

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

cerned because that constitutes a very important matter. I wish this problem was gone into a little thoroughly in the speech by the hon. Minister as well as by the University Grants Commission in its Report. It seems that they have by passed the whole issue. They have mentioned it because no one can talk about education in our country until and unless he has a word or two to say about the lot of the teachers. At the same time, there has been talk. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir, I will continue after lunch.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will continue after lunch but only for five or ten minutes, not more. There are a number of speakers.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1958

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

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1958, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd April, 1958.

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

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

#### REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION—continued.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, before the House adjourned I was just referring to the question of the salaries of the teachers. Now, Sir, it is well known that in our country the college teachers do not get what is called even a proper living wage commensurate with the standard of life. I would only refer to some old documents and in this connection the first thing that I would like to refer to is the publication of the Government of India "Universities in India—1949-50." According to that publication 67 per cent. of the teachers of the affiliated colleges were getting between Rs. 100 and Rs. 150 per month; only one per cent. was getting—one per cent of the teachers of the affiliated colleges as well as the universities taken together—was getting over Rs. 150. That was in the beginning of independence, when the Republic came into existence. Since that time there has been little improvement in this respect, and to-day you find in West Bengal, for example, that the majority of the college teachers of the affiliated colleges do not get even Rs. 150. Their normal salary on an average comes to Rs. 125 to Rs. 150. Most of the teachers in the affiliated colleges, the sponsored colleges as well as other Government colleges taken together fall in the category of Rs. 125 to Rs. 350. Now, as I have stated the majority of them get less than Rs. 150. This is the position with regard to their salary. I can give certain other facts. You will find that in the City College of Calcutta, in one department there are 197 teachers, out of whom 169 get less than Rs. 200 . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: May I remind my hon. friend . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . and 78 get less than what the chauf-

feurs of the West Bengal State Ministers get. This is the position.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: May I remind my hon. friend that the Central Government has not taken the entire responsibility of the universities? Under the Constitution the State Government has a major responsibility. It is only with regard to the determination and co-ordination of standards that the Central Government comes into the picture, and all this criticism which he is making really should be made in the Bengal Legislative Assembly rather than in this Parliament. I would, therefore, like to remind the hon. Member that the State of West Bengal has the major responsibility in this matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never thought, Sir, that the lights of information had been extinguished in the Ministry of Education in New Delhi. After all it is well known that the University Grants Commission is supposed to find and apportion all the money which is to go to augment the salaries of the college teachers. It is also partially their responsibility. If the State Governments do not discharge their responsibility it is all the more incumbent on the Government of India to share their responsibility.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only four universities are Central universities.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. I understand Education is a State Subject, but the arrangement is here. The University Grants Commission at page 23 of its Report has laid down a scheme for the salaries of college teachers. Now their proposal is that part of the money required for augmenting their salaries should be found by the State Governments, by the universities or the institutions, and part will be found by the University Grants Commission out of the allocations made by the Government of India. Am I right or am I wrong, I would like to know from the hon. Minister?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So far you are right.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If I am right then please hear the story.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What he says is that the State Government must come forward to implement that scheme. Then they will bear their share . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now I am coming to that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And the Calcutta University is a subject in which the Bengal Legislature is primarily interested.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, I am not at the moment speaking on the floor of the Bengal Legislature, but I am speaking in the sovereign Parliament of India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what he is objecting to. It is more relevant in the Bengal Legislature.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, it is relevant here also, and I will tell you how it is relevant. The University Grants Commission made the scheme and placed it before the West Bengal authorities and the colleges. This scheme has not been implemented, I agree, by the State Government or by the institutions there. Am I to understand that this University Grants Commission or the Central Government have to sit with folded hands when they go on flouting the scheme laid down by the Central Government? Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Education Department of the Government of West Bengal has scuttled almost every move in order to increase their salary? If so, what steps are they going to take? Sir, money is given to them in order that that money may be profitably utilised for increasing the salaries of the college teachers. Now we know that there are only four Universities under the Centre and the rest belong to the States. If the States fail to discharge their responsibility, not only the State

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

is accountable for the failure but the Government of India with its University Grants Commission is also answerable at least to some extent.

Now, Sir, I would like to point out in this connection that one of the complaints has been that some of the States are not in a position to find the matching grants and it is for that reason that the money available from the Government of India could not be utilised. I do not wish to go into this question in detail. If for any reason any State requires a little more money from the Central Government, that money should be given and the University Grants Commission should, if necessary, earmark that for the particular State so that the teachers do not suffer. But there is a lot of hide-and-seek between the State and the Centre, and when one commits a crime, there is a tendency on the part of the other to shield the crime. We are not for all this sort of thing. We want an assurance from the Government of India that the salaries of the West Bengal college teachers will be increased. Sir, it is all the more regrettable that a Syndicate Committee was appointed and that this committee could not do anything because of the most unsympathetic, irrational, illogical and unhelpful attitude on the part of the West Bengal authorities. I would like to know as to what they are doing. If they are short of funds let them pay more money to the West Bengal State Government and if the West Bengal State Government is not implementing the plan, then the Central Government should step into the picture. I do not want the University Grants Commission to make an announcement and then allow its decision to go by default. I do not want a caricature of such administrative responsibility. What I want is a powerful body, a University Grants Commission manned by the proper type of people, armed with necessary powers, equipped with finance, which can step into the picture, not only in order to remedy the grievances that are there but also to take the initiative. Leadership, I am afraid, is lack-

ing on the part of the University Grants Commission, not that the members of the Commission are men lacking in leadership but there is something which is standing in the way and that is the Central Government and its unkind and illogical policy.

We have here the hon. Minister speaking on the floor of this House and telling the public through this House that they want the number of students to be reduced. What kind of culture are we promoting when we say the number of students should be reduced? The number should be increased. Sir, this is the position. Now the Radhakrishnan Commission and others have all said that talents are to be retained. How are we to retain the talents? The talents go away to the Central Services, the Provincial Services and the big firms. The talents are not retained and invited into the temples of learning, into the educational institutions by offering them the proper scale of salary. This is the position. Can you expect a teacher to fulfil his function in these days of high cost of living with a salary of Rs. 125 or Rs. 150? I know of many lecturers who go out of their homes early in the morning and teach in three colleges in succession and return at night when they are fatigued and tired. How are we to ensure that these teachers will have ample time to develop themselves, to qualify themselves, to train and equip themselves more and more so that they can fulfil their responsibility and play their role well? It is a serious problem for the Government to ponder over. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, this is one thing. Now, Sir, there is one other point. Therefore I would say, let this scheme be implemented. The Government and the University Grants Commission should take full initiative in this matter.

With regard to the medium of instruction, all I would say is that regional languages should be made the medium of instruction in the university education and the Government of India should offer adequate help and every possible assistance should

be given so that English is replaced in the various States in the Universities by the regional languages. We must get out of a situation when we have to put up with English as our medium of instruction.

Finally, with regard to the students I do not wish to say much because there is a lot of patronising talk about students. Our student community is a fine lot of people; they are excellent stuff; they are very good raw material for moulding them into very fine architects of the nation but if today it has not been possible, the responsibility for this rests squarely on the shoulders of the Government and on those who are responsible for the conduct of educational affairs in our country. Neither the teachers nor the students are responsible for it. I would therefore request them to make it possible for the students to continue their studies at higher stages in the universities; if necessary, stipends should be given on a large scale; scholarships to meritorious students should be given on a much larger scale than has hitherto been the practice. Students' life should be made bearable. Hostels should be bettered; their family condition should be gone into in order to bring some relief and in order to extend proper amenities to them. Look after the students well. They are the makers of our new society; it is in their hands we have entrusted the future of our country. In very many ways the culture and civilisation we talk of, all will mean nothing until and unless the young generation that is before us is reared with all the care that we are capable of bestowing on them, unless we administer to their needs and demands with sympathy, with compassion and with understanding. This is what we want. Our student community should be looked after well by the Government and by the institutions. It is a shame today that the Government frowns upon the student community and talks of its indiscipline. When students die of tuberculosis, when many many thousands of students . . .

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Is there no limit to repetition and time?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . are not in a position to continue their studies because of chill penury, the Government sit with folded hands and do not have anything to do. I would therefore request the Government to change its policy with regard to the students. The students, the teachers, the human material are the things that should guide your education and every effort should be made in the direction of improving the lot of the teachers and extending proper amenities and free opportunities to our vast student community. This is how we can advance along the path of learning, along the path of culture, there is no other way. I hope therefore the Government will change its policy in this light and give proper authority and ideas to the University Grants Commission. I wish the University Grants Commission well and I hope the Government will find its way to remove the shackles that are put in the way of the University Grants Commission. Thank you.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard a most eloquent speech from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta but I do not wish to emulate his example. Eloquence is not in my line and certainly I do not think that vehement language is equivalent to sensible language. Now, we have few opportunities of discussing educational problems in this House and the Education Minister is to be congratulated on placing this Report before us for discussion. The Report, I notice, was signed in August 1957 and we are discussing it in April 1958. I think it should have been discussed earlier and it should have been placed before us earlier. Importance should be attached to university education, higher education and education generally. We know that education is principally a State subject but the Centre has certain responsibilities in regard to it, of co-ordination and guidance in a general way and,

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

therefore, this House should continue to take interest in educational matters.

The fear that some of us entertain is that there may be during the period of the Second Five Year Plan some pruning of expenditure on education. I think it will be a tragedy if in working for a socialist pattern of society we were to deny education the funds to which it is entitled. I do not think that there should be any retrenchment in educational expenditure. When we say that the Plan should go through we mean not only the three steel plants but we also mean the development of social services and among the social services education occupies the foremost position. Educational opportunity is fundamental for economic opportunity. You cannot have an egalitarian society without a wider diffusion of education. I do not think that the aim of the University Grants Commission is to restrict education by artificial means. I should be sorry if that was its aim. I think that higher education has still a function to perform in this country. We need more higher education and more higher education. We want our lower middle classes and the working classes to get equal opportunities with the more fortunately situated people to acquire the benefits of higher education. The only limitation to the acquisition of higher education should be the capacity of the person offering himself for higher education. Universities would be justified in having strict examinations for admission but when I say strict I must also make it clear that there must be some correspondence between teaching and examination. You cannot artificially raise the standard; if you want to raise the standard you must raise the standard of your teaching also. Therefore, in the ultimate analysis the problem of higher education is the problem of finding men of vision, men of knowledge, men having the capacity for research and men who are devoted to learning, for your institutions. It is sad to think that our administrative services offer more attractive salaries than those which

our teachers in our colleges get. I have had the opportunity of serving on the Special Recruitment Board for the emergency I.A.S. and I was amazed to find that some of the candidates who have had first class degrees, who were well educated, who were devoted to their subjects, were serving in educational institutions on salaries of Rs. 125, 150, 175, 200, 250. Now, you cannot blame them for preferring an administrative career to an educational career. It is said that the teacher has opportunities of increasing his income by writing books, writing for papers and by means of research which will be valued by the public, and that such papers will be read by the public. But we have not got such a kind of public in this country for people who write such books. In the first place, the teacher has not the leisure to write his books. He is made, in some places, to work 24 hours a week. In the second place, if he writes books there is no public to purchase those books. For whom is he to write those books? How is he to supplement his income by writing these books? Therefore, I am glad that the University Grants Commission has suggested a reasonable scale of salaries for our teachers. But then it is for the Education Department of the Government of India to see that the State Governments accept and implement this scale.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say one or two words about university autonomy. Certainly we all stand up for university autonomy. At least, I believe in freedom of thought and freedom of expression in our universities. I would like our university teachers to have the freedom to teach what they like, to think what they like, and all that, and to have freedom in teaching their curriculum, their courses of study and all that. But freedom also imposes certain responsibilities and while I have a very great deal of sympathy with our teachers and while I know that we have some very fine men in our educational services, I am afraid that I cannot honestly say that our teachers are measuring up to their responsibilities.

ties. I have, to my great regret, seen them encourage what I would call indiscipline among our young men. Now, I am not one of those who get alarmed at the many manifestations of spirit on the part of our young men. I welcome spiritedness. I would like them to be spirited young men. I am not thinking of their political activities. They may have leftist ideas. I am not concerned with that. I am not opposed to their having leftist ideas. But what I would like them to realise, what I would like them to appreciate, is that in the formative periods of their life, it is their business to devote themselves to study in a serious manner. And when you find that you can approach examiners, when you find that you can pass or you can get through your examinations by intimidating your examiners well, you feel a little disturbed as regards the future. It is the many manifestations of indiscipline which I greatly regret. I do not say that these manifestations do not exist in other countries. They do. The difference, however, between other countries and our country in this matter is that there is a public opinion in other countries against these manifestations of indiscipline. In our country there is a tendency to sympathise with the miscreant. I would tell you exactly what I have in mind. Two years back there was, what the University authorities of Allahabad University thought, serious indiscipline. Controversy had centred round the Chancellor. I am not concerned with the question whether that controversy was right or wrong. The Chancellor had been insulted at the Convocation. Deplorable scenes had occurred. Action had to be taken against some students who were responsible for these scenes. During the course of our investigation—I was serving as a member on that committee—we found that there was what you might call a loyal group, who were supporting the Chancellor, and there was a free fight between the loyal group and the disloyal group. Now, we took action against the disloyal group. But we also

suggested in our enquiry report that notice should be taken of the activities of what was the loyal group, because we felt that it was not for the loyal group to take the law into its own hands. But as to the question whether anything had been done by the loyal group too or not—which was a thing which called for action—we could say nothing, because that was not a matter with which we were concerned. We therefore suggested that another committee should be appointed to go into the entire question of the manner in which the disciplinary forces of the University had been organised. There were some delays in the appointment of that committee. One of the students—who is a very nice fellow, I know him very well, he is an estimable fellow in personal life—went on hunger strike. The announcement was thereafter made—it was not as a concession to his going on hunger strike, the decision had been taken before the announcement was made that a committee would be appointed to go into the question of the conduct of the loyal group as well. Now, when this gentleman broke his fast, some teachers of the University went and congratulated him at a public meeting and they offered him cups of orange juice and it was with their blessing that he broke the fast. Now, I say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that it is wrong for a teacher to encourage directly or indirectly fasting as a means of enforcing one's demands and a teacher who thinks that he can retain his popularity with his students only by resorting to some such ugly method of courting them does not deserve to be a teacher in a University.

These are 2 P.M. manifestations which, we must condemn. Of course teachers should have autonomy to regulate their own affairs, but then autonomy carries with it social responsibilities, and if you find that a university has become a hot bed of intrigue, that what the teachers are concerned with is to somehow get the students to fight with them in their struggle for a better deal, if you find

[Shri P. N. Saprū.]

that, then it is time for you to think and think clearly. I would, therefore, as a friend of university teachers say to them that they should realise their responsibilities in this matter. It is for them to guide our young men in a proper way. I do not say that there should be any ban on political activities in our universities. I have never agreed with the view that politics should be banned in universities. Politics is life and you cannot deprive students of the opportunity to think about vital matters as citizens of this country. But I should certainly like them to study hard, I should like them to develop a sense of responsibility for the future of this country.

May I also say that I am alarmed at the deterioration of standards in our universities, particularly in some of the universities of Northern India? I speak with knowledge in this matter. There was a time when we used to be proud of our Northern India universities and the standards reached by them. I do not care whether a man is able to express himself in English well or not, but I do want him to have the capacity for mature thinking. I remember in my Oxford days as a student hearing a Japanese student speak on "White Australia". Every single sentence he spoke was grammatically incorrect, the idiom was horrible, and yet the speech was a profound one and it has left a lasting impression on my mind. What I deplore is that our students do not display maturity of thought. I give you an example. I asked as a member of an Examination Board—now that Examination Boards are in vogue—I asked a candidate, "We have, broadly speaking, these two great systems of democratic government, the Presidential system of government and the Parliamentary system of government. We have chosen the Parliamentary system of government. Supposing you were to write on a clean slate which would you prefer for this country and for what reasons? Would you prefer the Presidential

system or the Parliamentary system?" The candidate who was a First Class Honours graduate of a university in Uttar Pradesh gave me this magnificent answer: "Sir, we have got a wonderful Constitution. We have got a President and we have got a Parliament. Therefore, we have got both the Presidential and the Parliamentary systems in our country." This gentleman had taken a First Class in Political Science, and a First Class M.A. of an honoured Indian University gave an answer of this character. When you cross-examined him as to what he had read or what he had not read, well, he would refer to some book which some professor had written on Modern History or European History—and that is the reading that these men do. I do not mind education being imparted in regional languages if that is your wish, but I would like the men that you turn out to be cultured men, to be educated men, to be men who will be able to advance research and knowledge in our country. That I think our universities are not doing. I should not like the grants for the universities to be cut down and I should not like the facilities for higher education to be restricted artificially. There may be natural restrictions. If a man is unfit for university education, he must think of something else, but there must be no artificial restriction on university education. I do not think that the University Grants Commission has any artificial restriction in mind.

Sir, we are indebted to Dr. Deshmukh and Dr. Kunzru for their valuable services on this Commission, and I am glad that we have had an opportunity of discussing this question today.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, although the Report of the University Grants Commission relates to a period of about 3 years and 4 months, it should be remembered that the University Grants Commission Act was passed only in February or March 1956 and that a

whole-time Chairman was appointed only in August 1956. The Report should be considered with these facts in the background.

The Act establishing the Commission defines its functions as follows:

"It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of university education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in the universities."

In order to perform these functions the Commission has been authorised to enquire into the financial needs of the universities, to give grants both to the Central universities and to the State universities and to recommend to any university the measures that it might consider necessary for the improvement of university education. In the beginning, i.e., before the U.G.C. Act was passed, the functions of the Commission were, I believe, restricted to giving help to the Central universities. But the U.G.C. Act allowed it to consider the needs of all universities. And when the Commission came to consider the needs of the affiliating universities, it saw that no improvement could be made in the teaching and standards of examination unless the affiliated colleges were helped to have properly qualified teachers. The Commission has, therefore, attached a great deal of importance to this question, and in view of the basic importance of having better scales of pay for teachers in the affiliated colleges for raising the standards of education, the Commission suggested that the following minimum scales should be made applicable to the colleges from the 1st of April, 1956:

Principal	.. Rs. 600 to Rs. 800
Heads of Department	.. Rs. 400 to Rs. 700
Teachers Class I	.. Rs. 300 to Rs. 500
Teachers Class II	.. Rs. 200 to Rs. 500

Now, Sir, these are not very generous scales. As the Commission says, these are the minimum scales. But when they were recommended to the Government of India and the State Governments suggested that the increased cost should be shared equally by the Central Government and the State Governments, the Government of India informed the Commission that it was not in a position to share with the State Governments the expenditure required for upgrading the salaries of teachers in affiliated colleges. The Commission, therefore, appointed a committee to consider this question. The committee did not submit a formal report, but it was the opinion of the Commission that the highest priority should be given to the improvement of teachers' salaries and of conditions generally in the colleges. This question is still under the consideration of the University Grants Commission, and unless the Government of India is able to provide the funds required to increase the salaries of the teachers to the extent of 50 per cent., it would be vain to expect any improvement in the standards of education in the affiliating universities. As the Commission has pointed out, the teaching profession has almost ceased to attract the best men and women and those already in the profession feel disheartened. Nevertheless, the Commission has tried to lay down the qualifications for different categories of university teachers and by giving thought to the standards of examination etc. has tried to bring about such improvement as is possible even under the present conditions. These subjects are still under consideration, but something has already been done in this direction. I shall not go, Sir, over the ground so well covered by the hon. Minister, but it is necessary to point out, Sir, what the condition of the colleges and the universities, and particularly of the affiliated colleges, at present is.

Sir, whatever our view with regard to the admission of students to universities may be, every one will, I



[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

am sure, admit, including my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, that a college or a university can deal efficiently only with a certain number of students. If the number is increased inordinately, it is bound to affect the standards of education. The Commission has pointed this out and has also pointed out the fact that the increase in numbers creates a very unsatisfactory situation with regard to contact between teachers and students. Apart from this, it is responsible for the creation of a spirit of restiveness among the students. Now the students need not be blamed for this, but the fact remains that the large increase that has taken place in the number of students has affected the standards of education and at the same time has created other problems which it is not easy to solve at the present time. Apart from this, we have to consider what the qualifications of the students seeking admission to the universities are. Every one of us here, I am sure, is aware of the fact that the students who pass out of the secondary schools are in many cases unfit to receive higher education. I cannot discuss the question of secondary education today—I hope to discuss it during the discussion on the Appropriation Bill—but I can only ask you for the present to take account of the fact that secondary education has deteriorated so much that a good many of the students who want to join the universities are not able to follow the lectures given in the university classes.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend, Pandit Prakash Narain Sapru, who said that he did not want any artificial restriction to be placed on the admission of students, admitted that their admission to the universities must depend on their qualifications. Now he is as well aware as anybody else that one of the reasons for the deterioration in the standards of university education is the deterioration in secondary education. Now what are we to do,

Sir, in the present state of things? Should we look with equanimity on this indiscriminate admission of students to the universities, which necessarily brings down the standards, or should we try to sift the qualified from the unqualified students? Obviously, anyone who has the good of the country and the good of the colleges and universities at heart, will try to lay down reasonable standards which must be satisfied by the students who want to enter the Universities. It is wrong to suppose that because the Commission has drawn attention to the large increase that has taken place during the last 10 years in the number of university students it is against the expansion of university education. This is what the Commission has said on this point:

“It is difficult to lay down any fixed principles on which the optimum numbers in Universities may be determined. In a free democratic society, the supply of facilities for higher education will have to respond in some measure at least to public demand. In our particular national situation, as the country's development projects progress, there will be a growing demand for men and women with high academic qualifications in the various avenues of industry, commerce and administration. There will be an ever-growing demand for professionally trained people, including especially teachers. We are therefore conscious of the need for a responsive flexibility in our plans. We have to take measures both to control numbers and to provide for expansion.” and so on.

It is clear from the words that I have quoted that the Commission is not in favour of any arbitrary limitation of the students in the colleges and universities but being acutely conscious of the need for improving the standards of education, it cannot but consider the qualifications of the student who wants to receive higher education and say there is some

way of selecting the right kind of students for admission to colleges and universities. I am sure there is no one here who will dissent from the line taken by the University Grants Commission. I am sure that similar conditions as those that have influenced the view of the Commission, will lead them also to consider whether an unplanned growth in the number of students in the colleges and universities is desirable in the best interests of the country. Taking the figures as they are . . .

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: What is a planned growth?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: That depends on two things. One is the improvement in secondary education which depends partly on (i) improvement in the qualifications of the teachers, in the libraries and laboratories that the schools and the colleges must have, and (ii) on the degree to which colleges and universities can without sacrificing efficiency permit addition to the number of their students.

The figures before us show that there is an increase of about 50,000 students annually on the rolls of university institutions. This fact must be taken into account in deciding whether the recommendation of the Commission on this subject is sound or not.

Just one or two points more before I come to the question of finances. As Dr. Shrimali has pointed out, the Commission, with the help of the Government of India, has been instrumental in persuading 14 States to adopt the three-year degree course suggested by it. The Central Government, according to the Report, is to provide Rs. 7½ crores including Rs. 2½ crores to be made available by the U.G.C. in the first stage. A similar amount is to be found by the States including contributions from private management. The total amount thus available in the first stage ought to be Rs. 15 crores and

this will be sufficient for upgrading some 180 intermediate colleges and reorganising some 360 degree colleges which should be taken as targets for the Second Five Year Plan. The Commission has done this in the hope that this three-year degree course will bring about an improvement in the quality of both collegiate and secondary education and bring about a revision of the syllabus, reduction in the overcrowding in colleges etc. It is clear that the introduction of the three-year degree course depends on the State and the Central Governments sharing equally the cost of change in the period of education at college or University but a difficulty has been experienced by the Commission in this matter. The Commission refers generally to the principle of sharing equally the cost of development of University education between the Central and State Governments, and says:

"This sharing principle has been adopted on the assumption that some funds for the development of University education are available with the State Governments, and that the State Government would naturally want to participate in the development of University education within their territories. In practice this principle has raised some difficulties, and sometimes caused delay in the implementation of schemes of development. This matter will have to be further examined by all parties concerned and a more expeditious *modus operandi* found."

Now I draw the attention of the Education Minister to these observations of the Commission. If the State Governments said that they have no surplus funds to devote to the development of university education, then the university education becomes *ipso facto* a wholly Central subject. The Central Government must, therefore, carefully consider this matter and find out whether adequate funds have been placed at the disposal of the universities for improving university

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

education as 14 States have accepted the scheme recommended by the Commission, that is to-day, at least 14 out of the old 25 or 26 States. I take it that some States certainly have some spare money for devoting for the development of university education. It is not merely in connection with the three-year degree course, but in connection with other schemes of development also that this question has arisen. It is, therefore, necessary that if the improvement of education and the progress of higher education is not to be held up for want of funds, that this particular difficulty is solved as early as possible.

I shall now say a word about the responsibilities of the teachers and the students in regard to the raising of the standards of education. I know the difficulties of the students and I personally have said more than once that in my opinion, students are more often than not, blamed for the faults of their elders. When they see what kind of standards of conduct are set before them by their teachers, by the State Governments and by the Central Government, it is not to be wondered at if they, consider principle and character to be subsidiary things and attach importance to pushfulness and their ability to create trouble. If students are asked to help various parties in carrying on their election campaigns, if students see that the Ministries do not always decide the important questions on the basis of principle, when they see how members, for instance, of the Public Services Commission are chosen, when they see their teachers running after membership of this or that university body, they naturally get bewildered and they fall a prey to the machinations of those who are not interested so much in university education as in party politics. Nevertheless, examples can be given to show how students have behaved, to show that the behaviour of students at the present time, in some cases at least,

has been highly reprehensible. Some examples have been given by my hon. friend Pandit Prakash Narain Sapru; but there can be other examples also which can be cited. We are all aware, Sir, of the difficulties created for honest invigilators by students who think it is their right to copy in the annual examinations. There are teachers who have lost their lives because they prevented students from resorting to malpractices. In the Uttar Pradesh, while the examinations were going on, one heard every day of invigilators being intimidated in more than one centre. Can we really believe that students whether belonging to the secondary schools or to the colleges, do not realise that copying in examinations is reprehensible or that it is not permitted and that they run the risk of being turned out of the examination hall if they are found copying? And yet they act in a way which shows that they consider it to be their right to resort to any malpractice they like in order to get through their examinations. As regards the teachers, I do not want to add to what Mr. Sapru has said. Not all universities are to be blamed, but there are at least some where the principle on which the appointment of university teachers is made is open to question. There are other universities where very little work has been done in connection with research, where teachers do not pay adequate attention even to giving proper time and attention to the education of their students. I agree, therefore, with the Minister of Education when he says that while there is a heavy responsibility resting on the University Grants Commission, it should not be forgotten that the responsibility of the teachers and the students is no less heavy.

Next I come to the last question that I shall touch and that is the question of finance. The Education Minister said that the Government has provided the University Grants Commission with the funds that it wanted. I should like to make one

general observation before I go into some details with regard to this matter. In view of the facts pointed out by my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, particularly with regard to the Calcutta colleges, where the numbers of students are in some cases phenomenal, the University Grants Commission thought that the most important need of the universities was for additional buildings for class rooms, libraries and laboratories. And out of the sum of Rs. 27 crores allotted to it, for expenditure during the period of the Second Plan, it proposes to spend as much as Rs. 10 crores on the construction of new buildings. It has been found that the shortage of steel, cement and other building materials has placed an obstacle in the way of the Commission. The buildings cannot be constructed as quickly as the Commission hoped that they would be. The Commission realised this and therefore, asked the Government to allow it to devote such funds as could not be used for the construction of buildings, to the other needs of the universities. But the Government has not agreed to this. It has, so far as I know, insisted that the Budget as passed by the Commission, should be adhered to. Now, the Budget can be changed from time to time but there must be some assurance that the total sum of Rs. 27 crores allocated for the development of university education will be given to the Commission during the period of the Second Plan. That assurance, I understand, has not been forthcoming. Then, Sir, as I have already informed the House, the Commission has intimated to the Government that the cost of the introduction of the three-year degree course will require the provision of Rs. 7½ crores by the Central Government; of this a sum of Rs. 2½ crores is to be provided by the University Grants Commission and the remaining five crores by the Central Government in the first stage. Now, I should like to know whether the Government of India has definitely agreed to accept this responsibility.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, Sir, we have already decided to implement this scheme and funds would be made available. In fact, we are already in touch with the Universities and the State Governments.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Haven't some funds been made available already in some States for the affiliated colleges?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The decision has been taken only very recently and we are now in correspondence with the State Governments and Universities. We have asked them to implement this as quickly as possible and funds in accordance with the scheme of the Deshmukh Committee would be made available to the Universities which implement this scheme.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Then, Sir, take the question of laying down higher salary scales for teachers in the affiliated colleges. I have already referred to the unwillingness of the Government of India to share the cost of upgrading salaries of teachers in the colleges equally with the State Governments. It is obvious that if the Central Government is unable to bear this burden, the University Grants Commission also will be unable to ask the State Governments to bear any cost and the Commission is not in a position to find the whole money itself.

Again, Sir, there is the office of the University Grants Commission. It has, considering the important responsibilities of the Commission and the function that it has still to discharge, a skeleton office, but the Commission does not know whether the promised funds will be given to it. The Commission must be assured that it will get the promised funds before it can increase the staff. The other day it held a Seminar on the teaching of English in the Universities and only a few days earlier it held another

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

Seminar on National Integration. It will be necessary to follow up such recommendations of these Seminars as are accepted by the Commission. These are important matters and it is obvious that an addition to the staff will be necessary if these and other matters that are investigated by the Commission are to be followed up.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, there is one other thing that I should like to say in this connection before I sit down. Dr. Shrimali said that the Education Ministry had provided the University Grants Commission with all the funds it had asked for but the University Grants Commission was apprehensive lest, if it asked for large funds, its request should be turned down and it has, therefore, restricted its demand but even so, I do not think that its requirements have been met. The Commission says that in 1957-58 it was informed by Government that Rs. 2.75 crores only would be available for development grants to the Universities excluding the maintenance grants given to the Central Universities and this sum has been provided against a sum of Rs. 5.24 crores asked for by the Commission. I was glad to know from the Education Minister that the Finance Ministry has been more generous this year, that it has provided Rs. 4½ crores, if I heard him correctly, for the University Grants Commission and that it has further agreed to increase the allotment if it is found that the Commission would need more to carry out its responsibilities. Sir, from what I have said, it is clear that the Commission has not been provided with adequate funds. The Chairman has made it clear more than once that more money would be needed if the functions laid on the Commission are to be fulfilled by it. If the Education Minister is able to assure us today that the entire sum of Rs. 27 crores allocated for the development of higher education by the Government of India will be

available to the Commission during the Five Year period, that is during the Plan period, nobody will be happier than myself.

There are other questions too, for instance, the question of the medium of instruction to which my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, drew attention but I do not want to take up the time of the House any more. The Report of the Commission, I shall say in conclusion, is a very important document. It raises questions which require the careful consideration of the country, of Parliament and of the Government. I hope that those hon. Members who take part in this debate will realise how vitally the future progress of the country is bound up with the progress of education.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have twelve more names. I would like Members to restrict themselves to fifteen minutes each.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for having given me an opportunity though late in the day to speak on a subject which is agreed on all hands to be one of vital importance. I am also grateful to the Union Minister of Education for having moved this Motion for consideration of the Report of the University Grants Commission, for rarely have we any opportunity of discussing education on the floor of this House. I have spent in all about 28 years as a teacher in one of the biggest and perhaps the oldest of the modern Indian Universities. I have some knowledge of what University education is. I have some inside knowledge of it and have seen our Universities grow over the last quarter of a century. I would not take much time of the House—only fifteen minutes have been given to me—but I would certainly support my esteemed colleague, Pandit Kunzru in his statement that this Report raises very important issues and has to be discussed not only on the floor

of the House but also by the Government and by those who are interested in education all over the country. It is not a matter in which non-academic and non-University matters should be brought in for discussion. It is not also a matter in which passions should be sought to be roused. Here we have a Report which, as has been said, raises some very important problems, but let me start with the most important point of criticism that was raised by my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. He was referring to the question of the rate of growth. The Report of the Commission says that one of the most important university problems to-day in India is the problem of numbers. Shri Bhupesh Gupta is not prepared to consider it as a problem at all. Certainly we do welcome numbers, I mean, we want our people in increasing numbers to go through the portals of education, elementary and secondary. But whether a large percentage of our school educated public should enter the universities or not is a problem which cannot be decided purely on the basis of the politics of the multitude. Since our esteemed colleague, Mr. P. N. Saprú, touched on this point which was also dealt with by Pandit Kunzru, I would not refer to it. But I would just refer to one point to which reference was made by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. He referred to Calcutta Colleges and wanted expansion and consolidation at one and the same time. In the same breath he complained of congestion in Calcutta colleges and he asked the Members of the University Grants Commission to visit the Calcutta colleges. For his information I might say, that the Calcutta colleges were visited by members of the Commission not once, not twice, but more than two or three times, and I may bring it to his notice that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Calcutta is one of the distinguished Members of the Commission, and what he does not know about Calcutta colleges is not worth knowing. The problem is that on the day of the partition of India, about 50 colleges fell to the share of West Bengal. Now in about

ten years there are more than 150 colleges in the State of West Bengal. The growth has been phenomenal and as a teacher I know that it is sometimes very difficult to manage this enormity of numbers in colleges which by itself is a problem. It is true that you can go on increasing the number of colleges, but these things cannot be looked at in an isolated manner, for, when we go on increasing the number of colleges, we must not forget the fact that it is not very easy to get teachers, good and well-equipped teachers, at the degree level in the colleges and at the post-graduate level in the universities. Those who are in the profession know very well that we cannot staff even our existing colleges. How many people know that in most of our colleges for months many of the posts go vacant? Because there are hardly any first-class or even high second-class Master's degree holders available.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where do they go?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: For better appointments. They go to business-houses and State and Central Governments.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, that has been the point.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: They go to other places. These are facts and they have to be faced.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And faced properly.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: And since we cannot get the requisite number and quality of teachers there is no point in increasing the number of colleges and universities at a pace that is beyond our control. I know of universities also, not merely colleges. Universities are coming up here there and everywhere, without sometimes any previous reference to the University Grants Commission, and once they are established by State enactments, in a few months'

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.]  
time they come to the University Grants Commission for funds. Now in some of these universities there is hardly half a dozen teachers who can be said to have reached the level of honours and post-graduate teaching. This being the condition, certainly the problem of number is a most vital one. Nobody wants to restrict higher education artificially, but there must be some test of the ability and capacity of students to take advantage of higher education at the collegiate and university level, and the universities and colleges certainly have their inherent right to examine that ability and capacity; otherwise higher education will be just a sham.

Of, affiliated colleges it is true that in most West Bengal institutions, especially in a few Calcutta colleges, the roll strength goes upto 4,000 and 5,000.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Is there a college with a strength of 13,000?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: I am coming to that. There is more than one college where there are more than 10,000 students in several shifts. In the case of Calcutta, considering the condition in Calcutta which is a very crowded city, the University Grants Commission made a concession that the maximum number in a college that can be allowed is 1,500 students. In all other colleges the University Grants Commission has made it a condition that 1,000 students is the maximum. Even so many of the bigger Calcutta colleges have not yet agreed to fall in line. I happen to be a member of the Syndicate. I am not giving out any secrets. I know what the exact position is in respect of the Calcutta colleges now. In so far as affiliated colleges are concerned except seven mammoth colleges in Calcutta, money to help libraries, laboratories and other equipments and allied activities has already been released or is going to be released in a few weeks' time. It is only the seven mammoth colleges that have

not yet agreed to abide by the scheme of the University Grants Commission that have been accepted—not for all time, but until, I am sure, they are prepared to agree to accept the scheme. One of these colleges is the college mentioned by my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Do these colleges want to accept grants from their own State Governments?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Some of these colleges are not, I am afraid, prepared to accept the grants.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: For obvious reasons. You may ask the members of the governing bodies of these colleges.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: They do not want to take any grant?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: May be a few colleges do not want to take any grant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: For reasons that are obvious. So it is no good blaming the Government or the University Grants Commission. I should think that the University Grants Commission during the short period of its existence heroically faced the issue and tried to meet the issues squarely. Let us face facts. They have been in existence not even for the last three years, and we must not forget that the first two Chairmen were Secretaries of the Ministry of Education. It is only when Shri Chintaman Deshmukh became its Chairman that we can say that the University Grants Commission came to exist in terms of the Act. It is hampered by lack of funds, hampered also by frictions of relationship between the Centre and the States. When the University Grants Commission takes up a scheme, it forwards the proposal to the State Governments.

The State Governments take time to say whether they would be prepared to give the matching grant. Then there is a tug-of-war between the university and the colleges on the one hand and the State Government on the other, and valuable time passes by. So there is delay. And then there is also the bureaucratic red tape. Despite all these, I should say, the Commission seems to be on the top of its work. Shri Bhupesh Gupta unnecessarily had a fling at the Members of the University Grants Commission.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** No, I never did it.

**DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY:** He said that the University Grants Commission is a creature of the Ministry of Education.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I never said it.

**DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY:** For all that I know the University Grants Commission showed a great deal of courage, and it is perfectly clear that they showed no signs of being overawed by the Government, and it must be said in fairness to the Government also that the Ministry of Education did not try in any instance to interfere with the working of the University Grants Commission. Dr. 4 P.M.

Kunzru here is a member of the Commission and he will be able to tell the House that there has not been one single instance when the Ministry of Education tried to interfere with the work of the Commission or with its programme. The University Grants Commission has shown purposiveness in its work. They have laid down a definite programme with well-planned priorities; they have said that the next five or ten years will be spent in building up the physical necessities of the universities and colleges and this has to be admitted on all hands but what I would like to suggest is this.

As an outsider, so far as the Commission is concerned, but as a teacher in one of the universities, what I

have felt is that these frictions of relationship between the Centre and the States relating to the sharing of grants and the establishment of new universities should be removed. These are the two points which cause friction—the sharing of the grants and the establishment of new universities. We must be able to find some way out. The University Grants Commission and the Ministry putting their heads together must be able to find some way out of the difficulties. I know of instances, in my own university and a couple of other universities I know of, where one valuable year was spent on settling whether the institutions themselves should give the matching grant or whether the State Government should give it, how much the State Government and how much the institutions, and all the while the Commission money lay in the Bank, and no work could be done. Not only that; it has resulted not only in delay but in a considerable amount of misunderstanding, misunderstanding of the functions and aims of the University Grants Commission, misunderstanding of the aims and objects of the Ministry of Education. For nothing—I know for local difficulties, difficulties in the States, difficulties in the institutions themselves, for purely local difficulties—the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission were made to stand on the dock. I know education is a State subject but I believe on behalf of the universities and on behalf of the State Governments, so far as universities are concerned, there must be a certain delegation of power to the University Grants Commission. How this could be done is a subject which I would humbly ask the Ministry of Education to take up for close study. They must think about it, and also the University Grants Commission.

Then there is the problem of new universities coming up. About the problem of dearth of teachers, I do not find any mention made in the Report. I am afraid the University Grants Commission has not paid much attention to this problem. It is



[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.]

not merely that the Government is competing or that the business houses are competing in the matter of recruitment of best talents; there are other factors also. There is a great dearth of teachers. Even in such a college as the Presidency College in Calcutta, which is one of the premier colleges in West Bengal and which has given some of the best talents to the country, year before last or even last year for long months a number of posts could not be filled up. We can not get people for such subjects as Physics, Chemistry, Economics, Political Science and History. It is indeed very difficult to get good teachers in any subject. In scientific and technological subjects it is becoming increasingly more difficult to recruit teachers at the university level.

Then there is the question of co-ordination and determination of standards which is the main function of the Commission. Here also I believe the sooner we give some attention to this problem, the better for us. The biggest problem today is this. Most of the States have accepted the three-year Degree course; most of the States have also fallen in line with the eleven-year higher secondary schools. Where does the teaching in higher secondary schools end and how does the syllabus and curricula get itself integrated into the first year of the three-year Degree course? These integrations have not been worked out and there is a great deal of suspicion among secondary school teachers and authorities as well as among those colleges that have accepted the three-year Degree course about the integration of the syllabus. I am interested in my own subject and personally I must confess that I have not been able to understand this problem of integration; that is, the picture to me is not yet clear. Teachers of history come to me asking this question or that question on Bengali or some other subjects. Personally I have not yet the clearest possible picture of this integration or how it can be done

I believe, this has not yet been worked out properly.

And then among the universities themselves there is not much of a parity of standard. The question of medium of instruction in colleges and universities has been raised by my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta—and I have every sympathy with him—and he wants the regional language to be the medium of instruction up to the highest standards. I will place only one or two considerations in this connection. In most of the universities—those who care to keep up the standards—in honours and post-graduate examinations, in D. Phil., D. Litt., and D. Sc. examinations, it is imperative, it is incumbent on us to appoint external examiners. We may want to appoint an external examiner for D. Phil or for any other post-graduate or honours subject from Lucknow or Allahabad, from London or from anywhere else in the world. This is the practice that we have been following at Calcutta University for the last sixty or seventy years. Now, if I have to have my regional language as the medium of instruction, then I shall have to find my examiners from within the limits of Bengal which means at once that the standard is lowered and in certain subjects it is very difficult to find suitable and required number of examiners within the language of the State. I am myself an examiner up to the highest stage of ten to eleven Indian universities of M.A. classes come to me written in, besides English, Urdu, and Hindi. How can I examine them? If you want to maintain national standards how can we manage to do what is suggested by Mr. Gupta?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then what is your solution?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: The solution is in the Resolution of the University Grants Commission. The Kunzru Committee and later on the University Grants Commission at a conference the other day in an unequivocal voice said that in the higher

stages, that is, honours and post-graduate stages, the medium of instruction has to be English at least for the foreseeable future. There is no way out. We cannot cut ourselves off from the main stream of world knowledge and thought. If we do that it would not be possible to maintain international standards which is very much more important to maintain in respect of science and in respect of technology, in respect of any branch of higher education. If we are going to close our doors and windows like this, we would be cutting at the very root of our national existence. These things have to be understood coolly, dispassionately and from an academic point of view. It is not merely a question of patriotism or playing to the gallery. There are many more important things which are much more important than patriotism itself. Nationalism should not be misspent. (*Time bell rings.*) Thank you, Sir. I would not wish to take a minute more.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome this Report which has been produced by some of the foremost educationists of our country and I also appreciate the balanced view and judgment which is incorporated in this Report giving a fair elucidation of the problems which confront higher education in this country. But, Sir, I feel sad when I look at this depleted House when one of the most urgent matters for our national life is being considered.

Sir, the main business of the universities is teaching and research, and there are two parties in this business—the teacher and the student. All the other factors which enter into a university are subsidiary. So whatever be the problems of higher education are problems which concern our teachers and students. It is generally agreed that there has been of late a deplorable fall of standard, fall of quality of teaching, of research and for the matter of that of teachers and students alike. If there is any difference of opinion, the difference is about

the reasons. I share the views of the Commission when it has said that the main reason for the lowering of standard is the too rapid expansion of higher education. We have been hustling through it without proper preparation, without renovating our secondary education; I shall go further, to the root, without renovating our primary teaching. It has been the practice with us to make a craze of speed. Since the attainment of independence we have been multiplying our colleges and of late even our Universities at too fast a rate. It is quite understandable that young men and women of an independent country will aspire for higher education. By all means we must encourage that aspiration. But we must also make necessary preparations to make that education useful, fruitful for the Nation. We have not made adequate preparations for that. We are making schemes after schemes, new schemes like the three-year degree course, eleven-year school course. I am not going into the merits of these new schemes. But have we made adequate preparations for these? Have we prepared, trained up teachers for teaching in the multi-purpose schools? Have we made proper arrangements for bifurcation at class IX? Without making all these preliminary arrangements we have been hustling through new plans and new programmes. I agree with the Commission when it laments that new universities are being started without seeking the advice of the Commission. Already existing universities are suffering under heavy financial strain. Already they have suffered a lowering of standards. Already they are in dearth of teachers. But still new universities, not to speak of colleges, are cropping up like mushrooms. I fully agree with the Commission when it has stated that consolidation rather than expansion is the need of the day. It is no use producing graduates on a mass scale like factories. We have to produce useful citizens for our country

Then, I also agree with the doubts and suspicions of the Commission

[Dr. A. N. Bose.]

with respect to the medium of instruction. I fully endorse the views expressed by my respected colleague, Dr. Ray. Just as we have hustled with expansion, I think we are running another risk of hustling with the so-called national language or official language. I have no dispute with Hindi. I am not raising here the question whether Hindi should be the national or official language of India. But it is quite a different matter when you adopt a language for higher education in a country. Our hard-earned place in the fellowship of learning of the world through the medium of English, I think, should not be abandoned so lightheartedly. English is a dynamic language and language is a vital element, the most vital element, in higher education in the country. Dr. Ray has pointed out the difficulties of examining a paper on research, but I think there are more solid reasons why we should not abandon English and adopt either a regional language or official language or national language in its place. After all obtaining a degree, D. Phil. or D. Litt, is not the end of research work. Research work is not primarily meant for a degree. It is primarily meant for the fellowship of learning of the world. What is the use of a research paper written in Urdu or Bengali or Hindi if it is not understood outside India? I think it will be the height of folly to abandon the advantage which we have earned through more than a century by learning English. English was the vehicle of our patriotism. English language was the vehicle through which we had fought our war of national independence. So, even the patriotic ground cannot stand against the claim of English as the medium of higher education.

I shall very much like the hon. Minister to state in his reply as to what has been the outcome of the Committee, the Committee which was appointed to consider the feasibility of maintaining English or switching over to some other language as the medium of instruction. From this point, I must

confess, I start to disagree with the findings of the Commission. In the first place, I notice in its Report that a class division has been created among the universities, an invidious class distinction between the so-called Central universities and State universities. From the figures given on pages 15 and 35, it appears that out of a total of Rs. 27 crores allotted during the two years of the Second Five Year Plan, Rs. 6 crores went to the four Central universities and Rs. 21 crores for the 28 State universities, apart from maintenance costs which were given to the Central universities. Then on page 35, in the current year, Rs. 185 lakhs have been spent on account of 4 Central universities and only Rs. 148 lakhs on account of 28 State universities. This disparity in figures will be all the more glaring if we make a comparison on the basis of student population; that should be the fair basis of comparison, the student population basis. I am afraid only one of these 28 State universities, namely the Calcutta University, will exceed the total number of students of all the 4 Central universities. So, I think, Sir, this is the most striking feature of this Report, the invidious class distinction made between the so-called Central universities and the State universities in the matter of allotment of funds.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would like to point out that the statement is not fair because the Central Government has responsibility not only for the development of the Central universities but also for the maintenance of these universities; whereas the State Governments are responsible for the maintenance of the State universities and funds are made available by the State Governments. It is only for development plans and development projects that the Central Government contributes to the development of these State universities, and, therefore, that comparison is not fair. The statement is not very correct.

DR. A. N. BOSE: So far as the figures on page 15 are concerned, they

are Rs. 6 crores for 4 universities excluding the maintenance cost and Rs. 21 crores for 28 Universities for development cost. You may stick to this comparison on page 15; that will be a fair comparison.

Then, I also observe with concern the statement made on page 16 where priority is given for building and equipment: "We have decided, after consideration of all the needs of the universities that for the first 5-10 years priority must be given to the improvement of the physical facilities of the universities." I find some inconsistency of thinking in this respect. On page 22 the same view is upheld where in connection with the centenary grants for the three universities of Madras, Calcutta and Bombay it is stipulated that 75 per cent. must be spent on buildings and 25 per cent. on endowing Professorships and Fellowships. Sir, it is not buildings and equipment which make a University. It is men, not cement, not building materials, but men, teachers and students, who make a University. I do not mean that materials, equipment and buildings are not necessary, but certainly they are not primary, and there are instances when universities have been made great, when the cause of learning has been furthered by men who started from scratch, by men without money, without materials, without equipment and houses. It seems, however, that the Commission was aware of this, because elsewhere it expresses quite different views. For instance, on page 24 the Commission observes:

"It is our considered view that the improvement of teachers' salaries is vital to the whole effort to improve the standards of teaching and research in the Universities and colleges. The teaching profession has almost ceased to attract the best men and women and those already in the profession feel disheartened."

It is here that they have really touched the point. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, I shall have to cover two or three more points. Kindly allow me ten minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish at 4-30. You may take five minutes more.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Sir, they have observed that with the salaries offered, with the prospects offered to the teachers, they are not attracting the best talents of the country. I am afraid that this is an understatement. They are not attracting even the second best talents of the country. But what is the redress? The members have suggested a scale for university teachers on page 13. Let us compare this scale with the scale of teachers of affiliated colleges, under-graduate colleges. The lecturer in a post-graduate University College is offered a scale of Rs. 250—500, and in an under-graduate affiliated college a Class I lecturer is offered the scale of Rs. 300—500. Then, if we compare these scales with the scales obtaining in the lower levels of Class I officers under the Central Government, they are Rs. 350—850, Rs. 600—1150, Rs. 1000—1400 and Rs. 1100—1800. Sir, are the qualifications needed of a university lecturer entrusted with post-graduate teaching much less than the officers under the Central Government in the lower grades of Class I? This is the reason why we are not getting teachers of the requisite quality. This is the reason why the quality of teaching is getting lower and lower.

Sir, I am not very optimistic about the Commission which was created to look into this matter. Let the hon. Minister enlighten us as to what recommendations have been given by this Commission. Whatever these recommendations are, I am afraid they are of no use unless the scales which are offered here are revised. Sir, ten years ago—I am speaking of the University of Calcutta where I am in a teaching job for the last twelve years—ten years ago even men with the highest academic distinction had to wait for years to gain entrance into teaching posts in the University. It was the dream of the best talents of Bengal to become teachers of the Calcutta University. But what is

[Dr. A. N. Bose].

happening now? As Dr. Ray has pointed out, posts are lying vacant and they cannot be filled up even with freshers, fresh M.As. barely with First Class or First Class Honours. Even such people are not available for filling up the posts. Naturally more remunerative offers are there even in clerical posts. I think, Sir, this point cannot be escaped; unless you drastically revise the salary scales of teachers you cannot get teachers of good quality and improve the standard of teaching. The same woeful ignorance of facts is evident in fixing the remunerations for scholarships and fellowships. The Commission says:

"With a view to stimulating research and attracting suitable persons to the academic profession, the Commission has proposed setting up a number of post-graduate and research scholarships and fellowships in the Universities."

What are the remunerations offered? Rs. 100 to 150 per month for scholarships to attract the talented youth of the country! The Rockefeller Foundation is granting scholarships amounting to Rs. 400 per month plus Rs. 100 for typing work. Then again, in the field of Science the amounts offered are Rs. 200 and Rs. 300. Why this distinction between Humanities and Science? You are taking advantage of the unemployment situation in the country. When you take advantage of the unemployment situation to man the research work, you cannot get the requisite type of students, students who are really competent for research.

Then, I should also remind you about the remunerations of the ministerial staff of the colleges and the universities. Do not, for heaven's sake, keep them out of your mind. After all, it is they who serve as the sinews of the administration, and unless you want to create an explosive material which sometime or other may cause an irreparable damage to the cause of higher education, please keep their interests also in view and please also look into their scales and see whether you can

redress some of their grievances. So, the whole issue boils down to this—that we have to provide teachers with respectable salaries, salaries which are at least to some extent equitable or equivalent to the salaries available in other vocations. I can understand that there must be some element of idealism in the educational career and the educational career cannot offer competitive salaries to the teachers, but still you cannot allow them to starve. After all, respectability in society depends to a great extent on the standard of living. So, I am afraid all this may mean a cry in the wilderness in view of the frank confession of the Commission that the Government has curtailed or reduced the grant, and that the Commission asked for Rs. 5,24,00,000 and something, but the Government made available to them barely Rs. 2,75,00,000. So unless there is a complete orientation of outlook and unless higher education is accorded to its proper priority, I think nothing can be done, whatever our educationists may think about this problem. Thank you.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is one of the reports which has come comparatively early for a debate in this House, and I thank the hon. Minister for bringing it comparatively early for our discussion. It is a very rare opportunity for the House to discuss a report soon after it is submitted to the Government, and I am glad that the Education Minister has brought it before us so early. I am very proud, Sir,—and I hope this House also associates with my idea—that we have very distinguished members on the University Grants Commission. It is a matter of special pride to the Members of this House that we have a very highly respected colleague of ours on the Commission, and it is also a matter of pride to us that the Chairman of the Commission, who was a Member of Parliament himself some time ago, has worked with considerable sacrifice, setting an example for all those who are interested in public work. This example of sacrifice is

highly commendable. This Report gives a fairly detailed idea of the work of the Commission. It details some schemes for starting libraries, expansion of library facilities, for starting new and special courses in particular universities, for starting some chair, scholarships and so on and so forth. This by itself is a good achievement indeed, and considering what we have read in the newspapers about the tours that have been conducted by some of the members of the Commission, particularly the Chairman, and the contacts that they have established with the staff of the universities, the syndicate members and students, we may say that they have given us a very gratifying account.

But, Sir, one point which I would like to press here is that when we consider the primary function of the University Grants Commission and try to assess how far they have succeeded in fulfilling that function, there is, I am afraid, a little disappointment. I do not want to be harsh in expressing this opinion about the Commission, because the subject of raising and co-ordinating standards is itself a very complex one, and it is not too easy to fulfil this primary function of the University Grants Commission. But my point is that I fail to see that they have taken some definite and precise steps to achieve this purpose. The Report says that a sub-committee has been appointed to consider the various steps and the means to achieve this purpose. Of course, it won't be fair for this House to be harsh on them, considering the complexity of the subject, to expect them to give us a full idea of what steps they have taken in order to raise and co-ordinate the university standards. Apart from the fact that a sub-committee has been appointed to attend to this subject, there is not the least indication that they are aware of the direction in which they have to proceed or at least the broad outlines of the steps that they have to take in order to achieve this primary purpose for which the University Grants Commission was brought into existence. The other

things which they have done are commendable enough, but they could as well have been done by the administrative committee which preceded them, although the measure of the work that has been done by the Commission is very wide indeed. I would not dwell upon the steps to be taken for raising the university standards, because after these experts of the University Grants Commission go into the subject and examine it fully and then give us the necessary data, we will be in a better position to consider all those things and give our suggestions. In the absence of that expert knowledge and data, it would not be fair for us to offer our suggestions, or useful to offer our suggestions, although it is not wrong to make suggestions. But since one or two suggestions have been made, I want to express myself particularly with regard to one thing.

We should not confuse, Sir, the efficiency of the universities with the increase in either the number of students who are seeking admission into the universities or the number of universities that have been multiplied in the country. Ours is a country with teeming millions who have been kept in ignorance and illiteracy for centuries, and it is but right that we should try to elevate the standards of the masses, to make the masses literate and to spread the benefits of education, as far as possible, deeper and deeper into the country. We have declared a socialistic pattern of society to be our objective, and when that is so, it is our duty and the duty of all our universities, colleges, secondary schools, primary schools and every educational institution to prepare the citizens of our country for leading a good life in such a socialistic society. Therefore, Sir, any suggestion for restricting educational facilities in any way, whether of higher education or of secondary education, will be an unwise suggestion.

In this connection, Sir, a suggestion was made that admissions to the universities must be student is not admitted as a matter of

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] restricted. Whether admissions to the universities or to the secondary schools should be restricted, is a point which has got far-reaching consequences. Sir, already there is a sort of restriction in the matter of admission. Just as in nature there is a natural selection, so also in the matter of university education, Sir, there is a natural selection. Seventy to eighty per cent. of the rural population cannot seek admission to the universities today, not because the universities have closed their doors to them, but because university education is expensive. It is beyond the reach of 80 per cent. of the people of this country. So there is a natural selection there. And when that is the case, what is meant by restriction of admission to students, I cannot understand. Well, how we can restrict, is only by means of considering their merit and performance. We may say that only first class students will be admitted to the universities or second class students with high marks will be admitted to the universities. That is there even today. In many of the States, to enter into or seek admission into a secondary school, one has to offer public examination and of course for seeking admission in a university, there are public examinations and one who does not pass the examination, cannot claim admission into the university. That is there. If we mean further that there should be restrictions, it would be only a restriction which operates against the student who comes from unfortunate classes or who comes from interior areas in the country. If it is meant that the university should be only for a few people, people who either by scoring high marks are entitled to get admission or by being fortunately placed in cities or by coming from educated families are entitled to get admission, then this step would be a suicidal one for the country and I am sure the masses in this country will oppose that step. If we have to raise standards of university education, we have to look for other steps. Let us diversify the courses, multiply the

institutions which prepare students for careers. Some of the students go there not for the ideals of university education but because they offer avenues for courses or careers for living. Let us multiply those separate institutions which prepare students for courses or for living just as they have them in America. Let us find out ways and means of enlarging these institutions and increasing universities but not try to restrict admissions to universities.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Should we admit even students who are manifestly unfit to receive higher education?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: This is a very relative point as to who is a qualified student.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is a very important point these days.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I agree that it is an important point but who can say as to who is the student who is qualified to go there? You only measure them by the performance in the examinations and educational experts have said that the present-day written examination do not test the real ability of the student. That is an admitted fact. That theory of examinations bringing out the merit of the student is exploded. Today in a country like ours, we have to look for other standards, for instance, willingness to serve society in any capacity and at a sacrifice.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Ability to follow lectures has nothing to do with examinations. It is a fact that can be tested by any university lecturer, which can be tested by the speaker himself.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I would not, in that case, blame the student at all. I don't think, if a teacher is properly qualified, there is any man, unless he is an imbecile mentally, who cannot follow lectures. I have seen myself, I have been a teacher and I have known teachers

and I have run educational institutions which take only students who otherwise would be merely refused as dullards and people who cannot follow a speech or a lecture. Those orphans, those people coming from downtrodden classes, only they are admitted into our institutions and I am proud to say that the educational authorities who have inspected our institutions and public-men who have seen our institutions have appreciated those institutions much more than the comparable standard Government institutions. I am saying this not to take pride in the fact but I say, provided you organise your teaching staff, provided your teaching staff is competent, I don't think 99 per cent. of the students would fail to follow lectures. True, there is what Dr. Kunzru points out. There is that feature today in the Universities. There is that feature today to be seen in high schools that there are many students who don't follow lectures. It is true. It is also true that there are many lecturers who are worse off than students. Students find fault of the grammatical mistakes that the teachers commit and the students find fault of the lack of knowledge of teachers and professors. Of that, I am well aware but what is the remedy for that? The fault does not lie with the student. The fault lies on the teachers, whether at the University or secondary or primary stage. You improve the teaching standard, give them proper training and then you will be able to see that every student will follow you and will try to be upto the mark. Well, that is a point into which I did not want to go at this stage. As I said I can offer many suggestions in this matter of raising and co-ordinating standards but the proper time will be when the sub-committee submits its report.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: According to you, there should not be failure at all of a single student and if there is a failure, the teacher is responsible!

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Let us not prevent any boy or girl from entering the institution simply because we, according to our standards of marking, find him or her unfit. That is all.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Is he referring to primary, secondary or university education?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: To all education. My friend over there said that education shall be a sham if we give admission to all and sundry. I say to him that education itself will be a sham if we restrict students from going to any institution which they like and I would not like to see such a state of affairs in this country of ours. The other point . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I don't think it is the intention of my hon. friend to class elementary education with higher education. I can understand the doors of an elementary school being open to every child but I don't think in any country the doors of higher education and university will be open to everybody. Some kind of a test and selection is always made when students are admitted into any institution of higher learning.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I did not say that there should be no test at all. In fact I am myself saying that there is a test today. Today a student is not admitted as a matter of course. Today you test them, you give examination and admit them after sifting. I don't mean to say that there should be no test. Let there be a test but not a restrictive test in the sense that a student is refused admission simply because he does not rise upto in the artificial existing standards. Let us perfect our standards first.

The other point which I wanted to refer to has already been referred to by my friend Mr. Bose. He has anticipated my point. The distinction



[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]  
between Central university and State universities should go.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I want to put a definite question. Does he want university education to become a Central subject?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I have said in this House that education itself should become a Central subject and I have never forgiven the framers of the Constitution who have placed education as a State subject for this reason that when we want to educate the masses of the country, we have to make education purposive, we have to make education directive, we have to plan education as the Commission has said. When that is so, with the autonomy that is given for universities, it is not possible. We know in Universities there is politics. Chief Ministers and Ministers are Pro-Chancellors of universities and there is communal element in universities—many of us know that. Today our universities are not ideal universities, as they should be. How do you reform this university? What power has the Commission got? It can withhold grants from them if they do not follow their instructions but beyond that it cannot do any thing. The Government should conceive of empowering the Commission or appoint another body to go into the question of reforming universities and arm them with powers to see that effective action is taken.

*(Time bell rings.)*

In this discussion, I am sorry that I have entered into controversies and lost time. This distinction must go. My friend has quoted some figures that Rs. 185 lakhs have been spent for Central universities whereas Rs. 148 lakhs have been spent for the 28 State universities which is unfair. Of course this includes maintenance grants . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It does not include maintenance. Maintenance grants are excluded from it.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: If they are excluded, the invidious distinction is all the more poignant. Now let us compare the students whom these four universities serve and the number of students these 28 universities in the country serve. If we take that into consideration, we are giving a privilege here and we are educating the students who come here at the cost of the tax-payers. Let them be State universities. Let the States in which they are situated, share the burden just as the other States are sharing the burden for the universities. What right have we apart from historical justification? We have no right to spend more for these universities at the cost of the general tax-payers.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Is it not a fact that these four Central universities . . .

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am sorry, my time is up. This distinction based on denominational character must go.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is statutory and they are governed by Central Acts. They are started and maintained by the Central Government.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: That is true.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are all-India institutions.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I know. I am just throwing out the suggestion. Parliament can change the Central Act.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The States also will have to do the same.

AN HON. MEMBER: We cannot compare these figures only. We have to compare the grants given by the States also to their universities.

**SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY:** That is true. But why should this denominational character remain? Let the Government take steps to remove this denominational character.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Finished?

**SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY:** I do not see any reason why the University Grants Commission should have suggested different scale of salaries for different universities. For instance, for Delhi University, the scale of pay for lecturers is Rs. 250 to Rs. 560 whereas for others it is Rs. 250 to Rs. 500. In the Santiniketan the scales are much lower. Other scales are also different. When we want to raise the standards of our universities, let us insist on uniform scales of salaries. Why should Government refuse to bear a portion of the increased cost of teachers in affiliated colleges, I do not see.

**SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, while considering the Report of the University Grants Commission, an opportunity is afforded to hon. Members to say a few words on higher education. The Report is factual, instructive and thought-provoking. It has been made by eminent persons in public life and who are known to be very sound educationists. But while analysing this Report an eloquent analysis of the evils in the educational policy of the Government was voiced by the Leader of the Opposition and he was very critical about the inadequate salaries paid to the teachers and the blame that is levelled against the student population for indiscipline. But he had no remedial measure to suggest.

Sir, the Report of the Commission gives us a clear idea of the state of affairs in university education and how university education has been divided into two groups. In the first group there are about 31 or nearly 29 universities that are autonomous in character and they are the

responsibility of the State and only for developmental expenditure they have to refer to the University Grants Commission. Only four universities that are protected by the Constitution under item 11 of State List, i.e. List II are excluded from the State's operation and they are the direct responsibility of the University Grants Commission.

Several suggestions are made by this hon. House about university education and the various defects that are found in it. I am a layman as far as education is concerned but I can claim that I am a fairly educated man as far as the modern sense of educated person goes. Education which should prepare a man for a way of life or for adjusting himself in life, that aspect of education is mainly lost sight of and education is considered as a sort of medium to get some benefits out of it, just to make provision for life or to get into service. That aspect of education is not yet taken out of the sphere of higher education. However we may claim that we have made far-reaching advances in the field of university education, still the question remains as to whether this education has been useful for the country as a whole. India lives in her villages and its characteristic is essentially rural. As my hon. friend Mr. Govinda Reddy pointed out, the majority of the people in India are denied the benefit of having a university education or college education because of financial conditions. While we consider this question, we cannot consider it in isolation. We cannot consider it without any reference to the poverty of India which makes the people deny themselves the benefit of receiving this university education. There is a tendency to restrict the numbers and to lay emphasis on consolidation. However wise it may be to say that things expanded must be well consolidated first in order to have better results, still this phenomenon will not work as far as Indian conditions are concerned. Education should be spread and schoolmaster should be abroad and every body

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil.] must get the opportunity to get education at whatever stage he is competent to get it. If students are denied admission because it impairs the standards laid down by the university, a condition of things will be created where we will have to see whether the standards or norms laid down by the university professors or university syndicates are really standards or norms which are desirable in this country. If a person is to be deemed incompetent because he has not attained a certain academic standard as far as education is concerned, I may say there are a number of people who will not stand even a simple test if different scales of standard are applied. Even some university professors may not know what is meant by a mango budding, or how a poultry farm is run or how a dairy farm is run, or what is known as deep ploughing and harrowing and inter-culture in agriculture. But these all are things which a university professor cannot ignore so far as rural India is concerned. Dr. Kunzru rightly insisted on maintenance of standards in higher education. But I know higher education in many respects ignores this aspect of the rural economy of India and merely theoretical or academic considerations weigh more when admissions are granted. Already a large number of people are suffering under the disadvantage because of poverty and only a few backward classes, the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes people because of the protection afforded by the Constitution get the advantage of university education.

Two points are made by the University Grants Commission—want of funds and freedom of action. If adequate funds are supplied to the Commission and if they have greater freedom of action in their activities, they will be able to do much in the field of higher education. Of course there is always this question of funds whenever some improvement in any field of activity is aimed at, because,

after all, this is a poor country and it depends on its limited funds. If funds are to come, then what is the remedy suggested? We have heard previous speaker complaining of government's neglect and of the Commission suffering from lack of funds. Still the question remains: What is the remedy? Have we considered whether we should have a re-orientation in the education policy? In this country are there sufficient or equal opportunities to those who are down-trodden, to the weaker sections of the population who have toiled and milled all these years for the luxury, ease and comfort of the few? Should they not have the opportunity to get higher education? That problem, according to me, has not been touched upon by the Commission, because the Commission has confined itself to the four corners of the Act and while considering the problem of higher education they have confined themselves to the limited idea of higher education which up to this time is propounded by educationists who are trained after the British pattern. After all university education under the British regime was meant to prepare a person for higher posts needed in the administrative services. Even then we have noble and illustrious examples of persons who, without going to any university, have risen to great heights, as for instance the great Rabindranath Tagore. So the question of higher education in universities needs re-thinking and we may require a re-orientation in the educational policy as far as university education is concerned. I agree with Mr. Govinda Reddy that university education must not be denied to such large sections of the population and it should be made a Central subject. Various universities, regional universities . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI SONUSINGH DHANSING PATIL: I may take another 10 or 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not 10 or 15 minutes, but only about 5 minutes. You may continue tomorrow.

There is a message from the Lok Sabha.

5 P.M.

# MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

## NOMINATION OF RAJYA SABHA MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that the following motion has been adopted by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on Tuesday, the 22nd April, 1958 and to request

that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion and further that the names of the members of Rajya Sabha so nominated be communicated to this House:—

"That this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that they do agree to nominate seven members from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Accounts of the House for the year beginning on the 1st May, 1958 and ending on the 30th April, 1959 and to communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 23rd April 1958.