

[Shri S. D. Patel]

of the Order of the President dated the 7th April, 1978 issued under section 51 of the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963, extending the President's rule in the Union territory of Mizoram for a further period of two months with effect from the 11th April, 1978 published in Notification No. S.O. 256 (E) in Gazette of India dated the 7th April, 1978. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2062A/78.]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1978-79—
Contd.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL
WELFARE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF
CULTURE—Contd.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO (Hanamkonda): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while speaking on these Demands, I do not propose to repeat all the encumbrances paid to education from time to time, starting right from Sanskrit and coming down to all other languages. I would only like to rush through some of the educational problems within the time available to me. At the very outset, I would like to tell the hon. Education Minister that in a very real sense, his success will depend on the performance of our brilliant Minister for Family Welfare. The demographic picture of the country is ultimately going to determine the educational picture, particularly at the primary level. We know from the statistics available to us that even now for every 1,000 population there is an addition of 35 babies annually. That means for every one thousand population, there is an additional need of one class, one teacher and all that goes with it. Now, according to this calculation, if we take the entire population into consideration, I have come to the conclusion that at any given point of time, we must have not less than 30 lakhs of primary teacher in this country. Nothing less than that will do. In fact, it will be more because there will be so many hamlets and each hamlet will have to be given education and if you take all these things into con-

sideration, it will be much more than 30 lakhs. Now, I would like to know if we do have 30 lakh teachers today in the country and if we do hope to have 30 lakhs of primary teachers in this country in the foreseeable future, Figures show that we would be short by 33-1/3 per cent and I am quite sure that it will not be possible to make good this leeway unless your brilliant colleague in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and yourself, both of you, give us the projection for the next 20 years of the demographic picture of this country as to how many school-going children are going to be there, say by the turn of the century and in that case how you are going to cater to their needs, etc. These will have to be dovetailed and a comprehensive programme has to be given to the country. This is the very first exercise which I would like all of you to undertake along with your colleague.

17.18 hrs.

[SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO in the
Chair.]

The next general observation which I would like make is in regard to the Constitutional position. Last year, the hon. Minister very cautiously made some statements in this House while replying to the debate, which have rather intrigued us, because while he said that the Constitutional position technically happened to be that education is in the Concurrent List, he does not propose to do anything in pursuance of it, because he is not in favour of it. He expressed himself very clearly in favour of giving education back to the States and making necessary amendments in the Constitution. That amendment has not come so far and today the States are in need of certain guidance, co-ordination and certain standards being maintained by guidance from the Centre which has not come forth. I would like to know if his attitude which was revealed in his speech last year in this august House continues to be the same or has undergone some happy change. I would

also like to know what is the rationale behind it. Whatever may be the likes dislikes or allergies in regard to the 42nd Amendment—into which I need not go—I would like to remind him that this proposal to include education in the Concurrent List is as old as the Constitution itself. A countrywide debate has gone on for the last 30 years and arguments have been advanced from both sides. Only when it was found that it was not possible to have the desired co-ordination, the desired maintenance of high standards and even the desired clearing information from one State to another—when all these things were found impossible of achievement—it was considered that the only way of tackling all these problems is to change the Constitution and put Education in the Concurrent List.

In this connection the hon. Minister quoted the Kothari Commission report last year, a very significant statement, but it was a statement which was ten years old and it was not really in consonance with the time when it was quoted. In that statement, the Kothari Commission says:

“We are convinced that there is plenty of scope within the present constitutional arrangement to evolve a workable centre-state relationship in education and that this has not been exploited to the full.”

Immediately after that the Minister went to say that the previous government did not wait and changed the Constitution; in spite of the recommendation of the Kothari Commission they brought education in the concurrent list. I would like to remind him most respectfully that the Kothari commission report dated back to 1965-66 whereas the inclusion of education in the concurrent list took place in 1976, ten full years later. And may I remind him that it was because of the experience during those ten years that this had to be done. If the Minister does not agree with this view, he should have come out with his own

plan of the centre-state relationship to which the Kothari Commission made a pointed reference. I should like to know during his speech or thereafter what exactly is the centre-state relationship which he has hit upon which will really do the trick without education remaining in the concurrent list or with education going back to the state list. Is it possible? It has not been found possible and therefore this was done. Either he has to agree to the inclusion or retention of education in the concurrent list, and do something in pursuance of which he will have to show that inclusion of education in the concurrent list becomes meaningful and it gives the desired results. Or in the alternative he should come forward with a foolproof method by which all that was expected of this change in the Constitution is also got achieved without the change in the Constitution. There could be no middle-way, no middle-course. This is where he will be judged by his performance and the scheme that he will place before the House.

There is one more ticklish question in regard to this matter. Entry 66 of the Union List very clearly says that in matters of higher education co-ordination and determination of standards has to rest with the Union Government. It has been argued time and again very forcefully that if you do not look after the standards at the school stage, you could hardly do anything at the higher education stage; you may do something marginally but the best way is to look after the foundation and if the foundation is wrong or weak it is futile to expect that the standards at the stage of higher education would automatically go up merely by our doing something at that stage. This has also been argued by the Committee of M.Ps. who in their report seem to have referred to this pointedly and stated that this was one of the reasons why some kind of uniformity, some kind

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

of co-ordination, some kind of determination in the matter of standards will have to be undertaken at the school level also. This is the reason why these changes had to come.

Now it is possible that although I agree for the retention or inclusion of education in the concurrent list, the hon. Minister may hold a different view. We are in an age of party politics and we cannot go beyond the party mandate. I sympathise with him. Whether he agrees or not, I propose to find something useful and with full sympathy I shall suggest something which might bring about the same result but which might also not offend or go against his party line or any other party line if there is one. We do not yet know what the party line at the moment is. But as I say सर्वनाशे समुत्तरे अर्धमत्यजितिपंडितः

I am prepared to go one step further and tell him very well, let us not take the entire education in the concurrent list; let the Administration of education remain with the States, but have one more item in the concurrent list, on the lines of item 66 of the Union list, in regard to school education. Now that will perhaps go some way in improving matters and giving you some scope to maintain standards in education, some uniformity in standards at least at the feeder levels. It is quite possible. Let us try this in the next five or ten years. Personally I am bound and convinced that having education in the Concurrent List would be an ideal solution. But you need not go to the other extreme and say: let it go back to the States. We all come from the States. We have certain experience of the State Governments in matters of education. And therefore, I tell you, even based on my own experience that educational standards at the school level are in a pell-mell today, they can never be brought up unless there is some kind of discipline and central guidance at

least in the short run. What happens after fifty years, I am not prepared to say. But this is the crying need of today and I would like to impress upon the hon. Minister to appreciate this not from the party point of view, but from the point of view of what has happened, undeniably happened in the matter of education in the last twenty five years. This is one suggestion which I am making in respect of the Constitutional position.

Now I come to the primary part of education, primary stage of education. I would like to take it along with adult education because curiously the failure at one stage increases the burden at the other stage. If we fail in primary education—and we have been lamenting our failures time and again—it would be automatically adding to our burden for mass literacy programmes later on. Therefore this matter of drop-outs which has become a bugbear in education has to be tackled at the early level. How can we stop these drop-outs? We have been talking about them, writing about them and we have been trying to some extent to stop the drop-outs, but not with very much success. I would like to analyse drop-outs, which are of two kinds mainly. The first category is of those who for financial or other reasons cannot even reach class five, even if it is available in a school. Even if there is a primary school, the boy or the girl has to leave education even before he or she reaches class five. The other category is of those who have reached class five, completed class five, but for the same reasons, they are not able to go to the next village which may be five or ten miles away and continue their education until class seven or eight. If we are able to catch hold of this second category and see that they continue their education, they are enabled to continue their education until class seven or eight, they may not automatically relapse into illiteracy. Because they have been exposed to educational process for eight years they will not so easily relapse into illiteracy.

The first category does relapse into illiteracy. What does that mean? Simply put, it means that we want more middle schools in this country. Taking the educational pyramid particularly, at the secondary level, we are told some people with some aesthetic sense have told us that it has a very slim waist line. A slim waist line may be very desirable in a human figure; but when it comes to education, it is not at all useful. We must have at least one middle school, one upper primary school for every two or three primary schools and if this proportion is maintained, I am sure that so many boys and girls who have to leave their education at the primary stage or even before that, will be enabled to go on upto class seven and eight. At the upper primary stage, number-wise, I am sure, that this is the position in all the States. It was so, at least three or four years ago and I do not see much having been done to improve the situation. I know about my State where there was a clear deficiency in the number of middle schools and I think the same conditions prevail in other States also. The hon. Education Minister will do well to look into this matter because this is going to save a lot of money later. You have two more teachers and two more classes to add here and you save a lot of money on adult education and all that goes with adult education. Adult education is not easy. To make a person of twenty five or thirty years, who meanwhile gets interested in so many other things to come and take a slate and pencil and read 'a-ah' is not so easy. I do not say it is impossible, but it is not going to be easy. It is easier to pick up a boy at the tender age of 10 or 12 rather than catch him later at 25 or 30. Of course, there have to be incentives to boys and particularly girls, from the weaker sections. Apart from scholarships, free books, free slates and pencils, I would like to make a pointed reference to the programme of mid-day meals. I had the bitter experience of being told

that the mid-day meals programme was suspended in many villages in my State and maybe in other States also because there was no firewood to cook the stuff. Obviously our people wanted that firewood also should come from America! This is preposterous. What is the coverage? The report which the Ministry has given has come as a revelation to me.

I was thinking that there was at least 25 to 30 per cent coverage of boys and girls in this programme. I am grateful to the ministry for having opened my eyes. I have found it is hardly 10 per cent. 2.17 lakhs children are covered by non-CARE programme locally. Is it something to gloat about? 76 lakhs boys and girls are getting food under the mid-day meal programme in the whole country. Is it something to gloat about? 2.17 lakhs is less than one district. 76 lakhs is about 30 to 40 districts out of more than 400. It is less than 10 per cent. All this is because we continue to depend on the charity of some other country for this programme. Why should we do it? Where is the need to continue to depend on some other country? We are having very heavy stocks of foodgrains on hand and we do not seem to know what to do with them. The previous government has been time and again blamed for having built up the stocks. I will not go into that. But I would appeal to you and the Food Minister, that instead of allowing these foodgrains to rot in rain and sun and to be eaten by rats and cockroaches, why can we not allow our own under-fed boys and girls to have some much-needed food and nourishment as far as we can? You have the other advantage of attracting them to the school, more than any other programme can. This has a double advantage and I would like the minister to go deep into it after consulting his colleague, the Food Minister and see that some massive, country-wide programme is taken up. Some years ago, I had seen one central kit-

[Shri P V Narasimha Rao]

then functioning near Madras which was catering to the needs of 40 or 45 villages. Some vehicles were going round taking the cooked food from school to school. I do not know if that scheme has been extended to other States. I am not up to date on that. But some such scheme will have to be initiated and extended to the whole country. We are very much progressing in food technology. Can we not think of some food packets centrally prepared and distributed? Or, can we not prepare them in each village, which can be a very lucrative and useful cottage industry? According to the circumstances, convenience and needs, both methods can be tried. Unless this is done, I am sure our drop-out rate is not going to come down. This is a special suggestion I am making.

Sir, coming to high school education I am afraid we are entering the field of controversy. And I am sure my statement will be corroborated with facts and figures. There is no dearth of high schools in this country. Really the number of high schools can no longer be considered really inadequate. In fact as we go into the countryside, we come across many high schools with uneconomic pupils strength. We have seen these schools. Pupils do not come because they just cannot come for economic and other reasons and still we have the schools functioning there. Let them function, and if there is any need still to augment the number of high schools. Let that also be done. Our Plan programmes will take care of that. But Sir, what our Five Year Plans have not taken good care of is the quality aspect of high school education. I have seen many high schools where even students of 10th class are not allowed to handle a test tube. They have to watch while the teacher does the experiment and they have to draw their own conclusions. Heaven knows how this is what is happening in our high

schools and if we do not really improve their standard, improve their equipment, improve the library facilities, improve all these things over a period of 3 or 5 years, I am sure that high school education is going to fail and therefore all education is going to fail. The high school stage is a very crucial stage of education which is the gateway to further education and is also a terminal stage in itself. If that fails everything else is likely to fail.

Now what are the measures? How do we improve school education? From some little experience that we have in the States I have certain specific suggestions to make. It has been our experience that even a good school inspector who operates in an area of 30 or 40 villages if he is to make an academic effort should be made immediately there is an improvement in that area. If there is a District Educational Officer who has got certain flair for the academic side he will see that the academic side is improved at least to some extent. This only shows that our present educational administration at the State level is very very faulty and it is not conducive to standards at all. Now, look at the phenomenal amount of administrative work which our educational officers are doing. School education cannot be imparted by officers obviously. And while they go on administering the Department, the actual imparting of education is nobody's business and this is the condition today. A phenomenal number of papers to be signed the District Educational Officer takes at least 5 or 6 days to sign the pay bills in his District. Nothing else he can do during these 5 or 6 days and he has to see a lot of people, dance attendance on VIPs and what not. How is it possible for this Administration to think of standards? How is it possible for this Administration to attend to the quality in education? So, unless there is a complete reorganisa-

tion of the educational administration at the State level, nothing is going to happen. I have no final answers to this, but from my own experience in our State I can suggest a few things. In the first place, there can be no compromise on one thing, that there should be a separate Directorate for higher education, a separate Directorate for school education and of course, there are separate Directorates for technical education in many States already. Where they do not exist, they should be started immediately. There can be no consideration of economy or anything in this matter. This will have to be done in all States.

Coming to the Directorate level, naturally the Director of Public Instruction, who will be the Head of the Administration at that level will have to be in overall control, but along with him there has to be an Additional Director of Public Instruction (Academic) who will not be overburdened with any administrative jobs, who will not be asked to run about making enquiries, who will not be asked to run about dancing attendance on bigger officers, VIPs and so on. He will sit in his room or go to the school room or go where the teacher is teaching and see how the teaching is taking place, how the boys are progressing, how the textbooks are faring, how the examinations are being held and how the results are being tabulated. All these matters will be his exclusive responsibility and nobody shall interfere in that. But, for the sake of enforcing these standards, he must have all the powers, including administrative power and power of punishment. All these powers will have to be given to him and he will have to be made answerable for results.

It should be on the same lines down the line. At the district level and lower levels also there has to be a suitable separation of the adminis-

trative from the academic side. In education these two sides will have to be taken care of by separate personnel. It is only then that it is possible to hold somebody responsible for standards. Today if you ask the Director of Public Instruction why the result in mathematics is 10 per cent, he will not be able to say anything, because he may not himself know mathematics, for all we know. This is the position. Then who to ask for an explanation? So, first set up the machinery, make somebody responsible and see that he works. This is what I would like to suggest, in so far as educational administration is concerned.

Now, I am not talking in the air. We have tried this in some States. We have tried it in Andhra Pradesh, and we have tried it with great success, I must say. So long as we tried it, it was successful. Because it was successful—I do not know—it was stopped later on. This is the logic sometimes that we sometimes follow. It happened and it can happen again.

Please look into this carefully, call your Education Ministers, ask them not to be worried about what they are spending on this separate Directorate, because it is the same officers—one officer is looking after two functions today; two officers can look after the same functions; they come mostly from the same personnel. So, there will not be much need for additional recruitment; there will be marginally some need, but not much need for additional expenditure also.

I have already referred to the School Improvement Programme. Cost-wise, let us say there are 30,000 high schools in this country which are in need of some improvement. Taking Rs. 50,000 as the average cost of improvement, it will come to Rs. 150 crores in a period of one

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Five Year Plan, which is not going to be prohibitive in any case, because if this education fails, we are going to waste much more than what we are spending on its improvement. That is what I would like to suggest in terms of cost.

While we are on the point of school improvement, I would very humbly suggest that at least now, let there not be this complete dichotomy between the technical and the formal streams of education. Today a boy passing out of the industrial training institute is considered inferior to a boy who passes out of a high school, because there is that hiatus, national hiatus, between what is done by hand and what is just mugged up from books. This will go only if these two streams are made to co-ordinate with each other. Today we have the Polytechnics and the Industrial Training Institutes. Can they not manufacture the simple needs of the Education Department? They can. But they are never asked to do that. Can they not manufacture calorimeters, burettes, pipettes, test tubes, test tube stands, furniture, school bags, school boxes, students' books, exercise books and things like that? Is it not possible? It is eminently possible. But it is never done. Even the Polytechnics get their requirements from the market through the contractor, because we all know what all happens between the contractor and the administration. And even if the administrators are honest, it will not occur to them, it will not strike them that these two streams can be made to help each other and strengthen each other.

Look at an engineering college. The Principal of an engineering college is generally of the rank of a Chief Engineer. All his staff are of the rank of either Executive Engineers or Assistant Engineers. No doubt they are doing a teaching job.

Similarly, in the medical colleges civil surgeons are doing the teaching job. But when it comes to constructing a building, or doing even small repairs or electrification, it is done by the regular Executive Engineer of the State Government through a contractor. And these great men just look on while it is being done. Is this really what should happen in this country? Why should the Chief Engineer not take greater interest, a more live interest, in the construction of his own building? I have spoken to some principals. They were grumbling about the design of the building. I asked them: "Why are you grumbling? You are a Chief Engineer yourself. You should have given your requirements." The answer was that when the building was constructed, they were not there. That is a different story, but the system is like this. This system has to go, and the technical and formal streams have to help each other. Only then work experience in the real sense and the status that has to be given to work will be re-established, otherwise not.

Now I come to a very delicate matter on which I really do not know what to say. Probably I will be talking some blasphemy, but I would really like to share my views with you. We have been reading and listening to speeches about education from life, education for life, education of life and what not. The net result of all this talk appears to me to be—maybe I am wrong, if I am wrong I will be very happy—to suggest that the importance of the class room and the teacher is being reduced somehow. I would like to submit that this is a very wrong approach, at least in the present context. Things are not ripe, our society is not ripe, conditions in the society are not ripe, for giving small children education from life.

Take a village, for example: half a dozen children of all ages huddled

in one hut, the father coming home drunk, beating the mother with religious regularity every night just when the children open their books for doing their home work. This is what they get in the house. Coming out of the house, whether it is the village or the slum areas of the city, we find exploitation, petty-mindedness, deceit, violence and everything that a child ought not to learn. This is what they get outside the home. This is the condition of our weaker sections, and we are talking in terms of giving them education from life. What is the education from life that they are going to get? They will become either frustrated or rebels. Only these two possibilities appear to me, there is no other possibility. So, at least for some time to come the importance of the classroom and the importance of the teacher cannot and should not be minimised.

How many of these parents are literate themselves? So far as the weaker sections are concerned, almost all of them are illiterate. Even in the middle class, they may have a smattering of their mother tongue, but they have no idea of the contents of the education that is being imparted to their children. How can they supervise the education of their children? So, the teacher will have to be the mother, the father, the guardian and the teacher of the child all rolled in one. This is the condition today, these are the stark realities which should not be forgotten.

It is all very well to say that we must give them an education which is work-oriented—yes, please give it by all means, but meanwhile do not put the cart before the horse. Do not lose what you have and run after something which is doubtful. Please achieve that in the shortest possible time and see that what you have is consolidated meanwhile, and not otherwise.

In this connection, I would like to make another very specific suggestion. Whenever in a village there is a school building, that building should serve as a centre for supervised study for two or three hours in the night. I am sure that the school will be full in the night as in the day, perhaps fuller, because the conditions are so bad that no child can read in his own home. He will certainly come. All that is required is lighting arrangement, maybe a few lanterns; if it has electricity, two or three bulbs. This is not going to give any unbearable shock to our exchequer, I am quite sure about that. Please look into that. Please see that in the lakhs of school buildings lying vacant in the night, some useful activity like study for two or three hours takes place and the children are given some time to study in peace without being disturbed by the atmosphere at home. This is the first need of the children of the weaker sections today.

श्री उदयसेन (देवरिया) : पिछले तीस सालों में तो ये भवन रात को खाली हो रहे हैं ।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: This struck question namely, what has been done during the last 30 years, I am not prepared to go into. For the benefit of the hon. Member, I may tell him that in all capacities, I have been asking for these things to be done for the last 30 years. It is not a brain wave which I got from the time you became the Education Minister and that I did not have it before. We have been asking for these things. If one Government has not done or done it only partly, there is no justification for the succeeding Government not to do anything. If that is your logic, please tell us.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION,
SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE
(DR PRATAP CHANDRA CHUN-
DER) I have not said anything

SHRI P V NARASIMHA RAO I
now come to higher education. I am
not in a position to say much about
it because it is a highbrow business I
come from a village. But things which
have come to my notice, I will bring
them to your notice and see what can
be done about it.

Most of the universities, whatever
may be the reason, are again experi-
encing certain traumatic shocks. Why
it is so, you will have to go into de-
tails. Whether you like it or not whe-
ther we like it or not here is a situa-
tion which we have to meet and reme-
dy. It is said by politicians them-
selves that it is the interference of
politicians that is resulting in this in
the universities. I am really amazed—
maybe they are right or maybe they
are wrong. So far as I know, I say
without any fear of contradiction that
every university in this country is self-
sufficient in politics. No university
needs any imported politics. In the
universities, there are cliques and
groups. The poor Vice-Chancellor is
in one group or another and most of
his time he is setting one against the
other for his own survival. This is
what is happening in the universities
which is common knowledge. I am
not talking of one university. This is
the situation as we find and I do not
know how politicians and politics can
be banned in the universities. Please
show me a way—I do not know. If
you know please do it. But I say,
please do not do it as politics is in
every department of life in this coun-
try. But politics need not be politics
that is being witnessed today. Politi-
cal parties can come to some kind
of an agreement, some kind of con-
sensus, some code of conduct of how
they have to behave, how they have
to conduct themselves in relation to
the problems of students and univer-

sities. This can be done. It is not
easy but under your care and under
your guidance, maybe something can
be thrashed out. Some of our senior
leaders say that we are going to ban
politics in the universities. I would
beg of them not to be so idealistic or
so utopian in their thinking. Let us
have politics by all means but that
should be of a healthy type. This is
going to be inevitable in this country.

Appointments are made in the
universities on party lines. If a per-
son belongs to my party, he is ap-
pointed and if he does not he will
not be appointed. If the Government
changes he is again demoted or sent
somewhere else. Now, this is some-
thing which is very unfair. If this
happens in any other institution there
may be a few demonstrations here
and there and there may be some
petitioning. But if this happens in a
university there is immediate likeli-
hood of very sharp reaction and over
reaction.

DR PRATAP CHANDRA CHUN-
DER I have not done that.

SHRI P V NARASIMHA RAO
What is happening in some of the
universities is common knowledge.

In a university if an unjust deci-
sion is taken if a palpably wrong
decision is taken the reaction is much
sharper than anywhere else. Why? It
is because the university is composed
of such elements. They want to fight
against injustice. They have a
certain innate idealism in them. Let
us be charitable to them, let us not
always condemn them. But what is
the remedy?

The university is an autonomous
body. As the Education Minister,
you will not be able to change one
dot or one dash or one comma of what
the Vice-Chancellor has written. The
only person who can change it is the
chancellor or the Visitor. Most of the
University Acts have a provision that
the Chancellor or the Visitor can in-
stitute an inquiry into the affairs of

the university. But that is something like killing a small bird with *Brahmastra*. That is to be so sparingly used. There is a stigma attached to it. If a Vice-Chancellor is told that an inquiry is pending or that the Visitor or the Chancellor is likely to institute an inquiry, he thinks that his university is going to be condemned. The very fact of instituting an inquiry is taken as a stigma. This is not proper. An inquiry by the Chancellor should be, more or less, a routine matter.

After all, autonomy does not mean autocracy. Autonomy should not mean nonanswerability. What is happening today in most of the universities under the cloak of autonomy? I am all for autonomy; I am not against it, I do not want it to be restricted. But I want some checks and balances to operate in the autonomy of the university just as they operate in Government, apply to you and to the President of India. Autonomy just cannot be completely scot-free.

I have got one suggestion to make in this regard. If the Visitor or the Chancellor institutes an inquiry, the inquiry, in fact, becomes an inquiry by the State Government or the Central Government. So, autonomy is lost. That should not be the case. Therefore, please see that the University Acts provide for the appointment of a person of the nature of an Ombudsman in each university. He is a person who has nothing to do with the Government. He will not come under the influence of the Government. But, at the same time, he will look into all the complaints pertaining to the university and will advise the Visitor or the Chancellor who will take action based on that advice. Some such arrangement will have to be made because not only justice has to be done but it should appear to have been done. This is not the case in many universities.

I would like to make a few points with regard to technical education.

The Estimates Committee of Parliament has adversely commented in regard to technical education on several points. One of the most important points is that technical education is very much theory-oriented and there is really no liaison between industry on the one hand and the technical institutes on the other. This is something which has been said time and again. But I am sorry to say that not much has been done to correct this defect. In U.K., as we all know, they have what is called the sandwich system. A student of an engineering college spends one year in an industry; then, he comes back to the college for three years and goes back again in the final year to the industry. That is the sandwich system that works there. I am not sure how it will work or what version of it will work in this country. That is for the experts to tell us. What I would like to say, as a layman, is that I agree with the Estimates Committee of Parliament and, I know, all of us agree, most of the people agree, that the technical education which is being imparted in our technical institutes is for removed from life and that it is theory-oriented.

18 hrs.

Secondly, in the field of technical education, the proportion between the engineer and the technician is very much distorted in this country. In other countries, for every one engineer, there will be at least four technicians. That is the ratio between the engineer force and the technician force. In this country which is a poor country, which is a developing country, which requires a much larger number of technicians, the corresponding ratio is said to be 1 : 1.25. This is preposterous; this should not be the case. This will have to be corrected at the earliest. Otherwise, we will have only strikes, unrest and nothing else; no work will be done in this country. Please see that the polytechnics, ITI's and the intermediary

[Shri P V Narasimha Rao]

level institutions are strengthened and the number of technicians is augmented. Even at the polytechnic level, it is said that it is theory-oriented. Really, there is no sandwiching with any industry available in the neighbourhood, even if it is available, they think that it is infringing to go there and try to learn something. An engineer says that he is an officer, it is his work to supervise the work of others, he cannot do anything, his engineer son cannot fix a fuse in the house. This is the position of our engineers today. I am not really criticising them, but I am only expressing a fact which is well known to everyone.

MR CHAIRMAN It is past 6 O'clock. We cannot go beyond, we will have to take permission of the House. Please conclude.

SHRI P V NARASIMHA RAO
These are some of the important suggestions which I wanted to make. I have a few more, I will pass them on to the hon. Minister. I am grateful to you.

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

18 02 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Tuesday April 11 1978/Chaitra 21 1900 (Saka)