

RESULT OF ELECTION TO THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF ANTHROPOLOGY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Raghubir Singh being the only candidate nominated for election to the Central Advisory Board of Anthropology, he is declared duly elected to be a member of the said Board.

MOTION RE THE FOURTH ANNUAL
REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY
GRANTS COMMISSION—*contd.*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, it is a good thing that we will be discussing problems of our higher education because such subjects should be discussed in this House and in the other House in our view a little longer than we do. I have read carefully the Report of the University Grants Commission and at once I looked at the names of those who constitute this Commission. They are illustrious people in their own line, distinguished men, but I believe this distinction came in the way of the proper kind of report that we would like to have. One should have expected penetrating analysis into the problems of our education on their part, a bold and courageous approach and a projection of their ideas into the future. Here in this Report we find there is sterile analysis of the obvious and instead of any courageous thinking there is routine recapitulation of what is decided by this House and the other House year after year. The newness in the Report is this that the gentlemen of the University Grants Commission have come to the wonderful conclusion after wandering a lot that the teachers should not be elected to the legislatures and that they should be nominated. It is a funny suggestion from a set of very distinguished men; teachers are not to be elected, they are to be nominated. It is an insult to the teaching institution and it is an attempt to introduce nominat-

ed elements into the legislatures and Parliament. I do not know whether the hon. members of the University Grants Commission were aware of the implications of what they wrote in this Report in their abundant wisdom. We cannot understand such a thing. However, Sir, the teachers are soon to be deprived of their fundamental rights. Government servants have been deprived of their fundamental rights and now the teachers are to be deprived of their fundamental rights according to them. I hope the Education Minister and the country would give no quarter to such a preposterous suggestion and I expect the teaching community to raise its voice in strong protest against this kind of suggestion which goes against the very principles of our parliamentary institutions and generally democracy. Well, then, I thought, why it is so. Dr. Kunzru is a lovable and a very revered Member of this House but then I found—I ran through the names and I found—that none of them had taken part in politics even under the British. How can I expect them now to take part in politics or understand the problems of political life of the country when we are free? I pity them; I sympathise with their predicament in this matter. That is one point. This is a thing which should not have been done. It will be resisted in the country and the University Grants Commission has done no service to itself by making such a provocative suggestion.

Let me now come to the question of student indiscipline. It has become the fashion of some elder people, those who live in the retiring rooms of political life to come out occasionally with this kind of sermons about student indiscipline. It is a defamation of the student community of the country. By and large the student in India is patriotic and is disciplined and we would not like our elder statesmen, politicians and retired people to come and say that they are an indisciplined lot. You do not advance the cause of the country or its integrity or its moral fibre by taking up every

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
opportunity to defame and libel the student community. That 12 Noon should stop. Everybody knows that this is a vast country. In India how many acts of student indiscipline have taken place and what are they? Many students are there in the colleges. Do we read in the newspapers about indiscipline on the part of students or do we read reports of indiscipline on the part of highly-placed people and politicians?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In Parliament.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, Sir, everywhere; in the P.C.C. offices, in the Government quarters even around your place. Now, this is the position. I mean in the Secretariat and so on and you know it. Therefore, let us stop that kind of thing. Here in the name of restraining student indiscipline there is a cold-blooded deliberate attempt to deny the students their fundamental rights, to curb normal student activities, to introduce a kind of thought-control and transform the student community into a cultural and political appendage of those who are in power. We discountenance that suggestion and I am glad that the student community rejects this kind of thing. Here you will find that everything is bracketed as student indiscipline. If our students come out in the streets and demonstrate against the murder of Lumumba is it to be put in the same category as when some students, a few of them, indulge in some kind of ugly incidents in the examination-hall? This is not the way to approach the problem at all. Are we to call it student indiscipline when students, hungry and starving, living in colossal want, demand better educational conditions, less tuition fees and more opportunities of life and come out in demonstration? Is it to be stigmatised and slandered as student indiscipline? That is the question I would put to the members of this Commission. That is what they are doing; they want to accuse the students of general indiscipline and

the students of general indiscipline and they are trying to shut up all union activities. The Punjab unions have been closed; in Banaras and Allahabad they are being closed; in Andhra and Kerala they are being . . .

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Will you give any chapter and verse for that statement that in Allahabad and Banaras Universities the unions are being closed?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They are not; thank God. Thank heavens or rather thank the University Grants Commission that they have not yet been closed but plans are in progress. I want to put an end to this kind of conspiracy against the student community. Now, that is the position. What about the Punjab? There it has been closed. Mr. G. C. Chatterjee, Vice-Chancellor of the Rajasthan University speaking at the 12th Convocation of the Rajasthan University said that the students' union should be closed and that one should not have any truck with those things. So this theory is being translated into practice in some places.

Now, what about the conditions of life of the student community? According to a survey carried out in the Calcutta University 60 per cent. of the families of the students in Calcutta have less than Rs. 60 per month as income—a family unit of three persons. 70 per cent of the students cannot afford one anna for their tiffin during the day when they go to colleges. We get here Rs. 21 a day. These students to whom we issue sermons from certain high quarters do not even have one anna for their tiffin during the day when they are in the colleges. Then according to the same survey 80 per cent. of the students do not have any place to study—that survey was carried out under Prof. J. C. Ghosh—and they cannot afford books let alone tuition fees. In Delhi the cost of education for a student when he goes to the hostel comes to Rs. 100 at least barring the tuition fees. This is the condition in which

our student community is placed today and they are displaying a magnificent kind of discipline and calmness. I think they are Buddhas incarnate the way they are behaving and they should not be slandered as indulging in indiscipline. We should try to improve their conditions of life, lessen the burden of education on their parents, and then you will have the right to say what you are saying.

Then comes the question of selective admission. There is a suggestion here to restrict admission into the Universities, as if the students are flooding into the universities in our country. Is that the case today? The cost of education itself prevents the bulk of the students from seeking university education. The portals of the universities are not open to the masses of our students; they cannot simply afford it. How many people in Delhi and outside can afford higher education? The parents would have to spend Rs. 100 to Rs. 150 per month. I think the gentlemen of the University Grants Commission should have noted this fact. A cruel sorting out is taking place and many of the students are not in a position to go in for higher education and they want to restrict even those who come. This is a clever, camouflaged attempt to restrict higher education having failed to extend it. Having failed to provide better conditions for the education of our young men coming from the working class, coming from the peasantry, coming from the lower income group, these gentlemen of the University Grants Commission and the Government are now working out a theory and then they will introduce the practice of restricting university education as far as the bulk of the students go.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: What is the theory and practice in Russia?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have propounded the theory and you have asked the States to practise it. You should be knowing it better. And certainly . . .

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, he has not answered the question about the theory in Russia.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It will be presumptuous on my part to answer such an esteemed and knowledgeable person. He can find the answer himself.

There is this question of higher standard of education. Do not talk of higher standard of education when your plan is to restrict it. We want expansion of university education. And here again the emphasis is on humanities when what is needed is technical education, scientific education. It is no use trying to improve the situation when they are trying to restrict admission to the universities. We all know that there are no proper technical schools. In Tollygunge in Calcutta there was a school where even non-matriculates could go in for technical education. Now, even matriculates cannot seek education there. So, diversification of education is needed today. You have to open more centres of technical education, more schools for engineers and others where technicians could be trained and you will see that that will lessen the pressure even under these conditions on the Universities of Calcutta, Delhi, Bombay, Madras, Andhra and so on. When that is not done, what is the use of patronising? What is the use of giving sermons? We want higher education to be taken as Mr. Katju said—I am sorry not Mr. Katju because he never says such things—as Mr. Sapru said to the door of the common man. Are we doing it? We are not doing it.

Then I come to the question of grades and so on. What is the role of the State here? On the one side is the University Grants Commission and on the other there are the universities. The State has become a kind of a broker between the University Grants Commission and the institutions. They get lost; they canvass some support from the University Grants Commis

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
 sion but the States are not fulfilling their function in this matter. And the University Grants Commission according to me, with all respect to the members of the Commission and more especially to Dr. Kunzru, is a bureaucratic body. It is a highly bureaucratised body; the elegance of its membership cannot conceal its bureaucratic substance.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Will you give some proof of that? How does it work bureaucratically? Will you explain it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, they never consult the teachers' associations or the students. They consult the Vice-Chancellors, I know. The Vice-Chancellors are good people and I would like them to be consulted but some of them have lost touch with the problems and many of them may not be useful for such consultations always in every matter. He does not consult the students' and teachers' associations. And this Report is an essay in bureaucracy. I am very sorry that I have to say a few critical things but I am restraining myself.

Then, Sir, here you can see the photograph of the professors in demonstration in the Calcutta Syndicate on the 27th of last month, that is, day before yesterday. They went to meet the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University. What were the grounds? On the 29th August 1959 the Senate of the Calcutta University drew up a code about provident fund, service conditions, and so on in the non-Government colleges, etc. unanimously, all together. It was sent to the Chancellor, who is the Governor, and somebody is sleeping over it all these years. Nothing has been done. Two hundred students had to go in demonstration to meet him in the Syndicate-hall to impress upon him . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Students or teachers?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: 'Teachers'—sorry, men and women. Dr. Seeta Parmanand will note that women were also there. They went there to impress upon the Vice-Chancellor that the code should be implemented. The Governor is doing nothing. Here I ask why the Governors should be Chancellors? Cannot we find anybody else? I cannot simply understand it and that should be stopped. The Chancellors should be other people. If the Governors do not have enough work, I can think of giving them some job, but certainly not the Chancellorship of universities.

The tuition fees should be reduced. Here it is highly expensive and the University Grants Commission should help in the reduction of tuition fees.

Then, Sir, about the matching grant, the result is that 64 per cent. of the allocations could not be used on account of the conditions under the matching grant. I think this system should go. The Central Government should give money and see that the schemes are implemented, and if certain rules and regulations come in the way they should be changed and their salary should be raised. Here, only the other day the Delhi teachers presented a 22-point memorandum to the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University in which demands have been made about conditions of service, economic security, social prestige and so on. That should be gone into. Even here in the capital they are suffering. We should pay attention to them.

Then, the evening classes should not be discontinued. They should be continued. The correspondence course in our country is essential. That also should not be given up. There is a suggestion, it seems, that it should be given up. I think it would be wrong to give up the correspondence course. Many of them would like to have higher education that way.

Then, a problem has arisen after the introduction of the three-year degree course. In some places

eleventh class does not exist. After they pass tenth class, they have to take another test or examination for getting admission to the university within a matter of seven months. This comes in their way of getting admission.

As far as the activities of students are concerned, there should not be any restraint whatsoever. On the contrary, union activities should be encouraged and promoted through elections and on a democratic basis. I cannot see why the University Grants Commission is opposed to elections. They are opposed to elections everywhere. The union activities are there in the Western countries. We all agree that they are useful and they should not be . . .

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: What about the activities of professional students?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We will talk about it. I am talking of students and not professional students.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: Professional students continue in the universities for a number of years.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If the students are in need of your advice, you can offer it to them. Therefore, that should not be done. What I say is that this is a very disappointing Report and we would expect the University Grants Commission, the high men, to come down to earth, meet the students, meet the teachers, meet their organisations, discuss the problems and understand them, in a better perspective and come out with a report that would inspire us, that would show the way out of the impasse that has come into the country and help the Government and the public to tackle the problem in a proper way.

SHRI K. M. PANIKKAR (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, the work of the University Grants Commission deserve our commendation. It is not a question of the way the Report is presented. It is a question of what they have

achieved and the achievement is indeed considerable. Wherever you go, whichever university you see, there has been a great deal of improvement in regard to the facilities available in the libraries, in the laboratories, in the salaries of teachers and all the other things which go to create a higher standard in regard to educational institution in our country. Therefore, I want to extend my congratulations to the University Grants Commission for the good work they have done in so short a period. Within the last few years they have really laid the foundations for a great expansion in our education, as well as in the quality of university teaching that is taking place in our country.

The basic problem, so far as we are concerned, with regard to university education is what the Commission calls the co-ordination of the facilities for study with the expansion in numbers. This is by no means a new problem. It is as old as the century when Lord Curzon, in his very famous convocation address at Calcutta, wanted to limit the number of students going to the universities. The Sadler Commission in 1917, I remember again, said about the revolutionary urge among the middle-classes of India to go in for university education. Undoubtedly that revolutionary urge has become much greater with our independence. But what is the reason for this extraordinary urge for university education? Has anybody really analysed it? To my mind the real reason for it is this that the first degree in the university till quite recently was really the end of our secondary school education. The secondary school education was so inefficient, was so inadequate that till actually the B.A. degree was obtained, a man's secondary education could not be considered as complete, and it was considered the most elementary qualification for all kinds of appointments. So long as you had the B.A. degree as an essential condition for appointment in almost all spheres, even for a clerkship in the Government, everyone wanted to take the

[Shri K. M. Panikkar.]

B.A. degree. Without it nobody was considered as educated. Now, though to some extent this problem has been met by the three-year course that you have started and by the technical institution towards which students are being directed, still even for appointments in Government service, for posts whether in industries or in commercial companies, a university degree is considered absolutely necessary. Till your secondary education becomes actually self-sufficient and your technical education can be branched off from the secondary level, it is not possible to consider the B.A. degree as anything more than the culmination of the secondary course. Of course, a beginning has been made by the three-year course which makes it possible for people who have taken only the school final examination or the higher secondary examination to go up for technical education. This, however, is only a beginning.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

But till the real problem of appointments, the problem of services and the problem of entry into services in companies and industries, is solved in such a manner that it is possible for people to go direct from the secondary schools to these institutions. It is no use thinking that you can eradicate this idea of people considering university education as the be-all and end-all of education itself, as providing the necessary stamp and authority to consider themselves as well-educated people. Nowhere in the world it is claimed that university education should be open to everybody. It is not the claim made in the most advanced societies that every person is entitled to university education, but at the same time there is no place in the world where there is a limitation put on people who want to go up for university education. The suggestion that there should be selective admission to the universities, to my mind, is therefore to a large extent reactionary. What we have to do is to see that every class of people

have the opportunity for going up for university education, that is to say, as in England today where I am told over 70 per cent. of the students who go up for university education go on scholarships and Government grants.

Then, as it has been pointed out, the expenditure in regard to university education bears no proportion to the income of the middle classes or the poorer classes. It is only through Government grants that the lower rungs of society can have the privilege of higher education. What is really essential is that we have got to make our education national, and we have got to see that at least 50 per cent. of the students who go up for university studies are maintained on the basis of merit scholarships and not left to their own financial resources. It is not possible at the expense which university education means for ordinary people, for people in middle class homes, to have two or three of their children sent up for college education. The ordinary expenditure of college education comes up to over Rs. 150 for each child. It is not conceivable that this could be maintained and the ordinary middle class families be given the benefit of college education. If it is not provided from the State, what does it mean? It means that only people in the higher incomes groups would be in a position to go up for university studies. Is that a desirable thing at any time? So, we have to consider this problem from two points of view: one of keeping university education fairly cheap or at least of providing sufficient grants to enable the poorer students to go up for university education, and the other is of keeping the door open to all classes of people to go up for the highest level of education.

The second problem that I should like to raise and which has been dealt with at considerable length in the Report relates to the salaries of teachers. The Report says that this question should be considered as of national importance. Undoubtedly. But what is the problem. The problem as it stands

is this, that the salaries we give to the educational workers are so low that we only get people to join educational services who could not get into higher Government services, in the employment in companies or in industrial concerns. In England and in other places of high educational standards the vast majority of the people who get a first class, in university Honours examinations take to teaching fellowships in universities. In Oxford and Cambridge more than 50 per cent. of the people who take their first class go in for such fellowships, that is a teaching career. It is only those in the second level who go in for Government appointments or for employment in companies and industrial concerns. In India the problem is exactly the opposite. People who have a first class or who are exceptionally brilliant students are always anxious to take up Government appointments, to such an extent that in the Public Service Commission this year there were at least four or five students who had qualified for degrees at Kharagpur as engineers, who sat again for examination for the I.A.S. The fact that engineers and other people with high technical qualifications who, one would have thought, would find careers of importance, come up to the Public Service Commission examination for Government service shows that so far as the general public is concerned the value that attaches to the most superior technical qualification is much less than that of security and authority that the Government services provide. What does this mean so far as the teachers are concerned? This means that unless the status of university teachers is raised high, unless their salaries bear comparison to what the Services, get, unless their living conditions are such as to provide them with ample opportunities of leisure and study, the educational service will always be considered a *Pinjrapole*. This, I think, is the gravest danger in India. I have had strange experiences in regard to this. Three years ago, before I went out to France, I was for two years chairman of a committee for the

selection of scholars for higher studies in humanities, and one of the strangest experiences I had in that committee was the discovery that people who had taken a high degree and had become lecturers in colleges had deteriorated in their mind during the course of their teaching, that those who were fresh from colleges after their M.A., stood a much better chance of selection than people who had taught the same subjects for three or four years in colleges. Why? Because they were over-burdened with work and they had families to look after. The amount of time available for study or for leisure or for the development of the mind was small. So actually the lower grade teaching profession in the universities in India is really in a state where it requires a great deal of our sympathy. Unless you raise the living standard of the lecturers in the universities, unless you raise their standing and give them facilities for the improvement of their minds and for teaching the students with greater freedom, there is no possibility of the standards of our education going up higher.

There are only one or two other points which I want to raise. We hear a great deal of talk about academic freedom. This is a strange conception which has come to us from the Middle Ages when the Church with its dogmas and prejudices used to interfere with the universities. Today in democratic societies without a certain amount of intervention from authority it is not possible for institutions to work on a national scale. It was all right in the Middle Ages when there were three or four universities which looked after the entire higher education in the country. There are 40 universities in India today. The funds for these have to come from the public, from the Government, and the public expects them not merely to maintain certain teaching standards but to conform to certain ideas and ideals. So long the question was a fight between vested interests and the universities, undoubtedly the universities had to have their academic free-

dom. But what does university freedom mean today? It means really the freedom to teach, the freedom to think, the freedom to write and publish and to maintain a standard of moral and intellectual integrity. But even this freedom does not mean that one could go and teach things which are against the common social or ethical point of view. It does not mean that you can teach subversive doctrines in the universities. It does not mean that you can teach things—on the basis of academic freedom—which are against progressive or commonly accepted ideas of mankind. It is like tolerance; tolerance is a very important virtue. Religious tolerance is very necessary, but nobody would therefore say that a person who believes in human sacrifice should also be tolerated in a modern society. In the same way, while there should be academic freedom—the freedom to teach, the freedom to think and the freedom to deal with new ideas—these are essential points with regard to all universities—there is no such freedom of academic life to promote the teaching of how to make bombs, for example, in a university, or to say that the duty of maintaining law and order, by police interference if necessary, does not belong to the Government but to university authorities. If it is on the basis that there has always been some kind of trouble at Oxford or Cambridge between the town and the gown, this is an old tradition, which is not repeated in other universities in England itself, so that the idea that academic freedom is something which takes the universities outside the normal life of the community, or the authority of the national institutions is, I think, entirely wrong.

I do not want to take more of your time, Sir; there is only one further point which I should like to emphasise and it is this. I think the general educational courses, which we are introducing, that is to say, the idea of humanising sciences, and giving some scientific background to general education is, I think, one of the essential

conditions of life today, because in every country this has become most important. Even in a very old-fashioned university like the Oxford, almost 50 per cent. of the students today take sciences, physical sciences. Now, in a country like India, where the demand for technology is very high, and we have to develop very rapidly—and that is possible only with higher scientific education—it is necessary that the emphasis in the years to come should be on scientific education. But an education which is purely scientific, which does not include the normal values of humanism would not be a really useful one for the country. So, it is necessary to have a basis of general education, that is to say, that students studying in scientific institutions must have a general background of humanistic studies in the same way as people who today take humanistic studies should have also a general background of science, because the science of today has become so comprehensive, and so permeating that a mere education in literature or philosophy and things of that nature, which was considered humanism in the past, would not entitle one to be considered an educated man. Therefore, I attach the greatest importance to it and I hope the University Grants Commission will see that this doctrine is pressed, namely, that scientific institutions must have a background of general education in the same way as basic scientific education will be given to the humanistic institution also.

I do not want to take more of your time. I see you, Sir, looking earnestly at the clock. So I know the time allotted to me is over.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is agreed on all hands that the University Grants Commission occupies a most distinguished position in the educational set-up of our country. If, however, it could free itself from the trammels and fetters of the routine rut, I am quite sure it would be a

wonderful agency for co-ordination, and effecting uniformity of standards, and also unity or purpose among the various universities of India. Sir, with the short span of its life—since its inception—the achievements that it has got, make a very creditable record. It is in this context that I extend my appreciation for the good work that this organisation has done so far. In spite of the heat that has been engendered on the floor of this House and the criticisms that have been made, I have a word of commendation for the members of the Commission, for the efforts that they have put in in shedding light on the various educational problems that are currently engaging our attention.

Sir, after the perusal of the Report I find that it has glaringly pointed out that because of paucity of funds the Commission stands very much handicapped. I understand there are limitations, and I also know that there are other various departments to which allocations have to be made, but because of the growing need of our country in the context of our educational expansion I believe it would have been in the fitness of things to have made a better allocation of funds for the purpose. The fact that inadequate allocation of funds has been made to the Ministry of Education in the Third Five Year Plan shows that, apart from the limitations of financial resources, there is less awareness of the reality that funds spent on education are really sound investments for national solidarity and development.

Sir, so far we have heard about the composition of the university staff. I feel that in spite of these handicaps the way the Indian universities have made progress is extremely commendable. Here are the figures which speak for themselves. While giving the figures of the foreign universities and also those of the Indian universities, it has been clearly brought out that with a meagre staff so badly handicapped financially we have made a considerable headway. This is a

matter of pride to us, because our graduates, the products of our universities compare favourably with their counterparts in foreign lands. I have observed that the research students produced by the Indian universities have done very well abroad. The figures are here. In Great Britain there were, in 1958, 10,500 teachers for 97,000 students—this is a figure concerning the students of the universities alone. In India there were only 5,700 teachers for a complement of students numbering 6,53,000. Now with such a small complement of teachers if the work which is growing steadily every day is done so creditably, I do not know what we can say about these people except to offer them a word of commendation and appreciation.

Sir, there is also a great problem about the composition of the university staff, the executive council and so many other allied subjects. I had a talk with the hon. Minister of Education the other day and felt that the limitations of the Ministry of Education at the Central level forbade him to interfere in the affairs of the universities run by the States. I know there are only four Central universities and the rest of them are managed by the States. The number has, today, grown up to 40, and if we add the two other institutes, the scientific institute at Bangalore and the agricultural institute at New Delhi, the figure rises up to 42. Now, there is a stupendous problem, and here I have to make a very humble suggestion. It is that since we are making a substantial assignment of funds to the various universities, the University Grants Commission should have also a right to make a probe into the affairs of the universities wherever exigencies arise. It should hold good not only in the case of the universities which fall under the aegis of the Centre but also those universities which happen to be in charge of the States. Also, Sir, to save the sacred precincts of the universities from vicious political incursions, it is essential that the University Grants Commission should be

[Shri Satyacharan.]
 invested with certain supervisory powers to look after the academic interest. In this connection, Sir, I have to make a humble submission. It is that in order to widen the powers and the scope of the University Grants Commission, if it is necessary, we may do so by a specific Act of the Parliament. I say so, Sir, because I have observed with great pain that in certain universities things are run in such a fashion which are not at all consistent with the traditions of educational institutions. For obvious reasons, about which I would not like to speak in detail, nor does the time permit, some of the people who are absolutely undeserving have been put on the executive councils of universities. May I say, Sir, that there are some members on the selection body who are hardly matriculates and they are supposed to interview people who are Ph. D. and D. Litt.? This is a sad commentary on the state of affairs obtaining in universities and it is for us, the Members of the Parliament, who are supposed to be the custodians of the rights and privileges of academicians, to think about it seriously. If the universities are going to be the preserves of politicians who are sometimes so very unscrupulous for obvious reasons, then there must be a curb, there must be a check on them and it is with that purpose in mind that I plead for giving more rights to the University Grants Commission in order to safeguard the academic interests.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Does the hon. Member have any specific example in view where a person who does not even possess the Matriculation certificate has interviewed a Ph. D. in the Delhi University?

SHRI SATYACHARAN: Yes, Sir. It is the University of Gorakhpur. To the hilt I can prove it. You can have all the valuable information . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: How does that concern the Central Government?

The matter should be taken up with the State Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But he can certainly look into it. I can show shopkeepers on academic bodies. They may be good shopkeepers.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: Sir, since the time is short, I want to take up one or two most important questions that are agitating the minds of the people at present in our country. It is the question of the medium of instruction. I have reports that the University Grants Commission has turned down the Union Home Ministry's suggestion regarding the possibility of introducing Hindi as the alternative medium for examinations held by the Union Public Service Commission for recruitment to all-India and other Central Services. Since it happens to be at variance with the recommendations of the Official Language Commission, I do not know what is exactly the policy of the Government. I very respectfully submit, Sir, to the hon. Minister of Education that, while winding up the debate, he would kindly enlighten us about this affair.

On page 23 of the Official Language Commission Report, it is very explicitly mentioned:

"So far as the all-India and Central Services are concerned (and this would apply, unless otherwise provided, also to other all-India services created hereafter), the alternative of the Hindi medium in addition to the existing English medium may be introduced after due notice"

Sir, I am also told that a special committee was appointed by the University Grants Commission. That was a working group. A very disquieting report appeared in the press and that, of course, drew my attention. That report, emanated from Ahmedabad, dated January 29, 1961, and published in "The Hindustan Times" of the 31st January, 1961, says as follows:

"Maganbhai Desai, former Vice-Chancellor of Gujarat University and member of the working group appointed by University Grants Commission to examine problems relating to change-over of medium of instruction, said here today that he had not signed the report of the working group. Mr. Desai alleged that he was not even consulted before submitting the final report."

Sir, it is said that the report under reference has to be submitted shortly and it is also said that it was apprehended that since Mr. Desai had very clear leanings towards Hindi, he was ignored. I do not know exactly the state of affairs as it stands but I would certainly like from the hon. Minister a word by way of clarification about this disquieting affair.

On the whole the Report is a good one because it has covered so many aspects. On the matter of discipline, whatever has been said there needs a little more examination. Here in the Report it is said:

"The political and economic tensions that many of the countries in Asia and Africa are experiencing are apt to be reflected in the behaviour of youth in these countries. Further, the tension consequent on the rivalry in ideologies and of power politics at the international level has its repercussions on young men and women generally and particularly on university students."

Sir, I beg to differ from this observation of the University Grants Commission. This is too big a question. The students are not going to be influenced by the affairs as they obtain in Africa or Asia or for that matter they are not at all concerned with the things happening on international levels.

In this connection I submit that we have forgotten the ancient values of life. The indiscipline that we see is symptomatic of the transitional stage through which we are passing. The fact is that we have probably forgotten

the old social and moral values of life over which stress ought to have been given. Sir, here is a well-known aphorism that was enunciated long ago and that inspired the students and teachers of India. It was:

"मातृमान, पितृमान, आचार्यमान पुरुषो वेद"

These were the three factors which student i.e., moulded the मातृमान that is, mother, पितृमान that is, the father and also the teacher. Then, the environment has a great effect. Students of educational psychology know it well that if the atmosphere and environment in which the students are put is healthy, naturally the students will be quite co-operative, obedient and they will respond to the teachings of the teachers. But now the things have gone to such an extent that we have to deplore it practically in all the convocation speeches that are delivered in the universities. We speak of this malady, repeatedly about the indiscipline spread all over India. Therefore, Sir, the only thing that I can comment about the observations that have been made in this Report is this: Let us think of the old values of life which we have forgotten and over which we have been laying less stress these days.

On the whole, Sir, the Report is a good one and I assure the members of the Commission through you, Sir, and convey the feelings of Parliament that we have a word of commendation for their work and send our good wishes for their future endeavours.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in speaking on this motion for the consideration of the Report, I should like to say that few in this House or outside would agree with the description of the Report given by my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that it is a disappointing document. The U.G.C. and the Government deserve to be congratulated on the splendid work that has been done during the short time that the Commission has been in existence.

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

I should like now to go on, since the time is only 10 minutes at my disposal, to one of the suggestions made by the U.G.C. regarding selective admission to universities. I believe, quite a large number of people are aware that on account of selective admission that was tried in the University of Madras, a private college had to be founded specially to give an opportunity to those who could not be able to get admission and secure their education in the colleges. We should not widen the area of discontent in our country and unless we provide employment opportunities, we should not try to put a bar to the 'indiscriminate admission' as it is called. There is one other aspect of the matter to be considered and that is, those who are dealing with industry and management would be able to say that the men who are offering themselves for employment in industries are of poor quality. They are people who have passed the matriculation or the intermediate standard. They do not fit very well into the managerial scheme of any industry. Our enterprises, public and private, are expanding and in the years to come we will require a large number of personnel to man industries and it is for the U.G.C. to consider the fact that university education, however, defective it may be, though it may yield only a large number of third class graduates, would be certainly a better background for the personnel of these industries and on that ground I do not think that I will be able to support the suggestion made by the U.G.C. that there should be selective admissions.

On the question of indiscipline I would like to say a few words. The growth of indiscipline has been one of the most distressing features of university education in this country but I believe the trouble arises from the political parties. If the political parties do not try to use the students for their purposes, there will be a toning up of discipline in the universities. In

this connection I would like to say that in recent years there have been a large number of students participating in the Peace Councils and Afro-Asian Conferences. I happened to preside over one of those conferences and I was agreeably surprised to find that the young students were fully aware of what was going on in East Berlin and West Berlin, in Hungary or what goes on in various parts of Africa and they were using slogans like 'Liberation struggle, anti-imperialism' and so on. While such education on international subjects to the students would be welcome, it was clear that the gentlemen concerned were qualifying themselves, in the fullness of time, to sit beside my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta and his opposite members in the other House. I think the time has come for the universities to lay down the policy that in regard to participation in these movements, including demonstrations about Mr. Lumumba, the previous consent of the college authorities should be taken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Further, political leaders too lose no opportunity of addressing the university graduates on controversial political subjects. The political leaders should accept a self-denying ordinance that they would not do so and allow the students to discuss matters among themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When Mr. G. L. Mehta went to Calcutta recently for delivering the Convocation Address, he made a political speech against the Communist Party . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am in agreement with my friend, Mr. Gupta, that these speeches should be avoided.

A recommendation made by the U.G.C., which has been implemented, is that 'hobby workshops' should be started. The problem of canalising youth energy has been engaging attention all over the world and the United States have tried the running of the

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

Members will restrict themselves to 10 minutes each. The House will meet again at two.

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

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

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, during the few years of its existence, the University Grants Commission has become a key institution for the progress of university education in this country. In this connection, it must be remembered that university education is a State subject and that the States have entrusted it to autonomous universities. Therefore, the University Grants Commission has no direct authority over the universities. It has to do whatever work it wants through its moral influence, through clarity of its ideas and through the wise distribution of the financial resources which the Central Government may place at its disposal. The financial instrument is powerful. But I do not think the University Grants Commission can do much through it alone. It is, therefore, a matter of gratitude that through the exercise of its moral influence and through its careful thinking of many problems relating to university education, this Commission has attained its present influence. Great credit goes to its first Chairman, Shri Chintamani Deshmukh, to whom references have been made by all the other speakers and I cordially associate myself with those tributes.

In one matter, however, the Commission has not done its part effectively and in proper time. On page 10 there is a wise paragraph about the medium of instruction. I entirely endorse that statement which is as follows:

"One effect of an unplanned piecemeal handling of the problem has been the lowering of the standard not only in English but in the

quality of teaching in the universities as a whole."

It is due to the fact that no clear ideas about linguistic transition have been evolved. I think it was the obvious duty of the University Grants Commission to have evolved these ideas and they ought to have got all the universities to agree to those ideas. Now, there is a veritable chaos in this matter. Some universities have changed over to regional languages wholesale, others are experimenting and some others are not even thinking of the problem, with the result that if the present chaos continues for a few years more, there will be no common intelligentsia in the country, and a graduate with a B.A. or an M.A. Degree will have no real common content. His degree will have one content in one university and another content in another university and so, there will be no co-ordination and there will be no basic minimum standard which we can expect of the products of our universities. Sir, I think this problem is very urgent. So far as I am concerned, the solution is clear. It must be based on two fundamental principles. Regional languages must be acknowledged to be the final and the proper media of instruction and a beginning must be made here and now to enable them to attain that position. Secondly, the knowledge of English of every student entering the university should be such that he can freely attend classes, read books and function in English on every subject. Therefore, I believe that from the beginning the two—the regional language and English—should be made the joint media—they should be accepted as such—and every professor in every college and university should acquire the capacity to deliver part of his lectures in every subject in the regional language while for some time he may go on doing most of his work in English. It is only through the progressive replacement of English by the regional language in slow stages that we can maintain the standard and make the transition complete.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): What should be the place of Hindi?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It will come at the second stage of transition. When all the regional languages of India have become thoroughly fit for teaching; for research and for everything that is done in other languages of the world, then the time will come when Hindi also will be able to step in to that stage. Now, Hindi is like every other regional language incompetent to function as a medium of instruction even in Hindi areas in most of the subjects, both humanities as well as science. I dislike the distinction that has been made between science subjects and humanities. It is considered that it is very easy to use the media of regional languages for economics, for politics or for philosophy, while it is considered to be very difficult to use them for physics, chemistry or other scientific subjects. Provided a commonly accepted dictionary of technical terms is evolved, my own view is that it will be easier to teach science subjects. Therefore, the linguistic transition must be uniform. Whether my idea is accepted or not, it does not matter, but it is of great importance that the linguistic transition should proceed uniformly and steadily all over India so that the content of the degree of B.A. or M.A. will be more or less similar throughout the country. Otherwise, whatever grants may be distributed through the University Grants Commission will be useless and we shall not have a common intelligentsia. We will have separate sets of people who have been trained in Tamil, in Telugu, in Marathi or in Hindi, and they cannot meet and function as common intelligentsia of this country.

There are some good paragraphs in this Report regarding teachers' salaries. I agree that the salaries of teachers in the universities should be increased and if they can be brought to more or less a uniform level, it will all be to the good. But I wish

that a greater emphasis is laid on the ability of the teachers to earn through papers, through books and other things based on personal effort. Merely to make the teachers professionally high salaried officials is not satisfactory. I do not see why the University Grants Commission should not have a special scheme by which a college professor or a lecturer can submit a valuable paper and earn a substantial remuneration. If he writes a book, then he should be given a substantial remuneration. Instead of being discouraged, he must be encouraged to write books and do other literary work. For instance, take the book review page of "The Hindu" every week. I think they are paying probably Rs. 500 or Rs. 1,000 a week for reviews. How many of them are professors or teachers? They want people like me to take up book reviews because teachers and professors are not experienced in reviewing books in a proper manner. I say, equip these people with greater capacities and give them money according to their capacity. Let even the youngest lecturer know that he can get a couple of thousand rupees if he writes a good paper or a good book. It is in this way that we can promote linguistic transition because today there are no people to write books in the regional languages. We cannot import them from outside. People who have been educated through the medium of English must learn through special efforts, to write books in the regional languages and when they write such books, let them be encouraged.

Sir, the next point to which I would like to invite the attention of the Commission is that they should concentrate on improving certain things and not try to disperse their funds too much. For instance, I cannot see why they should enter into the field of films. Why should they promote some kind of film councils for the universities, or the University Film Council? I think films can look after themselves very well and they are already distracting the students and I do not know why the University Grants

[Shri K. Santhanam]

Commission should come in for this purpose. There are so many other things to do, so many hostels to be built, so many libraries and laboratories to be equipped and so on. Why divert funds for a film council? Also, there is a tendency seen that wherever any university has any special project, the University Grants Commission comes in. Why should not people do something on their own initiative, without depending like this on the University Grants Commission? If somebody wants some research in psychology regarding students, why should the Commission come in? Let each university have its own project and finance it out of its own resources. Let the Commission concentrate on improving the common standards in certain essential matters like libraries, laboratories, instituting certain research professorships and scholarships and such other matters.

Only one more point and that relates to this question of elections and nominations. I do not think that anyone would prevent a professor or teacher from standing for Parliament or the Legislatures as a citizen. That cannot be prevented and it ought not to be prevented. But it is but right that when they are engaged in election controversies or in electioneering work, they should take leave, like other workers, from the universities. What really is objected to in this connection is the special constituencies for teachers with reference to the Upper Houses in the States. I think, Sir, that this provision of special representation was a mistake and the sooner this is rectified the better.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does not mention Upper House.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I think the reference is only to these special constituencies, the teachers' constituencies in the Upper Houses of the Legislatures. It is only there that the teachers become divide into parties, one teacher for one union and another for another union and so on, and a great deal of bad blood is created.

Any professor or teacher who wants to stand for Parliament or a Legislature should have the perfect right to do so. But these special constituencies should go. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Fourth Annual Report on the activities of the University Grants Commission for the year April, 1959 to March, 1960 that is before us for discussion today is undoubtedly a most admirable report. I congratulate the Chairman who has retired—Shri C. D. Deshmukh—and all the Members of the Commission, for the yeoman service that they have rendered to the cause of higher education and of university education in our country. Shri Deshmukh has contributed much for maintaining standards in the higher reaches of knowledge. I wish to place on record my appreciation of the work rendered in the Commission by our Member here, Dr. Kunzru.

It is said, Sir, that Shri V. S. Krishna, who was very well known to all of us—a fine personality in himself—his chairmanship of this Commission was cut short by his sudden demise and I want to express my heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved family. I hear, Sir, that the new Chairman of the Commission is a scholar of science. I wish him well in the arduous task that would be facing him in the future with regard to the work of this Commission.

The University Grants Commission Act of 1956 is described as an Act to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in universities and for that purpose to establish the University Grants Commission. That is to say, two aspects of education are emphasised here, namely first the maintenance of high standards and secondly, to bring about the co-ordination that is very necessary. In this respect the Commission has expressed the various difficulties it has to confront in its working. On page 2 of the Report it has been stated under the heading "New Universities. Need for Planning"—

"State Governments do not avail themselves of the advice we could give in establishing new universities or settling the detailed provisions of the relevant acts, so that care can be taken to see that the law embodies no provision constituting a serious invasion of the academic autonomy of the universities concerned or conflicting with well established principles of selecting teachers on expert advice. Such provisions are liable to be misused under political pressure for the ends of party politics"

This is a very serious situation, Sir. Those who have been teachers and have been connected with universities feel very strongly that first and foremost what is necessary for knowledge to be conducted purely on a knowledge basis and away from all the onslaughts of other influences is that the university's autonomy should be accepted as a dictum. The university should be there to pursue knowledge as it had been done in the past, without any kind of infringement of its rights. Therefore, it is up to the Commission to seek ways and means to get all the necessary co-operation from the Union as well as from the State Governments to see that the temple of knowledge is guarded as a temple and all that is best in intellectual, literary and cultural advances, is allowed to be conducted in that atmosphere, away from the stress and strain and turmoils of party politics.

Sir, in this connection I would like to state that in a growing democracy there is no doubt need for education to be taken to all. But the portals of universities should be guarded well and I completely agree with the findings of the Commission that selective admission to those who would profit by education in the universities should be emphasised more and more. It is not all who rush to the universities that should get admission. I am not particularising, but take for example the number of young men and women who seek admission into the universities. They hardly reach the second year of their courses when they dis-

continue their studies. And that causes a great deal of wastage. Those young girls who come for admission to the universities, they are not sure as to their objectives. That is what happens very often. I am not saying this especially about girls; but still I would like the universities and the governments to plan the thing in such a way that those who come to avail themselves of university education, do have a plan before them as to whether they are going to be homemakers or public servants. They should have a plan which would enable them to utilise the knowledge that they have gained from the university. I find many of our young women, having graduated, doing nothing but sitting at home, not utilising their knowledge either in the home or in the service of society outside. Education in the universities should also have in view the zeal for service especially in a growing democracy like ours with various projects and developmental schemes for functioning in the various fields. Therefore, I would insist that while the best is placed before the students they should also give a guarantee that they would function well and fully in a growing democracy as regards the State as well as society.

About the teachers, the Commission has pointed out that their number is increasing. I am glad that the number of universities has increased, has doubled from 18 in 1939 to 40 today—in the two decades that have gone before us, the number of admissions has increased, both for men and women, and I am particularly happy that they are giving special attention to women's education as a result of the recommendations made by the National Committee on Women's Education which had said that more facilities should be provided and more particularised courses for women in nursing, home science and other household arts should be provided. I am very thankful for all that but at the same time, I would plead before the Commission and before this House that quantity should not be empha-

[Shri T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]
sised at the expense of quality. That which marks the advance of nations is the way in which they have guarded and higher reaches of knowledge both in the scientific as well as on the humanities side. Research must be encouraged. We must select the scholars who come into the universities. The teachers also must feel the satisfaction that they are teaching students who are going to do well both in study and research in the long run. One point in regard to the teachers. You may say that we cannot go back to the ancient times of *Gurukul* and the *guru chela* basis but I do not see why the same kind of zeal that there was for the promotion of knowledge during the stage when the student was going on as a student should not be revived even at this stage. I know today there are so many distractions for students in our societies. We do not live on the top of the Himalayas. The students do not live so; they live in society with various calls on their attention but while living in society you should also inculcate in the students this habit of concentration so as to devote their entire time to their progress, mental, moral and physical, in the environment of the university. When they want to participate in the outside life in society, let them learn and participate but away from all kinds of party politics and party pulls which had been largely accountable for the indiscipline that had been the canker in our society in recent times. I will not shut knowledge either from the point of view of knowledge of various aspects of society or from the point of view of the international world, their knowledge of various countries and what is happening there; as students, they must become fully acquainted with all this. We live in a changing society and a changing world. But there is a way of conduct, there is a way of discussion in the various platforms of the university or even outside and on a purely academic basis, matters can be discussed and they can have their joy of debate on national and international issues of significance but interference on party

lines should be ended. Party politics should not influence academic debates.

There are many more things I want to say, but I shall finish in a minute, Sir. I welcome the assistance given to the libraries for their expansion but I would request the Commission to find out how much these books are actually used by the students.

I hope, Sir, the hostels will not be converted into just eating places but really residential institutions where the teacher, tutor, and warden will be in intimate contact with all that is going on in the hostel and all this means healthy, happy living for the students, hygiene and health. Let not the hostels be turned over to the contractors for the supply of food. After all, home science, household arts, etc., are all being taught to the women, and to a certain extent men also should learn these and they should undertake at least some kind of supervision of these mess arrangements through committees of staff and students so as to ensure proper development of their body alongside of their mind.

Thank you.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to those Members who have had a good word to say about the Report of the University Grants Commission. My hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, thought that the Commission's Report was an uninteresting and unimaginative document. The rest of the speakers have paid a tribute to it for the work done by it in order to raise the standards of education in the universities and to enable the students and the universities to perform their duties with greater ease and competence in the future.

I think, in this connection, we must pay a tribute to Shri Chintaman Deshmukh for the wise and energetic guidance that he gave to the Commission as its Chairman.

Sir, two or three points in the Commission's Report have engaged the

attention of most of the speakers. One of these relates to the selection of students on the ground of merit for admission to the universities. I think the hon. Members who have spoken on this subject have generally said that they were against any restriction being placed on the admission of students to universities. Now, Sir, the University Grants Commission has placed no artificial restriction on the admission of students either to colleges or to universities. The Commission has only taken existing facts into account, what has been happening at the present time. More students are offering themselves for admission than can be admitted. There is no room in the colleges or in the universities for all those students. Obviously, therefore, some of them will have to be left out. Well, this inevitably means that there must be some method for the selection of those students who should be admitted to institutions of higher learning and this is what the Commission has said. In this process, we naturally had to leave out students who have passed their examination in the third division. My hon. friend, Shri Sapru, said that he had a partiality for third class students. In England, a third class student had become the Prime Minister of England.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Fourth class.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: That is right, a fourth class student became the Prime Minister of England. Well, Sir, he too recognises, I am sure, that every student cannot become a Rosebery. For one student like that, there are 99 who cannot profit themselves by university education and, if admitted to the universities, will prevent better qualified students from receiving the education to which their talents entitle them. I do not see how this thing can be called reactionary or objectionable. My hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, called the University Grants Commission a bureaucratic body because of its adopting some method of selection for the

students who should receive higher education.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And for various other reasons.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Well, the other reasons he did not state but I fear that in the first place he did not have a clear idea of the meaning of the word 'bureaucratic'. He perhaps used it as a mild term of rebuke. I am grateful to him that he used words that he regarded as the mildest in his dictionary of abusive epithets. He would not have done even this had he not forgotten for the time being that even in Russia which is according to him a socialist country, all students offering themselves for higher studies are not admitted into universities. I know from personal knowledge because I made enquiries about it when I was in Russia two years ago though only for a few days. Only about one-fifth of the qualified students find their way into the universities and of these students a large number are rejected on the result of the annual examination. Therefore, only 12 per cent. of the students are left to pass the final examination. The University Grants Commission has not suggested anything so drastic although I think considering the circumstances in this country and the low standard of education given by institutions of secondary education it could well have said that the number of those who should be admitted to the universities and colleges should be considerably reduced.

My hon. friend, Shri Panikkar who, I am sorry, is not here just now said that there should be no barrier placed in the way of talented students who are obviously fit to receive higher education. The Commission is alive to that fact and it has said at the bottom of page 7:

"At the university stage the real national concern should be that really talented young persons are not denied opportunity for cultivation of their talents owing to lack of

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru]

financial means or to any kind of social discrimination. At no time in human history was there greater need to give facilities to the talented students. Scholarships and bursaries for gifted students and financial support for young men and women of superior ability have to be provided to enable as many of them as possible to continue their studies."

I submit, Sir, that what I have said shows conclusively that the University Grants Commission is not in favour of any artificial restriction of the number of students in the colleges and universities. All that it desires is that the space in the institutions of higher learning being limited those students should have a prior claim who are fitted by their talents and their qualifications to benefit by higher education. For the rest it is anxious that talented but poor students should not be compelled to cut short their education because of their poverty and is in favour of scholarships etc. being instituted so that such students might be able to prosecute their studies up to the highest stage possible.

Now, the other question which engaged the attention of most hon. Members was that relating to the observations made by the Commission with regard to teachers becoming Members of Legislatures. Members who criticised the observations made in the Report on the subject seem to me to have failed to pay any attention to the first sentence in the paragraph dealing with the subject-matter. That sentence runs as follows:

"Teachers standing for elections to Parliament or State Legislatures are sometimes tempted to use students in their election campaigns and to bring some of the passions of party politics within the precincts of the university; and teachers elected to legislatures have to be absent from the university for long spells."

For this reason some of the members of the Commission thought that it would not be a bad thing if teachers did not stand for election to the Legislatures.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do I understand from the hon. Member that it was only some of the members of the Commission who thought like this?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I will make the position clearer still. This is not a decision of the Commission. The words used here are:

"All these things have a bad influence on the atmosphere of the university. We have therefore wondered whether teachers, like employees of Government, should not be debarred from seeking election to the legislatures."

The words used here are . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have wondered.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: . . . "We have wondered" which shows that this is not a decision of the Commission. Those people who did not agree with this view did not want to prevent those, who in their anxiety for the maintenance of a proper atmosphere in the colleges and universities wanted that teachers should not take part in politics, from thinking loudly on this subject. Again, Sir, in some of the universities which allow their teachers to become members of the legislature some restrictions have been placed on the teachers in this connection. No teacher can be a candidate for election to any legislature without the permission of the university. I am sure nobody would object to this. The university cannot allow, say, two or three teachers in a department to become members of legislatures. The primary duty of the teachers is to teach and consequently the university must see whether, with due regard to the interests of the students, it can allow a teacher to stand for election. In the second place it is

necessary that the teacher should absent himself from his academic duties to attend the legislature only for a limited period. And subject to these two conditions I doubt whether any university would like to place a ban on teachers becoming members of legislatures. This paragraph of which so much has been made means really nothing except that some of the members of the Commission, considering the indiscipline that prevailed recently in the universities, thought that it would be a good thing if the teachers themselves could say that they were not involved in the hurly-burly of politics.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is a new interpretation of this paragraph. I would request the hon. Education Minister through you, Sir, to ask the University Grants Commission and its Chairman to furnish an elucidation and interpretation of what is said in this paragraph with the sentence, 'We have wondered . . .'. Who are these people who have wondered? How many of them? All of them?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: He may take it from me that the interpretation that I have given is correct. There is no Chairman of the University Grants Commission just now. The only Chairman who could have given the elucidation, namely, Dr. V. S. Krishna, is unfortunately no more. The University Grants Commission has suffered a great loss by his death. It, therefore, depends on the Members of the Commission to elucidate the meaning of it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right. Then, you meet and give us in writing in a supplementary note.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: If the Minister of Education agrees to his request and asks the University Grants Commission to elucidate the meaning of this, the Commission will gladly do so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope you, Sir, will kindly help us in this matter. The request may be conveyed to him, since he has agreed.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The meaning is clear and it is a lucid statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You don't give the interpretation. You are in trouble.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: There is one more question to which almost everybody has referred and that is the adoption of regional languages as media of instruction in the universities. I was surprised that Shri Santhanam, who is as a rule very accurate in his statements, should have said that the University Grants Commission had failed to evolve a suitable method of bringing about an orderly change-over from English to regional languages as the media of instruction. The paragraph to which he drew our attention itself states that the Commission is alive to this important fact and that it has appointed a Committee to consider the matter.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: May I offer a word of explanation? My point was that the matter has been delayed and that it should have been done much earlier. That was the only point that I wanted to make, not that they have not taken some steps.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: It is only in precept and not in practice.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Having been a Member of the Commission practically since its inception, I think I can say with some confidence that there has been no delay on the part of the Commission in dealing with this matter.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): What positive steps have been taken in that direction by the Commission, except appointing a Working Group?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: That is the most important thing. The University Grants Commission's business is not to satisfy politicians, but to bring about a method for an orderly change-over. It has to consider the effect of it on the students and on the standard of knowledge that the University students should have.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): But politicians guide the nation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, let him finish.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: If politicians are wise, they will be guided by educated people who have paid some attention to this important question.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: They are educated enough.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Well, even educated people sometimes speak on this subject as if they had forgotten all that they had learnt in the universities.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Does Dr. Kunzru suggest that politicians are not educated?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. He has no time. Let him finish.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The question is important enough to be considered calmly and it is not always that people can consider a question of this importance in a calm atmosphere. Politicians, I am afraid, generally are unable to have the leisure and the quiet to give that much thought to these difficult questions which they require. I think these were the three most important questions which were referred to by various speakers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Student indiscipline.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: My friend reminds me that there is another subject that was touched upon by every speaker. That is, student indiscipline. My friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, accused the University Grants Commission of having taken an exaggerated view of indiscipline among students. He could bear testimony

from his own experience, though it is not very reassuring, that the general body of students is well behaved and anxious to acquire that knowledge for which they have entered the universities. I am glad to say that the University Grants Commission finds itself in agreement with him on this point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I agree that there is a sentence.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: He admits now that there is a sentence which reassures him, but why did he not refer to that sentence at all, while he was making his fiery speech? This is the sentence that both he and I am referring to:

"But while indiscipline in our universities caused us anxiety, we have been comforted by the fact that the large majority of our students take a healthy and sane view of life and work in the university and do not support rowdiness. The morale of the normal, serious student must be strengthened, and universities and colleges must build up an *esprit de corps* that will 'Strengthen the good and destroy the evil'."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why this 'while'? I am discomfited because of the 'while' business.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Well, we have to keep our eyes open and we have experience of indiscipline in some universities, in some parts of the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very few instances.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: That is what is referred to in this paragraph. The Commission is afraid lest such a spirit should prevail in other universities too. And they naturally want as, if I may say so, the guardian of higher education and as the friend and philosopher of the universities, that they should take steps to develop an *esprit de corps* in the universities, which will

make the students proud of their universities and refrain from doing anything which would be subversive of discipline or injurious to the maintenance of those standards of education on which the ultimate good of the country depends.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have read the Report and I have found it more interesting than last year's Report. I hope that the Reports to come will be still more interesting. I think, however, that this Report is more outspoken than the previous ones. It is more forthright. For instance, it talks of the rush of students to colleges and universities and takes note that this rush is natural. It says on page 2, at the bottom:

"While we are not in favour of rapid multiplication of universities without proper planning, we realise that the facilities for higher education in India in the shape of colleges and universities and other institutions of a specialised nature will have to increase steadily."

And so the whole paragraph goes on. I have read the previous Reports. Never was there such a paragraph so outspoken and thorough-going in those Reports. They realise that the numbers have increased all over the country—all over the world for the matter of that—and that some arrangements will have to be made for increased numbers of students in colleges and universities. This fact was not taken note of in the previous Reports. More than that, I find that they mention on page 7 what they never mentioned in their previous Reports. They mention on page 7:

"What is, therefore, necessary, is to devise methods by which university education is made available to those most likely to profit by it. Steps must be taken at the same time to provide adequate avenues for the fruitful employment of the marginal and average student after the completion of his school course . . ."

They never said that before. They say so now. But I have a grievance on this score that they say so but ignore it. There should be ample avenues for drawing away students from the universities, from the colleges, into other occupations, into other courses, so that there would be diversification of occupations. I have a feeling that the University Grants Commission either ignores it or does not care for it. There are a number of courses which should be recognised by the universities and they are not being recognised. For instance, in the high school stage there is the post-basic education course. It should be some thing equivalent to matriculation, if not better. It should have priority, and preference, but the universities do not recognise it at all. The wall is raised and the door is shut. I go further. There are a number of courses giving diplomas. I rather think that these diplomas should be given on a much larger scale for many more occupations, not only for engineering but for medicine, public health engineering, agriculture, and so on. Diploma courses for three years, quite a number of them could be started. Some have been started in a very small way, but they have been started. Does the university recognise these diploma courses as graduate courses? They get no recognition. Some Governments have given recognition to these courses for purposes of employment, not all. But not a single university I am aware of has considered the diplomas as equivalent to the degrees of the university. The door is closed for them as far as post-graduate education or higher education is concerned. They are not admitted to that because they are not considered graduates. The universities are closing the door. There are very few avenues and they should be multiplied. But when the avenues are there, they should be open and they should not be closed by walls. The universities are creating walls. To my mind, I have a grudge on that score that the university is sitting on the head and on the shoulders of second-

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

dary education and is not allowing it to expand in more fruitful ways for which it is prepared, I mean the secondary education stage. Further, in going lower down to the first eight years' course called the consolidated or integrated eight years' course, there should be again a diversion from it, students going away from there for certificate courses for two years. If the university were to recognise the courses at the matriculation stage or at the post basic stage, the Secondary Education Board would recognise the stage after the 8th class, after they have finished the integrated basic course. Today the certificate course again is a mere trickle and is not recognised by the Secondary Education Board as equal to matriculation. To my mind there should be a big outflow of students at 8 *plus* and a substantial outflow at 11 *plus*. It is not so there at all, and the universities, to my mind, are instrumental for this blocking. There is a block there and the students cannot pass from one to the other. What is done at the primary stage is not recognised by the secondary stage. What is done at the secondary stage is not recognised by the universities at the college stage. Above all the university imposes a pre-preparatory course which is not really pre-preparatory. It is for teaching English up to a certain standard, to bring up the students to a certain standard of understanding so that they can comprehend what is being taught to them in the classes. So, there is an additional burden on the students—I do not however want to go into that subject. Here also, the universities are sitting on the head and shoulders of secondary education and primary education. For those in secondary education the medium is entirely regional for the last many years. It cannot but be regional also for the university stage, but suddenly they have switched on to English. The whole thing is illogical. The whole thing makes no sense at all for eight *plus* three years to teach through the

regional language and as soon as that is over to switch on to English. You find that the boys are not up to it, that the teachers are not up to it. The teachers do not talk good English. How do you expect the students to understand the teachers who talk bad English, ungrammatical English? So, this is my grievance that it is those people at the top, at the universities, who sit on the head and shoulders of secondary education repressing it, curbing it, and not allowing the students to go on to various occupations which the country requires for the national good.

Sir, there is another thing. The hon. Minister talked yesterday of financial limitations. I quite agree with him, they are there. But within those financial limitations a great deal can be done which has not been done. Now, in the draft Third Five Year Plan there is a total provision of Rs. 500 crores for Education. It may be more or less now but the total is Rs. 500 crores. Out of this Rs. 370 crores is for General Education and Rs. 130 crores is for what is called Technical Education. When you come to look at the break-up of the figure, there are only Rs. 180 crores for Elementary Education, Rs. 90 crores for Secondary Education, Rs. 75 crores for University Education, Rs. 25 crores for miscellaneous things, and Rs. 130 crores for Technical Education. You will kindly see that out of Rs. 500 crores only Rs. 180 crores are for Elementary Education. The other items absorb more than two-thirds or even three-fourths of the total allotment. The major portion goes to the higher education. In the break-up you will find, Sir, that the Elementary Education is being neglected and the University Education is being protected and is being financed far more generously than it should be. I have read a bit of Mahatma's writings as you must have also read, Sir. He was of the opinion that higher education must be self-supporting as far as possible without depending on the Government. Here it is quite the other way about. The

citizens are being taxed very heavily for university education and not so much for elementary education.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: Only richer class people will be able to support their higher education but we want scholarships for backward classes?

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: While you give two-thirds of the total for higher education, only one-third is given for primary education. To my mind two-thirds must go to elementary education and only one-third to higher education. It is my way of looking at it. The foundation must be strong (*Interruption*) You talk of teachers and their salaries. You talk of teachers in the primary schools. How much does a primary school teacher get all over the country? He gets Rs. 40 or Rs. 50 while a peon is getting Rs. 80. What do you think of that? You are thinking of raising the salaries of teachers in the universities. You have raised them. I am very grateful to you for that. They are very grateful to you for that. But what about the poor primary teachers, thousands of them? Look at the figure of pupils. It goes into lakhs at the primary stage. It will be 6 crores in the year 1965-66. Therefore, it will be 6 crores of pupils at the primary stage, that is the first eight years, and it may be about 10 or 12 lakhs only for university education. While you spend on the one only Rs. 30 per person per year, on the other you spend per person hundreds or more. You know it is to no good purpose at all. It is wasting your money. He has no merit for it. He does not deserve it. You go on pouring money as a torrent upon him, whereas you starve the other at the primary stage which is the foundation of good education. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, I am just warming up a bit and you are pulling me up. Anyway I would say, Sir, as it is at the present moment this whole allocation of funds to my mind is very unfair, is very unjust. The result is, even as things are, your buildings are for better than your equipment, your equipment is better than your tea-

chers, and even your students are much better than your teachers. I rather think that the pupils are much better than the teachers we have got in the colleges. I was also once a professor. I looked very decent in those days, and I think I am not less decent even now. But I rather think that there is tremendous deterioration in the quality of teachers now.

Sir, you have rung the bell when I was coming to the third and to my mind the most important point about the condition of higher education and what is wrong with it. It will take me ten minutes, and I know you will not give me these ten minutes in which I wanted to talk of indiscipline and so many other things. If you will give me five minutes, I will be very grateful to you. Sir, you will agree with me that the quality of education, the objective of education, the purpose of education, the meaning of education is not understood by the universities in India or by the University Grants Commission. It talks of a number of things but it does not give one solution for any important problem. It mentions the problems and sidetracks the problems, it mentions the medium and sidetracks it, it talks of numbers and sidetracks that question, it talks of quality and sidetracks it. It does not face any problem. The Report has got 18 pages. (*Interruption*) I am not satisfied with little bits of things here and there. What about the big problems? I want to put a question to them: what is the object of university education? What is the object of university education in India of the present day when there are tensions? What have you done about tensions? What have you done about conflicts and strifes that are going on all over the world—of course in India, of 3 P.M. course in every province for the matter of that? It is for you. You want autonomy. Very good. But you must have the freedom, the strength and the character to deserve that autonomy. Autonomy cannot be thrust on you. Autonomy cannot be

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]
 claimed by law, by statute. You must deserve autonomy. Have they deserved that autonomy? You do not want to put them in politics. You also say: "Become politicians, but you will not have the time for it." I rather think that the teacher today has so much time that he does not know what to do with it. He is too lazy, he is too passive, he is too inactive. He does not react to the conditions today in India. He does not think about what is happening all around him. He wants autonomy to have a good, easy, nice, lazy sleep. He does not work. He does not think. He does not work respond to public opinion. It is for him to mould public opinion, to shape public opinion, to lead public opinion. A teacher must not only tell me that we are alive; he must also teach me how to live, what are the values of life, and what are the values to which he is committed, what does he believe in.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Good teachers have come over here.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: You have selected just a few good Vice-Chancellors, and you know a lot of good that they have done. But you have blundered in the appointment of a number of Vice-Chancellors who have been your disaster.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A Divisional Commissioner of Rajasthan.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I rather wish that you, Sir, retired from here and became a first-class Vice-Chancellor. I rather wish that Shri Rajagopalachari became a Vice-Chancellor. He will be a first-class Vice-Chancellor. I rather wish that Dr. Sampurnanand got back to his old profession and did justice to the profession and treated it as a noble profession, as it was and as it should be. But these other people do not really understand the value and importance of higher education—the purpose of life and the purpose of education. Therefore, I rather say that the University Grants Commission must think about it, namely,

what is the new type of men we have got, what India needs today, how can we respond to it, how can we resolve the conflict, how can we bring out a new man who would make a new India. And without a new student and a new professor we cannot have a new India. We are all half dead; I am more than half dead—I am 71. But what is going to happen to the new generation?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you are more than alive.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I never combated him because we stand poles apart. But he said there was no discipline. Does he want that the roof of the House should fall on your head and crack your head? All around it is cracking and breaking, and breaking and cracking. He is not aware of it, because he is the cause of it; he is at the back of it. For him discipline is indiscipline. He thinks Malkani is undisciplined because he is very quiet. If I would like to become very disciplined, he would perhaps think that I am undisciplined. For him indiscipline is discipline. Now, his ideas of meanings of words are fundamentally different; his vocabulary is different.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: He is in the opposition.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I rather think that almost the roofs are falling on our heads and we are too negligent and criminally negligent of what is happening round about us. I do not know if I will be dead within a few years—I hope I will be. But what happens to India is the great question. Is the Commission seized of it? What is happening to the country and to the students of the country? Really the roofs are falling on our heads. We are not aware of it. It poses a very grave problem, and I am very much exercised over it. I look at the young boys and ask myself: What is going to happen to the whole of India? Is the University Grants Commission seized of that question? But it is bothered about numbers, and it becomes breathless, about numbers.

But you see that roofs are cracking.
 And what happened in Assam?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Malkani.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: And what is happening today in Jabalpur? The University Grants Commission must take note of that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Deokinandan Narayan.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I am sorry. I was too enthusiastic. I am very sorry.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभापति जी, अदरणीय शिक्षा मंत्री से लेकर अखिर तक के वक्ता, सब ने यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के काम की तारीफ की, प्रशंसा की . . .

डा० श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द : नहीं, सब ने नहीं ।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : एक एक्सेप्शन है और वह सदा का एक्सेप्शन है । वह कभी कम होने वाला नहीं है ।

श्री शीलभद्र धाजी : सप्रू साहब भी हैं ।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : साथ ही साथ, चैयरमैन साहब की भी प्रशंसा की गई । परन्तु मेरी समझ में अभी तक नहीं आया कि ऐसे योग्य चैयरमैन का सदुपयोग हम अधिक समय तक क्यों नहीं कर सके । कहा जाता है कि आयु मर्यादा के नियम के कारण हमें उनकी सेवाओं से वंचित होना पड़ा ही अच्छा होता यदि वह नियम बदल दिया जाता । मैं देखता हूँ कि यहां सत्तर पचहत्तर वर्ष के लोग योग्यतापूर्वक मिनिस्टर का काम कर सकते हैं । तो क्या श्री चिन्तामणि देशमुख जी ६५ वर्ष के बाद इस यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के काम को, जिसका मार्ग

प्रदर्शन वे अति उत्तम ढंग में कर रहे थे, नहीं कर सकते थे ?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would like to inform the hon. Member that this rule with regard to retirement was framed in consultation with the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, and he himself was of the opinion—I think he is still of the same opinion—that people should retire at the age of sixty-five. He does not agree with my hon. friend here.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : मैंने यह नहीं कहा कि आपने उनकी सम्मति नहीं ली होगी । सवाल यह है कि जब ऐसे सुयोग्य पुरुष की सेवाओं का सदुपयोग हो सकता था तब यह हमारा कर्तव्य था, हमारा धर्म था—क्योंकि उसमें नुकसान और नफा देश का था—कि हम नियम को बदल सकते थे और उनको यहां रख ले सकते थे ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On this point there is another exception, and that is he.

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू : एटारनी जनरल की ओपीनियन डाक्टर देशमुख के खिलाफ थी । उसको कैसे डिस्अलाऊ कर देते ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You have only ten minutes' time.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : All are interrupting me. तो मैं अब भी यह जानना चाहता था कि क्या आप इस रूल को बदल नहीं सकते थे । और मैंने तो यही कहा कि अच्छा होता यदि आप इस रूल को बदल सकते । यदि देशमुख साहब मिनिस्ट्री से इस्तीफा न दिये होते तो शायद ७५ वर्ष की उम्र तक यहां काम करते हुए आपको दिखायी देते । परन्तु चैयरमैन हो जाने के कारण हमें उनकी सेवाओं से वंचित

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

हो जाना पड़ा। इसलिए मुझे दुःख है, और मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या हमारे नियम बदल नहीं सकते ?

आगे चल कर यह कहा गया है कि युनिवर्सिटियों में दाखिल होने वाले छात्रों की संख्या पर रोक लगाना, यह एक नेशनल प्रब्लम बन गया है। बहुत सी दलीलें इस रोक के पक्ष में कमीशन ने दी हैं और अभी माननीय डा० कुंजरू साहब ने भी बहुत सी बातें कहीं। परन्तु एक बात की ओर दुर्लक्ष्य किया जाता है, वह यह कि हमारे समाज में जो सामाजिक वर्ण भेद सैकड़ों वर्षों से आज निर्माण हो गए हैं और उनके कारण जो हम आगे पीछे हो गए हैं, उस पर विचार नहीं किया जाता। हमारे बहुत से साथी मित्र हैं, दक्षिण में, कि जिनका तीव्र विरोध है, और विरोध का कारण है वर्णाश्रम का अभिशाप। आप परीक्षा रिजल्ट्स देखियेगा सैकड़ों वर्षों से एक विशिष्ट स्थान ब्राह्मण वर्ग का रहा है, जिनको सैकड़ों वर्षों से विद्या अध्ययन का अधिकार रहा और स्वाभाविक प्राप्त संस्कारों के कारण वे बहुत आगे बढ़ गए। और दूसरी बहुत सी जातियां हैं, बहुत से वर्ग हैं जो परम्परा के कारण बहुत पीछे रह गये हैं। यदि आप केवल टेलेन्टेड स्टूडेंट्स को ही एडमिशन देंगे तो जो टेलेन्टेड नहीं हैं, हो नहीं सके, क्योंकि टेलेन्टेड होना कोई दो चार वर्ष की बात नहीं है, एक जन्म की बात नहीं है, उसके साथ अनेक वर्षों के संस्कारों का सम्बन्ध है तो ऐसे लोगों को फिर कोई मौका ही नहीं रहेगा। इसलिये मेरा यहां जो विरोध है उसका कारण भी यही है। आप महाराष्ट्र युनिवर्सिटियों के रिजल्ट्स देखें तो आपको दिखायी देगा कि फर्स्ट और सैकेन्ड क्लास में ओवरव्हेल्मिंग मैजोरिटी ब्राह्मण स्टूडेंट्स की है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आपको ईर्ष्या होती है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : नहीं, मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि वर्णाश्रम परम्परा के कारण पिछड़े हुआओं को मौका नहीं मिलेगा। इसलिए मेरिट को ले कर एडमिशन का सवाल उठाना ठीक नहीं है। ईर्ष्या बढ़ाना है। आप समझिए, मैं क्या कह रहा हूं। इसलिए मेरा यह कहना है कि हालांकि आपकी दी हुई दलीलें ठीक हैं और आपकी कही बातें भी ठीक हैं परन्तु हिन्दुस्तान की आज भी सामाजिक हवा को देख कर आप ईर्ष्या और मत्सर के साधन पैदा न करें और वर्ग-संघर्ष के साथ वर्ण संघर्ष पैदा न करें। इसलिए जब तक बहुत से बैकवर्ड वर्ग एक स्तर पर साधारण तौर पर नहीं आते हैं तब तक आपको इस तरह की रोक लगाना ठीक नहीं होगा, क्योंकि इससे आपस में मनमुटाव पैदा होगा और लाभ बहुत कुछ नहीं होगा।

इसके बाद दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं वह शिक्षा के माध्यम का सवाल है। माध्यम का सवाल किसी देश में पैदा होना यह एक अनसर्गिक सी बात है। हमारी शिक्षा किस भाषा में हो, क्या यह सोचने की आवश्यकता होती है ? हमारी शिक्षा का माध्यम जो इस समय अधिकतर अंग्रेजी चल रहा है वह तो अंग्रेजों की देन है। जब यहां अंग्रेज थे तब वे कहा करते थे कि आपको स्वराज्य इसलिए नहीं दिया जाता है कि आप लायक नहीं हैं। अब वे तो यहां नहीं हैं। सिर्फ कहने वाले बदल गये हैं। अब हमारे ही भाई कहने लगे हैं कि आपकी भाषा माध्यम बनने के लायक नहीं है, वह माध्यम का काम नहीं दे सकती। पहले अपनी भाषा को बनाइये। जब प्रादेशिक भाषाएं प्रगल्भ हो जायगीं तब वह अंग्रेजी की जगह ले सकेंगीं।

डा० श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द : जब तक प्रगल्भ न हो, तब तक क्या किया जाय ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : वही तो मैं कह रहा हूँ । तब तक उनके ख्याल से वह अंग्रेजी की जगह कैसे ले सकेगी । जमीन पर चलने वाले मोटर तक पहुंचे तब तक जो मोटर में हैं वे आसमान तक पहुंच जायेंगे । इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि आप को कभी न कभी स्वतंत्र रूप से ही इस प्रश्न का निर्णय लेना होगा । हमारी जो भाषाएं हैं, उनका जितना स्तर ऊंचा है, उनकी जितनी ताकत है, उसी ताकत से हम आगे चलने वाले हैं और चलना चाहिये । हमारे लिए अंग्रेजी का आश्रय लेना हमारे स्वाभिमान और हमारे विद्याभ्यास के लिए बहुत ही खतरनाक बात होगी । बापू यह सत्य कहा करते थे : "Foreign medium is the greatest tragedy for this nation"

It is the greatest tragedy.

श्री मुडुमाला हेनरी साम्युवेल (आंध्र प्रदेश) : क्या साबित है ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : मैं हिन्दी के लिए नहीं कह रहा हूँ, सब प्रादेशिक भाषाओं के लिए कह रहा हूँ । Do not misunderstand me.

अंग्रेजी हमारी भाषा बन सकती है यह बात हम सांच भी नहीं सकते हैं और न वह हमारी भाषाओं में जान पैदा कर सकती है । माध्यम का सवाल उठता क्यों है ? प्रादेशिक भाषा में न पढ़ाने का सवाल इसलिए उठाया जाता है कि यहां बगल में अंग्रेजी खड़ी है । इसलिए भी बराबर उठता है कि यहां बहुत से अंग्रेजी के खैरखवाह हैं । सच में यह सवाल कभी नहीं उठना चाहिये कि आपकी प्रादेशिक भाषाएं तैयार हुई हैं या नहीं, उनमें किताबें लिखी गई हैं या नहीं ?

अगर आप प्रादेशिक भाषाओं को शिक्षा का माध्यम कीरन बना देते हैं तो किताबें भी आप से आप लिखी जायेंगी और वह भाषा प्रगल्भ भी हो जायेगी । अंग्रेजी की हिमायत हमारी गुलामी की निशानी है । अंग्रेज चले गये लेकिन अंग्रेजी की हुकूमत नहीं गई क्योंकि वह हमारी आदतों में इतनी गहरी पहुंच गई है कि हम यह तक नहीं सोच सकते हैं कि हमारी भाषाएं माध्यम हो सकती हैं । तो मेरी शिक्षा मंत्री जी से यह प्रार्थना है कि आप इस बात को न सोचें कि हमारी प्रादेशिक भाषाएं कितनी लायक हैं, कितनी योग्य हैं । आप इन भाषाओं में कीरन शिक्षा शुरू कर दें ।

तीसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह है विधान सभा—पार्लियामेंट के इलैक्शन के बारे में और इस संबंध में जो कुछ रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है वह अच्छी सलाह है । मैं इस पक्ष का हूँ कि जब तक आचार्य और शिक्षक शिक्षा देने का काम कर रहे हैं तब तक उन्हें पोलिटिक्स और इलैक्शन से अलग रहना चाहिये । आज हम देखते हैं कि माघारणतः सब ही पोलिटिक्स से बहुत आकर्षित होते हैं और उसमें बह जाते हैं । इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि देश को बहुत नुकसान पहुंचता है जब विद्याभ्यासगी लोग, बड़े बड़े आचार्य अपना पढ़ाने का काम, विद्यादान का काम, छोड़ देगे और पोलिटिक्स में आ जायेंगे तो शिक्षा का स्टैंडर्ड आप ही नीचे आ जायेगा । आज मैं अपने प्रान्त में देख रहा हूँ कि जो ट्रायपास लेकर आये—रेगलर वे, उनका समुचित उपयोग नहीं हुआ, कारण पोलिटिक्स । रेंगलर पदार्थों जी का देखिये । यहां यू० पी० ए० सी० में श्री महाश्री साहब बैठे हैं वे पेंपेमेंटिक्स के ट्रायपास पास हैं मगर उनकी विशेषज्ञता का कोई लाभ आज नहीं हो रहा है ।

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

इस तरह से बहुत से विशेषज्ञ देश में हैं जिनकी विद्वता का देश को लाभ नहीं हो रहा है, कारण वे पोलिटिक्स में फंस गये हैं।

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: U.P.S.C. is not politics.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: One minute and I shall finish.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL Do you mean to say that no politician should be a Vice-Chancellor also?

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Let me finish my speech because I have no time. I will reply to you in the lobby.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : एक मिनट में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है कि शिक्षा में स्टैंडर्ड की बात बार बार कही जाती है। टीचर्स की तनख्वाह की बात कही जाती है। स्टैंडर्ड की जब चर्चा होती है तब एग्जामिनेशन के रिफार्म की बात भी आगे आती है। आपने आजकल देखा होगा कि एग्जामिनेशनों के लिए कितने शार्ट कट्स तैयार होते हैं। आजकल गाइड्स, कीज और नोट्स तैयार किये जाते हैं। हम सब जगह आजकल इस तरह की किताबें देखते हैं—“History in 24 hours” “Geography in 12 hours”. “Philosophy in 24 hours”. इस तरह की किताबें लिखी जाती हैं, जिनका प्रचार भी होने दिया जाता है। उन पर कोई रोक नहीं लगाई जाती है। इस तरह से कैसे स्टैंडर्ड ऊंचा हो सकता है ?

डा० एच० एन० कुजूरु : हमारे लड़के कीज इसलिए देखो हैं क्योंकि किताबें उनकी समझ में नहीं आती हैं।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : यह कारण नहीं है। लड़के इस तरह की किताबें इसलिए मोल लेते हैं कि वे जल्दी किसी न किसी तरह पास होकर नौकरी के लायक हो जायें। परिश्रम नहीं करना चाहते।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There may also be a book called “Parliamentarian in 4 hours.”

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : यह बात नहीं है कि लड़के किताबों को समझ नहीं सकते, बल्कि वे मेहनत करना नहीं चाहते हैं। बात यह है कि उनका काम जल्दी हो जाता है क्योंकि बड़ी बड़ी किताबें पढ़ने के बजाय नोट्स से काम चल जाता है। इस तरह जब लड़के गाइड्स और कीज पढ़कर पास हो जाते हैं तो फिर वे क्यों सब किताबों को पढ़ने की मेहनत करें ?

जिन प्रोफेसरों और टीचरों को बड़ी तनख्वाह दी जाती है वे ही गाइड्स लिखते हैं, कीज लिखते हैं। पेपर्स का लीकेज कहां से होता है ? जब आप इस बात की तलाश करेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि जो प्रोफेसर या टीचर गाइड या कीज बनाते हैं वे ही पीक्षाओं के लिए पेपर्स तैयार करते हैं। लड़के सोचते हैं कि यही हमारा परीक्षक होगा और गाइड में के सवाल पुट करेगा। इसलिए अगर आप शिक्षा का स्टैंडर्ड ऊंचा करना चाहते हैं, एग्जामिनेशन में रिफार्म करना चाहते हैं तो मेरी आप से और कुंजूरु साहब से यह प्रार्थना है कि इस तरह की कीज, गाइड्स एंड एड्स की जितनी किताबें छपती हैं वे सब रोक दी जानी चाहियें। यूनिवर्सिटी के जितने प्रोफेसर इस तरह की किताबें लिखते हैं और

छापकार पैसा देना करते हैं, उनपर कि
 लगाई जानी चाहिए ।

(Time bell rings.)

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have read this Report carefully. The University Grants Commission has referred to a number of problems. The first problem they have referred to is the restriction to be placed on admission to the universities. This controversy, whether every student who has passed the secondary examination should be allowed to join the university or not, has been going on in the country for the last two or three years. The University Grants Commission has recorded its opinion that some sort of restriction should be placed on admissions to the universities. Dr. Kunzru has just now said that it is not the policy laid down by the University Grants Commission; they have only taken note of the situation obtaining in the country. I would point out to Dr. Kunzru that the Commission has rather devoted about 5 to 6 pages to this one particular problem. If you consider the tone of the Report, you come to the conclusion that the University Grants Commission is throughout emphasising on the restriction on admission to the universities. Sir, so far as my own view is concerned, I would like admissions to the universities to be made free for every citizen of this country. Firstly, ours is an infant democracy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is thirteen years old, not infant.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: A nation's age is too long. That way thirteen years are not enough. So, if you want to make this country safe for success of democratic experiment, it is very essential that every young person in this country should get every opportunity to cultivate better qualities and to develop his talent to the highest extent possible.

Apart from that, if we consider the figures, what do we find? Do we find that the universities are being flooded by students? On the other hand, after completion of Second Five Year Plan the percentage of the primary school-going children is only 60 per cent. The percentage of secondary school-going children is only 12 per cent. What about the university students? It is only 3 per cent. So, if only 3 per cent. of persons in that age-group are given facilities to join universities, can it be justifiably said that the universities are being flooded today by a large number of students? As Mr. Bhupesh Gupta pointed out, poverty is a sort of cruel restriction. We see that thousands of students pass the Higher Secondary examination but because of poverty and lack of financial resources, they are not able to pursue their education further. So, the question of restriction of admission does not arise. Of course, it has been pointed out by Dr. Kunzru that there is a large number of students. If there is a large number of students, the way to tackle the question is not by restricting the admissions but by providing more facilities for higher education. In this regard I would point out that the Government have not done what they could have done. In the Second Plan, originally they had allotted about Rs. 307 crores for education but afterwards this was reduced to only Rs. 273 crores. Out of this only Rs. 109 crores were spent during the first three years. It is clear that the Government has not paid due attention to the educational problems of this country. It is rather encouraging that during the Third Plan, Rs. 500 crores have been allotted for educational purposes and I hope during the Third Plan more opportunities will be available for higher education.

Apart from that, we already know that there is some restriction placed so far as scientific and technical institutions are concerned. There are a limited number of institutions with limited number of seats and even though a

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]

large number of students apply for admission, only very few are selected. So, the principle of selection is already there. What other principle the Commission or Dr. Kunzru wants to apply, I am not able to understand. Dr. Kunzru has not been able to point out what sort of restrictions he wants to place on admissions. Because so far as scientific, technical and other institutions are concerned, there is already a restriction imposed. About 15 or 20 years back, any student securing 40 or 45 per cent. of marks could easily get admission in any scientific, technical or other institution. But to-day, in spite of the students getting more than 60 per cent., they are not in a position to get seats in any of these technical institutions. It means that today so far as scientific and technical education is concerned, only those who have obtained high marks can get admission.

So far as the arts or commerce colleges are concerned, this problem can be tackled. There are already a number of evening colleges. There are a number of morning colleges also. Apart from that, certain universities have started a scheme by which those who want to appear for degree examinations can appear without joining any college or university. So far as engineering, medical or other technical institutions are concerned, definitely the seats will be restricted unless more institutions are established. But I do not understand why this facility of allowing students to appear privately so far as the art and commerce courses are concerned, should not be extended to all other universities. By adopting this scheme, the problem of a large number of students wanting to enter universities can be solved.

Then I would refer to the facilities to be given to the poor students and particularly to those from rural areas. Today we find that all colleges are located in the urban areas and towns

and if any student wants to prosecute his studies further, he has to spend at least Rs. 100 to Rs. 150 per month. It is not possible for any cultivator or landless labourer who is residing in the village provide for the education of his children. For that, I would suggest that colleges should be opened, as far as possible, in the rural areas. Secondly, scholarships should be given to students from the rural areas. Then higher education should be made free to all those who come from the rural areas. In this connection, I would commend the example of the Maharashtra Government who have made education free for all those children, the income of whose guardian is less than Rs. 1,200 per annum. So, any student whose guardian's income is less than that, can prosecute his studies to the highest extent possible. Therefore, I suggest that free education should be made available to those rural students.

Another thing is, because of the ceilings on land that are being imposed these days, there is a ceiling imposed on the income of people in the villages also and so it is not possible for them to pay the high cost of education.

Lastly, I would mention about a Chair for Buddhism. It has been mentioned in the Report that Buddhist studies have been confined to Delhi and Banaras Universities. There is a great revival of Buddhism. Large numbers of persons have embraced Buddhism and more and more people from this country—not only from this country but from all over the world—are taking keen interest in Buddhism. Particularly, in this nuclear age, when we find that the world is rather on the verge of war or when war-mongering is going on everywhere, the gospel of love and non-violence preached by Lord Buddha will be of great help and assistance in wiping off the differences by mutual co-operation and understanding. Therefore, it is very essential that Buddhism should be studied in all

universities and in that respect I would suggest that a Chair for Buddhist Studies should be established as early as possible.

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, as a teacher of very long service, I must first begin by expressing the gratitude of teachers for the steps taken by the U.G.C. really to do something very substantial towards raising the salaries of teachers. The only exception that I would like to make is that the U.G.C. has created new disparities in the scales of salaries. After all teaching is a bit of national service, more direct than any other avenue of service and those who are engaged in the national service deserve to be treated on a par with others. I am afraid the U.G.C. by insisting upon State Universities, Central Universities and the private colleges sometimes, was carrying the distinction even within the colleges, asking the colleges to pay more to those in the science groups which come under the U.G.Cs. purview rather than the others, thus creating heart-burnings among the members of the staff who have been living together like brothers for several years. I would appeal to the Minister of Education to continue the good work that he has done and see that all the teachers are treated as they are treated in Ceylon where all are paid the same salaries and are even entitled to pensions at the end of several years of service.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: What has the University Grants Commission done to differentiate between the scales of salaries of teachers of science and the teachers of humanities?

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: First of all, they bless the *status quo* and allow these differences to go on. For example, in my State the university pays one scale, the State Government pays one scale and the other private institutions pay another scale. What I am saying is,

just now the University Grants Commission has told our institution that for the M.Sc. Degree course which comes under research, the staff should be paid on the Central Government's scale.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: It cannot be.

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: Yes, Sir.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: They are under the State Government. The whole of higher education is not a Central subject.

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: With all respect, I would say that that is just now pending before the University Grants Commission, and that is the point at issue. Secondly, there are so many issues awaiting solution in the matter of higher education that we would like the work of the University Grants Commission to be broadened and deepened. After all, the crux of the educational problem is the status of the teacher and the status of the teacher depends on his salary. Secondly, he has got to remember that in our country both humanities as well as science are very important. I say humanities because we have got to build up the foundations of our nation right from the beginning and there should be a greater emphasis on the teaching of histories than has been the case so far. And even from the point of view of science, one lamentable feature is that students in their hundreds go to foreign universities like those in the United Kingdom or the United States even for the Arts courses and when they come back with foreign-manufactured degrees, they imagine that they have got a right of better treatment than others. The first service that the University Grants Commission should render to the country is to build up certain institutions of higher learning—learning that any university in the world can give—so that once again India might become not a country that sends out students to other countries but attracts students from other

[Shri T. Srinivasav.]

countries, and the calibre of the teachers, the wealth of the libraries and the atmosphere which will surround these places of learning should be better.

Sir, the great problem in India is about the languages. You must remember even now the struggle that was going on during the course of last week over the mere change of a name. We say, what is there in a name? But I would request you to see beyond your nose. In this country there are fourteen languages. The glory of our civilization has been that it has been a plural civilization not having only one point of reference, but several points of reference. It is better that we go slow—even we do not go at all—rather than take a wrong step. In this country I do not advocate the merits of English on its positive side even so much as its negative side. English has got the greatest common measure of agreement among the educated and, apart from it, it holds the key to modern knowledge. Besides, even our languages, from the point of view of literature, have got to gain very much by comparing themselves with the incomparable performances in the English language. We all know so much the language Shakespeare spoke and the prose that Burke wrote; our institutions and our Parliament with traditions of liberty and freedom and the rule of law are in the end British in their inspiration. I say, even fifty or a hundred years is nothing in the life of a nation. But before we take a step, we must be sure that it is a step in the right direction, and in the highest branches of learning, in the highest rung of the ladder, I would prefer English to remain, at the same time cultivating our regional languages to be fit for instruction in the higher reaches of education. We must produce several books, we must have teachers, we must have libraries. All these are matters of time.

Sir, on one day the columns of the newspapers contained two contradictory statements, one from the Minister of Education and another from the Minister of Transport and Communications. And Dr. Subbarayan was the Minister of Education in my State nearly thirty years ago. When Doctors differ like this, what are we, poor teachers and poor students, to do? I say, let us resolve this language problem with great patience and with great statesmanship, not in a hurry.

Much has been made in the Report about the three-year degree course. I am afraid some structural changes will not do the trick. What has happened to the three-year degree course is that, according to me, boys are made to hustle through in one year what would ordinarily take two years. Their extra-curricular activities have been sacrificed, and when they come to the third year course, they have to learn one language and then another. Both English and the regional language are a stumbling-block and as much as 40 per cent. of the students fail. If they are going to learn words, words and words only, when is the time for them to learn things? When is the time for them to begin to do things? I am afraid a mere organisational reform like that will not do. The great trouble with university education in India has been this. It was the first stone instead of being the coping stone and from the University, it went down to the primary class. Now is the time to come back and retrace our way. Sir, if the pressure on the university has got to be relieved, you must begin with the elementary system of education. The basic system of education as envisaged by Gandhiji was this that in the end it aimed at keeping most of the boys in the villages, devoting their time to agriculture and to the handicrafts, whereas now, I am afraid, basic education has lost sight of that purpose. We are thinking of it as an experimental in one method of education rather than as a great key

to the problem of the unemployed and the underemployed millions of the country itself. Secondly, secondary education in India has been in a very sad state of affairs. Secondary education is a bridge between the masses and the leadership and in India, secondary education has become a mere avenue, a blind alley, leading on to the universities. Even if we add one year more to the period of secondary education, that does not solve the problem. If we add one year, it becomes eleven years. The high school has got an additional capacity for transforming what is given to it. What is required is continuation schools, technical schools and multi-purpose schools so that many, many of us will have no occasion to knock at the door of the college at all and when we have done that, let us begin by laying the foundations of university education broad and deep. We may say that university education began in India first, with Nalanda, Taxila and Conjeevaram and so on. We can improve that knowledge by contacts between the teacher and the taught and combined with it, there is the new task that this age of planning and world competition calls for. Sir, Plato thought that the Minister of Education should be the dictator in his State. The burden which he has got to carry is very heavy. I wish to say a word of thanks and of appreciation to him, and a word of sympathy for the great task which he has got to carry.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, to begin with, I would like to pay my compliment to the work done by Shri Deshmukh, and I would also like to express my appreciation of the way in which the Report has been drawn. It is not right to call this Report uninteresting. A report would be uninteresting to people if it does not deal with problems from their points of view. But I feel that within its limited scope, this Report has done

justice to most of the important points. After all, it is not a thesis on every subject, it deals with, but it is intended to indicate the outline of the subject. I for one am very happy that nearly two pages of this Report are devoted to a review of women's education. While on this subject, I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that there is so much money available with the Government as money not being spent under Education. In the First Plan, for example, a sum of Rs. 15.47 crores was available and only Rs. 13.70 crores were spent. In the Second Plan as much as Rs. 57 crores were available for education and only Rs. 45.39 crores were spent. I would, therefore, suggest that this extra money should be allocated, even if some of it might have been withdrawn because of the Budget and the revised estimates, for women's education, because in these pages the University Grants Commission have said:

"It must of course be borne in mind that it is not only at the university stage that women's education lags behind and that efforts at equalising educational opportunities for women need also to be made more vigorously at the earlier stages. In order to encourage women's institutions we have been assisting them more liberally than men's institutions and particularly in the matter of women's hostels we have readily accepted a recommendation to this effect made by the 'National Committee on Education of Girls and Women'."

Incidentally, with reference to this National Committee on Education of Girls and Women, I would like to make a suggestion. As women's education has lagged behind and it is very important also, the Ministry would do well to appoint a separate Chairman who could devote all his attention to the subject, because one person being the Chairman of this

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

and also of the Social Welfare Board, would not be able to do justice to the tasks.

Next, Sir, I would like to deal with the question of the number of universities and the way in which universities are allowed to crop up. Of course, I have been told that where the University Grants Commission does not approve of certain policies of any university, it does not give liberal grants to it. But I am referring to the one-faculty universities which are coming up. The word "university" is thus being used in a very wrong sense, I would say. It would not be proper to use the English word "university" for such a one-faculty university. I am referring to the Roorkee University which was originally just an engineering college, and then to this Agricultural University in Uttar Pradesh and the Music University, the Indira University in Madhya Pradesh. To make the use of the word "university" there ought to be more than one faculty at least, and the University Grants Commission should draw the attention of the State Governments to this point and even if they have set views on this, the Commission should make them fall in line or not give any recognition to these universities at all, and not count these universities among the list of universities that the Commission mentions.

I would also like incidentally to refer to the various committees that are being set up with the help of the University Grants Commission and here I refer to three important committees. One is the committee on student indiscipline, the other on national service and the third on moral and spiritual education or instruction. Here I may point out that it is no use having committees which draw up reports and then leave the reports to the mercy of the State Governments for implementation. It should be within the power of the

University Grants Commission to see that effective action is taken on these reports. It is no use again and again talking of national service, and of Government service not being given to anyone who has not gone through this full course of national service after graduation or after matriculation and leaving these reports on the top shelf. That creates a great deal of confusion in people's minds. Not only students, but even educationists get confused about Government's policy or decisions and this does not make them think that Government is tackling these important problems with any determination.

With regard to the report on moral and spiritual education, that was more or less a unanimous report. The Central Advisory Board of Education has been pressing for the inclusion of moral and spiritual education as part of the curriculum at some suitable stage even in the college course. That they have been pressing for the last three years. It was then decided to appoint a committee and that committee brought out a fine report, but nothing was done beyond asking the State Governments to take action. Sir, it will be found that in our secular State, our younger generation's moral and ethical education is being sadly neglected. The State used formerly to provide this type of education through schools, but it is not able to do it now. I do not know why this should be discontinued like this and why we should be afraid of the word "religion". As is recommended by this committee, they should be able to provide instruction in all the religions. We need not be bigoted. We can do that and incidentally that alone would be helpful in solving these communal atrocities and activities, one example of which we had recently in Jabalpur.

I would like to say a word about the efforts that the University Grants Commission is making for raising the standard of education. If one goes

through the Report, one finds they have tried to do it by laying stress on libraries, laboratories, equipments and so on. I would, therefore, like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister of Education to the new scheme of correspondence course that is already being talked of in the press and being discussed there and I think perhaps the Commission's Fifth Report would deal with that scheme, namely correspondence courses. In one breath we cannot say that we should have all first-rate facilities for teaching, all these equipments including buildings, libraries, laboratories; and in the next breath maintain that the same degrees which are given as a result of teaching through all these equipments, could also be given through these correspondence courses. That is something which seems to be most illogical and impracticable. Either we believe in the first, or we think that the other degree also could be equally good. We cannot do both in any case.

One word more about these evening classes. If all these correspondence courses and evening classes are strictly restricted to students above the age of 25 or 30, or to those who are actually in some employment, then one could understand that such persons, from the very fact that in spite of all these hardships they are going through for these courses, would apply themselves with keenness to their work and would thus help to maintain proper standards. Otherwise, if these courses are not restricted to these persons, the standards are bound to come down.

With regard to the question of the salary of teachers, it is pointed out that the University Grants Commission tries its best to raise the salaries of teachers in other universities and to bring them on par with those obtaining in the four Central Universities. I for one think that this is almost impossible for Government to do, even if they spend twice the money that they are at present spend-

ing. They cannot bring this about. A way, therefore, should be found out and I suggest that this can be done by giving certain facilities to the teachers so as to give them some relief in their daily life, in the shape of certain amenities. For example, they should be given more money when they are married persons. They should have free education for their children, loans without any interest for the marriage of their children, free medical treatment in case of illness, for themselves and family members, free houses and houses in one locality so that they could employ common servants. After their retirement they should be given rent-free houses for occupation. If these amenities are given, it would help. Nobody wants to ask for salaries just for the sake of showing a certain salary figure and if Government were to seriously apply its mind to this task, to begin with, through the Education Ministry and later on through other departments of Government, then alone it would be possible. I was visiting one institution the other day at Pilani and there—the hon. Minister must be knowing—the teachers and everybody are given grain at very very low rate, something like Rs. 5 per maund. That is one amenity that is given to them. If these things are done, it would be possible to equalise salaries and not in the way mentioned here.

I would not like to repeat other things that are mentioned already but, I would like to mention only one thing before I sit down and that is with regard to women's education. The number of women in colleges is just one-sixth of the total; there are 1,15,434 girls in a student population of 7,47,016. It is therefore necessary to start post-matriculate half-day courses, vacation courses, summer schools, etc., for women in order to give facilities to all those women who have finished their school education and would like to have the benefit of university education.

One more word, Sir, with regard to teachers. It is very easy for us to

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

express our dissatisfaction with the progress of education that has been made. If we refer to the figures given in the Report itself, we would see that the progress made since independence, in India is six times. While the number then was 1,300,000 it is now 6,053,000. In other countries like Australia and Canada the progress is only twice. It may be argued that there is not much scope for progress there because they are already so much advanced but, Sir, with our limited means. I think, we have done well. I would again request the hon. Minister to actually allocate the money that has not been spent from the two Plans for women's education as pointed out by me already.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJEE (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have to make one constructive suggestion. As there is not much time, I would like to put forward the suggestion straightway to the House. A library in memory of Acharya Narendra Dev was started in Lucknow last year and in that library, an experienced man in university affairs, the present Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Mr. C. B. Gupta, introduced a scheme for the supply of text-books to the university students. Our experience is that a big number of students daily attend the library in the evening and they sit till late and actually carry on their studies. That shows that there is great scarcity of text-books in the university. There are many students who cannot afford to buy them. That is one aspect. Our universities are getting books from America and the United Kingdom. From America we are getting books distributed to different educational institutions out of the wheat loan interest which comes to about Rs. 2 crores every year. In the United Kingdom also, the same thing is happening. They subsidise college text-books for India and the London University allows outside students who are not residents of the United Kingdom to take advantage of its examinations. These examinations

must be held through a university. That is the rule. Ceylon, our neighbour, is utilising this. Ceylonese students get this advantage through the Colombo University. Both these countries are providing for our students. We cannot send all our university students to the United States of America and to the United Kingdom for want of foreign exchange. There is great difficulty felt by the students who want to go abroad for studies. We can, therefore, ask both the countries, I mean, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, to open their colleges in some important cities of India. Such colleges should remain under the management of their universities and will grant their own diplomas. This will make certain of our students going to those countries for higher studies unnecessary and a large amount of foreign exchange will be saved. I make this suggestion because it is quite feasible. When a small country like Ceylon can utilise this for its students, there is no reason why we in India, when we have got so many universities, cannot take advantage of this. I place this concrete suggestion before the Minister that he should make efforts to make use of this good opportunity offered by the United States of America and the United Kingdom. This is what I wanted to say, Sir.

4 P.M.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the work of the University Grants Commission during the period covered by this Report as well as before has been very commendable. Hon. Members who have spoken before me have appreciated this work giving instances and I need not go into all that. I join them in extending my congratulations to the Commission on the work that they have achieved and to the retired Chairman who from its inception built it up and to the Chairman unfortunately deceased—in whom we had very high hopes. Sir, I offer my condolences to the family of Dr. Krishna. I hope, Sir, that the new

Chairman who is a great scientist will take up the work of the Commission in a very highly commendable manner. While appreciating the work of the Commission, hon. Members have expressed divergent views on some of the opinions that the Commission has expressed. If I express some differences, it is not with the work of the Commission; it is not regarding the achievements of the Commission which I have commended but it is with regard to some of the views which they have expressed in this Report. Sir, I believe, with due respect to the Commission, that they could have saved themselves from expressing the opinions which they have done in pages 2 to 7. I do not think they serve any purpose. The Commission perhaps thought that by laying down these conditions they were enlightening the public, that they were drawing the attention of the States to the difficulties in the way of starting of universities and also of the interests concerned. But, Sir, this is not the first time that they have expressed these opinions. They have made similar observations in the previous Reports and what has been the result? They themselves observe that as far as the State Governments are concerned they have not cared to respect the opinions that have been expressed by the Commission so far. So, that way they have not achieved anything. They have not been able to prevent new universities from being started; they have not been able to withhold recognition to universities which fall short of the minimum standards. So, what is the object that the Commission has gained by giving expression to these views? The only result that has come about by making these observations is, as the Commission itself observes, there has been a lot of misunderstanding about the views of the Commission. Sir, I have carefully gone through the observations contained in pages 2 to 7 of this Report and the impression I get is that these observations have been made not with any relevance to the needs of the community in India, not with any relevance to the practical realities but

they have been made from an ideological point of view. It is as though a Commission consisting of foreign gentlemen has come over to India to make recommendations. Sir, exactly these are the observations which they would have made. The approach of the University Grants Commission is ideological. Of course, there is no exception to it. We do not take exception to the ideological conditions that the University Grants Commission have kept in view and have given expression to but what is the good of that? Can we enforce these ideological conditions in India? Sir, in my opinion, the University Grants Commission should first make clear the objective of education—let alone university education—in general. Sir, time was when the universities or intellectual institutions confined themselves to barren intellectual pursuits but that time has gone now. Now, education has come to be defined as equipping citizens with the ability to meet the needs of the community or in short as building up good citizens. The system of education which we should have should be able to meet the social, cultural and educational needs. If that is so, if we grant that in India we have a poor level of literacy, that in India we have terrible poverty, that in India there is need for building up industries, for building up vocations, trade and commerce, if we recognise the need to build up character in people, then we must subordinate education to these ends. Whatever system of education we might have, that education must serve these ends. If this is granted then it follows that in India we cannot achieve all these by imposing ideological conditions for universities, colleges or schools in general. Now, the University Grants Commission have given here two tests. For starting new universities they say that there should be the minimum equipment and the increase in numbers must be co-ordinated with the facilities available. Let us take this test. If we were to give recognition only to those universities which meet all these conditions, then we would not

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

have started even one-tenth of the universities we have in India. Let us go into the history of some of the universities in India. Many of them have been built up purely by non-official efforts. They have started from nothing and they have grown. If these conditions were to be met then we would not have even one-tenth of the universities today. The universities which have grown up now into big admirable institutions have grown up from nothing, from scratch so to say, and they have grown up into respectable universities some of which are not only the pride of India but the pride of the world. The main test is not that they should first have a certain standard of furniture, not that they should have so many buildings and things, but it is the devotion to the purpose that the organisers of the universities have in view. It is that which promotes the growth of a university. It is good to insist upon these physical standards; it is true but if the University Grants Commission places its entire faith on these conditions and gives public expression to it—here they say that they do not favour multiple universities because they fall short of standard—it will have a damping effect. Of course, the University Grants Commission must ensure that the minimum facilities are there, but if universities are to be started the purpose it is that should be reckoned with and not so much the facilities.

The second test which they have is about the question of admission to the universities. They have in unmistakable terms said that the universities should be places only for the talented few. If this is their view, I have to take serious exception. Hon. Members have taken serious exception already. The hon. Mr. Sapru, the hon. Mr. Panikkar and the hon. Mr. Deokinandan Narayan have taken exception to it and rightly too. First of all, talent and merit are not clearly definable. What we consider merit today is the marks that a student scores at examinations. Maybe a brilliant

student may get first class marks but maybe also a student who is not so brilliant but who mugs up or who is lucky in getting the questions that he has studied may score brilliant marks. Whatever it is, if that is merit, then it means that a large number of people will not be able to get benefits of university education at all. Here they have generalised on page 5. They say:

“But in order to train young people to high intellectual standards at the university stage they should come to the university with the right kind of preparation and with right intellectual equipment and what is more important, the right motivation.”

Ideologically this is correct. If we apply this to the society, to the community in India today, I am convinced that 90 per cent of the students will be ruled out of universities. Take my own instance. When I joined the university, there was nobody to guide me. My parents did not know what university education was and I had no motivation because I did not know what was what. So much so, in the past few decades people had gone to universities without motivation at all, without any preparation, except that they had passed through the secondary stage. If this test were in force in the case of people like me, today 90 per cent of the people in rural areas and at least 20 per cent. of the people in urban areas would not have had university education. The University Grants Commission should not view, in my opinion, from the height of the best elements in the country. They should rather view from the lowest levels in society and try to lift them up, elevate them and provide a system of education for the people. Now, how will this merit benefit the country? I can understand that in the field of research, in the field of technology, you can insist on brilliancy and a high level of intelligence measured by marks. But such a number would certainly be very limited. By and large, the majority of university products would be need-

ed in our administrative services, in our industrial field, in our economic and cultural activities. In those fields merit, in my opinion, should be defined in other words. We intend to establish a socialist society. Now, the university product will be the leader of the community. If he is to serve the community, the first requirement should be, in my opinion, that he should have sympathy with the masses in the country. He should live at the level of the masses and he should think that it is his duty, that it is life's mission to work for the upliftment of the masses. That should be the main test in the case of the majority of the educated people, particularly those who serve in the administrative field, in the industrial, economic and cultural levels. Now, if that test is recognised as a proper one, I think we should not insist upon this test, this test of passing in number one division and getting rank in number one division. So, this test of so-called merit, which is according to me indefinable, varies according to the examiner, varies according to the circumstances, according to the condition of the mind of the examiner at the time the answer paper gets into his hands, and according to the facilities available and the situation in which the student is placed for prosecuting his studies. On these varied conditions the determination of this test depends. I am not against it, but it should not be taken as the absolute test for either barring students from the university or for promoting them to higher levels of education. These are the things on which the University Grants Commission, in my opinion, should have kept aloof from expressing, but which they have unfortunately given expression to and which, as they themselves have recognised, give misgivings in the country. As I said, they damp the spirit of those who are for expansion of educational facilities.

I want to express my views on the question of indiscipline of students. I would not have done so but for the fact that repeatedly year after year

people lay the blame for the indiscipline of students on leaders and politics. This is not correct at all. It is true that politicians have made use of students, but can anybody now say that we can keep away students from politics? It is impossible. Now, students have come to the level of taking interest in politics and developing political opinions and nobody can prevent them from doing so. If a politician, as hon. friends have expressed, refuses to receive the aid of students, he runs a great risk in his elections. I do not advocate people calling students for their electioneering campaign. I am against it myself. But we have come to a stage when students *suo motu*, without being offered any inducement, take interest in politics and they do take sides. Nobody can prevent it. So, if their indulgence in political activities should be a cause of indiscipline, it is a limited cause no doubt, it should not be thrown on the shoulders of politicians. That is number one. Only one point more. According to me indiscipline is not because students indulge in politics. Indiscipline is because we do not have good teachers. I throw a challenge to anybody to show that, wherever there is a good teacher, he does not have control over students. I myself have seen many institutions where the teachers by their personality, by their power of inspiring the students, by their knowledge, have full control over their students. There are teachers who have no personality at all, who look much younger than the students themselves and who shake in their shoes when they come to address the students and who commit so many mistakes while speaking in English that students correct them. If that is the kind of teachers, how can you expect the teachers to have a hold on the students? There are several other things which the universities can do to divert the attention of the students to constructive lines, to provide them with various activities. I have no time to go into the details. So, it should be the earnest concern of

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

the University Grants Commission to first insist—at whatever cost, it does not matter at all—on improving the quality of teachers.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Pay them. well.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: They should be paid well, if they are to get any regard from the society and students. There is one more evil going on now. I do not know if it has come to the notice of the Education Minister. Because of the low pay every teacher now takes students for private tuition. If they go to him, then in his paper they will get pass marks. If they do not go to him, he will see that he does not favour them. He favours the students who go to him and he punishes the students who refuse to go to him. These evils have come on account of economic reasons. Their salary should be raised. I commend the earnest efforts that the Education Minister is making and the University Grants Commission is making to induce the State Government to raise the status and the salaries of teachers. Their training facilities also should be improved so as to draw the attention of the teachers to their proper functions and equip them with such personality and character as would inspire the students.

Thank you.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I join in expressing my heart-felt appreciation of the useful and strenuous work that the University Grants Commission has done and especially the Chairman of the Commission, Dr. C. D. Deshmukh. Dr. Deshmukh has rendered valuable services to the cause of education with a devotion which is rarely found in these days. There is a proverb in Gujarati saying that it is wisdom to tolerate even the kicks of an expert or a specialist for a good cause if thereby a good cause were to be advanced. Now, as we have heard, that problem has ended and, therefore,

I would not like to dilate on that matter. We have seen the appointment of a new Chairman, Dr. Kothari, and I hope that the Commission and Education will equally have the valuable services of a scientist like Dr. Kothari. Sir, the Report of the University Grants Commission deals with a number of points, and the Commission has thrown sufficient light on those points. They are such as need for planning, students' discipline or indiscipline, women's education, standards of education the numbers of students libraries, laboratories hostels etc. I will not deal with many of them as I have only a short time at my disposal and also as many of the hon. Members have spoken on them. I will deal with only one or two points.

Sir, the Commission has dealt with the problem of numbers at length. It is true that the schools and colleges are flooded with students. There is no space. The buildings also are full to their capacity. The teachers and professors are limited in number. The libraries and laboratories are limited and the funds also are within limits. Any amount of expansion that is being done, I fear, does not or is not able to keep pace with the demand and the onrush of the students to get admission into the colleges. This has an adverse effect upon the students and education also. The Report says that 50 per cent of the students failed in the examinations at the secondary school stage. This is a waste of time, waste of energy and loss of money to the students, to the parents and to the nation as a whole. Therefore, I consider it as a great national loss. The only possible solution which the Members have suggested and which the Report also suggests is to put a control on the admissions or to have a method of selective admissions. I also feel that that is the only possible solution. But I would like to point out to the hon. Minister a little danger that is hidden in such controls or restrictions. There may be a solution for that danger also but this is a minor point. We all know that the student at the secondary stage has very limit-

ed vision is a slave of the customs, of the community and of the very narrow circle which surrounds him. His outlook is not wide, but as soon as he crosses the threshold of the college, his outlook is widened and his vision is broadened. He finds himself amongst a community which is a larger one, a brotherhood which he cultivates, and thereby he feels that he is a bigger man. After all at that stage he sheds his narrow shell of communalism and casteism and all the superstitions and other things that accompany them. I, therefore, suggest that while we may think of restricting the admissions, we should see that such narrowness does not creep in. Therefore, the restrictions which are to be imposed should be imposed at a later stage in the college stage; that means that the students should have the opportunity of joining the colleges for a year or two so that their outlook may be widened.

Sir, the Report makes some mention about the advance that has been made in regard to women's education. It has been stated that the most significant change which has come about in the field of education is the increase in the number of women students. Out of the total number of 7,47,000 students in the universities there are 1,15,000 women students and out of 1,252 colleges there are colleges entirely for women which come to 146. It is also heartening to know that the University Grants Commission is trying to encourage women's institutions as far as possible more liberally.

Now, Sir, I have one request to make, and that is about the grants which are given to the universities. Sometimes the grants lapse if there is some delay in the construction of buildings or in getting some materials for which the responsibility may lie somewhere else. It may be beyond the control of the university. I may therefore request that such grants should not be made to lapse.

Then about the standard of instruction falling down, much has been said

by those who have spoken before. Sir, I have also noticed that the students do not read the textbooks. They rely on guides and notes and, as has been said earlier, these guides also do not help the students in acquiring true knowledge but they only help to make them cram up things which they forget as soon as the examination is over. I therefore, suggest that such guides and notes which are of no use to the students should be banned as far as possible. Thank you, Sir.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the first place I should like to express my feelings of gratitude to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and who have made several valuable suggestions. I am also happy to find that the work of the University Grants Commission has been generally appreciated by the hon. Members. It may not be possible for me to cover all the points that have been raised during the course of the debate, and if I do not touch them, I hope the hon. Members will forgive me. But, there are two or three fundamental points—questions of policy—which have been raised during the course of the debate, and I should like to touch them to some extent.

The first is with regard to the teacher's role in political life. Now, Sir, Dr. Kunzru has explained at full length that there has been some misunderstanding on the part of the Members. If the Members would look at the paragraph as a whole, they would understand fully the purpose and the meaning of the recommendation of the University Grants Commission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that purpose?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am coming to that. In my opinion it is not the intention of the University Grants Commission that teachers should be debarred from taking part in political life. Even if the University Grants Commission had made this recom-

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]
mendment, Government would consider it a retrograde step. But they have not made any such recommendation. I am coming to that paragraph a little later; we have to examine it more closely. I agree with Mr. Sapru and several other Members who said that it would be a retrograde step if the teachers were debarred from participating in political activities. Sir, when members of the various other professions, like lawyers, physicians, engineers and so forth have freedom to participate in politics, I do not see any reason why anybody should put this ban and restriction on one of the most enlightened sections of the community. If we did that . . .

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU) in the Chair.]

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, students and teachers taking part in the politics have done more harm than good to the student population and to the cause of education.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU): Order please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We must not send politics to Masulipatam.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: And if we ban, I am convinced, it would give a sense of humiliation and a feeling of irritation in the teaching profession. Some people may make mistakes; some members of the teaching profession may act in an irresponsible manner. Yet it would be a grave mistake if we were to put a ban on the teachers and thus create a feeling of despair in them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You were a teacher yourself.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, and I am supporting you, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, for the first time, but only to a limited extent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am satisfied with you even to that limited extent.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: You are supporting him in a very bad cause.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Well, Sir, I think, as an enlightened section of the community teachers must express their opinions on broad public issues. We must remember that they are also citizens. They are teachers but they are also citizens; and as citizens they have a right to express their opinions on political matters. They have a right to participate in political activities, and it would be a great pity if we debarred them from discharging their duties towards the wider community. There are questions of important public policy which are being discussed outside the university campus. The teachers, by taking part in these debates, the great debates which are taking place in our country, can raise the standard of these debates. They can raise the level of discussion by making their contribution to those questions which are being discussed in our public life. Now, having said this much, I must also say that the teachers must act with a sense of responsibility if they are to enjoy this full academic freedom which has been advocated both by Mr. Sapru and by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I would like to say that both mean very different things when they talk of academic freedom, and they both have a different purpose in view. We know how academic freedom is being misused by some people. Academic freedom is given to teachers in order that they might pursue truth, in order that both the teachers and the pupils might follow the truth wherever it leads to. Academic freedom is not given in order to teach errors, in order to indoctrinate the growing minds of the younger generation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I ask . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Let me finish my argument. Then you can ask questions

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: He is supporting you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What do you mean to say by 'indoctrination'? Here we have our Constitution, and do you mean that our teachers should not impart the spirit of democracy and ideals of that kind? Would you call it 'indoctrination'?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The teachers' first loyalty is to the academic profession. His first loyalty is that he must be a seeker after truth, and he must examine all the aspects of the question and place them before the students; he should not become a partisan. But with the infiltration of the followers of our friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I am afraid they are becoming partisans, and they are trying to undermine the academic freedom in order to destroy that freedom and democracy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I strongly repudiate such suggestions. The hon. the Education Minister must know his position and his responsibility, and he must not make such allegations. If he makes, then I may have to relate certain unsavoury stories about many people including the hon. Minister.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am only stating the truth, and the truth is that not only in this country but in various other countries at present an attempt is being made to undermine this freedom of the universities, and if there is any danger which we have to face today, it is this danger which will have to be counteracted. Yet I say that we must have freedom in the country; we must give full academic freedom to our teachers; we must allow them to participate in political activities, but the teachers must understand that their first loyalty is to the academic profession; not to others. But some of teachers have their allegiance to some parties outside the university.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Congress Party, the Praja-Socialist Party and so on.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Now they are committed; they are committed to certain principles and dogmas.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know, Sir, how then the hon. Minister, when he was a teacher owed allegiance to the Congress Party in whose Government he is a Minister today?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU): Let us not go into all those questions which are not quite relevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why then, Sir, should he say all these things? The hon. Minister owed allegiance to the Congress Party when he was a teacher, and then got himself elected as a party candidate to become a Deputy Minister first and now a Minister. Now, he harangues to the country.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta wants the teachers to take part in politics since he wants to exploit them for his own ends.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU): Will you kindly go on, Dr. Shrimali?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I want to go on, but my learned friend will not have patience.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: It seems the remarks have gone home.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, there are professors who are members of the Communist Party, and I would like to ask Shri Bhupesh Gupta whether they do not have primary allegiance to the Communist Party and just secondary allegiance to the academic profession?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the political field they have.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Then let me say . . .

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Let the hon. Member deny that his Party is corrupting the youth.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I say, do not corrupt the youth.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This is the basic question . . .

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar): If you call the devil, the devil will come. Reference to political parties—Communist, Socialist and all sorts of parties—should not be brought in the speeches here. If we refer to such things, we will be calling the devil and if we call the devils, they will come. This is a thing which should be taken very seriously.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister should not sharpen his scissors.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This is the basic question in this country. I stand for full freedom for teachers. But while they enjoy all freedom, they must also act with a sense of responsibility. They should understand their duties and obligations to the teaching profession. Their primary duty is towards the community and not towards any political party. They should not be dictated to by any external party. I am afraid, Sir, there are political parties which do not allow that mental and, intellectual freedom to their members. They are bound by their dictates. It is a very unpalatable truth but I am sorry I have to state that truth.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about your party?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: As far as I understand . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He will be dictated to by your leader.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This is a broader question. There have been very fine examples not only in this country but outside where people have been members of political parties and also members of the teaching profession, and they have set up a high standard of integrity. I should like to give the example of the late Prof. Harold Laski. He played a very important role in shaping the policies of the Labour Party and still he always had the highest integrity in his profession. He would never indoctrinate the students; he would try to place all the points . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Prof. Harold Laski, every day he used to give lectures on Marxism. What is he talking? Has he been a student of Laski? Every day I used to be told about his lecture on Marx.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Outside the class room.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The University Grants Commission has not raised this broader question but since this question was raised by hon. Members. I was dealing with this. The Report says:

“Teachers standing for elections to Parliament or State Legislatures are sometimes tempted to use students in their election campaigns and to bring some of the passions of party politics within the precincts of the university;”

This statement is unobjectionable and I do not think even our friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, will object to this statement, at least not here in this House. It goes on to say:

“and teachers elected to legislatures have to be absent from the university for long spells.”

I would like to know whether any Member of this House would object to this statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: "and teachers elected to legislatures have to be absent from the university for long spells."

Teachers have to do their duty. They have to teach in the university. That is the primary purpose.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not say that. The West Bengal Legislative Assembly meets in the afternoon. The colleges are over in the morning. They can go and attend the Assembly without being absent from the college. Such things are also there. Therefore, why go into details?

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: I should like to know whether he was allowed to contest the elections while in office.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Hon. Members do not have patience. I wish they had patience to hear me. The Report goes on to say:

"All these things have a bad influence on the atmosphere of the university."

The University Grants Commission has only posed a general question:

"We have therefore wondered whether teachers, like employees of Government, should not be debarred from seeking election to the legislatures. Teachers who are leaders in any particular sphere of knowledge and who would be able to make a special contribution to the discussions and debates in the legislatures could be nominated to these bodies in a suitable way."

People may have difference of opinion on this subject, but the question has some importance for us.

I should like to quote the example of some of the American universities where, I think, the teachers enjoy a great deal of freedom. Many of the professors during the recent elections have been returned to the Congress. A large number of teachers and professors participate in politics, but they do not ruin their universities. Take, for example, the Indiana University.

They impose certain conditions on their members who run for certain public offices:

"Thus Indiana University requires that any full-time employee who is a candidate for a full-time political position . . ."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Full-time.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I think membership of Parliament is a full-time position and if they do not do their full-time job, they do not do their duty properly. The book says:

"... for a full-time political position—except for minor municipal offices—shall from the date of nomination be placed on leave of absence without pay, until the date of election;"

Then they decide whether they want to continue with the university or want to take up that office. Further it says:

"... and any staff or faculty member who accepts the chairmanship or vice-chairmanship of any segment of any party organisation is put on 'compulsory leave of absence'."

If he does not take leave, he is given compulsory leave of absence.

Take the example of another university, the Purdue University. It is one of the best technological institutions. The book says:

"Purdue University requires that no employee of the university shall engage in any political activity while on duty for the university, that any employee must obtain leave of absence who wishes to campaign for or to hold any political office requiring full-time service over a period exceeding two weeks—aside from nonpaying local offices—and that this leave of absence is conditional on agreement that the person involved shall neither represent himself nor knowingly allow himself to be represented as an employee of the university."

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

If the universities have to be run properly, we must have people who are dedicated to the work. We must have people who consider teaching as their primary duty. All other things are secondary. As far as I am concerned, I am afraid many of our teachers do not understand this, and because they do not act with a sense of responsibility the University Grants Commission, out of a feeling of despair, have been led to the conclusion that the only way is probably to put a ban on this kind of thing because if the universities go down, the country goes down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that book?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: How many teachers are Members of Parliament or members of State Legislatures, and how many of them are responsible directly or indirectly for creating student trouble?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It is not a question of some people becoming Members of Parliament or of State Legislatures but a large number of people engaged in political activities. They work for political parties. For them the teaching work becomes secondary.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Our students are utilised for canvassing purposes by political parties.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Congress Party has the largest number of teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Quite wrong.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: If the political leaders do this, it is a mistake. But if the teachers also indulge in these activities, who is going to save the universities? After all, there must be some people who must set better standards in public life. If better standards do not come from the teaching profession, from where are they going to come?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It has been our experience that you have canvassed for candidates of your choice.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: In fact, I started by saying that . . .

SHRI SATYACHARAN: May I rise on a point of order, Sir? While the hon. Minister is replying, we should listen to him. It is now going to be converted into a forum of debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU): We have had enough interruptions. Let the Minister go on.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The time is very limited.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a thought-provoking speech that he is making!

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have started by saying that the teachers should have full freedom. I have also said that even if the U.G.C. makes this recommendation, the Government would consider it a retrograde step and would not put a ban on the teachers' activities, but at the same time I must also say that the teachers must act with a sense of responsibility.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: May I interrupt for a minute because it flows from what the Minister is saying? If it is a principle of politics not entering into academic life, would he consider the question of politicians becoming Vice-Chancellors also?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Would he consider that the President should not nominate professors on the recommendation of the Government.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU): There are so many matters that he has to cover.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I was silently sitting here listening to the speeches of hon. Members. I did not speak or

interrupt except once or twice when I asked questions. I am making such a non-controversial statement and still hon. Members are exercised over it. We have to build up proper traditions in our universities. At present there is a great invasion from outside of all kinds of forces on the universities. If the universities are to do their proper duties, then we must allow them to function in a proper atmosphere. They should sometimes be able to resist and say that they are more concerned with academic matters than anything else. Unless we do this and unless we resist this present tendency, I am afraid our standards will continue to deteriorate. I am not suggesting by any means that the universities should become ivory-towers. The universities are vitally concerned with national problems. They have to play a very important role but they can play this role only by doing their own work in a better way and setting up better standards, intellectual and moral.

The second question about which there was some discussion was with regard to the selection of students. I think hon. Members were greatly worried with regard to the proposal for restricting the number of students in the universities. This point also has been very well explained by Dr. Kunzru. Nobody in this country wants to stand in the way of our students getting the highest education. The only question which we have to consider is whether we have adequate resources. Our resources are not unlimited and the universities also have limited capacity. If we can have 200 universities in this country tomorrow, by all means give admission to all students who seek entrance to it. But taking it for granted that our funds are limited, taking it for granted that the universities have limited capacity, is it not the duty of the State to ensure that only those who can get the best benefit from education should go there? There is no point in crowding the universities and doing harm to everybody. The universities have a

very important role to play in all our programmes of national development. They are the bases, they are the places from which leadership would be provided and if they go down, the future of the country is very bleak. Therefore, let us think on this problem in a rational manner and if we think in a rational manner, I think we will all agree that some limitation or restriction will have to be placed on the admission of students. We cannot go on expanding. If we go on enlarging and expanding a rubber tube, then it bursts and the universities will meet the same fate unless we can resist this pressure. In order that we may give opportunities to those students who are not in a position to go to the universities or who are engaged in the various kinds of professions, we are proposing to institute evening colleges and correspondence courses. Now, this will meet, to a large extent, the needs of the people, the needs of the young men who have to take some kind of occupation immediately after passing their High School Examination, or people who cannot sometimes go to the universities. Another measure which the Government are taking is to expand this scheme of scholarship. We made a start in the Second Plan. That was very meagre. The number of scholarships is being increased considerably in the Third Plan. Our ultimate goal is that not a single student in this country should be denied the opportunity of the highest education on account of his economic circumstances. The economic barrier should not stand in the way of a student getting the highest education. It is only then that a real, democratic socialist society will come into existence and it is towards that end that we are constantly striving.

Then a question was raised with regard to the medium of instruction. In this matter also the policy of the U.G.C., I am afraid, has not been fully understood by the people.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: They will never understand.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Neither the Government nor the U.G.C. have ever said that English should remain as the medium of instruction for ever. At least as far as I know, nobody with some sanity would say that for ever in this country English should remain the medium of instruction. What the U.G.C. has said and what it is insisting on is that the switch-over should take place properly, so that the standards do not go down. Dr. Kunzru was appointed the chairman of that committee which gave a report in which it was clearly said that the transition should be smooth, that we should gradually replace English by the regional languages and make adequate preparations. Adequate preparations have to be made by the universities, not by making speeches either in Parliament or on public platforms that regional languages should become the media of instruction. We must . . .

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: It was also added by the committee that the students should continue to know English well.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No preparations are being made.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Who is to make the preparations? The preparations have to be made by the university people, by the professors, by the teachers who are teaching the subjects and not by making political speeches and making speeches from platforms. This work will have to be done in the universities. The Government are prepared to finance the universities. In fact we have written to the State Governments and universities that they can set up their co-ordination committees and translation bureaus so that they can translate books in Hindi and we are also going to ask them to do similar translations in the regional languages.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How much have you spent?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Spending will come only when the work is undertaken, when they have undertaken the work. We must have original writers, we must have scientists, we must have scholars who are able to write original books. It is not a question of mere translation. Unless we can have scholars and writers to write original books, it will be very difficult to replace English. The point is this that science is advancing so fast and so rapidly that your translate a book today and it becomes out-of-date by the time it is translated. Therefore, we have to be fully aware of the situation. I am strongly of the opinion that regional languages should be the media of instruction in this country. English cannot continue for ever as the medium of instruction but when it will become will depend on the work we do, not on speeches. Books will have to be written and translated and scholars will have to take interest in this work. There are many universities which have switched over to the regional languages at graduate level but how many books have been written, I mean original books? That is the real problem which we have to face in this country and unless we face it squarely, the problem will not be solved.

5 P.M.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Does he mean to say that the process has not begun?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nothing has been done.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It has begun, but it is very slow.

There are one or two points which I would like to explain. One of the points raised by my friend over there, Mr. Satyacharan, was with regard to some reference which was made to the University Grants Commission. There has been some misunderstanding about that point. The House is aware that the President . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU): It is time for you to finish the speech. I understand . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I will finish. If there had not been so many interruptions, I would have finished earlier. I will try to finish within five minutes.

The President passed an order on the 27th April, 1960 which contained a note with reference to the medium of examination for the recruitment of All-India Services and higher Central Services and this reference was made by the Home Ministry to the Union Public Service Commission which said that from 1963 onwards, it might be feasible to introduce Hindi as an alternative medium for the I.A.S. etc., examinations. The order was very clear in this matter. Unfortunately, the University Grants Commission went over the whole question with regard to the subject. The reference was very limited. That is they were asked to state whether this could be done by 1963 or we had to extend the period. But this misunderstanding was created because the University Grants Commission went over the whole question.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: My point was whether the directive was sent by the Home Ministry . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There was no directive by the Home Ministry. The reference was made by the Home Ministry to the Education Ministry and the University Grants Commission being an expert body, we made that reference to them. It was only for a limited purpose. But, unfortunately, they went over the whole question. It was quite unnecessary in my opinion.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Duty requires that you should place all aspects of the case before them.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, Sir. But we had expected that they would

touch only the limited purpose because the Parliamentary Committee had made certain recommendations on the basis of which the President had passed an order. We were not reopening the whole question, we were only dealing with a limited problem.

There is, one point which Mr. Panikkar raised which, I think, should not go unanswered. He said that the teachers were overworked, they had no time for studies and they deteriorated. In fact, he gave an example of teachers who were very fresh when they went to the interview immediately after finishing their education. But if they remained in their college for three or four years, they began to deteriorate. I should like to challenge this statement. I think teachers here work much less than what their counterparts in other countries do and teachers must also realise that. It is the duty of the Government to raise their salaries continuously and we have taken adequate measures.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do you know that?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I will have to take another two minutes.

Government has taken measures to improve the salaries of teachers all over the country. They have recently increased the salaries of the teachers of the Central Universities. The University Grants Commission will also take adequate steps so that the salaries of teachers in other universities are also improved. But at the same time I think we should make it clear to the teachers that in the interests of the nation, they must work harder and they must give more time to the guidance of their students. That is not being done at the present moment. That is a very sad thing which one has to say, but one must say it. And therefore I thought that Mr. Panik-

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

kar's statement that our teachers are overworked and therefore they are deteriorating should not go unchallenged. In fact, our teachers have various other interests outside the school or the college where they work.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You leave out Calcutta. You know how many teachers . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I should not like to detain the House any longer, and I should like to thank the hon. Members . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to ask one question. There was a report in the press that you appointed without consulting the Madhya Pradesh Government one Divisional Commissioner of Indore as Vice-Chancellor, and Mr. Pataskar, the Governor, made a statement criticising your action. What has it got to do with the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It has nothing to do with this.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has a very queer way of putting questions. I have nothing to do with the university. He was at some place at Ujjain. I said that it was wrong for a Commissioner to hold the office of the Commissioner and also the office of the Vice-Chancellor. The university's autonomy goes to pieces. In fact, I thought it was my duty to make this statement to safeguard the autonomy of the universities for which we all stand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, you are against such appointment.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very well.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Appropriation Bill, 1961, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 1st March, 1961.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 2nd March, 1961.