

"I had a heart attack on 16-2-1958 while the Rajya Sabha was in session. Since then I have been confined to bed and am not being permitted even to sit on the bed.

Under medical advice it will not be possible for me to attend the next session of the Rajya Sabha which commences on the 22nd April, 1958.

Kindly obtain the permission of the House as required."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri R. C. Gupta for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

(No. hon. Member dissented.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent granted.

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

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, Sir, resuming the thread of my unfinished speech yesterday, I made out a point that university education and for the matter of that, all education, must be the concern and responsibility of the Centre. I must here thank our ex-colleague Mr. Kishen Chand, whose presence we miss here, who had mooted this point that the report of the U.G.C. should be laid before the House. I extend my thanks to him in his absence and while dealing with that question, I say that university education is the apex of all our educational pyramid and it needs a very right and appropriate approach. Else, our young population of students will not be pressed into the service of the national cause. After all the purpose of education is to prepare a good citizen in a democratic set-up, a citizen who knows the responsibilities and duties of life, a citizen who knows his rights and can take wise decisions, a citizen who can adapt himself to the

business of living—that is the main purpose of education. The Commission is confined in its work to a very limited extent, since it cannot recommend loans if a particular university needs it and the meaning of grant is confined only to subsidy or grant and it does not extend to the term 'loan'. So there should be a better extension of the scope of the work of the present Commission. Then the Commission has laid stress on two important points, namely, the inadequacy of funds and secondly, the degree of freedom of action that is needed. The question of funds is always a matter of concern in the various developmental activities. Yesterday, the Minister in charge has made it clear that in the year 1957-58, even though Rs. 4.17 crores were provided for, only Rs. 3.50 crores were spent. There might be technical difficulties in spending the whole amount but the question remains as to whether these technical difficulties or the several red-tapisms that are seen, should deter our student population from going to colleges because it is one of the observations made by the Commission that unless the rising tide of students in the colleges, is checked at some stage, quality and standard as well as efficiency will suffer. This is an observation which may apparently appear to be very innocent and harmless. But looking to the needs and aspirations in a democratic set-up of persons coming from rural India especially, we must not close the doors or the portals of university only on the ground of efficiency. However efficiency and consolidation may have their own virtues, they must not be made much of and the interest of the rural population should not be sacrificed at the altar of efficiency and standard which are based more or less on old pattern. The needs of the society in the fast changing democratic set-up are quite different and unless education is made a creative job, unless education is made to take into consideration the various needs of the community, unless that community sense is developed, there is not going

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil.]

to be any substantial benefits out of it. The three-year degree course which has been suggested as a sort of reform in the university education is not accepted by all universities for reasons suitable to each university but as I pointed out yesterday, because of the so-called autonomy of the universities, the different regional universities are more or less led by parochial feelings, regional feelings and it is better we close all these ranks and entrust the whole work to the Centre but that will need a change in the Constitution, I know, and a change in the whole Governmental policy. As we see, most of our universities are a private enterprise and as it is expected of a private enterprise, whether it is educational or commercial, they have always an eye on whether it is economic or beneficial. That is the motto of a private enterprise. Howsoever it may be desirable, in the educational field, the motive of private enterprise should not be profit or expediency, but that is predominant and every university or college takes into consideration only its own economic side.

I will not take much time except to say that on the question of medium of instruction we must be more or less elastic. It must be adjusted according to the needs of each college and there should not be unnecessary emphasis on the regional language because, after all, any emphasis on region or part should not come in the way of national unity and unless we build up that pattern in the various stages of education, especially higher education, it will create more problems than it will solve. You, Mr. Chairman, have suggested that regional language wherever possible, should be adopted. That is a welcome suggestion but after all it must have its own limitation.

On the question of student discipline which is a vexed question, it has prominently figured in recent years because of the political upheaval and the political activities carried on by various parties which involve the student population unnecessarily in their politics. There might be other rea-

sons like students' poverty, their aspirations not being fulfilled, the inefficiency of teachers, etc. These may be responsible but one thing remains. If we really want to check indiscipline, the poor students must get some benefit. At least the poor and deserving students must get free university education. That is the vital necessity of the day. Up to this time university education was a sort of a monopolistic interest of certain sections and it has not spread beyond particular orbits. But now in democracy with high aspirations and dynamic working of society, the weaker sections of the population who come from the rural areas, have got to be given equal opportunities for being educated and if they are denied this opportunity, then that also gives them scope for indiscipline.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Patil. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur. I have got here 20 more names and it is impossible to give them all a chance. At 3 o'clock, the Minister will reply and until then we go on, sitting through the lunch hour. Members should be content to say whatever they have to say in as short a time as possible.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR (Punjab): Sir, in the first place I would like with all my heart, to welcome this Report. In the short space of a few pages, this Commission has raised many fundamental issues and they have also made many useful suggestions. I am in agreement with every word that fell yesterday from the lips of my hon. friend Dr. Kunzru. The subject matter of this Report is of vital importance to the future well-being of the country, for there is no gainsaying the fact that universities everywhere have a tremendous opportunity to produce the right type of educated men and women and above all, of turning out good citizens, filled with a sense of duty and responsibility towards the development of the country.

There are some points which I should like to stress in the few

minutes at my disposal, even though others have already stressed them. The ratio of student to teacher is most unsatisfactory, indeed alarming. How can we expect to maintain high standards of education in a world which is making such dynamic progress in every sphere, if our youth do not have made available to them facilities for imbibing knowledge, and how can they imbibe that knowledge under the existing circumstances? This is the problem that we have to solve. On all hands we hear that standards of English are going down, that students are unable to follow the lectures, that the general standards of knowledge of the students are also deteriorating. Hostel accommodation is just not available. Youth have little or no outlet for their energies and valuable contacts between students and teachers are lacking. Books are not available in adequate numbers in libraries, laboratory equipment is often inadequate. And the natural result of all this is deterioration in standards of teaching and of learning and indiscipline born of frustration from which both the staff and the students suffer. The thirst for knowledge is there and it is increasing rapidly as secondary education spreads. But we have to admit that no proper screening is done at the important stage in secondary education where it should be done. Therefore, the universities are flooded by youth who might do far better if they were helped to find places in institutions other than universities. In every advanced country of the world, Sir, the bent of the student is studied at the proper stage and he and his parents are advised and guided to choose the right career for the student. Very many more polytechnics are needed where our boys and girls can get facilities for learning many trades and be able to follow many occupations where they will make good. What is happening today? They join the ranks of graduates by the score and thereby join the ranks of the unemployed and increase that category in a most alarming manner. Liaison, therefore, between secondary

education and university education is a crying need and this can be met by raising the standards of school education, by proper guides for screening the teenagers, by creating schools like the London Polytechnic and by raising the school-leaving age to 18 and accepting the three-year degree course. I am delighted to learn that most of the universities have accepted this and I hope very shortly all of them will come into line.

All that I have said should certainly happen. But how? I feel that a far greater and indeed dynamic drive has to be made for producing first-class teachers and I would not hesitate to draw this teacher personnel from anywhere in the country, from any university, even from abroad, until such time as we can supply all our needs. Narrow parochialism should go where the general good is concerned. What is happening today? I found while I was Minister for Health that medical colleges would not accept a first-rate professor simply because he happened to belong to another State while they would accept a third-grade teacher from their own. All this is wrong and it must be set right.

As far as language is concerned, I know what a controversial subject it is and I do not want to say very much. I will only say this, that we should not allow our zeal for our regional languages and also for our national language to run away with our discretion where English is concerned. It is far too goodly a heritage for us to lose and in my humble opinion I think that we should change the Constitution, if necessary, and have it included in the Eighth Schedule—I believe it is that—and add it to the 14 languages that already exist there as the principal languages of India and it should be taught to our children from their earliest years just as the national language should also be taught.

Then I would like to stress the need for taking our temples of learning

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.]

out of the mire of party politics. Dr. Kunzru stressed this point in a very able manner yesterday and I would like to endorse every word that he has said. I would like also to add another suggestion. We should move out, by and large, all our universities from our capital cities. This would enable them to have the residential system whereby alone, in my opinion, we can build up healthy traditions for our universities. Every capital city needs accommodation for its growing populations. Why should not the State Governments take over some of the university accommodation and let our colleges move out to more pleasant and new surroundings? In any case, I feel that no new capital should have universities built in its precincts and no new colleges should be built in our capital cities.

Now, co-ordination of standards has been mentioned by many of the speakers and I look upon this aspect as a most important one. If this means that university education will come under Central control, I myself have no objection to this happening because I believe that that would mean the maintenance of uniform and higher standards and I hope, freedom from the influence of party and local politics which are playing havoc with the student world. I believe that this is a matter which needs very early consideration. I would also like to stress the need for all kinds of learning coming under the aegis of the universities. This Report has touched on it in one paragraph but I myself feel that there is no reason whatsoever now for keeping medical education, for example, outside the purview of the universities. I am also in favour of the Commission's comments on general education. The more the windows and doors of our minds can be opened to the light, no matter from where that light comes, the better men and women will we become.

In conclusion, Sir, I sincerely hope that the recommendations on the vital

points raised in this Report will receive the most favourable consideration of the Ministry of Education and that the University Grants Commission that has done such very valuable work in the last year or two will get the financial support that it has asked for and that it needs.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is one of the most important subjects for discussion in Parliament and I feel the entire country is tremendously concerned about the educational problem. There is also a feeling that since our Independence the educational aspect of our work has made very little progress. While we were fighting for Independence, I remember the speeches which indicated the kind of education we wanted, but the actual kind of education we are now promoting is entirely different from what we said we wished at that time. First of all, it is no more Indian than it was. Our colleges and our universities are trying to be copies of Western colleges and universities. Take, for example, the universities in England. Even if we have tried to copy them, it is obvious that our copy is a very very bad and a very superficial copy nor do we have anything like Oxford or Cambridge in our country. We do not have that atmosphere here and no university that comes out of copying can ever be effective. A university must be the result of a national growth and national consciousness. When we are divorced from that, we do not know where we are. See the result. We produce people who do not belong anywhere. Even if we try to give Western education, I am afraid, we produce foreigners even to Western countries, not only foreigners to India. And, this is a very unfortunate thing. The most important fact is that there is no definite principle with regard to our education. What is it we are aiming at? What do we want to produce? Do we want to produce people with degrees so that they may have jobs or, are we trying to change the human character? I feel that this part of it has not really play-

ed an important part in our educational programme and we have not thought of developing the human being.

We are now thinking all the time of trying to develop university education. Perhaps, we think that if the teachers are better paid then it may be that there will be more contact between the students and the teachers. Now, though it is quite all right for Professors to be paid better, I do not know why we think that they are so badly paid. The school teachers are even worse paid. The ambition of a school teacher is to pass M.A. and then become a Professor because he thinks that is a luxurious job. There is no end to the amount that we shall want. My own opinion is that being paid better is not going to improve the relationship between the teacher and the student. The only thing that will improve the relationship is a better attitude towards education and if I may say so, the Professors and the teachers are the people who need a complete reorientation and they need to have a different view of education. At least in schools you are supposed to take an L.T. in order to understand something about teaching but in colleges that is not so. What is the criterion? Who is a good Professor? Is there affection between the students and the teachers? I can positively say that very rarely is there that affection and I do not think affection will come out of money. In the old days, in our country, the ideal of education was so high that the greatest man in the country, the greatest philosopher, the greatest saint was the only person fit to be a teacher but nowadays we think of all the qualifications, of all the diplomas that he has. Well, the most important diploma is the relationship between him and the students and the love that exists.

I entirely agree, of course, that there is so much indiscipline but I must say we must thank the students for the indiscipline because otherwise we would not have tackled the problem

as much as we would like to do now. We might have been satisfied, we might be thinking that we are perfect if they had been dead young people but, thank God, they are alive and, because of that, we have become alive also to the problem. How are we going to solve this problem? I think we must definitely revolutionise our ideas of education. There is no doubt about it that our education must be for character. Secondly, we must ask what it is that a person is going to do in the country through education, what is going to be his vocation, what is going to be his work and, accordingly only they must come to the B.A. or the M.A. class. They think that by passing the B.A. or the M.A. examination they will get good jobs. What happens is that they do not get good jobs even if they have the best of education. Education in our country is so poor that they are the most incapable people when it comes to the ordinary things of life. I find, when it comes to such things, that the educated people are far more incapable than the so-called non-educated people and I think it is preferable to be non-educated considering the result that produced. I am not forgetting the question on Hindi examinations this morning, but certainly we generally forget everything learnt in colleges. Do you think an M.A. student will once again go to the same examinations and pass? The students have false sense of dignity and due to their incapacity find fault with others. The student thinks that the Professor is a very important person, so important that he thinks he would also like to become a Professor and become important. We are all full of this sense of importance and we do not realise that the most important thing is to do anything to be useful, to become cultured individuals, and to produce cultured individuals. I wish our schools were based upon our Indian ideals; I wish there was simplicity in our schools. Nowadays, we are thinking more and more in terms of equipment, laboratories and libraries. Well, it is all very good to have equipment but surely there is an end to it. I

[Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale.] think it is much better for Indian students, the teachers, the Professors, the Principals and even the Vice-Chancellors, to realise that it is much better to live as simple ordinary individuals. There is a problem now because all types of young people are coming into colleges, people who have never had more than a dhoti or two, people who have no money. This is producing complexes because while they are coming in tattered dhoties, they find more important people coming in colleges in some kind of a modern splendour wearing Western clothes which are thought to be superior. Gandhiji tried to set the example. He went through similar days and experiences but he realised finally that simplicity was the most important quality and service, the most important asset in education.

I wish we could re-establish such an ideal and also had residential universities somewhere where there is beauty. In ancient India, universities were always chosen in environments that were beautiful. Apart from the environments which are not beautiful. I am sorry to say that so many of our colleges look like barracks and if we go into the class-rooms or into the offices, they are the untidiest and the dirtiest rooms I have come across. There are a large number of them. though I will not make a wholesale statement, and there are a large number of that type where there is no beauty. How can we expect young people to grow up in such an atmosphere? The students have come from different schools. Is there any contact between the colleges and the schools? The schools are supposed to be run by Government while the colleges and the universities are independent. What is the age in which the young person comes to a college? Adolescent age, the most important age next to childhood from the age of 1 to 7. At that adolescent age even if a good school has sent that child to a college, what happens? Every good that has been done for the young people is undone and they learn bad

habits. They are uncared for. There is no guardianship of those young people. Their emotions are not helped. The result is they feel lost. They do not know what to do and they have no occupation even though there can be so many occupations which are creative and worthwhile.

Speaking of our culture, we are so proud of our culture. What are we doing to produce cultured citizens in our country? What is the culture we are giving them? We send our students to foreign countries to learn something. Well, they go to learn, generally they learn superficial culture of a foreign country, and they are supposed to come and teach us civilisation! What is the culture that they imbibe here and what is the culture they bring? They know nothing about our country. We say we are a secular country; we do not believe in religion; we do not believe in anything though we have grown out of a certain civilisation. Good or bad every Indian must know his civilisation. Not only must he know history, the period in which Akbar lived, etc., but he must also know the history of thought, the history of culture, the development of human character. We don't teach that, because we are not proud of our tradition. Evidently, we are all ashamed of it. That is why we don't teach them. That is what I think. I definitely believe that we do not want a narrow religion. After all, what is religion for? It is for the building of character; it is to help build character. Now, what is it that we are doing here to build character? Where are the homes of greatness and where is the teaching of greatness to young people? At that age when they are in colleges, that is the age of hero worship. They are ready to sacrifice. They will worship if there is the example. Only they have no heroes to worship as far as the colleges and universities are concerned. Of course, there are always wonderful exceptions.

We must provide many extra-curricular activities which are creative and

educative as well, and of course, one of the most important in my opinion is art. Now, there are some affiliated institutions where they are teaching music, dance, drama and so on. But I feel that in every college there ought to be these different vocations where they can give general education combined with specialisation in a particular vocation. Now, for example, a university theatre group came here from America. They are a splendid group of people who are specialised in the dramatic art. Side by side with their dramatic art they give also general education. In the same way we can bring in art, more as a part of education, and if it is assigned its proper place, this will train the young people, will educate them, educate their emotions and will also give a constructive outlet for their emotions and ideas. Because there is no outlet the young people are lost, and we see there is so much of trouble in our country from the students. The problem is not the young people. The problem is the people; the problem is the teacher; the problem is the father and mother; and the problem is the Government. Now, what about father and mother? Why is it that the universities don't make any effort to make the education of the young people a joint effort of both the teachers and the parents? In the schools they think sometimes of the parents, although I must say not so much in this country. But why should not the parents have something to do with education? What do the parents have to say about their problem children, what do they have to say about their sons and daughters who are disrupting the country? I can say this that on the whole our young people have life; they have refinement and they do respond to affection. They do respond to idealism. Only we must become selfless to rouse in the hearts of these young people the eagerness to become great. I was hoping that this University Grants Commission is going to be of tremendous service to our country. Somehow, it has not been able to do as much as it might have done.

Before I go on to further there are just one or two points. One is about the language. Of course, everybody talks about the language problem. So I feel I should also say something about it. Hindi may be quite useful, but I can tell you from my own experience that, after the age of forty, it is not possible to learn Hindi and think in Hindi, and until the time comes when we can do so, it cannot become the official language. I do not see why we should lose English which we have taken so much trouble to learn for 150 years. Let us learn Hindi because we must have contact with each other, but we must also remember that English has become the international language. (*Time bell rings.*) I will just finish. China and other countries are teaching English and likewise we should not lose that heritage. If I may say one small thing, I also think that though there are some people who are strongly for Hindi, they are not perhaps really so, and I am not sure whether in their own hearts they believe in Hindi, because I have seen people who insist that Hindi must be the medium of instruction and yet send their children to convent schools. When I ask them why they do so they say that their children learn English better there! I cannot understand this contradiction but this is happening amongst the people who are strongly propagating Hindi.

One important thing I would like to stress is that the University Grants Commission must be a body which can try experiments in education and they must be free to experiment in education. They must be able to develop new institutions, new ways of education, and I would like to see that the Government does not have control over the University Grants Commission.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

If there is control, I am afraid we will be going exactly the same way as we have been doing so far. Then another important thing I can

[Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale.] say is that all the money allocated for it has not been spent as it should have been spent. To me it seems a shame when there are so many poor children who have no facilities for their education, why should any money have been saved or unspent? We should have given that money even in scholarships to educate the poor children who are brilliant but have not the means for their further education. We must throw open education to all but not indiscriminately because we must also see whether any colleges have become commercial institutions. Sometimes they do. Therefore, it is very important, if this University Grants Commission is going to do really pioneering and splendid work for our country, that it must be free. Whatever money has been allocated under the Plan must be given to the University Grants Commission so that not only they can develop the affiliated institutions but also they can make new plans. They can then widen their prospects of work and try to develop a new type of education. In the commission we have got a group of people who have got ideas and I hope the Government will make it possible for them to work and not allow red tape to interfere with their work nor say: "We shall give you grants only on the basis of past accounts." They should be free to give the grants without examination by Government of the past accounts within the amount that has been allocated to them because only by that freedom there is the hope of a new development in education, and I hope the time has come when the University Grants Commission, given this freedom, with the new ideas, with the visionary ideas, will be able to benefit both the country and the young people and give to India the kind of education that India needs. Also finally give to India not a foreign citizen but an Indian citizen who will work selflessly for the country.

Dr. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Sir, the University Grants Commission, it

appears to me, is doing most valuable and important work. When it was first started as the University Grants Committee in 1945 we were hoping for great things from this Committee; and although our expectations have not been fully realised, I should say much has been carried out, especially now when we have a full-time Chairman like Mr. Deshmukh, one of the ablest men in the country, I am sure a great deal of valuable work will be done in the near future.

Now, I should also say that I am generally of the opinion that a certain part of the expenditure of the Central Government is wasteful, but I cannot say that of the grant for this Commission. To my mind every rupee given to this Commission is very well spent and it is worthwhile. And more and more money must be given to the Commission.

Many points were raised here about the universities and I think some of them are most important, in particular the question of overcrowding in colleges and universities. This is largely because our students are still hankering after B.A. and other degree courses. The importance of humanities and pure sciences is still dominating our universities. This is unfortunate. Humanities are important, I agree, but I do not think any large proportion of those who are crowding the colleges and universities now are good in humanities. They merely go there for getting a degree just because they want a job. That attitude must change in my opinion.

There is also another reason for this overcrowding. It is not all on account of the desire for degrees; it is also because the authorities of several colleges are more interested in expanding their incomes. Therefore, they attract larger and larger numbers of students, just for the purpose of increasing fee collections. It is going on in many parts of the country. I come from a part of the country, Kerala, where there are too many colleges, and the number of

students has increased considerably. But I do not think that on account of this increase in the number of colleges in the country there has been any improvement in the situation. The consequence has been that a large number of the educated people are in difficulties. They are unemployed and they are in a very difficult condition. They are finding it more and more difficult now to get employment in other parts of India and opportunities for jobs in Kerala are very limited. Now, I may also say that this overcrowding is one of the causes of indiscipline among students. Unless discipline is enforced we cannot attain anything great in the country.

Now, what is the remedy for this overcrowding? The three-year degree course is going to remove a part of this difficulty, because the colleges will have two classes less. Therefore this three-year course will reduce the number of students in colleges. In Kerala it has already happened and there is a fear that some of the colleges will have to be closed down, because already the number of students is falling and with this three-year degree course there will be a larger fall, and I am afraid that a certain number of colleges will have to close down. And probably that is not a great loss, because we do not want to have so many colleges for humanities and pure science courses. We want more people to be trained in technology. Therefore, this three-year degree course is necessary but the difficulty is, it raises very complicated issues. First of all, the colleges have to be more and more equipped and secondly one extra year in the high school has to be properly spent; that is to say, high schools are to be re-equipped for this purpose. Now, in my part of the country, in Kerala, in many villages there is a high school. Therefore it is a very big task to upgrade these high schools so that the final year of the students may be properly utilised. It is a very difficult problem to my mind and I do hope that the Government of India

will provide for that. It is a very big task for these institutions and I hope the Minister for Education will take this into account; some of the universities which have accepted this three-year degree course and are implementing the scheme are now in a very difficult situation. I hope this is now being fully realised both in the Central Government as well as in the Commission.

Now, I come to a more important point. The real remedy for overcrowding is not the above. We must have a proper objective for our education. What have we been doing all these years? We are now trying to put through successive Five Year Plans and for that purpose I am sure we will require a very large number of engineers and technical people. Therefore, we have got to have a regular programme for supplying a certain number year by year. A regular programme must be worked out and we must be able to find out how many will be required under different categories in successive years, and we have to prepare ourselves for that by giving the type of education that is required. That kind of planning in regard to training of personnel is absolutely essential, but I do not think that the Commission has touched upon that important aspect. Unless we lay down a certain objective and work towards it we would not be able to carry out our Five Year Plans. And as the hon. Lady Member opposite said, we will be able to provide the trained personnel required, even if this means our getting technical experts from outside to train them. I do feel that now the emphasis must be upon technical training, training in industry and on applied science. Hon. Members may probably know that in this matter other countries have been very active. America has got at least five institutions—big polytechnics. I understand that Russia has got more than 100 institutions called technicums and they are doing apparently well. If you want Five Year Plans to go through, then you require technical

[Dr. P. T. Thomas.]

men, not mere B.As or M.As or even B.Sc.s. but men trained in industries. In industries today we have many men with D.Sc. and other academic qualifications, but their work, in my humble opinion is not up to the mark, because their knowledge is not very practical. We want technically trained people, persons who have worked in the industries, people with practical knowledge of things and that is why we welcomed the setting up of the Kharagpur Institute. Dr. Ghosh is a very competent scientist but he is not there any longer. I hope there will be several other institutions like that. While these are all very welcome, the point is, are we progressing rapidly enough? Are we proceeding with this work vigorously? I do not think we are doing that; I feel that they are thinking still of having more and more universities and colleges of the old type. If you want to develop this country as other countries are doing, we must have this idea firmly in our mind.

I heard the hon. Lady Member opposite speaking about screening. It is a very important idea. When the boys pass the S.S.L.C. and when they come to the colleges, screen them properly; find out their aptitudes. For that, we should get competent men, psychologists. If some of those screened fall short of the requisite standard, there should be other avenues for them. Do not drop them out entirely. There is room for all people. So, this screening is necessary to secure the best men for our purposes. So, as I said special emphasis must be laid on technological training and unless it is taken up by the Inter-University Board much more vigorously than it is doing now, I do not think we can reach our objective.

We know the idea of education of old days; it was a sort of widening of the sphere of knowledge in classics and other things. Now, we want such people in only small numbers; we

want larger numbers of engineers and technologists. That is our problem and therefore we have to so adjust our university policy as to suit our needs as to suit our Five Year Plan which today is the most important objective before the country. I do not think we have been thinking sufficiently on those lines. Of course, much has been talked about technical education but I do not think that the kind of technical education that is required for the development of the country is provided to our students. Unless they work in factories, unless they get practical experience in factories, I do not think these people can be any good at all. In this field I think there is much to learn for us from foreign countries, from countries like West Germany, China, Russia and America. We now have many foreign technicians here in our new steel plants, but are we putting our young people along with those technicians so that they can get the training for the kind of work they have to do? That is the type of education that is needed today and we must shift the emphasis entirely from humanities and pure science to technological and industrial aspects of education and thereby raise in this country a large number of engineer and industrial technicians with practical experience and knowledge. I have not seen much done here, of course, something is being done, I am sure. The hon. Minister is not here but I do hope that he will give us some assurance that something is being done about this important matter. I do not think I need pursue this matter any further. In conclusion, I, who believe that a certain part of the expenditure of the Central Government is wasteful, have to emphasise again that more and more money should be given to this Commission and persons like Shri Deshmukh and his Commission must be given a free hand to spend the money and to devote attention to all these problems are attended to urgently, do not think that our objectives under planning and development can be effectively carried out.

*important problems. Unless the*

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Report that has been presented is an excellent document and I agree with many of the speakers that a very good job has been done. But there are certain matters which I should like to bring to the notice of the Minister and through him to the Commission itself. Let us look at the matter from this point of view. In the Second Five Year Plan about Rs. 4,800 crores is envisaged as the total expenditure; and for education only Rs. 27 crores are allocated for five years. It does not work even more than half per cent—Rs. 4,800 crores on the one hand and Rs. 27 crores on the other. My suggestion would be that Government should try to increase it, if possible. Of course, everything cannot be done. But Government wants technicians, men of knowledge capable of holding higher posts with integrity and character and so forth. So, unless the educational side is properly cared for, from where are you to get all these people? Then, you will have to be satisfied with men of lesser calibre and men of lesser knowledge also. So, I want particularly to stress that Rs. 27 crores is a very meagre allotment. That is all.

Then, there is another think that strikes me. You find that there are four universities which are called Central Universities. In this Report itself there is a regular list given of the universities that are being helped and so forth. Four universities take up a large amount. During 1956-57 the four Central Universities had Rs. 1 crore and 85 lakhs. That is one thing to be noted. While the 28 State Universities had only Rs. 1 crore and 48 lakhs. Notice the difference. Four universities get Rs. 185 lakhs and 28 universities even less than what the four universities get. I do not understand why it is so. I do not say that their share should be lessened. Let them get Rs. 1 crore and 85 lakhs, but let these 28 universities get at least Rs. 2 crore and 85 lakhs. That is my point. I want that it should be increased. The allot-

ment for education should be increased, but there should not be such a great discrimination between the Central Universities and others, which is really due to some historical and other causes. There is no difference really. In the education given, in regard to the graduates turned out, there is hardly any difference whatever. Therefore, I may submit let Government shoulder the responsibility for students that legislative enactment has put upon them. But let them not starve, as it were, or give a step-motherly treatment, to State Universities.

As regards the other 28 universities, now they have become 33. The Report refers to the period up to March 1957. After that, there are now several new universities. It has come now to 33. There is going to be a new university of Marathwada, Ujjain, Kurukshetra, and so many places. Therefore, that would be a very meagre allotment. This discrimination would be more or less troublesome and people will be complaining. That is my idea. Therefore, what I am submitting is, let Government keep the expenditure on the Central Universities where it is, but let the portion for other institutions be increased, doubled or trebled or whatever it is.

Then, another point struck me. The Report also says it creates a lot of difficulties because education is not a Central Subject. Education, including universities, is a State subject. Only four items are there in the Union List. They are 63 to 66. Item 63 only names the Central Universities. Item 64 relates to institutions for scientific or technical education financed by the Government of India. They are put under a separate item. Under item 65, Union Government agencies are dealt with. The only section that affects all universities would be item No. 66 in the Union List. The only province left to the centre is in regard to co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

research and scientific and technical institutions. That is the only thing that is left. It is not actual teaching, but co-ordination and determination of standards. That is all. My idea is that really the Constitution will have to be amended. At least university education should be a Central subject pure and simple. You will find that our education is divided into compartments. Primary education is entirely in the hands of the D.P.I. Then comes secondary education. That also is in the hands, purely, of Government now, because the school-leaving examination is entirely a Government affair. At least in Bombay that is the case. I do not know about other States. In Bombay the secondary school certificate examination is held by the Government now and the university has to accept those pupils. I do not know about other places, in Bombay and Poona, although there are 60 subjects for the S.S.C. examination, the university wants eight subjects. And if anybody has not got all those eight subjects, he will not be admitted to the university. So, these three different authorities clash. The Commission's Report also says there are the universities, there is the Central Government, the State Government and so on and, therefore, delays and difficult situations arise. Therefore, I should say that the hands of State Governments should be stayed. The State Government should be at the most at the secondary school leaving stage. Even that must be controlled to some extent by the universities because these people who are to go to the universities are to be turned out as graduates and so forth. Therefore, really the whole thing requires to be overhauled properly, but until that is done. I have to go into what exists already.

You will notice that university education as such being a State subject, every State has got different Acts. Even in the same State, in Bombay, we have had four different Acts. One Act came into being in 1904, one in

1928, and we have now another Act. The Acts are entirely different. So, there is no continuity or a natural growth even, as it were. Therefore, this is another point which I stress because it is not only the Minister for Education but everybody can tell the Government. The Minister is a part and limb of Government, so he can tell the Government that this is the view of some people, if not many.

Then, at page 9 of the Report you will find that it refers to various difficult problems. It is in the middle of the page: "It has been found in practice that this raises various problems of relationship between the University Grants Commission, the universities and the State Governments concerned. If the present constitutional set-up remains unaltered, it will be necessary for certain conventions to be established by agreement." Instead of conventions which will be flouted at any time, let us have some legislative enactment where these things will be straightened up.

Then, I refer to another matter. I find under the present University Grants Commission Act, only one post is fully paid, only one officer is a full-time officer. All the other eight people are more or less part-time men. I would submit that this should be changed. One man however intelligent or however clever, cannot deal with hundreds and thousands of subjects that have to be dealt with, for which institutions have to be started and promoted and so on. I would suggest that out of nine people in all five should be full-time people.

One is already there. He is a 1 P.M. full-time man. Then there should be four or at least three people, one for humanities, another for science, the third for technology and the fourth for medicine. In that way there should be men for whom it will be a whole-time job. We have a vast country. We have already 33 universities. We have so many diplomas and degrees and so many subjects. No provision

is made anywhere for atomic or nuclear physics. We have the Fundamental Research Institute at Trombay. It is not a University. It is an independent institution. What I am driving at is there should be something done by way of having full-time men, most eminent men. You look at the constitution of this Commission. As it stands, you will find they are very busy men—at page 7 you have got the names: Dr. Mudaliar, Dr. Zakir Husain, Pandit Kunzru, Prof. Sidhanta, Dr. Thacker, Shri Chatterji, Shri Saiyidain, and Shri Ratnam who is Secretary in the Finance Ministry. They are all full-time officers elsewhere already burdened with too many things. I cannot blame them if they cannot find time. It is the institution, the law, that has made these things. I would suggest that at least half of them should be full-time men.

Then I pass on to another subject, as regards the establishment of new universities. There was a good deal of talk about it. My hon. friend Shri Govinda Reddy and others said that all should be allowed to enter universities. Already there are restrictions. At present first class people do not get admission into the engineering colleges. At present there are very few engineering colleges. There are only three medical colleges in Bombay, but there are hundreds and thousands of candidates. Take the results of Intermediate Science—Chemistry, Physics and Biology. In that group whoever gets first class is supposed to get admission. If first class people could not get admission, what other method can you suggest? Then it will give scope to all sorts of things. If you allow other concessions to come in, then they may be able to participate. The university has declared these men as first class. It may be right or wrong. The university is an independent body. Even now there are restrictions. My idea is that you must put a stop somewhere and you must follow the British method. In Britain, as far as

I understand, even the poorest man's son can go to Oxford or Cambridge because the Government there provides 70 per cent. or even more of the total expenditure on university education. There is a special arrangement, a special board, by which even the poorest man's son, if he has first class ability, is taken up in the university, and all his expenses—boarding, lodging, teaching, in fact everything—are given by the Government. Are you prepared to do that? This may be done, but where is the money? With Rs. 27 crores, you cannot do that in five years. You must make the best of the matter and have the best of the bargain, and there must be restrictions. In my time sixty years ago only 3,000 candidates appeared for the Matric. Now, 1 lakh appear in the Bombay Presidency. In sixty years it has gone up by thirty times, and what happens? They rush to the colleges. In my time there was in the first year a university examination and only 30 per cent of the candidates passed. Now, it is a college examination and 90 to 95 per cent. pass because every college is afraid that if it makes people fail, some other college will get them admitted and it will lose them. College education is not necessarily meant for everybody. But everybody thinks it is good for him. The college may decide "he is a first class boy; simply because he is poor he cannot be penalised". I can understand that. But "come one, come all" should not be the principle. I should like to elaborate this point. Sir, may I continue after lunch?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are continuing through the lunch hour. You may take five minutes and finish.

DR. P. V. KANE: Sir, what I am saying is that you cannot have all people admitted into colleges. If you admit them, the result will not be good.

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

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

I was connected with the profession of teaching in different capacities. I was a teacher in Sanskrit for seven years, and I was a professor of law for six years. When I was a professor of Law, I had to lecture on such a good subject as the Criminal Procedure Code to 300 students because they were all admitted—at that time there was a single college for Law in Bombay. Therefore, 300 students were admitted, and everyday there was a big lecture. Some students were not listening, some students were reading something else, and it was taxing in the extreme to keep 300 boys going, and you were not allowed to have a smaller number. Unless you reduce the number, even if you pay the professor well, nothing will be done or can be done. Therefore, you must make up your mind that the intelligent ones only will be taken. How can that be effected? Whether it should be only by an examination or some other method, it is for those who are responsible for education to decide. I do not think there is any method which is better or superior than the university examination. I have got some experience in this regard, and I do not want to spend my time on it. If you use any other method, even those who are clamouring that the examinations are not good will come and say “let there be examination because the rich man's son will get all the chance and there will be no chance for the poor man's son.” My point is there is no method known so far as I understand by which you can find out who will benefit. The only method at present is that of examination.

Another subject that occurs to me is this. The Commission themselves admit that the highest priority should be given to the scale of salaries of teachers. That is what they say at page 24. I entirely agree. On page 24 they say “This Committee did not submit a formal report; but it was their view that the highest priority should be given to the improvement

of teachers' salaries and of conditions generally in the colleges.” That is what the Commission as a whole have put down on paper. I entirely agree, but please do not run away with the idea that salaries are going to improve everything at once. There are many men who are more or less idealists, and if there is sufficient competence given to them they would stick to the profession. But this latter condition is more important, the other environment, “of conditions generally”. Even now there are cases going on of professors being dismissed without being given six months' notice. That is not the general condition that should exist. Supposing the professor of a department is at fault, is that the way to dismiss him? Let there be admonition given to him, let there be deduction in his salary. Therefore, the general conditions must all be favourable, and of course higher salaries must be paid. You will find that in my time Rs. 100 was the salary for an M.A. First Class. I do not know what it is now, I suppose it is Rs. 150, but the difference in the cost of living is five times between then and now. In my boyhood days one could go to an eating house and pay Rs. 10 for a month. Now, you require Rs. 45 for that purpose. Look at pages 13 and 23 for comparison. You will find that the salaries are not proposed to be increased in the way in which things have become dear. Look at page 23 first. There you will find stated as follows:

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

Now, come back to page 13. For professors it is Rs. 800-1250. The increase must be one and a half times. But do you mean to say that the rise in the general level of expenditure is only one and a half times? No. It is four times or three times at least. So, even these salaries are not attractive enough. My point

is not that you should increase it to Rs. 3,000. But my point is this. Do not be carried away by the idea that mere salaries are going to secure you the best men and women for carrying on our education. I had been to Germany. In some of the big towns there, next to the Mayor, the head of the university comes in the order of precedence. But here nobody cares for the principal of a college. If he goes to attend any meeting, nobody will care to enquire whether he is a principal or anybody else. So, there are so many other things besides money, for example his position in society and the respect paid to him, even when he is wrong. After all, every man is likely to be in the wrong. So, the general conditions must also be satisfactory. What I am driving at is, do not be guided by the fact that merely an increase in salaries is going to cure all your ills. That is not correct. It may no doubt alleviate them. Of course, you may be able to get some good men, but unless their conditions of service and the treatment meted out to them are better, any increase ~~and~~ salary will not necessarily attract men. Nowadays, things are so difficult. In my time, of course, I travelled from the teaching line to the lawyer's line. Now, that line is also blocked because hundreds of people have crowded there. But my point is that this profession of teaching is rather difficult. People say "Oh, you are following a very noble profession." But it is a very sorry business, very badly paid, very badly treated, and not very much honoured. Yesterday, I suppose, Dr. Kunzru said that some invigilators were assaulted by the students because they were not allowed to copy. So, things have come to such a pass. And, therefore, unless you want that things should go on from bad to worse, many other things will have to be looked into. The hon. lady Member said that there should be a proper atmosphere created. But I could not understand what she meant by that. Did she want us to go to the days of the

Upanishads when the teachers taught in the forests and the students learnt whatever they could learn by old traditions? That is not possible now. In Delhi for example you cannot get even a small room or two. And you cannot go to a forest. I suppose there is no forest nearby. So, the point is that you must inculcate character and honesty etc. But that is something inner and subtle. I know, as a matter of fact, every witness comes and says "In the name of God, I wish to tell the truth." And you can get sixteen witnesses for a rupee. Character is not necessarily built by religion. It is very subtle and difficult to define it, and we can only rely upon good education being given and good opportunities being offered to the persons who join the educational institutions, and proper discipline being observed, as far as possible. That is all.

At present there is a committee which will decide qualifications. I think no committee would have been required if there had been five full-time men who could have sat down and come to some conclusion about qualifications. But they appoint a committee for that purpose. You will find that two committees have been appointed, one for deciding qualifications and the other for deciding the medium of instruction. Of course, that is a very thorny subject, and I am coming to that later on.

Then, Sir, as regards medical education, they say at page 24 that—

"Another limitation which we have so far accepted for historic reasons is that of not making any grants toward medical or agricultural education. These two branches of higher education have, in the past, been considered the responsibility of the Departments of Health and Agriculture."

That is a very serious thing, Sir, because our own health is concerned and there is no grant by the Government for higher medical research or anything of that kind. And I do not

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

know whether the Ministries of Agriculture and Health are discharging that responsibility, but the University Grants Commission should concern itself with the scientific aspect. The aspect of nursing and curing after the man gets a disease should be left to the Health Ministry and other people. In this connection, I would also urge that the University Grants Commission should look into the Ayurvedic and other systems of medicines also. I know a little bit of the Ayurvedic system. There is also the Homoeopathic system as also the Unani system and so many other systems. Do not suppose that any system has got the monopoly of truth. I have tried all kinds of systems on myself when I was ill, and therefore I can tell you as a matter of experience that every system has some good points, but not all good points. So there should be Ayurvedic research also because it is our own and the medicines are our own; they are growing in jungles. Therefore, it is better to use them rather than to send them to England and get tinctures etc. So, this should be one of their charges.

Then as regards scholarships and fellowships etc. I draw your particular attention to page 26. There they lay down certain things. I welcome them. But the provision made is rather meagre. They state as follows :

"As a beginning we have created 80 post-graduate scholarships of the value of Rs. 100 each p.m. and 50 Research scholarships of Rs. 150 each p.m. on the Humanities side."

Well, I would suggest that those who are research students and post-graduate students will all be in big cities and Rs. 100 would not be very much for them. Instead of taking up the post-graduate course, if he becomes a graduate and passes the I.A.S. examination, he can get much more than that, and in that case why should he spend two years or four

years on Rs. 100? Further it has been stated that—

"We are also proposing the creation of 100 Fellowships of Rs. 300 each and 100 Scholarships of Rs. 200 each on the Science side."

I do not understand why this distinction is made between arts and science. I do not agree there. Now you will see that there are more science graduates than arts graduates. Only ladies go in for arts. I know that in a college in Bombay there were 900 students in arts. Out of them there were 600 girls and 300 boys. I do not know what happens in the other parts of the country. So, my suggestion is that there should be no distinction between arts and science graduates. Let it be Rs. 150 for all, or let it be at least Rs. 100 for all.

Then, Sir, there is one thing over which I have always been hammering. The Government was pleased to send me as a delegate to . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Dr. Kane, you wanted five minutes, and now you have taken . . .

DR. P. V. KANE: Well, Sir, if there are many speakers, I do not want to impinge upon their time. I think if you will allow me five minutes more, I will enumerate only one point and I will not dilate on that.

Sir, the other point is that I want that we should have fellowships of Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 for our students to go and learn other languages for example Hittite, Mesopotamian and Egyptian because they have got a bearing on our past history. Then, Sir, as regards huge numbers, every year our population is increasing by 50 lakhs or 60 lakhs, and there will be 50 thousand more students every year. As the numbers are going to increase, you must find out some method, as I said, for them also. Naturally, standards will be lowered.

Lastly, I come to the three-year degree course. I don't see why this is so much talked of. In Bombay at least, in my part, there was this three-year degree course previously. Now it is 4 years. For 35 to 40 years in Bombay there was the three-year course but for the last 60 years they have the four-year course. The idea seems to be, up to Intermediate standards schools will cater, and the higher studies up to B.A. and beyond will be taken up by the colleges and universities. My idea will be, this three-year course if pursued, in this fashion, will result in far lower standards than at present. I give that warning. We know what kind of schools we have and if we add the first year—Inter Arts and Science—to schools, nothing will come out. It will be worse than at present. I have no time; otherwise I would have elaborated on that.

As regards the medium of instruction, at present there is anarchy; in different States there are different procedures. In our time, we used to learn English from the 1st to 7th classes. Now they have put it at 5th—from 5th to 7th. In the same standards there is also Hindi—from 4th to 6th. So, the students know neither English nor Hindi well and in the colleges they follow neither. The result is that education has become rather below standard and it will not improve easily. Medium of instruction is the most important thing. Let the Government take some time but let it apply its mind and make it a uniform thing everywhere. In this connection some loose talk and language are employed. They say Hindi is a national language. This is incorrect; they should say that Hindi is the official language, for official purposes. English was not a national language in British days. It was the official language. Similarly, Hindi will be the official language of the Union and the 14 languages shall be the national languages. Each one is a national language. They are on the same footing; in the Eighth schedule there are

14 languages. Therefore, let there be no loose talk of this kind. Hindi could never be accepted as a national language. Perhaps, 100 years hence it may be. At present this talk is loose and it puts up the back of people. Hindi is going to be the official language and the others are national languages. That is what I wanted to emphasise.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Sir, I shall content myself with one or two immediate and practical points. The hon. Minister informed the House yesterday that in respect of matching contributions to meet the additional expenditure on account of salaries to teaching staff in the affiliated colleges, the Government of India have already taken certain decisions and that they are in correspondence with the States for the implementation of the same. Now, I am informed that in giving grants for this purpose to the affiliated colleges, the Government of India are making a distinction between the affiliated private colleges and the affiliated Government colleges. That is, they meet part of the cost in so far as private affiliated colleges are concerned but are not giving the same aid to the Government colleges. In strict principles, there may be something to be said in favour of this distinction. But if this principle is enforced in actual practice, that will cause great hardship on some at least of the State Governments. To illustrate my point, I shall explain the position in Kerala. For historical reasons, the State Government in that area did pioneering work in the matter of higher education and a number of colleges directly, under the charge of the Government are functioning there. Now, if it were the responsibility of the State Government only to maintain these State colleges and to find the wherewithal for the development of these colleges, of course with certain difficulties they could somehow manage to do it. But their responsibility is not limited to that alone. Alongside of these Government colleges, a number of private

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.] colleges have also sprung up there. Already in Kerala, the House must be aware, out of roughly a budget of Rs. 13 crores, more than Rs. 10 crores is spent on education and the major share of it is going to university education, about one-third of it. Now, according to Government's decision, the Centre should meet half the cost in so far as increased expenditure of the private colleges is concerned. Now, who will find the other half? The hard reality is that many of the private colleges, placed as they are now, have not the resources to meet any additional expenditure. They know that if the standard of education is to be improved, they have to attract better type of teachers for whom they must give better pay and they must have more resources for the same. So, they have to look to either Government or private endowments. It is the sad experience now that you cannot expect much from private endowments. Now, they can look to the State Government. If the State Governments are required to meet all the expenditure for maintenance as well as development of the Government institutions, there will be very little left in their hands to help the private colleges. If on the other hand the Commission and the Central Government do not make this distinction, if they agree to meet or share the expenditure in so far as Government affiliated colleges are also concerned, then the amount set apart by the States can be utilized for the benefit of the Government colleges as well as the private colleges. The result will be that education will not be retarded. Otherwise, it will be very difficult for these private colleges to take advantage of this matching contribution which Government are giving. So, I wanted to impress on the attention of the hon. Minister this point very much and I trust that he will throw some light on this. Especially, in a State like Kerala where a number of these Government colleges also exist alongside with private colleges, if this distinc-

tion is made, then the whole sphere of higher education will be affected. That is one point which I wanted to make.

Then, a reference was made to overcrowding in universities, the big increase in the number of students in colleges and universities who go in for higher education. Now, suggestions have been made that there must be some steps taken to drastically reduce the number. The question of consolidation has been interposed to that of expansion. The Commission in their Report has referred to this fact of overcrowding in university institutions and they also refer to the number of problems which this overcrowding has given rise to. I would want to emphasise one point and that is, we need not be unduly concerned over this at the moment because a reverse trend is already in evidence. In my State of Kerala and from what I know of the state of affairs in Madras, where an attempt has been made to enforce this three-year degree course, where the reorganised education is also being applied, there has been a steep fall in the admissions to colleges, both in Madras and in Kerala. So, that trend is there because of the enforcement of this three-year degree course and because of the establishment of an increasing number of higher secondary schools and also because of the establishment of an increasing number of technical institutions and a very large number of students are being attracted, and very properly attracted, in my opinion, to these technical courses, and they who go in for higher education in colleges in the humanities and other such subjects, their number is getting reduced. So, I say, let us wait and see how this trend is working out in the immediate future and in the next few years and then it will be time for us to review the whole position. On the other hand, if in our haste and anxiety to improve the quality of our university education, we drastically reduce the number of students, that

would be a positive disservice to the cause of higher education and we will not be doing the fair thing by the rising generation also.

This issue is connected with the reorganisation of secondary education and this process will take some time, I know. Many of the States are yet to apply this reorganised course so far as their States are concerned. They will take some time. But what we seek to achieve by reducing the number, by diverting a fair number of students to technical and other courses and preventing such as are not competent from going in for higher education, can be achieved, I will not say wholly, but to a great measure, by the enforcement of this three-year degree course and also by the reorganisation of the secondary education.

Sir, these are the points that I wanted to make.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): Sir, I thank you very much for having given me this chance, though in a very thin House, to have my say on this important question. Sir, there are three or four points on which I propose to dwell when discussing this important subject. But before I proceed to discuss it, I welcome the Report which is the first of its kind in the history of the Union administration. Sir, I would have been very glad if the Report had given us more information especially about finance and other items which have been discussed here in the Report. Let me hope that this defect will be made up when we get the second report.

Next, I would like to thank the hon. Minister in charge of Education. Sir, we want freedom of thought and the freedom of educational institutions and universities. The University Grants Commission is a very important institution in this regard and I am very glad to see that absolute freedom has been conceded to this Commission and what is more, the hon. Minister in charge has dispelled all

our fears when he stated that all the grants allotted to the Commission have not been utilised. That is a very welcome feature for which we have to thank the hon. Minister and the Ministry in charge of Education.

There is one point stated by my hon. friend Dr. Sapru which needs the recording of a protest. He stated that the responsibility of the Government of India in this regard was only in a general way. I join issue with him and I feel and I have no hesitation to state it also, that the hon. Minister in charge of Education will agree with me, that the responsibility of the Centre is as great and as onerous as that of the provinces. Sir, the State Governments are merely field workers. All the sources of revenue, all elastic sources of revenue are with the Union. The Centre which in the British days, in the pre-war days, had about Rs. 110 crores of revenue, now has about Rs. 700 crores. Think of the finances of the State Governments. They have to attend to everything, along with education. Therefore, I would join issue with anyone who stated on the floor of the House that this responsibility of the Government of India was only in a general way. Sir, planned economy, planned programmes and five year programmes will all be meaningless if we take up this attitude. Therefore, I want to state categorically in this House that we do not join him, nor do we go with him, in this assertion.

One aspect of the question I want to impress both on the Government and on the University Grants Commission is this. The British Government have left India leaving some of the States fortunate and leaving some other States in an unfortunate and backward state. If you want to take India to its destined goal, you cannot stand on matching grants and their of schemes for which the State should pay so much and "I would pay much" and all that. That would be bad attitude. The attitude should be based on ability, on the availability

[Shri Biswanath Das.]

of money, the necessity to bring up the State universities to a level. If any university has gone beyond that level, gone up the level, then so far so good. But it should be the duty of the University Grants Commission to see that a certain standard is maintained and that all universities come to that level. Sir, think of the new universities and those in the poor States, think of their misery. There are universities started ten years back and yet they have no place of habitation to call their own, not even an office. Think of the Utkal University. Think of the Gauhati University. Think of the Rajasthan University and a host of other universities. If you place them along with old universities and weigh them on the same scales, then university education is bound to be as bad as is the economic position today in India, after these two Plans. In my note on defective planning, I have stated how terribly the Planning Commission has erred in taking up certain actions and how the advanced provinces have been put in a favourable position and the backward and poor provinces in a difficult position so as to make the uniform progress of India a difficult one for a long time to come. Are you going to repeat the same mistake in the case of the universities? I presume that the Minister for Education will rise to the level and the University Grants Commission will open up their eyes and see that this defect is made up. Therefore, Sir, the new universities and especially the universities of the poorer States call for more attention and more money. Sir, it took my breath away when I was told by my hon. friend of matching grants. It is a terrible rot which has eaten away India. Is it also going to eat away the universities? I cannot agree with anyone who stands on matching grants. You have got a giant and a pigmy and you want them to work together. Bombay will give you tens of thousands whereas where is Assam, where is Orissa, where is Rajasthan going to get money for matching grants? Sir,

matching comes in between a person and a person and I have never found persons and money matching. It is impossible, it is ridiculous and it is a negation of everything good. Therefore, I want the hon. Minister to repudiate this matching grant, this notion of matching grant in this House.

I now come to the question of discipline. A lot of things have been stated about discipline. Before approaching the question, let us think of the existing conditions and circumstances. The students were the vanguards in our fight for freedom. Therefore, they were enthused and they were a set of people with certainly advanced thinking. After ten or twelve years of freedom, they find that they are taught in the same English by second, third and fourth-rate teachers who paid greater attention probably to private tuitions than to instruction in the colleges and schools. Therefore, the result is that the colleges and the universities have ceased to have any attraction for them. As a student, I know that whenever we had a bad teacher, we used to avoid him. Our thoughts were, "Why waste an hour with him. Therefore, avoid him". What is the result of it today? Today, young people, with a vision before them are being taught in English by persons who themselves do not know probably good English. The students in Japan, he knows, are taught in Japanese; the students in China are taught in Chinese and they are very forward and they are no less forward than any European country students. People in Turkey are taught in Turkish and so are the people of Egypt who are taught in their language, not in English or French or German. Necessarily, therefore, the students are enraged. If anyone like our respected friend, Shri Rajagopalachari, or anyone needs English and wants it to be a national language, let it be for them. No one denies that but each student should have the right to think for himself. Why should he be taught in this language? That is his first rage. The

second is the teacher. There are very many teachers. You do not offer them good scales of pay and therefore, as was admitted by many of the friends, the first rate people go in for executive service or for some service which will pay them more. The result naturally is that second rate or third rate people come and they take more time for their private tuitions than for college work. College work is difficult, taxing work and they have no time to prepare the subject and deliver the lecture. I want to know from the University Grants Commission whether they have taken any step in this regard, namely, to go to a class and sit in the class like a student and ask the professor to explain and teach the students. I think that should be the principle. The management and the University Grants Commission should take some action, some steps in this direction and see that the profession of teaching which is so noble and so respectable is respected.

Sir, the third item is this. India is a country of high morals and religious notions and feelings. You prescribe textbooks having mainly the philosophy of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This is the philosophy inculcated amongst the student. What is he to do? The class-room is no more attractive nor the hostel for him and so he is necessarily driven to rebel. He was born a rebel and continues to be a rebel. The result is indiscipline and who is to blame? You have to blame yourself.

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE** (Bihar): Engels did not preach indiscipline.

**SHRI BISWANATH DAS:** No, he did not. Go to Russia, you will not find any indiscipline there. It is absolutely disciplined. Your *Saddarshana*, the *Vedanta*, the *Mimamsa* and other schools of philosophy have no place in our universities even after the lapse of ten or twelve years. Your philosophy has no place. The teaching in the colleges and the institutions and the rest of it, the entire university life, makes

them a rebel. Therefore, what is the use of blaming the students? I paraphrase a few words of *Kaliya Upakhyaana*. Who is this *Kaliya*? I speak from the *Dasamaskandam*. Gopa Leela of *Shrimad Bhagawatham*. What did *Kaliya* say when he was overpowered by the Lord? He fell prostrate at the feet of the Lord and says, "How have I sinned? You have made me a serpent. You have given me poison, and you have given me the company of snakes and have kept me in the *Kalindi* lake. What else could I have done? except casting my poison at your feet what else could I have done?" Therefore, friends, with the conditions you have created for them, what else could you expect except indiscipline? Therefore, to me it looks that the university, the teacher and all that they stand for are responsible for creating the present tendencies. I do not blame the students.

(Interruptions.)

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY):** Order, order. Let him continue.

**SHRI BISWANATH DAS:** Including myself because I am a product of this. Therefore, I do not blame the students. Therefore, I request the University Grants Commission and I would appeal to all the Vice-Chancellors of the universities to give this their close attention and take necessary steps.

Sir, having stated so much, I come to another equally important question. Before the advent of the Westerners we had our own systems and science. One hundred and fifty years of British rule have wiped out, not wiped out, have practically thrown out of gear our systems of thought, our institutions and the course of our culture and science. Sir, ten years have elapsed and I have a right to claim from my hon. friend the Education Minister as also the universities and the University Grants Commission as to what steps have been taken to do anything in that direc-

[Shri Biswanath Das]  
 tion. When I say this I have in mind the various schools of philosophy, the six schools of philosophy, and then our own medical science, the Ayurveda, the Siddha and the Unani, our systems of *materia medica*, our systems of astronomy, our *yoga*, *tantra* and a number of other branches. Sir, have not these systems a right on the Government as also on the thinking public and the universities? Have they done anything to revive them? Have they done anything to touch them with even a pair of tongs? My hon. leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in the course of a reply, when some people pressed for Ayurveda, was good enough to say: Well, you cannot expect us to accept it without experiments in the scientific way, unless there is scientific proof of it. I never said that you should accept them as they are, without any examination. I want you to put them to scientific test. But have you taken any steps in that direction? I ask the Government, the University Grants Commission and the universities whether they have taken any steps in that direction, to put them to scientific test, to see whether they are worth accepting or rejecting or whether any steps could be taken in that regard, to improve them or to carry on research in them or to organise them and to see whether the works of our ancient scientists and philosophers had any use still in this modern world. Were our ancient scientists and thinkers fools to bestow all their lives and thoughts on these systems and evolve these systems of thought and systems of science for nothing, to be thrown out like anything? Therefore, I would appeal to the University Grants Commission to take some definite steps in this regard. Why should they not request universities to carry on research in this regard, the research being financed by the University Grants Commission? Why not they call upon the universities to do it? But it is a matter of regret and shame that no university except two has yet taken any steps in this regard. When I see this I am

most ashamed. Except the poona University which has a chair for ancient philosophy, and the Hindu University, I do not think any other university has taken positive steps in this direction. Therefore, I would appeal to the University Grants Commission to bestow their thoughts on this and spend money in this regard.

Sir, another question, probably the last, which pains me very much is the health of the student community. They are the future hopes of this country. In any scheme of planned progress for India I do not feel that we will be wiser by neglecting or omitting the question of the student community of India. Their health is deteriorating. This is not my assertion alone. This has been admitted by the university inspectors, by medical men and all the rest of it. Now, what positive steps have been taken? You have got the students hostels, the university hostels, the college hostels. Are any definite steps being taken in this regard?

Sir, everyone talks of planned programme, balanced diet . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: . . . and balanced population.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Yes, balanced population. I agree with you, friend. I want to ask the University Grants Commission whether they have taken any distinct steps in this regard, to provide a balanced diet in terms of the Kumarappa Committee Report which ensures 2800 calories for each individual Indian on a diet sheet, which does not cost very much? Sir, this should be applied at least to the hostels and student community and positive steps taken in this regard so that we get a healthy and robust student population.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: But does it concern the University Grants Commission?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Certainly it does, student hostels. They are all the concern of the University Grants Commission.

Sir, I have something more to add; I wanted to say something more, but in a thin House it is no use saying more.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): Sir, the Report of the University Grants Commission is a most valuable Report, and the Commission and its Members deserve our hearty congratulations, not only on the work they have done but also on the proposals they have made and for their careful analysis of the problems confronting university education, education in the lower and higher levels, and for the suggestions to meet these problems, to save knowledge, scholarship, culture, and all that is best in our tradition from deterioration and decay and to make them survive unto eternity.

On pages 4 and 5 of the University Grants Commission's Report it is said under the "Functions of the Commission":

"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 Universities, and for the purpose of performing its functions under this Act, the Commission may" deal with funds (in one Section) and see that proper standards are maintained (in a second Section) and take steps with regard to the vital need for co-ordinating the work of various universities.

They have on page 11 of their Report referred to "co-ordination and determination of standards" and said how for all this the medium of instruction is vital, and for a long time to come, English, they hope, would continue as the medium of instruction at the university stage, and they don't see the wisdom of changing

the medium from English to any other language. And a committee has been appointed which is led by our learned colleague, Pandit H. N. Kunzru, and I hope this Committee would go very carefully into all that is involved in retaining English as the medium of instruction at the university level, and report in a way that would be congenial not only for the democracy that we have constructed here basing its root on all that is not only ours but also of other countries and also see that the future generation, in fact our present generation of youth will not suffer from a muddled and confused syllabus right through, at the primary, secondary and university levels. I am saying all this, Sir, in order to meet some criticisms that have come forward attacking an expression of opinion, on a platform like this, and casting a slur on such persons for a mere expression of opinion. I demand of this

2 P.M. House whether we are not here to give expression to our ideas at various stages. Shri Rajagopalachari was referred to; he is an elder statesman and whatever he might have said we have to meet ideas with ideas; that is all and beyond that, I hope, this House and our democracy will not proceed. We started with the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis but who in our heart of hearts today does not feel that things might well have been dealt with otherwise. In my own family an elder statesman on his death-bed one day wrote an article that the linguistic division is not desirable. He went and gave the article to a paper—the Express in Madras—and died the following day with this idea running in his brain, "Is linguistic division reasonable for the unity of India?" Well, we cannot go back now; conditioned as we are, we have to make the best out of the creation that we have evolved and therefore the University Grants Commission comes at a very good juncture to see that education is saved at all stages.

Things were said about lack of Indian education, Indian standards,

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]

Indian way of life etc. by some speakers here. I am also an Indian; all of us here are Indians. I want to ask this question. Down through the ages, the long array of our leaders, from the great Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Bipin Chandra Paul, Surendra Nath Banerjee, Bhupendranath Basu, Pandit Motilal Nehru, our Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Radhakrishnan and other great fighters for freedom, patriots, intellectuals, saints and sages, Sarojini Devi, Dadabhoi Nauroji, Lokmanya Tilak, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Ranade and the Rt. Hon. Srinivasa Sastriar, "the silver-tongued orator of the East" and our Swami Vivekananda himself, who pleaded our cause in the councils and conferences of the world—and I can quote many others also—and our Mahatmaji himself, in what language did they plead the cause of our nation, with what effort did they construct this edifice that is our democracy? Has Mahatmaji not been an Indian even though he was educated in Western universities and in the Western method of instruction? Are we to deny what is due to our education, now that we are thinking of injecting, may be something new, into this culture that we have derived? I feel that many books in our library, in this House, in our way of life and in all the edifices that we have put up as constitution and legislation have to be demolished if we forego our allegiance to the education that we have inculcated in our universities and in our schools so far during the last 150 years.

Sir, there is another evil that is corroding our society and that is that we must abolish history as part of it is not pleasant; we must pull down this statue or that statue because it is not congenial, not in keeping with our patriotism and national pride! It is a very dangerous practice and it is not in keeping with all that is education and culture to do this kind of thing. We must have history in order to look at history, to study history in

its proper perspective and to teach our younger generation and to enable them to judge for themselves . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:  
Are they not signs of slavery?

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Well, I do not know; very often it is interpreted in different ways and through slavery, Sir, nations have gained freedom and realised its charms—all the greater tribute to such achievement of freedom. Ideas have nothing to do with slavery. In the British Constitution, the American Constitution, in the realm of ideas, this question of slavery need not enter at all. That is what I am pleading now. I want to pay a tribute to all the progressive ideas in our universities. In fact, it is since independence that the lowering of standards has taken place due to many reasons. I will not blame the professors or the students or the system itself, but due to various circumstances, economic, social and political, education among other things is going into the melting pot. Today a syllabus is released, tomorrow it is scrapped and the third day there is another. I am sorry for the younger generation of children. They are in difficulties today. Till yesterday Sanskrit was one of the compulsory subjects and they could study Sanskrit. And today not that they object to learning Hindi as such, because if we can study French and German for passing examinations there will be no difficulty for this but it is the way in which it is presented that it is only through that door that you can see Heaven, that is upsetting the younger generation. Therefore, I hope that the University Grants Commission will see that right from the school stage—even though education they say is a State subject, well, you cannot construct a superstructure without the base being properly investigated into—English should form part and parcel of education in order to enable us to lead the students to the university level and in order to enable them to understand . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:  
But, Sir . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Order, order. The hon. Member knows that he cannot interrupt from different places.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: All that is possible in all lines of education; not only literary, humanistic, scientific, technical and all that but in all lines. I am not saying that no child should love its mother-tongue. I am a lover of my mother-tongue; I love my Tamil but that does not mean that I could give a lecture or a talk in Tamil here when all the others do not follow me. It is in the same spirit that I would like to point this out. You can have your mother-tongue. Have educational institutions on that basis not only in your State but if other States would allow it, have it. But at one time you say that India is a Union; it is a unity and we ought to think in terms of a common citizenship of the whole of India, nay of the whole world and on other occasions you state that this is a State and therefore the State has to deal with this question and we should have nothing to do with it. I think this kind of discrepancy must be clarified for the good of our young generation. I remember Sarojini Devi addressing a youth gathering, looking at them, said: "If you ask me what is the hope of tomorrow, I would only say, you are the hope of tomorrow". What are we doing for that "hope of tomorrow"? We are leaving them in this kind of muddle; they do not know what to do, what to study, what to live for. That is the problem that is to be confronted not only by the University Grants Commission but by all thinkers. The hon. Minister, Dr. Shrimali, has to consider that and plan in such a way that we steer clear of confusions and conflicts and build our educational edifice on solid and firm foundations.

Sir, there were many issues that were raised but I am concerned only with a few of them because time will not permit me to deal with all of them. And one of them is the stress that is laid on technical and scientific research at the expense of humanities. Of course, Humanities are provided. As my friend, Dr. Kane, has pointed out the allocations made and the scholarships given are all discriminative. That is, science and technical subjects are given more and Humanities are given less. I would like you to remember, I am addressing the Education Minister—I am glad that he is there—and I am happy that he has assured us yesterday in the House that the universities are autonomous, that Government is not going to allow politics to infringe the liberty of the universities. I am very happy that he is here and I would like him to remember that if Humanities are not given their proper status and proper support for their continuous development, a merely industrialised, a merely technologically built culture, is not going to save this world from deluge and destruction. And that I would say is the warning that has been given by all people, great thinkers of this country not only now but for ages. And so I would plead for a proper place for the Humanities to be given in these universities.

Again, universities are springing up like mushrooms. I do not know if they could maintain the standards and whether the University Grants Commission has the right to order the universities to observe standards. I hope the standards will be maintained. Standard is everything in the realm of knowledge and education. We have at one time said that we should have the highest reach of achievement in the universities. The great Ramanujam and Dr. C. V. Raman in the field of science and Rabindranath Tagore in the field of literature, all these men have been the result of our universities that had attempted to maintain standards and, therefore, I would like the standard to be emphasised more and more. In

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]

our zeal for mass education, in our zeal for spreading education as much as possible, let us not forego the ideal of university education. For such an ideal to be well realised there is need for more, and more residential institutions. When I was in charge of some of the colleges, a Minister had come putting before the college staff the idea of a shift system in a residential college. I know that the Vice-Chancellor of our University and we ourselves resisted that and we said we do not want to turn out factory products. It will nullify all that goes with residence—the intimate contact between the students and the tutors. The tutors in residential institutions not only teach and supervise teaching but they pay special attention to each student, enter into their lives and watch their progress not only in the literary direction or educational or intellectual direction but also in the direction of health.

My friend over there said that health was neglected. But what is to be done? Again and again, the question had been posed by the Secondary Education Board and since the Bhore Committee, for medical check-up and compulsory medical inspection in all educational institutions from school to college level, but there is no money, they say. Health should not be neglected. The tutorial system goes carefully into the proper maintenance of health and many of the residential institutions do insist upon health. They have extra-curricular activities and see that the full life of the student is enjoyed in the university. And, therefore, in such residential institutions where there is this proper relationship, where a proper student-teacher ratio is maintained and where there is respect for the teacher by the student, there is no trouble. There cannot be any trouble. All the troubles have arisen because of overcrowding and lack of proper relationship between teacher and taught among other causes.

And I come to the next point of indiscipline among the students. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: One minute more please. There is indiscipline among the students and what is the cause of indiscipline? It is amazing how students in these days can actually dictate what paper they should have, what questions should be posed, what teacher should teach them, and what teacher should be expelled, and taking to all kinds of factory methods of strike. Strike against what? Strike against the very knowledge that they are going to receive in the university. All these disturbances are very much due to various causes coming into the lives of the students away from the precincts of the university. You say, Sir, that politics does not enter the portals of a university. Now, in pre-independence days there were advisory committees in various colleges. Those advisory committees consisted of people who have had the best interests of the institution, in their mind and not politicians. But recently for admission and other purposes very many elements are brought in for representation and to a certain extent there is deviation from the norm of standard in the universities. There enters caste, there enters all kinds of communal discrimination and it is an open fact that many students who reach the topmost rung of the ladder get frustrated simply because of these other inroads into the assessment of values in selection. And indiscipline results from this kind of frustration among the lives of the first class and top-ranking students. The only way to avoid this is to have advisory committees free from other interests, more and more of residential institutions with staff and student contacts to a greater degree, which would enable them to understand more and more

without the various distractions of life. I am not pleading for the Gurukul system of university in a forest where you can study until the end of the *Brahmacharya* stage, and it is said that when a student began to feel that there was no salt in his diet, the master said, "your education is ended. now, you can go out into the world." I do not say that we have to live that way of life. It is only allegorical, it is only symbolic. It points out the extreme concentration that is required even like that of a *yogi* in a student when he is pursuing knowledge. It is the same in the university level; it is the same in the secretariat level when files are to be studied and scrutinised. That sort of *yoga* is necessary, concentration, away from distraction from the din and noise of life. In this democracy not only during election we utilise students, but also both teachers and students—some of them, I am not speaking about all of them—have discussed things from the plane of political allegiance. And I think the University Grants Commission should do away with that in order to save our young people from this catastrophe that is overtaking them, misleading them into channels that bring condemnation on the students which is none of their own but of the system that perpetuates this attitude among the students. And the staff members also are not above this. These must be detected and a close watch should be kept that a proper atmosphere in a university is maintained.

You say, Sir, that time is up. I have got many more things to say, but I would say this. As an educationist myself I would plead with all the strength that is in me that for many years to come—I do not know what will happen if the Sputnik begins to operate—the world is ours and I would like every son of India, every daughter of India to be educated in a spirit of "give and take." Let the stream of scholars from the world come and educate themselves in our universities, take the best out of

Indian culture, and let our students go to foreign universities and drink deep from the fountain of knowledge that is all there in the world and thus enriched and thus equipped let them go forward to maintain the standards not only at the university stage but in the lives of the citizens of India. That is the only thing that has kept us surviving all these years. Let us not Statewise become bottlenecked and live in watertight compartments. As it is, when I travel in the train it is so difficult to converse. For exchange of ideas English is necessary, and if we want to take the best from the world, we must learn not only English but other languages also. Let us not say like bad economists "let us export but let us not import". I do not know whether that is not medieval economics, but let us not go back to medieval politics and much less to a medieval system of education that used to keep a book locked up and release it only to a favourite few. We want education to speed along not only in our country but throughout the world in a spirit of "give and take"—that is the only way of living a richer and fuller life in order to fulfil our function, that is to enrich India and the Indian culture and thereby enrich the world.

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): Sir, we are having a welfare State in India and in a welfare State one is supposed to have equal opportunities not only in the field of education but also in other aspects of one's life. When I read the Report of the University Grants Commission, I find at page 5 that very little powers have been vested in the University Grants Commission for opening up new universities. If one takes initiative in this respect, perhaps he has to fight very strongly with the State Governments or with the Central Government. But there are some provisions to the effect that if in the opinion of the University Grants Commission it is necessary to have new universities, they can have them.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

[Shri T. Bodra.]

Sir, in 1954 when the late Shri Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar was alive, I and some of the Members of Parliament from Ranchi went on deputation to him and pleaded with him for a new Central University at Ranchi. He was kind enough to visit Ranchi in connection with a convocation of the Bihar University, and when he came back he said that there were many good reasons why there should be a university at Ranchi. Correspondence then started and unfortunately the Government were reluctant in giving replies to the queries that were made by him. With the death of Shri Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar that chapter also came to a close.

Now, Sir, to have equal opportunities and chances in one's life, one must have education. It is only the educated people who can be the most effective people in this world—people who have education of the university standard. Unless the universities are within the easy reach of the citizens, it is rather difficult for the underdeveloped and backward areas like Chota Nagpur to come on a par in a short time with other people. Sir, the whole House knows that this Chota Nagpur plateau is in the heart of industrial India so far as iron, coal, bauxite, zinc, cement, asbestos and uranium deposits are concerned. Well, what is happening? The lands of the people, specially in these areas which are dominated by Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes, are being acquired for the new factories, and these people are being turned into landless labourers. One fact is admitted by all and that is that these people have not seen the light of education. Now what is the alternative for these people? The only alternative for these people is to die of starvation or to work in the factories and mines as unskilled labourers. All the engineering staff and the technical staff must come from outside, say from Madras, Bombay and other places where there are technical schools, colleges and universities.

All the education that we have had up till now was due to the kindness of the Missionaries. Sir, it is only the Missionaries who have spent their money and labour for educating the Adibasis, the Scheduled Castes and the Backward Classes in this area. We have got 854 elementary schools, 62 middle schools, 12 high schools, and two colleges—the St. Columbus College at Hazaribagh and the St. Xavier's College at Ranchi. When we look at the grants that are being allocated by the Government, what do we find? We find discrimination being made, and here is the chance for the University Grants Commission to put their finger on this state of things if they want to do justice to our colleges and schools, if the Government is not prepared to open new schools and new colleges in an underdeveloped area like ours, like Chota Nagpur. It will be amazing to see how much money is being allocated to these private Missionary institutions. No one will deny that there is hardly any place in which Missionary activities in the field of education have not preceded those of the Government, but we are today in 1958 and I am very sorry to say that neither in the First Five Year Plan nor in the Second Five Year Plan have Government come forward with a proposal for any new college or any new school in our area. I was speaking about the discrimination made, and just for the sake of illustration I will submit that, whereas the T.N.T. College at Bhagalpur was granted Rs. 1,34,152 and the L.S. College at Muzaffarpore was granted Rs. 3,74,254, the St. Columbus College at Hazaribagh was given a grant of Rs. 66,778 and the St. Xavier's College at Ranchi Rs. 10,000 only. These are two Missionary colleges which are catering for the education not only of the Adibasis but also of other residents who are inhabiting the Plateau. These are two colleges which are giving the best results in the I.A., I.Sc., B.A. and B.Sc. examinations. If this sort of discrimination is meted out to the private institutions and if the Government is not coming for-

ward with new schools, colleges and universities, where is the chance for the Adibasis and for the underdeveloped people to come on a par with other people? Here is a duty cast upon the University Grants Commission to investigate into the matter as to how far there are reasonable grounds or possibilities for having a university at Ranchi. You are having a Central University at Aligarh, you are having a Central University at Banaras, you are having a Central University, Visva-Bharati, at Santiniketan, but what prevents you from having a university to cater to the needs of so many people who are backward and underdeveloped? There are so many eminent members in the University Grants Commission. They will only consider how much money is to be allocated to the Visva-Bharati University, how much money is to be allocated to the Banaras University, and so on, but none of the members is ever coming to think whether it is desirable to have a university at Ranchi. I, therefore, take this opportunity of making a strong appeal in the name of fairplay and justice, in the name of social justice, in the name of the welfare State of India, to give us a university at Ranchi.

**SHRI ABDUL RAHIM (Madras):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, education, elementary and higher, has been long neglected by the former rulers. That was their crime. Of course, during the two hundred years of British rule both elementary education and college education have been neglected, and they had practically no interest at all in our advancement and so education at both stages was neglected. But after the achievement of *Swaraj* what are we doing? Are we concentrating our attention on the advancement of education on the same lines as we have been pressing when the Britishers were ruling? What is the use of appointing Commissions? Have we allocated proper funds for them? Every political party says that education is a most important and

vital thing, and the Government also says so. But when it comes to the question of rupees, annas and pies, we find that a very meagre amount or a very paltry sum is allocated for education. If the University Grants Commission is not provided with enough funds, what is the use of their going round the country at all? Of course, they have taken enough pains to visit each and every place. Wherever the universities are there, they have taken enough pains to record the necessities of the universities and all those things. But the allocation in the Five Year Plan is miserably low and we cannot claim that we have done much towards the advancement of education. Teachers, whether college teachers or elementary school teachers, are proverbially poor. They are miserably low-paid and we cannot expect better work from them when we pay them so low. And now the States are expected to share the amount spent for paying higher salaries to the college teachers. I cannot understand any reason for that. You can very well ask: What has the Central Government to do with college education? You might have seen in the newspapers that the Central Government want only first class candidates and for them they offer better salaries than what the States can pay, and better salaries naturally attract the best talent available in the field and they go to the Centre for service. So the Centre will be justified in paying the fullest contribution towards the increase of pay that is recommended by the University Grants Commission. And furthermore, most of our students and the best of the lot go for foreign service because very attractive salaries are offered to them. In order to avoid our best students going to foreign service it is better that we ourselves should offer them reasonable salaries. My friend from West Bengal yesterday was telling that the standard of teaching is very very low. And the reason is that the best students do not retain themselves in the States because the Centre offers them better salaries,

[Shri Abdul Rahim.]

Therefore, I again repeat that the Centre will be justified in offering its fullest contribution to the college teachers.

Now, Sir, there is another point in which the University Grants Commission is interested, namely, helping to construct university buildings. From the time of great Moghuls up to the Britishers you might have seen that palatial buildings and massive structures have come up, and when the Congress Government came into power, they too wanted to copy the same. The Britishers spent lavishly over buildings because it was not their money; the Moghuls spent lavishly over buildings because it was not their money. Our revered leader, the late Mahatmaji, was off-and-on telling us that instead of going in for palatial and big buildings, it should be enough to have the ordinary type of buildings which were in existence before the Britishers came here. What is the point in constructing massive and palatial buildings for universities? In such cases only you require huge funds for buildings. I appeal to the members of the University Grants Commission to think over this point, and they need not set apart huge sums of money for building purposes.

Sir, there is just one other point with regard to indiscipline among the students. It is regrettable to note that almost all political parties, with the exception perhaps of the Congress Party, are exploiting our students to the fullest extent. I do not say that the Congress did not exploit them. But nowadays the Congress has no organisation as such for students. And I do not know why students want any organisations. In those days all were exploited, not only students, but also labour etc. All sections of the people were attracted towards politics. Now, I do not understand why students want any organisation today when there is the people's Government and there are the people's representatives to look after their interests. When

the teachers and professors are equally interested in the advancement of students, why should they want a separate organisation and thereby lose the discipline which we see today? I appeal to my friends in other political parties not to lay their hands on the students and thus spoil their future and the country's future in showing them ways which are not proper for their advancement because we ourselves now feel it. Most of the students who took part in the political activities in those days are left helpless and for God's sake, please do not take students in parties and exploit them for political purposes because in the long run it will tell upon the nation as such and I request the University Grants Commission to go into these points and do the needful in the matter.

SHRI S. P. DAVE (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I take this opportunity to express my views on this subject which is now being discussed here and in the country not because we have done nothing in the matter in the last decade but because we have not been able to do enough that the subject deserves. It is true that we have advanced very much materially and in other respects since we attained independence but if our progress has not been marked sufficiently in any sphere, it is in the sphere of education. Unfortunately, there are certain reasons to justify this. Our ancient heritage and culture led us to educate our people in a particular fashion which was peculiar to India—the ancient customs and usages and its learning, which were indigenous. We were made to forget that in preference to the Western education, we could not completely follow the West. It is impossible for any country to do that. Hardly 1½ per cent of the people in the country today may be in a position to read and speak and learn English in a proper manner. That is not considered to be what may be a desirable thing. Now, those of us who have advanced thus far happen to be incharge of manifold

spheres in the administration of the country or at the top of the society and a come-back is a difficult affair for many of us. The ancient way is forgotten. There is no more Taxila for us to go even if it were here. Things have changed since then but even if we have a culture of India, it will surely have to be a reborn, newly orientated culture based on a new education for India. Therefore, in this combat between the old and the new, we are possibly groping in the dark. The U.G.C. is composed of the best brains of the people. I pay them tribute for their scholarship, learning, insight and depth and for the few suggestions and conclusions they have reached. Today if we look to various universities and the results that are there, I am one with the feelings of sorrow expressed by many here on the floor of this House, especially the Lady Member who spoke some time before the recess. What are we to do for all these problems? There is overcrowding. There are misfits, people who should have gone up have no opportunity. In my part of the State possibly things are worse or because they are nearer to me, they appear to me so bad. Actually university papers are out before the date of examinations and they can be purchased at Rs. 250 a paper. I am further being told that a person who wants a particular degree has to spend Rs. 2000 and he can get a degree. I am also told that to secure a first class, one is to spend so much and then he is assured of a first class. The first class is a necessity if one wants to get admission to certain technical schools and colleges. When somebody talked here about building up of character, I said to myself: "We have forgotten, in trying to learn from the dictionary the origin of the word, the fundamental point, namely, character, and character building and building of citizenship." Let alone the ideas of building up a new man by universities, let alone the idea of career building and the university being a fit place to help our young men. Today the question that actually arises is, does a

man who goes to the university come out better than what he was before as a family member, as a man to be relied upon, as a man of character, as a man of integrity, as a man of honesty? These are questions to be asked. I am told: "Come with me to a particular hostel and youngsters between 15 to 20 per cent. of them have actually learnt how to indulge in drinking and smoking is not considered a vice by youngmen in certain cities." This is the bad side that comes about when one begins to think of it. Sir, I am an optimist. It may be that the newly-won freedom and the new aspirations and certain currents which were let loose during the political fight, may have turned the minds and heads of people in a certain direction. There is yet time enough if we take stock of the situation and try to control them. So, let us try to settle the fundamental principle of education, of what we want in India. Let there be a phased programme of education as we have in other respects and then possibly we shall come gradually to our own. There is today too much of duplication of the same type of universities and so there is not much scope for research work. Today we don't find the same amount of learning and scholarship, depth and the years of study that used to go in a particular subject among young men. Possibly, opportunities also are wanting. Students are not being taken care of as in the old days. Some say that it is not the fault of students at all. It is those who are in charge of the institutions who are unfit to run the institutions. Why do you find fault with the students? One does not know as to whom to hold responsible for this. But one thing is certain. There is something wrong and grievously wrong. If we want to set this in order, let university charters be granted only to such institutions where we are sufficiently assured that such education will be imparted which will build the character of the future generations of the country, where more regard will be paid to what we call the roots of honour, to the true

[Shri S. P. Dave.]

foundation of habits than merely to learning. It is not proper that courses and curriculum may be prescribed but the books may not be available even for 2 or 3 months after the commencement of the term and nowhere have I seen the complete course being taught at all. They say, "This is a college. In a college, like a high school, you don't expect the course to be completed. It is for the students to read". Then the students fall back upon cheap guides. There is a class of people who have come to exploit the weaknesses of the students and the weaknesses of the colleges by publishing costly books called "guides" on various subjects, and they mint money. Professors in old times never used to give tuitions. It was unheard of. They used to utilise their spare time in research work, in reading and trying to remain up to date. That is why the number of periods allotted to them was generally only ten or twelve per week. But today what we find is that the remuneration is so poor that the high school teacher earns more on tuitions than a professor. The universities lay down the scales of pay and categories of professors, readers and lecturers. But in a large number of colleges, even in affiliated colleges, proper remuneration is not being paid and people are not made permanent for so long a period. Sir, all these uses and abuses sometimes make a man feel very bad about these things. Possibly, one of the reasons for this is that those donors who help in founding universities or colleges, they also have a sort of fancy to regulate the affairs of the college or university. They may be rich men. They may be good traders, merchants and manufacturers. But I wonder how, simply because they have the money bags with them, they can be said to be experts in education. Actually, I have seen university charters granting seats in the highest committees to donors and their representatives. I think this is bad. People who have a right to advise on educational problems are those who have spent a life-time in education. Ability,

talent and genius have their provinces and so long as we are tied down to the men who have the purse, I think this evil is bound to remain. It is bound to be there because the man with the purse always calculates in terms of production and in terms of margin and in terms of profit and money.

There is another thing. A poor country like India cannot afford to have big buildings where lakhs and lakhs of rupees are required, for the senate hall, for the convocation hall and so on, for the library and for this, that or the other. I would have it all if we could afford it. But priority must go to the man in the poor village where there is not even drinking water or to the primary school in a town where compulsory education wants you to open more schools. I would not mind even sitting in hired premises if you have no money.

Moreover, today our scheme of things allows anybody who has the money to pay the college fees to go right up from anywhere to anywhere. Let us have some screening at some stage somewhere. Let us be told in very clear language, "You are not cut out to be a man of letters. So go to some profession for which you are fitted". There is nothing wrong in that. Let us try to evaluate our manpower. We have to evaluate our manpower according to their talents and our wants. On the one hand, we are told that we are short of thousands of engineers and on the other side I find that the number of colleges admitting pupils of Inter Science into engineering colleges is so very limited. Even boys getting first class have hardly a chance of admission. On the other hand there are hundreds of students in the first year arts or science classes. There is something wrong somewhere. Why should there be so many students in the arts classes, students who have hardly managed to pass after three trials in the school leaving certificate examination? Simply because they have nothing to fall back upon, at the age of 20, they are groping in the dark and because their parents can afford it, they are sent to the colleges.

They should not be sent. I would say that the college should be the special preserve of those who have the capacity and the talent and the intelligence to qualify by further learning to be citizens useful to the country. Therefore, the primary aim of education which appears to have been forgotten, must be reiterated and it must be pointedly brought to the notice of those who are in charge of education.

I am one with the opinion expressed here that the Government must keep itself aloof from the field of education. I think that is a wise counsel. The Government of the day performs its duty, I believe, when it sanctions the desired money towards education. Then the spending of it should be left to the educational experts.

In a country like India there ought to be so many experiments going on at the same time ; but today, I do not think that is happening. When the one road which we are on is found to be inconvenient and we have not been able to remedy the defects, then it means that there ought to be experiments in education in so many directions so that the approved one can be adopted by the country.

I do not want to say much on the heated question of the medium of instruction. Rightly or wrongly, whatever it may be, I am a believer that India must have its own language. I have seen no other country in the world which speaks in a foreign language. It is a handicap and it is a heritage of the past. Our country being so large and because a common language could not be evolved at an early stage, the British rulers imposed upon us a common language when they wanted people to be writing and reading machines. But this should not be perpetuated and at the earliest moment we must adopt as the medium of instruction the regional language, with Hindi as the national language for all of us. It may be that there are different opinions on this subject. However, we are not going to lose

much by trying to be in line with the Constitution that we have adopted. I believe that after having adopted that Constitution and having taken the oath to be loyal to that Constitution on the floor of the House, it does not behove any of us to say that possibly English should have a better chance.

Sir, I believe that the University Grants Commission have done a very useful job and if more and more is translated into action from the recommendations of this Commission, then many of the evils that we find today in the educational system will be things of the past.

3 P.M.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not find it very necessary for me to discuss this matter at any great length after the broad and comprehensive sweep in which it has been discussed and debated on the floor of this House, and the debate has reached a very high level. Speaker after speaker has discussed different aspects of the recommendations made in this Report and I think we have, to a very large extent, profited by this debate. Sir, the University Grants Commission has tackled a subject which goes to the very root of all our national aspirations. Just as it is necessary for us to find the money to carry on all our efforts to a successful end in the field of industrialisation, in the field of agricultural improvement and so on, the manpower upon which we must depend to make all our efforts successful and fruitful will have to be produced by our universities. And it is from that point of view that in a supreme moment of careful planning this University Grants Commission was appointed by the Government for the purpose of finding out the best method of producing men who can be charged with the duty of creating a new nation. Sir, my esteemed friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta, has painted a picture of conditions in Calcutta which is very largely correct. The conditions of overcrowding in the Calcutta colleges is appalling and he has done

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.]

well in drawing attention to it. But, unfortunately, he has laid the blame at the wrong door. It is not the Government of India, it is not the Ministry nor the much hated West Bengal Government who are responsible for it. It is the condition through which we are passing. It is the colleges themselves who open their portals wide for the admission of vast numbers of students without having the necessary accommodation to provide for them. It is they who conduct classes in three shifts, morning, day-time and evening and none of these shifts can accommodate enough students which may be pouring in to take lessons in these colleges. I would not put it down at the greed of the college authorities but the demand for admission is so enormous that it is difficult for these college authorities to say "No" to these boys who are hankering after university degrees. This is an aspect which has been prominent in the minds of the Commission and when they ask these universities and colleges to invest in more accommodation, in providing more building facilities, I think they are on the right track. Comment has been made that instead of investing in buildings, they should pay more attention towards building up laboratories and libraries and in improving the lot of the teachers. All these are necessary but, at the same time, if these colleges are to cater for the needs of the students by accommodating as many as possible, then it is absolutely necessary that buildings must be expanded. I do not, at the same time, agree with my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, when he says that expansion is the key-note of all our educational and university development. It is not, Sir, important . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I did not use the word "key-note". I said both are necessary, depending upon the circumstances.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Both are necessary, but we must adjust things in such a way that we do not

sacrifice quality for quantity because, the inevitable result would be that these students who are lured by the temptation of having a university degree are bound to suffer severe disappointment in existing conditions. At the same time, I do not agree with the hon. Minister when he says that the fact that fifty per cent. of the examinees are failures would go to show that these boys had never the necessary talents for a university career. I do not agree. The conditions in which this education is imparted are largely responsible for the failures and not the lack of talents in many of our young men and women. Therefore, Sir, it is our supreme task to adjust the conditions of things in colleges in such a way that the students who are really talented and have a good chance of showing or improving their career in the right spirit are given the opportunity of achieving their ends.

At the same time, Sir, I would lay much more stress on secondary education than is being done today. My esteemed friend, Dr. Kunzru, has reserved his observations on this point for the discussion on the Appropriation Bill and very rightly too because, in this debate we are discussing only university education. But as secondary education is the basis and foundation of university education, we cannot altogether pass over that aspect of the matter in this debate. Sir, let us make secondary education self-sufficient in the fullest sense of the term as they have succeeded in doing in Britain. The vast majority of boys and girls there do not go beyond the secondary stage; and they have been running an empire not with university graduates but mostly with high school matriculates. The great commercial houses all over the world which are being run by the Britishers are run by people who had never seen beyond the gates of their own secondary schools. Have they been failures in any respect in building up their commerce, in building up their trade and in establishing themselves as a premier nation in that

respect in the world? No, because secondary education has advanced to such an extent in that country that it gives complete education as far as it goes to their boys and girls. I would, therefore, submit, Sir, with great humility that secondary education should fill our mental picture much more than it does today. Secondary education has necessarily got to be placed in the hands of State Governments undoubtedly but the Central Government ought to be able to give directives, guidance, in such a manner that the State Governments would be bound to follow them in every possible way. The University Grants Commission is charged with the responsibility of building up a great system of university education in this country and that presupposes that secondary education must be given proper attention even by the University Grants Commission because, without that solid foundation they cannot build up the edifice of university education at all. From that point of view, I should say that secondary education should be given the prominence that it deserves in our educational scheme.

My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has talked of student discipline. His sympathies, most of them, are with the students and probably he will lay the blame . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Generally with your children.

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:** With our children? Our children do not require that attention from my friend and his Party and we would rather be left severely alone so far as my friends are concerned.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Sympathies only.

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:** Only recently, we had witnessed a spectacle in Calcutta of which any country, any people, would be ashamed. A mass attack was made on student examinees, boys and girls. By whom? By hooligans who had not

prepared their lessons and who were not prepared to face the examination paper. They organised mass raids and went about to other examination centres, beating up boys and beating up girls, tearing question papers and answer papers, smashing window panes and furniture. That is the kind of thing that we had witnessed. I would have expected my esteemed friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, and his Party to have come forward and condemned those activities in unambiguous terms. As recent converts to non-violence, having abjured the path of violence, they should have been the first to come forward to condemn this violent outburst. But they have not done so.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** We never support such things.

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:** I am glad that you have said so here in the seclusion of this Chamber and I hope like your other utterances these words will go forth to the country. I would have expected him and his Party to come forward and give a lead to the students in this respect. But they were silent. I hope, Sir, that student indiscipline will be met with great severity by every section of the people. At the same time we should not forget the difficulties and the various wants from which the poorer classes of students suffer and so many of them are unable to pursue their studies. I know of a student myself, in my locality, a very fine young man struggling with poverty, struggling with most inadequate space in his two-roomed flat, living with his poor mother and his relations. He has shown brilliant results in his examination, but he is suffering for want of a little space where he can quietly sit down and study. He has found admittance in the Jadavpur University, West Bengal Government has given him a stipend to make it possible for him to pay his fees. But the other wants are still persisting, and he is a type of student in whom talents are pressed down and not allowed to flower because of these unfortunate conditions. This is not a solitary instance. There are others so

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.]

that Mr. Gupta was not wrong when he drew pointed attention to this aspect of the matter. I should, therefore, suggest that instead of trying to expand the number of students who get through the portals of universities, let us make a well deserved screening so that those who can go up further and can make good as university students only should be allowed to go forward. Others who have not reached that stage should be given such a thorough secondary education as would fit them for the struggles of life. Let us remember, Sir, that education was planned in British days for the purpose of recruiting clerks to their offices. Now, it is altogether a different aim that we cherish in the matter of recruitment, it is for the purpose of building up our manpower, for the purpose of building up of our soldiers to fight poverty, misery and squalor. That is the standard that we have set before ourselves, and from that point of view I hope that the entire scheme of secondary education and university education will be planned, and we should go forward to reach the goal along the path chalked out before us by our Government.

**THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION**  
(DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Mr. Deputy-Chairman, Sir, before I deal with the points that have been raised during the course of this discussion I should like to thank the hon. Members, many of whom had a great deal of experience in university education, either as teachers or as administrators, for having participated in this debate. We have had a very high level of discussion and I must express my feelings of gratitude for the very valuable suggestions that the hon. Members have made on this very important subject. I am sure both my Ministry and the University Grants Commission will give full consideration to the various points that have been raised during the course of this debate.

Sir, during this short time at my disposal it would not be possible for

me to deal with all the points. I would like however to touch on a few of the major issues. Now, the one point about which there has been a great deal of discussion is with regard to the number of students who are seeking enrolment in our colleges and universities. I am afraid my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, had misunderstood the Report of the University Grants Commission. Also, I think he was not fair to me because nowhere in my speech did I say that we were afraid of these increasing numbers, or that we would like to put some kind of an arbitrary restriction on the numbers that are seeking enrolment in the universities. The whole question of the numbers of students will have to be viewed in the social and economic and political context of our society. A great democracy like ours which is planning social, economic reconstruction on a large scale necessarily will require a large number of people trained in the universities. There is no doubt about it. At the same time, I am afraid, I cannot agree with my friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy, or Mr. Bhupesh Gupta on the opposite side, that there should be no restriction on the admission of students. Our revered friend, Dr. Kunzru, and Mr. Sapru rightly pointed out that this indiscriminate expansion of the universities will have to be stopped if the universities are to perform the right functions.

**SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY**  
(Mysore): What are the right functions?

**DR. K. L. SHRIMALI:** The universities have certain functions to perform. They are the centres of teaching and research. They have to inculcate certain moral and social values among the students, and if they are having more numbers than they can manage, naturally, it is obvious that they cannot perform these functions effectively. I am afraid I have to differ from my friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy, who almost suggested that we should have mass higher education. No country can put higher education on the same level as elementary education. Higher

education has necessarily to be selective. It is meant for people who have the talent and who have the calibre to derive benefit from university education. Apart from the question of the optimum size of the university population in the country as a whole which, I think, will have to grow with the growth of population in general, and with the needs of our society, we shall have to consider this question very seriously as to what should be the optimum size for the universities. In my opinion some limit will have to be fixed beyond which further expansion should not be allowed. The Education Supplement of the Times in its leading article of March 22, 1957, compares a university with a balloon and says: "You can blow up a balloon so high, and if you go on it bursts and you are left with a piece of coloured rubber which is not balloon at all". I think we cannot have a better analogy than this as far as the expansion of universities is concerned. If we go on expanding, the universities will burst like balloons and they will lose their real character and they will not be able to perform very effectively their functions of teaching and research.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Are the universities bags filled with gas?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There is plenty of gas in the universities at the present moment and they will not be able to continue to function as centres of learning and centres of teaching and research. It is therefore, necessary that we shall have to put some kind of limit on this indiscriminate expansion.

Now, with regard to the selection of students I think both the universities and the University Grants Commission will have to devise some method by means of which people who can really derive benefit from university education can get admission to these centres of higher learning. Of course, in a democratic society which is moving towards a socialist pattern, we shall have to ensure that no per-

son who shows intellectual promise and interest is denied the advantage of higher education, whatever the social and economic background may be. This is the real question which the Government, the universities and the University Grants Commission will have to solve. Many of the progressive countries like the U.K. have solved this problem by providing 80 per cent. of scholarships out of private or public funds. If we are to make the maximum use of the talents and abilities of our youth, we shall also have to adopt some measures in our country; that is, the Government will have to take responsibility to provide the material needs for providing education to all students of potential university calibre. In a socialist State financial barriers cannot be allowed to stand in the way of a person to enable him to make his unique contribution to the society. In this matter I would like to say that the Government has made a small humble beginning by instituting a scheme of merit scholarships recently and this scheme intends to help brilliant and meritorious students who on account of financial condition could not normally be in a position to proceed to a university or a college.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): What is the number of these scholarships?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It is proposed to make 200 awards every year. This is a modest beginning compared to what the U.K. is doing but this is a beginning in the right direction. More funds will have to be placed at the disposal of the Ministry of Education, if we are to democratise our university education and if the society is to make the maximum use of the potentialities of the youth of the country. I hope that in the near future we may be able to expand the scope of this scheme and more and more of those intelligent students, who on account of economic barriers cannot gain access to universities, may be able to take advantage of university education.

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

Sir, my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, also suggested that we were doing nothing with regard to the students coming from low income groups. It may not be out of place to mention here that the Government have been increasing the budget provision for scholarships for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes. The budget provision of Rs. 30 lakhs in 1952-53 has increased to Rs. 2 crores in 1957-58. During the last five years the total amount spent by the Government was Rs. 7,09,74,919 and the total number of scholarships awarded were 1,47,836.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Is this the value of the scholarships or is this the number?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The amount as I have said comes to about Rs. 7 crores and 9 lakhs, this is the total number of scholarships awarded. Now it will be agreed that these measures which the Government have taken will ultimately act as effective instruments for breaking down the economic barriers which stand in the way of the youth coming from backward and poor classes from taking advantage of higher education.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: What about the non-backward classes?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: We have merit scholarships and we have made a beginning in that direction and I hope we may be able to extend the scope of that scheme.

Now, with regard to the question raised by my revered friend, Dr. Kunzru, I have already said in my introductory speech that it has now been decided to increase the salaries of teachers of affiliated colleges as recommended by the University Grants Commission and the Commission will give 50 per cent. of the increase in expenditure provided the State Governments, the universities or the colleges concerned are agreeable to pay the other 50 per cent. In the case of women's colleges, since we

wish to encourage women's education, the Commission might pay up to 75 per cent. of the increased cost, the remaining 25 per cent. being payable by the State Governments, universities or colleges concerned. Now, there was some difficulty at an earlier stage but that difficulty has now been overcome and it is now possible for the University Grants Commission to give grants to the affiliated colleges also.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Government colleges also?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am coming to that question. There are some difficulties with regard to that point. The Commission has resolved that no grants should be paid for this purpose for raising the salaries of teachers employed in Government colleges. The difficulty is that the teachers employed in Government colleges are Government servants and have their own pay structure, pension and other benefits, and it is difficult for the Commission to treat the teachers belonging to private affiliated colleges and those in Government colleges on a par. For this reason it has not been possible for the Commission to apply this scheme to the teachers of Government colleges.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: If the Government agree to revise the scales as suggested by the University Grants Commission, would the Central Government be in a position to give necessary help to them?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: That is a broader question and the State Governments also must take some responsibility in this matter. We would certainly like the salaries of teachers, whether they belong to the Government or to private colleges raised but at the same time since there are differences in pay structures it has not been found possible for the Commission to consider giving grants to the teachers belonging to Government colleges at least for the time being. That question will have to be examined further whether grants would be given to the State Governments if they agree to raise the salaries of their teachers.

Now, my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta raised certain question with regard to the conditions of teachers in West Bengal, I would like to inform him that among the States the West Bengal is the one State which has agreed to share the increased expenditure in upgrading the salary scale of teachers of those colleges of Calcutta University where enrolment is below 1500 and no other State Government has come forward so far to share the increased expenditure.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** But the scheme has not yet been implemented at all and there are many colleges which account for a much larger number of students.

**DR. K. L. SHRIMALI:** If it has not been implemented it must be in the process of implementation. Among the universities, the only university is the University of Bombay which has so far agreed to share the expenditure in revising the salaries of teachers of its affiliated constituent colleges. And some colleges, nearly twelve have expressed their willingness to implement the scheme on the proposed sharing basis. Now, Sir, in this connection, I would like to say that the University Grants Commission . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** May I ask a question? May I know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the West Bengal Government have laid down certain conditions for giving this matching grant and owing to these conditions it has not been possible to implement the scheme?

**DR. K. L. SHRIMALI:** I am not in a position to give the detailed answer at the present moment. But my information is that the West Bengal Government has taken a decision to upgrade the salaries of teachers and I think the West Bengal Government has to be congratulated in this matter for taking a lead.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** It is badly in need of congratulations.

**DR. K. L. SHRIMALI:** Now, in this connection, I would like to say that

the University Grants Commission has laid down certain conditions which will have to be fulfilled by the affiliated colleges in order that they might receive these grants. As we increase the salaries of teachers, we should also expect them to help the University Grants Commission in raising the general standards in the colleges and in creating a more favourable atmosphere for study and research in these places. The University Grants Commission has laid down that, in the first place, the scheme of upgrading the salaries would be applicable only to full-time and permanent teachers of colleges and secondly payment of grants to a college under this scheme would only be made if the number of students in the college is below one thousand and in the case of other colleges if the colleges agree to face the reduction of numbers. The purpose is that the pupil-teacher ratio in these colleges should improve, that the teachers should be able to give more attention to the work in the colleges, that there should be greater contact between the students and the teachers so that the general standards of our colleges might improve.

The Commission has also decided that colleges receiving assistance under this scheme should be required to regulate private tuition work undertaken by the teachers. While the Commission is anxious to raise the salaries of teachers, it also wants to create a congenial atmosphere for study and research.

Dr. Kunzru also raised the question with regard to the funds placed at the disposal of the Commission. It is true that in connection with their budget proposals the Commission has been asking for more funds than the Commission included in the budget estimates for the particular year. As I have already said in my introductory speech, it is also true that the University Grants Commission have not been able to utilise the funds approximating to those actually provided for. I think I should explain the position of the University Grants Commission also in this matter. There

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

have been various difficulties in making full use of these funds. In their building programmes, it was not possible for the universities to find steel and cement. And, then, sometimes the State Governments and the universities . . .

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Cement is available now.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Then they can use it if it is available.

THE MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS (SHRI B. GOPALA REDDY): What about steel?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is not always needed. It is not as necessary as cement.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am trying to explain why there was a shortfall in the expenditure of the University Grants Commission, because I do not want to blame them here. They have done their best, but in spite of their best efforts they were unable to utilise the funds which were placed at their disposal.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The Education Minister said that the University Grants Commission was not able to utilise the funds at its disposal. He is referring to a difference of Rs. 4 lakhs between the sum allotted to the Commission at its request and the sum spent by it. If it has asked for more funds, it can spend more. Actually for the year 1958-59 it has asked for larger funds. My hon. friend referred yesterday to a sum, I think, of about Rs. 4-1/4 crores that has been agreed to by the Finance Ministry. That I understand from the Chairman of the University Grants Commission includes also the maintenance grants to the Central Universities.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have already said that if the University Grants Commission can utilise these funds, more funds will be made available to them.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The main point, let me repeat, is this. Will the

University Grants Commission get by the end of the Second Plan period the sum allotted to it in theory, namely, Rs. 27 crores?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: With regard to that I am sorry I am not in a position to make a firm commitment . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He can consult the Finance Minister there.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I shall be very glad if my friend can make that commitment. But it will be our earnest endeavour to find the necessary funds for the development of universities. We would not like to see these development schemes retarded in any way. My own feeling is that it may probably not be possible for the University Grants Commission itself to utilise all this Rs. 27 crores taking into account the amount which they have spent during the last two years and the amount which they are likely to spend in the third year.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister is making a dangerous statement. They will take the cue from him. The grant of Rs. 27 crores he will not get if he says like that.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The whole problem has to be looked at in a realistic manner.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Up till now Rs. 12 crores have been handed over to the Commission; Rs. 15 crores are yet to come.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And he is bartering away.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have already said that the University Grants Commission can utilise these funds. I have an assurance from the Finance Ministry that additional funds would be made available.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I have a specific question to ask on this point. The Education Minister said with re-

gard to the year 1958-59 that more money would be placed at the disposal of the University Grants Commission if it was required. But I understand that this promise has been made only with regard to the maintenance grant to be given to the Central Universities which was cut down during the previous regime, that is, by the previous Finance Minister.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: That is so. But I may say that there is a general assurance and if the University Grants Commission can make use of the funds, additional funds would be made available. As far as I understand the University Grants Commission . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): And you will be sorry if it is not made available.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I will personally be very happy if all this Rs. 27 crores can be made available and can be utilised for the development of our universities. I feel that the growing universities do need more funds.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: I have got a point for clarification. How to reconcile that in the year 1957-58 Rs. 4.17 crores were provided and only Rs. 3.5 crores were spent? Why were Rs. 67 lakhs not spent? What are the reasons?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I just explained that there were difficulties in the way of the University Grants Commission not utilising all the funds.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Why were not Government wise enough to review the sum allotted to the University Grants Commission? If the sum of Rs. 27 crores was set apart for the University Grants Commission, it must have been because the possibility of this money being spent wisely was present to the minds of the authorities. Why are they using all kinds of arguments now in order to justify a reduction of this sum?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would earnestly like to say that I am not trying to make any false pretext and I would personally be very happy if all these Rs. 27 crores can be made available to the University Grants Commission.

Now, Sir, the position is that when the Plan was drawn up, we were not sure that all the funds that were provided for in the Plan would be made available. It is deficit planning, and I would like to tell the House that the Government wishes to give a great deal of importance to education. The universities, particularly the universities which are growing and which are developing, need money just as the growing children need food. In fact if a university is not spending enough money, it is my belief that it is not performing its functions properly, and it is the duty of the Government to make the necessary funds available. The difficulties which are arising are not because the funds are not being made available by the Central Government but the matching funds are not available either from the universities or from the State Governments, and we may have to bring about a greater co-ordination between the universities, the State Governments and the Central Government in this matter. I hope, as the work of the University Grants Commission progresses, we would be able to set up proper conventions and adopt suitable measures so that there may be greater co-ordination between the universities, the State Governments and the University Grants Commission.

Lastly, some question was raised with regard to language, the medium of instruction at the university stage. The University Grants Commission had already appointed a Committee and the Committee has submitted its report, and the University Grants Commission has given its general approval to the recommendations of that Committee. Now, whatever the views of the Government may be with regard to the language question and with regard to the question of the

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

medium of instruction, I think this is a matter which the universities should decide for themselves in a cool atmosphere and not in the heat of political controversy. The University Grants Commission has taken a decision and has given a lead in this direction, and I do hope that the universities in the country will take their guidance from the University Grants Commission in this matter.

SHRI A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): What is the decision?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have said that the University Grants Commission has generally approved the recommendations of the Kunzru Committee.

SHRI A. N. BOSE: What are the recommendations?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: They are that there should be no haste in changing over from English to the regional languages and the whole process should be gradual so that the standards of education might not be lowered.

Sir, there are various other questions involved. References were made to the reorganisation of secondary education, to the expansion of elementary education and various other related questions, because university education deals only with the super-structure, and it is quite true that we cannot build up a good edifice without solid and sound foundations. I may be able to inform the House on some other occasion that the Government are already making some efforts for the reorganisation of secondary education. The problems that we have to face in the reorganisation of education of this vast country are of very great magnitude, and the resources that are available are limited not only in terms of money but also in terms of manpower, and we cannot expect quick and immediate results as far as education is concerned. The work that the University Grants Commission and the Ministry are doing will make

their impact in course of time, but I think it will be too much to expect quick results. Ten years are not too long a period; in fact the Commission has functioned as a proper Commission only for a year and a half, and I think we can look upon with pride on the work and the achievements of this Commission. We have made a right beginning and, as I said, the Commission and the Government of India and the State Governments and the universities, all the parties which are interested in the development of our university education, have worked in a spirit of co-operation and harmony, and I think we have laid the solid foundations of a true university education. As we develop our universities, it is quite true that we shall need more funds. University education is expensive, and without incurring more expenditure on our universities, without providing better salaries for our teachers, without replenishing our libraries, without providing better equipment for our laboratories, we cannot raise the standards of education, and for all these we want money. At the same time I do not think we can overlook the fact that in a country where there are several other pressing needs—providing food for our people, providing money for certain basic industries, and there are certain other pressing and rival claims—all have to be attended to, and so the work that is being done in the field of education has to be viewed in that total picture. In that situation. If the work of the University Grants Commission is considered in that picture, in that proper perspective, I have no doubt that we have every reason to feel satisfied with their work.

Sir, I would also like on this occasion to convey our thanks to the Chairman and all the members of the Commission who have given their valuable time and energy for the work of this Commission. It is a very difficult task, and I take this opportunity on behalf of the Government to express my gratitude to the mem-

bers of the Commission. Thank you very much.

**SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY:** Sir, on a point of explanation. The hon. Minister, in the course of his reply, interpreted me as having said yesterday that I was advocating almost mass university education. It is so unfortunate if the Ministers do not understand us correctly, and particularly when the Education Minister does not understand us correctly. Sir, I was not making any such suggestion. As the House remembers, only when a point was made here that there should be a restriction for admission to universities. I said that there is already a restriction. Just as there is a natural selection, there is a natural selection here, and 80 per cent. of the people in this country cannot afford to have university education, and therefore they are prevented, because it is expensive. And next, we have a system of examinations which eliminates students, as it is. So, in addition to these restrictions, if we mean proposing further restrictions, I said that that would operate against the people who are in the interior areas and who belong to the unfortunate classes. That is all that I said. I am not such an Utopian as to think that under the existing circumstances we can have mass university education. I do not know how my friend got that idea.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** That is all.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Sir, we had raised the question of upgrading the salaries of the West Bengal teachers. I, therefore, through you request the hon. Minister to supply to the Members of the House some sort of a statement giving the exact position in regard to upgrading the salaries of the West Bengal college teachers. We will be very much benefited if the hon. Minister will kindly find out the facts and let us know through a statement either on the floor of the House or circulated to us, exactly where we stand with regard

to this matter. Our information in regard to this matter is that this is being systematically scuttled by certain agencies in West Bengal.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Yes, the discussion is now over. We will take up the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1958.

#### THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL, 1958

**THE MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS (SHRI B. GOPALA REDDY):** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1958-59, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this Bill provides for the drawal out of the Consolidated Fund of India moneys required to meet the expenditure charged on that Fund and the grants voted by the Lok Sabha. The figures in the Bill follow the provisions shown in the Budget documents and are inclusive of the sums voted on account and provided for in the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Act of 1958 for one month's supply.

The Demands for Grants on which this Bill is based are for gross amounts that is total amount of expenditure exclusive of receipts and recoveries. Accordingly, withdrawals from the Consolidated Fund of India for which authority is sought through this Bill amount in all to Rs. 7,124.57 crores, of which Rs. 1,066.28 crores relate to expenditure on revenue account, Rs. 597.70 crores to capital expenditure, Rs. 362.53 crores for disbursement of loans and advances and Rs. 5,098.06 crores for the repayment of debt. As the Members are already in possession of the Budget documents and as there has been a general discussion on the Budget in this