

without exaggeration, surely anybody who needs that service is entitled to it. We shall live to see a day, as early as possible, when these difficulties will not arise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective excess sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the order paper be granted to the President to make good the amounts spent during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1956, in respect of the following demands entered in the second column thereof

Demands Nos. 6, 24, 30, 39, 51, 62, 64, 97, 101."

The motion was adopted.

14.54 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we will take up the next item. Dr. Shrimall.

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the University Grants Commission for the period April, 1957—March, 1958, laid on the Table of the House on the 17th February, 1959."

I would not like to take too long a time of the House. I would only like to place before the House the salient features of this Report. It will be observed from the Report that during the period, April 1957 to March 1958, four new universities came into existence in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Punjab. They are the universities of Gorakhpur, Jabalpur, Kurukshetra and Vikram. The Commission was not consulted before these universities were started.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): May I inform the hon. Minister that the Vikram University Bill was passed before the coming into existence of the University Grants Commission?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: The Bill might have been passed by the State Government. The State Government is quite free to pass legislation; I am not questioning that. But, I am only saying that the Commission had not been consulted.

This aspect creates a little difficulty for the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission is concerned mainly with the development of the universities and the funds at its disposal are not unlimited. The State Governments are quite free to start universities. I am not questioning their authority in any way. But, after starting the universities, if the universities come to seek financial assistance from the University Grants Commission, it creates a difficult position for the Commission because its funds are already allocated for certain specific purposes for the existing universities.

I think it would be desirable if the State Governments consult the University Grants Commission before they start the universities, if they want that for developmental purposes they should seek later on financial assistance from the Commission. Though the University Grants Commission is already in touch with the universities which have been newly started, I hope, in future, there would be more of consultation between the University Grants Commission and the State Governments. It is only in that way that the University Grants Commission can help in the co-ordination and in the maintenance of standards. If you go on multiplying the Universities and the University Grants Commission is not consulted in the matter, obviously, the Commission cannot play the role for which it has been established.

Another step which the University Grants Commission has taken during

[Dr. K. L. Shrimall]

the year under report is that, in order to check the unauthorised award of degree by private educational institutions, they have since issued a notification under section 22(3) of its Act specifying the list of degrees to be conferred only by universities. And, this list of degrees was notified with the previous approval of the Central Government. With the issue of this notification, it becomes unlawful for any private education institution to confer or grant any of the degrees so specified.

In our country, in the past, there have been some institutions which have been giving unauthorised degrees. After this notification has been issued, I expect that this practice will be checked and stopped.

Another issue that has been raised in the Report of the University Grants Commission is with regard to medium of instruction. It will be observed from the Commission's Report that the Commission has accepted the recommendations of the "Kunzru" Committee Report.

In this pattern, there is some misunderstanding which I would like to clear. As far as the University Grants Commission and the Government are concerned, we have accepted the recommendation of the University Education Commission which says that pupils at higher secondary and university stages should be made conversant with three languages, the regional language, the federal language and English language and that higher education be imparted through the instrumentality of the regional language with the option to use the federal language as the medium of instruction either for some subjects or for all subjects. The Kunzru Committee has not deflected from this objective. The main ultimate objective remains the same, and that is, we would like the regional language to be the medium of instruction in course of time. The Kunzru Committee has only stressed the fact that we are not yet ready to

switch over to regional languages. We shall have to prepare text-books and we shall have to write original books in science and technology, and unless this is done, if we switch over to regional languages, we shall only lower our standards. They have only cautioned us and they have suggested that we should make a sort of gradual change. The change should not be too rapid. As far as ultimate goal is concerned, it remains the same.

15 hrs.

Then another important step which has been taken by the University Grants Commission is with regard to the improvement of salaries of university teachers. By the end of the year 1957-58 all universities, except Baroda and Sri Venkateswara, which had lower scales of pay for the teachers and which are at present in receipt of a grant from the Commission have implemented the recommendations of the Commission with regard to the revised scales of salaries for university teachers, and have agreed to bear 20 per cent. of the increased cost of expenditure for this purpose, the remaining 80 per cent. being met by the University Grants Commission.

I am glad to report to the House that since this report was placed before this House, two other universities, the University of Baroda and the Venkateswara University, have also agreed to share the expenditure, and so, now all the universities—except Roorkee which has already high grades—are now in a position to give increased grades which were suggested by the University Grants Commission with the assistance of the Commission. This, I think, is one of the happiest features of our report because the Commission and the Ministry of Education have continuously stressed the fact that unless we pay better salaries to our teachers we cannot attract first-grade teachers. In fact, it may be necessary to increase the salaries further because at present the talented people are

going away from the universities—the universities are being depleted—and they are going to business and to administration. Unless we pay decent and adequate salaries to the teachers of universities, we shall not attract first-grade talents. Unless we can retain the services of those people, we obviously cannot raise the standards of our universities and unless we raise the standards of our universities we cannot raise the national standards as a whole. Therefore, it is gratifying that the Commission has laid great stress on this aspect of our educational system and with considerable success.

When the University Grants Commission Bill was being discussed, many hon. Members had expressed a desire that the affiliated colleges should also come within the purview of the University Grants Commission. I am glad to say that the Commission has prepared a scheme under which funds are made available for the revision of the scales of pay of teachers in affiliated colleges also on the basis that the State Government and the university or college concerned will share 50 per cent of the increased expenditure in the case of men's colleges and 25 per cent in the case of women's colleges. The Commission is giving a little larger share as far as women's colleges are concerned. I am glad to say that 14 universities have agreed to provide their share of the expenditure on the implementation of this scheme. They are: Allahabad, Andhra, Bombay, Calcutta, Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Madras, Osmania, Poona, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sagar, S N D T and Sardar Vallabhbhai Vidyapeeth. I hope in course of time other universities will also take advantage of this offer which the University Grants Commission is making.

Under the Act, one of the important functions of the University Grants Commission is the promotion and co-ordination of university education. To discharge these responsibilities, the University Grants Commission had appointed a committee, a co-ordination committee, to suggest line of

action as may be adopted in this regard. The Commission has appointed another committee to suggest certain minimum qualifications for lecturers, readers and professors. I am glad to say that this committee has made recommendations since this report was published and the University Grants Commission is now considering to issue a notification which will lay down minimum qualifications for lecturers, readers and professors. The University Grants Commission had consulted all the universities and I am glad to say that there is general agreement in regard to the prescription of these minimum qualifications for university teachers of different grades. So, the University Grants Commission is not imposing something which the universities do not want, and the whole thing has been done in consultation with the universities. But I think it was desirable to lay down these qualifications because unless we lay down certain minimum qualifications for university teachers we cannot maintain proper standards.

The co-ordination committee has also suggested a uniform procedure for awarding doctorate degrees by various universities and the matter is being examined by the Commission in consultation with the universities. I hope in the near future in this matter also we shall be able to lay down minimum standards. All these measures will go a long way in the improvement and co-ordination of university education in the country.

The Commission has also drawn up a list of colleges which would be assisted by it and it is going ahead with the improvement and extension of library and laboratory facilities and construction of hostels for students. This will, of course, be an addition to the grants which we have given to the colleges for the improvement of salary scales of teachers.

The Commission has expressed the view that it gives the highest priority for putting up hostels for students and staff quarters, and the Ministry of

[Dr. K. L. Shrimall]

Education, on the recommendation of the University Grants Commission, is giving loans to the universities for putting up hostels.

The report raises the question with regard to the funds of the Commission. On account of the overall cut in the Plan, a reduction was made in the budget of the University Grants Commission also.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): The Plan was not curtailed by one-third. Here the reduction is nearly one-third.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am coming to that point. The Commission considered this matter in all its aspects at its meeting held on the 8th and 9th July, 1958 and passed a resolution urging that in order to enable it to perform its statutory function of maintaining the standards of universities in the country the Government of India should make available to them a total sum of Rs. 19 crores during the Plan period. The initial allocation was Rs. 27 crores and as the hon Member rightly suggested, it was reduced to Rs. 18.63 crores for the second Plan period. The University Grants Commission suggested it should at least be Rs. 19 crores. I am glad to say that the additional amount of Rs. 37 lakhs would be made available to the Commission as desired by them. In fact, I am trying with the Finance Ministry to make to the Commission another crore available, if they require further funds for development purposes. The Finance Minister has on the whole been sympathetic towards this proposal and if necessary, we shall explore this possibility further.

The Commission has also taken up the question of reform of examinations and the committee had submitted an interim report. As soon as the final report has been submitted, the Commission will take the necessary action in this matter.

In the report, the Commission has drawn our attention to certain difficulties which the Commission had experienced. They are three-fold: (i) shortage of steel and cement; (ii) difficulties in the availability of foreign exchanges and securing import licences and (iii) inability of universities and State Governments to meet their shares of the expenditure involved in the implementation of different schemes.

With regard to the first, there was general shortage of steel and cement and there was a crisis through which the country had to pass. I hope the crisis is over now and the universities will have all the steel and cement which they require for their development purposes. As regards foreign exchange, we have been trying to help the Commission. I am glad to say that we were able to secure a special allocation of Rs. 20 lakhs by way of foreign exchange to meet the requirements of the universities for the period January to March, 1959. We have also ascertained from the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports that he had already issued licences for Rs. 42 lakhs up to 2nd March 1959; he is also expected to issue licences for Rs. 24 lakhs more for educational institutions including universities during 1958-59. I hope with these facilities, the universities will not be suffering for scientific equipment and other material. We are taking every possible step to help the universities and the University Grants Commission in this matter. Steps have already been taken to make suitable provision of foreign exchange for the period April to September, 1959.

As regards the third difficulty, this is a real difficulty which the University Grants Commission has to face. It has been very often found that universities or the State Governments are not able to find their matching funds and the progress is retarded in many cases because those funds are

not available. The Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission are at present examining whether they can find some solution out of this difficulty and if a suitable portion of the States' receipts from the Central Development Fund for Higher Education be made available to the University Grants Commission, probably they can go ahead with the development of universities. It is not possible for me to say anything definite at this stage, because this matter is still under examination. But realise this is a real difficulty and if we want rapid progress with regard to the development of our universities, we have to find a solution to this problem.

The House will remember that two committees were appointed—the first Deshmukh Committee and the second Deshmukh Committee. The first Deshmukh Committee gave us the estimates for implementation of the three-year degree course. I am glad to say that apart from the Rourkee University, which is an engineering university, all but two universities have either decided or agreed in principle to introduce the three-year degree course. The only exceptions are the Bombay University and the Gorakhpur University, the Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Mysore, Orissa, Rajasthan and West Bengal have also agreed to provide the matching contribution which would be required for the implementation of this scheme. The Government of U.P. have expressed their inability to do so. This matter was considered by the second Deshmukh Committee. As far as the Government are concerned, they have accepted the recommendations of the second Deshmukh Committee also and we are taking the necessary steps to implement the recommendations. I hope that those universities which have not switched over to this three-year degree course will also accept this scheme in course of time and will help us in developing a uniform pattern all over the country.

These are the main issues which arise out of this report. I would not like to take any longer time of the House, since I am sure many hon. Members have many valuable suggestions to make on this report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

“That this House takes note of the Report of the University Grants Commission for the period April, 1957—March, 1958, laid on the Table of the House on the 17th February, 1959.”

May I have an idea of how many hon. Members want to speak? I find quite a large number. So, we shall have to place some time-limit. I think 15 minutes would be all right.

Some Hon. Members: 20 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In that case, I may not be able to accommodate all those who want to speak.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central). **Mr. Deputy-Speaker,** Sir, I am glad we have this opportunity of discussing the report of the University Grants Commission and I wish to begin by saying that though we appreciate the good work which has been done by and large by the University Grants Commission, and particularly by its Chairman, I wish, however, at the outset to express a grouse that this report is presented to us rather later than it might have been. It is for the year April, 1957 to March, 1958 and we are discussing it in May, 1959. Possibly some of this time could have been saved.

I find certain lacunae in the working of Government and the first point which struck me when I looked at this report was that during the year under review, about four universities came into existence without the UGC having been consulted at all; this in spite of the fact that the University Grants Commission had made it clear that it would like very much to be consulted before fresh universities were set up. I welcome more universities—the more the merrier—

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

but, after all, we are living in a period of planning and when we have the University Grants Commission, surely it should be consulted and the difficulty in regard to the State Governments being in charge of education should not be an insuperable one as far as this point is concerned. I was struck next by the attitude taken up by the University Grants Commission in regard to the question of the medium of instruction. I have not much of a quarrel with the Commission in regard to this, but I fear not much serious thought has been given to the problem by the University Grants Commission. The principal decision which they made is that there should be no precipitated change over from English to Hindi, or any other Indian language. Now, I also do not want a post-haste change over from English, though I wish we get the change as soon as ever that is feasible. But the University Grants Commission cannot function in an environment which is insulated from the country's overall atmosphere, and the University Grants Commission certainly knows that the Indian languages, Hindi and the other national languages, would have to be the medium of instruction as soon as ever that is possible. And since the UGC pays the piper, it can call the tune. It can take the initiative, it can take the leadership in regard to the publication of books needed for university studies in our Indian national languages.

Then another grouse which I have felt as a member of the Calcutta University Senate is that so much of money comes but it is not spent sometimes in the direction which I think should have the first priority, and I think we should begin as soon as we ever can with the production of books in our Indian languages and should not wait for some sublime Monday morning when we get up and find we can push English out of the picture. We cannot do it. We have to make some preparation and in regard to that the UGC has not taken the initiative, has not taken the lead,

which it can and as I said, since it pay the piper can call the tune. It can call upon the universities to do something in regard to this straight-way.

In regard to the question of salaries of teachers, particularly in regard to the teachers of the affiliated colleges of different States, I should certainly pay an unreserved tribute to the UGC for the work it has done. Surely it requires very highly to be commended. But I have only one grouse. I find, for example, in the State of West Bengal, which bristles with private colleges, a very large number, and I do wish that they get money and they are going to get money, but the UGC has unnecessarily resorted to a certain process of categorisation of these teachers which could have been avoided. That is to say, I do not understand why there should be four different categories—principals, heads of departments, lecturers and tutors and demonstrators. It could easily have been reduced to three categories. I refer to this matter because I find that on account of this unnecessary categorisation there has taken place a certain amount of avoidable heart-burning and jealousy among people who were normally getting so little, that when they are going to get a little more they should not be subjected to this kind of thing. This unnecessary categorisation could perhaps have been avoided by the UGC.

The next point to which I wish to refer is the question of the central universities. These central universities are the University Grants Commission's special cup of tea, so to speak and it has a special and direct responsibility. But we find that in such places as Banaras all kinds of things have taken place and for that the responsibility of the UGC cannot be wished away, cannot be dismissed. The UGC not only has overall control on the central universities. It is also represented, I am told, on the finance committees of the Banaras and other central universities. And lately there have been

allegations about the unwarranted purchase of zamindari bonds in the UP and that kind of thing. I am not going into the details of the matter. But my point is that since the UGC is represented even on the finance committees of these universities, there should be a better and more efficient control of the working of the central universities.

In regard to this also I find from a Bombay journal, the *Economic Weekly* of the 18th April 1959 that a writer has worked out the amount of money spent on account of the central universities during 1957-58, and it comes to a total of Rs. 1,82,79,751. The total number of students in the four central universities being about 28,000, the *per capita* grant works out at over Rs. 650. On the contrary, in this journal there is an account given of the money which is received by the different universities and the affiliated colleges in Bombay State from the UGC as well as from the State Government and it is a total of Rs. 1,04,20,404 while the number of students in Bombay was over 100,000 which gives a *per capita* amount of only Rs. 104. That is to say, in the central universities we were spending on each student an average of Rs. 650 in 1957-58, while the comparable figure in a State like Bombay was Rs. 104. Calcutta has a larger conglomeration of students and so perhaps the expenditure per head would be even less. This disparity is a little too much and particularly the fact remains that in the central universities you really get people who live in the regions round about, Delhi or Banaras or Osmania or wherever it might be. Therefore, it should be seen to that at least the disparity should not be as large as it is here.

My friend, Dr. Shrimall, referred to the three-year degree course and he expressed his desire, which I share, that as soon as ever it is possible this course, this three-year degree course, is accreted all over the country. But

102 (A1) LSD-7.

I have certain difficulties in appreciating the acuity of Government as far as this part of our educational programme is concerned. In the Report it is stated that the three-year degree course idea is "part of the total plan." It is also said that the multi-purpose school idea, or the 11 class school idea, is a corollary, auxiliary or subsidiary or whatever you might call it, that the two things must go together, that we cannot have a really good three-year degree course unless we have a really good 11 year course system going at the same time. Now, as far as secondary education is concerned, we find that planning is almost non-existent. Up to now I fear that high school students are being held as hostages to Government's incapacity to arrange things so that the transitional period is shortened. I know that in a period of transition there will be a certain amount of upset. But that upsetting should not continue in the way it is taking place. I find that there is a kind of anarchy all over the country—those who are going to the 10 class schools and those going to the much rarer 11 class schools are being put in different categories and there is a pre-university examination which is creating a hell of a lot of complications to be solved. So, unless that is done, this three-year degree course idea will not really produce the results which are desired.

I wish also to refer to another matter, and that is the question of centenary grants which were given to three universities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, where Rs. 1 crore were given to each, I fear that the universities concerned have not behaved as efficiently as they ought to have done, because much of the centenary grants already given to them remain unutilized, not only in Calcutta, where there is perhaps a larger amount of disorganisation than in other places, but in Madras also, which is supposed to have a reputation for systematisation, even there a very large amount of money remains unutilised. In Calcutta what has happened is that out of Rs. 1

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

crore allocation, the main idea is to spend Rs. 50 lakhs—they are budgeting for Rs. 40 lakhs which will go up to God knows what figure—they are going to spend over half a crore of rupees in putting up a multistoreyed building. This brick and mortar mentality is invading the university atmosphere and now even the University Grants Commission is thinking of having a plot of land for a building of its own. May be it needs it. But we are having too much of this brick and mortar idea and very much less of the advancement of learning. In Calcutta I can say there are so many schemes which can be adopted here and now, but they are thinking much more in terms of having a tremendous prestige building, a 15 storey building, which will be a land-mark and that sort of thing. The kind of cry which emanates for the construction of buildings is not the kind of cry which I can commend, particularly as far as the universities are concerned, but in many cases this craze for buildings and that sort of thing is hindering the utilisation, proper and efficient utilisation of moneys given to the universities, and even the centenary grants, of which very special advantage ought to have been taken.

Then there is some expression used in the course of this Report about "regulation of" admissions to the universities. I know that a certain amount of control a certain amount of restriction might be necessary in the interests of better education but, at the same time, we want more students to come into our universities. We want ampler facilities for universities. As a matter of fact, even in it that the handicapped section of our community are given greater opportunities. As a matter of fact, even in England, which prides itself on being a welfare State and all the rest of it, there was a report published by the Association rest of it, there was a report published by the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth, published in 1957, which said

that 93.3 per cent of the successful candidates at the British Foreign Service were educated at exclusive universities like Oxford and Cambridge. Now most of the students who go to Oxford and Cambridge do not have working class parents. That is also a finding of this Report, even though compared to conditions 50 years ago, or even 20 years ago, things are improving. But, all the same, in England in spite of so much advance in the direction of social welfare we find that exclusive education is still largely the rule as far as the best tiers of the educational system are concerned. Let us not have it. Let us safeguard ourselves against that kind of thing. Let us make special provision so that those who are the handicapped sections of the community get very special facilities in order to get entry into the universities. I sometimes cannot understand when questions are asked and answered in this House about the position of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people. Sometimes the figures given regarding the representation of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people in our services are fantastically low. That is only because the opportunities for education are not open in ample measure to these people who have been backward, who have borne the agony of our country very much more than the rest of us. It is we who have got so much advantage out of our own country and we do not repay back to the country what we owe her. But this is a situation to which Government ought to give its attention and the University Grants Commission might make a kind of report on the lines of this report by the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth and then they can do something in regard to this.

Then, I find that there are some lopsided schemes to which occasionally I have tried to draw the attention of the House. For instance, there is the idea of a Chair of Buddhist studies at the University of Delhi. You have

already started it. I do not mind Let Delhi have a Chair of Buddhist studies. But after all there should be priorities. In Delhi there is no tradition of studies of subjects like Pali or Sanskrit. If you are going to have a Chair of Buddhist studies, you better have it at Banaras, Shanti Niketan, Calcutta or such places where there is some kind of a tradition, some kind of a gathering together of people who have studied this kind of thing. But in order to have some kind of international publicity and propoganda possibly you could have a Chair of Buddhist studies in Delhi University where nobody reads Pali, where nobody knows Sanskrit because I find that in the Hindi-speaking areas Sanskrit is neglected a great deal more than in the non-Hindi speaking areas. But that is the kind of thing which, I find, takes place in spite of the University Grants Commission.

There is another matter—I shall conclude very shortly—to which also I wish to make a reference. I do so with great hesitation. I referred to this matter once before in this House. That is the point of tours undertaken by the officials of the University Grants Commission. I know that foreign travel is very conducive to so many things and may be occasionally it is very necessary for the officials of the University Grants Commission to go abroad. These days almost everybody goes abroad from time to time. Government is very generous in sending people abroad in spite of the foreign exchange difficulty and all that sort of thing. But sometimes in order to pursue some-what fanciful schemes, like, the kind of examination system we should have, whether we should abolish examinations altogether or not or what we should do about general education whatever that might mean, or how English is taught in Sweden, Germany and Denmark, to study this kind of thing somebody from the University Grants Commission, who holds a very important position, goes there and spends some time. Maybe it is very necessary. It is very good for us to know how the Germans

are teaching English to their people. We have been learning English for years and years now and if we cannot make up our mind now as to how we are going to reshape the teaching of English in our country and if we have to go to Germany, Sweden or Denmark to find out what they are doing and then try to adapt their conditions to ours, then I should say God help us. If this is the set up, surely I feel that there is something wrong somewhere and that there should be a check upon unnecessary tours. Let there be necessary tours and justifiable tours undertaken by whoever it might be but let there not be unnecessary tours and let not people who are in charge or who are in a responsible position be away for much of the time of the year, because people come from different parts of India to see them. I have been told of people who have come to see a very high official of the University Grants Commission but who cannot see him. Others who are there are not real substitutes because they have not got the background, they have not got the understanding and they have not got the experience of the working of different universities inside India and not somewhere—Japan, North America or somewhere else. That is some thing to which, I wish the hon. Minister pays his attention.

The last point to which I shall make a reference is the point in regard to the desirability in our country, above all things, of emotional integration in the context of national planning. I know that the UGC some time ago held a seminar on this subject. But only one seminar is not good enough. I say this because at the present moment our country is really in danger because emotional integration has not taken place. In the South for example, there is a kind of feeling which has led masses of people to ridicule our epics and all that kind of thing. Why can the University Grants Commission not take the initiative in regard to the arrangement of extension lectures all over the country? In the universities, north and south east

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

and west—we have a large number of them now—we can have extension lectures on different things. We can get foreign scholars and spend foreign exchange on them—not on sending our people abroad, but on getting some real good foreign scholars to come and talk to us on Indian humanities and on the culture of this country. They have done great work in the past—many of them. We have not got that kind of xenophobia that we keep out the foreign scholars also. We can get them to come and deliver speeches. We can pay special attention to the question of study of Sanskrit, which perhaps will be discussed tomorrow in more detail, and all the other Indian classical languages. We can get the universities to take the lead in putting before our country the idea of Hindu-Muslim harmony in the development of our culture. Men like Dr. Tara Chand have produced very good work and we could have extension lectures and similar things so far as the propagation in our country of the idea of this harmony is concerned, which has always existed along with whatever diversities have been in our country. So, the unity between the north and the south, the unity between the different communities and the unity between the different Provinces, all of which do have a basic fundamental unity in the sphere of culture are things which can be popularised and propagated by the University Grants Commission by taking the initiative, by getting the different universities to do something and to have definite programmes, in that regard. But I fear that, once you become a Government Department, everything is approached in a terribly dry-as-dust manner. Everything is done in the red-tapish atmosphere which we have inherited and which we cannot get rid of. The result is that even a body like the University Grants Commission—we are all ready to applaud it, we are all ready to help all the time with more money: you come and ask for money we will certainly let you have it—we are all ready to applaud this kind of

a body and we are all ready to see how the goodmen, who comprise the University Grants Commission, who are men of whom we are proud, but at the same time the atmosphere of routine administrative work which prevails everywhere in this country is also affecting the work of the UGC. There is lack of imagination. There is lack of a link-up with the living problems of our people. That is why I wish that the Ministry as well as the Commission give more thought to this matter and when they report next to Parliament they give us a very much better document that they have given us this time.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Chingleput): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, there is a great deal of misapprehension regarding the purpose and functions of the University Grants Commission. I should like to remind the House that the University Grants Commission has been constituted to promote and co-ordinate university education and to determine and maintain standards of teaching and research in the universities. To achieve this objective it has been entrusted with the duty of allocating and disbursing funds to various universities and affiliated colleges.

I shall take up the recommendations of this body first. The recommendations relating to the change-over in the medium of teaching in our universities are eminently reasonable and will commend themselves to those who have given thought to this problem. On the question of change-over from the English medium, to a regional language, there has been an unseasonable controversy, not over the objective but over the methods that should be employed. The familiar argument employed by hot gospelers of immediate change is that the standard of English is so low that the benefit accruing of keeping English as the medium of instruction is largely illusory. It is of course true that for a good proportion of the students English is a difficult medium. But whose fault is it? We have neglected

the study of English in our schools, a neglect for which we are paying dearly, largely, if not solely, due to experimental reasons conducted by our educational planners. The University Grants Commission has rightly emphasised the need for a more realistic and radical approach to this question in our schools. While I do not deny that English as the medium of instruction may pose very real problems even to students whose inherent abilities or schooling is adequate and may impose an additional burden by the mere fact that it is not their mother tongue, this disadvantage has to be weighed—and I emphasise it—against a far greater disadvantage associated with the use of regional languages as the medium of instruction for a long while to come. While these languages are a part of our environment in which the student grows up and therefore a part of his personality, they are still inadequate as vehicles of thought and expression, particularly in the case of subjects which are highly technical or in which there are considerable new ideas and techniques developing in different parts of the world. Let me underline something which has already been pointed out by the University Grants Commission. A language, in order to be a suitable medium for the purposes of higher learning has to satisfy three criteria at the same time. First'y, it must have a richness and variety required for expressing precisely complex, thoughts or subtle nuances. Secondly, the literature of the language must have an adequate fund of knowledge in all branches. It needs to be emphasised that it is not enough to have such a fund by mere translation of a few text-books in one or two subjects, since the purpose of University education, after all, is to help the student to develop his interest in allied subjects. Thirdly, the language must have a flow of knowledge which is reflected in its current literature like magazines and learned journals. I am emphasising these facts in order to show the great leeway that we have to make before we think of switching over. All this requires a great deal more of conscientious en-

deavour and honest unostentatious work and I hope and trust that those who are entrusted with academic affairs will apply their mind to this question and will be given necessary financial help.

Having said this, I should like to reiterate that there are many disadvantages in hastily switching over from English to medium, in adopting certain other devices which cannot commend themselves to any democratic society. I am very reluctant to refer to State Governments. But, I regret to point out that the Madras Government has, of late, adopted a wrong policy. What is most surprising is the attitude adopted by the Minister of Education on this question of University education. One may leave it to the State Assembly to question the wisdom of a policy of giving special inducements to those students who enter a pilot college where Tamil is the medium of instruction even though text-books and other facilities may not be available. One cannot question here the propriety of that policy. One may doubt its wisdom. But when an Education Minister begins to use the threat of fiscal measures against those academic institutions which, on the basis of their experience and considered judgment, want to continue teaching in the English medium, the issues involved assume an entirely different complexion. It is a question of basic importance as to whether a Director of Public Instruction of a State should be allowed to wield the big stick just because academic institutions have to rely on the State Government for financial support. Clearly, it would be extremely ill-advised for any State Government to use the sanction of refusing grants in the case of colleges which, in effect, are implementing the policy of a co-ordinating authority like the University Grants Commission.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Which is following a wrong policy.

Dr. Krishnaswami: It is not at all wrong.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Yes.

Dr. Krishnaswami: I can tell my hon. friend that it is following the correct policy.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It is following a wrong policy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We are not taking votes now.

Dr. Krishnaswami: The hon. Member has not evidently understood the implications of what I am suggesting.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I have correctly understood.

Dr. Krishnaswami: I would counsel him to be patient. After all, in a debate, he has to understand the other person's point of view before he attempts to interrupt.

I suggest that a co-ordinating authority like the University Grants Commission has taken a stand which has been endorsed by almost all Universities and by almost everyone in the academic fraternity. That is my justification for saying that the stand taken by the University Grants Commission is right.

My hon. friend Mr. H. N. Mukerjee, of course, did not question the objective of switching over to a regional language. His complaint was that we were not moving more rapidly towards this goal. I am certainly in agreement with him. Probably, if we had a cut in the amount of grants that are devoted to Hindi and the savings were devoted to the development of regional languages, we would progress faster. But this will raise other political issues. I would like to point out that, in the present case, it appears that the Colleges the Universities in Madras State and the University Grants Commission are of one view, while the Education Minister is of a different view. As it happens, the State gives grants. It is tempting, therefore, to use this as a method for bludgeoning the academic institutions into toeing the line of the Education Minister.

But, this game can be played by others as well. Let me sound a note of warning. What is there to prevent if the University Grants Commission refusing to render assistance to colleges which receive such assistance from the State Government? It is a double-edged weapon. The State Government is treading on dangerous ground by needlessly trying to force the pace, ignoring the consensus of academic opinion and the welfare of students.

My hon. friend Dr. K. L. Shrinani referred to certain other features in this report to which I should like to make a brief reference. The University Grants Commission is interested in the welfare of teachers. We all know that within the next year or two, if we are to have better education given to our youngmen, there would have to be a reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio. Naturally, this involves further recruitment of teachers, more teachers, and better teachers for the Universities and various colleges. I have always had a great deal of sympathy for the teaching profession, and I do feel that their lot is one which ought to be improved. The University Grants Commission has offered to bear the 50 per cent. of the increase in salaries, it would give 50 per cent. 25 per cent. is to be borne by the management and 25 per cent. by the State Government. I understand that, this formula has been generally accepted. Unfortunately, the Government of Madras has adopted a perverse attitude on this question. I cannot for my life understand the logic adopted by the Minister of Education. Since this deals with the welfare of teachers in colleges, I have a right to bring it to the notice of hon. Members of this House. It is a strange scale of values which leads a State Government with a revenue budget of about Rs. 65 crores not to spare about Rs. 6 to 7 lakhs a year in order to improve teaching in colleges by contributing towards improvement in scales of pay.

My hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee referred to the craze for building huge structures. I agree that we ought to

curb this craze. But there are certain difficulties which have been brought to our notice by the University Grants Commission of which we ought to take notice. It makes sorry reading to be told that teachers of higher learning tried to get imports of scientific equipment and books but experienced unusual difficulties during the past year or two. One witnesses a game of battledore and shuttlecock played between different departments which deputed applicants from colleges from one end of one Government department to another. It is a shocking thing to be told that the Ministry of Finance issued a permit and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry was unable to provide the necessary facilities for import, and for months and years, text-books and other articles for use in laboratories were not made available to students, partly because of red tape and more because of the cussedness of certain departments in our Government. But, I would like the Minister for Education to tell us what part he played in attempting to smoothen the friction that obviously occurred between the University Grants Commission and the Finance Ministry. It is true our Ministers were more active in trying to provide better facilities for the University Grants Commission, so that it might promote the objectives which Parliament has asked it to perform, instead of paying lip homage to the great services rendered by the University Grants Commission.

When the University Grants Commission Bill was considered by this House, I remember several of my hon. friends telling us that the purpose of having a University Grants Commission was to canalise grants through the University Grants Commission or through technical bodies. One does not know whether all grants are canalised only through the University Grants Commission or through other expert bodies. Government Departments are usually unwilling to surrender their power to exercise patronage, and I understand that even today,

there are grants given to private educational institutions without consulting the University Grants Commission. By all means, let the Ministry of Education give grants to educational bodies, but let us have a White Paper giving out what the criteria are, and on what grounds these grants are given. Sometimes, Government Departments give these grants on political grounds and not on grounds of academic necessity or grounds of promoting obvious social advantage.

The University Grants Commission has suggested that they should have a quinquennial grant. It is a powerful plea made to Parliament, and I do hope that when we are talking of resources being given to the University Grants Commission, Parliament may consider the advisability of waiving control and giving them a ceiling amount to spend for five years. It is better to allocate . . .

Shri Nanshir Bharucha (East Khandesh): That will conflict with the Constitution.

Dr. Krishnaswami: I am coming to that. That is why I want Parliament to consider how it can be done. I am aware of these difficulties. But, when we are talking of a ceiling amount being given, some device can certainly be introduced which does not infringe the Constitution, and also promotes the freedom of the University Grants Commission to give grants.

My hon. friend the Education Minister referred to the autonomy of educational institutions. I want to point out to this House that universities and other institutions of higher learning have been placed in a different category, notwithstanding the fact that most of them are creatures of parliamentary enactments. That is what has happened in the United Kingdom, where the reputation of universities

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

is so jealously guarded that that great and powerful individual, the Comptroller and Auditor-General, is unable to interfere with their activities. So hard-boiled a group like the Treasury of the United Kingdom has proclaimed its faith in academic autonomy, and in the need for ensuring the dignity and strength of the various academic institutions.

With your permission, I shall quote briefly what the Treasury has to say on this question, and I think those words will be borne in mind by the Minister of Education and our Auditor-General here.

"They explained . . ."

—that is, the Treasury—

"They explained that the unique relationship between the Government and the universities called for financial arrangements which were also unique. It was clear that if the Government and Parliament are to abstain from the sort of control that would normally follow from the grant of considerable sums of public money, while at the same time, desiring to impose conditions as to allocation and use, there must be a devolution of some of the functions of Government to some body standing between the Government and the universities and enjoying the confidence of both. The University Grants Committee had been appointed to fill that role, and the Treasury have complete confidence in the determination and ability of that committee to discharge their functions with a full sense of responsibility both to the Government and to the universities. In evidence, your Committee were informed that the view of the Treasury was that the grant to the Comptroller and Auditor-General of access to either the books of the universities or the records of the University

Grants Committee would involve the risk of interference with academic policy."

I hope these things will be borne in mind, and that the University Grants Commission will grow from strength to strength and that within another few years we shall have the opportunity of congratulating ourselves on having created an institution which apart from coordinating standards has shown capacity to initiate fruitful developments in the academic sphere.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Harish Chandra Mathur.

I would request hon. Members not to exceed the time-limit of 15 minutes. In spite of my rings hon. Members go on, and that would perhaps push out certain hon. Members who could otherwise be accommodated.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am very glad that the Ministry of Education have, after all, seen the wisdom of taking the initiative in discussing the report of the University Grants Commission every year.

Here I would like to suggest that it would be much better if the Ministry submit the report along with a memorandum from themselves, a certain explanatory memorandum, as to the reactions the recommendations and suggestions made in the report by the Commission arouse in the mind of the Government, and what steps have already been taken, whether they differ from the Commission, what recommendations have been accepted by them, what recommendations have not been accepted by them etc. It would be much more profitable and useful for a discussion; it will also tend to grow into a healthy tradition that the Government will be called upon to take early decisions, and I am sure it will be very difficult for the Government to differ from the recommendations and suggestions of the Commission if they know that they have got to place such a memorandum on the

Table of the House. Otherwise, so many suggestions, so many recommendations, are made from year to year and we do not know what has happened to them.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I should like to inform the hon. Member that we have so far developed a very healthy relation between the Commission and the Government, and there has not been one occasion where there has been any difference of opinion on any matter.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am very glad if the position is such. So, I say that they should place a memorandum along with the report saying that they have accepted all the recommendations. It would be a very nice thing. Let them say so.

On going through this report I would say that where the Government does not accept the recommendation of the Commission, they only cover it by a very thin veneer, they do not take any decision in the matter at all, and the matter which is very important and pregnant, is kept pending for years on. That is the position.

If you look at the various reports which have already been placed on the Table of the House, you will find that certain recommendations are repeated year after year, and we do not know whether the Government have given any consideration to them.

Even about this matching grant, this report was finalised in March 1958 and the Government has not been able to come to any decision to this day. The Commission has made a very anxious reference to the matter and stated that they can make no progress, that university education can make no progress, that they cannot help affairs until and unless something is quickly

done about it. It is 1½ years now, and Government have not been able to make up their mind.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Again, I would like to correct the hon. Member. It is not the Central Government alone with which the Commission has to deal, it has to deal with the State Governments also; and the difficulty does not arise in its relationship with the Central Government, but only with the State Governments because they have to provide for the matching funds. We are now exploring the possibility of arriving at some arrangement by which this matter could be facilitated.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: This has been pending for the last five years, and I may inform the Chair that I have personally raised this question here at least in three debates, even before the Commission referred to it, and now it has been pending for three years. That is exactly my complaint, that this Ministry lacks vitality and life, that they cannot take quick decisions, and where we have to make rapid progress, our progress has been considerably slow.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am afraid the hon. Member is unnecessarily making these remarks. He knows that when the Budget is passed, certain grants have to be provided by the Commission, and certain grants the State Governments have to find. If the State Governments are unable to find the matching funds, what is the Central Government to do—because Parliament sanctions the grants on certain conditions. This is the real difficulty which the Commission is facing. It is no use accusing the State Government of negligence or lack of vitality. This is quite unwarranted. I can only tell my hon. friend that there is a certain difficulty, the situation is somewhat

[Dr. K. L. Shrivasthi]

difficult. The State Governments are completely autonomous and the universities are completely autonomous, and here is the Commission which is trying to grapple with the problem, and the Central Government are giving them full support in this matter, and will give full support in this matter. The hon. Member is unnecessarily making remarks which, I think, are uncalled for.

16 hrs.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I will repeat those remarks. My remarks are not against State Governments; my remarks are against the Central Ministry here. They lack vitality and strength. This is fully supported by the further fact that in spite of the fact that many of the reforms are extremely vital—they are of a very preliminary nature—we have not been able to put through those schemes. We have not been able to do anything in this matter. Yet, what happens is that the Plan allocation of Rs. 27 crores is cut to Rs. 19 crores. This again reflects nothing but weakness in the Ministry at the central level. We know that we are not making any headway. We have not been able to adopt certain reforms even in the matter of discipline. They want to have certain tutorial classes. We cannot do that without more money. We know we cannot do anything without matching grant. We cannot tackle the affiliated colleges until and unless we have more money. But in spite of the fact that these are all absolutely essential steps which have to be taken, what we find today is that the Plan allocation—this is not so in various other Ministries—is cut down. Particularly in respect of university education, we must realise that we have been able to do very little. We find that the Plan allocation is cut down from Rs. 27 crores to Rs. 19 crores and my hon. friend feels happy that he has been able to get back Rs. 37 lakhs, and he is complacent that something is being done. He does not realise that in

various other Ministries, they have not permitted a cut—of more than 8–10 per cent. Here we find a cut from Rs. 27 crores to Rs. 19 crores. This is extremely disturbing. This only reflects, as I said, the fact that this Ministry lacks vitality and courage.

Dr. K. L. Shrivasthi: I would like the hon. Member to kindly look into the expenditure of the University Grants Commission. During the last three years of its working, the Commission has not been able to spend the amounts which were allocated to it. It has certain difficulties. It is no use accusing me.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: This very point was raised even last time by the hon. Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do realise that any explanations from the Minister would not be able to decrease the vehemence and enthusiasm of the hon. Member. Therefore, he might reserve all his explanations for his reply at the end.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The Chairman of the University Grants Commission himself has given a very fitting answer to the points now raised by my hon. friend. The same thing was said by the Minister last year and the Chairman himself explained the whole position. I do not want to repeat all that the Chairman had said in explanation on that point.

What is the University Grants Commission doing? Look at the amounts which it has been able to spend during this year. More than half, Rs. 1.64 crores go to the four Central Universities and it is only Rs. 1.63 crores which are distributed among all the remaining Universities in India. Do you think that this country can make any progress in the field of university education with these petty amounts in the hands of

the UGC? They have said in explanation that if they knew in the beginning they would get a certain amount, they would be able to plan accordingly and spend accordingly. It is not correct to say that the Commission are not in a position to spend the money. They said that they must know that they would be able to get so much so that they could plan from the very beginning and be able to spend the money. That is their explanation.

That is why I say that we must put more vigour into this work. What we are doing is absolutely inadequate to meet the situation. Here is a question of indiscipline among students. In this very report, the Commission have dealt with this problem at length. They said that the position is deteriorating every day. Something radical must be done about it. There are certain steps which they can take. They can introduce certain reforms. But they are not able to introduce those reforms for lack of funds. That is abundantly clear. They have also said in the last paragraph that it is expected that the Government will pay certain attention to this matter, that the national leaders will devote some attention to this matter. I expected that the hon. Minister who initiated the discussion would throw some light as to what attention Government have paid to this suggestion made by the Commission. What have they done in this matter, what have Government done in this matter? Have our national leaders given any thought to this matter, have they invited the views of the various political parties in the matter and have they tried to evolve a certain code of conduct in this matter? I mean to say that the University Grants Commission has not been permitted to do anything for lack of funds. I want to know why Government have not taken any steps whatsoever. That is my first point.

The University Grants Commission is working under certain handicaps

and certain difficulties. Their main recommendation, which was pointed out by the last speaker, was that they should be permitted to function, regarding the funds of the Commission, as mentioned on page 20. They have been making this recommendation from year to year. Shri Bharucha says that there would be legal difficulties. We know there would be legal difficulties. I would admit that myself. I say the Chairman of the University Grants Commission is quite conversant with these difficulties, as conversant as any of the hon. Members here. He is an ex-Finance Minister. He is putting missionary zeal into the development of university education. He is working with an absolutely missionary spirit and he is going from place to place and doing everything he can. And, if he is making this recommendation, he is making it under compulsion of circumstances. I expect the Government will give us their reactions, what is going to be their approach to these and whether they have discussed this matter with the Finance Ministry or not or whether they have been able to find some solution or not. I think between the Finance Minister, the Education Minister and the Chairman of the Commission they should find some solution. After all, the Chairman is not a man merely with some academic qualifications making certain recommendations which will not bear the scrutiny of the administrative and parliamentary procedures.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that his recommendation may be given proper consideration by the hon. Minister. I hope that in the reply he gives, the hon. Minister will tell us what consideration has already been given by the hon. Minister to this matter.

I am only dealing with the relationship between the Education Ministry and the University Grants Commission and the difficulties of the University Grants Commission at the present moment. Something has

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

been said about the affiliated colleges. Might I remind the hon. Minister that even before this University Grants Commission was constituted, when they had appointed an interim Commission, we raised this point that unless and until you take note of these affiliated colleges you will make no headway. After all, the base is these affiliated colleges. And, now, after 7 years, there is realisation dawning upon the Ministry. I raised this point from the very beginning that you will make absolutely no headway.

After all, what is the university constituted of? The university is constituted of these affiliated colleges. It does not exist anyway independent of these affiliated colleges. Even now it is my serious complaint that these affiliated colleges are being given a step-motherly treatment. What is the grade which has been recommended for the principal of a post-graduate affiliated college? The grade is Rs. 600—Rs. 800. It is the same thing as that of the section superintendent in the Secretariat. There are people below an Under Secretary who are getting Rs. 800. If you have not got funds you have got to revise the entire structure of your services and there is no reason why the university teachers should have the superiority complex as compared to teachers in the affiliated colleges. You have got to take greater care of affiliated colleges so that the proper type of teachers are sent there so that you can inculcate respect for these teaching institutions. I strongly protest against the step-motherly treatment which is being given to the affiliated colleges.

Sir, a word about the recognition of the Universities. The University Grants Commission has made a recommendation on page 7. I appreciate that if the University Grants Commission has got to make financial aid available to these universities,

certainly, it should be consulted first. But, I want to know what the views of the Chairman of the University Grants Commission are. He has on more than one occasion said that he wants at least 200 universities in this country. We know that there is a definite scope and there is a definite need for a larger number of universities. These again are handicapped simply because of the lack of funds. I would never like to put an embargo on the powers of the State Governments in opening universities if they do not require assistance from the University Grants Commission. We should never take away that liberty of universities coming into growth. I strongly object to this, because we must now realise that we are every day talking about decentralisation and all that, but the autonomy of the States is being completely ignored. Until and unless they want in a particular year any financial assistance from the University Grants Commission,—of course, then, they will have to consult—the States should be free to open universities.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): May I ask the hon. Member, what is the minimum requirement, according to him, for a university to exist and work efficiently?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It all depends. It will differ from university to university. We have got the report in our hands, which says that universities are running from a few lakhs of rupees to Rs. 70 lakhs or Rs. 80 lakhs or even a crore of rupees. It will depend upon the particular development stage at which a university is, and the types of universities which we are envisaging, such as residential, etc. But there is definitely a need for more universities. I am only talking about the autonomy of the States.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I have hardly taken 13 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken 15 minutes.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Inclusive of the hon. Minister's interruptions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps he is losing more of his time!

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Just this morning, if you will remember, there was a question about the Government of Kerala and I intervened and asked whether the Government had paid any consideration to this matter—this particular recommendation made by the University Grants Commission. I would like to point out the recommendation made by the University Grants Commission in this regard. It has said that it would be necessary to have text-books prepared on scientific principles and the Government of India or the Council of Secondary Education should take up this question for consideration. The hon. Minister did not throw any light, and said as a matter of fact that it was exclusively a subject for the State Governments and that he has got nothing to do with it. May I know whether he has not accepted this recommendation of the University Grants Commission? It is not to impose anything on the State Governments or upon the universities. It is just to give a lead and to promote a particular activity. So, I wanted to know, when certain text-books are prepared, what consideration has been given by the hon. Minister to this aspect.

I find the mention of certain grants in the report. I do not know whether it would be proper or not to give such grants. Certain grants which have been made by the University Grants Commission are not very clear to us. They say that the total approved cost of a particular

project in a university—the Baroda University—was Rs. 5 lakhs and they have granted Rs. 2 lakhs. As against this, to the Punjab University, there was an approved project of Rs. 22 lakhs to which they have granted only Rs. 1 lakh. I do not know what criterion has governed this and what is the way of working of the Commission. I would like the hon. Minister to explain to us and throw certain light on this particular matter.

There are various matters to be referred to but because we are short of time I leave it at that. I do hope that proper attention will be paid to the recommendations of the University Grants Commission—that it will be strengthened, that much better funds will be made available to them and that the affiliated colleges will be given a proper deal.

श्री श्रीनारायण दास (दरभंगा):
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग के प्रतिवेदन पर आज इस सदन में विवाद हो रहा है। यह हर्ष की बात है। इस प्रतिवेदन को पढ़ने के बाद शायद ही कोई व्यक्ति होगा जो आज उसके काम को प्रशंसा न करे। जब से राष्ट्राकुण्ठन विश्व-विद्यालय शिक्षा आयोग की रिपोर्ट देश के सामने आई तब से बराबर इस सदन में और बाहर भी इस बात की मांग की गयी कि यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा के स्टैंडर्ड को ऊंचा उठाने के लिये और देश में यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा के प्रचार के लिये इस प्रकार के आयोग की आवश्यकता है और इसकी स्थापना की जानी चाहिये। पहले सरकार ने एक यूनिवर्सिटी अनुदान कमेटी बना रखी थी जिसका कार्य बहुत ही सीमित था और वह यूनिवर्सिटी की सहायता करने का काम कर रही थी। लेकिन बाद में जा कर के इस सदन में एक विशेष कानून पास करवा कर इस सरकार ने इस आयोग की स्थापना भी की और उस आयोग ने अपनी यह सूची भेजी है इस सदन के सामने और देश के सामने।

[श्री श्रीनारायण दास]

मेरा खयाल है कि इस धायोग के जितने भी माननीय सदस्य हैं, वे सभी अपने अपने कर्तव्यों का पालन ठीक तरह से करते हैं, सभी को भिन्न भिन्न बातों का धीर विषयों का जिनकी धीर इस रिपोर्ट में ध्यान आकषित किया गया है पूरा ज्ञान है। पूरे तौर पर तो नहीं लेकिन मेरा खयाल है कि विश्वविद्यालय के विभिन्न अंगों का, सरकार की सहायता से धीर स्वयं अपने परिश्रम से, सारे देश में धूम करके धीर जांच पड़ताल करके, इस धायोग ने सभी पहलुओं पर प्रकाश डालने का प्रयत्न किया है। इस सबके लिये मैं धायोग को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ।

सबसे पहली बात जिसकी धीर मैं धापका ध्यान लीचना चाहता हूँ यह है कि नये विश्व-विद्यालयों की देश में स्थापना का जहां तक ताल्लुक है जिन को सोलने का अधिकार राज्य सरकारों को धीर केन्द्रीय सरकार को है, यह देख कर मुझे दुःख हुआ कि जो भी विश्वविद्यालय कायम किये गये हैं, उनको कायम करने के पहले इस धायोग से परामर्श नहीं किया गया। जब कानून द्वारा हमने इस धायोग की स्थापना की है धीर जब विश्व-विद्यालयों में स्तर को देखना तथा दूसरी बातों को देखना इस धायोग का कार्य है धीर जब हमने कहा कि विश्वविद्यालयों के सम्बन्ध में जब चाहे परामर्श लिया जा सकता है धीर धायोग परामर्श देगा, तो विश्वविद्यालयों की स्थापना करने से पहले क्यों इससे परामर्श नहीं लिया जाता है? जब हर प्रकार की शिक्षा को, विश्वविद्यालय की शिक्षा को बढ़ावा देना, तरक्की देना इसका काम है तो बड़े दुःख की बात है कि विभिन्न राज्य सरकारें यूनिवर्सिटियों की स्थापना करने से पहले इसका परामर्श नहीं लेती हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार अपने से या तो अपने प्रभाव से धीर या संविधान की धाराओं का प्रयोग करके या संघोचन करके राज्य सरकारों इत्यादि से राब लेनी कि बिना

उसका परामर्श लिये हुये विश्वविद्यालयों की स्थापना न की जावे। इसका कारण यह है कि देश में जितनी भी यूनिवर्सिटियां हैं वे ज्ञान ज्ञान विषयों की शिक्षा देती हैं, विशेष विषयों को ले कर चलती हैं धीर अगर यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन से परामर्श लेकर धागे काम हुआ तो उससे देश को धीर समाज को लाभ होगा धीर जो कमी है उसकी पूर्ति हो सकेगी। इस बास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस धीर धापका ध्यान जावे।

दूसरी बात यह है कि मैं जानता हूँ कि इस धायोग के जो अध्यक्ष हैं धीर जो माननीय सदस्य हैं, वे बहुत विचारपूर्वक काम करते हैं, सभी शिक्षा के प्रेमी हैं, देश को अवस्था का ज्ञान उन्हें है लेकिन शिक्षा के माध्यम के बारे में जो उनके विचार हैं, उनसे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। यूनिवर्सिटी में शिक्षा के माध्यम के लिये उन्होंने एक समिति बनाई थी धीर उस समिति ने बहुत सी सिफारिशों की थी जिनका इसमें जिक्र किया गया है धीर इस धायोग ने उस समिति को सिफारिशों को मान लिया है। उसका सांगस यह है कि यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा के माध्यम को क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं में बदलने में हमें जल्दी नहीं करनी चाहिये। अगर ऐसा किया गया तो इसके जो बहुत से खतरे हो सकते हैं, उनकी धीर हमारा ध्यान लीचना है। उसने कहा है कि जो क्षेत्रीय भाषायें हैं जिनका जिक्र संविधान में किया गया है जब तक उनका पूरी तरह से विकास नहीं हो जाता है, हर प्रकार से वे विकसित नहीं हो जाती हैं, तब तक उनको माध्यम नहीं बनाया जाना चाहिये धीर अंग्रेजी ही माध्यम रहना चाहिये। मेरी तुच्छ राय में वह बिल्कुल उस्टी धारा बहाना चाहता है। उड़े ही वर्ष तक हम लोग अंग्रेजों के गुत्राम रहे धीर अंग्रेजी पढ़ते रहे लेकिन फिर भी हिन्दुस्तान में एक प्रतिफल से अधिक लोग अंग्रेजी पढ़ लिये नहीं सके हैं। मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारे देश में जो बड़े बड़े अंग्रेजी के विद्वान हैं धीर

यिन्होंने अपनी विद्वता का परिचय अंग्रेजी में दिया है, अंग्रेजी में ज्ञान हासिल किया है, उन में से बहुत ही कम लोगों ने उस ज्ञान के अंधार को अपनी मातृभाषा में भरा है। बड़े बड़े विद्वान हमारे देश में हैं लेकिन उन्होंने अंग्रेजी में सोचा। वे अंग्रेजी में सोचते हैं और अब भी उनको यह स्वप्न देखने में आता है कि हमारे देश की भाषा जो प्रायः अंग्रेजी है वह हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत दिन तक कारगर रहेगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो विचारधारा है वह गलत है। मैं इसके सम्बन्ध में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेशी भाषा के माध्यम के द्वारा, चाहे वह नीचे के क्लासों की शिक्षा हो चाहे विश्वविद्यालयों की शिक्षा हो, मौलिकता का विकास नहीं हो सकता है, योरिजिनलिटी नहीं आ सकती है। मातृभाषा के द्वारा, जो हम अपने घर में बच्चे के साथ बोलते हैं, जो बच्चा अपने माध्यमिक स्कूल में पढ़ता है, जब हम शिक्षा ग्रहण करेंगे, तो अगर हम यह सोचें कि यूनिवर्सिटी में आकर अपने सोचने के ढंग में, वह अपनी मातृभाषा को छोड़ कर अंग्रेजी का प्रयोग शुरू कर दे, तो यह नहीं हो सकता। मैंने दुःख के साथ सुना जब कि प्रोफेसर हीरेन्द्र नाथ मुकुर्जी ने कहा कि अंग्रेजी की शिक्षा जिस तरह से हो, इसके सीखने के लिये अब भी हमारे देश के अंग्रेजी सिखाने वाले हमारे देशों में जाते हैं और सीखते हैं कि अंग्रेजी की शिक्षा किम तरह से होनी चाहिये। जब डेढ़ ती वर में हमारे देश में अंग्रेजी चलती रही उसके बाद भी अंग्रेजी पढ़ने वाले कम हैं, तो मैं नहीं समझता कि जब तक हम अपनी शिक्षा में मातृ भाषा या क्षेत्रीय भाषा को जारी नहीं करेंगे तो हमारी मातृ भाषा का विकास कैसे होगा। हमारी मातृ भाषा इस तरह से विकसित हो सके ऐसे स्थिति कभी नहीं आ सकती है। हमको चाहिए कि हम अंग्रेजी के मुकाबले में ऐसी स्थिति बनायें कि समाज यूनिवर्सिटी में अंग्रेजी को हटा कर क्षेत्रीय भाषा हो जाय। इसलिये मैं इसका जोरदार विरोध करता हूँ

और कहना चाहता हूँ कि यूनिवर्सिटी बोर्ड्स कमिशन ने और जो भी काम किये हैं, लेकिन उसने मातृ भाषा के स्थान पर विदेशी भाषा के द्वारा शिक्षा देने के जो परिणाम होते हैं, उनकी तरफ पूरा ध्यान नहीं दिया। मैं किसी पर आरोप नहीं करना चाहता, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि देश में जो थोड़े से अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं, चाहे वे कहीं भी हों, वे समझते हैं कि सायद हमारी भाषा बहुत कमजोर है। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान मुसलम न होता और क्षेत्रीय भाषा के द्वारा, मातृ भाषा के द्वारा अगर शिक्षण का काम होता तो हमारी जितनी भी क्षेत्रीय भाषायें हैं सब का पूरा पूरा विकास हो गया होता। लेकिन हम लोगो ने अपने देश के संकटों नहीं करोड़ों बच्चों की सुविधा का ध्यान न करते हुये अंग्रेजी शिक्षा पाने के लिये बाध्य किया, जिसके अन्दर १४ वर्ष तक वह अपने विचारों को प्रकट नहीं कर सकते हैं। यह शिक्षा काम नहीं आयेगी और देश के लिये बहुत हानिकारक है। मैं डॉ० राधाकृष्णन यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमिशन रिपोर्ट से कुछ उद्धरण देना चाहता हूँ। वह उस के पैराग्राफ ४० में लिखते हैं

"It is educationally unsound to make a foreign tongue the means of acquiring knowledge. Dr Hans, Lecturer in Comparative Education in the London University, points out in his recent book the serious drawbacks in adopting a foreign language as a medium of instruction. He says, "before entering schools the pupils have acquired a proficiency in their mother tongue. have built up a vocabulary covering most of the objects of sense impressions and their daily activities. At school they have to superimpose on this basis a language of ideas and abstract relations, expressed entirely in a foreign medium. Their minds become split into two water-tight compartments one for ordinary things and actions expressed in

[श्री श्री नारायण दास]

their mother tongue, and another for things connected with school subjects and the world of ideas expressed in a foreign language. As a result they are unable to speak of their home affairs in the school language and about learned subjects in their mother tongue."

श्री अश्वत्थ दत्त (गढ़वाल) : अब तो कारेन नहीं है बंगाली, फौज एन्वरी के अनुसार ।

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : इनलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर हमको अपने देश में विद्यार्थियों के अन्दर, जो कि विश्वविद्यालयों में पढ़ने वाले हैं, मौलिकता का विकास करना है, रचनात्मक प्रवृत्ति लानी है, जहाँ जहाँ पर क्षेत्रीय भाषाएँ हैं वहाँ वहाँ हमको इसके लिये अपनी क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं को शिक्षा का माध्यम बनाना चाहिये ।

श्री अमरनाथ सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : लेकिन इससे तो बंगाली बालों का असर कम हो जायगा ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जो मेम्बर साहब बैठे हैं अगर वह इस तरह तकदीर करेगें तो उनको बड़े हो कर बोलने का मौका नहीं मिलेगा ।

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि जैसा आप जानते हैं, जिस कानून के अन्दर इस आयोग का काम चल रहा है उसमें इस आयोग ने अपना प्रयोग कोष कायम किया है । लेकिन इस रिपोर्ट से पता नहीं चलता है कि इस आयोग को किस प्रकार धन प्राप्त हुआ है । जो कुछ केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अनुदान दिया है यानी ३ करोड़ ५० लाख रुपये का, उसका जिक्र तो किया गया है लेकिन और दूसरे स्रोतों से इस आयोग ने जो धन प्राप्त किया है, वह व्यक्तित्व चन्दे से हो या दान से हो,

किसी भी प्रकार प्राप्त किया गया हो, उसका कोई जिक्र नहीं है । कोई-बन प्राप्त हुआ भी हुआ या नहीं, हम यह भी नहीं जानते । इसके सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि जब यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की नियुक्ति हुई तो इन बात के लिये उसका प्रयोग कोष कायम कर दिया गया था । इसका मतलब यह है कि विभिन्न राज्य सरकारें इस आयोग को अनुदान दे सकती हैं, केन्द्रीय सरकार तो देती ही है, लेकिन इसके अलावा भी उसे प्रयत्न करना चाहिये । बहुत के हनारे दानवीर लोग हैं जिनको यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की तरफ से एरोव किया जाय बिना प्रकार की यूनिवर्सिटी का स्थापना के लिये, या उच्च शिक्षा की बेधर प्रादि को कायम करने के लिये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि लोग उसकी तरफ अवश्य झुकेगें । मुझे भानूम नहीं कि इस क्षेत्र में यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने क्या काम किया है । लेकिन मैं चाहूँगा कि उसका प्रयत्न किया जाय ।

हमारे देश में जो शिक्षा का प्रचार है उसमें जो हमारे बड़े शरीर के लोग हैं, उनके विद्यार्थी हीं प्राते हैं, कास तीर से जो विश्व-विद्यालय की शिक्षा है, उस को अगर देना जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जो ऊँचे तबके के लोग हैं जिनकी आमदनी ज्यादा है, जो कि बुद्धिमान और प्रभावशाली छात्रों को भेज सकते हैं, उन्हीं लोगों के अन्धे यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा को प्राप्त कर सकते हैं । इससे यूनिवर्सिटी शिक्षा प्राप्त करने के लिये प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिल पाता । मैं जानता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार और राज्य सरकारों को पद्धति में कुछ दोष है । हालांकि जिन लोगों की आर्थिक अवस्था बहुत खराब है उनको मदद देने के लिये स्कीम बनाई गई है, लेकिन मेरा खयाल है कि अभी तक छात्रवृत्ति देने की जो प्रथा है वह बहुत कम है । मैं इसके सम्बन्ध में एक ही बात की तरफ ध्यान आकषित करना चाहूँगा । डॉ० राधाकृष्णन बुद्धि-

बसिटी शिक्षा कमिशन की जो रिपोर्ट है उसमें उन्होंने बताया है कि ग्राक्सफोर्ड और कैम्ब्रिज में पढ़ने वाले जो छात्र हैं उन में सरकारी सहायता प्राप्त छात्रों का परसेन्टेज ज्यादा है। उन्होंने बताया है कि ६२ परसेन्ट कैम्ब्रिज में और ८२ परसेन्ट ग्राक्सफोर्ड में है। ध्यान दि होल जो यूनिवर्सिटीज यूनाइटेड किंगडम में हैं उनको मिलाने पर यह ६७ ६ परसेन्ट आता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश में लोगों की आर्थिक अवस्था को अच्छी बनाने के लिये प्रयत्न करने की आवश्यकता है। जब विदेशों में जहाँ आर्थिक अवस्था बोगो की अच्छी है इतने व्यापक रूप से छात्रवृत्ति दी जाती है तो हमारे देश में सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि अधिक से अधिक लोगों को छात्रवृत्ति दे कर पढ़ाया जाय।

द्वितीय पञ्चवर्षीय योजना में जो रकम रक्षी गई है उसे कम करने की जो तजवीज है वह ठीक नहीं है। इसका उत्तरदायित्व प्लैनिंग कमिशन पर है, फाइनेंस डिपार्टमेंट के ऊपर है। शिक्षा विभाग ने जहाँ तक हो सका अपनी योजना को पूरी तौर पर रक्षित। लेकिन उसकी आर्थिक अवस्था को देखते हुए कहना पड़ता है, जैसा कि अभी तक खयाल रहा है, कि सरकार का ध्यान शिक्षा की तरफ और विभागों की अपेक्षा बहुत कम है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रकृति चाहे केंद्रीय सरकार की हो चाहे राज्य सरकार की हो, ठीक नहीं है। हमेशा यह देखने में आया है कि जब भी शिक्षा का प्रश्न आता है, हालांकि वह एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है, वह टल जाता है। इसलिये नहीं कि वह चाहते नहीं हैं इसके लिये कुछ करना, वह चाहते तो हैं लेकिन वहाँ पर भी कोई योजना लागू करने लगने है तो हमेशा रकम की कमी पड़ जाती है। इसलिये उनका विभाग इस तरफ से हट जाता है। इसलिये शिक्षा विभाग को काफी रकम नहीं मिली। जब शिक्षा विभाग को काफी रकम नहीं मिली तो फिर यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स

कमिशन को तो रकम कम मिलना स्वाभाविक ही है।

एक और चीज के बारे में यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने ध्यान दिलाया है और वह देश के सामने है। वह चीज है यूनिवर्सिटीज के अन्दर विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता। इसके लिये हम बोग बहुत दिन से सोचते रहे हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके लिये एक चीज की बहुत जरूरत है और वह यह है कि विद्यार्थियों और प्रोफेसरो के बीच जो सम्बन्ध है वह बहुत कम है। जितनी रेजिडेंशियल यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं उनमें विद्यार्थियों की तादाद इतनी ज्यादा है कि वे विद्यार्थियों में और शिक्षकों में सम्बन्ध नहीं स्थापित हो पाता। इसलिये यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने सिफारिश की है कि कालेज में १००० या ८०० से ज्यादा लड़के पढ़ने के लिये न रखे जायें। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक ऐसी चीज है जो कि अच्छी है लेकिन जिसको कि करने में इतना समय लगेगा।

इसमें तो सभी सहमत हैं कि आज जो बहा पर अनुशासनहीनता फैली हुई है उसको बन्द किया जाय। लेकिन इसी के साथ एक बात ध्यान में रखनी चाहिए कि जो यहाँ पर राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ हैं उनके कारण भी यह अनुशासनहीनता यूनिवर्सिटीयों में पैदा होती है और इसमें राजनीतिक पार्टियों का भी हाथ रहता है और इस अनुशासनहीनता के लिये उन्होंने राजनीतियों को भी दोषी ठहराया है उनका भी उसमें हाथ बतलाया है। मैं उनकी इस बात से इंकार नहीं करता लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं वह भी मानता हूँ कि शिक्षा संस्थानों को जो चलाने वाले लोग हैं शिक्षक हैं, चांसलर्स हैं, वाइस चांसलर्स हैं, उनका भी इसमें कम दोष नहीं है और केवल राजनीतियों और पोलिटिकल पार्टियों पर ही अनुशासनहीनता का दोष बोध देना ठीक नहीं है। इसके लिये अच्छी कथियाँ भी कम दोषी नहीं हैं और

[जी श्रीनारायण दण्ड]

बिनाको कि सुधारने के लिये वैसे की जी जरूरत है लेकिन वैसे के साथ साथ मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी शिक्षा संस्थाओं के जो चलाने वाले हैं, शिक्षा के जो अधिकारी हैं ऊपर से नीचे तक, उनका ध्यान उस धोर जाना चाहिये और अगर ऐसा हुआ तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस समस्या को हल किया जा सकता है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रतिवेदन का समर्थन करते हुये अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ।

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, I have gone through the report of the University Grants Commission very carefully and I welcome this report with mixed feelings of pain and satisfaction, pain because of the fact that I feel, as the report has pointed out, that quite a good number of hurdles are put on the way of the University Grants Commission when it tries to implement some of those very laudable programmes. Whenever the axe of the Finance Ministry falls, it generally falls on the budget of the Education Ministry and that gives me pain. That is why I say that I have some amount of pain in my heart when I welcome this report. I do not know what are the reasons for the Finance Ministry coming down upon or putting its foot down on the budget of the Education Ministry. My friend Shri Harihar Chandra Mathur has tried to find some reasons for it. But, I think,—I hope you will excuse me if I say so—our Education Minister is very peaceful as a dove and it is because of this, possibly, he is not been able to or succeed in forcing or compelling the Finance Ministry to come forward with grants for the implementation of the programmes laid down by the University Grants Commission.

There is another thing very startling—I do not understand why it should happen only so far as the University Grants Commission is concerned. It has complained of three-dimensional difficulties. The Education Minister has pointed out lack of

materials like steel, cement and iron rods for the construction of some of these buildings. I do not understand why the University Grants Commission of all institutions in this country should suffer for want of building materials. I feel that the cause of education must come first. Development projects so far as education is concerned must be given top priority. I do not understand why it should suffer because of lack of materials. We see before our eyes luxury buildings, prestige buildings going up into the sky in other sectors of our life, not only so far as the other departments of Government are concerned, but so far as private endeavour is also concerned. In the city of Calcutta, you will find private endeavour having palatial and luxury buildings. I just want to know why building materials like steel, cement and these things are not forthcoming in order to implement or execute the development projects of the Education Ministry. How is it that building materials like steel, cement and iron come forward in order to satisfy the vanity of these individuals who want to perpetuate the memory of their power and influence by erecting colossal buildings in the different cities of this country? That strikes me most.

Another thing about the salaries fixed by the University Grants Commission for teachers. This is also very laudable. I welcome this because the University Grants Commission has paid attention so far as the teachers of the affiliated colleges are concerned. Quite a number of speakers have made pointed reference to this. The proposal is that 50 per cent of the money would be forthcoming from the exchequer of the University Grants Commission and the State Governments are to make a matching grant of 50 per cent. The whole scheme had to be cold-stored for so many years because of the fact that the State Governments were indifferent to the

proposals of the University Grants Commission. It is very fine to hear that some State Governments have come forward to implement these proposals. At the same time, I know of State Governments that are opposing, evolving new conditions for implementation of the recommendations made by the University Grants Commission. I know that some of the State Governments have evolved certain new conditions. And what are they? They say that in order that a teacher or a professor of an affiliated college might enjoy the benefit of the pay scales granted by the University Grants Commission, he must have put in a service of at least fifteen years in a particular institution. This is one condition. Another condition is still more startling. It says that in order that a teacher may get the advantage or enjoy the benefit of this enhanced salary scale granted by the University Grants Commission, there must be honours in that college in the subject in which he teaches. Now, the responsibility of opening up honours classes does not lie with the professor or the lecturer. The responsibility of opening up honours classes lies entirely with the management or the authority of the college; and if the authority of the college fails to open up honours classes in a particular department, it does not mean that the teacher belonging to that department should suffer simply because of the failure of the authority of the college. These are the new conditions.

There are other things also. There are some colleges, where in spite of the fact that the State Governments have agreed, or at least some of the State Governments have agreed, to offer matching grants so as to implement these very laudable recommendations of the University Grants Commission, now, they say that these should be treated only as allowances; these would not be coordinated into the existing salary scale of the professors. I feel that these must be coordinated. Now,

there is another thing. There is no provision for regular increments. These allowances might be stopped at any moment according to the sweet will of the management or the authority. These would not be treated as basic salary or as part of the basic salary, but these would be treated only as an allowance. This appears to be innocuous but it is really not so. For, I feel that the teacher is the fly-wheel of the educational machinery; and if the teacher's condition is not looked after, all the efforts and all the schemes to improve the standard of university teaching would prove futile, because the improvement of the standard of teaching in the university or in an affiliated college is and must be coordinated with the salary that the teacher gets. I feel that our universities and our State Governments are failing quite a lot, so far as this particular aspect of the recommendation is concerned.

Coming to the three-year degree course, I welcome it very much, and firstly, in principle, because the three-year degree course is going to usher in a new era in the sense that it is going to allow better attention to the secondary stage of education. So far, the secondary stage of education was regarded or accepted by our educationists only as a ladder to education in the colleges or in the universities. It was a sort of pass-port to the campus of the universities. But I have always felt that the secondary stage of education must be self-contained and self-sufficient and it must be able to equip the young learner with sufficient ammunition to face the battle of life. So long it did not equip the young learner in the secondary stage, because the secondary stage was accepted only as a pass-port to university education, and it failed to equip the young learner to face the battle of life; and the rub was there. Now, because of this three-year degree course, and this plan which has been accepted by most of the universities and Education Ministers as such, there is going

[Shri Hem Barua]

to be an intensive study at the secondary stage; and this intensive study would make the secondary stage self-contained and self-sufficient, and that is very welcome.

At the same time, there is a practical difficulty. I feel somehow or other—and if I am wrong, I hope the Education Minister would correct me—...

Shri D. C. Sharma: The hon. Member cannot be wrong.

Shri Hem Barua: I cannot be wrong? That is what my wife also tells me. In the actual field of operation, it is going to suffer to a certain extent because we are trying to rush through this scheme with great haste without making adequate preparation so far as the secondary stage is concerned. The three-year degree course means an eleven year school course, and unless and until we have a net work of eleven year school courses all over the country, sufficiently and suitably managed, it would be wrong to have in haste the three-year degree course superimposed on an unstable foundation. That is what I have found. I welcome it in principle, and I welcome it because of other reasons, but I find this difficulty in the way, and that is why I have tried to point it out.

In the report there is reference to indiscipline among the students, and for this very often different reasons are trotted out. Actually, there are psychological and economic factors involved in it. The Commission is trying its level best to provide amenities and facilities to the students in the universities and colleges, but they are not sufficient. And simply providing them would not do, we have to see that the students are made to utilise these amenities and facilities.

For instance, when I read the Mudaliar Committee Report on the Banaras University I was astonished

to find that the playgrounds in the campus wore the appearance of a deserted village, that in the evenings the students never go there.

Education in our country is very costly. It has aptly been said that the nation can be divided into two parts, the privileged few and the unprivileged many. The privileged few are those who have the benefit of education, the unprivileged many are those who do not have the benefit of education. In our country education has become costlier day by day, and this is going to widen the gulf between the educated few and the uneducated many.

A survey was conducted very recently about the living conditions of students in the city of Calcutta by the Calcutta University, and they have made the startling discovery that 70 per cent of the students in the Calcutta University at present belong to families with Rs. 30 per capita income. This is the condition, and we find students desirous of higher education, improving themselves, refining themselves of being serviceable to the country. They live in sub-human levels. Unless and until the level of the student is improved, his living conditions are improved, it is most useless I would say to speak about indiscipline among the students.

On reading the report I find that there is a mechanical process of the Commission trying to implement the projects and programmes, but I feel that education must have a pole star to guide and inspire it. Recently in the U.K., Lord Simon has written a series of articles about a committee to be appointed to enquire into the working of the universities, so that the work of the universities might serve national purposes. I feel somehow or other that our universities, as they exist today, are either service stations or employment bureaus. There should be a national purpose to guide them. There is no impression created, or no idea given, by the

ⁿ University Grants Commission as to the national purpose for which we have the universities or for which we establish our universities.

Somebody said that if the States can pay for the universities, they must have the opportunity of establishing the universities. In that case I would say it is no use having this University Grants Commission, because one of the purposes of the Commission is to standardise and co-ordinate different patterns of university education in our country. If the State Governments are given the opportunity to have universities at their sweet will, then there will be a mushroom growth of universities without any co-ordination. They would be a sort of super-autonomous bodies, and that will do greater harm to the cause of university education rather than serve it.

I had a mind to say something about the Official Language Committee's Report and the Kunzru Committee's Report. There are certain things which, I feel must be brought out. I am of the opinion that our regional languages must be developed. We must have a national language. As I stood in the Indian Embassy grounds in Moscow and as I saw our national flag broken on the mast on the 15th August and as I found that speeches were made in fault-less, eloquent English. I felt some sort of qualms in my conscience, because we must have a national language. Everybody would agree with me that India must have a national language. That is true. At the same time, we have a responsibility and the Ministry has also a responsibility, to see that the national language develops. More money should be spent to see that the regional languages are developed. Until and unless the regional languages are developed, until and unless our national language is developed, it would—I would rather say—be foolhardiness to try to wipe out English entirely from our syllabus or from our pattern of life, because it gives at least a sort of national

appearance today. At the same time, it is co-ordinating education in the different Universities. Now, because English is there, a Professor in Madras University can examine the paper of a student in Gauhati University.

It is a sort of a unifying force. But I would very much like that in order to occupy this position, the regional languages and our national language must be developed. Government should see that some attention is paid to this aspect.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, an ex-Finance Minister put in charge of the University Grants Commission is not finding money to implement the plan which he has made. I think this grant for education should not have been cut because after food and clothing, we want education for our countrymen. We are glad that the Central Government have at last taken in hand the responsibility of running the colleges in our country. First of all, they wanted to take the Universities. But they have also taken in hand the affiliated colleges to guide them. The affiliated colleges that have grown in number need proper attention for the real education of students in the country.

We are complaining of indiscipline. We are complaining of inefficiency. But the teachers, on whom rests the responsibility of turning out real educated men in the country, are not looked after. We cannot blame the students. We must look to the guardians and teachers who take care of them. We are glad that the pecuniary condition of the teachers and professors of colleges are being looked into. The affiliated colleges are in a very precarious condition. The amount that is to be disbursed by the University Grants Commission is dependent on the matching contribution of the State or the University concerned.

We are glad that many State Governments have come forward with

[Shri S. C. Samanta]

matching contributions. But, actually, when this scheme is going to be implemented, the teachers are not so much benefited as we expected.

My hon. friend Shri Barua was telling how because of the many conditions created matching contributions are not coming forward in most of the cases. Teachers are enlightened but if, for want of these matching contributions they cannot get their dues, how can we expect that they will take care of the students with that much of attention as we want them to bestow. I would request the hon. Minister to see that no other excuses are put forward by the State Governments for not implementing this scheme.

16-51 hrs.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

These mofussil colleges, these affiliated colleges, are being put to too much of difficulties. They were hoping that they will get something, especially the teachers who have served for long those institutions and are going to retire. If matching contributions do not come, what will be their fate? The teachers who are going to retire are at a loss to understand this. And the teachers who are serving are also thinking of what their fate will be when they retire.

The Central Government have come forward with 50 per cent grant. If another 50 per cent grant does not come from the States or the Universities, will the Commission give its share to those teachers who are retiring at present? I put this demand before the House and for the consideration of the hon. Minister and the University Grants Commission.

We are thankful to the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, whom we know to be very kind-hearted, for taking this strenuous task on hand. I would only request the hon. Minister and this House to see

that the money that will be required for the plans he makes will be granted to him. I think in the next budget this question should be taken up by us and sufficient money should be allotted for the University Grants Commission and if possible an exception should be made in regard to the cuts. Other departments may undergo cuts but the education department should not have any cuts because it is education and education alone that will take us ahead. We must spend huge amounts of money for the elevation of the country, and if we are not educated who will enjoy? I would request the Government to come forward before the House with some more grants for the affiliated and university colleges.

Shri Khadlikar: Mr. Chairman, Sir, let me first congratulate the University Grants Commission on some good work that they have done concerning coordination and integration in the field of university education. Some aspects of the report have already been touched upon. I would like to draw the attention of the House to some other aspects. At the present juncture, somehow or other, we are suffering from—I do not know exactly how I should call it—either some sort of inferiority complex or some sort of false sense of pride and patriotism concerning the medium of instruction. I find that so far as higher learning is concerned we will have to depend on English language for a pretty long time. It is no use just putting that case in a straightway—practising it, laying down more or less a law or a rule of conduct that English shall remain for a long time, but, at the same time, paying some lip-service either to Hindi or to the regional languages.

What is the reason? The reason as I see from my own experience is that because of a certain amount of chaotic thinking at the top and at certain lower levels, the teaching standards in English have considerably lowered. Several times, as if the young students

are raw materials for experiments by the State Governments, curricula are changed. Even now, after going through this report, I do not find that there is a definite scheme about this question of medium of instruction.

I would like to offer a concrete suggestion. I for one would desire that we must have a *lingua indica* or a national Indian language of our own. But let us understand perfectly clearly that if we are going to catch up with the progress of the world we will have to depend on English; because we are acquainted with that language and that language is rich enough to provide us a living contact with world thoughts and scientific developments in the world. Even China has adopted the Latin script and a second language, Russian, in order to catch up with the progress that has been achieved in the scientific field in Russia. With this point clearly understood, what I would like to say on this matter is this. Certainly let us make a beginning, but do not make a beginning anywhere in a half-hearted manner, nor, like the mixed economy, have some sort of mixture—at a certain stage, English, at a certain other stage, the regional language and at a certain other stage, Hindi. I would suggest that if regional languages are developed and ripe enough, then certainly have institutions and universities where purely the regional language is followed as the medium of instruction, but no mixture either this side or that side . . .

Mr. Chairman: It is 5 o'clock. He many continue tomorrow. The House will take up the next item of business.

17 hrs.

EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND SCHEME*

श्री कालीदास दांडे (हता) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान प्राविडेंट फंड के बकाया के सम्बन्ध में दिलाना चाहता हूँ

श्री कालीदास दांडे के जिम्मे बकायी है। मैंने हाउस में एक सवाल किया था। उस स्टारब क्वेश्चन नं० १८२० के जवाब में माननीय अम वंत्री ने बतलाया था कि जो रुपया प्राविडेंट फंड की मद में इकट्ठा हुआ है वह २३ करोड़ है। उसे देखते हुए जो रुपया बाकी है वह केवल १.६ परसेन्ट होता है। सवाल यह है कि देखने में यह अमानत बहुत कम मालूम होता है, लेकिन मैंने जो आंकड़े इकट्ठे किये हैं उन को देखने के बाद आपको पता चलेगा कि यह रुपया २.५४ करोड़ है जो कि एम्प्लायर्स के जिम्मे बाकी है। आप सोचें कि प्राविडेंट फंड की स्कीम इसलिये रखी गई है कि मजदूरों को बुढ़ापे के वक़्त में कुछ सहारा मिले, जो लोन रिट्टेन हो जाते हैं उन को कुछ पैसा मिले। अगर वह सहारा उन को न रहे तो इस प्राविडेंट फंड की स्कीम से क्या लाभ? यह बात हो सकती है कि जो टोटल रुपया है उस को देखते हुए बकाया की रकम बहुत थोड़ी है, लेकिन आप ब्यास करें कि जब से रुपया बाकी है इस बीच में बहुत से मजदूर मर गये, बहुत से नौकरी से अलग हो गये और उन को इस का कोई फायदा नहीं मिला। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कितना रुपया हर प्रदेश में बाकी है : प्रांथ में ५.६२ लाख, बम्बई में ७१.७२ लाख, वेस्ट बंगाल में ६१.६२ लाख, मध्य प्रदेश में ५२.४६ लाख, उत्तर प्रदेश में २३.११ लाख और बिहार में, जो कि टेक्सटाइल की दृष्टि से एक छोटा मोटा प्राविडेंट है, ४.६६ लाख। मैंने जो इस का टोटल किया हुआ है वह २५४ लाख होता है। मैं उस समय भी इस बात को हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता था कि यह मामला कितना गम्भीर है क्योंकि उब लोगों के लिये जिनका रुपया मालिकों ने सरकार के हाँ बना नहीं किया है कोई सहारा नहीं है। प्रांथ उत्तर प्रदेश के कानपुर शहर में ३०,००० मजदूर ऐसे हैं जिन्होंने कुछ से अपना पैसा कटवाया