नहीं है कि उन लोगों को कालेजों तथा विश्वविद्यालयों में प्रवेश दिला सकें। आज दिल्ली में ही हजारों विद्यार्थी प्रवेश पाने के लिये हर तरह की कोशिश करते हैं मगर उन्हें प्रवेश नहीं मिलता है। हमें युनिवर्सिटियों की संख्या बढ़ाने के बजाय इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये कि हमारे देश में कालेजों की संख्या ज्यादा से ज्यादा हो जाय ताकि किसी को भी प्रवेश पाने में कठिनाई नहीं हो। विद्यार्थियों को प्रवेश पाने के लिये जगह जगह युनिवर्सिटीज का चक्कर न लगाना पड़े, इस बारे में हमें विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये और ज्यादा संख्या में कालेज खोलने चाहिये।

जहां तक नियुक्तियों का सवाल है, डा० राधाकृष्णन् ने आज से १२, १३ वर्ष पहले जब यह रिपोर्ट बनी थी उसमें बिल्कुल

स्पष्ट कह दिया था और वह चीज आज भी वैसे की वैसे ही लगती है कि हमारे यहां नियुक्तियों के बारे में यही परिपाटी चली आ रही है। उस रिपोर्ट में यह कहा गया था :

"Universities are more and more inclined to recruit their staffs from among their own students and teachers. Secondly, there is negligence in applying criteria of merit in the selection of the lecturers. The first breeds narrow parochialism, gives a stimulus to provincialism and leads to stagnation. The second is dangerous because it encourages favouritism, depreciates the value of the work of the lecturers and gradually vitiates the whole atmosphere of the university, for the Lecturer of today is the Reader and Professor of tomorrow."

तो इस तरह से जो अव्यवस्था नियुक्तियों के सम्बन्ध में हमारे यहां इस समय चल रही है उसके लिये मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूं कि संघीय चुनाव की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। यह चुनाव योग्यता के आधार पर, विद्यार्थी काल में उनकी प्रतिभा कैसी थी इसको देखकर, उनके पढ़ाने की क्या क्षमता है, विद्यार्थी के अगवा बनने की उनमें क्षमता है या नहीं, उनकी सारी एक्टीविटीज को देख कर, उनके आचरण को देख कर उनकी नियुक्ति की जानी चाहिये। अगर हमने इन बात का ख्याल नहीं किया तो जिस तरह से "प्रोफेसर" चित्र में हमारे समाज की दुर्व्यवस्था दिखलाई गई है वैसे हो जायेगी और इसको कभी भी उचित नहीं कहा जा सकता है। अन्त में मैं यह निवेदन कर दूं कि जो हमारे शिक्षण के अलग अलग हिस्से हैं जैसे बेसिक ट्रेनिंग माध्यमिक शाला, हायर सैकेंड्री, युनिवर्सिटी, इनका कोई को-ऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है और उसकी जगह से सब अपनी अपनी हैसियत से अपने यहां पर संशोधन किया करते हैं। वास्तव में चाहिये यह कि युनिवर्सिटी आयोग यह तय

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया]  
करे कि हम किस प्रकार के विद्यार्थी अपने  
यहां पर पढ़ाना चाहते हैं और वह तय करने  
के बाद वह अपेक्षा करें कि बेसिक से लेकर  
आगे तक बढ़ते बढ़ते किस तरह की उनको  
ट्रेनिंग मिले जिस से उस योग्यता के विद्यार्थी  
हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों में आ सकें। जब  
तक यह कोऑर्डिनेशन की व्यवस्था नहीं  
होती तब तक हम यह अपेक्षा करें कि अच्छा  
कैलीबर हम को मिलेगा, अच्छा स्तर हम  
को मिलेगा, यह संभव नहीं।

आपने समझ दिया। इसके लिये  
धन्यवाद।

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the University Grants Commission for the excellent work which they have been doing and for the brief but lucid and comprehensive Report which has been placed before us. The Report shows all round progress. The number of universities has increased during the Second Five Year Plan from 33 to 46 and now during the year under review another five universities have been added. In order to maintain and improve the standard of teaching certain measures have been taken. For instance, the scales of pay of teachers of universities have been raised not only for the Central universities but the State universities have also been encouraged to adopt the same scales and quite a number of universities have taken advantage of this encouragement. Grants for libraries and scientific apparatus have been given. Certain other proposals and schemes for bettering the conditions of service in the universities are also under contemplation.

We have been hearing for a long time about the deterioration of the standard but I am glad to find that on page 9, the Commission remarks:

"It may also be mentioned that standards at the post-graduate and

research levels in many of our universities have improved substantially during the last few years."

This is gratifying. As a matter of fact the real reason for lowering of standards had been the great expansion and when we have not got sufficient institutions and sufficient teachers, naturally with the expansion of the number of students the standards are bound to go down. But all these steps have been taken by the University Grants Commission mostly to see that the standards do not go down.

Now, I will make some observations about certain matters contained in the Report. On page 19 it is said:

"If increasing number of students continue to be admitted in our universities without corresponding expansion of facilities there is grave risk of the academic standards being impaired further. Also in view of the increasing cost of university education, it is necessary from a purely economic point of view to see that only such students are admitted to our universities as are most likely to benefit from university education."

As far as post-graduate classes and research work are concerned, I am prepared to agree with this observation of the University Grants Commission but to prevent a student who has completed his secondary education from even obtaining a Bachelor's Degree is too much. We have introduced compulsory free education at the primary stage and there is great expansion of secondary education and unless we are able to divert a large number of students who complete their secondary education to other courses we cannot possibly deny to them education up to at least the B.A. or the B.Sc. standard. The words used here are—

"only such students . . . as are most likely to benefit from university education"

This will exclude a very very large number of students. I won't mind if this sentence is changed to read as "only such students are not admitted to our universities as are most likely not to benefit from university education" so that we should refuse to admit only such candidates about whom we can positively come to the conclusion that they cannot get any benefit from university education.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** What is the object of university education?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY):** Let him proceed with his arguments. He has no time.

**SHRI NAFISUL HASAN:** The object of university education? Naturally . . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY):** You have only a minute more. You make your point.

**SHRI NAFISUL HASAN:** I am sorry. Then leaving all other points I will draw attention to one important feature and that is about the dyarchy which is prevailing in our educational system in the country. According to our Constitution 'universities' are a State subject except some institutions which are Central Universities or which may be declared as such. In the case of such institutions the responsibility for their maintenance is that of the Union. Generally the present position is that the maintenance grants of the State Universities are under the State Government while the development grants are under the Union Government, that is, they are at the disposal of the University Grants Commission. On page 6 of the Report they say:

"As far as development under the Five Year Plan is concerned proposals of the Central universities are examined by expert visiting committees in the same way as those of the State universities. In the case of Central universities,

however, the entire development expenditure sanctioned is met by the Commission, whereas in the case of State universities part of the development expenditure has to be met by the State Governments concerned."

Now, if we look at the statement given on page 2 it gives the number of university students per thousand of population.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The hon. Minister referred to West Bengal where it is 3.7 and also to Orissa where it is 0.9. But I find there are at least two other States—Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh—where the number is only 1.4. Although Uttar Pradesh has nine universities including two Central Universities—and most probably it is contemplated that another two universities, one at Meerut and the other at Kanpur are to be started—still the percentage there is practically the lowest except in Orissa. When it is admitted that one of the objects of university expansion is to reduce disparity in the facilities for higher education especially in the professional subjects among the different regions of the country, there is no reason why special attention should not be paid to areas where the percentage is the lowest and the principle that the State should also contribute, in my opinion, acts adversely on the interests of some of the States which are not economically in a good condition. A State which is economically better off can spend money and make its contribution. But when you insist on a poor State to make its contribution equal to the other States, naturally the same results will follow about which there is so much of complaint, namely, the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer. The State which is poor cannot afford to pay the same proportion of contribution for the development of education. Therefore, I would say that the requirements of the various



[Shri Nafis] Hasan.]

regions should be based on the conditions existing there at the present moment. Thank you.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Madam Deputy Chairman, as a Member of the University Grants Commission it is not for me to say a word of praise, nor can I be expected to say a word of criticism because that would be an act of committing suicide. But it is open to me to clear up certain misconceptions which have been given expression to by various Members of this House. And when these misconceptions come from such a seasoned educationist like my friend, Mr. Ruthnaswamy, or a seasoned educationist like Mr. Chettiar, it becomes all the more necessary to clear them up. Well, it came as a shock to me to learn from Mr. Ruthnaswamy that the UGC has an office in Madras. I was even more shocked when he said that he had seen it with his own eyes. I am perfectly certain that there is something wrong there. It is not so. I have been connected with two universities and I know that there are no UGC offices there.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Has the hon. Member visited the Madras University and seen the offices?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I shall explain to you how your illusion has arisen. There was a huge lot of correspondence to be carried out by the University with the UGC and there was such an amount of delay that even the UGC came to be suspected. Therefore, the UGC resolved to give a certain amount of money to each university to establish a section in its office to deal exclusively with the affairs of the U.G.C. In other words, the so-called UGC office exists in the interests of the university concerned, not so much in the interests of the UGC. Probably that has given you the illusion that it is a UGC office.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Of course, a board is put up: "UGC Office".

PROF. A. R. WADIA: It ought to be: "UGC Section". "Office" is a wrong expression. Anyway, even if it came to the worst, Mr. Ruthnaswamy accepted that the Madras University got Rs. 1 crore from the UGC and if one or two rooms were set apart for UGC purposes he should not grudge it. But I can assure you that the UGC is not going to make that demand.

Another thing that he said is that the Reviewing Committees should invite educationists from outside. As a matter of fact, it is done. I myself have been on some Reviewing Committees and against one Member of the University Grants Commission we have had about three or four or even more other professors from different universities. Sometimes there is not a single member of the University Grants Commission and the Reviewing Committee consists of all outside professors. That is also objectionable and at least I know that one of my colleagues has objected to it.

Another thing that Mr. Ruthnaswamy said is that all these small institutions should not be raised to the dignity of universities. Now, if he reads the UGC Act he will find that the Act itself provides for the recognition of institutions which may be deemed to be universities. They are not full universities. We do not call them universities, but they are deemed to be universities.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Rural universities, agricultural universities, engineering universities.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: They are not universities. They are deemed to be universities. They are different from the universities.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the meaning of 'deemed to be universities'?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Now, the only advantage is this. Institutions which have been doing very good work and which could not give degrees are now

permitted to give degrees. They will, of course, also get the benefit of some assistance from the University Grants Commission.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** What is the difference then? If they give degrees and get grants, what is the difference?

**PROF. A. R. WADIA:** The difference is that in a regular university you have got a number of faculties and a number of degrees are given. In regard to an institution which is deemed to be a university, only one or two degrees will be given, in a certain limited field.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** That was his objection.

**PROF. A. R. WADA:** And I do not think there is anything wrong in it.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:** It has a certain snobbery.

**PROF. A. R. WADIA:** Another objection that Mr. Ruthnaswamy has raised is that the university buildings had a huge grant, whereas the books had about half that amount. But surely you do not have buildings every year, whereas books can be purchased every year. And without university buildings, where are you to place these books?

On one point I agree with him, that there should be more hostels. Now, there is a tremendous amount of overcrowding in hostels. I also agree that quarters for teachers are needed. It is only a matter of funds. If we had more funds, we should surely be glad to give them quarters. He referred to hobby workshops. I can assure him that they are not only to be found in engineering colleges. They are to be found also in arts universities.

Now, so far as Mr. Chettiar's remarks are concerned regarding 'Rabindra Bhavan', I leave it to the hon. Minister to deal with it. He complained that the Central Universities were paid cent per cent. Now if he had studied the Act, he would have found that these Central Uni-

versities were being maintained by the Centre, by the Ministry of Education and when the UGC came into existence these universities were transferred to the UGC. Therefore, every pie of their expenditure had to be met by the UGC. There was no escape from it. There is no partiality in this. I admit that a huge chunk of money is taken away by the Central Universities, but you cannot help it. Now, we cannot stop the grants that were being given by the Central Ministry. There is such a thing as development and charity begins at home. We do find it necessary to encourage development in the universities which are directly under the UGC. I admit that more money is spent on the Central Universities but so far as the other universities are concerned, we try to be as impartial as is humanly possible. As far as the Reviewing Committees go, the proposals are sent up by the universities. I can assure you that the Reviewing Committees are most gentle in dealing with them. In fact, most of the suggestions and proposals coming from the universities are accepted, funds permitting.

Now, so far as my friend, Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, is concerned, he complained about the affairs of the Andhra University. I should like to point that the universities are very sensitive about their autonomy and I can assure you, Madam, that the University Grants Commission is equally anxious to maintain and respect the autonomy of universities. Now, in extreme cases it may be desirable for the UGC to interfere and we did in one case. It was brought to our attention that in a certain university convocations had not been held for a number of years. It is an annual event in every respectable university but in this unfortunate university, thanks to the imagination of the officers, no convocation was held for about five or six years. It was also brought to our notice that the amounts of money given to them were not spent properly. Therefore, in this extreme case the University Grants

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

Commission appointed a Committee of which one of my colleagues was Chairman, and they produced a very drastic report. It was certainly not very complimentary to the university concerned. As a result of it the Vice-Chancellor had to resign, the Registrar had to be changed . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: If the facts disclosed by Mr. Reddy are correct, do you not think that there is a strong case for the University Grants Commission to take action?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I am saying Madam, that the University Grants Commission can be justified in interfering only in extreme cases, and if the Andhra University is as bad as Mr. Reddy points out, it is for him to draw the attention of the University Grants Commission, and something will be done.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: It is said that the University purchased a car for Rs. 55,000 from the amounts that were given by the University Grants Commission.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I agree, but the University Grants Commission did not give money for this. It must have been from the block grant, and there is such a thing as autonomy of the university. Block grant means that a university spends it according to the various sanctions already made in the previous years, and it is given a certain amount of freedom to spend a certain amount of savings on something else. Now I agree with Mr. Chettiar that if the Vice-Chancellor spends Rs. 40,000 on a car . . .

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Rs. 55,000.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: So much the worse. I heard it as Rs. 40,000 yesterday. Evidently the figure has gone up by Rs. 15,000 in one day. I entirely agree that this is a misuse, and this is a reflection on the commonsense of the Vice-Chancellor concerned. The University Grants Commission cannot be blamed for it. The University Grants

Commission has nothing to do with it. The University Grants Commission was not consulted about it.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Will the hon. Member kindly say one thing? Under section 26(g) of the University Grants Commission Act, when the University Grants Commission makes regulations prescribing the period of teaching as five years of a university and if the Vice-Chancellor of a university construed that regulation to mean the teaching of that particular university, what is the duty of the University Grants Commission? If the University Grants Commission fails to pull up the Vice-Chancellor, then why all these regulations and rules?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I may say that officially the attention of the University Grants Commission has not been drawn to this; and if it is drawn I do not know, the University Grants Commission may take some action.

Mr. Samuel was very hard on the University Grants Commission. He compared us to a good old man distributing gifts. Well, it is a very good function.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Only one information I want. Prof. Wadia said that the attention of the University Grants Commission had not been drawn. I myself had written a letter to the Commission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be very brief. There is hardly any time.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: I myself wrote a letter to the University Grants Commission indicating to them that this was how their regulation was being interpreted by certain universities.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: That is all right. Due notice will be taken of that letter by the authorities concerned.

Then regarding what Mr. Samuel said, it is not a bad thing to have a good old man distributing gifts, and I

can assure him that all the universities fully appreciate the existence of this good old man from whom they can get gifts. If Mr. Samuel had been connected with any State university as I have been, he would have known what a struggle it was, an uphill struggle, to get grants for universities from the State Governments, partly because the State Governments have to look after the claims of primary education, secondary education, and so on, and there was a tendency to treat the universities as step-daughters. Now that the University Grants Commission has come into existence, money is forthcoming much more than it ever did before, and I think, if anything, Mr. Samuel ought to be thankful for that instead of being critical.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up, Prof. Wadia.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: If you wish me to stop, I will stop.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take a minute and wind up.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Then he said that there are bad teachers. I know that there are bad teachers. But how is the University Grants Commission responsible? We have done our very best. We have improved the grades of teachers. Professors in my generation could never have hoped to draw more than Rs. 1000. Now they are easily going up to Rs. 1800. He complained about the librarians. As a matter of fact the librarian's status has been very much raised in every university. A trained librarian has been placed in the grade of a professor. So the librarian's status is very high and he is expected to guide the students, of course not all by himself but along with his other colleagues. I do not think that is a very fair criticism. There is disparity in the students of universities and in the students of colleges. But is there any country in the world where disparity does not exist? In England do we not always look upon Oxford and Cambridge as being superior to other universities,

rightly or wrongly I do not know? In America there are half a dozen universities which are really first class. The other universities are absolutely second rate or third rate as the case may be. So this disparity is inevitable. You cannot help it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But it is much more here.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: It may be partly because some of our colleges are very very poor. They should never have been started without proper financial resources.

Shri Sri Rama Reddy complained about the failures being too high. There is only one way in which this could be remedied, and that is to tighten up admissions. You cannot admit anybody and everybody to a university and then expect it to produce cent per cent results. I think it was pointed out very clearly by my friend, Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray that we do not want quantitative expansion. We want qualitative expansion, and therefore we have to tighten up admissions to our Honours courses and Post-Graduate courses. Thank you very much.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Madam Deputy Chairman, I welcome this Report. On a previous occasion I had to remark about the indifference with which the report was prepared. I am glad to note that the authorities have done much better this time, and the report is not only readable but presents things in the proper perspective and very well. I do not agree with those who want to bring all the universities under the Central Government and make the University Grants Commission a sort of bully and a coercing authority. I think that is the simplest way, shortest way to kill every kind of initiative and enterprise in higher education. Therefore, I think that the University Grants Commission is right in adopting only persuasive methods and a mild coercion in the distribution of grants. I think it should not resort to more than that, and with these mild methods it has been able to effect considerable

[Shri K. Santhanam.]

improvement in higher education. So I want to spend the few minutes at my disposal to make some suggestions to strengthen the hands of the University Grants Commission to pursue its work of improving the standards of higher education in this country.

I think one of the defects at present is that the Institutes of Technology have not been brought under the University Grants Commission. They are kept separate. As a result it is not possible for the University Grants Commission to co-ordinate the higher technological education in this country. Take only one little thing. Higher technological education depends upon very costly equipment. Now no one knows how much equipment there is in all the universities taken together and in the technological institutes. Each institution is working as a separate entity. Therefore, in some institutions there is equipment which is not used at all, and in other universities and higher technological institutions there is no equipment, and therefore it is essential that higher technological education should be brought under one supervising body. The only supervising body that can perform this task is the University Grants Commission. Now, I wholeheartedly endorse the efforts of the University Grants Commission to promote post-graduate research and create centres of advanced studies. How can you create centres of advanced studies without these technological institutes? They are the best places where these centres can be created. And here is an anomaly. The Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, which is really on a par with the higher technological institutions has been brought under the purview of the University Grants Commission while the others have not been brought.

I would also urge that while I agree with the Minister that careful discrimination and concentration is needed to make the centres of advanced studies really useful for the country, the most important thing to stress is the availability of really capable pro-

fessors. They should start them where there are professors, not because they want to start them somewhere. I think it is a sad state of affairs that the National Physical Laboratory should be without a Director for two or three years, and from what I hear, the Laboratory is going to dogs while it should be the premier research institution of this country. Therefore, I do not want that the centres of advanced studies should be started somewhere at X, Y or Z and then the authorities should go about searching for suitable professors. Start the centres wherever you have got the professors and do not start a centre till you have secured the professor. That should be the principle. Now, on the opposite side, everywhere courses for M.Sc. and Ph.D. are started without any proper professors and then they go about searching for them and somebody or other indifferently takes up the classes and distributes the degrees. That is not the way to promote higher education.

Now I have to say a word about foreign exchange. It is said that for the year 1961-62 a grand sum of Rs. 42 lakhs has been placed at the disposal of the University Grants Commission, and the University Grants Commission distributes this wretched sum of Rs. 42 lakhs into two lakhs, three lakhs, etc., to the universities. When these amounts are distributed, these universities have to apply for licences and then there is Customs clearance, so that many of the universities are not able to make use of them. I suggest that the University Grants Commission should be made the agent of the Central Government for determining the amount of foreign exchange needed for higher education and its certificate must be sufficient for any kind of import of these instruments. Even though the formal right may be with the Import Controller and others, they must act on the certificate of the University Grants Commission. I would also like the University Grants Commission to consider whether it should not be the main importer of all the

scientific instruments instead of allowing the import to be done by the various universities. It must prepare a chart of the most essential equipment needed by the various universities and place the orders directly with the foreign makers to supply the instruments. Actually, the instruments can go to the particular place, Madras, Bombay or Bangalore, wherever they may be needed. That will simplify matters and it will save a lot of time. Side by side, there should be a generous attitude in the matter of importing the equipment because it is only when there is good equipment that the engineering student becomes fit. Without handling the instruments, without knowing what a computer is like and without looking at an electron-microscope, how do you expect your M.Sc.s. and Ph.D.s. to be equal to the M.Sc.s. and Ph.D.s. of other countries? Therefore, I would urge upon the Government of India that it would be penny wise and pound foolish to stint in the matter of foreign exchange for scientific equipment and books. Any university must have it for the asking. I suggest that if you centralise and have a proper register of all the equipment in all the universities at the office of the University Grants Commission, we can not only get the equipment but also get the maximum use of the equipment. But we should not be content with importing the equipment, we should try to get the equipment manufactured. At every institute or university, there should be a workshop. I think the University Grants Commission would do well to give generous grants to every university and every higher technological institute to build up proper workshops. I have been representing the Rajya Sabha in the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, which is one of the highest technological institutions in this country. It has been existing for more than half a century but I was surprised to find that there was no workshop. When I met the professors, all of them said that they could repair all their instruments if they had a workshop, that they could design, that they could fabricate new instruments

but that they could not get money to put up a workshop. Therefore, I suggest that it should be obligatory upon every professor, every doctor and every post-graduate student to repair his own instruments and, if possible, to fabricate, if not the whole instrument, at least some spare parts. This will be a better technical training than a mere reading of books and simply indexing in the library.

I do not want to speak about hostels and other things but one thing that has disappointed me is that the issue of the medium of instructions has been dealt with in a most unsatisfactory fashion. On page 23, we read that:

"In our opinion the transition from English to an Indian language should be brought about in as short a period as possible consistently with the maintenance of proper standards."

Two things are needed. The University Grants Commission should impress upon every university to make its final decision, whether it wants to change over to the regional language as the medium or it wants to continue English as the medium. If it wants to change over to the regional language as the medium, then it should be assisted in bringing about the change-over as quickly as possible. A long period of transition will cause deterioration of the entire university. At the same time, the 3-language formula should be very rigorously insisted upon wherever there is a change-over to the regional language medium, so that all the students in the graduate and post-graduate classes will be able to function not only in the regional language but also in English and Hindi. Therefore, there will not be any disintegration whatsoever. I think for this country the best thing is to accept the principle of regional language being the medium of instruction and at the same time laying sufficient emphasis on the other two languages, so that any student can go anywhere and function not only in his regional language but also in English and also in Hindi. It is the only way in which national integration at the higher edu-

[Shri K. Santhanam.]

cation level can be brought about, and I hope that the University Grants Commission will take more appropriate steps to deal with this matter and persuade the universities to go forward and implement their decisions. If they want to continue English, let them continue it—I am not going to object to that—but let them not be faltering between two ideals and fall between them.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** Madam Deputy Chairman, I am glad to congratulate the University Grants Commission for the thoroughness of their report. I would like also to say that we are grateful to the Education Minister for a thoughtful survey of the entire position as disclosed in this report.

The first question on which I would like to say something is about the Instructors|Assistant Lecturers. Instructors|Assistant Lecturers were not initially contemplated by the University Grants Commission and I am afraid the institution of Instructors|Assistant Lecturers is being used by the State Governments and State universities to get over the recommendations of the University Grants Commission in regard to the emoluments that should be hereafter paid to university teachers.

I would like to express my concurrence with the view that the degree course should be a three-year course. In the Uttar Pradesh universities we have this difficulty. We have a Board of Intermediate Education. Even if we retain it, the degree course should be a three-year course. In Scotland, I believe, the degree course is four years and I know that there is no university which gives its degrees in less than three years. The first degree should be obtainable in a period of not less than three years.

Also I would like to urge that the time has come when there must be legislative enactment prohibiting the admission of students below the age of 17 to a university. I know of a case in which a very brilliant young man took his M. Sc. degree in the first class at the age of only 17.

But it is an exceptional case. But these things are happening every day. It is not right that a young man should be subject to this strain at a tender period in his life.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:** How long did he live?

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** Then, Prof. Ruthnaswamy raised a very important issue, namely, that Vice-Chancellors should not be members of the University Grants Commission. He referred to the practice obtaining in England. But there, as he knows, the University Grants Commission is controlled by the Exchequer and is not a branch of the Education Department.

**DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY:** It is University Grants Committee and not Commission.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** Yes, it is a Committee. The difficulty is that the number of qualified men in this country is very limited.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:** Question.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** And if we eliminate the Vice-Chancellors, we may not be able to get educationists of equal status to occupy positions in the University Grants Commission. These positions will have to go to politicians.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:** What about ex-Judges of High Courts?

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** Some of them can be called educationists only by courtesy. I seriously think that it would be a mistake to substitute ex-Judges of the High Courts for Vice-Chancellors. Ex-Vice-Chancellors, I think, should have a place in the U.G.C. and the only way to ensure that he has a place is to see that Vice-Chancellors are appointed to the U.G.C.

Then, a good deal has been said about research and the stimulus that the Commission should give to basic research. Personally the way I look at this question is this. The question in this country is between basic scholarship and research. At the moment we should emphasise basic

scholarship; research will come later. But let us have good teachers, let us have good and able men turned out by our universities. That, I think, is the way to look at this question.

A question to which, I think, the U.G.C. has given some attention is the question of examinations. Now, I think surely the method of examinations requires a change. But the change in the method of examinations should be very gradual because I am rather old-fashioned and I believe that these examinations with the name of the candidate undisclosed and the name of the examiners undisclosed are good for conditions such as we have in this country. Then I would like to say that in regard to this question of examination methods no doctrinaire attitude should be adopted.

As regards the question of the measure of control which the U.G.C. should exercise over State universities, under Entry 66 of List I of the Seventh Schedule, University higher education is the exclusive concern of the Centre; Higher education and co-ordination, etc. is the concern of the Centre. Under Entry 11 of the State List, the universities, excepting the Universities of Varanasi and Aligarh and the Viswabharati, are State subjects. Now we have to reconcile these two Lists—Entry 66 under List I and Entry 11 under List II. (Time bell rings.) I had a great many more points to speak about but before I close, finally I would like to say that the extent to which our standards have gone down is exaggerated. I was rather happy to hear Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray point out with his vast experience that the best student of today is better than the best student of yesterday. I can personally bear testimony to the fact that the best student of today is better than the best student of yesterday. There has been an improvement in the qualitative and quantitative standards in our university education. The difficulty is this. We have in Uttar Pradesh, for example, given recognition to colleges the managing committees of which are

controlled by bankers and traders. They appoint the personnel of the teaching staff. Teachers with third class degrees, even without any degrees are often preferred to teachers of a higher stature. Finally I would like to say that medical education and technical education too should form part of the activities of the U.G.C. These are all the observations that I could make with in the time available to me. Thank you very much, Madam, for giving me this opportunity to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Diwakar. You have to be very brief.

✓ SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR (Nominated): Madam, I am thankful to you that even under the stress of time, you have allowed me to say a few words. It is a rare combination that a man of high literary reputation along with very great experience in education, almost a professional educationist, is to-day the Minister for Education in India. In the first place I would like to say that the University Grants Commission, its name itself, savours something like a market transaction. Those who go to the Grants Commission go more for money than for anything else. Really speaking, if there is going to be an amendment in the Act, I would suggest that it should be called the University Standards Commission rather than a Grants Commission. No doubt raising the standards is one of the objects of U.G.C. but the object almost comes in as a kind of Gaun Paksha or secondary matter. Several things have been said and I do not think I should repeat them but I should, at the same time, record my view on certain points and not argue them out.

As regards numbers and quality, I think a university is something where we look for quality, not for numbers. I think we have not the daring and possibly not the imagination to try to see that we screen every student who wants to enter the portals of a University. We are not doing it and that is how we have people on our hands who go through the portals with very ordinary capacity. Possibly they



[Shri R. R. Diwakar.]

would have shown better capacity and contributed to the wealth of the country if they had taken up some other course and vocation. Possibly we have not the machinery to see that this screening is done at the beginning of the university career of the students.

I entirely agree with the Minister that the services, that is those who are manning the university to-day, should have a far more democratic atmosphere and for that purpose there should be in the grading and scales, a far greater approximation to each other rather than great differences and disparities that we see to-day. I have seen some universities as well as some colleges and schools where for instance, there is a spirit of camaraderie and that spirit of camaraderie helps to raise the standards of teaching, and brings out the best out of the teachers and professors. Thereby the students of that institution are far higher in standard than in other universities. I would cite, for instance, Pondicherry and the International University there. We see there that the teacher who teaches a nursery class feels himself quite equal to and a brother of those who engage in the university classes. So a healthy camaraderie is there. It may not be possible, of course, to introduce these things in all the universities or in all educational institutions but that should well be a kind of ideal.

I quite agree that sixteen plus should be the minimum age and students below that age should not be allowed to enter the portals of a university.

I see a small para in this report about national integration. It was really a matter of congratulation that the U.G.C. started a seminar on national integration but at the same time I see that no further steps have been taken to see that national integration and such ideologies are part and parcel of our teaching in the universities. If the universities are to discharge the high function of inculcating great ideas from the national point

of view, ideologies of that type have to deliberately form part of the university teaching. Unless that is done I do not think the ideal, particularly of national integration and such high ideals, can be a part and parcel of the equipment of people who come out of the universities.

I see that there is also a small para about Gandhi Bhavans. This idea was very gladly accepted by the then Chairman, Mr. C. D. Deshmukh; but I see that even in that respect, though the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi is bearing half the burden of the grant, it is not progressing to the extent that it should have. When this scheme was accepted by the U.G.C., I may mention, the main idea behind it was to provide ethical standards. We have no religious or moral education of any kind as we are a secular State. Gandhiji was the embodiment of ethical ideas and moral principles. He lived among us very recently. His teachings should be studied so that the standard of ideological ideals and views is raised so far as the younger generation is concerned.

As regards the medium of instruction, I think the halting policies both of the U.G.C. and of the Government of India, are playing a great havoc and I think it is better that quick decisions are taken and enforced, otherwise this chaos will continue and are actually seeing the younger generation suffer from it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you will have to wind up. Otherwise, the Minister will hardly have any time.

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR: I am finishing.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister has nothing to reply.

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR: Dr. Wadia has already done a good job in answering a number of points. Now I am also one of those who would suggest that it is necessary that higher education should be a Concurrent subject. Though I have many other things to say, even so, I thank the Deputy Chairman for the time that she has

given me and I do not want to impinge upon the valuable time that the Minister should have to reply to all the debate.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Before I call upon Mr. Kabir, I want to inform the House that Five o'clock was the fixed time for the Half-an-Hour Discussion. We may commence that discussion at 5-15. Mr. Gupta has agreed that that discussion could begin at Five Fifteen. Mr. Kabir.

**SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR:** Madam, I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have taken part and made valuable suggestions about the working of the U.G.C., both in respect of the review of its works and also the suggestions for its future working. I am particularly grateful to Prof. Wadia because he has taken upon himself to reply to many of the points which were raised. If I had the time, Madam, I would have dealt with every one of the points raised by the different hon. Members. But as you know, I have myself reduced the time which you were pleased to allot to me in the beginning, by fifteen minutes and now I have to finish in less than 25 minutes or so. I can, therefore, only refer to some of the more important points and I hope hon. Members whose points I do not answer will not think that I do not attach importance to them or that I have no answer. I have an answer and I also attach great importance to them, but it is shortage of time that prevents me from answering all of them.

I will deal very briefly with the question of the constitution of the Grants Commission. A very interesting suggestion was made by Shri Diwakar, that the Grants Commission should be called a University Standards Commission and not the University Grants Commission. It is rather too late in the day, but I think it is the function which is more important than the name, and one of the major functions of the Grants Commission is to maintain and raise standards. I may

also refer briefly to the point connected with the constitution of the Grants Commission raised by Shri Ruthnaswamy and say that the Vice-Chancellors have to be there under the constitution of the Act. Situated as we are and with the kind of correlation we have between the Central Government and the University Grants Commission, it is necessary that some officers of the Ministry also should be there on the Grants Commission. A comparison between the University Grants Commission here and the University Grants Committee in Great Britain is not very appropriate because that is a body outside the Ministry of Education or any educational authority. It is a body attached to the Treasury and it advises the Chancellor of the Exchequer who places certain funds at the disposal of the University Grants Committee. Of course, the University Grants Committee has completed autonomy with regard to the funds placed at its disposal. It may probably interest hon. Members to hear that in Great Britain itself there is today a greater approximation to our way of thinking. Very recently two committees were appointed there—the Robins Committee and the Trent Committee—which are examining the question of university finances and the question of finances of every kind of non-official agency engaged in research, and their preliminary thinking seems to be more or less on the lines on which we have proceeded.

One very important question about Central Universities was raised by a number of speakers, particularly by Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar, and Prof. Wadia has replied to it. But I would like to return to it all the same. The Central universities are the direct responsibility of the Government of India. It is not only because the Central Government makes allocations to the Central Universities and the Grants Commission has to make the full payment, but it is laid down in the Act itself. There was a good deal of discussion on this when the Bill

[Shri Humayun Kabir.]

was passed and it was agreed by Parliament that the Central universities must continue to remain the responsibility of the Central Government, since there is no other source from which they can draw. The State universities are the primary responsibility of the States. Mr. Chettiar quoted certain figures. If he will look at the figures again, he will find that in the matter of development, the Central universities are treated, more or less, on par with the State universities. In the matter of maintenance grants, he referred to page 26 of the Report for 1961-62 and what he said was certainly correct, that seven universities or institutions for which the Centre is directly responsible, received among themselves Rs. 3-31,68,000[-]. But in the case of the development of the Central universities, together they have received only Rs. 34 lakhs. They got only Rs. 34 lakhs as against Rs. 1,52,98,000 given to the State universities. Therefore, I do not know wherefrom he got the figure to say that a greater proportion of money was being spent on the Central universities.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: All the figures are in the Report.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Both sets of figures are given separately and I am afraid the hon. Member did not go beyond page 26 and he did not look at page 29 of the Report.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I referred to the other page also.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Also the Grants Commission has been giving considerable assistance for the development of the affiliated colleges both in respect of hostels and in respect of teachers. Mr. Ruthnaswamy and other friends referred to the question of hostels. I am in entire agreement with them that far more provision should be made for hostels. In the case of technical institutions, we have

accepted responsibility for 50 per cent. of the students and said that they will be provided with hostel accommodation and that target is being fulfilled throughout India. In the case of the other institutions also, if not 50 per cent., quite a substantial proportion of the students should be provided with hostel accommodation. For that purpose the Grants Commission has made a beginning by giving grants for hostels in colleges. Rs. 44.68 lakhs were given in 1959-60, Rs. 40.6 lakhs in 1960-61 and Rs. 35.02 lakhs in 1961-62. I have no doubt that when the figures for 1962-63 are available it will be found that a considerable provision has been made for hostel accommodation for students in the colleges.

Similarly, in the universities also, grants for hostels have been made of the order of Rs. 16.68 lakhs in 1959-60, Rs. 25.27 lakhs in 1960-61 and Rs. 45.05 lakhs in 1961-62. I agree that even more may have to be done. But this again is a matter where we have to make up for past deficiencies and with the rate at which university students are increasing, it is almost impossible to keep pace. Nevertheless, every effort will be made to improve hostel facilities both in terms of numbers and in terms of the amenities and facilities. I entirely agree with my hon. friend that a hostel without a common room or without a reading room, is not suitable for students and does not fully serve the purpose for which it is intended.

Similarly with regard to teachers. I have mentioned already earlier in the morning the efforts made by the Grants Commission in improving the quality of the teachers, throughout the country, both in the universities, Central and State, and in the affiliated colleges and I am glad that there is full recognition of that fact in the House. I am sure things will improve as the social climate is built up. I would like to place before the House this consideration also, that it is not salaries alone that count. There is the social climate. What is the social

appreciation of the teacher? If there is proper social appreciation of the teacher, things will improve, especially with the salaries which have been introduced today and which I hope in the Fourth Plan will be more or less on the lines which I have tried to indicate and place before the House.

Madam, Mr. Chettiar and other friends also, referred to the problems of research. I am afraid I cannot agree there. I think it was, Mr. Sapru who said that we have to concentrate today only on basic scholarship and not on research. I do not accept that division. There cannot be any basic scholarship and there cannot be any teaching, especially in the post-graduate levels, unless it is reinforced by research. Contrarily, research cannot be developed or have any significance, if there is no teaching. It is the pressure of the younger generation, of those admitted into the universities and colleges, which keeps the teachers on their toes. The experience not only in our country but throughout the world has been that where research is divorced from teaching, or training in some way or the other, there research itself suffers and within fifteen or twenty years many of the most magnificently endowed research institutions have not been able to give results which the universities give.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: There are research fellowships without any teaching at all.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Research fellowships are only temporary things. A research fellowship is given to a young student to train him up. A research fellowship is not meant to be a permanent thing. We have found that experience here and elsewhere is that teaching and research have to be combined.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Research fellows also have to do a little teaching.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I would request hon. Members not to inter-

rupt me, because I have very little time and a very wide field to cover.

I do not know wherefrom my friend Mr. Chettiar got the figure to show that only about Rs. 40 lakhs was spent on research.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: It is from a paper by Prof. Mahalanobis given to the Planning Commission.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: May be, but figures are not always completely correct and there are many sources. From the C.S.I.R. itself we are giving assistance to a very large number of universities for research to be carried out in the universities and actually these figures have not been fully compiled. Only yesterday, I saw a report under preparation—and I hope to place it before both Houses of Parliament before the end of this year—showing what is the actual amount spent on research, on scientific research in this country. At the moment even in the report to which my hon. friend referred, Prof. Mahalanobis makes it quite clear that these are only certain tentative figures, and these figures by themselves are not conclusive.

5 P.M.

There was also the reference to Rabindra Bharati and to the Tagore lecturers. Mr. Ruthnaswamy and a few others referred to it. The Tagore Lectures are on any subject in the field of humanities. In fact, except the name Tagore, they have nothing else to do with Tagore as such. The lecture is in any subject in the field of humanities and in certain cases the lecturership can go even beyond humanities. In regard to Rabindra Bharati again, if the Report is read, the University Grants Commission's Report, I think this will be cleared. I think most hon. Members missed one word. It is said that music and the fine arts will be the main items. There is a world of difference between 'mainly' and 'totally'. Actually,

[Shri Humayun Kabir.]

the University is taking up the entire field of humanities. It is a growing University so that in course of time, it may expand further and it would be premature to judge this University which had come into existence only about a year or a year and a half ago.

Another point which was raised by a number of friends was with regard to failures. I am as concerned as any other hon. Member about failures, especially at the different stages of the University examinations. The position is not quite as dismal as it is sometimes painted. Very recently I had a survey made of the failures in the first degree examination for engineering. For India as a whole the failures are about twenty-one per cent. Now, that means that seventy-nine per cent. succeed. This compares quite favourably with engineering institutions anywhere in the world. I think hon. Members will probably be surprised if I give figures of failures for so well-known—failure is not probably the correct word. It should be the figures of those who do not complete the course in the stipulated time—an institution like the MIT. It is much higher than twenty-one per cent. In fact, perhaps it is almost double this figure. Nevertheless, we must be continually on the guard.

Reference was made by my hon. friend, Mr. Sri Rama Reddy, about the entrance examination for the IITs. The southern Universities have recognised that to some extent they have programmed the syllabi in a way which was not suitable for scientific and technical education; I believe the Madras University has already taken steps to rectify that position and other Universities will fall in line. But obviously standards of all-India institutions and the standards of engineering education in the country cannot be lowered simply because some Universities chose to lower the standards of the syllabi or dilute it in a way which is not conducive to best results in higher education. This pro-

blem, I am sure, will be taken care of very soon and I am confident that with the inherent ability and intelligence and industry of my young friends from the south, the students from Madras, Mysore, Kerala and Mysore will next year give a far better account of themselves than they have this year. In that connection, reference was also made to professional colleges and whether they should be started by private bodies at all. It was Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy, I think, who in particular dealt with this problem. That is natural perhaps, because he comes from a State where the problem exists in the most serious form, if I may use that expression. I have recently had discussions with the Chief Minister and the Education Minister of Mysore and they also agreed that something should be done to prevent the springing up of this kind of what one may call, with due apologies, mushroom colleges. In future, no college will be allowed to come up unless it is properly financed and properly staffed and if some colleges have been started in the past, we will try to see that they are upgraded. In fact, in one or two cases, the All-India Council for Technical Education has taken steps to see that a college or polytechnic which was not properly set up was built up with assistance from Central grants but I would not agree with him, and I think with another friend who said that, private bodies should not be allowed to have colleges at all. That, I think, would be a wrong thing. After all, we do want private initiative and if there are philanthropic men and women, if there are non-official agencies which want to serve the community by providing education at different levels, we should welcome their efforts and we should not in any way put handicaps in their way; the only thing is that we should guarantee that the standards are properly maintained and these institutions do not suffer in comparison with State institutions either by way of equipment or by way of other amenities and certainly not by way of staff.

I entirely agree with my hon. friend, Shrimati Bhargava, that greater attention should be paid to women. It is a pity that at the moment there is no woman on the University Grants Commission. I am sure that when we find a woman Vice-Chancellor or a woman educationist at the appropriate time, the University Grants Commission themselves will keep this in mind and we will certainly do whatever we can but regarding the specialised committees . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): May I know what steps were taken to find a woman Vice-Chancellor?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I will leave that to my hon. friend, Mr. Gupta, for the moment . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I am not the Minister of Education who . . .

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Mr. Chordia raised one important issue. It is important in this respect that if the rules change without adequate notice to the Universities, the Universities cannot take advantage of what may be offered. I will pass on his suggestion, with which I agree in principle, that the rules of the University Grants Commission should be made at least one year in advance. Sometimes, the programmes cannot be taken up exactly in that way because a situation may arise where some new programme has to be undertaken by the University Grants Commission and, therefore, without making a fetish of it, generally the spirit of that observation should be observed.

There was reference to foreign exchange by a number of friends particularly, my hon. friends, Mr. Santhanam and Mr. Chettiar. Now, we have surveyed the position. The total requirement of foreign exchange for Universities for India is like this. Their demand is only for one crore of rupees and a sum of about forty or

fifty lakhs was given last year. This was not adequate but the picture is not quite as dismal as Mr. Chettiar tried to suggest and I have every hope—I am glad the Finance Minister is here—that it will receive sympathetic consideration. The resolution which was passed recently at the conference of scientists and educationists had put the total requirements of foreign exchange at one crore of rupees for the Universities, two crores of rupees for the technical institutions throughout the country and two crores of rupees for all research institutions in the country, in all five crores of rupees, for the whole country and for a year. I am sure, with my hon. colleague's known interest and sympathy for scientific and technical education and higher education, this sum of five crores of rupees will be forthcoming and I have suggested that this may be done in a way . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope you will take it up in the Cabinet meetings also.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I have suggested that this may be done in a way so that once the allocation is made, every head of institution has some free foreign exchange at his disposal. The rather laborious and difficult process of going through licence and application may be, if not altogether abolished at least severely curtailed in their case. This matter, I would like to inform the House, is now being examined by the Ministry of Finance. We have already passed on the proposal to the Ministry of Finance and it is under examination.

There was also reference to the question of discipline and moral teaching. I am sure that every one in this House desires that the tone of discipline in all educational institutions, and if I may be permitted to add, in all spheres of life including public life, should be raised and there will be no difference of opinion among Members of this House. I am sure this will be kept in mind by the University Grants Commission. As

[Shri Humayun Kabir.]

was mentioned by Mr. Diwakar, some steps may not be very sweeping steps but some steps, in this direction have already been taken.

I am afraid I cannot agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Santhanam, when he wants the Indian Institutes of Technology to be brought under the University Grants Commission. This House and the other House, i.e. the Parliament, having considered that question set up a Council of Indian Institutes of Technology precisely for that purpose. The functions of the University Grants Commission and that of the Indian Institutes of Technology are somewhat different and by a mix-up of the two, the cause of technical education may suffer in this country but there is no possibility of lack of co-ordination and no possibility of duplication or overlapping because the Chairman of the University Grants Commission is a member of the Council of the Indian Institutes of Technology and similarly, in the University Grants Commission, there are persons who are fully conversant with the requirements of the Indian Institutes of Technology and are familiar with their work.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have just five minutes more.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I will finish in five minutes.

There was the question of screening so that the number at the university level can be controlled. Again that is a point where there will be no difference of opinion. Attempts are being made to see that only the meritorious go to the universities but we cannot take that step till we have also provided some kind of an alternative for those who are not going to the universities. That is why the question has been taken up of providing some kind of a professional, vocational or technical education at the secondary level itself. Also some changes in the rules of recruitment may be necessary but this would again

take me rather beyond the present discussion.

There was also reference to the question of medium of instruction. It is a very ticklish issue and in the three or four minutes left to me I cannot deal with that adequately. I would only say that everyone will agree that while we will have to have Indian languages—and we desire to have Indian languages—as the medium of instruction in our universities, any hurried step would be undesirable. Haste is not always conducive to quicker results. Actually there has been some damage to the standards of education because this was not always carefully thought out. Further, it is not a question of only preparing a few lists of terminology or a few text-books. At the university level, education depends and ought to depend on a wide background of literature and till that wide background of literature is created in the languages, we have to be bilingual for some time to come. Also it is correct to say that in the universities today, the medium is not merely English and not merely the regional language. Every teacher uses both the languages, sometimes side by side and sometimes one after the other and the students also in their discussions use both the languages. This bilinguality, I think, in the circumstances will have to continue for some time till adequate literature is created and for that we are making every possible effort.

Madam, there was also a suggestion that universities should be made a concurrent subject. I cannot enter into that question now but I do agree that even within the existing provisions of the Constitution the University Grants Commission can and does help in raising standards through judicious allocation of grants, through suggestions in the way of revision of syllabuses, through improving the quality of teachers and in all these directions I am happy to see that in the ten years the University Grants Commission has existed, three or three and a half years as a non-statutory body and thereafter as a statutory

body, the University Grants Commission has already rendered considerable service to the cause of university education in the country.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** May I know what the University Grants Commission has done?

**SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR:** I would refer my hon friend to the Reports which have been published from time to time.

Now, Madam, my last point, and that is, the question of consolidation versus expansion. Here again a basic question has been raised. In our country, I am afraid, we cannot choose between the two alternatives. They are not the two horns of a dilemma but they are two parallel developments which we have to entertain side by side. With the enormous expansion in elementary education, with the enormous expansion in secondary education, it is inevitable that there will be expansion in university education as well. At the same time, if that expansion takes place at the cost of quality, that expansion will not be in the national interest but may be actually detrimental to national interest. Therefore consolidation has to be given equal importance. I think that on the whole, the University Grants Commission in its ten years of existence has always tried to balance the demands of consolidation against the demands for expansion and by and large I think, Madam, we can say that university education in the country today, while it is not all that we desire, while it is far short of the ideal, while it is perhaps even short of what is possible, is certainly in a state of progressive advancement and I do not think we need be unduly apprehensive or nervous about the state of affairs.

I once again thank all hon. Members who have taken part in the debate.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Madam, may I ask . . .

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Your Half-an-hour discussion is there. It is 5.15 now.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Let me ask one question.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** All right.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** The Calcutta University Senate drew up a College Code several years ago. I think it was drawn up unanimously by the Senate but up to now I am told it has not been implemented and the Governor as the Chancellor is not giving consent advised by the West Bengal State Government. In such matters what the University Grants Commission does, I would like to know.

**SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR:** The State Universities are primarily the concern of the State Governments.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION REGARDING CONDITIONS FOR TRAVEL ABROAD

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):** Madam Deputy Chairman, I am glad to find the hon Finance Minister here. I should like him to consider the problem that I am raising in this House this afternoon with a fresh and open mind so that we improve matters and set things straight. In the beginning of last year the Government introduced some kind of a procedure in regard to the booking of passages for travel abroad. These are now dealt with under what is known as the P. Form. As soon as the matter came to our notice we discussed it and I think the Government also in a press note on the 10th May 1962 clarified this particular regulation and explained under what circumstances applications on P. Form would be considered. It was made abundantly clear that the whole object of this measure was to prevent certain misuse of foreign exchange by