

[Shri Balasheb Patil]

the Treasury. There are so many things that have to be done; we have to apply; then, the collector has to see, then there are notings on files, and there are many officers through whose hands the files have to go; and after nearly six or ten months or even years, the order for the refund is given, and then we get the money.

Therefore, my submission is that the Minister should think over this and make it very simple so that a person going to the collector with the stamps will get the amount within a few days without unnecessary trouble and harassment. I hope Government will think over this seriously.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I think we can resume the discussion on this Bill tomorrow.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** We can finish it today.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There are some other hon. Members also who want to speak.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I do not think there are any other hon. Members desiring to speak. I shall just take a minute or two.

**Some Hon. Members:** We shall take it up tomorrow.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We shall take it up tomorrow.

We shall now take up the next item on the Order Paper.

#### MOTION RE: REPORT OF UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali).** I beg to move the following motion standing in my name and those of eleven other hon. Members of this House:

“That the Report of the University Grants Commission for the period December, 1953 to

March, 1957, laid on the Table of the House on the 3rd March, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

It will have to be conceded that we wasted a lot of time, and very valuable time at that, and were not even able to appoint the University Grants Commission till 1956. It is true that certain *ad hoc* arrangements were made, but these arrangements were half-hearted and perfunctory, and those persons whose hands were already full with other work were asked to carry on as chairman and members of the commission almost as off-time jobs. All this has happened, and what is much more important is that university education has been ignored at the most crucial time in the nation's history when new problems and new ideas in the wake of Independence and Partition had a great impact on our life. And during these seven or eight years, when university education has started expanding under very abnormal circumstances, during this very crucial period in the nation's life, it is really painful and unfortunate to find that there was little or nothing done to see that a certain new content and certain new values were given to our university education so that the already low standards of education did not further deteriorate and more co-ordination was brought about.

I mention this only to stress that these circumstances have cast a far greater and accumulated responsibility both on Government as well as on the University Grants Commission. Now, they have got to tackle problems which are the resultant of a situation which went uncared for, and at a time, which, as I mentioned before, was the most crucial in the nation's life. But I have to hesitation in congratulating Government on the composition of the University Grants Commission when it was appointed in 1957. The personnel of the commission is certainly unexceptionable; it commands the respect and confidence

of the people. And we must take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the present chairman of the University Grants Commission who in certain very difficult circumstances was able to rise above the situation and accept the chairmanship of the University Grants Commission and without any remuneration. Though he has been working without any remuneration, still it will have to be acknowledged that he has put in extraordinary zeal, and he has worked in a selfless manner.

I am also prepared to concede, and it is gratifying to acknowledge, that during the year 1956-57, a little commendable work has been done by the University Grants Commission; though they were working under certain handicaps, constitutional as well as financial, and though because of those limitations, their physical achievement is not very much, yet, what is much more important, to my mind, is that a good bit of thinking has been done. Good thinking has been done by the commission as well as by certain committees. And as we go through the report, we also see that there is a determination to go ahead and to tackle the problems in a bold manner. This too is acknowledged by all of us.

But I am really sorry to have to say that Government have not played their part in the game. My hon. friend whom I personally hold, and we hold, in personal affection, made a loud claim on the floor of the other House the other day that the universities, the Centre and the University Grants Commission had all worked in a spirit of concord; he said that they worked in an exceptionally harmonious manner. I am afraid I cannot admit this claim by the Government and by the Minister.

If we go through the report, where do we find the University Grants Commission coming in immediate contact with the Ministry? We are told that the co-operation and assistance of the Ministry is wanted. Though it

is a very dignified report and written very well, still if we read through the lines, we find that they leave an unmistakable impression on anyone who reads with his eyes open, that the University Grants Commission did not get the co-operation and support which they were legitimately entitled to get from Government.

The University Grants Commission have mentioned that even during 1956-57, they were told by Government that they would get only Rs. 2.75 crores, excluding, of course, certain grants for the Central universities. They had, as a matter of fact asked for Rs. 5.24 crores. If these demands were exorbitant and exaggerated, then we could understand the difficulties of Government. But my submission is that these demands were absolutely within the Plan, and within the provisions which had already been made; and still, these amounts have not been made available.

And the matter does not end here. The commission further complain that they do not know what they are going to get during the rest of the Plan period. If they do not know what they are going to get during the rest of the period, how on earth are they going to plan, and how on earth are they going to draw up their programme, and on what basis are they going to make funds available to the various universities where they have got to do a colossal job? I submit that this is very unfair to the commission.

We understand that a sum of Rs. 27 crores has been set apart for the University Grants Commission, or rather for the universities, I might say. But the University Grants Commission does not know whether the whole amount will be made available or not. At a time when the country is clamouring and the country is feeling very much perturbed about the deterioration in the standards in the universities, it is really shocking to know that our hon. friend is not even in a position to say that the amount which has been set apart will be

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

made available. If this is the state of affairs, then how on earth are we going to expect the University Grants Commission to work with any amount of satisfaction?

The only other matter which the Commission referred to Government was regarding the affiliated colleges—I am talking about the co-operation and support given by the Ministry. There is no other important matter which was referred by the Commission to the Ministry. They recommended that improvement in the affiliated colleges is essential, it is the crux of the problem and it has got to be solved. The additional expenditure should be shared by the Centre and the States. But the Central Government do not see eye to eye with the Commission, and they do not know what they can do in this matter. They have made a reference to it in the Report itself.

**The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali):** May I inform my hon. friend that Government have already taken a decision with regard to the affiliated colleges? They have approved of the scheme which was prepared by the Dcshmuikh Committee and it is now in the process of implementation. The matter was under consideration when the Report was submitted by the University Grants Commission.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** I am very glad that after all, Government have seen light and reason. I would like to remind my hon. friend that at the time the University Grants Commission was constituted, we stressed this point very much on the floor of the other House. I said—you cannot even touch the problem, you can do absolutely nothing until and unless you extend your assistance to affiliated colleges. I do not know exactly the percentage; possibly 90 per cent of University education is being imparted by these colleges. Now we have been clamouring from 1956 when this measure was brought before the

House, and even in this Report it has been said that Government do not see eye to eye with the Commission. I am very glad to learn that this has been conceded after all. They should have had the proper vision. As a matter of fact, the lead should have come from the Government themselves. They had all the criticism. If there is no lead from Government and if in spite of the criticism offered in the House, if in spite of the recommendations of the Commission, all sorts of obstructionist policies are followed and demands are not conceded in time, it will necessarily have its own effect.

While talking about affiliated colleges, there are the grades. You will be surprised to know that in these colleges where you have got even post-graduate studies, the grade for the Principal has been proposed as Rs. 600—800. Now, this grade has got to be examined. I shall be perfectly satisfied with this grade Rs. 600—800, but then it has got to be examined in the context of the pay structure obtaining in this country. Let us not forget that this grade of Rs. 600—800 is much less than what an Under-Secretary gets; it is even half of what a Deputy Secretary gets. If this is the approach that they have got, if they want that heads of post-graduate colleges should get half the salary of a Deputy Secretary or Under Secretary, then let us have no illusions; let us be very clear in our minds that we are going to have third-rate teachers in the profession and that the standard of education will continue to be very low and will deteriorate.

There is no other choice and no other go. I know the difficulties of Government. I can say that we cannot go beyond our means. But let us have a proper pay structure. Now the Pay Commission is sitting. I think this question should be brought strongly before the Commission. The entire integrated pay structure of the country has got to be examined if we

are going to make any advance and improvement, if people of light and learning are to be drawn to Universities, if first-class people are to be drawn to the engineering line and the industrial line on the one hand and to the teaching profession on the other. That is most essential if we are to make any progress worth the name. So my hon. friend should not be grudging in this. I think he will have to display a lot of strength and vision. He will have to go about in this matter not in the hackneyed manner, not in a routine and rut manner, but he will have to develop special strength to deal with these problems if we are really to break the ice.

Having said this, I would like to say a word about the question of matching grants. The University Grants Commission has also referred to it. They say that it gives rise to a lot of difficulties and delays. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Central Government have given any thought to this matter or not and how they are going to deal with this matter. You will be surprised to know that even when the Central Government were prepared to give a particular set of grades to Universities, it is only about 14 Universities who have taken advantage of it; the other 7 have not taken any advantage of it because of this trouble of matching grant.

Now, I am talking on a fundamental basis on a fundamental question when I am talking about matching grants. I would like to invite the Minister's attention to what the Finance Minister stated in the other House. He said that in a welfare State, the question of the resources of the States as distinct from the resources of the Centre does not arise at all. It is against the concept of a welfare State. I wish my hon. friend to revise his notions about these matching grants, about the responsibilities of the State

Governments. We have a welfare State. Take, for example, the State of Rajasthan. Is it not a fact that that State has done all it could possibly do to raise additional revenues? The Planning Commission said that the State has to raise another Rs. 8 crores during the F. Y. Plan. They have gone out of their way in imposing all burdens on the poor people and have raised additional Rs. 8 crores, and yet they are not able to take advantage of this matching grant. Am I to understand that these States are going to be starved? Am I to understand that the standard of education in half the States in India is going to be different from that in the other half? Is that Government's concept of a welfare State? Is it not an ante-diluvian concept which is better discarded earlier than later? The Commission has itself invited attention to this.

Then the attention of the Commission should be pointedly invited to two most important factors. One is the failures in Universities. I think it is only in this country that failures of students are so abnormal. Let us imagine what colossal national wealth, national energy and national time are lost over these. It is not the system of examination that I am talking of; it is the system of education that I am referring to. Something has got to be done. Maybe, they want to admit to Universities only persons who get 50 per cent marks. But this colossal waste of national wealth and national energy in terms of these failures have a hundred and one evils flowing from them, as the position exists today. Most of the difficulties and evils we face are due to this unsatisfactory state of affairs, the failures in Universities. Immediate thought should be given to this matter.

It becomes the responsibility—we will not blame the students once they admit the students—of the institution, it becomes the responsibility of the University to see that during the prescribed time they impart them education which fits them to pass the examination after the specified period.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Otherwise, it means a colossal waste of time.

Another thing also is relevant. Though we are limited of funds, there is considerable waste of money in Universities. I know of a particular University where from year to year it has been pointed out that there are no regular accounts being kept, and that huge waste is being indulged in. This wasteful expenditure will have to be taken note of before the University Grants Commission makes funds available to the various Universities.

I also want to know what is the position of the University Grants Commission so far as the scientific and technical personnel is concerned; whether the University Grants Commission has any responsibility for the higher technical education or not. My mind is not clear. As I said the other day, I do not feel at all happy about this bifurcation of the Ministry. I am not able to understand and I cannot understand how it can work efficiently. The University Grants Commission is under the control of my hon. friend here.

At present this country is very much concerned about the stepping up of technical education and about scientific personnel. Has the University Grants Commission got any responsibility or not? Will the University Grants Commission be able to give the same treatment for the requirements of technical personnel? Who is going to judge it? Is my friend going to judge it or somebody else? How is co-ordination going to be brought about and how is the responsibility going to be discharged?

We had a resolution placed on the Table of the House by the hon. Prime Minister. We do not know what has been done since then, to give effect to the fine ideas embodied in that resolution. I would feel grateful if my hon. friend enlightens us on this subject, because there must be a cer-

tain body which plans our scientific and engineering personnel. The Prime Minister in his public utterances has all the time been saying that this is our great bottleneck. He spoke only the other day. But, I wish to point out that there is no proper planning of the requirements; and, much more than that, there is absolutely no planning for the utilisation of the scientific personnel. Nobody knows that.

I would like to know from my hon. friend, who is responsible to say that there is proper utilisation of the scientific and engineering personnel. If there is any investigation made, it will be found that most of the engineering talent in this country is being wasted. They are not doing the engineering job at all; they waste most of their time like Babus in office. At the time when the country needs technical personnel, why is it that much of our talent is being wasted? Even the existing talent is being wasted. I know it from experience that at least 60 to 70 per cent of the time of our engineers is wasted simply in office, doing the administrative job or the Babu's job. I think there should be a certain authority because they alone will be able to do something about it.

Another most important point to which I would like to refer is about the medium of instruction in the Universities. I feel deeply concerned about it. I think a lot of harm has already been done in this country because of the wavering and the indecisive policy of the Centre as well as the States in this matter. We are going to be worse off than what we were in the past. At least we had one medium of instruction in all our Universities before independence, whether it was English or whatever it might be. But, now, if the regional languages take the place of the medium of instruction, let us calmly visualise what is going to happen. Apart from the falling standards, apart from the various hundred other

difficulties which might arise out of it, what is going to happen? Today my son is receiving education in Bangalore in an Engineering College; and Shri Dasappa's son is receiving education in Delhi. Are we then going to stop this? I think the University Grants Commission should give proper thought to this matter.

They have been giving thought to something which is far less important, about the standard of English. I am not very much concerned with it. Of course, we must maintain a very high standard of English. It is true English has its own place. English will certainly be required for international use and also for our use here. But, what is most important is, what is going to be the medium of instruction. I should say that until and unless we come to some agreement, let English continue to be the medium. There is no harm. Let us not be in a hurry. Let us not do any harm to ourselves by adopting the regional languages in the various Universities. The regional languages have their own place. They can be given all the fillip they can be stimulated and encouraged in any manner you like. But the integrity of the country, the national unity of the country should, under no circumstances, be impaired by adopting the regional languages in any of the Universities and the University Grants Commission should make....

**An Hon. Member:** What is your suggestion?

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Let English continue till we are agreed. I am prepared to adopt Telugu. What does it matter if Telugu is adopted as the language for the entire country, if you are agreed upon it? It does not matter. But, let there be one unifying language which is adopted by the entire country so far as University education is concerned. Let us all understand each other. Let your son go and study in Rajasthan; and let my son go and study in Hyderabad. There should be no bar and there

should be no difficulty; and that is all I am interested in. Till you come to any conclusion, let English continue. There is no harm. It would be far more dangerous to impose these regional languages in our efforts simply to oust English.

In conclusion, I would say that another important aspect to which the Universities have got to give their attention is the very purpose of the University. It is time now that we examine and investigate whether the Universities are fulfilling the purpose for which they are meant. Don't think I am crazy, or that I am making novel suggestions.

Only during last May, in May 1957, in England in the House of Commons an hon. Member tabled a resolution asking for the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into whether the Universities are fulfilling the purpose for which they were meant. I am not suggesting the appointment of any Commission; but, I do suggest that the University Grants Commission itself examine this question whether the purpose is being fulfilled. One of the purposes, we know, is to cater to the vocational needs of the community. What are the vocational needs of the community? The Universities must so plan and organise that they bring about national unity. I think little or nothing has been done in that direction. We have lost in the beginning, the most valuable 7 or 8 years. We must bring about emotional, moral and mental integration. Universities must pay particular attention to strengthening the moral fabric of our students.

There are so many other points; but I think there would be many other hon. friends who will be speaking and they will be dealing with them.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Report of the University Grants Commission for the period December, 1953 to March, 1957, laid on the Table of the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

House on the 3rd March, 1958, be taken into consideration."

May I know roughly how much time the hon. Minister would require?

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** It will depend upon the points raised; anyhow, I may take about 25 to 30 minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We have got only one hour for the other hon. Members to speak. So let us have 10 minutes each. Shri Mukerjee.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta—Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when the University Grants Commission Act was passed some two years ago, the country and Parliament had great expectations. Its Chairman, whom we miss here in this House, at the same time, an eminent administrator, is naturally somebody from whom we have a right to expect a great deal. Yet, I fear I cannot enthuse over the work which is reported to the House.

This report, I should say in the beginning, is a rather sketchy affair. The idea of the University Grants Commission was that it should look after the expansion of educational opportunities, it should look after the determination and development of standards that it should try to improve the conditions of life and study as far as the teachers and the students were concerned and that it should also link up educational programmes at the higher level with the requirements of the Plan. It is from these points of view that I find its work rather discouraging.

Of the 33 universities in India, four are "the direct and complete responsibility" of the UGC. These are the words used by the Commission in its report. Of the four, Viswa Bharati has been for sometime in a sort of a mess. This university has for its Vice Chancellor one of our foremost scientists and a very lovable personality but pettifoggers have fairly made

it impossible for the ideals of ashram education, which Rabindranath Tagore had when he started his school at Santiniketan, to come to terms, as it must, with the modern requirements of education. Perhaps if the Commission had tried to do so, it could have effectively intervened but it has not done it. I have heard also unsavoury reports about Benares. I am not so sure about what is happening in Aligarh. Perhaps Delhi alone has a presentable record but Delhi is not the whole of India and the credit for Delhi doing whatever it has been doing should not go to the Commission alone.

The Commission has complained and the Minister should, I feel, refer to this matter, that new universities have sometimes been set up without prior consultation with the Commission. Naturally, in the plan period we cannot have universities which are unplanned and it is not enough for the Ministry just to come to us and say that the States have their autonomous rights. There is no reason indeed for the Centre to be supine and look on. I am sure the States will not be unreasonable when the position is explained to them.

The Commission has no doubt done some good work as far as upgrading the salaries of university teachers is concerned. But in regard to the teachers of affiliated colleges I fear it has moved very slowly and even now things are not in a very happy posture everywhere. I know it is not entirely the Commission's fault since matching grants have to come from the States or from the institutions concerned. But the fact remains that the brunt of graduate teaching in this country is borne by affiliated colleges some of whom might be badly run but on the whole they represent a long and creditable tradition of educational idealism. I find, for instance, from recent answers given by the hon. Minister to questions in the House that the West Bengal Government has agreed to offer matching grants for colleges where the student roll does not exceed

1500. This is a proviso, which, the Chairman of the UGC knows very well, because he went to Calcutta and got to know the conditions there, will exclude very important institutions which could not overnight change their pattern of work. This is a matter which pertains not only to West Bengal but to other States like Kerala and others which I could name. I wish the Government seriously applied its mind to this aspect of the matter.

Then, I find that the three-year degree course is now more or less a settled fact and the UGC and the Government are both going to see that it is followed everywhere. Very probably, it is a very good idea and a very excellent scheme—the three-year degree course. But there had been trouble with the Finance Ministry earlier and though my hon. friend, the Minister, recently assured us that there would not be any trouble any further, there is no provision so far in the Budget of 1958-59 on this account.

Quite apart from the financial provision, we cannot forget that universities like Bombay—one of the premier universities of this country—and Agra have said that they cannot adopt the three year degree course. Other universities which willingly or otherwise have accepted this scheme find that arrangements are lacking, arrangements which would like the secondary education structure with the universities. The Ministry of Education has had a programme for setting up a little over 500 multi-purpose schools and to assist some 300 schools for science teaching. But this is a drop in the ocean. The States of course are to do whatever they can but I will give you the instance of West Bengal where there are nearly 1800 high schools of whom only some 300 have been upgraded so far. I submit that the justification of the three-year degree course and its success are linked up with the question of the upgrading of our present secondary schools or at least with providing interim arrangements for a pre-

university course of study. All that is perhaps not in the Commission's street but in a period of planning particularly, the UGC does not function in a vacuum.

The Estimates Committee of this House lately called for perspective planning and naturally we expect that the UGC with its carefully chosen personnel would respond to that call. I am sorry to have to say that the Commission continues to function almost as if it were another Government department. In this connection, I refer to what was quoted in the *Education Quarterly*—a Government of India publication in its March, 1958 number reporting the observations made by Dr. J. C. Ghosh, a member of the Planning Commission who said last year that there was a colossal waste of time and money because our system was dominated by external examinations rather than by good teaching. He gave certain figures. About 10 lakhs were appearing at the Matriculation examination and out of them 5 lakhs will fail. 4 lakhs would appear in Intermediate examinations and two lakhs are going to fail. Perhaps 1 lakh will ultimately get some kind of a degree and this means callousness and frustration as well as financial loss; and anti-social activities which such failures create are taken almost as a matter of course. This is the observation which he made and in connection with this, the writer in the *Education Quarterly* points out that in China in 1955-56, only 0.61 per cent of the total enrolment in the universities were not allowed to go up to the next class or to obtain a diploma or degree at the end of the year and only 0.23 per cent of the total emoluments were dismissed. Here the position is desperate and it needs to be looked after. And that is why the Commission's hands as well as the hands of the educational administration should be strengthened.

I see also that with the report appends a number of photographs of buildings in the process of construction. I was reminded of the Prime Minister who said lately about the PWD mentality prevailing in certain



[Shri A. N. Mukerjee]

sections of the administration. I notice a passion for multi-storeyed buildings in this country. We have a gloriously sunny country but they put up mammoth structures that darken the inner space and they only provide air-conditioned comfort on for the fortunate few inside mausoleum-like structure which we put up. We do not know how much beauty would be shored against the ruins of Delhi a few centuries hence. In any case we are putting up this kind of structure. Handsome buildings are all right but let us remember the adjuration of the Estimates Committee which says that there should be modest programmes as far as the construction of buildings is concerned. The Estimates Committee discovered for instance that in the Technological Institute at Kharagpur, there were so many very precious and valuable instruments lying unused but there was such a programme for building constructions of all sorts which they did feel called upon to object to. In Calcutta, for example, I find the Centenary grant is to the extent of a crore of rupees and out of that Rs. 45 lakhs are earmarked for a multi-storeyed building. I do not see why it should come to be built. We are short of steel and cement for essential purposes.

My friend's Ministry has a low-cost housing expert; I do not know what the low-cost housing expert says about these matters. If we want to have buildings for educational purposes, let us have buildings in conformity with the traditions of our country. Our teachers never wanted commodious accommodation of the sort which present day demands appear to indicate.

I feel that monies could be expanded in other ways. There is a centenary grant to Calcutta, Bombay and Madras of Rs. 1 crore each. They are spending it, God knows on what. Calcutta is going to spend so much on a multi-storeyed building. Could not they have a plan....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Sir, could I have five more minutes?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It cannot be extended to 15 minutes.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Sir, I will try to finish as soon as I can. I feel that they could have a plan for bringing out a number of books, not just 'cram books' but real academic productions in the languages of the country. They could have a scheme for extension lectures. They could bring foreign scholars. They could expand library facilities, not by putting up new buildings but in other ways. They are not doing it.

I see also that the University Grants Commission appears to be in favour of retention of English as medium of instruction in the university stage. If so, let the U.G.C. speak up its mind. Otherwisc, let us make as good a start as we can in regard to the development of our own languages and at the same time decide what should be the role of English. In regard to that, the U.G.C.'s pronouncements should be more categorical and should not be given in the tentative fashion of Government departments.

I shall conclude, Sir, by referring only to two matters. One is that I feel that if we are going to have real education in this country it has got to be purposive and, to be purposive you have to evoke pride in your past; and at the same time to prepare and train people who would be equipped for scientific and technological jobs which need to be done today. To these two tasks attention has not been shown. A Sanskrit University is put up at Kurukshetra, while actually you could develop the Banaras University or the Chidambaram University. Buddhist studies has a chair at the Delhi University, which has not even a provision for the teaching of Pali in the higher stages. There is this kind of wastage of money done as far as humanities are concerned. But you ought to have maximum possible provision in our country for technological development. There is no liaison

between technological institutions and the U.G.C., and the result is that the planning is not done properly.

The report also refers to certain things like the members of the Commission or the members of the staff going abroad. I find that the Secretary, for example, spend nearly half the year abroad. I do not think it is necessary at this stage of our country's progress to go abroad from time to time to find out more details about the kind of education which we should have. We can ask if necessary, foreign scholars to come to this country. Now the Secretary goes out and the Assistant Secretary who is a matriculate—he may be a very capable officer, but he is a matriculate—is in charge of the administration. This kind of thing happens, and I feel that this is a very great element of weakness in the administration.

What is wanted is a new spirit so that our country can be enthused. The U.G.C. has a personnel which commands the confidence and respect of the country. Therefore, they should speak with a stronger voice. They should impose on Government the adoption of policies which would bring about something like an evocation of pride in our past and the efficient performance of the technological tasks of the present.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is said that the University Grants Commission is modelled on the British pattern, but when I compare the University Grants Commission with the University Grants Committee, as it is called in the United Kingdom, I find that there is a lot of difference between the two.

When I examined the report of the University Grants Commission, I found that the main purpose of this Commission is allocation and disbursement of funds. The funds are those that are placed at their disposal by the Government, the funds that the Commission obtains. Those are the funds that are distributed among the different universities in this country, not according to the needs of the uni-

versities but according to the funds made available by the Government.

We find that during the Second Plan period there is an allocation of Rs. 27 crores. During 1956-57 there was an allocation of Rs. 2.42 crores and during 1957-58 there was an allocation of Rs. 2.75 crores. This pace is very slow. With this pace I doubt very much whether Rs. 27 crores allocated for the Second Plan period would be covered altogether or not.

Sir, when we compare the University Grants Commission with the University Grants Committee in England, as I have already said, we find that there is a lot of difference between the two. What are the functions of its British counterpart? Its British counterpart controls the entire university education in that country. Here the University Grants Commission does not control the entire set up of university education in this country. There is a sort of quadrangular control in this country. Here the universities are controlled to a certain extent by the University Grants Commission, they are controlled by the Central Government, they are controlled by the State Government and they also control themselves. Therefore, to say that our University Grants Commission is modelled on the British pattern is a misnomer, is a betrayal of facts.

I have gone through the report. I have closely examined the functions and responsibilities that are enjoined upon this University Grants Commission. As I have said, I find one central motif running through its responsibilities and that is the allocation of funds. This is called a Grants Commission, and perhaps, with an idea to justify its nomenclature it is burdened with that sort of responsibilities. When I read the report I got only one impression, the impression of a commercial manual rather than of a document that is concerned with a subject as alive and as soul-stirring as education is. It lacks in attitude and there is a basic absence of policy and plan that determines the work of the

[Shri Hem Barua]

University Grants Commission. One looks in vain for a basic approach to programmes in this report. The report is only a dry cataloguing of certain statistics and facts.

Now, what is the attitude that its British counterpart has? The British counterpart has the responsibility of examining, prescribing and making recommendations towards national needs. In this University Grants Commission we do not find any recommendation like that or any responsibility like that.

I think university education is two-dimensional—research and instruction. What is the attitude of the University Grants Commission towards research and instruction? That is not plainly stated in this report. The purpose of university education is to meet the challenge of time. What is the challenge of time today? In our country it is the challenge of technology, industrial development, science. In the world there is the challenge of the Sputnik. In the United States recently I have found that the Federal Government has made available 5000 stipends and the State Governments have made available 10,000 stipends to meet this challenge of space. Here we are having the challenge of industrial development, challenge of technology, challenge of scientific development. In the report of this University Grants Commission there is no approach, no attitude, nothing of that sort to these challenges.

At the same time, I find from the report that the University Grants Commission wants to be a fully free body not subject to frequent and detailed scrutiny by Government like its British counterpart. But, as I have said, to me the University Grants Commission only appears to be a post office of the Education Ministry—nothing more or nothing less. That is why there is a lot of pessimism running through this report, a lack of confidence, a lack of faith in it. I do not hold the University Grants Commission responsible for it. I hold the Government responsible for it,

because the Government has failed to infuse the necessary faith into it, the necessary confidence into it. It has failed to give it the necessary autonomy and the necessary freedom. When I compare this with its British counterpart, so far as the British counterpart is concerned, its advice is accepted without debate, and it is exempted from financial investigation by Parliament or by the Public Accounts Committee. But here it is not so. In 1957-58, the University Grants Commission made a demand, after consulting the different universities, for a grant of Rs. 5.24 crores and the Government promised only Rs. 2.75 crores. They cut it down by half,

Now, I find from the report certain practical difficulties. One of them is the pressure of students, so far as universities are concerned. The report says that in 1951-52 there were 4 lakhs of students in our universities and that today there are 7½ lakhs of students. There is an annual increase of 50,000 students, and the receipt or prescription given by the University Grants Commission is, "consolidation rather than expansion is the need of the day". I quite understand that. We have to consolidate our achievements, but, at the same time, I do not understand or I am not able to understand that consolidation means total eclipse of its functions. Consolidation and expansion are not mutually exclusive terms. At this stage, when we are building a democracy and when freedom has opened the floodgates of opportunities, it is quite natural for people to hunger after higher education. During the British time, educational facilities were determined by the bank balances, and that is why we find that there were two broad divisions of the people in our country, the privileged few who had the opportunity of education and the unprivileged many who did not have the opportunity of education. That was the broad division in our country. If the same thing is to continue today, I would say that the purpose of the University Grants Commission defeats itself.

It is a fact that there is an onrush of students. But where is the solution? The solution is there, England also faced this problem after the second world war. I suggest that there should be a bifurcation in the post-matric stage. There must be more technical institutions. We need more men of the professions, and commercial institutions. If we can divert a mass, a section of our student population, in the post-matric stage to these institutions, professional and commercial institutions, I think the onrush of students on the universities could lessen. Then there might be another process, the process of screening. That process of screening is possible only after we make provision for the absorption of students in other institutions.

Then there is another thing that the report says. The report says that the teaching profession has ceased to attract the best men and women. For this, the teaching profession is not to be held responsible. For this, I will hold those people who administer the education departments responsible. The teacher is often called the fly-wheel of the educational machinery, but at the same time, the teacher is lowly paid. He is treated with contumely. He is neglected. At the same time, our leaders raise slogans, slogans of high ideals, of sacrifices and sufferings on the part of teachers. They ask the teachers to emulate the high ideals of our ancient *rishis* and *gurus*. But our people forget that the socio-economic conditions of those days are not the socio-economic conditions that obtain today. I would say that when the walls of the stomach burn and irritate, it is more than cruel to try to hammer into the heads of the teaching profession, the teachers, the high ideals, however, noble they may be, of our ancient *gurus* and *rishis*, because the socio-economic conditions in which the *rishis* and *gurus* lived and taught the students are not at present obtaining here.

I am glad that the Education Minister has pointed out the fulfilment of the minimum scale prescribed by the

University Grants Commission for the teachers of the affiliated colleges. When the University Grants Commission made the proposals they said that these proposals were to be given effect to from the 1st April, 1958. During all these two long years, except the State Government of West Bengal and that too under duress, the other State Governments refused to co-operate with the University Grants Commission. At the same time, the University Grants Commission could not enforce its decisions or recommendations on the State Governments because of the tier-system of administration. The University Grants Commission, in the circumstances, reminds me of that organisation called the League of Nations, grandiose in structure, grandiose in aspirations, but without power to enforce its decisions on its constituent units. That is what I am reminded of. But I thank the Education Minister for making this announcement on the floor of this House. After a long wait, lasting for a couple of years, the Government have at least seen the necessity of fulfilling the demands of the teachers belonging to the affiliated colleges.

About student indiscipline the report has said certain things. About student indiscipline I would say that there are social factors also. It is a fine thing to see that the University Grants Commission is desirous of making physical amenities available for the university students. Besides that, society must take a responsibility. Unless and until society takes a responsibility, the student population cannot be said to improve in spite of the physical facilities, because the students live in the educational institutions only for the time being, for a brief period, and the little light that they get from within the four walls of the class-rooms, when they go out,— gets lost and blurred in the enveloping darkness that is modern society today.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the Ministry of Education because, when I scan the educational map of this country and also the

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

educational map of some of the progressive countries in the world, I think that in no country, no Ministry of Education is so prolific as our Ministry of Education. If you could judge the performance of a Ministry by the number of Commissions it has appointed, by the number of Committees it has, by the number of Committees that are there but have not submitted their reports and by the number of Committees that have been appointed but have never met, I think our Ministry of Education will deserve the first prize in any part of the world.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not the Ministry of Education that has to be considered; it is the report of the University Grants Commission.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** One of the great things done by this Ministry of Education is that it has appointed this University Grants Commission. When we have the University Grants Commission, the Council for Elementary Education, the Council for Secondary Education, the Sahitya Akademi and the Lalit Kala Akademi, when we have all these beautiful children of the Ministry of Education, I feel honestly that the children should supersede the parents. I submit very respectfully that the children should be allowed to work independently, in their own right, work as self-existent and self-sufficient units, and as was said by my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee, to do something for the improvement of education and also for the improvement of culture.

Somebody talked about a scientific policy and all that. For that, we have also a Council of Industrial and Scientific Research. Therefore, I do submit that when I look at this report of the Commission, I feel happy because I think this Commission has done good work within the limited resources, within the limited funds at 17 hrs.

its disposal. This Commission has done its work quite well and if the Education Ministry, in the course of

a year or two, appoints such commissions, I think it will be a very happy day indeed for the country, because then the confused manner in which our education is being run in this country will disappear, and because I think there will be somebody from whom elementary education, secondary education and University education can take their cue. From that point of view, I think the Ministry of Education should specialise in these things and should bring up the children in a vigorous fashion and retire, so to say, into some kind of inactivity, so that they can do their work properly.

Now, the University Grants Commission has a very illustrious Chairman and I join my hon. friends who have paid tributes to him. I also pay tributes to Shri C. D. Deshmukh, because I know he has given a new look to the University Grants Commission. But the University Grants Commission is mainly concerned with the Central Universities, Delhi, Banaras Aligarh and Viswa Bharathi. Now what is their condition. There is an inquiry committee to inquire into the Banaras University. So far as the Viswa Bharathi is concerned, I do not want to say anything, because it is associated with the illustrious name of the greatest poet of India in the modern age. Aligarh is taking shape. Regarding Delhi University, we live in Delhi and we know all about the Delhi University. It can be seen from the columns of the newspapers and more from the extension lectures and from the propaganda sheets; and raising the standards of education what it has done for advancing scholarship is not known. All this is happening. Therefore, the University Grants Commission has not much to show, so far as the Central Universities are concerned.

Then, what about the State Universities? I will admit that the University Grants Commission has been doing something for the State Universities. I cannot deny it. But what are the State Universities? The State

Universities are like a map. The reality behind that map is a territory, a population. Similarly, the State University is a name. The reality behind these State Universities are the affiliated colleges. The affiliated colleges are the blood of the State Universities, are the life of the State Universities. Of course, the affiliated colleges may be leading a precarious life. An affiliated college may not be paying its staff as adequately as possible. All these things may be there. But I should say that the University Grants Commission doing something for the State Universities without thinking in terms of affiliated colleges is a very unreal thing. The affiliated colleges are the backbone of the Universities. If you do not think about them, you are not moving in the right direction. My friend over there said that if you give these teachers what you are at present giving, you will only get third-rate teachers. Now, I would judge the University Grants Commission and I would judge these things by the improvement that you can show in the salaries of teachers in the affiliated colleges, in the conditions of their service, and in the raising of the educational standards in these colleges I am very very unhappy when I say that the University Grants Commission has not done its duty by the affiliated colleges so far.

Then, I am glad that the University Grants Commission has taken a step so far as the welfare of the students is concerned. For instance, I find from the Report that they are going to get some scholarships, that the University Grants Commission is going to give money for the building of hostels and all that. I am very happy. But India is a poor country. This morning I was reading in a paper about China, and I was told in that paper that in the Universities of China every one student out of two students should be a student who comes from the family of a peasant or the family of a worker. So, what I wish to submit is that unless University education is made available

to these persons who do not have enough of money to avail themselves of it, I think all our State Universities, all our Central Universities, all our commissions, all these things, will not further that objective which we have in our country, the socialistic pattern of society.

Therefore, I would submit very respectfully that the University Grants Commission should apply its mind in this direction, and when it does something in that way, I think perhaps the Universities also may follow suit.

I will now come to another point. If you read the report of the Commission and the Ministry you will find that this Ministry is specialising in sending people abroad. I do not want that people should not be sent abroad. They can send them abroad. But the kind of "over-fondness"—I was about to use a harsh word; I have corrected myself—that they have developed is not good. They have developed a kind of excessive fondness for sending people abroad. I would ask: what is the good of sending them abroad? When they come back, do you try to take advantage of anything that they have learnt and put them into practice somewhere? Have they submitted any reports? Of course, they will submit their reports. But, have the Ministry taken any action on them? So, what I wish to submit is this. The Ministry of Education should give more money to the University Grants Commission and to elementary education, Sahitya Akadami and Lalit Kala Akadami. It could be like a parent who is superseded by his children. He is a happy parent who feels eclipsed by his children. These are the children of the Ministry of Education and they are fast eclipsing it. I think the Ministry of Education should help in the process of being eclipsed by them. I think that way lies the salvation of India.

My hon. friend was talking about the challenge of the times. I agree with him. We are facing that challenge of the times, but I submit, if our education is changed then we will

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

meet the challenge of the times; otherwise we will go on in this routine fashion. I know the Ministry of Education, like other Ministries, has made an art and a science of routine.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, देश के जीवन स्तर और उस के हर एक भंग को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये शिक्षा की बहुत आवश्यकता है। लेकिन सरकार शिक्षा को क्या महत्ता दे रही है, अगर हम इस पर विचार करें, तो शायद दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ेगा, और युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में है, कि सामूहिक रूप से उस का ध्यान इस तरह बहुत कम है। अभी अभी हाल में एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री को डाउनग्रेड कर दिया गया है। कैबिनेट रैंक का कोई मिनिस्टर एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर नहीं है तब बजट में, हमें के लेन देन में उस के बढ़ाने में उस का क्या असर हो सकता है। इस तरह से यह मंत्रालय कमजोर पड़ता जायेगा। मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री से अपील करूंगा कि एजुकेशन का मंत्री तो जरूर ही एक कैबिनेट रैंक का मिनिस्टर हो। किसी भी देश के लिये एजुकेशन की उतनी ही महत्ता है जितनी किसी और चीज की हो सकती है। हमारे भिलाई प्लान्ट और दूसरे प्लांट जो बन रहे हैं, वे शिक्षा के द्वारा ही चलते हैं। अगर हमारी शिक्षा का ट्रिटेन ऊंचा नहीं रहा, उस पर जोर नहीं दिया गया तो हमारी प्रगति चारों ओर से रूक जायेगी, हमारा देश कभी भी आगे नहीं जा सकेगा इस सम्बन्ध में अधिक न कह कर युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने अध्यापकों के वेतन की तरफ जो ध्यान दिया है, उस के सम्बन्ध में चन्द बातें कहना चाहता हूँ।

हमारे देश में दुर्भाग्य से अध्यापकों की समाज में कोई गणना नहीं है, जो उन की

कद होनी चाहिए, वह नहीं है। किसी समय भारत में ऋषियों की प्रथा थी। उस समय सब से बड़ी पूजा ऋषियों की कर्म-पतियों की होती थी, जो कि जंगलों में रह कर, गुफाओं में रह कर विद्या देते थे और पढ़ाते थे। इस बात का दुःख है कि आज विद्या देने वाले और पढ़ाने वाले समाज में उतनी कद नहीं पाते हैं जितनी कि सरकार की ओर से देने वाला एक अफसर या अधिकारी पाता है। उन की तन्स्वाह भी इतनी कम है कि उस की बराबरी किसी अपराधी की तन्स्वाह से की जा सकती है। आज प्राइमरी स्कूल के टीचर की यह स्थिति है। हमारा सारा ढांचा ब्रिटेन के अथवा यूनाइटेड किंगडम के ढांचे पर आधारित है। हम ने अपनी डिमान्सेस भी उन्हीं की डिमान्सेस के आधार पर रखी है। लेकिन दुःख है कि हम ने अपनी सर्विसेज का आधार वह नहीं बनाया है जो आज ब्रिटेन में है, शिक्षा का भी आधार वह नहीं बनाया है जो वहां है। हम बिल्कुल उस के उल्टे रूप में हैं। उन्होंने यहां पर जो अपनी बुराई छोड़ी उसी को हम यहां पर कायम रखे हुए हैं। नूलना के रूप में कुछ तथ्य मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने साफ कहा है कि हमारे एफिलिएटेड कालेजों के टीचरों की तन्स्वाह बहुत कम है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि जब तक एफिलिएटेड कालेजों सही तरीके से काम न करेंगे, असली शिक्षा नहीं देगे तब तक शिक्षा की प्रगति नहीं हो सकती। उन के वर्डस ये हैं ;

"Many of these colleges receive grants-in-aid... Obviously, much of the quality of University Education in India will depend on the standards maintained by the colleges, and unless it is made possible for them to make rapid improvements in their staff, equipment, libraries, laboratories and

other facilities, no real improvement of University Education will take place."

यह उन की फार्डिंग है, जो कि अपने स्थान पर सही है। जब तक कालेज में में इम्प्रूवमेंट न हो, उन की तरक्की न हो, प्रगति न हो, तब तक हमारी शिक्षा आगे नहीं बढ़ सकती है। आप देखिये कि उन के वेतन स्तर क्या हैं। आज जितने डिग्री कालेज हैं उन में से अधिकतर प्राइवेट चलते हैं, जिज लोग उन को चलाते हैं। उन को तन्स्वाह कमा बेश कम ही है। यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने कहा है कि उन की तन्स्वाह किस तरह से हो। इस के लिये यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने कुछ खपया नहीं दिया है, लेकिन सरकार से, केन्द्रीय और राज्य सरकारों से, अनुरोध किया है कि व भी इस में शेर करे। उन्होंने कहा है कि कम से कम यह पै स्केल होनी चाहिये ---

टीचर्स मेकण्ड बलाम	२००—४००	•
टीचर्स फस्ट बलाम	३००—५००	•
हंडस आफ डिपार्टमेंट्स	४००—७००	•
प्रिंसिपल	६००—८००	•

जो कि आज किसी भी एफिलिएटेड कालेज के अध्यक्ष को नहीं मिल रही है, बिच दी एक्जेशन आफ डि फिंड। साथ में यूनिवर्सिटी टीचर्स की जो तन्स्वाह दे रक्की है वह भी इस प्रकार है :—

लेक्चरर्स	२००—५००	•
रीडर्स	५००—२५—८००	•
प्राफेसर्स	८००—५०—१२५०	•

इस मुकामले में से आप को यू० के० के अध्यापकों का वेतन भी बता देना चाहता हूँ कि उनका वेतन कितना है, प्रोफेसर्स का वेतन क्या है और वहाँ की सिविल सर्विस के लोगों का वेतन क्या है, वहाँ के प्राइमरी स्कूल्स के टीचर्स का

वेतन कितना है। मैं एग्जुकेशन इन १९५६ बींग वि रिपोर्ट आफ वि मिनेस्ट्री आफ एग्जुकेशन नामक किताब से पढ़ रहा हूँ। वहाँ पर प्राइमरी स्कूल टीचर की तन्स्वाह १ अक्टूबर, ५६ से ४७५-२५—६०० पौड है। मर्से और औरतों के वेतन में थोड़ा फर्क जरूर है जो क्वालिफाइड वीमन टीचर्स प्राइमरी स्कूल्स में पढ़ाती हैं उन का वेतन है ४२०—२०—७२० पौड। लेक्चरर्स, और प्रोफेसर्स के ग्रेड्स भी अलग अलग हैं। असिस्टेंट्स ग्रेड ए और ग्रेड बी हैं उन के ग्रेड इस प्रकार हैं :—

असिस्टेंट ए ग्रेड ४७५-२५—६०० पौड  
असिस्टेंट बी ग्रेड ६५०-२५—१,०२५ पौड  
लेक्चरर्स का जो ग्रेड पहले ६६५-२५—१०६ पौड था वह अब १ अक्टूबर, ५६ १२००-३०—१३५० पौड हो गया है यानी १३५० पौड तक तो वहाँ का लेक्चरर पाता है और सीनियर लेक्चरर पाता है १३५० से १५५० पौड तक। हैड आफ दि डिपार्टमेंट पाता है १५१५ से १६६५ पौड तक जो कि सन् १९५६ से १९०० से २०५० पौड तक हो गया है। यह तो हेड्स आफ डिपार्टमेंट्स की तन्स्वाह है लेकिन जो साइंटिफिक हेड्स हैं, टेकना-लीजी के हेड्स आफ दि डिपार्टमेंट्स हैं उन के वेतन और भी ज्यादा हैं। रीडर्स का ही वेतन उन में १५५०-१८०० पौड तक है। हेड्स आफ दि डिपार्टमेंट का वेतन २०५०—२२५० पौड तक है यू० के० के अध्यापकों का वेतन इस प्रकार है जब कि वहाँ के जो सिविल सर्वेंट्स हैं उनका वेतन ४५० पौड से लेकर १७५० पौड तक ही है। अब अध्यापक समाज इज्जत के अधिकारी हैं, और जब समाज को सुधारने की ओर सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिये, तब मर्रा कहना है कि अपने भारतवर्ष में भी अध्यापकों की कड़ा



## [श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

सरकार के किसी भी अधिकारी से अधिक होनी चाहिये। जब तक यह कदम उसकी नहीं होगी, जब तक समाज में यह स्थान अध्यापक को नहीं प्राप्त होगा तब तक हमारे यहां न शिक्षा को प्रगति हो सकती है और न इंडिपेंडेंस हो सकती है जो कि आज हम विश्वविद्यालयों में चारों तरफ देख रहे हैं। आज जरूरी है कि अध्यापक की इज्जत हो, अध्यापक किसी के अधीन न हो। आज हम देखते हैं कि जब प्रधान मंत्री जाते हैं, बड़े बड़े नेता जाते हैं राष्ट्रपति भी जाते हैं, तो अध्यापक की कोई पूछ नहीं होती है। अगर किसी यूनिवर्सिटी में ही बै लोग जायें तो भले ही उन अध्यापकों की कोई पूछ हो जाये, वरना किसी दूसरे फंक्शन में उन को वह स्थान नहीं मिलता जो कि एक अन्य अधिकारी को मिलता है। इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन को चाहिये कि वह किसी तरह इस बात पर जोर दे कि अध्यापकों का अधिक ख्याल रक्खा जाये। जहां पर भी प्राइमरी स्कूल है उन स्थानों पर एक पटवारी की ज्यादा इज्जत होती है बनिस्वत एक प्राइमरी स्कूल के टीचर की। जब प्राइमरी स्कूल के टीचर को तनख्वाह कम, कदम भी बहुत कम तो वह लड़कों पर कैसे आधिपत्य रख सकता है, लड़कों पर वह कैसे अपना गौरव स्थापित कर सकता है? उन्हें पेट की ही फिक्र रहती है और लड़के भी उन की इज्जत नहीं करते हैं। शिक्षा देने वाला जो पुरुष है वह कम से कम रोज की जो जरूरियात हैं उन की फिक्र में रहें। हर्ष है कि इस तरफ यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने कुछ ध्यान दिया है।

यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने प्रोफेसर्स के बारे में भी कहा है कि उन के पे स्केल बड़े पृष्ठ है, उन्होंने ने 'पुअर' का शब्द कहा है वहां अभी हाल ही में जो पे कमीशन बैठा है उस को भी विचार करना चाहिये कि इस तरह की सविज्ञेय के पे स्केल क्या हों। एक बार पहले

भी पे कमीशन बैठा था, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य है कि जो भी पे कमीशन बैठते हैं वे अध्यापकों की ओर कभी ध्यान नहीं देते। वे केवल उन्हीं बड़े बड़े अधिकारियों की तरफ ध्यान देते हैं जिन के हाथ में शक्ति है। जो लोग असली गुरु हैं, जो देश के निर्माणकर्ता हैं, जो देश का और हमारा स्तर ऊंचा कर सकते हैं, उन के ऊपर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। मैं आप के जरिये यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि नया पे कमीशन जो बैठा है उस को इस बात की देखना चाहिये कि यहां हायवेस्ट पे के कितने प्रादमी हैं और वे कौन हैं, कितने प्रादमी उन में से साइंटिफिक और इंजीनियर हैं। अभी हम ने एक विधेयक पास किया है उस में कहा गया है कि हम टेक्नालाजिकल हैड्स को अधिक सुविधा देंगे देखना है कि उन को क्या सुविधा मिलती है। हम यहां बहुत से विधेयक पास करते हैं लेकिन विधेयक कार्यान्वित किस रूप में होता है, यह पता नहीं चलता। कभी कभी नहीं भी होता है।

तो मैं अधिक न कह कर इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप जब भी अध्यापकों को रखें तो इस प्रकार से रखें कि समाज में उन की कदम हो, उन की इज्जत हो और वह पैसे रुपये के मामले में अपने किसी समकक्ष अधिकारी से कम वेतन पाने वाले न हों। एक यूनिवर्सिटी का प्रोफेसर किसी कलक्टर से कम तनख्वाह पाने वाला न हो, तब तो उस की कदम हो सकती है।

दूसरे यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन से मेरी शिकायत है कि हमारी गोरखपुर यूनिवर्सिटी को सन् १९५६-५७ में एक पैसा भी नहीं दिया गया है। अभी वहां पर एक नई यूनिवर्सिटी रूरल यूनिवर्सिटी के नाम से खोली गई है। उस यूनिवर्सिटी को और तरजीह मिलनी चाहिये लेकिन सन् १९५५-५६ का जो हिसाब बतलाया गया है उस में उसे एक पैसा भी नहीं मिला है। सन् १९५७-५८ में मालूम नहीं कि मिला है कि नहीं मिला या

धारा क्या मिलने वाला है। यह युनिवर्सिटी उस क्षेत्र में कायम है जिस क्षेत्र में कि हर तरीके की दिक्कत आज गवर्नमेंट के सामने मौजूद है। उस क्षेत्र में खाने और कपड़े की दिक्कत है और मंहगाई की दिक्कत है। जहाँ तक उस क्षेत्र की जन संख्या का सम्बन्ध है मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद भारत के किसी भी भाग की अपेक्षा वहाँ आबादी अधिक है और प्रति वर्ग मील पर वहाँ १००० आदमी आबाद हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उस कक्ष की जरूरियात को पूरा करने के लिये कोई योजना प्रथवा स्कीम सोची जा रही है कि नहीं। उस क्षेत्र की ओर सरकार का और विशेष तौर से युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन का खास ध्यान जाना चाहिये। उस को एक ऐसी युनिवर्सिटी बनाये जो कि सही मानों में एक आदर्श युनिवर्सिटी हो। गोरखपुर एक छोटा सा शहर है, दिल्ली जैसा बड़ा शहर नहीं है। देहातों के जो गरीब आदमी वहाँ आयेंगे उन की सेवा करने के लिये वह युनिवर्सिटी कायम की गई है और इस लिये उस तरफ ओर अधिक ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये। अब चूँकि घंटी बज चुकी है इसलिये मैं ओर अधिक न कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

**Dr. K. L. Shrivastava:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and have made valuable contribution to the problem of university education. I would like to assure them that the various suggestions which they have made will be fully considered both by the University Grants Commission and by the Ministry of Education.

I would briefly like to touch on some of the points that have been raised in the course of the discussion. In the first place, I think I should like to mention that it is a matter of great pride that in our country, which is still a young democracy, we have been able to set up an institution, the University Grants Commission, which is laying the foundations of true democratic life. I am saying this because

it is from the Universities that the proper men who would run the democratic State would be produced. It is most important that our Universities should function in an atmosphere which would be congenial to the production of the right kind of citizens for a democratic society. It may appear to be a very small matter, but, if we look at it from the point of view of setting up proper conventions and proper traditions, I would like to submit that it is one of the most important steps that the Government have taken. I am in full agreement with my hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma that in matters of education, Government should gradually get eclipsed and people should take greater and greater responsibility. That is the only way of functioning of a true democracy. I do not mind if the Ministry of Education gets completely eclipsed and institutions like the University Grants Commission, which have been created by the Ministry play an important role in the development of our education. I think it would be a very happy day when more and more institutions come into existence and they exercise greater and greater responsibility, financial as well as otherwise.

I am afraid my hon. friend opposite was not very fair when he said that the University Grants Commission has worked like a Post Office. This is neither fair to the University Grants Commission nor to the Government. The Ministry of Education has functioned in the true spirit of the University Grants Commission Act. There has not been one occasion when there has been any complaint from any quarter that there has been any kind of interference or infringement.

**Shri Hem Barua:** I did not mean infringement or interference. I was only saying that in the context of the responsibilities that are entrusted to the University Grants Commission as reflected in the report, allocation and disbursement of funds, it gives the impression as if it is a Post Office by which the funds that the Government makes available, are distributed.

**Dr. K. L. Shrivalli:** That is not correct. I would like to correct my hon. friend and tell him that the University Grants Commission has full freedom and autonomy to initiate policies and programmes. It has also to take into account the national needs and national requirements. It is stated in the Act itself that it cannot ignore at any stage the requirements of our society, changing society to which my hon. friend referred.

I have said and I would like to repeat that in the earlier stages of our democratic life, it is most important that we set up proper institutions. The University Grants Commission is one of the institutions which is trying to lay the foundations of a true democratic life, because the Universities are the places from which the future citizens and future leaders of society will be produced.

My hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur says that he has great affection for me, but he has been very vehement in his remarks as far as the work of the Ministry is concerned. There is a certain misunderstanding with regard to the allocation of funds to the University Grants Commission. In the first place, I would like to say that when a provision of Rs. 27 crores was made for the Second Five Year Plan, it was our intention that it should be possible for us to make this fund available to the University Grants Commission for disbursement for the development of the Universities. The House is fully aware that the fulfilment of the Plan depended on certain conditions. The conditions were that both internal and external resources would be made available. At this time when we are in the process of reviewing the whole Plan, when we are not sure that all the funds that we have provided for in the Second Plan would be made available, how is it possible for me to give an assurance to the House or to the University Grants Commission that all the amount that was provided for would be made available. This is

a difficulty which I would like both the House and the University Grants Commission to understand. We have explained that to the University Grants Commission and I would like to explain it to the House also that as far as the Ministry of Education is concerned, we are keen that funds should be made available to the Universities so that they may develop on proper lines. They are hungry for funds. They want more money for their library, for their staff, for their equipment. Without these, we cannot improve our Universities. At the same time, we have to look at this picture in the background of the total economic situation in the country. With regard to that at this stage I can only say that it will be our earnest endeavour to see that the development plans and development programmes that the University Grants Commission has undertaken are not retarded in any way. It will also be our endeavour to see that we are able to meet their needs from time to time, but the House will understand the reasons why it is not possible for me to give an assurance at this time that the total provision which we have made in the Second Five Year Plan would be made available. After a few months when we have been able to review the whole economic position of the country, it may be possible for us to let the Commission know how much funds would be made available.

I can understand the difficulty of the Commission also. In order that they may plan properly, in order that they may draw up proper development programmes, it is essential that we should be able to let them know well in time how much funds would be available for development purposes. I can only tell the House that as soon as we have reviewed the situation and we know the actual position with regard to our total plans, we would let the Commission know about this matter.

Shri Mathur also stated that we have been slow in making these funds available to the Commission and that

we are not making all the funds available. With regard to the last two years I would like to say that in 1956-57 the Central Government placed Rs. 3,50,00,000 at the disposal of the Commission and they were free to spend this amount. Actually they were able to spend only Rs. 3,43,19,890. In 1957-58 the amount which was placed at the disposal of the Commission was Rs. 4,17,00,000 and they were able to spend only Rs. 3,50,00,000. Therefore, it is not correct to say that we have not been able to meet the needs and requirements of the Commission.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Then may I know how is it that they make a complaint in this report that for 1956-57 funds were not made available to them? Were they made available to them in time? Were they told in time?

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** It is true the Commission asked for more funds, but after scrutiny we found that, after all, the Commission had also limited capacity to spend, and therefore these funds were made available, and as the House will see, even the funds which were placed at their disposal were not utilised by them. Therefore, our conjecture that it would not be possible for them to spend those amounts at that time was correct.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** My point is this. After the year is over, when they write this report, why is it that they have made a specific complaint about this matter? They should, in fairness, have said that they had been able to spend only so much, and they could not spend more. Rather, they say that they wanted this much and only this much was made available. They have made a specific complaint after the year is over.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** I do not want to enter into an argument. They asked for certain funds. The request was naturally scrutinised and then we said how much would be made

available. This was made available, and they were not in a position to utilise it. That is the position that I am stating before the House.

Another question that was raised by my friend Shri Mathur was with regard to the matching grants. It is true that, as the Commission itself has stated, the State Governments and the universities have difficulties in finding suitable matching funds in order that they might make use of the grants made by the Commission, but at the same time, we should remember that the Central Government has not taken up full and entire responsibility for university education. They have a limited responsibility in this matter. I would personally be happy if the Central Government can take full responsibility, but in the present situation when our own resources are limited, I think for some time to come we will have to devise some methods by means of which we can develop greater co-ordination for the development of the universities.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** How are you going to get over the difficulties mentioned by the Commission in this respect?

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** This is a matter which will have to be examined in consultation with the State Governments and the universities, and I shall take the earliest opportunity to examine this matter.

With regard to the affiliated colleges also, the question was raised, and I am in general agreement with the Members that unless we can solve the problem of the affiliated colleges, we do not solve the problem of higher education, because we have about 800 to 900 affiliated colleges and only about three dozen universities. After a great deal of consultation with the Commission, we have now decided that it is possible for the Commission to give

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

grants to affiliated colleges also out of the funds which will be placed at their disposal. From this it will be clear that it is not our intention to leave the affiliated colleges out of the purview of the Commission and I hope as more and more funds are available to the Commission, they would be able to improve not only the universities, but the large number of affiliated colleges which are scattered all over the country.

The question was raised with regard to the salaries of teachers. From the report it is clear that the Commission has given a high priority to the improvement in the salaries of teachers. They gave liberal assistance, 80 per cent of the increased expenditure for improvement in the salaries of university teachers, and now they have decided to share at the rate of 50 per cent for improving the salaries of the teachers of the affiliated colleges also. They are giving more assistance for the teachers of women's colleges.

I was not able to understand what my friend Shri Mathur meant by suggesting that the engineering talent was being wasted in this country. As far as I am aware, we are making full use of all the engineers and technicians who are coming out of our universities and colleges, and I think it should be a matter of satisfaction for us that today as far as engineering personnel is concerned, this country is able to meet all its requirements.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** They are not getting employment.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimali:** With regard to employment also, I am not aware that there is any acute unemployment as far as the technical personnel is concerned. What happens is that sometimes a student comes out of an engineering college and goes straight to the employment exchange and gets a job after two or three months. And we get the impression that engineers

do remain unemployed. My information is that as far as engineers are concerned they are fully employed in our factories and in various kinds of industrial concerns. I could not understand when my hon. Friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur said that engineers should not be asked to administer. That was a point which I could not understand.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** I never said it.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimali:** As far as I remember, he said that the engineers should not have any administrative responsibility and they should not work like clerks. The work of a clerk is also a noble work. I do not think that that is something on which we should look down upon. An engineer also has to do certain administrative work, and I do not think it is fair to say that that should be looked down upon.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** It is not a question of looking down upon. I said that most of our engineering talent was being wasted on clerical work. And that is not only my complaint, but if you read the papers, you will find that at least half a dozen letters have appeared on this very subject showing how the engineering talent is being wasted.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimali:** I do not think it is possible to divide these responsibilities completely and say that the technical man should handle only technical work and should not have any administrative work and that an administrator should not have any technical knowledge. Some kind of combination there will always have to be in all kinds of technical work.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** There is too much of red-tape, which has to be cut out.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimali:** Now, I come to the question of language. Various Members have raised the question of

the medium of instruction. The University Education Commission had made certain recommendations with regard to the medium of instruction. Since then, that matter has been examined by various committees, and recently by the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission had appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Kunzru, and that committee has made certain recommendations with regard to the medium of instruction at the university stage. And the University Grants Commission has accepted the recommendations of the Kunzru Committee. The recommendations of the Committee are that as far as the medium of instruction is concerned, the changeover from English to the regional languages should be a slow process, and in that process we should ensure that the standards are not lowered in any way. The University Grants Commission has accepted that position. And I am hoping that the universities also will follow the example and will follow the general policy which has been laid down by the University Grants Commission. In this matter, it is neither possible for Government or the University Grants Commission to dictate to the universities, nor would I like the University Grants Commission or Government to dictate to the universities. The universities in our country must be free to frame their own courses and curricula. It would be a very unhappy day for the country when Government dictate to the universities what courses and what curricula and what medium of instruction they should follow. And this is a matter which I think we can leave to the discretion of the universities, and I hope that they would not do anything which lowers our standards or which is not in the interests of the nation.

**Shri Dasappa (Bangalore):** I would like to know whether Government have any views on the question of

medium of instruction in the universities.

**Dr. P. Subbarayan (Tiruchengode):** He has already said that he would leave it to the universities, and that there would be autonomy for the universities.

**Shri Dasappa:** I do not want an answer to be given by the hon. Members here. I would be grateful to the Minister if he gives an answer. Have Government come to any decision as to the advisability of having one medium of instruction for all the universities or would they allow the regional languages to be the media of instruction in the universities?

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** Government have accepted the report of the Radhakrishnan Commission. And as far as the policy of Government is concerned, it is laid down in the report of the Radhakrishnan Commission, which has been accepted by the Central Advisory Board of Education as well as the Ministry of Education.

**Shri Hem Barua:** The Inter-University Board does not accept the Radhakrishnan Commission's recommendations. It has refused to do it.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** I have been asked to state Government's policy, and I have explained what Government's policy is.

My hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee referred to the Central universities and said that there were all kinds of complaints in the Vishvabharati University and the Banaras Hindu University. With regard to the Banaras Hindu University, I would like to say that Government had recently appointed a committee, and that committee has completed its inquiry, and I am expecting to have the report in the near future.

It is true that some of our universities, because of various historical reasons or because of various other circumstances, are not able to discharge the responsibilities which a university should discharge. Our universities should be centres of learning and research. Our universities should

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

disseminate knowledge. But, at present, sometimes, our universities and the university men are involved in petty quarrels and petty intrigues, and are not able to concentrate their attention on teaching or the development of research. This is a matter to which the University Grants Commission is giving serious consideration. I hope that as time passes, the University Grants Commission will be able to make its impact on the development of the universities and give them proper guidance.

The time at the disposal of the University Grants Commission has been very short. It is only for about a year and half that the University Grants Commission has been functioning. In matters of education, it is not possible to produce quick results. Education is the work of generations. We have only to see whether the work that is being done by Government and the universities is on proper lines, and whether we are clear about our objectives and our fundamental values.

I would like to submit that as far as the objectives are concerned, and as far as the purposes of university education are concerned, we are clear about them, and we are gradually moving towards our objectives.

Then, there is a general complaint about indiscipline and various other matters. We shall have to have some patience, as far as the results are concerned. We should judge the work of the University Grants Commission not by immediate results but by the way in which the University Grants Commission has tried to tackle this very difficult problem. The problem is of great magnitude, and the resources are limited. It is in that situation that the whole work of the University Grants Commission has to be judged. And I would like to remind the House that the task has been by no means easy for the University Grants Commission.

The House would remember that when the University Grants Commission was being set up one or two State Governments had objected to the very idea of setting up the University Grants Commission. The State Governments naturally wanted to have their freedom as far as education is concerned. And the universities wanted to have their autonomy intact. I think it is very creditable that in spite of these various difficulties, we have been able to see up an agency which is trying to develop co-operation with the State Governments and the universities, and we have been able to make some impact on university education.

Take, for example, the implementation of the three-years degree courses. This subject has been debated upon in the country for the last several decades. It is a question of very great importance as far as university education is concerned. It has been agreed unanimously by the committees and commissions that the students who go to the universities should have a certain standard of maturity, and that nobody should go to the university unless he has attained certain intellectual standard and certain maturity of judgment. It was with that in view that the scheme of three-year's degree course was prepared. It was recommended by the University Grants Commission, the Radhakrishnan Commission and the other Committees and Commissions. It is the first time that we have taken an actual step to implement this programme. There are bound to be difficulties because the present system has been prevailing for about 100 years. It is not easy to changeover from an old system to a new. There are difficulties of transition. There may be a University here or a University there or a State Government here or a State Government there which may have their genuine difficulties in implementing this course and we shall have to have patience in this

matter. I am hoping that in course of time all Universities will fall in line with this national pattern.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, also suggested that the University Grants Commission should intervene and put the Central Universities in proper order. If it were done, he would come forward and say that the Commission is interfering with the work of Universities. Therefore, we have to be very careful in this matter. We have to build up proper traditions and conventions. I can only assure the House that the Commission will not be completely indifferent to the utilisation of funds sanctioned by Parliament. They will have to see that the funds are properly utilised and Universities are able to utilise them for raising academic standards. It will be the duty of the Commission to see that proper academic atmosphere is maintained in Universities. But, as I said, in this matter also, results cannot be too quick. We will have to have patience.

I do not know how my hon. friend, Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, found a note of diffidence in this Report. My own impression is that nowhere is there an expression of lack of confidence. In fact, the University Grants Commission is proceeding with this job with full confidence. There are difficulties of availability of funds, but these are difficulties which will, as I said, have to be viewed in the total context of the whole Plan. It is true that education is also an instrument for the development of the economy of a country. At the same time, it has also to depend to some extent on the economic conditions of the country, and I do not think we can be completely indifferent to that situation.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** I said just the other way round. I said the Commission was going with confidence;

it was going in a bold way with determination. That was my opening remarks. I did not speak about defeatism or anything of the kind.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then there is agreement between the two hon. Members.

**Shri Hem Barua:** It was I who said that.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** I am sorry. Some hon. Member on the other side made a reference to that.

In the end, I would like to thank hon. Members who have participated in this discussion. I am hoping that the directions in which the University Grants Commission is moving are the right directions, and I have no doubt that the Commission will in course of time make its impact on the development of our Universities and University education. I can only assure the House that as far as Government are concerned, they will give full autonomy to the Commission. I am very happy to say that in spite of what Shri Harish Chandra Mathur has said, there has been perfect harmony and understanding between the Commission and the Ministry of Education. I am saying this both on behalf of Government as well as on behalf of the University Grants Commission, and I am expressing the feelings of the Chairman of the Commission.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** The hon. Minister has not referred to two important points which were raised. One is about the technical and engineering education, and the responsibility of the University Grants Commission in that respect and their sphere of work, whether they are also responsible for this or not.

The other point—and that was made by me—is regarding the colossal waste arising out of failures which are only peculiar to this country. The figures were given by my friend Shri Mukerjee hitherto emphasise what I had



[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

raised. Is this matter receiving the attention of the University Grants Commission and the Education Ministry?

**Dr. K. L. Shrimali:** With regard to technological education, the University Grants Commission disperses grants to all the technological institutions which are connected with the Universities. The Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs looks after the Bangalore Institute and the four Technological Institutes which are being set up—one of them has already been set up. For the rest of technical education, the University Grants Commission gives grants on the advice of the All India Council of Technical Education, which functions under the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs.

This is the position and there has been no difficulty in the development of technical education. The All India Council of Technical Education makes a proper appraisal with regard to the man-power and has been making recommendations to the University Grants Commission from time to time. And, on their recommendations, the University Grants Commission gives grants for the development of technological institutions.

With regard to the other point referred to by both Shri Mukerjee and Shri Mathur regarding wastage—I did not speak because I was trying to finish my speech in time—I wish to explain that the University Grants Commission and the Government are fully seized of this very difficult problem. I am in full agreement with the hon. Members that this is colossal waste and we will have to do something to stop this wastage at the stage of University education. It is true that both at the intermediate level and the graduate level there are nearly 50

per cent of failure and it would mean that we are depriving the really talented people from getting admission to the Universities.

There may be various factors; lack of proper instructional facilities; admission of students who are not fit to go to the Universities and ineffective teaching. This will have to be examined by the University Grants Commission. I also think that the University Grants Commission will have to lay down certain criteria with regard to the admission of students to Universities. I am hopeful that in course of time, the University Grants Commission will be able to find a solution to this difficult problem.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now this Report has been considered.

---

#### RELEASE OF A MEMBER

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have to inform the House that I have received the following telegrams dated the 29th April, 1958, from the District Magistrate, Bhubaneswar and the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Khurda, respectively:—

(i) "Shri Pratap Kesari Deo, Members of Parliament released on bail on 28-4-58. Formal report is being dispatched by Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Khurda, before whom he was produced and who had remanded him to jail on 27-4-58."

(ii) "Shri Pratap Kesari Deo, Member, Lok Sabha, released on bail on 28-4-58, afternoon under High Court orders. Detailed report follows."