

16.08 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
—contd.

Mr. Chairman: Now, we will take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Dr. K. L. Shrimali on the 5th August, 1960, namely:—

“That this House takes note of the Report of the University Grants Commission for the period April, 1958—March, 1959, laid on the Table of the House on the 24th February, 1960.”

The time allotted is three hours and the time taken already is 2 minutes. So, there are 2 hours and 58 minutes. Dr. Shrimali.

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali): I should not like to take much time of the House because some of the Members have requested that they might be given an opportunity to speak—particularly, my hon. friend Prof. Hiren Mukerjee since he is leaving tonight. Therefore, I would only make a few preliminary remarks before the House takes this report into consideration.

I was saying that the Central Government and the University Grants Commission have limited responsibility, and that responsibility, except, of course, for Central Universities, confines itself to the maintenance and determination of standards. And, it is with that view, under the provision of the Constitution, that the University Grants Commission has been set up.

I am reminding this House of this fact because very often when the report is considered one gets the impression as if the Central Government have taken over complete responsibility for university education. That is not so. The State universities are set up by the Acts of State Legislatures. The administration of

the universities is entirely in the hands of the universities which are themselves autonomous bodies.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): In name.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: The University Grants Commission is giving assistance to the universities for certain development programmes and development schemes and for improving certain facilities so that the standards might be improved. The University Grants Commission is making an effort to persuade the Universities and the State Governments to accept its policies and programmes. The report makes it clear that in some cases the State Governments do not accept the advice. What is to be done? Under the Constitution, the Universities are created by an Act of the State Legislature and they are free to run them in the way they like. The only thing that the Central Government and the U.G.C. can do is to tell the Universities that if they do not follow the policies and programmes, they would not give financial assistance and in some cases the U.G.C. had refused to give financial assistance. That is the only thing that it can do.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): That is a very important and vital thing.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Yes. I would like the House to remember this fact because the Commission has to work under certain limitations. It was trying to bring round all the Universities and by and large most of the Universities had accepted the policies and programmes laid down by the Commission and the Central Advisory Board and the Government of India. But still one finds some lapses here and there.

Another thing which should be remembered by this House is that in education results cannot be shown quickly. It takes time. If you improve the salaries of teachers today you cannot show the results tomorrow. Reforms will start making their

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

impact in course of time. One of the important things that the U.G.C. has done is to improve the salaries of teachers, which is the central problem in the whole system of education. We must try to bring in better quality of teachers. That is the crux of the whole problem. With the co-operation of the State Governments the U.G.C. has tried to tackle the problem of upgrading the salaries of teachers. In that scheme the affiliated colleges were not brought in at first. I am glad to say now that these colleges have also been brought under this scheme and the teachers of those colleges will get the benefit of this scheme.

Other efforts have been made. Libraries have been improved. Better laboratory facilities have been given. Teacher-pupil ratios have been improved. The Commission said that in the affiliated colleges they should not have more than 800—1,000 students. The whole purpose is that there should be better relationship between teachers and pupils. We should try to improve teacher pupil ratio so that the teachers are able to give proper guidance to the students. All these things narrated above will no doubt make an impact on the education system but they cannot be expected to produce results tomorrow. It will take some time. In dealing with the universities we have to show a great deal of patience.

Lastly, I would like to appeal to the House that in dealing with the Universities, as far as possible, we should try to make a non-partisan attitude. In U.K. they have established a convention that no questions are put in Parliament about the Universities. The Universities are not discussed in the Parliament. There also the grants are given by the University Grants Commission but the Universities are not discussed in Parliament. This House in its wisdom decided to discuss the matter. We can set up our own conventions in this matter and discuss the Universities.

Universities do not serve any particular section or political party. They serve the country and the nation as a whole. They are instruments for uplifting the whole of our country; (An Hon. Member: They should be so.) Therefore, I will only appeal to the House that in discussing the Universities' problem as far as possible we should try to make a non-partisan attitude and approach and exercise some patience with the Universities because it will take some time before results become visible.

I would not like to take more time because I would like to give an opportunity to Shri H. N. Mukerjee who is leaving tonight and benefit by his advice and comments on the report. I will have an opportunity to reply to this debate and so I would like to finish at this stage.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the University Grants Commission for the period April, 1958—March, 1959, laid on the Table of the House on the 24th February, 1960."

There are certain amendments. Are they moved?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, I am moving my amendments. But in the last sentence of my second amendment—amendment No. 4—it reads: "which they choose to elect". It should read "whichever they choose to elect."

Mr. Chairman: I think the other amendments are also moved.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): I beg to move:

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

"and is of opinion that no restrictions whatsoever on the admission of students to Universities can be deemed warranted unless adequate avenues of later-

native training and employment are first made available." (1)

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

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

"and is of opinion that the University education should not be made the monopoly of a few but should be made available to the masses, the backward classes of India, at any cost." (2)

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I beg to move:

(1) That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

"and disapproves of the views expressed by the Commission with regard to the medium of instruction in Universities and recommends to the Government that upto graduate classes the regional language be declared as medium of instruction and for postgraduate studies Hindi be declared as the medium of instruction". (3)

(2) That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

"and is of the opinion that restrictions of whatever character on the admission of students to Universities should not be placed and if ever they are placed then there should be a condition precedent that all those students who are refused admission in the Universities shall be given some alternative technical or vocational training or employment whichever they choose to elect." (4)

Mr. Chairman: The motion and the amendments are before the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Mr. Chairman, I am thankful to the Minister for his courtesy in cutting short his speech in order to enable me to participate in this discussion on which I am particularly

keen and I think I can best reciprocate his courtesy by assuring him that as far as the question of university education is concerned, we do not have a party approach. We believe that after all higher education makes a large contribution to the development of our country and we should all pool our resources together so that our education might be worthy of the kind of country which we are trying to build.

By and large, the U.G.C. has been doing work which has earned appreciation and in the latest report towards the end there is a welcome note of humility where the Commission refers to its inability to deal with the problems as quickly as might have been desired and I think this House should strengthen the hands of the Commission when it makes a complaint that it was not consulted or consulted in a perfunctory way regarding the setting up of many new Universities. I find, for example, from an answer given in this House on the 8th of August that the U.G.C. was not consulted or its advice was not accepted in regard to the University of Kurukshetra. Personally, I have a feeling that the Sanskrit Maha Vidyalaya at Banaras is a very sound proposition. As far as Kurukshetra is concerned, we have to think very hard before we can consider it right to have a University there because it might be a University only in name. But in this regard, the Commission's advice was not accepted.

The Minister has said that the U.G.C. has not much control over the Universities except in regard to its allocation of grants. But I feel that this House is particularly keen to find out why it is that in the Central Universities which are directly under the control of Government, the U.G.C. cannot make a better showing of it. It may be the Ministry of Education had a special division to look after the Central Universities. I do not know. But I should think that the University Grants Commission has a direct responsibility for the conduct of affairs at Banaras, Aligarh, Delhi and Vishva Bharati and, surely, in some of these

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

places everything is not very lovely in the garden.

Sir, a question arose the other day in regard to which the Report of the University Grants Commission has given us some points, and that is in regard to the number of students in colleges and universities and what we are going to do about it. The Commission reports that in 1958-59, the number of students at universities was about 8,50,000. This number is growing. Are you bothered about this growth in the number of students at the university stage? We find that the other day the Minister made a statement which was construed by most of us, at least on this side of the House, as imposing very special restrictions on the admission of university students.

Sir, I agree entirely that we should have the best of our students entering the university stage, but I know at the same time that we cannot have the best of everything in our country as it is conditioned at the present time. Even if you have a good deal of tests it is discovered that the students perhaps do not come up to the mark—may be, it is not the fault of the students, it is the fault of the environments, educational process and all that sort of thing, but the fact remains that we do not have in our country up to the present day a sufficient supply of adequate personnel. And, therefore, I believe that the first thing which the Government should do today is to ensure that the gates of higher education are not shut in the face of those who are willing and able to enter.

Now, some observations which are cheap and facetious have been made by the University Grants Commission, and at page 13 of the Report, the Commission says:

“But the university should not be treated as though it were some kind of a waiting-room in which young men and women collect

before entering upon a wage-earning career.”

I think it is rather in a kind of taste which I do not approve of to refer to students looking forward to the opportunity of university education as having collected in a waiting room. That is not the kind of attitude which we expect from the University Grants Commission. I would like Government and the University Grants Commission to have respect for the urge of our people for higher education which has found expression in the past in the setting up of so many colleges sponsored by private individuals.

Now, this thing has gone up, and now when you are shutting the doors to our young people because of the lack of opportunity for vocational, technical, professional and other kinds of education, you find people who are passing certain examinations, who under the rules are eligible for admission to universities and yet you are stopping them by putting up a new kind of barrier by asking for a new kind of criteria.

I was rather pleased, sometime ago, to notice that the Secretary of the University Grants Commission, Shri Samuel Mathai had been to Calcutta last February and he spoke to the students of the Scottish Church College, and there he had pointed out that only 2 per cent. of those in the 16 to 23 age group had the opportunity for higher education. He gave these figures—I am quoting from the *Statesman* of 4th February, 1960—in the context of the oft repeated remarks about over-crowding in colleges and universities. I think this House should make it clear, as we have found sometimes governmental agencies also to point out, that we should not have any nervousness about the increase in the number of university students. Sir, I am quoting from the papers supplied to the Education Panel of the Planning Commission, and at page 3 of the papers supplied it was said that “the

increase in the number of university students in the developing economy of India cannot be looked upon with much apprehension, the students who would be educated in the Third Plan would be needed for employment in the Fourth and the Fifth Plans when the increased tempo of industrial and economic development of the country would probably require larger numbers of suitably qualified persons". There is no need for us to bother about the danger of the numbers increasing as far as university education is concerned. Besides, we have to consider the condition of our students in contrast with the students in the more advanced countries of the world. In United Kingdom, 75.7 per cent. of the students in the institutions of higher education are in receipt of financial assistance from one source or another—I am quoting from the Draft Outline of the Plan which has been supplied to us. When that is so, it is rather cruel and it is rather unmindful of the interests of the country that an effort appears to be made to shut the doors of higher education. Let there be alternative arrangements made—evening courses, correspondence courses or whatever you think fit—but let not the doors be shut in the face of students who are aching and yearning and thirsting for an opportunity for participation in higher education.

Sir, I welcome the observations of the University Grants Commission in regard to the recognition of the role of affiliated colleges which we have been told must go on receiving attention for a very long time. At page 10 of the Report some very good observations have been made about the scale of pay of the teachers. The Report says:

"We feel that the basic time-scale of pay for university and college lecturers should compare favourably with that offered for Class I posts in the administrative services of the States and the Central Government."

I know, Sir, that money is not the sole criterion. Many of those who

join the teaching profession are not asking for higher emoluments just for the sake of it, but since money is important in real living terms, it is necessary that you make such provision as is absolutely essential for their carrying on.

I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the Minister also to another matter which is being felt very acutely in at least the place from where I come, and that is the mismanagement which is taking place over the introduction of the three-year degree course. There is a gap between secondary education and higher secondary schools. There are very few higher secondary schools. Pre-university courses promise much trouble because they have not been organised very properly—books are hardly available, the curriculum has hardly been settled and sometimes we find that even after passing the higher secondary examination students are being asked to read for a pre-medical or a pre-engineering course. The idea certainly was that after passing the higher secondary examination a student would be in a position to walk into any of these professional or technical institutions; but, as a matter of fact, it has been found necessary to have a pre-engineering or a pre-medical course. But the whole thing is a mess-up. I feel that the present generation students at this stage are being sacrificed because you have introduced something which you cannot carry into effect as efficiently as we wish you to do.

In regard, also, to observations made in this Report about the medium of instruction, I have to repeat my misgivings which I expressed last year also. The Commission says that the question of the medium of instruction is an academic and not a political question. But I feel that in academies also, there may be and there are vested interests and, perhaps, there is some opposition to the introduction of Indian languages as the medium of instruction in the universities, because in that case the occupation of many of those who are running the universi-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

ties would be gone because they are specialised only in English and they cannot speak a few consecutive words of our own language. That being the trouble, I believe, Sir, some very special steps ought to be taken.

I feel, for instance, that no serious steps are being taken in order to publish books, worthwhile books in Indian languages. The University Grants Commission has taken no initiative at all in getting the universities to sponsor special schemes for the publication of books in Indian languages. We have to have good books. There are cram books in the Indian languages. It is a shame that our students are given a supply of cram books. But good books will not sell immediately because the students have been accustomed to these cram books, and good books would need to be subsidised, they would need to be sponsored by educational institutions. The universities should be specifically asked and special grants should be given so that books can come out in Indian languages, books can be utilised for purposes of instruction in the higher stages. I believe, this question of the publication in Indian languages is extremely important. I have been shouting myself hoarse about it. I referred to this matter in the last year's discussion of the Report. But, as far as I can find out, the University Grants Commission has taken not the slightest note of the urgency of assisting publication in Indian languages.

I find reference in this report to the question of student indiscipline, a matter which comes up in this House quite frequently, but I feel that where certain cases of absolutely inexcusable indiscipline have sometimes appeared, it is very easy to blame, it is very much more necessary to understand, even though sometimes the conduct of students has been inexcusable, perhaps more often than not, the authorities have been no less to be blamed. I know, for example, in Calcutta, there was some trouble over the examinations. Surely, I would not like the

students to be very indignant if the questions happen to be rather stiff, but if the questions have no relation to the syllabus at all, if it so happens that those who set the questions and those who moderate the questions have not really taken that amount of pain which it was absolutely their bounden duty to do, then surely something is very rotten somewhere. And not only attacking the students' indisciplined behaviour would solve the matter; it is necessary for us to find out where the fault is being committed by people in authority. Are the minds and bodies of our students adequately occupied? How is it that we expect our students to behave very much better than they sometimes do?

I am not holding a brief for the indisciplined behaviour of the students, but I know very well that all kinds of vested interests work. I know my hon. friend the Minister will perhaps say that the political parties are the villains of the piece; they are the culprits; that the political parties should take their hands off the students' associations, that the students should cease to take any interest in political parties and then everything will be lovely in the garden. But trouble arises more often because of faction fights for university control and near that area political parties which you have in mind have had no opportunity to go, as in Lucknow where there were some big bugs in the Government or formerly in Government who wanted to control the university and a situation was created where naturally there were some un-social or anti-social elements who got their opportunity. There is absolute demoralisation all-round as far as educational institutions are concerned, because the old idealisms about which we used to hear in the old days seem to have vanished. There is such demoralisation and there is such an attempt on the part of vested interests who have nothing to do with the Opposition political parties that these vested interests fight for power and even want to control the universities.

I know it for a fact that in the Senate election in Calcutta, the ruling party of the country set up a large number of candidates—all kinds of constituencies. This sort of thing happens all the time. It is no good merely blaming the students. I know it is sometimes said that students should not take interest in political matters. In England,—in the Oxford or Cambridge or other universities—the students have their own associations. There are Conservative students' organisations, Labour, Liberal, so on and so forth. You cannot stop the students of an independent country from taking a lively interest in political matters, though of course there are certain limits beyond which, during the period of study, students should not go unless there is a very serious national emergency, of the sort which incited the students of Korea or of Turkey to come out in masses and demonstrate, and all that kind of thing.

Shri Ranga: To throw out the existing regime.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Except in emergencies, the students need not come out and have this kind of demonstrations at all. But, at the same time, it is very necessary for the students to try to have a grip on the matters which agitate everybody and to understand the political factors which prevail in the world today. Therefore, I feel there is no use blaming political parties. Political parties would not like to poke their nose into university affairs. It is only because university affairs are mismanaged; it is only because the academic spirit is vanishing from our universities and it is only on account of demoralisation these instances of student indiscipline take place.

This deterioration of academic quality is a very serious matter. We find academicians running after bureaucrats or trying to become bureaucrats themselves. I hate to have to say this—the Prime Minister is a very fine man with a passion for science—that

foreign people have commented that it is rather peculiar that every session of the Science Congress has to be inaugurated by the Prime Minister, perhaps because many of our scientific experts want to be on the right side of the Prime Minister and want to be photographed along with him and all that kind of thing. It shows that there is something wrong. I am not saying this off my own bat. Foreign scientists like Professor J. B. S. Haldane have remarked about the Science Congresses becoming a *tamasha*, becoming a mere demonstration and serious scientific students do not find very much that is taking place in the Science Congresses of which they can take advantage. Our national laboratories have not produced results which we fondly expected of them.

I feel also that the University Grants Commission should put its own house in order. I have discovered from the figures which we get in answer to questions in the House that it is a very top-heavy organisation. I cannot understand why, for example, in answer to Unstarred Question No. 1688, on the 2nd April, 1960, Dr. K. L. Shrivastava informed us that in 1958-59, the pay of officers amounted to Rs. 1,04,237.53 and the pay of the establishment was Rs. 1,01,332.56; that is, the pay of officers is higher in total than the pay of the establishment. It seems rather top-heavy. The officers including the Chairman cost more than the establishment. The officers....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Before the hon. Member proceeds further, I think it is better to fix the time-limit for speeches. There are only two hours and a few minutes left. I have got the names of 16 hon. Members before me. They all want to participate in the discussion. Therefore, I would fix the time-limit for each hon. Member as ten to 15 minutes.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Vellore): The time allotted for this may be extended by one more hour.

Mr. Chairman: That is a different matter. That can be fixed subsequently. Let us fix the time-limit for each

[Mr. Chairman]

hon. Member now. It can be ten to 15 minutes each. If the House agrees to my suggestion, many hon. Members may find time to take part in the discussion.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): When the matter was discussed in the Business Advisory Committee meeting, the Speaker was pleased to say that the time of three hours may be extended to four hours.

Mr. Chairman: That is a different matter. I will consider it subsequently when we finish the allotted time. At the moment, let us fix the time for each hon. Member. It will be ten to 15 minutes each. So far as the hon. Member who is on his legs is concerned, he has already taken about 20 minutes. He may finish soon.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Thank you, Sir. I was going to finish. I feel that the officers are sent out perhaps too often abroad, and sometimes officers nearing superannuation are sent out and their reports would probably be not very particularly useful. I believe that if the University Grants Commission sets its own house in order, then it can assert its moral authority and then alone it can see that the advancement of learning and the advancement of our country's interest can go hand in hand together.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, I am glad that we are having an opportunity to discuss the report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1958-59. In this report, the University Grants Commission has made a statement that their efforts have been very much appreciated and that their efforts have brought about "a noticeable change in the attitudes and outlooks of the people concerned." To state it very mildly, this is at variance with what the hon. Minister has just now described. He thought that the changes to be brought about in the field of education cannot be sudden. It takes many, many years for changes to take place. But here is

the University Grants Commission saying that they have been able to bring about a change in the outlooks and attitudes of the people concerned in a very short time. I want to ask myself what is the noticeable change in the attitudes and outlooks of the people concerned to which the University Grants Commission refers?

An Hon. Member: On what page?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Page 33.

I think the University Grants Commission has done one good thing and it is this. It has doled out money—I don't say plentifully, but reasonable amount—to many institutions. It has been a good God Mother. It has been a kind of *Kamadhenu*, the cow of plenty. It has tried to help universities and colleges. I think the universities are always there to be helped by the States and by private donations. For example, the Banaras University is a monument of private philanthropy. The Calcutta University is also in some ways a standing example of private benefaction. But I think that the private colleges are not always looked after so well, as they should be.

I submit that the University Grants Commission, by amending a rule, has done well in bringing the private colleges within the orbit of its operation. I congratulate the UGC for that good work. It has paid some money for raising the salaries of the college teachers. But I find a strange anomaly in this. While the salaries of private college teachers have improved in some States on account of the money given by the U.G.C., their salaries have remained the same in the Government colleges. Here is an instance of a noticeable change that while the private colleges have been more responsive in some States to the call made by the U.G.C. for upgrading the salaries of the college teachers, the Governments of certain States have taken no step to raise the salaries of the teachers working in the

Government colleges. "Physician, heal thyself!" I would say to the Government and the Education Ministry here as to the Education Ministry in the different States of India that they should heal themselves. They should set a good example for the private colleges and they should not be found lagging behind the private colleges, so far as increase in salaries of college teachers are concerned. I think this is the most urgent problem of the day.

We must have the right kind of personnel in our colleges and universities. We must have teachers with the requisite qualifications in our colleges and universities. But what do we find? Some young man joins a college and I meet him after two years. I ask him, "Where are you?" He says, "I am in the I.A.S. or I.P.S. or in the income-tax service". Why does this happen? I think the UGC has to tackle this problem rationally, scientifically and financially and they should see that the best talent of our country does not shun education as we shun our poor unfortunate relations. They should see that the best talent of our country comes into education and once it has come into education, it is induced to stay there.

Pandit J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): They should not enter politics.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think you and I are symbols of the same category. We have run away and I think we did well in running away.

I was submitting respectfully that the UGC should devise ways and methods, so that the teaching profession is made as attractive for our young men and women in our country as any all-India administrative service or any other service.

I have seen this chapter "Schemes for the Welfare of Students". I think so far as schemes for the welfare of students go, the U.G.C. has not acted very imaginatively. It has not felt the pulse of the student community of our country. It has not tried to understand their needs, their hopes and aspirations. I know they have

been able to establish some health centres. Health is very necessary; there is no doubt about it. They are also in favour of establishing some hobby workshops. I do not know much about hobby workshops, but the word 'hobby' is fairly respectable and I think they must be fairly good establishments.

They have also done a few other things. They have instituted the Students' Aid Funds. The UGC has appointed so many committees—examination committee, religious education review committee etc. I would respectfully submit that the UGC should appoint a committee to study in detail and exhaustively the case for students' welfare. Students' welfare can be undertaken at college level, university level, provincial level, and it can also be undertaken by the Central Government and the University Grants Commission. I, therefore, think that this item in the U.G.C.'s report should have received much more attention than it has received. I am very happy that the Students' Aid Fund is there, but I must very respectfully submit that it is not utilised very much, because this requires a matching grant. Moreover, the Students' Aid Fund is not as abundant as it should be. To put it very mildly, I think it is very meagre. So, I would submit very respectfully that the U.G.C. should amplify its schemes for the good of our students.

Another point is that education should be made a concurrent subject. Education should not be merely the prerogative of the States. Why do we have the University Grants Commission? I agree with the report that it has done some good. But what is happening so far as our elementary education is concerned? What is happening so far as our secondary education is concerned? Our elementary education is a wilderness. Our secondary education is a chaotic jungle. Somewhere you have higher secondary classes, somewhere you have matriculation courses, somewhere you have this or that. In primary educa-

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

tion, somewhere it is for five years, somewhere it is for six years and so on and so forth. Why is that happening? I tell you, I am much more concerned about elementary education than even about the university education. What is happening there and why is it happening like this? It is happening because each State goes its own way and the poor teachers are not paid adequately. What are the emoluments of primary school and secondary school teachers? What I am saying is that if we have a commission for elementary schools and another commission for secondary schools I am sure the lot of primary school and secondary school teachers will improve and the standard of instruction of those institutions will also improve. I am sure also that India would become a better place for students and teachers, so far as this is concerned. Therefore, my feeling is that we should see to it that instead of having elementary education council of an advisory kind, secondary council of an advisory kind, we should have something comparable to this. Our constitutional *pundits* should sit together and find a way out of this difficulty so that our education in this country will improve all along the line.

I am very glad that the Commission is devoting some attention to science and technical education. I am very happy that it has not neglected Humanities. I think on the whole its approach is very balanced, so far as the standard of education is concerned but I would like that it should concentrate its attention more on the welfare of students than it has done so far.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): I am afraid I will not be able to show even that much tolerance and reconciliation on the working of the University Grants Commission, as my friends, the two previous speakers have done. We have got in our hands and we are discussing the report for the period April 1958 to March 1959. This report of the University Grants Com-

mission was published in 1960. We are discussing almost out-worn facts. So much has happened since this report has been published, so many things of far reaching significance have taken place regarding university education. I wish the University Grants Commission should have submitted this report in September 1959 and we should have discussed this much earlier, and at this time we should have been discussing the report for 1959-60.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I should like to inform my friend that this report was before this House earlier but could not be discussed on account of lack of time.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I wish to point out that this report itself was published in 1960. What about the report for 1959-60? That has not yet been published. That is my grievance. The report for 1959-60, period ending 31st March 1960, should be published at the latest by the month of June and it should be in our hands and we should discuss that. Since then the University Grants Commission have set up some committees and, as a matter of fact, some of them have submitted their reports. We are discussing them in the consultative committee and here in the House we are discussing certain worn-out facts and certain old events. I think a sense of urgency must be injected into the working of the University Grants Commission, certainly.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: In the Ministry too.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That is all I would say on this particular point.

As I open the first page I find the names of the members of the University Grants Commission.

They are, without doubt, very respectable people. They are people who are held in high regard in the country. There are many of them who I personally know and whom I hold in high esteem. But I wish you to note

that there is not one non-official who is below the age of 60.

Shri D. C. Sharma: What?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: My hon. friend, Shri Sharma, is shocked.

Shri D. C. Sharma: No, no. I am not.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I definitely feel that the entire University Grants Commission should be reconstituted. You must have at least 50 per cent of the members who are between the ages of 45 and 55 or at the most between the ages of 50 and 60. You must have at least 50 per cent of such people.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Which age group?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Age group 45-60 or 45-55, I would say. I think my hon. friend has no use for any advice which comes from people who are below the age of 60. Let us take note of what is happening all over the world. America can have a President who is of the age of 43. Ceylon can have a Prime Minister who is of a much younger age.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): And a woman too!

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: If you look at the age of the Cabinet in the U.K., you will find that there are many people who are in the age group of 45-55. But here we have developed a sort of indispensability for everyone. Of course, they are nice people. They are very good people. But they have certainly outlived their utility in a particular respect. We want the ripe experience of a few people there, but we must have a certain number of younger people who know the urges and the aspirations of the people of this country and of the student tribe in particular. Their entire outlook will be different. Can you not in this country of 40 crores of people produce such people who could at the age of 40 shine? Russia

has produced many generals who could be given much bigger charge at the age of 40. The man who is commanding an international organisation there is between the ages of 50 and 55. But here we will accept nobody who is below the age of 60. That is the most unfortunate thing, more particularly when you are looking to the youths' organisations. I do not rule out people of higher age groups.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Could I ask a question of my hon. friend, Shri Mathur? What profession will he suggest for people who are over 60 years of age? They shall get unemployed.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am not ruling them out. So please do not bother.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: They will go to religious monasteries.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: But I certainly say that possibly now is the time for that. I started by saying that I have very great respect for them. But I wish that when my hon. friend thinks of reconstituting the University Grants Commission he must think of appointing a new Chairman and of doing everything else, I hope he will bear this in mind when he reconstitutes the University Grants Commission or when he makes fresh appointments to it.

The first item the University Grants Commission has dealt with in this report is the number of the universities and how the universities are being set up in this country. Unfortunately, what I feel is that the hon. Prime Minister thinks in a very different way. He has said that we do not want more universities and this and that. The University Grants Commission thinks in a different way. The State Governments think in a different way. There has been a completely lopsided development in the entire country. Now I understand that Bihar has set up a university for each division. So they may have five universities. Rajasthan has got only one university.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): Probably they are Hindi universities.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Whether they are Hindi or English they are universities all the same. I think we should be able to sit together and decide upon the line of action. There should not be that allergy against a larger number of universities. We must lay down certain standards and certain criteria which are only necessary. I do not also want the University Grants Commission to be consulted at every stage. I am not at all in favour of these things. This sort of thing has already gone too far. If you go and examine the working of the University Grants Commission, you will find that it is degenerating itself into a sort of a department. It is already doing so. It is just functioning as if it is one branch of the Finance Ministry whose entire job it is to see how much to pay, whom to pay and what to pay. This could be done by one of our Joint Secretaries.

An Hon. Member: A Deputy Secretary could have done it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I was simply surprised to find that one of the affiliated college's Principal is getting a grant. That affiliated college is getting a grant. If they have to have two peons, the matter must go to the University Grants Commission. Will you believe it? It is almost degenerating itself into one branch of the Finance Ministry. I do not wish that the University Grants Commission should go to that level.

The University Grants Commission has got a much more important function to perform. Even about the setting up of universities, the University Grants Commission has made a complaint that they are not consulted. I do not think it should be necessary for

the State Governments to consult them. The University Grants Commission, in consultation with the universities and with the Ministry of the Central Government, should lay down certain norms, standards and principles. They should say, "these are necessary, and the University Grants Commission would be forthcoming to give assistance if newly established universities fulfil these conditions". It should rather try to help and give a direction that there is not that sort of lop-sided development.

17-00 hrs.

And on the part of the Government the Prime Minister and the Education Minister may discuss it among themselves and come to certain conclusions in the matter, and they must give a correct lead to the country, instead of speaking at divergence. Now, I will not take much time over this, because there are many points raised while dealing with the setting up of new universities, what type of universities they will be and so on. It will take a long time.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: Are we sitting beyond five o'clock?

Mr. Chairman: I am adjourning the House at five. Has the hon. Member finished?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: No, I have finished only two points. I have three more points to urge very strongly.

Mr. Chairman: He may continue his speech tomorrow. The House now stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

17.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 12th August, 1960|Savana 21, 1882 (Saka).