

[Shri B. R. Bhagat.]

- tions of the Ministry of Finance Department of Revenue):—

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 148, dated the 7th February, 1959, publishing certain amendments in the Customs and Central Excise Duties Refund (Fixed Rates) Rules, 1958.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 149, dated the 7th February, 1959, publishing certain amendments in the Customs and Central Excise Duties Refund (Brand Rates) Rules, 1958.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-46/59 for (i) and (ii).]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE SEA CUSTOMS ACT, 1878

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I also beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of section 43B of the Sea Customs Act, 1878, a copy each of the following **Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue):—**

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 150, dated the 7th February, 1959, publishing an amendment in the Customs Duties Drawback (Fixed Rates) Rules, 1958.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 151, dated the 7th February, 1959, publishing an amendment in the Customs Duties Drawback (Brand Rates) Rules, 1958.

(iii) Notification G.S.R. No. 169, dated the 7th February, 1959, publishing an amendment in Government Notification No. 296-Customs, dated the 6th December, 1958.

(iv) Notification G.S.R. No. 170, dated the 7th February, 1959, publishing an amendment in the Government Notification No. 296-Customs, dated the 6th December, 1958.

(v) Notification G.S.R. No. 1958, dated the 14th February, 1959, publishing an amendment in Government Notification No. 296-Customs, dated the 6th December, 1958.

(vi) Notification G.S.R. No. 186, dated the 14th February, 1959, publishing the Customs Duties Drawback (Hand Inflators) Rules, 1959.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1247/59 for (i) to (vi).]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE NOTIFICATION MAKING CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN SOME EARLIER NOTIFICATIONS

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I further beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification G.S.R. No. 191, dated the 14th February, 1959, making certain corrections in Government Notifications G.S.R. Nos. 382 and 383, dated the 17th May, 1958. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1248/59.]

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 153 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted three hours for the consideration of Dr. K. L. Shrimali's Motion in respect of the Second Annual Report of the University Grants Commission.

MOTION RE THE SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:

“That the Second Annual Report of the University Grants Commission

for the period April, 1957 to March, 1958, laid on the Table of the Rayya Sabha on the 16th February, 1959, be taken into consideration "

Sir, with your permission I should like to place before the House a few points arising out of this Report. Before I do so I think it is my duty to pay my tribute to the Chairman and members of the University Grants Commission who have worked with great sincerity and devotion and sometimes at personal inconvenience

The University Grants Commission has already started making its impact on the universities, and the House will bear with me that the Commission has before it the most difficult task of reconstructing and rehabilitating our universities, and I think I am expressing the general opinion of the House when I express my feelings of gratitude to the Chairman as well as to the Members of the Commission.

Sir, the Commission had to face certain difficulties during the year under review. I shall first of all say a few words with regard to these difficulties. The House is aware that the year under review has been a year of great strain and stress. There was a time when there was acute shortage of steel and cement and at one time the Ministry of Finance gave a directive that in order to save steel and cement for the essential projects undertaken in connection with the implementation of the core of the Plan no new construction programme should be undertaken. As a result of this shortage unfortunately the construction programme of the universities was hampered. I think it was very unfortunate because just at this time we needed more buildings and accommodation for the universities. But this is a matter which was beyond our control. The situation is easing and it will further ease and thus enable the universities to go ahead with their construction programme.

Sir, with regard to foreign exchange, the House is aware that there

was a shortage in this regard also, and the University Grants Commission had to face special difficulties in obtaining the equipment and apparatus both for the science laboratories and the technological institutions. I am however glad to inform the House that we have now been able to secure a special allocation of twenty lakhs of rupees by way of foreign exchange to meet the requirements of the universities for the period January, 1959 to March, 1959, and we have also taken steps to make suitable provision for foreign exchange for the period April, 1959 to September, 1959. We have already indicated this to the University Grants Commission and I understand, they have informed the universities about the availability of foreign exchange, and I am hoping that this would now enable the University Grants Commission to go ahead with their plans for equipping the science laboratories.

They had also to experience difficulties in dealing with the State universities, because the latter could not find the matching funds. The grants given by the University Grants Commission are normally on a matching basis, that is the State Governments or the universities have to find their share in order to utilise the grants given by the University Grants Commission, and it is regretted that many of the State Governments and the universities were not able to utilise the grants allotted by the University Grants Commission, because they were not able to find the matching funds. We are having discussions with the University Grants Commission to devise some method to resolve this difficulty. If some arrangement could be made by means of which the State Governments could make their funds available to the University Grants Commission, it would greatly facilitate in developing the universities. The Central Government makes the funds available to the University Grants Commission, and if the State Governments could also entrust these funds to the Uni-

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

iversity Grants Commission, it would facilitate the development programme. In this matter we have to negotiate with the University Grants Commission and the State Governments, and I hope that in the Third Five Year Plan we may be able to solve this difficulty.

Sir, the University Grants Commission has suggested that there should be some kind of flexibility in the allocation which is made to them for utilisation. The House is aware that the Plan allocations available to the various sectors had to be cut down, as a result of which the allocation made to the University Grants Commission was also reduced from Rs. 27 crores to Rs. 18.63 crores for the Second Plan period. The Commission considered this matter in July 1958 and passed a resolution urging that in order to enable them to perform their statutory function for maintaining proper standards in universities, the Government should make available to them a total sum of Rs. 19 crores during the Plan period. I have already communicated our decision to the Chairman of the University Grants Commission that we shall divert the remaining fund, that is, Rs. 37 lakhs for development purposes. In fact, I have been trying with the Ministry of Finance to secure an additional one crore of rupees, in addition to Rs. 19 crores. The Ministry of Finance have been sympathetic. Though they were not able to make any firm commitment, they have assured me that if the University Grants Commission is able to utilise these amounts, the question will be considered sympathetically in the last year of the Plan.

I would also like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that grants were released to the Commission in lump sum allotment and no fund is earmarked by Government for any specific scheme or objective. The Commission has full freedom in allocating the grants. No directive is given by the Government for use of

these funds while placing the funds at their disposal. The Commission is quite free to utilise the funds in any way they like.

In the Report, mention has been made that the University Grants Commission had to face difficulties with regard to their offices. They have part of their offices in the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research building and part of them are in a rented building. I would like to inform the House that the Government have now allotted a plot of land, measuring 0.75 acre in the Rouse Avenue area, New Delhi, for the construction of a building for the University Grants Commission. A provision of Rs. 5 lakhs has also been made for the construction of the office building in the U.G.C. budget. I hope that the University Grants Commission will soon have its own building so that they can discharge their responsibilities more efficiently.

Sir, one of the major achievements of the University Grants Commission is with regard to the reorganisation of university education. You are aware that both the University Education Commission and the Secondary Education Commission had strongly recommended that university education should be reorganised and a three-year degree course should be implemented as quickly as possible. I am glad to inform the House that most of the universities have accepted this in principle and some of them have already started implementing the programme.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated):
How many?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am just coming to it. Before the scheme was framed, Delhi and Jadavpur had already a three-year degree course. The universities, which have introduced a three-year degree course by

1958-59 are Saugar—introduced in 1956-57; Baroda, Karnatak, Kerala, Madras, Marathwada, Osmania and Visva-Bharati—introduced in 1957-58; Andhra, Annamalai, Aligarh, Mysore, Nagpur, Poona, Rajasthan, S. Vallabhbhai Vidyapeth Venkateswara and Vikram Universities—introduced in 1958-59. Thus, it will be seen that 18 universities have already introduced the three-year degree course by 1958-59.

Then, there are some universities which have decided upon a particular date by which they will introduce the three-year degree course. They are Bihar, Jabalpur, Patna, S.N.D.T. Women's, Utkal, Calcutta, Banaras, Punjab and Gauhati universities. Some of these are willing to introduce the course in 1959-60, some in 1960-61, some in 1961-62 and Gauhati in 1962-63.

Then, there are some universities which have agreed in principle to introduce a three-year degree course, but they have not yet decided the year of introduction. They are Agra, Allahabad, Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Kurukshetra and Lucknow. The second Deshmukh Committee has already submitted its report which is under examination, and I hope it would be possible for the universities of Uttar Pradesh and Bombay also to implement this course.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Is Government aware that Mr. Chatterjee, President of the Inter-University Board, has said in a meeting of Vice-Chancellors that he was opposed to the introduction of the three-year degree course since it has only led to a lowering of standard?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I read the report of the speech this morning. I think the speech was delivered yesterday. This may be the personal opinion of Mr. Chatterjee.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: He said this while presiding over a meeting of Vice-Chancellors.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Is the hon. Minister aware that there are plenty of people in the House who hold the same opinion?

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: It is a very divided House then.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The majority is in favour of three-year course.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The University Grants Commission has taken this decision in consultation with the universities; they have all agreed. The only university which has not so far agreed is the University of Bombay. Since all other universities in Bombay State have accepted the scheme, I hope the Bombay University will also accept the scheme in course of time. Gorakhpur University is having the scheme still under consideration. For Roorkee, which is an Engineering University, the scheme is not applicable. Thus it will be seen that this is the major achievement of the University Grants Commission. Through persuasion and various ways they have been able to bring round the universities, and for the first time we see a uniform pattern emerging for the whole country.

Certain educational problems have been raised in the Report of the University Grants Commission. I am sure the House will give full attention to these problems. One of the problems is with regard to the student numbers. The Report says that the present estimated number is 8,50,000, and the figure is likely to rise to one million within a year or two. Well, Sir, while we all welcome the increase of student population in the universities we are concerned about this matter because we find that the students are not getting adequate facilities and the standards are going down. The University Grants Commission has been greatly exercised about this matter. Nobody in this country would deny that there is a need for larger number of graduates for the various fields in order to find available personnel for our various development

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

plans and projects. But, at the same time, it should be our concern that the graduates who go to the Universities maintain a high standard of efficiency, academic as well as executive ability. I think as the numbers increase, we shall have to satisfy certain minimum conditions if we want that frustration and discontent among the educated people is avoided. To my mind there are three conditions which must be satisfied if we are to avoid this frustration and discontent. Firstly there should be no increase in any faculty which would have difficulty in finding satisfactory employment for these graduates. Sir, at present a large number of people are not able to get employment and they are feeling frustrated. Now this is not a very happy situation either for the universities or for the society or for the Government.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): How long will this unemployment remain?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I hope the hon. member will give me the opportunity. I am trying to explain the whole position and it is very difficult to say how long this unemployment will remain. The Government are doing their best and they are hoping that by the end of the Third Five Year Plan they would be able to provide jobs for all educated people.

Therefore, Sir, if we are to avoid this situation there should be a closer relationship between the employment pattern in the country and the output of graduates and some kind of planned development will have to take place in the universities. Secondly if we are taking a larger number of people we must also provide adequate accommodation and equipment. There is no point in admitting a large number of students and not providing adequate facilities in equipment, laboratories and libraries and for tutorial work.

Then, with the increase of numbers we should not allow the standards to decline. Some expansion in the university education is inevitable. But, at the same time, the development has to be linked up with the general development of our economy in order that the youngmen and women who are going out of the universities may not be faced with unemployment and frustration.

Another aspect of the University education which is a matter of great concern, is the large number of failures, both at the intermediate and the graduate levels. Nearly 50 per cent of the students fail at various examinations which indicates that we are actually wasting 50 per cent of funds on students who are not fit to take advantage of university education. The universities will have to make selection and also to limit the number, to some extent, so that proper standards may be maintained and the funds may be utilised for students who can derive maximum benefit out of university education.

Sir, in this connection the Central Advisory Board had passed a resolution which I hope will be acceptable to the State Governments and the universities. The purport of the resolution was that access to higher education should be regulated by the adjudged capacity of the students to benefit from the higher education and admission to colleges should be determined according to their capacity and resources. They further went on to say that there should be a speedy reorganisation of the secondary education and closer relationship between the employment pattern in the country and the output of graduates.

One of the happy features of this Report is that the University Grants Commission has given a great deal of attention to the improvement of salaries of teachers not only in the universities but also in the affiliated colleges, and now we are find-

ing that we have more or less a uniform scale all over the country. The University Grants Commission are giving liberal grants and they expect some share from the State Governments and the universities and the whole scheme has been working satisfactorily.

I think it is not necessary for me to stress the importance of improving the economic conditions of teachers because we find that the universities today are being depleted of all talented people who are going to various kinds of occupation, government service, business and trade and the universities today . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Why are they leaving?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The obvious reason is that their salaries are low and therefore I think it is right that the University Grants Commission has taken some steps to improve the salaries of teachers, and I hope they will continue to review this position because as the value of money declines and as other occupations and other trades give higher salaries to people, the University Grants Commission also will have to review the position from time to time.

Sir, the University Grants Commission have also raised the question of discipline. And I would only like to reiterate the appeal which the University Grants Commission have made. The problem of discipline has become acute among the university students and the co-operation of all parties,—parents, teachers and political groups,—has been invited by the University Grants Commission. If we undermine the discipline of the students, we endanger the future of our society. I was very much pained to read a few days back the report of a speech made by one of the prominent members of a political party advising the students to jeer and shout at the teachers if they speak in English. Well, Sir, if that is the

kind of advice which is being given by political leaders we can imagine what the future of the country would be.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): May I know the name of this gentleman?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I do not want to go into the details.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Was this advice ever followed? Did any case occur that the students acted upon this advice?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There was an interesting editorial in one of the papers which said that it was fortunate that nobody paid heed to the advice which was given by this leader because the students were busy with examinations. If the students start jeering and shouting at the teachers, there would be complete chaos in this country and we should stop thinking of academic and moral standards in this country.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: You can excuse him because he has gone off his mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. He is not here to defend himself and to say that he is in proper mind.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Then why was the case referred to at all?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I was giving only an illustration.

Sir, as I have said, the future of our country depends on the way in which we run our universities. The future of our country depends on the ability and the moral standards which the graduates bring to bear in public life. And therefore, it is not a matter which should be dealt within a political and partisan manner. We all should be interested vitally in the welfare of the universities and I hope that the good work which is

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

being done by the University Grants Commission and the appeal which they have made will receive the full support of this House. I do not like to take any longer, because there are many other hon. Members who would like to speak on this motion. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Second Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the period April, 1957 to March, 1958, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 16th February, 1959, be taken into consideration."

There is an amendment by Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Sir, I move:

"That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House recommends that in co-operation with the Universities greater attention may be given to encourage production of learned literature in University subjects of study in the Indian languages, to prepare for the change-over of the medium of instruction'."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendment are both before you.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Sir, before I speak on my amendment, I would like to say just a few words about what has been said just now by Dr. Shrimali, the hon. Minister of Education. If I heard him correctly, Mr. Chairman, he said that he is moving in the matter, or the States will consider placing such funds as they have for university education, into the hands of the University Grants Commission. Is that the suggestion that he made?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: That is the practice we are following.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: You are following or the State Governments? That is what I am asking.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: What I suggested was, since the States find it difficult to find matching funds, the University Grants Commission is not able to proceed with the programmes because funds are not available, and therefore, they are working out a suggestion whether it will be possible for the State Governments to place their share also at the disposal of the University Grants Commission

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: By making this suggestion, Sir, he is certainly not improving the relationship between the University Grants Commission and the State Governments. In fact, he has done a distinct disservice to the cause of creating a better atmosphere in their relationship by making this suggestion. I do not think the State Government in any State will surrender its funds. What can they do in the universities by offering their funds to the University Grants Commission? Knowing as I do the relationship that obtains in the execution of their plans between some of the State Governments and those working these schemes, I think this suggestion has come rather at a bad time. This will rather do harm than good. Now, Mr. Chairman . . .

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: May I ask the hon. Member whether he is suggesting that the relations between the University Grants Commission and the States generally, or some of the States, are far from happy?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Some of the States; I cannot say for all. I can speak only from my experience.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Could he tell us really what these States are and

what were the reasons for their dissatisfaction with the University Grants Commission?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Dr. Kunzru, as a member of the Commission should know and the very fact that some of the State Governments have not come forward to participate in the sharing of their funds shows that there is something in which there is no agreement, that there is no full agreement.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I am not aware that the relations between the University Grants Commission and any State Government are unsatisfactory.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: The State Governments have naturally to deal with the universities concerned.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, is this a question-hour or a speech? I don't know where we are.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: The State Governments have to do with the universities concerned. They deal with the proposal of the University Grants Commission through the State universities concerned.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): If I may interrupt the hon. Member for a second. So far as the recent controversy regarding the enhancement of the fees for the students in Calcutta is concerned, the University Grants Commission came to the rescue of the State Government and there was complete unanimity of opinion between the State Government and the University Grants Commission with regard to this vexed question of the enhancement of fees.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: That may be with regard to the State Government about which the hon. Member knows. But he certainly cannot speak about all the

fourteen State Governments, and I think this suggestion is not going to be a satisfactory one, as far as the relations between the State Governments and the University Grants Commission are concerned.

Now, let me come to certain other matters which I want to raise. The University Grants Commission has done a great deal of service in raising standards in certain aspects. They have given large amounts of grants for better buildings, for better equipment, for raising the salaries, for better teacher—pupils ratio, for reorganisation of courses etc. Now, what really is this raising of standards? Mr. Deputy Chairman . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: No Deputy Chairman.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I am very sorry, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not concerned, you get along.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: What is really this raising of standards? Sir, the hon. Minister in his speech referred to certain wastages. We are accustomed to reading paragraphs and pamphlets about wastages in elementary education. We find that when children are taken into the first year of the elementary schools, the total that comes out in the fifth class is only about 40 per cent. So by that time, out of those who were admitted into the first class, some 60 per cent had stopped and all that is a waste. Those statistics we find and we are trying to find out ways and means of avoiding this wastage. But what is happening in our universities? If you look at the figures, Mr. Chairman, that are given in this Report on Education in India for 1955-56, we see the amount of wastage that is there at the university stage. We find that in the I.A., that is to say, Intermediate Arts, the percentage of those who pass is 40 to 43 per cent. In Inter Science it is 45 per cent. In the B.A. (Hons.) it is 47 per cent. and B.Sc. (Hons.) it is 47 per cent. and so on. I may add that this does not give us a complete pic-

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] ture, because there is, as we all know, the selection examination. These figures of 47 per cent. and 43 per cent. are of those who pass from among the pupils that are admitted into these examinations. But you know what obtains in Madras and other places in the South; of the students, about 25 per cent. are detained in their respective classes and are not being sent up for these examinations. That means that really the percentage of students who pass in these examinations is really only about 33 per cent.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): We have to follow the speech, but we cannot follow the hon. Member's speech . . .

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants you to be a little slow.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM: CHETTIAR: Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that between the pupils who admit themselves and those who pass out at the examinations, the difference is so much and the wastage really comes to nearly two-thirds or about 66 per cent. You want to improve standards and for that I really appreciate that there should be better buildings, that better equipments are necessary and better staff is necessary, and better courses are necessary. But these alone will not succeed. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The standards are to be raised, but here you condemn a large number, about 8 lakhs of pupils, as unfit for anything else, having failed. That I say, is not proper organisation of university education. Then what is to be done? Why do they fail? Sir, some persons who were interested in college education have investigated this and collected some figures of the marks obtained at the university stages and they have tried to find out how the students fail. Sir, the figures and the results are very revealing. The position has

been worsened by the introduction of the pre-university course. In the Intermediate the medium of instruction is English. Till the VI form, the students study through their mother tongue, the regional language. When they come to the Intermediate class, they can at least adjust themselves because of the two-year period allowed but with this one-year course and with the immediate change of the medium of instruction into English, the result has been devastating and the number of failures has been colossal. This is a matter which we ourselves are faced with in the Madras University area. Being connected with the Madras University, I know how much we feel. We see number of failures in the pre-university class of the Madras University. What is the reason? The reason is that the medium of instruction is suddenly changed from the regional language to English so that the students not only have to study the subject but also have to fight with the language so that they may understand the subject. We know the effect of the medium of instruction in regard to secondary education. I had the honour of introducing the regional language as the medium of instruction when I was Minister of Education in Madras. We have now a syllabus. What do we find? The content of education in all the subjects has increased; the knowledge-extent has increased while it is true that the knowledge of English of the pupils has decreased. That is what we have found in the secondary schools. The knowledge content has certainly increased but the knowledge of English has decreased because the medium of instruction has been changed from English to the mother tongue. The real facts are these. What do we want of education? What is the objective of education? The objective of education is knowledge. If knowledge is the objective of education then the change of medium of instruction in the secondary schools is amply justified but if the objective of education in

the secondary stage is mere better knowledge of English, then we may accept to have failed; but the objective of any course of study, of any scheme of education is to give better knowledge and, judged from any point of view, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the recent number of failures as we find from the statistics, is due to this medium of teaching. This is through a foreign medium. What is happening in this country now is just what Gandhiji stated about this. I would presently like to quote just a few lines from what he said about this subject. The foreign medium has reduced the quantum of knowledge which each individual has learnt. That is number one. Number two is, it has created a great cleavage, gulf, between the educated and the uneducated. There is no medium of expressing higher subjects, higher knowledge, between the educated and the uneducated so that anybody who does not know English is tabooed from higher knowledge today. That is number two and number three, Mr. Chairman, is that this has created a number of failures in university education and this large proportion is entirely due to the English language. We have dubbed many of our young men as useless. We have dubbed many of our young men and women, otherwise of tremendous ability, as useless simply because they do not know a foreign language. They are debarred from any executive or any other post. The result is that for a large population, we have closed the doors and windows of knowledge. Literature in regional languages refuses to grow. We give prizes of thousand rupees and so on for books but who studies them except the educated? Where is the market for these books? This is because the educated people would like to go only for English and the uneducated people who want to study are so few . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: But who prevents the Madras University from

adopting its own regional language as the medium? Who prevents this, surely not the Ministry here?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member's views are not shared. That is why he has been pushed into Rajya Sabha.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Quite possible. That is also true but the point that I am trying to raise is this.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

So long as the medium of instruction in our colleges continues to be English the standards may not be raised and will not be raised. You may increase the salaries, put up better buildings and so on. These will help to a certain extent but in the true sense, improvement of standards can come in only when we produce books in our own regional languages. I do not, Mr. Deputy Chairman, say that English is not wanted. It is wanted for higher studies. We want, all of us, to study English; we want our boys and girls to study and attain very good standards. The medium of instruction is one thing and learning the language is another. Today, we want English to be studied; we want good English books to be stocked in all our libraries and we want English books to be translated—English books in all subjects—so that we can profit by them but I say that it is wrong for us to keep the medium of instruction as English and out of a million people in the colleges, only about 20 or 25 per cent. of them pass.

So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I hope the reason for the amendment is very clear. The amendment says that previous preparation for the change-over must be made. I would like to ask the University Grants Commission as to the previous preparation that has been made till now. Have they developed books, have they made arrangements to publish books? Nothing has been done and so, I would like that

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] this matter be brought to the attention of the University Grants Commission that, in addition to the work that they are doing, this work also should be done.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are eighteen speakers and so, the time has to be restricted to fifteen minutes for each. You have already taken more than fifteen minutes.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I shall take just a few minutes more.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard so much about discipline. Let us see what they themselves say about discipline. They themselves say that the state of discipline is also partly due to certain defects in our teaching and examining methods by which it is possible for students to have a great deal of free time in their hands. I would like to say that there is also a para about examination research. We are having only one examination at the end of the year which determines the merits of the boy in order to see whether he passes or fails. It has been accepted all over the world that this is not a very good system. If you want to improve standards, you must go into the character, good habits, etc., of the boys and give values to them in order to judge students.

I do not want to take much of your time. I would like these points to be considered further.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, instead of spending time which is limited, I shall just start with the three-year course. My submission would be that this amounts to putting the cart before the horse. Education must be integrated. Secondary education must be improved; then only you can have the three-year course. There is no charm or a magician's wand in this three-year

course. In Bombay there was this three-year course in my boyhood but it was changed to four years. If you improve secondary education, then, whether you have a three-year course or even a five-year course, things will improve, not otherwise. We must first aim at improvement in secondary education. That has not been done. I do not see it anywhere; nothing is being done about it. There are no good teachers. Even the Commission says that there is difficulty about teachers. Now-a-days, mostly, up to the matriculation classes, you get B.As. and M.As. as teachers not B.Sc. men. The material that comes in for arts subjects is comparatively poor. Everybody rushes for the science course, medicine, engineering and so on. All good students go there and the riff-raff that is left out comes to the arts course. That is the thing. Therefore, unless you improve the standard of secondary education, nothing can be done.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair.]

I am not against the three-year course. It should not be understood that way. The point is, as I said, you are beginning at the second floor while the foundation is not pucca. Therefore first have improvement made in the secondary course. You are transferring one year to the schools, but are there teachers in the schools who are capable of doing that higher work? That is the point. I was a teacher for seven years long ago, 50 years ago, and I know what kind of teachers we had. Even then it was difficult to get good teachers and now it is absolutely impossible. The teachers had to work four hours every day. Now they are called periods; there are six periods. All the day they are working and what is the pay? You start on Rs. 60 or Rs. 75 and the maximum they reach, if they are not head masters, is only Rs. 250. What sort of people you will get

as teachers for that? As a matter of fact I was a teacher for seven years and I left because there was no prospect. So you can never get people who have distinguished themselves, as teachers, unless it is in some schools such as under the Deccan Education Society where there is a spirit of service. They want to serve the country and were prepared to serve even at Rs. 30 a month but that category of people are not found everywhere. You must pay them adequately. That is what is required.

Sir, I do not find that the Commission has done anything as regards the actual improvement of the standards of education in the secondary schools. There is nothing so far as I can see. Therefore, as I said, I am not against the idea of three-year course but I am against its being hurried through. Now, we are told here that so many universities have actually begun it. On page 8 of the Report you will find about 15 or more universities mentioned. I do not know what they have done. I think the result will be worse than at present. This is what is stated on page 8:—

“The universities of Baroda, Karnatak, Kerala, Madras, Osmania and Saugar have already started the three-year degree course.”

I do not know whether they have looked into the question of the kind of students who are coming before them. They have already started this three-year course. There are two or three categories of universities which are taking this up:

“The universities of Aligarh, Andhra, Annamalai, Mysore, Nagpur, Sardar Vallabhbhai Vidyapeeth and Sri Venkateswara are expected to implement the scheme in 1958-59. . .”

That is, they have already begun. Almost a year has run out. So here we find there are 13 universities which

have introduced this three-year course. There is also another category. They say:

“... the universities of Poona, Rajasthan, S.N.D.T. . . .”—that is Karve's University—“... Utkal and Vikram in 1959-60.”

So that, we have here about 18 or 19 universities which have implemented this scheme. There are about 37 universities in all, of which you will find that five universities have recently been added. They are mentioned on the first page and they are the universities of Gorakhpur, Jabalpur, Kurukshetra and Vikram. There is also another and I think it is in Marathwada. So five universities have been added during the last two years. They are not mentioned here because this Report deals with 1957. So my contention is half the universities have already taken this up. While there is no unanimity on the question, my own idea is that people want to press the universities into hurrying in this matter of three-year course so that their sons and others, whoever are under their care, will get the charm of getting B.A. or B.Sc. Degrees in three-years. Otherwise, we should go slow in this matter. Let us have a sure foundation by way of secondary education and then only we can proceed. My time being very limited, I do not want to spend more time on this. There are other questions on which also I have to say something, and I shall go into just one or two other questions.

I am quite in favour of good salaries being given. Even now the scale for the post of a Lecturer is Rs. 200—15—320—20—500. At the time of his retirement a man may get Rs. 500 but at present they start on Rs. 200 and what kind of people you will get for Rs. 200? B.A. First Class or M.A. Second Class, I think, is the standard that is demanded, I do not know, in all, but in some universities. But if you give him Rs. 200 in these days, I do not know whether he will be able to rear a family consisting of himself, his wife and two children in these days of high cost of living. So here again the result will

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

be lower quality of people. I do not say that this is not good enough but you can make it better. Now, take the Principal. He is given Rs. 600—40—800. He ends his life with Rs. 800. I do not say that we can compete in this matter with the business houses but this is not surely attractive enough in these days. This might have been attractive in my time, 50 years back, but not now. Otherwise you will get the same sort of people that you are getting or even worse perhaps. So this must be considered by the University Grants Commission as well as by the Education Minister here and in the States and the scales must be improved. You require first class men if you want your pupils to be taught well.

This is not the only thing; it is not only the question of salary. You will find that the standard of students turned out is also bad. Even now good material is not coming for Arts classes; the good material goes to science. I know; as a matter of fact my own grandsons who got first class in Matriculation with first prize in Sanskrit went for science. They are getting Rs. 900 a month now at the age of 30 and I could not have got even Rs. 350 if I had remained as a teacher. First of all you are getting bad material and secondly there is a great deal of crowding because schools are only few. This year in Bombay 1·20 lakhs of students appeared for the S.S.C. or Matriculation whereas in my time only 3,000 appeared. So education is going up like this. All sorts of people are there.

Then there is another thing that struck me. Last year in the Inter Science Examination in Bombay which is the entrance examination for medicine, engineering and many other courses, more people passed in first class than in third class. 900 people were declared first class, 600 second class and 300 pass class. In my time in the B.A. examination only 5 passed in first class and that too only in two subjects, Mathematics and Science,

and all the rest were in second class or third class. But now because the teachers find that a first class is required for entrance into medicine or engineering, therefore so many were declared in first class. You look at the results of the Inter Science Examination in all the universities and compare them with the results that obtained 20 years back or even ten years back and you will find that now we are flooded with first class students. Are they really first class? Half the students get first class; I do not mind their getting first class but why this sudden change? Are the teachers more learned? Is the teaching better? Are the boys better? I do not know; or whether what I am stating is at the bottom.

Now, there is another matter about the medium of instruction. Here again, one university has already said—and I think it is Saugar University—that its medium of instruction will be Hindi. All the universities must be so managed that students can pass from one to another. India is one. Although there are so many universities, the standards and other things must be the same as far as possible. If some universities had merely Hindi as the medium of instruction what is to be done for the boys who go from, say, the South or from any other place and whose father is transferred or when some such thing happens? What is to be done in such cases? Therefore do not be rushing these things. You may have Hindi books and everything. I have no objection but it should be optional. At least two languages must be there in each university through which education will be imparted, generally Hindi, or English in some cases and some language current in that area, I mean the vernacular of the place. But here I find that many people have become enamoured of the idea. Whether our language is capable of coping with this burden that has been cast upon it or not, nobody bothers about it. We were once great but we had fallen for 700 years, conquered by foreigners, but we think that now that we are

free, we are in a position to do everything. It is not possible. You must lay a sure foundation. I am not against the medium of instruction being Marathi or any vernacular of the area but the point is, are these languages capable, at this stage, of supplanting English? Any language, even Bengali for the matter of that—it is better in that respect—is it capable? My idea is, it is not. But it is for Bengalis to say. My point is, you should not hurry to make the change-over. You may allow Hindi if one wants to have Hindi; you may allow English if one wants to have English. Here Saugar is one of the latest universities and it has gone in for Hindi at once. Now apart from this university of Saugar 11 other universities are going to introduce Hindi by stages up to B.A. and in certain cases up to M.A.

Now, as regards the finances, the Commission itself says on page 20:

“A sum of Rs. 3,50,00,000.00 (for plan and non-plan as well) was placed at the disposal of the Commission during the 2nd year of the Plan, i.e., in 1957-58.”

Now, one year more is past, that is, 1958-59 which is nearly finished. Just now, the Education Minister said that about Rs. 19 crores are made available. Am I correct, in all Rs. 19 crores in the Five Year Plan?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes.

DR. P. V. KANE: Three years have passed. In the remaining two years are you going to spend more than half of Rs. 19 crores? I think it was Rs. 3 crores for the second year. For the first year it was much less. For this year. I mean, 1958-59 I do not know exactly how much it is. I think it is not more than Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 crores. My point is that more money must be found.

And there is one more point about the Central Universities.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Will you take more time?

DR. P. V. KANE: Two or three minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Then, I think we better adjourn.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let him continue, Sir.

DR. P. V. KANE: I would like to draw your attention to page 26 of the Report. There you have got a statement showing grants paid to universities during 1957-58 and there you will find that four Central universities are there. If you look into the two columns and the total, they have got Rs. 182 lakhs. Out of Rs. 350 lakhs, they swallow—I don't grudge—Rs. 182 lakhs. My point is Rs. 182 lakhs are spent on them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I think we better meet at half past two.

DR. P. V. KANE: Sir, I want a little time. I want to develop this matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

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

DR. P. V. KANE: Sir, when the House rose for lunch, I was on the question of the grants made to the different universities. I am only drawing the attention of the House to pages 26 and 27 and if you look at Appendix C, on page 26, you will notice that the four Central Universities take Rs. 182 lakhs—Rs. 164 lakhs

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

plus Rs. 18 lakhs. As regards the remaining, there are 28 universities. The total there is Rs. 163 lakhs. You may omit the thousands for the present. What happens is this. The four universities exhaust Rs. 182 lakhs and 28 universities are given Rs. 163 lakhs. You will say that the State Governments help them. That I am coming to. But my point is this. It is not only 28, now there are 5 new universities. You will find that at the first page he has mentioned those 4 universities and one more in Marathwada has come. So, there are now in all 37 universities—4 Central and 28 plus 5. What is the criterion for the Central aid? Let all universities be treated alike and let what the States contribute to the universities be taken into account. I have no objection. What they contribute is not told anywhere here and I do not think that in the General Budget of the Central Government that will come. I have no idea. But let me say this that some of the universities may be willing to forego the State money if they will get grant on the scale in which these four universities are given. That is my point. I want only to say this. Let these figures be given to us. What is the amount given by the different States to all the different universities—33 in all? Let that be added to what the Centre gives to them. Still I think that the four universities will be regarded as consuming more than all the 33 universities taken together. At present no figures are available. I put it cautiously. I want to have no distinction made. The real distinction is the Aligarh University and the Banaras Hindu University have got Central Acts.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: These universities are the direct responsibility of the Central Government.

DR. P. V. KANE: But the Government is one in the whole of India. We have one Government. It is not a separate Government and they are all one. The Government is interested in

education in all the universities. Otherwise, there will be motherly and step-motherly treatment. I do not grudge the grants to these people . . .

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Pradesh): From where did these other universities get their charter?

DR. P. V. KANE: I have no time. I must finish. Of course, I do not grudge, but my point is that there should be equality. Again, if you turn to page 26, you will find that the Calcutta University gets Rs. 21 lakhs, Bombay University Rs. 14 lakhs and Madras University Rs. 23 lakhs. I do not understand what the basis is. No basis is disclosed. Why should Bombay, supposing it has got more funds—I do not know, now I am not very much connected with it for the last ten years though I was once the Vice-Chancellor—get less? My point is Bombay has done well, but is that a reason for depriving Bombay of sufficient money? There is no money sufficient for education anywhere. So that point also, I suppose, Dr. Shrimali will explain. There must be some explanation. But at present it does not look fair to me.

Then, one more point about these universities. You will find on page 14 that there is going to be a Chair in Buddhist Studies. That is what you have said on page 14. I have no objection, but I have been hammering for the last five years for a Central Institute of Indology. It has not come into being at all. The Buddhists may take care of themselves, but what about the Sanskrit studies? We are all talking about our culture. Culture does not consist of only dance and drama. What is the Centre doing actually about the Sanskrit Literature which is the embodiment of our culture? The States are doing something, they are supplying the funds. But there is no Central Institute of Indology in the whole of India. That is one point on which something should be done by this Commission, but they have not said anything. And

not only that, India was closely connected with the Near East and such countries as China, Tibet and Egypt. There must be Chairs in all these somewhere. I have been hammering on this I have been to several international conferences. I have found that most of those universities have got Chairs not only in Sanskrit, but also other languages. But we have got no Chair. You will find that in 1400 B.C. there was a treaty.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU). I am sorry to interfere, but the hon. Member has taken more than 22 minutes.

DR. P. V. KANE. However, that is one point. Only one more point is left. On page 8 you will find the names of the universities which had agreed to provide 50 per cent. of the cost of hostel buildings, etc. I find, of course, that the grant made is very little. The grant actually paid is about Rs 6 or Rs 7 lakhs, but then the approved cost is so much. Punjab gets Rs 22 lakhs. The total is Rs 46 lakhs, out of which Punjab gets Rs 22 lakhs, Baroda gets Rs 5 lakhs, Karnatak gets Rs. 7 lakhs, Nagpur gets Rs 3 lakhs and Rajasthan Rs. 5 lakhs and so on. That is one thing.

I think I should finish now. There is only one point left. That is on page 9. I was saying something about placing the cart before the horse, that the three-year degree course is like that. Now, look at page 9 and I shall read these two paragraphs. I do not want to criticise. The Commission itself admits it:—

“As already stated, the scheme of the three-year degree course presupposes the re-organisation of High School education also as it will involve the addition of one more year to the present school years and the re-shaping of the last years of school in such a way as to make that stage both a finishing stage in such education and a preparation in some measure at least, for Higher Education. .”

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. It is time.

DR. P. V. KANE. It goes on.

“The expectation is that the boys and girls leaving the Higher Secondary Schools after completion of the course at the age of 17 plus will be adequately educated persons capable of entering any walk of life at the appropriate level and making the necessary adjustments and adaptations. We hope that the introduction of the Higher Secondary course will be carried out in this spirit everywhere.”

Is it being carried out? My point is introduce this three-year degree course after all this is carried out. But, then there is nothing to show that anything has been carried out.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated). Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have always looked upon the creation of the University Grants Commission as perhaps the most important landmark in the history of university education in India and from that stand-point I feel particularly interested in the work of the University Grants Commission. Now, Sir, the very first sentence of the Report is very disquieting. It mentions that as many as four universities were founded without any consultation with the University Grants Commission. I think it does not speak well of the future of the University Grants Commission if different States create more and more universities without any proper justification and then expect help from the University Grants Commission with all its slender resources. I think it should be a definite convention, and I won't mind making it a statutory provision that no university should be founded without prior consultation with the University Grants Commission.

Well, Sir, I particularly admire the spirit of sobriety and reasonableness with which the language problem has

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

been tackled by the Language Committee of the Commission and those recommendations have been accepted. Briefly summarised, the recommendations are stressing the necessity to have knowledge of English, both in the schools and in the universities, and secondly, stressing the necessity to have proper textbooks prepared before switching off from English to any regional language or Hindi as the medium of instruction. I congratulate the Commission on accepting these recommendations. I wish, Sir, I could congratulate the Commission in the same manner on the way in which they have tackled the question of the three-year degree course. I am glad in a way that my friend, Dr. Kane, has already tackled this question, and I should like only to supplement what he has said against the introduction of the three-year degree course. As a mere academic proposition every educationist will admit that a three-year course in a university is very desirable, very good, and this proposition has been acted upon by the best universities in the West. But we forget that in the Western countries the secondary education is of a very high type. They really prepare the students for university education, and therefore the three-year course is quite reasonable, quite appropriate, in their case. In the case of our educational system we have to recognize that our secondary education is the weakest link in our educational system. Our high school students are not so well prepared for university education, and therefore it is not desirable to say that by adding one year more to the school education you will produce a better type of people for university education. Now as a matter of fact, I was going to read some portions—but I shall not read them as my friend, Dr. Kane, has already read those portions—which go to show that the University Grants Commission, I am afraid, are not very logical in what they say. First of all they say that the three-year degree course presupposes the reorganisation of the high school course. One would naturally expect that after recognising

this simple, elementary, educational fact, they would have seen to an improvement in our secondary education and then, maybe after eight years or ten years, introduced the three-year course, assuming that by that time a better type of students will be produced by our schools. That is not the case. They go on to say that the changing of secondary school education will take a little time, and therefore they want to introduce this three-year course immediately. That seems to me to be, Sir, most illogical. Coming as it does from some of the most eminent educationists in the country who are members of the University Grants Commission, I am afraid they have a guilty conscience in the matter, because they go on to say: "It may be argued that with the introduction of the pre-university class all that happens is that the total period of four years is divided slightly differently and that the change is meant to be from tweedledum to tweedledee." Of course this is followed by the sentence beginning with "But". But what follows is not at all convincing. What is mentioned cannot prevent us from saying that this is really only from tweedledum to tweedledee. Special emphasis is laid on the question of general education, as if general education could be introduced only in the three-year course.

Now on page 10 they again admit very frankly—and I admire their frankness—that suitable books are not in existence, that suitable teachers are not in existence,—and God knows, without suitable textbooks and without suitable teachers what sort of general education we are going to have. I think in educational matters it is desirable to hasten a little slowly.

Now, Sir, the hon. Education Minister has made a good deal of the point that a large number of universities has already accepted the three-year course. Well, Sir, on paper they have. But what is the reason behind it? I know that a certain impression exists in the universities—I do not know how far the University Grants Commission itself is responsible for

that impression—that unless the universities switch on to the three-year course, adequate assistance will not be forthcoming from the University Grants Commission. Now every university is so starved

DR H. N KUNZRU How does that hon Member come to that conclusion?

PROF A R WADIA I know that the impression exists, but I do not say University Grants Commission is responsible for that impression. I modify that statement. (*Interruption.*) It is not imaginary basis. I bow down to Dr. Kunzru's experience in affairs generally, but so far as education is concerned I may, at the risk of being immodest, plead a little more direct experience of the universities. Even at this moment I am connected with universities and I know what the feeling of the universities is. This is the position. Therefore, the mere fact that so many universities have accepted this does not by itself justify it. Of course I do not for a moment suggest that we should go back on this policy. We cannot be changing our policies every two or three years. But I only point out that unfortunately very early in the history of the University Grants Commission a false step has been taken. The consequences will be a little disastrous. Dr Kane already pointed out the difficulty of migration from one university to another.

Then, Sir, it is argued that the Delhi University is running a pre-university class, in justification of this three-year course. But a pre-university class run by a university is a contradiction in terms. It is a University class. It only implies that the Delhi University has reshuffled the four-year course, calling the one-year course pre-university and the rest direct university course. If that example is to be followed by every university, I am afraid this change to a three-year course is only nominal. Sir, in this connection I may point out that this experiment of a

three-year course is by no means entirely new in our university education. In 1916 when the University of Mysore was founded, there was a definite provision that the university course should be only of three years, and one year was added to the school course, and a new examination was introduced called the Entrance Examination. Of course, purely from the theoretical standpoint this was a very good move, and when the Saddler Commission visited Mysore they were praising this departure on the part of the Mysore University. But again, the majority of members of the Saddler Commission came from outside, and they were thinking of the standard of the secondary education in Europe. Unfortunately within a decade the Mysore University had to go back to the four-year system because the three-year system did not work. Now I should be very sorry if after ten years the University Grants Commission found it necessary to go back again to the four-year course but I shall not be surprised, assuming that I am living at the end of ten years, if this came about.

Now, in connection with the appointment of Vice-Chancellors—I am sure we have read with some sort of dismay what the Law Commission has to say about the appointment of High Court Judges, and I regret to say that the same language could be applied to the appointment of Vice-Chancellors with this difference that the High Court Judges, even if they are second rate people, at least know their law. I dare not say that every Vice-Chancellor can be credited with knowing what university education is, because they are appointed for political reasons, for their past service to political parties. Whatever part they may have played in the freedom struggle, it does not justify their appointment as Vice-Chancellors. Vice-chancellors nowadays are appointed on the basis of caste, on the basis of State, on the basis of language. I know that one Vice-Chancellor who

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

was appointed or was elected merely on the communal ticket knew nothing of university education. He had literally to begin from the very ABC of university education. Well, Sir, what can we expect? After all, the Vice-Chancellor's is a very high office. I remember, in connection with the Banaras University, the Education Minister said that the office of a Vice-Chancellor was as important as the office of a High Court Judge or any other high office in the country. I entirely agree with him. I say that a Vice-Chancellor must have the requisite qualifications and if he does not have those qualifications, he can hardly be expected to run the university well. I remember, one person, who was connected with the Inter-University Board a few years ago went to the length of saying that he used to have a very high impression of Vice-Chancellors, but after his experience with the Inter-University Board, he had changed his opinion. I am not surprised myself considering the unfortunate considerations which weigh with the appointing authorities about the appointment of Vice-Chancellors.

Sir, I am making these remarks with a purpose. The University Grants Commission is a very important body. The Chairman is necessarily bound to be a man of very high qualifications, a person to whom to look up with respect, and the members of the University Grants Commission are all eminent educationists. It will be extremely healthy if the University Grants Commission or at least its Chairman is consulted before any particular person is appointed as Vice-Chancellor. When it comes to a local university, local considerations prevail. In recent years I find that some of the appointments have been made and one has to say that nobody was appointed because of his educational qualifications. In one case it was said that he was a member of a particular political party. In another case it was said that in a particular constituency there were many people belong-

ing to a particular community and so a person of that community was appointed as Vice-Chancellor. Nobody said that he was eminently suited. That is a very sorry state of affairs and that sort of thing could only be overcome by bringing the University Grants Commission in the appointment of Vice-Chancellors. It will at least take away the local prejudices and prepossessions and an independent body or an independent Chairman can bring to bear an independent judgment on the appointment of Vice-Chancellors.

Sir, I find that very great importance is given to technical education, especially the engineering colleges. I heartily welcome it; our country needs it. But may I point out that our engineering colleges and technical institutions might well follow the example of that world famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology and that example is that this famous Institute found it necessary to introduce a certain number of humanitarian subjects in their curricula?

THE MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR): This is also done here.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I am glad to hear that from a person like Prof. Kabir who is acquainted with it. Well, it has been done—I accept it—and I congratulate him.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: It is being done.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I hope the engineering college authorities will react to it with sympathy and not shut it into some obscure corner of their time-tables.

Sir, there is just a point to which I should like very briefly to refer, and that is the salaries of the university teachers. Appendix A is rather misleading.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time is limited, Dr. Wadia.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: If you wish, I will sit down. I have something to say. If you give me a chance, I will speak. But if you want me to sit down, I will do so. I would like to have a little more time. I leave it to you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take a little more time.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Appendix A is a little misleading, although the nature of misleading is covered up by the sentence where it is mentioned that certain universities are not mentioned there because their grades of salaries are already higher than those recommended by the University Grants Commission. I think Appendix A should be suitably modified.

I welcome the suggestion that there should be a list of qualified professors drawn up by the University Grants Commission. At this juncture, such a list will be eminently useful. But once we switch on to regional languages, I do not know of what utility this list will be because the best man is not going to be appointed. The best man in the State knowing the language well and competent to teach in that language is going to be preferred. But the suggestion is certainly very good.

Grants are given for publications. I should like to know whether any provision is made for a certain payment to be made to the authors because universities undertake publications without paying anything to the authors. It is very unjust.

I welcome the several things that have been done for the welfare of the students. One of them is hobby workshops. I personally feel that hobby workshops will be more consistent with school education than college education.

Then I find that Gandhi Bhavans have been brought into existence. But I regret to note that there is none in the old Bombay State because in the

present Bombay State, Nagpur comes in. I wonder whether it is a meed of praise or criticism. Does it mean that Bombay is so Gandhian that no Gandhi Bhavan is necessary or does it mean that Bombay State is so un-Gandhian that it does not deserve to have a Gandhi Bhavan? Anyway, I hope the principle of having Gandhi Bhavans will be extended further and further.

There is another small thing. I find that there is a grant given of Rs. 6,000 to each university for supplying information to the University Grants Commission. This seems to be extraordinarily strange. After all, a university office with a highly paid Registrar, Deputy Registrar, Assistant Registrar, and what not, should be in a position to supply any information that is available to the University Grants Commission, because when you work out, this sum of Rs. 6,000 a year for each university comes to Rs. 2,22,000 and when money is so scarce, that amount could be easily saved.

Sir, there is one thing which I want the University Grants Commission to do—and they are going to do it—and that is to deal with the problem of examinations. This is a very serious problem—how the examinations should be conducted and of what type. I hope something useful will come out of that enquiry. But something will also have to be done in connection with the question of appointment of examiners. It is another scandal in our universities. I have been told that in the Indian Science Congress, the main business is to exchange examinerships for the succeeding years. Now, I do not say that the Indian Science Congress is alone guilty of it. Probably the same criticism applies to other bodies also. But that is an unfortunate sort of thing. I wish the University Grants Commission to have also a panel of examiners suitable, especially for the higher degrees, and I would particularly welcome that for the medical education. As a Bombay man, I am ashamed to say that there is a terrible

[Prof A R Wadia]
scandal in the Bombay University about medical examinations for the higher degrees. It is openly said that the students of, say, college A however brilliant they may be, will not pass if the examiner belongs to college B and *vice versa*. It has been openly said and that sort of evil could be overcome only by the good offices of the University Grants Commission.

Finally, Sir, I like to repeat that the University Grants Commission is the pivot of the hopes for university education in India and we look forward to it to serve the universities and the country.

3 P M

SHRI P N SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):
Mr Deputy Chairman, I should like to say that we are indebted to the University Grants Commission for a lucid survey of the problems of university education. The House should welcome the emphasis that the University Grants Commission has laid upon the study of the English language.

I listened with respect to the speech of Mr Avinashilingam Chettiar, but I regret to say that I do not find myself in complete agreement with him. From an educational point of view it is, of course, indisputable that the regional language is the language in which instruction should be imparted to students. But there are some practical difficulties in the way, and those difficulties are not overcome by over-enthusiasm. The difficulty is that in most of the regional languages you have not a sufficiently large number of standard text-books which can be read with profit by university students and scholars. Our scientific and technological development is bound up with our educational progress. This was emphasised by the Commission which was presided over by our Chairman in stirring language, and I know that this has been emphasised by the University Grants Commission as well. Now, if knowledge of English—it is the modern European language for us—goes down,

then the apprehension that I entertain is—and I think it is a reasonable apprehension—that our science standards, our standards in technology, will suffer, and it is no use talking of big plans without the means of executing them. Therefore I was interested in the observations which have been made by the Committee appointed by the Commission to examine the problem of the medium of instruction with a view to ensure that our candidates acquired adequate proficiency in the English language at the university stage. The difficulty with many of our university students in this transition period is that they know neither the English language nor the regional language nor the State language nor any other language in which they can express themselves with ease. They have fluency in no language at all, and I do not understand the Commission to be opposed to the introduction of an Indian language or the regional language as the medium of instruction. What I understand them to say is that there should be an adequate preparation both in the cultivation of the Indian language concerned, as medium of expression for learned purposes, and by preparation of a sufficient body of learned literature in that language in all subjects of study. It is also important to bear in mind their recommendation in regard to the manner in which the English language hereafter should be taught. It is not necessary that our students should be given very high education in English literature. What we need is that they should be enabled to read with ease and fluency books of modern interest in the English language.

Now passing on to the question of the salary of university teachers, I know that the Commission has suggested a minimum, which most universities have accepted, but I think, Sir, that that minimum needs to be reconsidered in the light of rising prices, and I was impressed by what Dr Kane said about the salary of university teachers. We want the very best men to join the educational services but it is disheartening to find

the brightest products of our universities joining the I.A.S. or the I.P.S. or the other Central Services, and if they can't get into the Central Services they even prefer the Provincial Services to educational service. It is true that university teachers are not very highly paid even in Britain, but then the university teacher there has a lot of leisure. He does not have to teach for as many periods as his counterpart in our universities has to, and then he can write books, and these books sell well because there is a reading public. Here unfortunately, even if he devotes himself to study, even if he devotes himself to research, even if he devotes himself to writing books seriously, he can make no fortune, or even a moderate income out of the sale of these books. Therefore, the question of an improvement of university education is bound up with the question of improving the quality of our teaching staff and their salary.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say that I am very strongly in favour of the three-year degree course, and the universities which have not accepted this plan of a three-year course should be induced to come into line as early as possible. It takes a year for a student to get himself adjusted to university surroundings. Then at the end of the second year he finds that he has finished his under-graduate study at the university and he can continue only as a post-graduate student. I know of no British University where the course for the Honours or M.A. degree is less than three years, and for the Matriculation stage in Britain you require about eleven years of study. By the time the higher secondary stage is reached the student here will have put in eleven years of study, and I think in eleven years he should be able to reach the standard which is reached now in twelve years. A pre-university course at the universities for students who have taken their Matriculation, I think, is likely to do no good; we should go in straight for the three-year degree course.

Another point, Mr. Deputy Chairman, which I wish to emphasise is this. It is assumed in this country that there should be uniformity of standards so far as universities are concerned. We assume, or we make recommendations on the assumption that all universities must have common standards. Now I think there should be a minimum standard which every university must reach, but, subject to this requirement, variations in standards should be permissible. The United States has got about two thousand universities, or more—I do not know the exact number of universities and higher educational institutions that that country has, and all those institutions are not of equal standards; their degrees are not of equal standard. There are a few universities which have high standards and entrance to them is a little difficult. I think that should be the case here also. I do not want that entrance to them should be easy so far as rich men are concerned. I want entrance to these universities to be by fair competitive tests. Sir, I do not mind this variation in standards because we have somehow to balance the claims of efficiency with the claims of expansion. I do not think that we have too much of university education. Having regard to the fact that we are 350 million people, the number of graduates turned out by our universities is not large. But it is unfortunately a fact that the standard in many cases is low. But, while trying to impose the minimum standard, let us also take care to see that standards in some universities are kept higher than minimum standards in others.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say one or two words about Prof. Wadia's suggestion that no university should be started without previous consultation with the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission cannot be given a veto, as it were, for the expansion of university education in the States. The University Grants Commission is an advisory body, a very highly respected body. It has on it distinguished statesmen like Dr. Kunzru. But it is

* [Shri P. N. Sapru.]
not a supervisory body over education in this country; it is an advisory body and it would constitutionally not be proper for us to vest this power in the University Grants Commission.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: The new universities are opened without seeking their advice.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: This is what I say.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: They should have sought their advice.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: But, I think, as a matter of convention the University Grants Commission should be kept informed.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Not informed, consulted.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Informed or should be consulted. I would go as far as that they should be consulted in opening new universities. But that consultation does not confer on the University Grants Commission any executive authority in regard to university education.

Sir, I do not regret that new universities are springing up. What I want is a greater co-ordination on the part of these new universities. (*Time Bell rings.*) In regard to the question of co-ordination in post-graduate matters among the different universities in a State, the University Grants Commission is silent. I hope, when they come to present their report next year, they will have something to say about it.

There are many other points on which one could speak so far as this Commission's report is concerned. I would wind up by saying that the University Grants Commission is one of the most valuable Commissions that we have in this country, and the greater the emphasis that we give to education—university education in particular—the greater is the confidence with which we can face the

future. Without a good university base there is no hope of progress for the country.

The unfortunate fact today is that not only our university standards—it may be the minimum standard in many respects—are going down but also the standard of discipline in our universities. On that question I have a lot to say but I cannot say it due to paucity of time. (*Time bell rings.*) I will say only this thing that it is important that political parties, the Government, the parents and the students should all realize their responsibility in this matter because if our standard of university discipline continues to go down, it will not be good for our country.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have before us the Report of the University Grants Commission which, to my mind, is an uninspiring report. It lacks in vision and it is also lacking in a sense of reality. The problems of university education and higher education are only partially reflected in this Report, and the solution suggested is still less. For this I do not blame the University Grants Commission. It is a body of distinguished men who are, no doubt, motivated by the best interest of the country. But, I, Sir, have some complaints against the Ministry of Education both at the Centre and in the States. It appears to me that the Government of the day do not have a clear-cut education policy; they are groping in the dark.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Does that apply to Kerala State also?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Kerala, I leave it to you.

They are groping in the dark. In order to formulate a policy they falter at every step. Sir, this, undoubtedly, would create a difficulty in the way of any Commission such as the University Grants Commission. First of all, let

me take the question of grants. We saw how valiantly our hon Education Minister was fighting for the banner of the Banaras Hindu University. It was a wrong fight according to our judgment. But, I have never known him fighting against the Finance Ministry in order to have the allocations increased. He has been living on the doles of the Finance Ministry, and in the year under review, the total grant was only of the order of 3½ crores of rupees.

Sir, the over-all grant in the Second Five Year Plan has been reduced from Rs 28 crores to Rs. 17 crores—a complete surrender on the part of the Education Ministry.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I should like to correct my hon. friend. In my introductory remarks I have already explained that. I have already informed the University Grants Commission that they would have full Rs. 19 crores for which they have asked. In fact, I am trying to get an additional one crore of rupees from the Finance Ministry for this purpose, and that fight will continue.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am glad the hon. Minister is cultivating the faculties for a fight for a good cause.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): At the same time it has been reduced from Rs. 24 crores to Rs. 19 crores.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I was saying that the allocation is inadequate and there is no reason why more allocation should not be made for education both at the Centre and in the States. For example, take the West Bengal State. The total amount spent annually on education is Rs 20.17 crores, out of which the Government's share of educational expenditure is only 58.5 per cent. As against Local Board's 4 per cent., Endowment 2.5 per cent. Other Sources 6 per cent, Government should have a bigger share in the matter of expenditure on education.

And much of the educational expenses are left to the parents and local bodies. These are something which these bodies and the parents cannot sometimes bear. Naturally the cost of higher education is unjustified on all hands

Then, Sir, let me come to the question of utilisation of the funds. I regret to say that in many cases the funds are not properly utilised. I have heard complaints coming from some universities—Gauhati University for example—where funds have not been properly utilised. If you go to the affiliated colleges under the universities you will find improper use of the funds built up out of the tuition fee of the students. This is another matter which requires the attention of the Government. Every penny out of these funds should be utilised properly and maximum benefit should be derived when money is scarce. Now, Sir, in this matter the Centre has a special responsibility. Unfortunately we have divided the subjects in our Constitution in such a manner that there is always a possibility of mutual evasion of responsibilities and in the matter of mutual evasion of responsibilities I think you cannot beat the Education Ministry at the Centre and the Education Departments in the States. I hope now they will try to have a better understanding among themselves so that these things do not go on.

Now coming to the question of problems of reconstruction of our education about which the hon Minister spoke, what is the reconstruction the Government have in mind? Have they any policy, any clear cut policy, about this? It is said they want to give emphasis to scientific education, engineering education and so on, in our country. But what steps have they taken? Have they reorientated our educational system in such a manner that the emphasis shifts on to technological and engineering education rather than the education of humanities and so on?

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Now, Sir, if you take West Bengal for example, you will find that Commerce accounts for 42 per cent. of the students, Medicines 17 per cent, Law 14·7 per cent., Engineering and Technology 13·5 per cent. This is the position. It is only a small percentage that is now accounted for by engineering and technology. Reorganisation of education is naturally needed in this respect.

Then, Sir, it is not merely a question of having a system of education. The doors of our educational institutions are not open to the common people today. With the costs of education going up—tuition fees, books and other charges, everything—it is becoming increasingly difficult for lower income groups and for the poor people to go in for university or college education. This is another problem, of a big dimension, which is to be faced by those people in whose charge the country's education has been placed. There the Government is failing. Education is more and more taking on an upper-class character with the costs of education going up, whereas in any democratic system, it is of utmost importance that the children of the working class, of the peasantry and of the lower income groups are there more and more in the proper fields of education such as technical education and engineering education, this is not being done in this country.

Then, Sir, the question of overcrowding is very much spoken of in this respect. I understand this problem and this problem has to be solved but it is not merely a question of drastically reducing the number of students, as to whether a college may take 1,500 or 1,000 students, or, in the case of Calcutta, 800 to 1,000 students. What about the classes? The classes should not be overcrowded. For instance, is it conceivable that an educational institution which has 800 students, may have classes consisting of 100 pupils or so? Edu-

cation suffers there. Therefore, that aspect of the matter should also receive the attention of the Government.

Then, Sir, it is no use just telling, reduce the number of students. Construction of hostels, educational buildings, college buildings and so on, will have to be undertaken wherever there is need for it. We find private people are being allowed to build palaces. We have seen in Calcutta—if you go to New Alipore area you will find—palaces have come up; some have been built up by Jains, some by Goenkas and others by Birlas and Shinghanias. But when it comes to the question of our educational institutions, we do not have cement, nor steel, and anything and everything will be available for somebody else to make good use of them. Now this is another problem.

Then, Sir, with regard to the question of pay-scales of the teachers, this is a very very important question. The hon. Minister has said that they do not get talents because pay is low. What are you doing? Are we to lament over the matter and bemoan the position in which we are placed today or are we to take some steps? The University Grants Commission has prescribed certain pay scales, but these are not being implemented, at least in most of the colleges in our country. I can speak about the salaries of the college teachers and university teachers in West Bengal. Sixty-seven per cent get Rs. 100 to 120, 23 per cent. Rs. 251 to 450, 6 per cent. Rs. 451 to 650, 2·4 per cent. Rs. 651 to 850 and 1 per cent Rs. 851 to 1,000. This is the position. This is how our analysis of 3,500 teachers in Calcutta gives the picture. This is the position. In most cases the recommendations of the University Grants Commission are far from being implemented. Naturally you cannot draw talents. You cannot get even a good Deputy Minister until and unless you pay a handsome salary.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU
RAMAMURTI (Madras): May I ask

if among the 67 per cent. who get salaries between Rs. 100-120, there happen to be demonstrators also?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the position I have been told. How can you get a Principal of a College on a salary of Rs. 300 or 400 when it is a hard job even to find a Deputy Minister from the back benches? I am not blaming any Deputy Minister, maybe they are very sacrificing. But that is the position. Here the problem arises because with regard to the scales of pay and salaries the recommendations of the University Grants Commission are not being implemented. When they are supposed to be implemented, the problem of matching grants comes. As you know, unless 50 per cent is found by the State Government, another 50 per cent would not be given by the University Grants Commission as a recurring grant. The result of this is that many of the colleges had been hard hit because the State Governments treat them in a step-motherly way. In some cases the colleges are at fault in the matter of administration of their finances and the result is that the University Grants Commission's recommendations with regard to pay scales remain in abeyance in regard to a large number of colleges, even in States like West Bengal. Perhaps to make a matching grant, as far as I know, the University Grants Commission has not laid down any condition but the West Bengal Government imposes this condition when it gives matching grants. Sir, you will be surprised to hear—the hon. Minister should kindly take notice of it because the Government are improving the grants-in-aid rules prepared by the British half a century ago or even earlier—that these rules are applied in order to impose conditions on the colleges where the grants are made by the West Bengal Government.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The University Grants Commission also ask for matching grants.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But they lay down other conditions. I have got these before me. They apply certain other conditions which are attached to these grants and the rules that were prepared by the British, are now used. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, our group was given 30 minutes. That is the arrangement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no such allotment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I was told, but anyway, it is for you to decide. Otherwise I would not have spoken.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to give a chance to others.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will give them chance.

Now, this is the position. In giving grants-in-aid, conditions are placed. And then screening goes on in the colleges, as for instance in West Calcutta six teachers have been dismissed as a result of this police screening and promotions determined on the basis of police screening. This is an absurd thing.

Now I come to the question of approval. They lay down the condition that all the appointments to the aided colleges, those which get aid from the Government, should be subject to the approval of the Government. Why? I can understand getting the approval of academic experts or selection boards and so on, but not certainly that of the Government, because political considerations come in and all kinds of witch-hunting goes on in this matter and this has created a very serious situation in at least West Bengal.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of students' discipline. About discipline among students, yes, I do not deny that there has been some measure of indiscipline among certain sections of the students. But by and large, our student community and the teachers are a very very peaceful lot. They do not indulge in indiscipline. Then why indiscipline?

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

That is the problem today and that question has not been gone into here. The Commission makes an interesting . . .

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: What happened in Kerala?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Ask your own colleagues.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Kerala students? You instigated them and used them for political purposes—some of them. What can I do? Well, take for instance this agitation by the students in relation to such matters as the raising of tuition fees. These students could not have taken part in it without the knowledge and consent of their parents and other persons. In Calcutta five colleges raised their fees and the students opposed it. Even Dr. B. C. Roy said there was no justification for raising the fees and I was there present in the Assembly when he made that statement. But nobody would listen to them. The authorities would not listen to them. Naturally, the students came out, and this might have caused some irritation to the Prime Minister because there was a procession and all that. But ultimately they succeeded in getting the increased tuition fees reduced, that is, the increase was suspended. So, that is the position. Naturally, there is no use saying anything against them. The students do not have enough facilities for sport, common rooms, library room and so on. In a Kanpur college, for instance, in the D.A.V. College Rs. 72,000 are collected every year for sport, but very little is spent for that. You don't encourage union activities. In a Punjab D.A.V. College for example, a union will not be allowed to be formed, and sometimes the authorities take possession of the union.

AN HON. MEMBER: Union activities or trade-union activities?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I always give facts, concrete facts.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all for the State Assembly, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But these are educational problems and we are discussing them . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But we are discussing the Report of the University Grants Commission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And the Commission itself has said . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: These are matters of detail.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then I have to raise a point of order, Sir, The University Grants Commission have made observations about such other activities, like common room and other things. So please do not think I am going absolutely outside the subject. This is what the Commission say and the Central Government should be interested in these matters, how college unions are being promoted and other extra academic activities for the students are being encouraged. Otherwise, there is no use talking of students' indiscipline and writing big notes about it. That is what I am saying. Sir, do you know, and you will be surprised to hear that some of the college authorities maintain goondas and they use goondas against students, due to factions—and you say politics also comes in. But, Sir, in Visva-Bharati there is no politics. Neither the Congress Party, nor the Communist Party, nor the Praja Socialist Party is there. But why is the Visva-Bharati in the doldrums today? Principals quarrel with principals, vice-principals quarrel with vice-principals and so on. And there is a state of chaos in that University. You should go into such matters. That is why I mention this particular fact.

(Time bell rings.)

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

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me finish, Sir. Therefore, it is not enough to just talk about indiscipline. What is more important is to expand the activities of the students and so on; have other activities, start cultural activities, union activities and so on; and behave with the students not as lords, not as their masters, but as one who shares their problems and sorrows with them. This is how the matter should be gone into.

As far as technical education is concerned, I will only say this much. More attention should be paid to technical education. We have heard that equipments are not available. But I know for certain that in the Hijli Institute of Technology and in the Dhanbad Institute, some good equipments are not being used. The coal-mine owners do not allow the students to go and make proper use of the instruments. They are lying idle. This is one thing. Secondly, the eastern region is supposed to be the most industrial region and there the development of technical education and the expansion of education in engineering and technological subjects have been less, it seems. This is another problem. These are questions to be gone into.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Malkani. Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have placed enough problems before the hon. Minister and I hope the hon. Minister will consider them and try to answer some of the points that I have made.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I have read the Report and on the whole, I have liked it, except for one part. But the part that I have liked, which is the major part, is not impressive, does not make what is called, attractive reading. I expected a touch of the Chairman of the Commission in this Report. There was some such touch in last year's report, but here there is hardly any such touch. It appears as if it was written by some

superintendent in the department and it reads as if A.B.C.D. was done, with a few figures added but nothing impressive in this Report. And it is not written with sufficient imagination and warmth. I expect warmth in a report on Education. This is not a report on Transport or Shipping, it is a report on Education and one expects something imaginative about it, something warm about it; but there is no such touch in it.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: You can't find it unless it is there.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: It is not there. You may find it, but I am a little more imaginative and . . .

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: I say, you can find warmth in the Report only if there is warmth in education.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, this is my general impression about this Report. I must say, however, that the Commission has attempted seriously to undertake the reorganisation of university education. It is a difficult task. It is a very heavy and an uphill task, as we found just now here. For instance, there is the three-year degree course and we have been hearing of it for many years, that it is coming. It has been coming and my hon. friend just now said that some eight universities have adopted it and eight universities are on the point of adopting it, and the rest are thinking about it. And there are about 40 universities in the country. This is progress, but it is not very enlivening or enheartening. It is just progress with which I have got to reconcile myself and if I get reconciled to it, there will be no more progress. This is a matter which does not stand by itself. It is connected and interlinked. University education is connected and interlinked with secondary education and secondary education is connected with elementary education. They all stand together. If universities practise the trick that they have been practising

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

all these years and sit upon secondary education heavily and if secondary education sits heavily on primary education, then primary education is crushed. They always sit upon somebody else. It is time they got up, time they stood up and walked on their own, not sitting heavily upon anything else.

Sir, it was a great surprise and an unpleasant surprise to me to see the President of the Vice-Chancellors' meeting in Jaipur the other day, talking in a manner in which if a Minister had talked, he would have been out of order; it was an act of indiscipline. He was discussing important points of policy. Basic education is a question of policy. It is not for a Chancellor or a Vice-Chancellor to talk of it and say, "this is cant and humbug". Well, he used the words "cant and humbug". I might say, he might look within and find something like it within himself. And that is why basic education does not make progress. It is these people in high seats who speak of cant and humbug and who say, I am humbug and I am cant, it is because of them that education does not make any progress. And I do think, Sir, that the time has come when discipline should begin not with the students so much as with the men at the top. If men at the top talk in this manner, then the man in the street will talk anything. Men at the top must be more responsible. They may not be responsive as I expect you to be very responsive. (Interruption.) Please do not interrupt me, I have only fifteen minutes. You are responsive, I must say, Sir. But I find others not responsive and not even responsible. This is an act of indiscipline. A man gets up there in an important position and discusses the whole policy of the Government about the three-year course, about basic education, etc., which are all matters of policy and rejects them. Just imagine, Sir; here is an educationist at the very top in our

own country, the President of the Inter University Board. See the other man, a layman there, the Governor, talking nothing but hard common sense. There is a little paragraph about indiscipline. It appealed to me; every line went into me and I felt, "Here is something convincing". Here are men who are real educationists and there are men, shall I say, make-believe educationists, counterfeit educationists. Re-organisation has begun and I am suggesting, that at the very high level, at the level of the University Grants Commission, educationists should come to an agreement and that agreement must be pushed forth. If the authorities find any obstacles or hindrances in the way, then the grants must be stopped or the grants must be reduced. The university must be treated as out of order for not following the policy of the Government. We have given too many concessions; we have been too weak-kneed about it. I know the University of Bombay does not want this thing at all for its own reasons. It is considered to be a very progressive and a very advanced university—the University of Bombay—but it is a very backward university from my point of view. This is a matter which has been taken up but I would rather feel that it should be taken up with verve, with a little vigour. If there is no response, action should be taken. There should be a kind of time limit, two years, three years or five years but if it is five years, then make it five years and not five and a half years.

What is a little disappointing to me is that there are a number of other urgent and important questions which are not mentioned in the Report. The question of numbers is there. It is there and to my mind, it is bound to be there and is bound to come up tomorrow when you are thinking of universal education. The numbers will bang at your door; if you do not throw open the doors, they will smash the door and come

in But there must be sifting properly done to such an extent that only those who are fit come up and are admitted to higher education Only the fit must be admitted At the same time, the universities must see to it—though this is what they say but do not practise—that the reshaping of the last two years of schooling is done in such a way as to make that stage both a finishing stage and a preparatory stage There should be a finishing stage at the age of 14, there should be another finishing at the age of 17 as well as diversification and preparation The universities have not done this up to now Look at the Rural Institutes for Higher Education They are all hanging in the air not because of you, Sir, but because of the universities which do not give them recognition These Institutes do not know where they stand “Are we graduates or not” is the question the students ask They are graduates, certainly much better graduates, but they do not have any recognition and they do not know where they stand, either on their head or on their feet The universities should give these Institutes recognition and they should be encouraged In fact the number of Rural universities should be increased and the urban universities should be glad to have them as it is All pupils getting into the primary stage begin to think that they are destined for the secondary stage, all getting into the secondary stage begin to feel that they are all meant for higher education and this is because the universities have always given very much high value, and to my mind an overestimated value, to the so-called university education Time has come when you have to think about it and allow only the very best in the higher field

The Report has said nothing about indiscipline among students and how to deal with it There is not a word about it which is satisfactory Take another case about which also I find

they are harping the autonomy of universities I like that word also. I myself wish for autonomy about my own activities, my way of thinking and way of doing Autonomy is good but isolation is not good, segregation is not good To my mind, our universities are segregated, isolated Are they in touch with the common man? Are they in touch with the intelligent man? Are they in touch with the needs of the people, of the nation? At the present moment, we are thinking of the Third Plan We had the First Plan, the Second Plan and now we are having the Third Plan Are they aware of the things in the Plan? There is the socialistic pattern of society The State is meant to be formed on a socialistic pattern Are they, in any way, introducing socialistic patterns within the universities? Are they working for this in their syllabi? Are the syllabi moulded towards a socialistic pattern of society? And yet, they talk of autonomy The professors have become minor politicians, mimicpoliticians, second-hand politicians, for getting into office, or for getting a little success but not for educational purposes For their own ambitions, they do not care for autonomy but when it comes to educational matters, they want autonomy I have cuttings of educationists and I keep them I value them I have a dozen newspaper cuttings but not one of them belongs to a Chancellor or a Vice-Chancellor I have got cuttings of Rajen Babu, I have got cuttings of Jawaharlalji, I have got cuttings of Radhakrishnanji and I have got cuttings of other people but not one of them is a Chancellor or a Vice-Chancellor Whenever such a person opens his mouth, I feel not only that I do not want to keep that cutting but I do not want to read even I ask, what is the age in which he is living? This is what is happening to education when educationists talk of things which are not education, quite the reverse of education and non-educationists talk of real education

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA How do you like the cuttings of the speeches of the Chancellors from . . .

SHRI N R MALKANI Not your cuttings.

I am afraid of the time bell and so I will cut down my speech. The University Grants Commission, I expected, would have laid down the aims and objectives of higher education. We should be clear in our minds as to the aims, as to what we mean by higher education. Ordinary education is for your livelihood, getting on in life and so on but when it comes to higher education, what is it that you want with higher education? What are its objectives? What kind of educated men do you really want in this country? There was a time when in England they said, "We want a fine gentleman." The emphasis was on sports, outdoor life, riskful and adventurous life, polished manners and so on. Later on that was changed in USA and they wanted a sharp businessman, hard-hitting, ruthless, hard-working, greedy, grabbing and competitive. That became the ideal of higher education and you had fine businessmen, sharp shopkeepers and industrialists. In Russia today, we have got what is called tough Communists. I do not mean any disrespect to you—though you are equally tough. They are very ruthless, very tough and also very clear about their educational ideals. They believe in science and, more than that, they believe in applied science and technology and today they give higher importance, give higher values and rewards to scientists and technologists and they pour in money like water for technological success. Their success is assured and I am certain they are going to lead in science and technology especially whatever America may think, I am perfectly sure about it. They will make excellent technologists and they cannot be easily overtaken. But are

we clear about what kind of man we want? I personally feel that man has two sides, physical and metaphysical. We in India were excellent metaphysical men before but today in this matter-of-fact world, we will not succeed very much with metaphysics and I think we will not succeed in physical sciences either. We have ignored them long, we must learn now. We may even know them but I do not think we are going to do anything original or distinguishing in physical sciences. But somehow I feel that we can do a great deal in a different way which is this. We can produce what is called a good neighbour, a kind neighbour is rather too much for this matter-of-fact world but a good neighbour will do. I feel, Sir, that there is an excellent precedent of compassion in Buddhism which we have since forgotten. Rukmini Devi knows what happens in India today. Buddhism, we say, excelled in psychology but then why can't we modernise our Buddhist psychology and why can't we change the bent of our mind and simply think along these lines? Let us not think of man and his relation to God. Let us also not worry about man and nature. Leave them to the West. We will be just second, third or fourth or just follow them in the race but let us think of man and man. We say that God is there in every man, in every human being and so, why can't we think of man and his relation to man? The world, to my mind, Sir, is today looking to India for guidance here. If we can, we should like to produce a social man, a kind man at least a neighbourly man. We know how to develop psychology, how to study it, how to think about it in that manner, for psychology comes to us naturally. We can teach a psychology of the good neighbour which means each giving and each sharing with all. To my mind, Vinobha Bhave has done us the greatest service by saying, "Here is man and here is society. Even the most precious things he has he does not want but wants to give and share with others. If the poor man can share out of his poverty the

rich can share of his superfluity. There are Americans who should share and share out of their surplus. There are Englishmen who can share and give much more. Why can't we make these men in education take up this attitude and impart education based on the psychology of sharing with others? We will train our boys with this ideal before us. Make a boy social, good, neighbourly, friendly; and if you do that in the universities, the thing may spread outside in the whole of India and from India to the world. This is a mission for India to my mind and this is the only way in which our educational system should be fashioned. And this Report does not in any way give me that flavour or that scent which one would like to see where the Chairman is Shri Deshmukh for whom I have great respect, who is a scholar, and more than that, who is a literary person, a man with imagination, and I hope he will import all these qualities in future Reports.

Thank you.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I happen to be the only member of the Commission who is a Member of this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And a signatory to the Report.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I shall have, therefore, while dealing with the problems raised in the Report to refer to the criticism of the working of the Commission that has been voiced by some hon. Members. When I read this Report I thought that the work of the Commission was of such a character that the Report would seem to be an inspiring document to everybody. This is not a Report, Sir, on a general educational question. This is an annual Report giving an account of the work done by the University Grants Commission in the course of the year 1957-58 and if you look at the Report from that point of view and consider the work done by it during the course of the year, I am sure that you will not fail to be struck by the devotion that it has

shown to the problems the solution of which had been entrusted to its care and the genuine effort made by it to win the co-operation of the universities in the great task that it has to perform. I shall not refer to the questions that were tackled by the Commission during the course of last year. I shall only refer to those questions with which it is still struggling to deal, for instance, the salaries of the teachers in the affiliated colleges, the co-ordination of standards, the reform of the examination system, the raising of the standards of education and attainments in the universities. Sir, these are not small problems and if sincere and hard work put in for the solution of these questions does not appear inspiring to any hon. Member . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I used the word 'impressive'; not "inspiring".

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Another hon. Member used the word 'inspiring'. If he does not find the Report either inspiring or impressive, I can only say that he has come to depend so much on general formulas and slogans and imagination that he has made it very difficult for himself to appreciate the value of concrete work done in connection with the problems which are crying for solution.

Sir, being aware of the work done by the Commission during the last, say, two or three years, I can say with some confidence that the greatest testimony to the work done by it lies in its creation of a new atmosphere in the universities. There was general frustration in the universities but they feel now that they can get funds for their future development and that the needs both of the teachers and of the students will be considered sympathetically and with a desire to do the best that the Commission can do in order to make our universities equivalent to the best universities in the world.

Sir, I shall now deal with some specific objections that have been urged by some hon. Members. The

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.]

Commission has adopted a thoroughly objective and impartial attitude in dealing with the request for assistance received by it from the universities. The hon. Dr. Kane complained of the disproportion between the grants received by the Central universities and those received by the State universities. Sir, if he will turn to page 28, he will find that the block grants to the Central universities amount to Rs. 1,38,00,000. The total sum received by the Central universities is about Rs. 1,65,00,000 and if we deduct from this amount of Rs. 1,38,00,000 received as maintenance grant, all that is left is a sum of Rs. 26 or 27 lakhs which the universities received for their development. There can be a comparison between the Central universities and the State universities in respect of the development grants given by the Commission, but not in respect of the maintenance grants because the maintenance of these universities is the responsibility of the Centre while the maintenance of the State universities is the responsibility of the State Governments that have established them. Now, if we look at it in this way, we find that the total development grant agreed to by the Commission amounted to about Rs. 1,90,00,000 and of this only about Rs. 25 or Rs. 26 lakhs have been received by the Central universities. The rest of the money has gone to the State universities. It is clear therefore that the University Grants Commission has—far from being partial to the Central universities—given perhaps more attention to State universities than it has to the Central universities.

Another point that was mentioned was that no reasons were given for the difference between the grants given to the various State universities. Obviously it is not possible to state in full why each university was given a particular sum granted by the Commission. The Commission receives requests for assistance from the various universities. It considers the schemes received from them; it appoints scrutiny committees and

visiting committees in order to find out to what extent the universities will be capable of carrying out the schemes drawn up by them and then decides what help should be given to each university. I think this is as good and as fair a procedure as could be adopted by any organisation like the University Grants Commission. My

hon. friend, Prof. Wadia, 4 P.M. said, with reference to the acceptance of the three-year degree course by most of the universities, that the impression that prevailed among the university authorities was that unless they agreed to the three-year degree course, they would get a step-motherly treatment from the Commission. How this impression has come to prevail, I do not understand. There are some universities which have not agreed to the three-year degree course, particularly the universities in the U.P. But their demands have not been rejected by the Commission. Nor has there been any desire on the part of the Commission to treat them on a different footing from that on which the other universities have been treated. I assure hon. Members in general and Prof. Wadia in particular that there is no basis in the policy or the work of the Commission for such an unfortunate impression.

My hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, said that while a great deal of attention was paid to the development of technology, which includes engineering, little importance was attached to the humanities.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, I did not say that.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I thought the hon. Member did.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My complaint is this that there is not enough attention being given to technological education such as engineering, whereas we are paying attention to humanities. It is the other way about.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Perhaps the hon. Member wanted to say this, but said the reverse of it.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: He did say it.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: But, however, if he realises that that is not a fact . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what he said.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: He says now that he meant to say just the reverse of that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He meant that greater attention should be paid.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: It is enough for my purpose.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think I should make it very clear—because I would not like to be misunderstood—that I want more attention to be paid to technological education and I pointed out the eastern region.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are right, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thank you, Sir.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Then, Sir, as regards the creation of new universities, my hon. friend, Shri Sapru, said that the University Grants Commission should not be allowed to decide whether new universities should be started in a State or not. Now, the University Grants Commission has never claimed the right to decide whether a new university should be opened in a State or not. But then the States also should realise for their part that the University Grants Commission, with its limited funds, should not be supposed to be under an obligation to go on supporting all the universities that the States start. To ask the University Grants Com-

mission to help all the new universities that are started is virtually to say to the Central Government that while it is the right and privilege of the State Governments to start new universities, it is the duty of the Central Government to go on providing the money required for their development. This is not a desirable position. All that is needed is more consultation between the University Grants Commission and the States and when there is this consultation I am sure that an agreement would be arrived at on most questions.

Lastly, I come to my hon. friend, Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar. Perhaps he is not in the House.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: He is there.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I am glad to see that he is there. He spoke about the medium of instruction in the universities. Now, Sir, the Committee whose Report has been accepted by the University Grants Commission and over which I had the honour to preside, never presumed to say that English should be the only medium of instruction in the universities. All that it said was that whatever the medium of instruction, our students must have an adequate knowledge of English. Without proficiency in English they would not be able to pursue their higher studies. But I have to ask my hon. friend, Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar, to go beyond the conventional ideas which seem to prevent him from thinking on fresh lines. It is very good to be a patriot, but it is better to think of the future, to think of how the lives of the young people who pass through the universities should be shaped. Have we any right to ask them to act in accordance with our fads and not care for the situations that they would be confronted with in future? And I say this on educational principles which have been invoked time and again in this House. It has been said that it is a simple educational principle, a fundamental educational principle that people can imbibe education

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.]
better through their mother tongue. But is it part of the duty of education or not to keep the country united? Is the maintenance of the unity of the country a more fundamental educational principle or not?

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Excuse me Sir. One does not conclude the other. You can have unity of the country by insistence on English and English is a vital necessity for national unity for a long time to come. At the same time, nobody prevents our regional languages from being developed. Nobody can prevent it. Both are possible under the Report. Is it not so?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The University Grants Commission is giving money to enable students to learn, apart from their own language, some other regional language.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One at a time.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: For the purpose of unifying the country.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, there must be some language in which the intelligentsia of the country can exchange its ideas. That language is at present English. An effort is being made to develop Hindi to take the place of English. I shall be very happy if Hindi is developed rapidly in order to replace English.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: In due course.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: But we all know that it will take some time for Hindi to develop to such an extent as to be in a position to express all those complex ideas of which the English language is the vehicle for us at the present time.

If we neglect English at the present time in the hope that 15 or 20 or 25 years later it will be replaced by

some other language, what will happen during the interval when there will be no language in which the educated people of the country will be able to express their ideas adequately and to know one another's thoughts?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Sir, he is dealing with what I said. English is necessary. Everybody accepts it. I accept it. But the medium of instruction need not be English. You have yourself said in your report that it should be in the regional language.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: If my hon. friend will listen to me for a minute more, he will understand why I have laid stress on the proper learning of English. So far as I understood, Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar said that it was necessary to learn English in order to be able to understand books, but that was the only purpose of learning English. I go further and say today that we must know English sufficiently well to be able to express our own ideas in it. It is not enough that we should understand ideas expressed in English by other people. It is also necessary that we should be able to express what is in our innermost minds and hearts in that language too. That is why, Sir, the University Grants Commission accepted the report of the Committee over which I had the privilege to preside. I do not think there is one word in that report which can be regarded as a derogation of the regional languages or as indicating the need for English being permanently used as the *lingua franca* of India.

Sir, I will finish very quickly. I shall set aside the objections that have been raised . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Regarding matching grants, I want to know whether you have laid down any conditions.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Matching grant means, that itself is a condition. The University Grants Commission will give a certain amount of money if the

State Governments and the universities provide an equal sum.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What I want to know from the hon. Member, since he is a member of the Commission, is that some State Governments, specially the West Bengal Government, say that they will give matching grants provided they are allowed to screen the teachers. This has resulted in the dismissal of some teachers, the stoppage of promotion to some, and the curbing of the freedom and other activities in the educational institutions concerned. Is the hon. Member aware of these things? If so, has the University Grants Commission acted in the matter?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The University Grants Commission has never done that. It is not within its province to do anything of the kind. As regards what Bengal is doing or any other State is doing, I do not know.

There are only two or three remarks that I should like to make with regard to the future work of the Commission. At present while the needs of humanities and science can be taken cognizance of by the University Grants Commission, it cannot give grants to medical and agricultural institutions. Medical education may lead to a profession, but so does law. Besides, all the subjects that are learnt by medical students are not of a special character. You take subjects like physiology and biochemistry which are being taught in the universities. I see no reason, therefore, why medical education should not be regarded as being within the scope of the Commission's activities. I say the same thing with regard to agriculture. The Institute of Agricultural Research in Delhi has been recognized as an institution with a right to confer degrees on the recommendation of the U.G.C. I see, therefore, no reason why the U.G.C. should be debarred from giving grants to such institutions, to agricultural and medical institutions. I think that

the sooner it is allowed to do so the better. I venture to say that there will be more research in the field of medicine at least if medical institutions are brought within the Commission's scope.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of secondary education. I do not want to repeat what has been said by others, but in view of the close connection between secondary and higher education, it is obvious that secondary education should not be allowed to become the concern only of the administrators in the Education Secretariat or of those engaged in secondary institutions. It is necessary that university people should be associated even with the formulation of principles relating to secondary education, and I venture to say that the Commission has had to consider this question several times. The hon. Minister will receive the resolution passed by the Commission at its last meeting which was held in Madras a few days ago, but I say for my part that I feel that the U.G.C. should be consulted in regard to the problems of secondary education, and I can go further and say that the experience of the Secondary Education Commission shows convincingly that what we need at the present time is a body which can give grants to selected secondary institutions in order that they might be further developed. What is the University Grants Commission doing with regard to affiliated colleges? It is not in a position to help all the 850 colleges that are in existence. It is making a list of the more important colleges. There may be 100 or 125 colleges in that list. It will first turn its attention to these colleges and try to develop them so that the standard of teaching there may rise and there may be more contact between the teachers and the taught there. Now secondary education can be developed in the same way. It will not be developed by commissions or committees enquiring merely into principles of education or syllabi or things like that. It will be developed only when there is an independent agency functioning in the impartial

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.]

manner that the University Grants Commission is doing and trying to help the important high schools and higher secondary schools in the country to raise themselves to a higher level so that the level of secondary education here may not be one whit less than it is developed, say, in England or in Scotland or in France or in Germany.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Then why do you insist on a three-year degree course until you have reached that stage?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The reason is this. The country needs highly educated men.

And we have highly educated men. The course of instruction has to be extended. You cannot wait to develop higher education till the secondary schools have come up to a much higher level. The need for educated men with good knowledge and a high calibre is immediate and urgent and something must be done to solve that problem. That is why we have taken up this thing. But we realise that the standard of the universities cannot be raised in isolation. Ultimately, the ability of the University Grants Commission to raise university standards will depend on the material that the universities will get from the secondary schools.

Lastly, I shall say about finance that I hope in the next quinquennium the Government will be much more generous to the Commission than it has been so far. If the affiliated colleges are to be helped, if education in the universities has to be developed in various directions and if the laboratories, libraries, etc. have to be increased and to be of a high order, more money will be needed. Government will hear soon from the Commission on that point. But, as the Minister of Education is here, I take the liberty of emphasising the urgent need in the interests of the country of placing a much larger sum of

money at the disposal of the University Grants Commission.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am calling the hon. Minister at five O'clock, extending the time by another half an hour.

Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt. Please take ten minutes each. I am sorry.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT (West Bengal): Sir, I appreciate the remarks made by the Minister of Education about the excellent work that is being done by the University Grants Commission in pulling up the universities to a certain standard. Particularly I appreciate the decision of the Commission to grant help to the affiliated colleges to increase the emoluments of the teachers of these colleges, which is an urgent necessity at the present moment.

It is a matter of regret—the hon. Minister has already referred to it—that the Commission experiences difficulty in securing matching grants from the States. Generally, the States have fixed up a certain amount for the universities and they are very unwilling to increase that figure because the States are committed to the other departments like police, food etc., education coming last. Whatever they spend on education, they want to spend more on primary and not on university education. The only way to get out of this is that the University Grants Commission should deal directly with the State Ministers rather than through the universities. Generally, universities do not get any hearing from the State Ministers.

I shall now touch the point of overcrowding in colleges. Most of the students are aimless. When they come to join a college, they start applying for science. If they do not get science, they take to arts. If they do not get art, they take to some other subject. The question is mainly of employment. The minister referred to this matter and I would

suggest that the Government should think of opening new avenues of employment. If the Government announces that there are so many avenues of employment for which candidates are needed in a year, I believe there can be a diversification of courses, and the students need not be quite so aimless as at present. There is a rush for science; there is a rush for technology; but the students do not know what their future will be. So, it is necessary that the Government should come out with some figures as to what the requirements will be each year for academic services, for technology or industries or for other services. If this is done, then there will be less overcrowding in colleges.

In this connection, I should like to say that commerce as a subject should be excluded from the university teaching. It is really a technical line and it need not be of a very high type. If we can eliminate the commerce subject from the university, then this overcrowding will be lessened. What we want is that the science students should also learn a bit of humanities for the scientists are equally interested in art, music and such other fine arts. We have generally made science and arts completely compartmental. A science student will take to science only and not touch arts and an arts student will study only arts and not touch science. It should be that the science student should study art and the art student should learn a bit of science. This is the system that is followed in some of the foreign countries.

In the modern teaching system, the university should take up only the higher forms of studies. It should not cater to the lower type of education. We have several colleges—arts, commerce as well as technology—which cater to a lower type of education. These, I think, should be converted into autonomous bodies offering diplomas and not aspiring to offer degrees. University degrees should be meant only for the

higher type of education. If we can separate them in that way there will be less of overcrowding in the colleges. If the colleges are given ample money by the University Grants Commission to make their both ends meet, I do not think any college will admit that number of students it is admitting now. It is only to meet the financial needs of the colleges that they usually admit more students than they can accommodate.

I want to say a word about the three-year degree course. Unfortunately, the University Grants Commission has said that it wants to push this three-year degree course though the schools are not yet ready to prepare the students for the eleventh class. Consequently boys will be in great difficulties in this transitional period of two or three years. As far as my experience goes, generally those boys who study in the tenth class and then one year in the preparatory class of the colleges do better in the competitive examinations that are being held for admission to the engineering or technological colleges. Therefore, those students who come out of the eleven-year course will get comparatively little chance in getting admission to these higher technical courses. This will be a great disadvantage to them. Unless this situation is remedied, I think we shall be doing a great disservice to the eleventh-year class students. At the present moment, students in the eleventh class do not see a laboratory. Their teachers are mostly recruited from the school teachers who are usually B.Sc.s, whereas even in the first-year class of colleges, the teachers are well equipped M.Sc.s and the colleges have got fairly good laboratories. The students who go to the colleges after the tenth class and who prefer the science course will be much better than the eleven-year students. Therefore, I would request the Government that they should insist that either all schools take up eleven-year courses and all colleges have three-year degree courses or follow the old system and not keep a *via media* of

[Dr. Nal-naksha Dutt.]

- a preparatory class. Just retain the ten-year class for five years more and then when the colleges and the schools are ready, you start the eleventh class. I think in this matter we are hurrying up.

I hope the Government will also not fix any age-limit. At present, there is no age-limit for the Matriculation examination. I find in the Report that there is an idea of putting an age-limit of 17.

Another way of reducing the pressure on the colleges is that the Government should prefer for class III or class IV posts only Matriculation-passed candidates. When they advertise for candidates, they should say that the minimum standard required is Matriculation and they should not allow the graduates or the I.As to sit for the examination. What happens is, for the post of a peon in the post office, a B.A. candidate applies. So also is the case with the police department. If the Government insists that for these lower categories of posts of class III and class IV only the matriculates will be allowed to apply, and that no B.As or M.As will be allowed to compete, I think, hundreds of boys will stop at Matriculation and not rush to the colleges.

I find that less and less attention is being given to the study of humanities. What is needed for the humanities is only a library, not a laboratory. The expenditure is not much. We should not neglect the study of humanities.

I notice from the Report that a Chair in Buddhist Studies has been created in the Delhi University. Unfortunately, in this University there is no library for this. Without a library, the study of humanities is meaningless. In Calcutta and in Santiniketan, there are very good libraries for Buddhist studies. But the Government has not been able to

lend their helping hand to these centres for the advancement of Buddhist studies. They have not provided a Chair in Buddhist Studies in these two Universities. I would request the University Grants Commission as well as the Minister of Education to see that they really help the progress of Buddhist studies in the centres where there are already arrangements for these.

The first necessity in the direction of advancing Buddhist studies now is to send out some teachers to Japan, China, Burma, Ceylon and countries in South-East Asia to study the Buddhist literature and the languages there. After studying those, after equipping ourselves with all the materials for Buddhist studies, the Chairs in Buddhist studies should be established.

Lastly I would only say that the salaries of the college teachers should be made attractive in comparison with the other services, in which better emoluments are offered by the Government or the industrial bodies. In foreign countries the profession of teaching is regarded as a highly respectable one. In U.S.S.R. the professors are aristocrats and they get as their emoluments nearly 5,000 to 10,000 roubles, and I hope some day will come when our teachers will be paid highly and they will have esteem in the society. Unless and until their emoluments are increased there will be very little attraction for brilliant students to take up the teaching line.

These are the few comments that I wanted to offer.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, an educationist who goes through this Report will be struck by a mixed feeling of pain and satisfaction, pain at the numerous obstacles placed in the way of our higher education and satisfaction at the commendable task done by the Commission despite these obstacles.

The Commission has attacked every conceivable problem of our higher

education. It has tackled the problem of maintaining the quality and standard of teachers, the problem of remodelling and improving the service of our libraries, the problem of students' welfare with such institutions as student homes, health centres, etc. But, Sir, going through the first few pages one will be struck with anxiety, anxiety that our university education is perhaps going to be bogged in the controversy over the question of language. The Members of the Committee on the Medium of Instruction appear to have yielded to the political pressure that has been going on persistently for dislodging English in favour of Hindi and the regional languages as the media of instruction even at the higher stages. English is going to be displaced, the language that gave us national unity. The picture that is presented by the Commission on page 3 is alarming indeed. Different universities are going to adopt different languages, Hindi and the regional languages, as media of instruction in the higher post-graduate stage and naturally also in the research stage. Perhaps our country is going to be reduced to a babel of tongues, cut off from the thought-currents of the world. Sir, I am not opposed to the promotion of Hindi or all our numerous regional languages. Let them be promoted by all means. Let even original works of research be done in Hindi and regional languages. But one language is necessary as the common medium of instruction at the higher studies; one language is necessary as the common link in our thought-currents and to link up these currents with the currents of the world. Sir, my concrete suggestion is that regional languages or Hindi be adopted as the medium of instruction up to B.A. pass stage and at the same time let English be reserved as a compulsory subject taught with special emphasis and care up to that stage. Beyond that let English remain as the medium of instruction. This necessity of retaining English will be very much evident as soon as we come to grips with practical problems.

The Commission has very rightly addressed itself to the question of improving and maintaining the qualifications of teachers. How can we standardise the qualifications of teachers? Well, by standardising the post-graduate degrees and research degrees. Teachers are recruited in the colleges on the merit of their degrees, and we cannot have standardisation of the teachers' qualifications if there are certain universities producing first-class B.A.'s. and M.A.'s. in abundance while there are other universities which are very strict and niggardly in the award of first-class degrees or diplomas. So there must be uniformity of standard in our degrees, whether post-graduate or research. How can this be done? One obvious way is to send all post-graduate examination papers or theses to external examiners, to examiners outside that university. Another way is to exchange teachers and professors between the universities. The M.A. examination papers of Calcutta University should be sent for examination by the teachers in Delhi or Madras, and again the M.A. examination papers of Delhi should be sent for examination by teachers in Madras and Calcutta. Similarly teachers of Calcutta should go to Delhi as visiting professors and teachers of Delhi should go to Madras and Calcutta as visiting professors. How can this be done if the different universities have different languages, if in Delhi teaching is rendered through Hindi, in Madras through Tamil and in Calcutta through Bengali? So to introduce and maintain any sort of standard in teaching qualifications and then again to maintain the integrity of our country it is very much essential that English be retained as the medium of teaching at the honours stage and at the post-graduate stage and research stage. Sir, it is so unfortunate that the emotion of patriotism has been mixed up with . . .

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): May I interrupt the hon. Member?

DR. A. N. BOSE: I cannot stand any interruption because the time you have allotted me is only fifteen minutes, and I have to cover a lot of things.

Sir, it is so unfortunate that the emotion of patriotism has been mixed up with this question of medium of instruction.

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. A. N. BOSE: There is another question involved in the standardisation of teaching and qualifications of teachers; it is the question of salary. You cannot have teachers of any decent standing or equipment unless you offer decent and stable scales of pay. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission is entitled to take pride that the revised scales of pay given by the Grants Commission has led to an enlivening of the spirits among the teachers. But this is only partially true. I find, Sir, that the money allocated for teachers in the universities and in the affiliated colleges by the Grants Commission is not consolidated with the pay drawn either from the university or from the college. It is shown as a sort of allowance, because neither the university nor the college can take the responsibility for regularly giving this additional increment. They are afraid that Government may sometimes stop the grant or sometimes may divert the grant from one project to another. So, they are advised to treat this additional emolument as a sort of allowance. I do not know whether provident fund deductions are made on the basis of the new scales of pay. Not everywhere perhaps. My point is this that the emoluments previously offered by the universities or by the affiliated colleges should be consolidated with the amount contributed by the University Grants Commission and shown as the basic salary.

Then I come to the question of research. Dr. Kunzru was going to answer the point which he thought Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had raised, but I am raising the point. There has been a very one-sided discrimination against humanities and social sciences in favour of scientific subjects so far as research is concerned. I brought this question before the House during the discussion on the first Report, but here in the second Report this discrimination appears to be more glaring. On page 6, under the head "Scholarship and Publication grants", we find that while for science subjects the Commission has decided to institute 100 post-graduate scholarships of Rs. 200 p.m., the number of corresponding scholarships for arts is only 64 of Rs. 100 p.m. Then, there are only 37 research scholarships of Rs. 150 p.m. in arts as against 100 post graduate scholarships of Rs. 200 p.m. for science. So, while in a post-graduate research scholarship the science student is given Rs. 200 per month, the art student is given Rs. 150 per month.

While there is provision for post-doctoral fellowships of Rs. 300 p.m. and Senior Fellowships of Rs. 500-600 p.m. for science subjects, there is nothing corresponding for arts subjects. I emphasise this point because we have been accustomed to hear so many homilies about importance of human studies, values of life, tradition of Indian culture and all that even from our Prime Minister.

About the three-year degree course, I shall make only a very brief reference. I am not going into the merits of the change. The only thing is that this tremendous change was adopted without sufficient preparation. I do not blame the Commission; it was thrust upon them because of the changing course introduced in the schools. The schools had to take up 11 years instead of the original 10 years' course without any syllabus. I know, Sir, in West Bengal this was started without any syllabus, and

hen the syllabus was framed, there were no text-books. When the text-books were written, they were quite out of the syllabus. Even now in many subjects like social sciences, text-books are out of the syllabus. I do not mind absence of text-books if there were qualified teachers. But here were no trained teachers because there were no training institutions. There were no reference books which the teachers could follow. This is how we have started. We have hustled with the eleven-year school course. And while the eleven-year school course is in complete confusion, has not taken any shape, we are building up the three-year degree course on the basis of this unstable foundation.

I shall end with a reference to student indiscipline.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: What do you suggest?

DR. A. N. BOSE: There is no time for suggestion. If the hon. Deputy Chairman gives me time, I will suggest. You should have taken time for stabilising the base and built up the superstructure on sound foundation. Do not hustle with it. Education is not a sphere in which you can afford to hustle.

Sir, I shall end with a reference to student indiscipline. Much has been said about political parties. They have been made a scapegoat, and I have been pained to find that even academicians like the members of the Commission should have cast a fling upon the political parties. I was even more pained when the hon. Minister made a reference to a political leader—whose words are not followed by a single student in the country—that they should jeer at the teachers in the class. I shall tell the House the reason for student indiscipline.

Firstly, it is the examination system to which a reference has been made by the Commission itself. Our

examination system is a gamble. It is not a test of merit. It gives scope to all sorts of malpractices. The invigilation system itself is a slur on the student community, it is a slur on the entire society; it cuts at the root of the ethics of an academic institution. Sir, I very much appreciate that the Commission has recommended the revision of the examination system and the substitution of examinations by seminars and tutorials. Let that be done very early.

Next comes over-crowding. We are told by the Commission that within a few months we are going to have one million students. Sir, with 39 universities—while we require 200—imagine what sort of overcrowding exists in our institutions. Then there is the deplorable sub-human level of existence among the students. There was an enquiry undertaken by the Calcutta University where it was found that 70 per cent. of the students come from houses with Rs. 30 or below as *per capita* income. Imagine what kind of conduct we should expect from them under these circumstances. Then, there is the prospect of unemployment after they come out of the Universities.

Sir, last but not the least comes the corruption and factionalism in governing bodies of the institutions, even in our universities. I shall cite one single instance to clarify this point. Reference has been made in the Report as also in the House to the recent student strike over the enhancement of their fees. What happened? Overnight students found that their fees had been increased by Rs. 2, Rs. 3 or Rs. 4. They made protests. Very peacefully, very lawfully they approached the Governing Bodies; they approached the Principals; they approached the Vice-Chancellor and the Chief Minister. Nothing doing. And, then they came out on the streets, led processions, interrupted academic activities, besieged the Senate meetings and things were set right within five minutes.

[Dr. A. N. Bose]

over the phone. With a little imagination, with a little foresight, with a little affection towards the students, I think, 70 per cent of the problem of student indiscipline can be solved. The remaining 30 per cent. can be solved only if you improve the condition of the students. Let the Ministry and the Commission address themselves to this task

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

DR A N BOSE I shall conclude within a minute with a reference to what the Commission said on page 11 of its Report:

"There is an insufficient appreciation in this country of the role of higher education in the development of the nation."

I think this be better addressed to the Government. Not to the Education Ministry. I am in full sympathy with the Minister of Education who has tried his level best to come to the aid and rescue of the Commission. I am addressing to the Ministry of Finance who were responsible for putting hindrance in the way of planning and development.

Reference has been made by the hon Minister to the lack of cement, lack of building materials, etc. (Time bell rings.) Sir, even cinema houses are coming up, but there is scarcity of the same material for university buildings. Without blaming the students, the public and the political parties, the Ministry and the Commission should look at the affairs in the universities and in our academic institutions and rectify the evils there.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, even if during the last few minutes I have the opportunity of addressing the House I would like to express a few words about the work

of the University Grants Commission particularly as I have had a great deal to do being connected with one of the youngest universities in the country. I am particularly inclined to mention this because there was a lot of reference to students in this House and about difficulties of housing of students. I would venture to suggest the example of the university built up in a short period of 9 years by a retired engineer with the help and co-operation of the people—co-operation is what my friends on the other side are now harping upon so much with the co-operation of people. A university was built up in the space of 9 years, with hardly any assistance from the State. The university was built up on a new pattern, a university that will completely change the outlook particularly of the rural people of this country. I am happy to say that when Dr. Deshmukh and the other officers of the University Grants Commission came and saw the work there, perhaps the most sympathetic words that were ever received by this poor institution were from the University Grants Commission. Unlike other departments of Government from whom we have only difficulties, we received a word of encouragement from the University Grants Commission and as a result of that the university is going to benefit. But just as what was a loss of the Finance Department of the Government of India has become an advantage of the Education Department particularly the University Grants Commission in the personage of Dr. C. D. Deshmukh, after the work of building up this university and after large grants have been sanctioned by the University Grants Commission and their officers have scrutinised the proposal when the money was about to come, once again politics came into play and it is going to be somebody else, somebody who does not know what is education, who is going to be the Vice-Chancellor who would deal with it. I hope the University Grants Commission, and the Vice-Chancellors

themselves who are meeting at Chandigarh at the present moment will pay attention to this serious problem. We talk of the problem of universities, of letting them develop in their own way. I am entirely for that. I do not believe in regimentation at all in any walk of life. Regimentation will kill life. Just as you do not want a student to be regimented from early age and you advocate Montessori method of education, similarly a university must be allowed to grow its own way. That cannot happen if people are thrust on the top of a university because they are politicians, because they have no other occupations and some places have to be provided for them, as has been done unfortunately in this university.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: On a point of information, I want to know whether the University Act prevents the appointment of a politician as a Vice-Chancellor to which a pointed reference has been made by my hon. friend Shri Patel

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: For the benefit of my hon. friend I may say that while technically the University Act provides for this, the Chief Minister of Bombay, not more than two years ago when he visited this spot, assured the workers there that nothing would be done at this University without taking the advice of the Vice-Chancellor, Shri Bhailalbhai, who built up this University for this rural area. Now, Sir, where is that assurance of the Chief Minister? I also want to know why the process of appointment of Vice-Chancellors in other areas is different from that of the Bombay State? Why do not you have a uniform practice? For instance if the University of Poona is able to send up names for selection of a Vice-Chancellor and before Government selects, two of the persons withdraw their names leaving Government no choice but to appoint the person who is nominated by the University, why not the same policy here, where you

oppose somebody who has built up the University without any money from Government, without any assistance from the State Government? That is what I complain against. This is trying to regiment a university, which has been built up without regimentation. It is a crime on education and I hope the University Grants Commission will speak against it.

Sir, in this University methods have been developed to utilise local available material, the least amount of cement or steel has been asked for. In fact there were years when nothing was available. Yet this University has been built up. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission has recognised this work of the Vice-Chancellor and taken him on the Building Committee of the University Grants Commission because he sees that here is a man who knows how to advise a university on its buildings, who knows how to make buildings cheaper and better. Therefore, Sir, it is because of that that I could not allow this opportunity to go without speaking on this matter.

There are two points in the Report particularly which worry me. On page 20 of the Report it is said: "We should like also to receive encouragement from the Government to go all out to meet the multifarious needs of Universities" I am afraid this shows a suspicion, that the Chairman of the University Grants Commission is not sure that the Government is going to give all the money that is required by the University Grants Commission. I heard the assurance that the Minister gave but, after all, it is the Finance Minister who gives the grants. He is not the Finance Minister. Is he in a position to assure the House on behalf of the Finance Minister that the University Grants Commission is going to get all the money that it needs? The education of the country, particularly university education, is in safe hands as long as Shri C. D. Deshmukh is the Chairman of the University Grants Commission and I am sure he will have

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

the support of all sides of the House in the great work that is being done but what is the view of the Finance Minister? We have not heard anything about it and I would like the Minister in his reply to assure us that he has the assurance of the Finance Minister that all the grants that would be required and demanded by the University Grants Commission will be given.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Wait for the Budget, Sir.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Well, I hope I would have my opportunity to speak on the Budget also.

But there is another distressing factor that I would like to point out. On pages 18 and 19 there is mention about the essential requirements of the universities in the matter of equipment for which import licences are required. Now, Sir, it is most distressing to see Professors, Vice-Chancellors and Heads of educational institutions having to go from door to door in the Import Control Department. Need I say in this House and in this city what the reputation of that Department is and how licences are given and how people get licences and what methods they employ to get licences? Are our University Professors, Vice-Chancellors and Heads of educational institutions also expected to employ such means in getting import licences? The experience is to the contrary. Licences are not given. I am sure that the Chairman of the University Grants Commission has pointed this out in the Report. This is an unusual experience and it is high time the Government remedy this defect if they really have the education of the country at heart. Of course this regulation also is an indirect means of regimentation. My fear is, and particularly after the new policy that the Congress has enunciated, our life is going to be regimented on all sides and where we talk of

giving freedom to universities, the idea is to regiment the universities and the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor at this University is one such example. I do not know what else is going to come.

I am very glad that the University Grants Commission has laid down its policy on English. In the State of Bombay we have been the greatest sufferers. There has been no policy for nine years. Once this State was supposed to be the best State, and education in Bombay State was supposed to be of a high order.

Suddenly we reversed our 5 P.M. gear and we went back to the teaching of the regional language. I welcome that. But along with the teaching in the regional language, the teaching of English up to the high school stage was prohibited. This was a great crime. It is a crime on the coming generation. I had to do a great deal with a commercial institution. I got applications from students, both from the University of Gujarat and from the University of Maharashtra, studying in commercial institutions in Bombay. As soon as the student came he was put to a test and he failed in that elementary test in English for being taken as a clerk, because he was not taught in English. But commercial institutions run their business in English because it is in English that the laws of the country are administered. And these institutions have to conform to the law. So that is the disability to which the students coming from these universities from this area have been put. Much less, Sir, can a student who has not studied English up to Matriculation cope up with his studies if he goes to a technical college or if he goes for medicine? And I don't know what these students would do in law and what would happen to their clients if they started practice without knowledge of English. I am very glad, the University Grants Commission has also crystallised opinion on this matter. Perhaps, that is the reason why the Government of

Bombay has also—at least partially—changed its policy in this matter and more and more universities and teaching institutions and high schools in the State of Bombay, have now started introducing English as an additional subject. While it is called an additional or optional subject, teachers are going all out to encourage the students, particularly those students who have an idea of going into technical institutions, to take advantage of the tuition in English that is being given now.

(Time bell rings.)

I would have liked to say much more, but you have limited my time. I have made the main points that I wanted to make, though I would have liked very much to elaborate many other points. But since there is no time, I will bow to your ruling.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Regimentation again.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am glad you support me, sometimes.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the first place, I would like to thank the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and who have made many valuable suggestions. I am quite sure the Ministry of Education as well as the University Grants Commission will give full consideration to the various suggestions that have been made. To my mind, the creation of the University Grants Commission was one of the most important and significant steps in the field of education that has been taken after independence. And the way in which the University Grants Commission has worked has vindicated the step that the Government had taken.

Sir, the most important feature of the work of this Commission is that they have established cordial relationship not only with the Government of India, but with the State Govern-

ments as well as the universities. The Commission is working in an atmosphere of cordiality. There is no coercion. They do not try to force the universities to do anything unless they are convinced about certain steps and certain measures. There is consultation and there is persuasion and I am glad to say that during the last few years that it has been in existence, the Commission has done an admirable job. My hon. friend Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar was apprehensive that if the State Governments placed their funds at the disposal of the Commission there would be interference and the whole thing would be strongly resented by the State Governments. Sir, I cannot understand why there should be any fear or apprehension on that point. The Central Government have placed funds at the disposal of the University Grants Commission and have receded into the background, and I am glad that this has been done. Similarly, as far as development programmes are concerned, the University Grants Commission is facing a serious difficulty. They formulate the schemes and then they find that on account of lack of matching funds, they are not able to make much headway. Therefore, the suggestion which I made, I don't think was so fantastic or so absurd as to make my hon. friend Mr. Chettiar to think that the State Governments would take strong objection to it. In fact, the suggestion should be welcomed by the State Governments and the universities, because we shall be able to develop our universities more speedily. Again, in this matter we have no power to coerce the State Government. We can only make suggestions to them, and request them to play their part in the development of the State universities. The State universities are really the responsibility of the State Governments and the Central Government through the University Grants Commission is giving liberal grants for development purposes, and it will be a great pity if they cannot find their share and the universities suffer on that account.

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

My hon. friend Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar has moved an amendment with regard to the development of the regional languages. There has been two extreme opinions on that subject. On the one hand, my hon. friend. Dr. Bose has suggested that at least for the post-graduate and research work, English should always continue as the medium of instruction and the medium of work. On the other, my hon. friend Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar has said that we are not going fast enough and that the University Grants Commission should take immediate steps to produce literature so that the regional languages might become the media of instruction. In fact, he went to the extent of saying that all the evils that exist in the educational system today, the lowering of academic standards, the failures in the examinations, were all due to the fact that English continued to be the medium of instruction. Well, I am afraid, I do not share that view with him, though I am in sympathy with the object that he has in view. The University Education Commission over which Dr. Radhakrishnan presided, had recommended that higher education should be imparted through the instrumentality of the regional language with the option to use the federal language as the medium of instruction either for some subjects or for all subjects. So as far as the principle is concerned, Government have accepted the principle that higher education should be imparted through the regional languages. The question is whether we are ready to switch over to the regional languages. A good deal of spade work has to be done. Text Books in regional languages will have to be written and translated. And let us not have a false sense of patriotism about this matter. I think I am in agreement on this subject, but language is an instrument for achieving a certain objective, and not an end in itself. At present, when we are trying to build science and technology in this country, the lowering of standards in English will be detrimental, and it will be a

retrograde step and not a forward step. We should be clear about it.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): May I put a question to the hon. Minister of Education?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Let me finish. I like the regional languages to take their due place in course of time and the regional languages should be the media of instruction and in principle that is agreed. That recommendation was made by the Radhakrishnan Commission and the Government of India have accepted that principle. This is a sound educational principle and we are doing everything that is possible. The University Grants Commission recently have set up Chairs for other languages in the Hindi-speaking areas. Similarly, they are anxious to support schemes for the development of the regional languages. But the whole question is whether we are ready to take this up immediately. And I think on this matter the sound advice which has been given by the Kunzru Committee and which has been accepted by the University Grants Commission, should be acceptable to the country also, that in this matter undue haste might bring ruin to us.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Don't hasten slowly, but slowly hasten.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, that is agreed. Dr. Kane I think, made a point and he was quite right in saying that unless we improved secondary education, all the reforms that we bring about in university education will lead us nowhere. That point was made by Dr. Wadia also and I think by Dr. Bose too. Sir, on this matter I am in entire agreement with them. Secondary education and university education are both interdependent and unless we have better university education, we cannot have better teachers for our secondary schools, and unless we have better secondary schools, naturally we cannot produce better candidates for the universities. As far as the three-year degree course

s concerned, there were many Members—Prof. Wadia and I think Dr. Bose also—who said that we have taken this step in haste. This is far from the truth. The whole question has been debated for the last nearly 40 years and the recommendation was made both by the University Education Commission and the Secondary Education Commission.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Only the necessary preparations were not made; that is what I said.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The question was discussed at the Education Ministers' Conference and then the Deshmukh Committee went into the whole question very thoroughly and they prepared estimates as to how much it would cost for the change-over to the three-year degree course, and funds were provided both with the University Grants Commission and with the Ministry of Education. And now we are in mid-waters. It is no use saying that we must go back and that this was a rather hasty step. The whole thing, as I said, was thoroughly discussed, discussed by the Inter-Universities Board, discussed by the Education Ministers in the Education Ministers' Conference and discussed by the Universities. And the recommendation was made by such important bodies as the University Education Commission and the Secondary Education Commission and the Government have now taken a step for implementing that recommendation. Sir, most respectfully I would like to submit that in this matter there is now no going back; we have to move forward. And I am glad that some of the universities have already implemented this programme. The remaining universities have accepted this in principle. There are only one or two universities which have not accepted this but I hope they will also accept it and we will be able to have a uniform pattern in the whole country.

Sir, reference was made by some Members that the University Grants Commission was not consulted before

starting new universities. This point has already been answered by Dr. Kunzru and I would not like to repeat it. The State Governments are quite free to start their own universities and the Central Government or the University Grants Commission cannot do anything to prevent them from starting new universities. But if they ask for funds, it is only desirable that, since funds are limited, they refer the matter to the University Grants Commission. If this convention is not accepted it creates great difficulties. For example, in regard to a Sanskrit University, the University Grants Commission were definitely of the opinion that Sanskrit Universities should not be started, that one Faculty universities do not do much justice to the broad educational programme in which the universities should be interested, but in spite of that the Sanskrit University was started and if they then come forward and blame the University Grants Commission that they are not getting full justice or they are not getting grants, it is hardly fair. Therefore I hope that the State Governments, before they undertake new ventures, will take the University Grants Commission into confidence.

Prof. Wadia made a reference with regard to the appointment of Vice-Chancellors. That point was made by Mr. Patel also. I do not want to go into the merits of the case, but I am in full agreement with the principle that Vice-Chancellors should not be appointed on political grounds. They should be appointed on account of their academic ability, on account of the position which they occupy in public life and on account of their administrative ability. I consider the position of Vice-Chancellor as one of the highest positions in public life and if we want the universities to flourish, if we want the universities to grow and maintain their academic freedom, it is necessary that the Vice-Chancellors should be men of the highest repute, the highest academic and administrative ability.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Bombay): It was on this very basis

[Shri Deokinandan Narayan.]

that the new Vice-Chancellor was appointed.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am only enunciating the principle; I am not going into the case.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Will the Minister be pleased to advise the State Governments to do so?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: We have already . . .

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: There was no question of advice. It was done on this very basis.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Then, Sir, I am sorry my hon. friend, Mr. Gupta, is not here. I always listen with great respect to what he says, but I am afraid today either he has not fully read the Report or he was not fully informed. He made many statements which have absolutely no basis. He said that the Government of India have no clear-cut policy or the University Grants Commission has no policy with regard to university education. I must say, I am amazed at the statement which he has made. There is the report of University Education Commission; there is the report of the Secondary Education Commission. The educational policies have been enunciated by these commissions and there is no question of enunciating new policies; we are trying to implement those policies and programmes and I think nobody in the country would agree with Mr. Gupta that today we do not have a clear picture of the national pattern of education. We are in the process of implementing the programmes and we are gradually moving towards our goal. So it is wrong to say that there are no clear-cut policies.

Then he said that the Central Government were shirking responsibility in the field of education. Sir, the Central Government have taken more

responsibility in the field of education than in any other field. That is my contention. We are giving grants for free primary education; we are giving grants for the improvement of secondary education; we are giving grants for the improvement of affiliated colleges and universities and certainly nobody who knows our Constitution would say that we are shirking our responsibility. In fact, we have taken responsibility for the subjects for which we do not have a direct responsibility and I am happy that we have done it. I would like the Central Government and the Ministry of Education to take greater and greater responsibility as far as education is concerned.

Well, Sir, Mr. Gupta also said that we were doing nothing with regard to poor students. I would like to inform him that today the Government of India are spending Rs. 2,25,00,000 for scholarships to Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe and other Backward Classes students. All eligible students among Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes who can manage to pass the examination get a full scholarship and maintenance grant from the Government of India. Sir, I am happy that we are doing it. Let us not minimise the work that the Government of India are doing in this direction. Apart from that, the Government of India have instituted merit scholarships. We are giving scholarships to deserving poor students who are meritorious and who on account of financial stringency cannot proceed to universities. The number is limited but I hope that in course of time we can expand that scheme and give scholarships to a larger number of students so that economic barriers do not stand in the way of poor and deserving students receiving the highest education in the country.

Sir, I was surprised because he made several statements which had absolutely no basis. He is not here now. With regard to salaries of teachers he said that the State Governments were not implementing the

schemes. I would like to inform him that by the end of the year 1958 all universities—except Baroda and Venkateswara—which had lower scales of pay for teachers and which were in receipt of grants from the Commission have implemented the recommendation of the Commission in regard to the revised scales of salaries for university teachers and have agreed to bear 20 per cent. of the increased expenditure for this purpose; all universities except the two universities of Baroda and Venkateswara. These two have not been able to accept the responsibility for meeting the 20 per cent. of the increased cost but I hope that in the near future these two universities would also come forward and agree to this because in our opinion it is most important that we pay adequate salaries to teachers in schools and universities so that they can carry on their academic work without day to day anxiety.

I would also like to inform Mr. Gupta that during the second Five Year Plan the following amounts have been paid by the Commission to the universities for improving the salary scales of teachers. In 1956-57 it was Rs. 2,89,349/1/-. In 1957-58, it rose to Rs. 7,32,869/26 nP. Of course, these figures do not include the grants that were paid to the four Central universities. I would further like to inform him that the Commission has also prepared a scheme under which funds are made available for the revision of scales of pay of teachers in affiliated colleges on the basis of the State Government|University|College concerned sharing 50 per cent. of the increased expenditure in the case of men's colleges and 25 per cent. in the case of women's colleges. And I would like to inform him that the State Governments, Universities and Colleges have since agreed to provide their share of the expenditure for the implementation of the scheme. There are nearly 14 such universities which include the University of Calcutta also.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Sir, on a point of

information, the colleges run directly by the Government are left out from the purview of the Commission and thus works as a hardship in the case of particular States. May I know if the Government and the University Grants Commission would reconsider this matter?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I can reply to that question. The Commission has not helped people who are in Government service. It is the business of the Government to help their own servants. If the Kerala State wants that its professors should be helped, then they should not be servants of the Government. There must be university autonomy. That University must be in the same manner as the other universities. Otherwise, the University Grants Commission cannot be expected to help it.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Kerala having taken the initiative in collegiate education earlier, why should the professors be penalised for that? That is what it comes to.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Why should they be penalised for the omissions or commissions of the Government?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The money given to the University Grants Commission is not for increasing the salary of Government servants.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It is discrimination between a professor working in one college and another college.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: It is not our business to fix the scale of those professors. The hon. Member should understand that.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On a point of order, may I know whether Dr. Kunzru has been appointed by the University Grants Commission to answer questions for them in this House?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is only explaining it. There is no point of order.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Dr. Kunzru made a point with regard to the University Grants Commission giving grants for medical and agricultural education also. Well, Sir, the U.K. Grants Committee has a practice that all kinds of education come under its purview, that is, medical education, agricultural education, technical education and general education.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: On a point of order, normally on a motion like this, the mover gets only 15 minutes to reply. Not more than that. That is the convention.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no such rule so far as such resolutions are concerned. I am allowing him time.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I may assure the House that I do not want to detain the House longer.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: We want to listen to the Education Minister.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It is going beyond five o'clock.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This practice has been prevalent in the U.K. and I think it would be a very healthy practice if all kinds of education, professional as well as general education, including medical and agricultural education, comes under the purview of the University Grants Commission. In fact, some time back we had taken up this matter with the Health Ministry and the Ministry of Agriculture and we have not been able to convince them about the necessity of transferring the funds, whatever they have at their disposal, to the University Grants Commission. But we shall continue to make that effort and, in my opinion, this is a very sound and healthy practice.

Another point which was raised by Dr Kunzru was with regard to the

reorganisation of secondary education. In this connection I would like to point out that as far as the Central Government are concerned, we have to work through the State Governments. As far as the University Grants Commission is concerned, they can deal directly with the universities and there is no difficulty. But as far as the secondary education is concerned, I do not think we could set up a kind of independent Commission or independent Board which would deal directly with the high schools or higher secondary schools, of which there are thousands in this country. From our experience in the past, I feel that whatever work we do, we must do in close collaboration with the State Governments. And I hope the way in which we are trying to reorganise the whole pattern of the Secondary Education Council in the Central Government, will help in promoting better relations between the State Governments and the Central Government and will be more effective in helping the State Governments in the reorganisation of secondary education. I am in full agreement with all Members who have said that the reorganisation of secondary education is vital not only for university education but for the country as a whole. The majority of the people will complete their education at the secondary stage and it is most important that the education which they receive in secondary schools should be of such a type that it not only prepares them for vocations but also they get a broad training in citizenship and understand their social responsibilities.

I am afraid I do not agree that any kind of political pressure has been brought on the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission consists of people who would resist all kinds of political influence and certainly in the matter of language we have given full freedom to the University Grants Commission. The universities can chalk out their own programmes. So, Dr. Bose, I think, was not quite justified

in making that remark that the University Grants Commission has also been led into this belief because of certain political pressure. He also said that the University Grants Commission was making some discrimination against the humanities. I would like to say that this has happened on account of certain misunderstanding and the University Grants Commission. I understand, is already reviewing the whole position, with regard to the scholarships which have been granted.

These are the main points. I know that the University Grants Commission has had to pass through very difficult times, but I think we can face the future with great hope and faith.

Thank you. *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you accepting the amendment?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: No, Sir. I would request Mr. Chettiar to withdraw his amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chettiar.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I was thinking that he was going to give us an assurance on this matter that he was going to forward it to the University Grants Commission for their consideration.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have already said that all the suggestions which have been made by hon. Members—this and other suggestions also—will be fully considered by the University Grants Commission and the Ministry of Education and I would request the hon. Member not to press his amendment.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

*The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

*For text of amendment, vide col. 2069 *supra*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The discussion is concluded. There are two messages.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

I. THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959.

II THE PARLIAMENT (PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION) BILL, 1958.

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

(I)

"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, 1959, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th February, 1959.

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

(II)

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that the following amendments made by Rajya Sabha in the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1958 at its sitting held on the 18th December, 1958, were taken into consideration and agreed to by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on Tuesday, the 24th February, 1959:—

Clause 3

(1) That at page 2, line 21, the words 'which is an advisory body' be deleted.

(2) That at page 2, lines 37-38, the words 'director or member' be deleted.