

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA : I have every right to say that at least the Minister concerned should be consulted about his convenience.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam, the Minister was present and we also have given notice. The Minister was here but perhaps the Home Minister does not know. I agree there, but you are our steward in charge of Parliamentary Affairs. You kindly meet the Home Minister on behalf of us all, since you agree with us, and settle this in a proper way amongst yourselves.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA : I do not say "no".

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is all right.

The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, the DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

RESOLUTION RE RE-ORGANISATION OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION IN THE COUNTRY—*continued*

PROF. B. N. PRASAD (Nominated) : Madam, I have very carefully listened to the long speech of the mover of the Resolution. He gave a detailed analysis of the present deterioration in teaching especially in schools and colleges. As a result of his elaborate analysis, he has suggested that the system of education known as the Intermediate course should be re-introduced and that the pre-University course should be abolished. While giving my remarks on the merits of the Resolution, I should first of all like to clarify or correct certain statements made by the mover. It is not a fact that the pre-University course has been adopted everywhere in the country. As a matter of fact, there are at present certain States in which this pre-University course is prescribed while there are other States in which the old Intermediate course is still prevailing. Take, for example, the State of Uttar Pradesh and the Board of Intermediate and High School Education.

Perhaps this Board sends the largest number of students to appear at the examinations of High School and Intermediate stage. The number at present is about five lakhs. In spite of all attempts on the part of certain authorities, the Board of Intermediate and High School Education is still retaining this Intermediate examination. Similarly, there are certain other places in which the Intermediate examination is still prevailing. On the other hand, there are certain States which have replaced the old Intermediate course by this so-called pre-University course but let me tell you, Madam, that this differentiation is practically in name only. The usual practice is different. The boys and girls appear at the high school examinations which are supposed to be held after ten years. After that, they study for two years if they want to go in for their Intermediate course and after passing the Intermediate examination, they become eligible for admission to the University for the B.A., B.Sc., or for other degree courses. On the other hand, those institutions which have prescribed this pre-University course have raised the high school duration to, I suppose, eleven years, and one year is taken in studying for the pre-University examination. I have been connected with a number of Universities and even with the Examination Boards and I have seen that while actually setting the papers, the convenor and the members say, "It is only the second year of the Intermediate course. So, the papers might be set more or less on those very topics and on those very lines" so that although there is a change in name, the actual standard of examination in this pre-University course . . .

SHRI N. PATRA : But is there no syllabus for this pre-University course ?

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : There is, but the syllabus corresponds to the second year of the Intermediate course. The papers are set accordingly, and the boys and girls appear in these examinations. After passing this examination, either they go to join the arts and science groups or some technical institutions. The point that the mover stressed is very nearly correct. When these boys and girls get two years' time and study in an institution which goes by the name of a college, they get into touch with a slightly higher academic

[Prof. B. N. Prasad.]

atmosphere. On the other hand, when they come through this pre-University course, their mentality remains more or less the same as that of a school boy. That in itself makes a certain difference. This difference has been felt so much so that I may inform the House that in some of the Universities of Madhya Pradesh, where they had formerly established this pre-University course, they have now gone back to the old Intermediate course. Such type of actions go in favour of the mover. The mover has tried to show by various statements that there is a good deal of deterioration in the standard of education. Those who are in touch with education know that this is a fact—and nobody can deny that in spite of all the statements that come out either from the Central Ministry of Education or from the State Education Departments—that the standard is going down and is not improving. That is a factual thing which I can say as a teacher who has been in touch with these institutions for nearly over forty years.

Naturally, everything has got its own reason. Why is this so? There are very many reasons. This is not the time for me to go into details, but in a casual manner I would like to state a few points. I have noticed that the teachers, especially in the primary and secondary schools have no heart in teaching. Long, long ago when we ourselves were students, we know how the teachers took sincere efforts in teaching us. That type of thing is lacking in general now. As the mover has said, those parents who have got enough money can employ private tutors.

As a matter of fact, this custom of employing private tutors has very much increased. I may inform the House, Madam, with your permission, that I was never taught by a private tutor. All the schooling, all the university education I received was only in the institution. I never stood in need of a private tutor but at present in almost every house which can afford to employ tutors, there are private tutors. Why is it so? Our little boys and girls tell us, the master sahib has not taught us this thing, he has left out this thing and so on. Therefore those who can afford to pay to the tutors employ private tutors for their wards and children. This

is the condition now. -

Now, a question may be asked, how is it that those very tutors who were reputed to be sincerely devoted to the profession of teaching are not giving the same amount of attention to teaching as the former teachers used to do? For this, Madam, there are many reasons but if responsibilities were to be assigned, I should say that the Government is responsible primarily to this state of affairs. One may ask why I blame the Government. Well, the facts are clear. Go to any State, especially to West Bengal, and you will find that in spite of the very high cost of living the primary school teachers are paid—I do not know the exact figure—something near about Rs. 50 or it might have been increased by a few rupees. Now, one can imagine how a teacher who has to put on a piece of white *kurta* can manage his family with a sum of Rs. 50 or so. The Government may say, well, we have no money. I would say that it is a question of degree of the preference which the Government decides to give in the matter of its expenditure. There are very many types of expenses which the Government is incurring. It is not my purpose now to point out the channels through which Government money is spent but the Government should think that a teacher is after all a person who has undertaken a pious profession. He should not be treated worse than the peon or the servant who is employed in that very institution. I have seen with my own eyes a school in which there is a teacher and a peon and this peon whom we call kahar in Uttar Pradesh gets really more emoluments than the teacher. Now, if this be the state of affairs, can it be imagined that the teacher will have any real heart in his profession of teaching those boys? We in this country put a good deal of faith in what is called blessings and curses, in *ashirvad* and *shaap*. When a teacher is put to so much trouble, put to so much difficulties, in making both ends meet, do you think that the teacher will give *ashirvad* to these children? He is bound to say something unpleasant, something nasty, sometimes something poisonous to these young children and when those children at their impressionable age hear this from their teachers, to whom as usual they are very much devoted, they form a very, very unfavourable impression

towards the Government. It is because of these reasons which I have just mentioned briefly that we see in the newspapers that in West Bengal, in Calcutta, thousands and thousands of teachers, bare-bodied except for the loin cloth, are sitting on the road approaching Raj Bhavan seeking relief.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD: This is one of the factors on account of which deterioration in teaching has set in. Then, there are so many colleges and schools, so ill-equipped, coming out that we might say there is a mushroom growth of such institutions. There are certain institutions where there is no library, no building, no experimental equipment and still we give recognition to those institutions for teaching purposes. Naturally these institutions cannot be expected to fulfil the object for which they are established.

Take another thing. There has been so much growth of text-books. Will it not surprise the House if I say that at present the practice has been, for a teacher or two teachers to combine, write out some sort of text-books and then force the students to read them? I have seen a number of these text-books. It is sufficiently bad for a text-book when it is not well-written but it is unpardonable when mistakes are included in the text-books, and there are plenty of text-books which are full of mistakes. There is no check to take away those text-books from those institutions. In this way there are so many reasons but since this is not the occasion for me to go into more details I would only say here that deterioration has set in, and it is a fact. But if we think that by merely replacing the pre-University course by the previous Intermediate course we shall be able to improve the standard of education, I feel that possibly our hopes may not materialise. Therefore, while just appreciating that possibly the Intermediate course may prove better than the pre-University course, that alone will not serve the purpose for which this Resolution has been moved.

Lastly, I must say that the wording that is put in the Resolution that the Intermediate education should be re-introduced is not correct because Intermediate educa-

tion already exists in a number of States and there is no question of its re-introduction.

Thank you.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान):

उपसभापति महोदया, यह प्रस्ताव जो हमारे सामने सदन में आया है उसके सम्बन्ध में पहली बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह समय के अनुकूल नहीं है और निरर्थक है क्योंकि अभी हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार ने एक एजुकेशन कमीशन एप्वाइंट किया है जिसको सारी ही शिक्षा के ऊपर, चाहे वह प्राइमरी हो, चाहे सेकेन्डरी हो या हायर हो, सारी शिक्षा के ऊपर खोजबीन कर के 31 मार्च, 1966 तक रिपोर्ट दे देनी है। तो हमको वैसे भी इसकी इंतजारी करनी चाहिए थी कि यह एजुकेशन कमीशन जिसमें एजुकेशन के एक्सपर्ट्स रखे गये हैं वे क्या कहते हैं—हम से ज्यादा एक्सपर्ट्स जरूर होंगे वे। तो उसके बाद अगर हम कुछ कहते, जो हमारी समझ में गलत होता उसके ऊपर कहते तो ज्यादा सही था। यद्यपि एक वाक्य में मैं यह जरूर कह दूँ कि जिस प्रकार एजुकेशन कमीशन काम कर रहा है उससे मैं बहुत संतुष्ट नहीं हूँ क्योंकि मैं अपने खुद के, पर्सनल, अनुभव से कहना चाहती हूँ कि अभी जब एजुकेशन कमीशन जयपुर गया था तो वहाँ पर मुझे मालूम नहीं यूनीवर्सिटी वालों से, किससे मिला क्योंकि मैं यूनीवर्सिटी में प्रारम्भ से सीनेट की तथा सिन्डीकेट की कई वर्षों से सदस्या हूँ और मुझे नहीं मालूम कि सिन्डीकेट के मेम्बरस से भी नहीं मिला तो कैसे उसने यूनीवर्सिटी के बारे में जांच की है कि क्या उममें सुधार होना चाहिये। मुझे उसके बारे में कोई निमंत्रण नहीं था। तो मुझे नहीं मालूम कि एजुकेशन कमीशन वहाँ गया तो वह किससे मिला, कैसे उसने फैक्ट्स फाइंड किये। खैर, यह बात दूसरी है, यह तो मैंने यूं ही कह दिया, मैंने आपसे कहा भी कि उसके लिये यह समय अनुकूल नहीं है।

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

दूसरी बात मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह जो इन्टरमीडिएट कोर्स प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी की बजाय रखने के लिये कहा गया है, मेरे खयाल से यह प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी भी एक बीच का स्टेप गेप अरेंजमेंट, बीच की व्यवस्था, की गई है जब तक कि सब हाई स्कूल हायर सेकेन्डरी और मल्टीपरपज स्कूल कम्पलीट नहीं हो जाते हैं। इन्टरमीडिएट के बारे में बहुत वर्षों से यह हो रहा था कि इसको हटाया जाना चाहिये क्योंकि न तो यह स्कूल में था और न यूनीवर्सिटी में था, इस पर खर्चा भी बहुत होता था और इस पर किसी का नियंत्रण नहीं था, इसलिये इन्टरमीडिएट को हटाने की बात वर्षों से चल रही है। मैं आपको याद दिलाऊँ कि 1917 में बंगाल ने एक कमीशन नियुक्त किया था जिसने यह तय किया था कि थ्री-ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स होना चाहिए—वह बाद में नहीं चल सका यह बात दूसरी है। उसके बाद 1941 में दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी ने थ्री-ईयर डिग्री कोर्स अपनी यूनीवर्सिटी में प्रारम्भ कर ही दिया और वह आज तक चल रहा है।

इसके आगे हम जायें तो मैं आपको बताऊँ कि कितना इसके ऊपर विचार किया गया है। मैंने कई रिपोर्टें पढ़ीं। 1944 से बराबर इस पर निश्चय होता रहा कि यूनीवर्सिटी डिग्री कोर्स कितने साल का होना चाहिये, इन्टरमीडियेट होना चाहिये या नहीं, स्कूल के बाद किस प्रकार के कोर्सेज होने चाहिये और सभी आयोगों ने और कमेटियों ने, सबने यही कहा कि थ्री-ईयर डिग्री कोर्स होना चाहिये। 1944 में केन्द्रीय सलाहकार समिति ने भी यही निश्चय किया कि हमें थ्री-ईयर डिग्री कोर्स करना चाहिये। उसके बाद, स्वतंत्रता के बाद, हमारे आज के राष्ट्रपति डा० राधाकृष्णन की अध्यक्षता में जब यूनीवर्सिटी कमीशन बनाया गया उससे भी यही कहा गया था कि स्वतंत्रता के बाद हमको किस प्रकार की यूनीवर्सिटी एजुकेशन बच्चों को देनी चाहिये

और उसमें हमें क्या-क्या तब्दीलियाँ करनी हैं इस पर विचार करके रिपोर्ट दे। उस यूनीवर्सिटी कमीशन ने 1948-49 में जो रिपोर्ट दी है उसमें कहा है :

"To suit future requirements of the country, the institution of a three-year continuous degree course at the completion of twelve years of schooling or its equivalent, i.e., after the passing of a qualifying test which would correspond to the present Intermediate standard."

उसके बाद एक सेकेन्डरी एजुकेशन कमेटी मुदालियर साहब की अध्यक्षता में 1953 में बनाई गई। उसमें भी उन्होंने बहुत विचार विनिमय करने के बाद अपनी रिपोर्ट दी कि :

"The reorganisation of the first Degree course in Indian Universities was an essential corollary of the reorganisation of Secondary education in the country. The present Intermediate stage should be replaced by the Higher Secondary course which should be of four years' duration, one year of the present Intermediate being included in it and the first Degree course in the University should be of three years' duration."

फिर, इसके बाद भी, छानबीन करने के लिये केन्द्रीय शिक्षा समिति ने एक सर्वे कमेटी 1953 में बनाई, उसकी भी रिपोर्ट यही है। मेरे पास शायद समय कम होगा इसलिये मैं अधिक नहीं पढ़ूँगी। फिर वाइस-चान्सलर्स आफ यूनीवर्सिटीज और चेयरमैन आफ दी बोर्ड की जो कमेटी बैठी थी 8 जनवरी, 1955 को उसने भी यही कहा कि :

"There should be a Higher Secondary Course continued up to the age of 17 followed by a three-year integrated course leading to the Bachelor's Degree."

इसके बाद इन्टर-यूनीवर्सिटी बोर्ड पटना में 25 जनवरी, 1955 में मिला। तब भी यह निश्चय हुआ कि थ्री-ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स होना

चाहिये। फिर केन्द्रीय शिक्षा सलाहकार समिति 18-19 जनवरी, 1956 में मिली, उसने भी सर्वे कमेटी का समर्थन किया। 1956 में एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर्स की कान्फ्रेंस हुई, उन लोगों ने भी यह तय किया कि यह थ्री-ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स हम सब लोग स्वीकार करते हैं और यह होना चाहिये। इसके ऊपर एक एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी बनाई गई, यह तय करने के लिये कि इसमें क्या खर्चा होगा और किस तरह से काम किया जायगा, किस तरह से योजना बने ताकि वह बच्चों के लिये हितकर हो, विद्यार्थियों के लिये हितकर हो। उस एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट जो 1957 में हमारे सामने आई उसमें इन्टरमीडिएट के बारे में बहुत साफ शब्दों में लिखा है जो मैं थोड़ा सा पढ़ कर सुना दूँ।

"The main defect in the above arrangement has been that the two halves—the Intermediate and the post-Intermediate—are usually unrelated to each other academically and sometimes even administratively, as for instance, when the Intermediate classes are under the jurisdiction of a separate Board. Such a lack of correlation has been on the increase in recent years as, owing to paucity of funds, purely Intermediate colleges have been started in large numbers. Besides, the Intermediate examination, coming as it does in the middle of the Degree course, breaks the continuity of University instruction, thus making it impossible for the University to offer a compact, comprehensive and integrated course for the first Degree. The student, on his part, has to waste a considerable time in adjusting himself twice to new courses and often to new colleges. It has also been felt that the number of examinations which a student has to take prior to obtaining the first Degree (three at present) is too many and that there is often a long interval between the students' passing the Intermediate examination and his admission to third year class which is so much additional waste of time."

तो एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी ने भी इन्टरमीडिएट कोर्स के खिलाफ कहा है।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं एक बात और आपसे कहना चाहती हूँ कि अभी हमारे यहाँ यह थ्री-ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स शुरू हुए, बहुत कम समय हुआ है और सारी स्टेड्स में यह हुआ भी नहीं है। हम जब किसी चीज को शुरू करते हैं, प्रारम्भ करते हैं तो कितनी छानबीन के बाद करते हैं—इतने बोर्ड बना कर, सर्वे कमेटी बना कर, सलाहकार समिति बना कर एक-एक बात निश्चय करते हैं कि कहीं कुछ रह न जाय और पिछले कई वर्षों में जितने आयोग वगैरह बने उन्होंने बड़ी छानबीन की—फिर भी हम यहाँ पर एक प्रस्ताव ले आते हैं कि इसको हटा कर इन्टरमीडिएट फिर शुरू कर दें। यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। मैं खुद मानती हूँ कि शिक्षा का स्तर गिरता चला जा रहा है। शिक्षा का स्तर बढ़ना देश हित के लिये सबसे आवश्यक चीज है, मगर शिक्षा का स्तर गिरने का कारण उसको मैं कभी नहीं मानती हूँ। मैंने "आन ए प्वाइन्ट आफ इन्फार्मेशन" प्रस्तावक महोदय से पूछा था कि जहाँ इन्टरमीडिएट है क्या वहाँ शिक्षा का स्तर ऊँचा उठ रहा है या नोचा है? मुझे कोई उत्तर नहीं मिला। मगर उत्तर न देने के मानी "भौनम् सम्मति लक्षणम्" मैं मानती हूँ—चुप रहने के माने यह थे कि नहीं बढ़ा। और यह बात सही है कि देश में शायद कोई प्रान्त ऐसा नहीं है जहाँ इन्टरमीडिएट हो या हायर सेकेण्डरी एजुकेशन हो जहाँ आजकल शिक्षा का स्तर बढ़ा है। इसके कई कारण हैं। मैं आपको बताना चाहती हूँ कि यूनीवर्सिटी टीचर्स के वेतन में काफी वृद्धि हुई है और मैं उससे बहुत खुश हूँ और मैं सोचती हूँ कि शिक्षा का आदर किया गया है, यह मैं नहीं कहती कि इसके आगे उसमें बढ़ोत्तरी की गुंजायश है कि नहीं। है, मगर मैं इसके बारे में इस वक्त कुछ नहीं कहना चाहती हूँ। पर हायर सेकेण्डरी स्कूल टीचर्स का वेतन बहुत कम है। मैं यहाँ तक कहने को तैयार हूँ कि यहाँ दिल्ली के चपरायियों को जितना मिलता है—मैं नहीं कहती कि चपरायियों को बहुत ज्यादा मिलता है—उसका आधा मैट्रिक पास, पढ़े-

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

लिखे अध्यापको को मिलता है जो मिडिल-क्लास कहलाते हैं और जिनको मिडिल-क्लास की तरह से अपना स्तर भी रखना पड़ता है, अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाना-लिखाना पड़ता है और कुछ समाज में अपना रिश्ता रखना ही पड़ता है। वे बेचारे कैसे रोटी खाएँ, कैसे बच्चों को पढ़ा सकें, यह सोचने की बात है। उनकी शोचनीय दशा है। इसीलिये जैसा कि कहा गया, वे प्राइवेट ट्यूशन में ज्यादा इन्टरेस्ट लेते हैं। आपको यह भी मालूम है कि स्कूलों में जाने वाले बच्चे आजकल जो निजी क्लास चलाते हैं वहाँ जाने में ज्यादा इन्टरेस्ट लेते हैं क्योंकि वे जानते हैं कि वहाँ जाने से हम परीक्षा में पास हो जायेंगे। आज के विद्यार्थी का उद्देश्य पास होना है। तो यह चीज हमको दूर करनी है। वह इन्टरमीडिएट को बदलने से कतई दूर होने वाली नहीं है।

3 P M

अगर आप कहे कि किसी के पैर में किसी जगह कोई तकलीफ हो गई है तो उसका पैर काटकर फेंक दिया जाय, तो उससे तकलीफ दूर होने वाली नहीं है। पैर पर अगर किसी जगह कोई घाव हो जाता है तो उसका इलाज करना चाहिये न कि पैर को काटकर फेंक देना चाहिये। हमें तो रोग का इलाज करना चाहिये ताकि वह ठीक हो सके। अगर आप शिक्षा की प्रणाली को फिर बदलना चाहते हैं तो हम लोग फिर हसी के पात्र बन जायेंगे। लोग सोचेंगे कि भारत सरकार ने पहले तीन साल डिग्री कोर्स का फैसला किया और अब वह 5-7 साल बाद फिर इन्टरमीडिएट कोर्स लाना चाहती है। इसके माने यह है कि उसको असली रोग का पता नहीं है। असली रोग का अगर पता लगाना है तो उसको इस बात पर ध्यान देना चाहिये कि हमारे देश में शिक्षा का स्तर क्यों गिरता जा रहा है और इस चीज का पता लगाना सरकार का काम है। यह ठीक है कि आपने इस बारे में कमीशन और कमेटी बनाई है और वह जरूर कुछ न कुछ पता लगाकर रहेगी लेकिन

हम सभी को अपनी तरफ से इस बारे में पता लगाना चाहिये। इसके साथ ही साथ सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि इस समय जो हमारा शिक्षा का स्तर गिर गया है उसको किस तरह से ऊँचा किया जाय, इस पर ध्यान दे।

इसके साथ ही मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि आजकल स्कूलों में बच्चों को इतनी किताबें दे दी जाती हैं कि उसका बोझा तक नहीं उठा पाते। उन्हें स्कूलों के लिए भारी-भारी किताबों का बस्ता ले जाना पड़ता है। अगर उनसे स्कूल के बाद आकर पूछा जाय कि तुमने आज क्या पढ़ा तो वे कुछ जवाब नहीं दे सकते हैं। बच्चों के लिए इतनी ज्यादा किताबें खरीदना मुश्किल है परन्तु स्कूलों की लाइब्रेरी में किताबों के सबंध में बहुत कम सुविधा विद्यार्थियों को प्राप्त होती है। स्कूलों में ट्रेन्ड टीचरों की बहुत कमी है और इसके साथ ही साथ और भी बहुत-सी बातें हैं जिनके बारे में छानबीन करने की जरूरत है तथा उन्हें दुरुस्त करने की आवश्यकता है। मैं इस सबंध में जो खाम बाँत कहना चाहती हूँ वह शिक्षा के स्तर के बारे में है जोकि बहुत गिर रहा है और जिसके बारे में ज्यादा रिसर्च करने की जरूरत है। मैं नहीं जानती कि एजुकेशन बोर्ड इस बारे में इतनी रिसर्च कर पायेगा या नहीं। यह बात तो भविष्य ही बतलायेगा। हाँ, एक बात की जरूर मुझे खुशी है और उसे मैं कई बार दोहरा चुकी हूँ और मैं केन्द्रीय शिक्षा के मामले में किसी व्यक्ति की बात नहीं कहना चाहती हूँ लेकिन मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहती हूँ कि अब शिक्षा को ऊँचा उठाने का पूरा-पूरा प्रयत्न हो रहा है जोकि पिछले वर्षों में नहीं हुआ था। मैं बगैर नाम लिये यह बतला सकती हूँ कि पिछले शिक्षा मंत्री जी ने जो तीन साल का डिग्री कोर्स किया था तो मुझे मालूम नहीं कि वह सब की भावनाओं में आकर किया था? इससे कुछ दिन पहले उन्होंने मुझसे यह कहा था कि मैं इसके पक्ष में नहीं हूँ और मैं नहीं चाहता कि तीन साल का डिग्री कोर्स हो,

क्योंकि सब लोग कह रहे हैं इसलिए हम इसको कर रहे हैं। यहाँ पर सब चीज कहना तो गलत हीगा लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि जो कुछ हो गया वह तो हो गया। तीन साल का जो डिग्री कोर्स शुरू किया गया वह आयोग, कमेटीयाँ और लोगों की सलाह से शुरू किया गया और अब हमें उसे सुधारने का पूरा-पूरा प्रयत्न करना चाहिये ताकि वह सचमुच में एक ऐसी शिक्षा बन सके जिससे हमारे बच्चे फायदा उठा सकें।

अभी हमारे श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने इस संबंध में कुछ बातें कहीं और मेरे ख्याल में उन्होंने इंटरमीडिएट, हायर सेकेण्डरी या प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी के बारे में कोई बात नहीं कही। उन्होंने तो एक राजनीतिक भाषण दिया कि सरकार यह नहीं कर पा रही है और हमेशा की तरह उन्होंने एक स्टेटमेंट दिया तथा कोई नई बात नहीं कही। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में यह कहा कि यह गवर्नमेंट लायक नहीं है और यह कुछ नहीं कर पा रही है। अब मैं नहीं कह सकती कि यदि उनकी गवर्नमेंट आ जाय तो वह क्या करेगी और क्या स्वर्ग को उतार कर पृथ्वी पर रख देगी। उनके भाषण से यह पता नहीं चलता था कि वे इंटरमीडिएट या प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी के पक्ष में हैं या विपक्ष में हैं और उनकी बातों का जवाब देना मैं उचित भी नहीं समझती हूँ।

हमारे प्रस्तावक महोदय ने जो उल्टी-सीधी बात कही कि प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी की व्यवस्था उचित मालूम नहीं देती है, मेरा तो ख्याल है कि हायर सेकेण्डरी एजुकेशन को एक कम्पलीट एजुकेशन बना देना चाहिये ताकि अगर कोई हायर सेकेण्डरी एजुकेशन के बाद आगे डिग्री शिक्षा के लिए किसी मकसद के लिये जाना चाहता है तो जाय, वरना उसको जाने की जरूरत ही न पड़े और साथ ही साथ यूनिवर्सिटीज और कालेजों में भी भीड़ न हो और इन्टरोलमेंट के लिए भी नाराजगी न हो कि हमें जगह नहीं मिली। हायर सेकेण्डरी शिक्षा को मल्टीपरपज के रूप में

बना दिया जाना चाहिये चाहे वह बायलॉजी के लिए हो, क्राफ्ट के लिए हो या मैथमैटिक्स के लिए हो और सिर्फ वही लोग कालेज या यूनीवर्सिटी में जायेंगे जो किसी टेक्निकल लाइन में जाना चाहते हों और बाकी जितने विद्यार्थी हैं उन्हें हायर सेकेण्डरी तक ही पढ़ाया जाय। ऐसा कानून बना दिया जाय जिसमें no intermediate whether it is one year or two years between Higher Secondary and degree education. मेरा इतना ही निवेदन है और इसके बाद मैं समाप्त करती हूँ।

SHRI D. B. DESAI (Maharashtra) : Madam Deputy Chairman, the Resolution gives us a good opportunity to discuss certain aspects of higher education. I can to a certain extent agree that there was no need of this Resolution as an Education Commission has been appointed and is actually touring the country. But I feel also that there is a real necessity to discuss the various aspects of education in this House as well as outside it, in the academic as well as non-academic field.

If we consider the aspect of standard of education in the present day educational activity of the country, first we will have to consider what is the meaning of standard in education because, when the Macaulay education system was introduced in this country, the expectation of the authorities of the Government was that a number of official posts were to be filled up and they wanted the personnel or the people who can take up the responsibility of the civil administration in the country, and the education standard was fixed or the curriculum was decided to satisfy the needs of the Government. I may say that the elder generation of today has been taught in the same manner as when the Macaulay system prevailed. If those people were asked to determine the standard of education of the present-day younger generation, they will automatically think or feel that when a fourth standard boy or a boy of the matriculation standard was up to a particular standard in previous days, he is not so now. That means academically that a boy who passed his matriculation previous to 1947 was superior to the S.S.C. boy of today only in some academic field. But we must blame ourselves, or the Government must blame themselves that in the

[SHRI D. B. DESAI]

last eighteen years they have not yet determined the exact nature of education or the purpose of education. In previous days education was not a real governmental activity. Every individual was a student up to his last days.

He could study all sciences, he could study all arts, he could study anything as he liked. But now what is the position? Now the entire student community of the younger generation is asked to learn what is taught in the schools, in the high schools and in the colleges, nothing more. If at all he has to learn something more which is to his liking, there may not be facility or there may not be any encouragement from the society itself. The present standard of education has to cope with the official requirements of the Government or the economy of the country. I can say that every educated youth—of course, a majority, I can say—is employed in some sort of service. The educated youth is not encouraged to take to independent profession, independent research or independent industry. We cannot find agricultural graduates working in agricultural farms. (*Interruptions.*) But I know that you are a politician, not an agriculturist. We cannot find a scientist working independently in the laboratory. We cannot find a mathematician working in the various fields according to his science. That means that the entire purpose of this educational system is still what it was in Macaulay's time, that is, to fill in the gaps or to fill in the number in the officialdom of the Government or industry or banking or other things. None of the other fields are taken up by the educated youth or educated people.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) :
Law.

SHRI D. B. DESAI : I do not call it a real profession.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why not?

SHRI D. B. DESAI : I am a lawyer myself. Take for instance law, medicine and other things.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) :
They are unemployed.

SHRI D. B. DESAI : It might be put in any case. I think that the educated youth

must be encouraged to take to higher learning which may be conducive to his educational or academic capacity.

I was pressing home the point that the present standard on the present educational system is still in that particular psychological spirit of Macaulay. I would urge upon the hon. Members here and the country that we must take out the entire educational system, we must revolutionise the entire educational outlook, which will be helpful for the development of the society or the economic conditions or the social conditions or the cultural conditions of the country. So, the Education Commission should be entrusted—and I know that it is entrusted—with the basic task of advising about the educational activity of the country so as to satisfy the needs of the society.

The point that has been introduced for discussion by this Resolution is that uniform standards must be there. What are uniform standards? We have no definition as such. Last year, "The Education Quarterly", a bulletin published by the Government of India (Education Ministry), had organised a seminar on the standards of education. The problem before it was whether the standard of education was falling, and a number of participants in that seminar had categorically stated that there was no standard that had been fixed. So, you cannot fix a standard for an educated youth because we can think of academic standards, we can think of cultural standards of a student, we can think of the physical standards of a student, we can think of the standard of social behaviour of a student. Now, the students are taking part in politics, sometimes they are leading the entire nation and perhaps we may feel that the standard of the students for discipline, for respect to the elders and for respect to law and order is falling. So, what is the standard? If at all we have to consider the academic standard, there is also confusion, there is no standard because in some of the States there is the SSC course, 10-year course up to the secondary stage. In some other States there is the 11-year course up to the secondary stage. In previous days, before 1948 I believe, there was the matriculation examination. It was conducted by the university. It was a sort of entrance examination to the university. Now there is an examination

conducted by the Governments under the auspices of the various SSC or SSLC Boards. As Shri Reddy was telling us in the morning, there also some 50 per cent. or 40 per cent. of the students are sacked. Then comes the pre-University examination. There also some 60 per cent. are sacked, and what is called the cream in the academic standard is brought forward for the three-year degree course. I may just request the Minister of Education to ascertain the academic standard of the students of present day. He will see that the graduate of today cannot write a single simple sentence correctly.

Miss MARY NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): In English.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: I may say, even in Hindi. A graduate of a Hindi university is not in a position to write correct language, write correctly one sentence in his own language. According to the Education Ministry or the university or the University Grants Commission, the students are expected to know the language but to what extent can they converse in English, to what extent can they write in good, simple language? If they want to learn English for higher studies, they can take to post-graduate courses and thus they can go in for higher studies. Even in regard to science taught at the primary stage, at the secondary stage and at the college stage, there are gaps and these gaps are not recognised. The same is the case with history, the same is the case with mathematics. These gaps should be removed. For instance, at the primary stage, up till the fourth standard the student is expected to study various types of calculations, that is, sums, subtractions but no multiplication. But at the higher stages, he does not know this mathematics, and has to jump to another level, the college level, and he has to learn solid geometry and others. So, Madam, unless these gaps are removed, there cannot be even academic standards. I may say that just introducing an Intermediate standard or abolishing the pre-University stage is a question of curriculum, of syllabus, Government must have a scientific syllabus taking into consideration the capacity of the student to learn at a particular age level, and that syllabus will help the youth to take to education step by step up to the higher standard.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to my friend, Mr. Reddy, for introducing this motion for it has resulted in a very useful and interesting debate though I do not agree with the terms of the Resolution and I will explain, why. He has diagnosed the disease, but, I am afraid, the remedy he has prescribed is not a remedy that will cure the patient. If anything, it will accelerate his end. Therefore, we have really to find out what the causes of the disease are.

Now, I agree with everybody here that unfortunately the standards of higher education are falling. My hon. friend just said that today a graduate cannot even write a correct sentence of English or of Hindi. It is a very sad commentary on the state of education in this country. I do not go to that length. But I agree that the standard has fallen. The graduate of today has not the same high standard that the graduate had 15 or 20 years ago.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): But the best graduates of today are better than the best graduates of yesterday.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: If you take the top level, they are. I agree with Mr. Sapru. The most brilliant graduates or the most brilliant M.As. or the most brilliant Doctors in any subject, they are better than the similarly educated people of yesterday. But the average level has fallen. I think my friend, Mr. Sapru, will agree with me. Now, what are the causes?

I think, by and large, the causes are two. One is the tremendous increase in numbers. Today we have $1\frac{1}{2}$ million students studying in the universities. Compare that with the situation before independence when a university had 3,000 or 4,000 students, a fair number of professors and teachers who could give individual attention to the students. Today with this tremendous expansion—in a sense we welcome it—the standards have fallen. The other reason is that the students enter the university unprepared for university life. They are immature. They are not fit for the university life; they should still be in school. And, therefore, the solution, to my mind, is to strengthen our higher secondary education. As one of the hon. Members said, that is the crucial sector in our education. Now, Madam, if this Resolution

[Shri M. C. Chagla.]

were to be accepted, it would be, to my mind, a very retrograde step in education. Today 46 universities have agreed to have a three-year degree course. We have in all 61 universities.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: In concurrence with the Academic Councils also. I think the matter has been discussed about the three-year degree course in the Academic Councils of these universities.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Forty-six universities have agreed to a three-year degree course. What my hon. friend's Resolution suggests is that we should go back to a system whereby we will have two years for Intermediate and two years for the degree course. Now, the objection to that system is obvious. We want an integrated three-year degree course in the universities instead of a system of training which would split up the degree course into two, and this has been as one hon. Member pointed out, recommended by academic bodies for a number of years. I do not want to take up the time of the House by reading out the resolutions of various Committees, Commissions, the University Grants Commission and so on. But it is almost unanimously agreed by all academic bodies that we should have a three-year degree course.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Except the U.P. universities.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Uttar Pradesh is unique in many ways.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In what ways?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: The idea is to strengthen the secondary schools. It is also agreed that as an ultimate objective we should have in all a 15 years' course leading up to the first degree course, 12 years in school and three years for the first degree course. We have not reached that objective in most places. Even Delhi has actually 11 years' school course and a years' degree course, and we have agreed that for the time being that should be the pattern, 11 years in school and 3 years for the first degree course. But what is important is not so much the number of years.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: It will be better to have 12 years.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I agree. That is the objective. We have laid down 12 plus 3, but we have not yet reached that. That is exactly what I was saying. All the authorities have said that we should have 12 years' schooling and 3 years' degree in a university, and that a student should not enter a university before he is 17. Today a boy of 14 or 15 is entering a university. There is no age limit. It is unheard of in any European or American university that a student should enter a university before he is 18. Take Oxford or Cambridge. He will not be admitted before he is 18. Here a boy or a girl can join it at 13, 14 or 15 when he is a raw, callow boy not ready to take advantage, to receive the benefit of university education. But as I was saying, the emphasis has to be placed not on the system, not on the number of years, but on the content of education. That is the most important thing. All our Education Ministers' Conferences have been emphasising that before the student enters the university, he should have received in school a training which corresponds to the training which he received up to the Intermediate standard in the olden days. But that training should be given to him in school, not in university.

It has also been pointed out that you are wasting the monies of the university, you are wasting the time of the professors by making them teach boys who should be taught in school and not in the university. And that is the main objection also to the pre-University course. But the answer is not the two-year Intermediate system. The answer is to do away with the pre-University course and to strengthen the higher secondary schools. Now, in the last Education Ministers' Conference which I attended, it was agreed by all the Education Ministers that the pre-University course is a temporary measure. Ultimately it will be done away with, and it will be transferred to the secondary schools. We in the Ministry have been giving special assistance to schools which are converting themselves from secondary schools to higher secondary schools. In Delhi, all the schools are higher secondary. From the school the boy or the girl goes straight to the university. Therefore, our objective in education is to have a school curriculum, to have a school course, which will fit

and equip the boy or the girl for the university. I am not in favour of the pre-University course at all. But what has been pointed out to me by many of the Education Ministers, by many of the States, is that a boy or a girl leaves the school before he or she is ready for the university. Therefore, this system of pre-University has been devised. But that is not a satisfactory system. What should be done is to strengthen the secondary education to transfer this pre-University course to the secondary school, and the school should have a first class secondary education which will, as I said, fit the boy or the girl for the university.

Now, I agree also with Shrimati Bhargava that higher secondary education should be such that it should be self-contained. It should be terminal in nature and many boys and girls need not go to the universities at all—they should finish the higher secondary school either academically, or through multi-purpose school learn some art or craft or some vocation. Today the position in India is that every boy and girl wants to go to university . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Because there is no alternative.

SHRI N. PATRA: There is no alternative for them now . . .

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Therefore our duty is to supply fresh avenues to these boys and girls and that is what we are working for, to set up multi-purpose schools, to set up junior technical schools, to set up more agricultural schools so that the only objective and target that a boy and girl should have should not be for a B.A. degree. There is too much status symbol about the B.A. degree and in a way I blame the Government for it because for every job that is advertised, the first qualification that is laid down is that one must be a graduate and therefore everybody wants to be a graduate. So what I would ask my hon. friend who has moved this Resolution is to emphasise, not the two year Intermediate course but rather to emphasise the importance of strengthening our secondary education or to improve the quality of our secondary education.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Can we ever do it? If that is the case, all the

present secondary schools have to be converted into higher secondary schools. There are lakhs of them, and in many high schools even the equipment are not available, as they are at present constituted. Is there any possibility within the near future to convert them?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As far as expense is concerned, I do not see the difference between converting secondary to higher secondary schools and having the system of two-year Intermediate course. Except in U.P., hardly any State has this system and we have asked U.P. to change it but because the expense is tremendous, they say: 'Let us continue with this'. I have not the figure but I can give it to the hon. Member that many high schools have been converted into higher secondary schools and gradually more and more are being converted into higher secondary schools. Therefore, the emphasis that this House should put, and I entirely accept that such an emphasis should be placed, is to ask to improve the standard and quality of secondary education. That is the vital, crucial sector of our education.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: The Education Minister stated regarding the disease and regarding the diagnosis and also the medicine or cure for it. The point is, if at all we want to convert the present system, if we want to strengthen the present secondary education, what are the means that are adopted by the Government and whether in the Fourth Plan we are going to have such sort of schemes whereby we shall be in a position to convert the various schools into what we can call the terminal schools whereby the students will be in a position to have some sort of vocation or employment opportunity?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: We certainly are trying to do that but the main thing we are doing in the Fourth Plan is to have more and more terminal courses for boys and girls.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And also age-limit.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes, also the age-limit. But what is important is that every boy and girl should not think of going to the university. Personally I would like to divert fifty per cent. of the boys

[Shri M. C. Chagla.]

and girls who are going to university to these vocational, technical, multi-purpose, post-basic—whatever you like to call—schools so that their education should be terminating with the higher secondary and leading to some vocation instead of adding to the number of educated unemployed. It will take time but that is our goal and our target, and we are going to push ahead with it in the Fourth Plan.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : With the possibility of improving their educational standard as they get settled in life ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Yes. They can have refresher courses, we can have summer schools and I would also provide that even though a child may go to a vocational or technical school or multi-purpose school, there should be courses so adjusted that if he or she changes the vocation, he or she can go to the university. I do not want to shut the door to anybody for higher education but let us realise that everybody is not fitted for university life and yet they are driven to the colleges because they have no other avenue.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat) : How would you send them out ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : If you send them to multi-purpose and technical schools, if you watch their aptitudes, if they know that they can do something with their hands, with their talent, it is possible. Everybody has a talent. Unfortunately, we have not been able to discover the talent or to make use of it. The paramount duty of an educationist is to discover the talent of a child and to give a full opportunity to that talent and that is how the educational system should be built up.

I also agree—now we have the Education Commission sitting—that this Resolution—if I might say so, though I disagree with it—is rather premature, but I can assure my hon. friend that a copy of the proceedings will be sent to the Education Commission and they will benefit greatly by what the hon. Members have said.

Turning to my friend Mr. Gupta, he did not speak on the Resolution but he spoke on many other matters of great importance and he spoke about teachers. Mr. Gupta

knows—I have said it publicly, I have said it in Parliament—that teachers are very badly paid in our country. I have every sympathy for them. I am prepared to do anything that I can but let him remember that education is a State Subject and not a Union Subject. Even so, the Central Government has offered 50 per cent. aid to every State for improving the salaries of the teachers and some of the States have not been able to avail themselves of this help because they have not the money, but may I say this to Mr. Gupta that if he has any influence with the teachers, whether primary or secondary . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : He has none.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : . . . whether college or university, he must impress upon them that the last people in India, who should go in for direct action or for strike, are the teachers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No. Will he yield ? As he says, I have no influence. That is beside the point. Now today, for example, the secondary school teachers in West Bengal are marching to the Assembly. By now they will have reached. I have not influenced them. They have been driven to that position. Just now I have signed a statement supporting a demand of the college and university teachers who want their salaries upgraded and they want your help. They are boycotting the examination. What are you going to do ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I have persuaded them—the university and college people who came in deputation day before yesterday—and I took an assurance from them that they would give up this threat to boycott the examination and they have agreed. I have . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do not applaud. I advised them that they should meet you.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : But I pointed out to them that if they wanted discipline among students, they should be disciplined themselves first. How can you expect discipline among the students if our teachers themselves take to direct action and boycott the examinations ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is not direct action. I have the papers coming from them which are distributed to Members of Parliament and others. They say that they had waited for four years and the State Government would not implement even the recommendations of educational and other bodies set up by the U.G.C. or through the U.G.C. or by the Government. What are they to do ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Whatever else they may do but they must not resort to direct action. That is the last thing that a teacher should do. That is my advice and I am very glad that the teachers and professors of Bengal who came and saw me have accepted my advice and they have called off. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What have you given them ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I have told them that their demands will be sympathetically considered and I will do what I can for them but I will refuse to look at their demand if they go in for direct action.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is a threat. What was the need for saying this : 'I will refuse to look at your demand' ? The Education Minister should not function like the Home Minister. That is what I say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let the Education Minister finish his speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But I do not like his saying 'I would not look at your demand if you do this'. They came with their demands; they say : 'We have been driven to that position'. What is the use of giving a threat ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I met them for at least an hour.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I would request my friend to at least spare the teachers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But it was said I have no influence on them.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Let every section of the society do what it likes—I am not responsible—but if in India teachers take to direct action and boycotting, I

think there is the end of education and end of democracy in this country . . .

Well, Madam, I do not want to take any more time, but I would request my hon. friend not to press this Resolution, because it has served the purpose for which he tabled it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I wanted to ask the Education Minister and that was in connection with uniformity of standards. Now I have heard a great deal about the desirability of having uniform standards. And is it really necessary for us to have uniform standards ? After all, in the United States they have got over two thousand or three thousand institutions of varying degrees of efficiency. And what does it matter if there is some variation in the standard here ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I would only like to say this. In fact, the University Grants Commission has appointed a standards committee, which has yet to report, but it is very difficult for me to understand how. With every university being autonomous, every university having the right to select its own professors, appoint its own examiners, you can have common standards. It depends upon every university—a university maintains high standards, gets the best professors. Even in India today you can name four or five universities which are first-class. There are others which are very bad. How is that ? It is because those universities which are good have the best professors, have high examining standards, and so on, and in this connection I may say that we are seriously considering whether for the Honours Degree we should not have a four-year course rather than three years—we are just thinking about it. It may be that one way out of the difficulty would be to have the present three years for the pass course and add one more year to the Honours Degree course.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Or have three years for B.A. and three years for M.A.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Well, these are all suggestions which are being looked into and which the University Grants Commission will examine.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now that the dialogue between the former Judges is

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

over, I may ask the former Chief Justice—now Education Minister—whether he is in touch with the representatives of the secondary school teachers or the other teachers in Calcutta, who are now in the midst of an agitation to which they had been forced, so that he can help them also.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Well, anybody . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Because I have given notice of a motion, you will be expected to make a statement next week. Therefore I just remind you in time in the name of the secondary and primary school teachers . . .

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : But I have been telling all the teachers in those States that our offer is open, we are prepared to pay 50 per cent. of whatever the State will spend on increasing their emoluments. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You can do more.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : We cannot do more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The States say that they do not have enough financial resources. They expect also the Centre to give them adequate help.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Adequate help is 50 per cent. My hon. friend must remember that I am only the Education Minister, not the Finance Minister, I cannot write cheques, and the only thing I had been able to persuade the Finance Minister is to agree to this 50 per cent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In the name of the teachers and their cause, let us all join, sign a memorandum and place a common demand before the Finance Minister.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : My friend should give up his hostility to the State Governments, develop good relations with them and persuade them to spend 50 per cent.

DR. SHRIMATI PHULRENU GUHA (West Bengal) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I have listened to the Education Minister very carefully, but I think there is still some scope to discuss the Resolu-

tion. I thank the mover of the Resolution for giving us an opportunity to speak on a subject which is vital for the country, and particularly this Resolution deals with the young and coming generation, without whose help the country cannot progress. If we want our country to go ahead, we must consider very carefully the present standard and scope of primary and secondary education. Unless primary and secondary education are sound we cannot expect good education in colleges.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND CHAND) in the Chair]

It is very good to have a good new system, a new plan, and I would like to point out that it is not very difficult to draw up a good plan but it is not always very easy to implement the plan, particularly when many factors are involved in executing the plan. Higher secondary schools have been established in small towns and Sub-Divisions, but it is very difficult to get qualified teachers, particularly for technical and science courses.

There are a number of schools without teachers. Even when teachers are appointed, it often happens that they leave off the course after a few months and it becomes very difficult for the management to arrange for teaching the courses. It is also very difficult for the students to learn the subjects. You can easily understand it. When there is no teacher in the class, how can we expect the students to be disciplined? There are a number of instances where boxes containing equipment for science and technology courses could not be opened for a long time due to the absence of the teachers who can handle them. What I would like to place before the House is that unless we have a number of good teachers who can take up the teaching in the schools we cannot expect good results. And to get good teachers, higher salaries have got to be fixed and paid. It is not as if only secondary schools are to be considered. The question is linked up with primary schools also and with the question of the salary of primary school teachers also. The basis of college education is the primary and secondary education. Unless there is improvement in our primary and secondary education and there are better salaries paid to these teachers,

we cannot expect better education in our colleges.

I wish the Government had started this three-year degree course in a more systematic way. The question of primary schools and high schools should have been settled first also the question of the salaries of the teachers and the availability of teachers, equipment, books and so on. These should have been taken into consideration before starting this course and having money for building. It is quite easy to get money for the building, but it is very difficult to get good teachers. We should not take up a scheme which can be successful only in towns or cities. We must remember that the majority of our people are still living in villages and they will continue to do so in the future also. Therefore, whatever plans are drawn up, we should first consider the conditions in the villages and the plans should be drawn up accordingly. The Government can sanction the schools and give money for the building. But wherefrom are the teachers to come? It is not un-natural that a qualified person should like to have the same salary as his friends are getting in other services. Unless the salaries of the teachers are attractive we cannot expect that bright young persons will join the secondary schools. Even if they join, after some time they leave off the schools and go to other jobs.

Of course, it must be admitted that in spite of low salaries there are brilliant educationists in both primary and secondary schools. But we must remember that the days are hard and more and more difficult days are ahead. Therefore I say we cannot get good teachers in the future unless we make the conditions of the teachers better.

Another point that I would like to place before the House is that after passing the school final examination, the students now have to pass the pre-University course before they can join the degree course, and if you calculate the actual time available for it, you will find that it is hardly six or seven months. How can you expect the young boy or girl to study all the subjects in the pre-University course and pass the examination? Even when they pass the examination we cannot imagine that they

have a good standard. Unless there is a good standard for the pre-University student, how can you expect the standard of our college education to be good?

These are a few points that I wish to place before the hon. Minister and I would like him to consider these points along with the other points placed before the House by other hon. friends.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I find myself rather in a perplexing position. I am afraid this changeover to the three-year degree course has been so recent and so many lakhs of rupees have been spent on it that I do not think it would be wise to go back to the Intermediate system immediately. At the same time, I do feel that this so-called reform was very badly conceived and it was executed in undue haste. We have started at the wrong end. Unfortunately university education looms so large in our estimate that we think of university reform without considering the fact that you cannot have a good university without a good basis in secondary education. This reform was conceived on the idea that one year should be added to the school to make the students more fit for the university. But that was a wrong idea. It has to be admitted that the worst college in India is much better than most of the high schools in our country. Therefore, we feel that one year more at the university is much better than one year more at the school level. That was the feeling that I have always had. It is interesting to note that as far back as 1916 when the Mysore University was started, it started a very interesting experiment. It started with a three-year degree course and one year was added to the school course and a special examination was held at the end of that one year, called the entrance examination. This scheme was particularly blessed by the Sadler Commission and when they visited Mysore University, they complimented the University on it. But in actual working we found within six years that the system did not work well because one year added to the high school did not satisfy the requirements that the Government had in mind or the educationists had in mind when they proposed that scheme of the three-year degree course in Mysore. So we went back to the Intermediate course and

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

the two-year degree course. I am not sure that we may not find it necessary again to go back to the two-year Intermediate course after a few years; but I should not like to be a party to it at the present moment.

I was very, very happy to listen to the hon. Minister when he said that he recognised the fact that the secondary schools are the weakest link in our educational system and that the secondary schools must be improved and must be put on a good basis. If that is done, then the three-year degree course would be quite welcome. I entirely agree with him that the so-called pre-University course is absolutely anomalous. At best it can only be a temporary measure or a temporary stop-gap, for the simple reason that the pre-University course by itself is much too crowded. Most of the colleges admit that what is sought to be taught in one year is too much both for the students and the teachers. Therefore, the real measure of reform would be to improve our schools and then introduce the three-year course. Instead of doing that, we introduced the three-year course and left the schools to themselves. That was most unfortunate. The only thing that we can do is to try to improve secondary education as much as possible. The mischief has been done. I quite agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Reddy, that the present system, as it is worked at present, is most unsatisfactory. It has not merely created havoc in the rural population but it has created equal havoc in our cities. I am glad that in spite of the pressure put by the Education Minister—that was before Mr. Chagla's time—and in spite of the pressure put even by the University Grants Commission before I became a member of it, the universities in Uttar Pradesh and the Bombay University have had the guts to resist this premature reform. I admire them for it and it is a great pity that so many other universities fell before it, partly under persuasion and partly under threat. That is a most unfortunate thing that has happened in our universities, and to that extent our universities have been weakened. I can only hope that with Mr. Chagla's abilities and his enthusiasm, our schools will improve and we shall produce a better type of students, fit to enter the universities. I entirely agree with him that

the idea that everyone has the right to enter a university is an entirely false idea. I do not think it is an idea which has been accepted even in the communist countries. I know, university education is free in the communist countries, but even there they pick and choose the students and they do not let anybody and everybody enter the university. They select the very best and that will have to be done by every university worth the name.

Miss MARY NAIDU : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank my hon. friend, Shri Sri Rama Reddy, for bringing up this motion and thus giving me this opportunity to speak on the subject of education. Our hon. friend, Prof. Wadia, agreed with Mr. Reddy in his desire to change the present education system and switch over to the old system. Before I go into details, may I say that when we go on switching over from one to the other, and *vice-versa*, we are confusing our children. We are not giving them stability in any thing. However, this system of changing over to the pre-University class was done, I believe, after great deliberation by eminent educationists. It was felt that there was need for a bridge between the secondary education and college education. The children having finished their high school education of ten years or so, jump into the colleges and there the bridging was not proper because two years of Intermediate completes nothing and what they had done in the schools did not correlate with what was being sought to be taught in the colleges. They had to spend two years again to choose their subject and then go into degree course.

If we clearly understand what this pre-University classes are, I feel it will be agreed by all that this is really a better system. It is not as if everything is sought to be crowded into one year of study. The position seems to have been wrongly understood. May I please explain that children are asked to choose their courses as early as in their 8th standard. In the 8th standard they take the particular course which is to fit them into the pre-University class. They take their optionals, as they were called, in the 8th standard. This means that they study the subjects in the 8th, 9th and 10th classes plus one year, *i.e.* the pre-University class, that is, in all for four years. And so, as was ex-

plained by the Education Minister, in four years they are quite well prepared for the subjects which they are going to take in the university classes. What is more, they 4 P.M. complete a course and those who enter into the university class, they are not strangers to the subjects at all. Anyway, they should not be strangers to the subjects. However, I do agree with my hon. friend, Shri Sri Rama Reddy about all those difficulties that he mentioned. He has not under-valued the difficulties because it is true that children especially from the rural areas, find it very difficult to fit in into these pre-University classes but the cause is not in the policy of education or in the scheme of education. The cause has to be searched for elsewhere. In the rural areas the children study in their mother-tongue. They have regional language as medium of education. They have the knowledge; they have the standards but when they come over to the pre-University classes and switch over to English, they find it difficult to express themselves. And it is there they are misfits; it is not because that they have no knowledge, it is not because that there is no proper teaching in those classes but it is because they have to express in English language in the P.U.C. classes. That is why the children get confused and the standard falls. It is not because that the education scheme itself is wrong. May I bring it to the notice of this House, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that to switch over again to the old system of education is not at all advisable or feasible?

I also agree with my other friends who have brought in other reasons for education not being up to the standard. One cause and the main cause is teachers and overcrowded classes. Now the classes are 60 to 70 strong. In olden days when there were Intermediate and B.A. classes, the class rooms did not go beyond 25 to 30 but today the class rooms contain 60 to 70 children each.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : Or even eighty.

Miss MARY NAIDU : Or even eighty, as my friend, Shri Sri Rama Reddy points out. That is the main cause, not the system of education. An ill-paid and over-worried teacher cannot cater to 70 chil-

dren in a classroom and complete the lesson in some forty or fifty minutes. Hence the syllabus is not covered within the given time. Another mistake is that the educationists go on forming committees and inviting great learned people to prepare text-books. Those learned people do not cater to the difficulties of either the teachers or the pupils. They do their best in preparing the text-books. And the teachers are asked to teach according to those books. The books are very well graded. They have to teach a certain amount of science in the 8th class and a certain amount in the 9th, 10th and 11th classes, and if all that is taught, the students will find no difficulty in the colleges; but the teacher is not able to finish even half the portion. The other half is not finished in the next class either because the next class teacher begins with her text-books, so that great portions are left untaught. That is the reason why children do not have good knowledge. There are many other factors, which have to be considered, for the failure of children when they come into the P.U.C. classes; not that the three-year degree course is in any way bad.

I would also like to bring to your notice another point. Some hon. friends seem to feel that there are no proper labs in the higher secondary classes. The Education Departments and the Central Government are giving grants to the schools which are to be raised into higher secondary schools. They are given grants for building, for equipment and also for employing proper teachers. We cannot say that the teachers are not proper. Every teacher tries her level best to teach properly but he or she is unable to cope with sixty or seventy children in a class. All these must be improved. Today the teacher's salary is at the lowest ebb and it must be remedied. You will all agree that those teachers who are about to retire are the best staff members because they have all the experience behind them; but sometimes they are the worst teachers in these days, the reason being that the teacher knows that on the day he retires he has to walk out into the street with his family. There is no provision whatsoever for him to retire upon. He has no security whatever, for his future. It is true that some sort of a pension is being given for the

[Miss Mary Naidu.]

Government teachers and are less amount of pension to the aided teachers, but pensions are hardly received by the teachers before their death. It takes years and years before pensions are given to the teachers. If this works on in their mind it is impossible for the teachers who have to retire within two to three years to give their best to their classroom because their minds are all the time occupied by thoughts about their future life, about what will happen to their wives and children. Can we blame them for it? We cannot; the pension is supposed to be for the teacher, to be paid on the date when he retires and the schools and departments know when the teacher is to retire. Why don't they begin to prepare his pension papers a year or two before and give the pension papers into the teachers hands on the date he retires from the school? If that is done, we may get the best from those teachers for the benefit of our children. It is easy to come up and say, let the teachers be the last people to strike or to do anything public; why not give them the best conditions so that they will be the last people to clamour for anything? If the teachers' condition is improved, the school's condition will be improved, the children's standard will be raised and education will become perfect.

Thank you, Sir.

प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धान्तालंकार (नाम निर्देशित) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सैडलर कमीशन के आने से पहले अपने देश की शिक्षा व्यवस्था जो थी उसमें दस साल तक मैट्रिकुलेशन होता था और उसके बाद चार साल तक यूनीवर्सिटी की शिक्षा होती थी। सैडलर कमीशन ने जब यहां की शिक्षा का अध्ययन किया तो उन्होंने यह निर्णय किया कि विश्व-विद्यालय के अन्दर जो छात्र पहुंचते हैं उनकी शिक्षा बच्चों की सी शिक्षा होती है, वहां पर जो अध्यापक हैं उनको कालेज स्टूडेंट्स को पढ़ाना नहीं होता बल्कि अधकचरे को पढ़ाना होता है, और इसलिए उन्होंने सिफारिश की कि विश्वविद्यालय की शिक्षा को दो हिस्सों में बांट दिया जाय और जो विद्यार्थी इंटरमीडिएट के होते हुए विश्वविद्यालय के अन्दर

रहते हैं और वहां पर रहते हुए भी स्कूल चिल्ड्रन के तौर पर रहते हैं उनको वहां से अलग कर के विद्यालय के साथ, स्कूल के साथ मिला दिया जाय। वह इसलिए किया गया क्योंकि वे शिक्षा के स्तर को ऊंचा उठाना चाहते थे। वे बच्चे जो कि छोटी उम्र के थे और जिनका दिमाग अभी पका नहीं होता था वे जब कालेज के अन्दर जाते थे तो प्रोफेसरों को स्कूल मास्टर का काम करना पड़ता था और प्रोफेसर लोग यह सोचा करते थे कि इन बच्चों को हम कैसे ऊपर उठाएं। इस दृष्टि को सामने रख कर के सैडलर कमीशन की सिफारिश के अनुसार शिक्षा को दो हिस्सों में बांट दिया गया और जो स्कूल का क्षेत्र था उसके साथ इंटरमीडिएट शिक्षा को मिला दिया गया।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) IN THE CHAIR.]

इसके बाद शिक्षा का और विकास हुआ क्योंकि हमारा जितना सारा का सारा शिक्षा का क्षेत्र है वह एक इतिहास में से गुजरा है। धीरे-धीरे यह अनुभव होने लगा कि विद्यार्थी इतने उतावले हैं कि वे यूनीवर्सिटी तक जाएं बगैर रुकते नहीं हैं और वह इसलिये नहीं रुकते क्योंकि डिग्री के बगैर उनके लिये अपने जीवन की समस्या हल करने का कोई दूसरा उपाय ही नहीं है। इस समस्या को सामने रखकर फिर शिक्षाविज्ञों ने सोचा कि यह समस्या कैसे हल की जाय? उन्होंने यह सोचा कि शिक्षा को एक व्यावसायिक दिशा दे दी जाय और इसलिये आप देखते हैं कि जो हमारी नयी पाठ्य विधियां बनी हैं उनके अंदर शिक्षा को भिन्न-भिन्न क्षेत्रों में बांट दिया गया है। कुछ विद्यार्थी ऐसे हैं जो कि साइन्स लेना चाहते हैं, कुछ ऐसे हैं जो कि व्यापार लेना चाहते हैं, कुछ हस्तकला कौशल लेना चाहते हैं। इसलिये स्कूल के अंदर शिक्षा को भिन्न-भिन्न भागों में बांट दिया गया और इसके बाद यह प्रयत्न किया गया कि विद्यार्थी की शिक्षा वहां पर

जाकर एक जानी चाहिये और जो विद्यार्थी बहुत ही योग्य और उत्सुक हो वे आगे जाकर विश्वविद्यालय की शिक्षा के योग्य समझे जाने चाहिये और उनको विश्वविद्यालय में ले लेना चाहिये। तो यह व्यवस्था जब आई उस समय यह सोचना आवश्यक हो गया कि वह विद्यार्थी जो कि विद्यालय के अंदर है और एक खास व्यवसाय को लेकर शिक्षा ग्रहण करना चाहते हैं उनकी शिक्षा यहीं पर रोक दी जाये या आगे चलाई जाये। इस समस्या का हल करने के लिये एक नयी व्यवस्था जारी की गई और वह व्यवस्था यह थी कि विद्यालय के अंदर 12 की जगह 11 वर्ष का कोर्स कर दिया गया और विश्वविद्यालय के अंदर तीन वर्ष का कोर्स कर दिया गया। तीन वर्ष का कोर्स करने के बाद यह समस्या उत्पन्न हुई कि जो विद्यार्थी उससे पहले की स्थिति के अंदर थे उनका क्या हाल होगा? इस समस्या को हल करने के लिए उन छात्रों के लिए प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी नाम से एक कक्षा खोल दी गई। जैसा कि शिक्षा मंत्री ने बतलाया कि जो प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी क्लासेज खोले गए हैं वह कोई स्थिर व्यवस्था नहीं है, वह ऐसी व्यवस्था नहीं है जो कि सनातन काल तक चली जायगी, वह व्यवस्था सिर्फ सामयिक व्यवस्था है। जो समस्या इस समय उत्पन्न हो गई है उस समस्या को हल करने के लिये यह व्यवस्था की गई है। तो जैसा कि प्रस्तावकर्त्ता महोदय का कहना है वही व्यवस्था इस समय भी चलने वाली है, वह इमलिये कि जब यह प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी क्लासेज समाप्त हो जायेंगे, तो उस समय यह जो कक्षाएं हैं, जिनके ऊपर यूनिवर्सिटी खोली जाती है, वह सेकेंडरी स्कूल के अंदर या यूनिवर्सिटी के अंदर मिला दी जायेगी। फिर या तो इन्टरमीडिएट में दो साल का कोर्स अपने आप हो जायेगा, या यूनिवर्सिटी का तीन साल का कोर्स हो जायेगा। मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि जिस शंका को लेकर यह प्रस्ताव रखा गया है वह शंका तभी तक कायम रहती है जब तक यह प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन बनी रहेगी। प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी

एजुकेशन, जैसा कि शिक्षा मंत्री ने कहा, स्थिर व्यवस्था, अंतिम व्यवस्था नहीं है। यह सामयिक व्यवस्था है और सामयिक व्यवस्था, सामयिक समस्या हल हो जाने के बाद अपने आप खत्म हो जायेगी। फिर वही व्यवस्था हो जायेगी जो व्यवस्था प्रस्तावकर्त्ता महोदय चाहते हैं, या दूसरी व्यवस्था आ सकती है। या तो यह एक साल जो कि प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी का है इन्टरमीडिएट के अंदर मिला दिया जायेगा या यूनिवर्सिटी के अंदर मिला दिया जायेगा --हर हालत में वह व्यवस्था नहीं रहने वाली है जिस व्यवस्था को आप हटाना चाहते हैं। जो व्यवस्था अपने आप हटने वाली है उस व्यवस्था के ऊपर हमारा किसी प्रकार का आग्रह करना निरर्थक है।

मैं तो इस बात से चिंतित हू कि हमारा जो शिक्षा का क्षेत्र है वह एक अत्यंत विचित्र क्षेत्र है। हम शुरु से न जाने कितनी समस्याओं को लेकर चले, उनके बाद नयी समस्याएं आई, उनके लिये नया समाधान किया, पर अंत में हम किसी परिणाम पर पहुंचे नहीं दिखायी देते। इसका कारण यह है कि शिक्षा का जो विषय है वह प्रत्येक राज्य का अपना-अपना विषय है, प्रत्येक राज्य उसके लिये स्वतंत्र है। केन्द्र के आधीन शिक्षा का विषय नहीं है। इसका परिणाम यह होता है कि किसी राज्य के अंदर कोई एक व्यवस्था चली है, तो किसी दूसरे राज्य में कोई और व्यवस्था चली है। अभी, जैसा कि शिक्षा मंत्री ने कहा, 44 विश्वविद्यालयों ने तो इस बात का स्वीकार कर लिया है कि फर्स्ट डिग्री का तीन वर्ष का कोर्स रखेंगे, बाकी ने नहीं किया। उत्तर प्रदेश, जो कि इतना बड़ा राज्य है वह इस बात को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। तो सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि शिक्षा के विषय को केन्द्रीय विषय बनाया जाय। केन्द्रीय विषय बनाए बगैर शिक्षा की समस्याएं भी बनी रहेंगी। एक राज्य एक दिशा में चलेगा, दूसरा दूसरी दिशा में, तीसरा तीसरी दिशा में। हम

एक ध्येय को सामने रखकर जब तक नहीं चल सकते तब तक हम कैसे किसी अंतिम निश्चय पर पहुँच सकते हैं। शिक्षा ही एक ऐसी व्यवस्था है जिसको अगर आप्रपूर्वक और निश्चयपूर्वक अपने हाथ में ले लिया जाय तो दस साल के अंदर देश की सभी समस्याएँ हल हो सकती हैं। हिटलर ने दस साल में अपने देश को क्या का क्या बना दिया, मुसोलिनी ने दस साल में अपने देश को क्या का क्या बना दिया। जो लोग शिक्षा को केन्द्रीय मुख्य विषय समझ कर चलते हैं वे दस साल के अंदर अपने देश को बदल सकते हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Hitler did not do that

प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धा-तालंकार मैं आपसे यह कह रहा था कि एक छोटा बच्चा, जो कि मेरी भाषा को नहीं जानता, वह दो वर्ष के अंदर अपनी बात मुझे बतला सकता है और मैं अपनी बात उसको बतला सकता हूँ। यदि रशियन माता-पिता का बच्चा है वह रशियन में बात कर लेगा, जर्मन का है तो जर्मन में बात कर लेगा, इटैलियन का बच्चा है तो इटैलियन में बात कर लेगा, हमारे देश का बच्चा है तो हमारी भाषा में बात कर लेगा। भाषा के बाद शिक्षा को ले लीजिए। सात वर्ष के बच्चे को चौदह वर्ष के अंदर आप ग्रेजुएट बना देते हैं जो कि धारा प्रवाह भाषा में अपनी भावनाओं को प्रकट कर सकता है। तो दस साल या चौदह साल किसी देश को कुछ का कुछ बनाने के लिये पर्याप्त है। हमें आजादी को हासिल किये पन्द्रह साल से ऊपर हुए लेकिन आज तक हम इस बात के लिये लड़ रहे हैं कि हमारे देश की भाषा क्या होनी चाहिये, हमको किस दिशा के अंदर चलना चाहिये, हमको क्या करना चाहिये, शिक्षा का क्या ध्येय होना चाहिये। तो जब तक हम शिक्षा के क्षेत्र के अंदर एक निश्चित ध्येय को निश्चित नहीं कर लेते और निश्चित करके उसे कार्यरूप में परिणत करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हो जाते तब तक अपने देश का भविष्य उज्ज्वल नहीं है।

देश का भविष्य उज्ज्वल तब होगा जब कि अन्य क्षेत्रों में हम जितनी शक्ति व्यय करते उससे अधिक शक्ति इस क्षेत्र में व्यय की जाय। हमारे यहाँ कितने ही मंत्रालय हैं लेकिन शिक्षा मंत्रालय ऐसे चल रहे हैं देश के अंदर कि मालूम ही नहीं होता क्या उनकी नीति है, क्या वे करने वाले हैं। आज एक निश्चय होता है कल दूसरा निश्चय हो जाता है। यह क्षेत्र ऐसा है जिस क्षेत्र को अगर पकड़ लिया जाय, जैसे जड़ को पकड़ कर आप वृक्ष को कुछ का कुछ बना सकते हैं वैसे ही शिक्षा को हाथ में ले ले तो सारे देश को कुछ का कुछ बना सकते हैं।

तो मैं सब समस्याओं का एक समाधान समझता हूँ और वह समाधान यह समझना है कि यह जो छोटी-मोटी बातें हैं कि एक वर्ष बढ़ा दिया जाय, दो वर्ष बढ़ा दिया जाय—आप एक वर्ष बढ़ावे, दो वर्ष बढ़ावे—उससे कोई फर्क नहीं होने वाला है। शिक्षा की सारी व्यवस्था को हल करने के लिये शिक्षा को केन्द्रीय विषय बनाना होगा और जब तक आप शिक्षा को केन्द्रीय विषय बना कर सारे देश में एक नीति का संचालन नहीं करते तब तक एक राज्य एक रास्ते पर जायेगा, दूसरा दूसरे रास्ते पर जायेगा और एक समय आयेगा जब सब लड़ेगे, झगड़ेगे, जैसा हो रहा है। यह इसलिये हो रहा है क्योंकि उनको एक सूत्र में पिरोने वाला कोई नहीं है। हर एक शिक्षा मंत्री स्वतंत्र है। उत्तर प्रदेश का शिक्षा मंत्री कहता है कि मैं तो अपने राज्य के अंदर तीन वर्ष तक कोर्स चला ही नहीं सकता, दूसरा कहता है कि मैं चला सकता हूँ। तो यह जो स्थिति देश में उत्पन्न हो गई है कि शिक्षा के क्षेत्र के अंदर हम एक रास्ते को सामने रखकर नहीं चल रहे हैं, हर एक व्यक्ति और राज्य अपने-अपने रास्ते पर चल रहा है, इस नीति को समाप्त करना होगा और जब यह नीति समाप्त हो जायेगी और आप एक दिशा निर्धारित कर लेंगे तो आपकी समस्याएँ अपने आप हल हो जायेगी।

बाकी रही एक वर्ष की बात तो एक वर्ष इन्टरमीडिएट में चला जाय या एक वर्ष यूनी-वर्सिटी में चला जाय, इससे कोई फर्क होने वाला नहीं है। इस समय तो शिक्षा का वैल्यूएशन ही बदल गया है। आप कहते हैं शिक्षा का स्तर गिरता जा रहा है—किन लोगों को देखकर आप यह कहते हैं? आज जो साठ-साठ, सत्तर-सत्तर वर्ष के लोग हैं जिन्होंने न जाने कब शिक्षा ग्रहण की, उनको देखकर कहा जाता है शिक्षा का स्तर गिरता जा रहा है। गलत बात है। आज शिक्षा के प्रकार ही बदल गए हैं। आज का बच्चा जितनी बातों को जानता है—रेडियो को जानता है, रेल को, एयरोप्लेन को, न्यूक्लीयर बम आदि जितनी बातों को आज का बच्चा जानता है—उनको आज से 60 वर्ष पहले का बच्चा नहीं जानता था। आज के बच्चे के सामने ज्ञान का क्षेत्र बढ़ गया है। इसके साथ इसका यह भी कारण है कि जनसंख्या बहुत बढ़ गई है। उस समय इतने आदमी नहीं थे, इतने व्यक्ति नहीं थे, इतने विद्यार्थी नहीं थे जितने कि आज दिखायी देने हैं। लेकिन उस समय की तुलना आज के जमाने से नहीं बैठ सकती।

यह खयाल गलत है कि शिक्षा का स्तर गिरता जा रहा है। शिक्षा का स्तर नहीं गिरता जा रहा है बल्कि शिक्षा का स्तर गिरता हुआ मालूम पड़ता है क्योंकि विद्यार्थी का ज्ञान-क्षेत्र बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि अब प्रत्येक विश्वविद्यालय और प्रत्येक विद्यालय के अन्दर अपनी मातृभाषा के माध्यम से शिक्षा दी जाने वाली है। जब अपनी मातृभाषा शिक्षा का माध्यम हो जायेगी तब शिक्षा का स्तर अपने आप ऊँचा उठेगा। इस समय जो शिक्षा का संक्रांति काल है, बीच का समय है, उसमें विद्यार्थी न अंग्रेजी जानता है, न हिन्दी ही जानता है और न अपनी भाषा ही जानता है। इस समय क्योंकि उसके अन्दर किसी भाषा की गति नहीं है इसलिए इसका परिणाम

यह है कि हमें शिक्षा का स्तर नीचे गिरता नज़र आता है। लेकिन ज्यों-ज्यों हम एक रास्ते पर पड़ जायेंगे, त्यों-त्यों हमारा स्तर भी उठता ही चला जायेगा। अगर उत्तर प्रदेश में हिन्दी माध्यम के द्वारा शिक्षा नहीं दी जायेगी, बंगाल में बंगला द्वारा शिक्षा नहीं दी जायेगी, तो इसमें संदेह नहीं कि शिक्षा का स्तर गिरेगा। अगर मनुष्य अपनी भाषा द्वारा शिक्षा ग्रहण करेगा तो वह बहुत अधिक सीख सकता है। पहले अंग्रेजी द्वारा ही लड़कों को शिक्षा दी जाती थी, अंग्रेजी को ही विद्या समझा जाता था, यहां तक कि रामायण भी अंग्रेजी के द्वारा ही पढ़ाई जाती थी और संस्कृत भी अंग्रेजी के द्वारा पढ़ाई जानी थी। इस तरह की व्यवस्था पहले हमारे देश में थी और जो अंग्रेजी जानता था उसको महा विद्वान समझा जाता था। लेकिन अंग्रेजी का जानना ही या कुछ भाषाओं का जानना ही विद्या नहीं है। विद्या और भाषा भिन्न-भिन्न चीज़ें हैं। अब तो समय बदल रहा है उसमें ऐसी अवस्था आ जायेगी कि प्रत्येक राज्य में अपनी भाषा के द्वारा शिक्षा दी जायेगी। अगर एक वर्ष प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी के लिए कहा गया तो वह एक वर्ष बहुत काफी होगा। इस समय यह काफी इसलिए नहीं है क्योंकि अब भी अनेक स्थानों पर अंग्रेजी में ही पढ़ाई चल रही है। लड़के घोटते हैं, इस समय जो शिक्षा है वह घोटने की है और जिसने रट लिया वह शिक्षित कहा जाता है। लेकिन जब बच्चे को उसकी अपनी भाषा के माध्यम से शिक्षा दी जायेगी तो वह अपने को घोटने तक सीमित नहीं रखेगा और इस समय जो आपके सामने शिक्षा के स्तर के गिरने की समस्या है, वह भी नहीं रहेगी। शिक्षा का स्तर तब गिरता है जब आप किसी विदेशी भाषा के माध्यम से बच्चों को पढ़ाते हैं क्योंकि उसका सारा ध्यान भाषा को सीखने में लग जाता है और इस तरह से वह शिक्षा को अच्छी तरह से ग्रहण नहीं कर पाता है। जब बच्चे को अपनी भाषा के माध्यम से शिक्षा दी जायेगी तब शिक्षा का स्तर अपने आप ऊँचा उठ जायेगा।

[प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धान्तलंकार]

इसलिए मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें इस बात से घबराना नहीं चाहिये कि एक वर्ष का कोर्स हो, दो वर्ष का कोर्स हो, तीन वर्ष का कोर्स हो, इससे कुछ नहीं बनता है। असली चीज यह है कि शिक्षा का कार्य केन्द्र द्वारा संचालित होना चाहिये और शिक्षा अपनी मातृ-भाषा द्वारा दी जानी चाहिये। अगर आप शिक्षा का कार्य केन्द्र द्वारा संचालित करेंगे और अपनी मातृ-भाषा के माध्यम से बच्चों को शिक्षा देंगे तो जो शिक्षा आजकल बच्चे एक वर्ष या दो वर्ष में ग्रहण कर रहे हैं उससे भी कम समय में ग्रहण कर लेंगे।

SHRI S K VAISHAMPAYEN (Maharashtra) Mr Vice-Chairman, I rise to make some observations on the subject matter raised by the Resolution moved by Mr Sri Rama Reddy. I will be brief because after having heard the hon Education Minister I would not have to say much because many points which I wanted to explain in detail have been placed before the House. I have purposely used the word "observations" because I do not agree with the solution proposed in the Resolution. But the Resolution is certainly a stimulating one and it should be considered so by this House and by those interested in education.

The Resolution presumes that nothing has been done to ensure a uniform standard of education at the college level, and therefore they are suggesting that the pre-University course should be substituted by the old Intermediate course at the college level. But this particular solution would be almost going back on what we have achieved up till now. First of all, I do not consider that during the course of the last 14 or 15 years our country, the Central Government and the Ministry of Education have not done anything in order to see that a certain measure of uniform standard is achieved in our country. By ensuring uniform standards I mean to say having a sort of educational system, a sound educational system which will have a certain specific duration. It will have a certain syllabus having some purpose and at the same time it will have some methods evaluated which will go to strengthen this particular system.

If we look back into the history of educational development of our country, we will find that the Government has made many efforts to evolve not only a common, uniform pattern in the field of college education but it has done so also in the field of secondary as well as primary education. Sufficient thought has been given by different committees and commissions to this question. I may only draw the attention of the House to the report of the Zakir Husain Committee about primary education, the Mudaliar Committee's report with regard to secondary education and the Radhakrishnan Commission's report with regard to university education. I would call these reports as something like a Bible or Quoran or Veda of our educational systems. I think everything has been said in these reports which should serve as a guidance to see that a sound educational system develops in our country.

As far as the college education is concerned the Radhakrishnan Commission has made out a really very valuable report in 1949 within a very short, record time of six to seven months. The Commission analysed the various defects that were there in the system which prevailed, that is, including the Intermediate course system which prevailed before 1949. It suggested remedies in all directions. It suggested certain courses, certain syllabi for giving content to college education and gave a new pattern so far as university education was concerned. It not only gave a new pattern but it also defined certain objectives. Some hon Members here observed that in our educational system there is no purpose but I do not agree with them. I think if these three reports of the Radhakrishnan Commission, the Mudaliar Committee and the Zakir Husain Committee are read, they will find that there is enough purpose so far as our democratic country is concerned. These recommendations were made the basis or the guidelines by the Central Government to implement a uniform standard, a uniform pattern of education throughout the country. It has not only secured the concurrence of the State Governments but it also established in 1956 a high powered expert body, that is, the University Grants Commission, and up till now you find that this University Grants Commission is not only looking

after it but is also applying its mind as to how the standard of university education has to be raised. Out of the 61 universities, as has been pointed out by the hon. Education Minister, 46 universities have adopted this three-year pattern. Only 9 or 10 universities in the U.P. and the Bombay University have not switched over to this three-year pattern. We can almost say that so far as our country is concerned these 46 universities with their affiliated colleges have been woven into a uniform pattern of education, and through that we are trying to make efforts to ensure that some sort of uniform standard is achieved so far as college education is concerned.

After going through the report of the University Grants Commission, I have found that about Rs. 25 crores have been spent during the last six to eight years in implementing the three-year degree course in the universities and the different affiliated colleges. This is besides what the University Grants Commission is spending on the improvement of the pay scales of teachers, on the training facilities and other things. This is what the University Grants Commission is spending for improving university education. How can one say then that there has been no progress in ensuring a uniform standard of education? Of course, we can generally say that there has been a fall in the standard of education.

But that fall, as has been pointed out, is due to the increasing number of students that are coming up both in the schools as well as in the colleges. So, my point is that we are already having a particular pattern. We have come to that pattern after careful consideration, careful deliberations, by the Radhakrishnan Commission. If it is pointed out that there are certain deficiencies, certain imperfections in this particular pattern due to which this ensuring of uniform standards has not been possible, I can understand that, and we may try to improve upon them, we may try to apply our minds to see that all those deficiencies, all those defects, are removed from this pattern which has been suggested by the Radhakrishnan Commission so far as college education is concerned. So, from my point of view, the solution does not lie in

substituting the present pattern which we have evolved during the course of the last ten years but in seeing that this particular pattern is strengthened.

Secondly, if I go into the defects that have been pointed out by the different Commissions in the past so far as the previous courses are concerned including the Intermediate course, you will agree with me that it is no good having that old system which was bereft of any kind of objective, except of preparing personnel for our services, besides being examination-ridden. I am not going into all those details. Of course, it is worthwhile reading the criticisms made by the different Commissions—the Mudaliar Commission and the Radhakrishnan Commission—on the system prevalent before 1949.

So, I would submit to the mover of the Resolution that instead of trying to substitute the present pattern of 3-year degree course we should try to improve upon it, consolidate it and see that the weaker link in secondary education that has been pointed out is strengthened. That is the real solution and this is the task before us, and if we are able to do this, we will be able to do something for this generation, which will be remembered in future. So, what is necessary is unity of action, to put through whatever measures and recommendations have been made by the different commissions, and if we do that, I think we can achieve our object. We are not satisfied with the conditions that are prevalent in the educational sphere now. Of course, in order to strengthen secondary education which is the weakest link and in order to make it a self-contained system, it is necessary that the States should agree. And it is there that one finds that though the States generally agree on principles, they do not implement them in the spirit in which they should be.

Therefore I am of the opinion that the real solution today is—if at all we want to have a very sound educational system at the primary, secondary and university levels—that education must be made a Concurrent Subject, and taking that into consideration, I hope that the mover of the Resolution will consider again whether the present pattern of education should

[Shri S K Vaishampayan]
be substituted by the old Intermediate course

SHRIMATI TARA RAMACHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra) I rise to support the Resolution moved by the hon Shri Sri Rama Reddy I learn that in the Mysore University there is no Intermediate course and he wants to reintroduce the Intermediate course But I can tell him that in the Bombay, Poona and Gujarat Universities, they have already this course and they are still continuing it After the SSC course examination, which is conducted by the Government Board, we require four years to have our degree of B A or BSc, and the students who wish to take up medical science or engineering have to give two examinations in the college Those are also university examinations Previously the first year examination was held by the colleges and the third year examination also was conducted by the colleges But now all the examinations in the university, the students can take up either medical science or engineering In that way, for engineering course, they require 2 plus 3½ years and for medical course, they require 2 plus 4½ years and for six months they have to work in the villages I agree with him that there should be an Intermediate course and after that, they should select their courses, whether they want to take up medical course or other courses

I take this opportunity to put forth another important point here In Maharashtra State, the age limit for a student, for a child to enter the school is six Below six, no child is allowed to enter the school When the child goes to school, he requires at least 11 years to appear for the SSC examination That means, when he becomes 17, he appears for the SSC Board examination After that he has to enter the college and pass the Intermediate examination By then he becomes 19 I want to bring to the notice of the House that the age limit for the Defence Ministry examinations is 17—where the minimum qualification is prescribed as matriculation and with minimum qualification of Inter-Science the limit is 19 So, it is difficult for these students to gain entrance to these Defence courses I request the Ministry concerned through you, Sir,

to think over this matter and do the needful

I again support the Resolution which is before the House

श्री दयाल बास कुरें (मध्य प्रदेश) उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सकल्प के सकल्पकर्ता श्री श्रीराम रेड्डी जी आज सही माने में धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं जिन्होंने इस सकल्प को सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया। इसमें कोई सदेह नहीं है कि यह विवादग्रस्त है और विवादग्रस्त इसलिए है क्योंकि इसके भीतर उनकी भावना बिलकुल ओतप्रोत हो गई है। उन्होंने देखा यह कि शिक्षा की यथार्थ में जो स्थिति है, वह किस तरफ जा रही है।

शिक्षा बढ़ रही है। हमारे देश में शिक्षा का प्रसार काफी हो रहा है, इसमें तो दो मन हो नहीं सकते। आज श्री राम रेड्डी जी भी इससे सहमत हैं और आगे भी होंगे। लेकिन एक बात जो उनके दिमाग में आई, जिससे मैं बहुत प्रभावित हुआ, वह यह है कि यूनी-वर्सिटीज और कालेजेज में आज जिस तरह कि शिक्षा दी जा रही है और उसका जैसा स्तर बनाया गया है, उससे उनको सतोष नहीं है और सतोष इसलिये नहीं है कि यह जो प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी कोर्स रखा गया है, उसके रिजल्ट को, उसके परिणाम जो आये हैं परीक्षाओं में, उसको उन्होंने देखा है। मैं भी ऐसा महसूस करता हूँ, मुझे भी ऐसा लगता है कि परीक्षाओं के परिणाम में स्तर तो काफी अच्छा है लेकिन जब हम उसकी अच्छाइयों और बुराइयों की तरफ आते हैं और जिस स्तर पर विद्यार्थी आगे अपना जीवन निर्वाह करते हैं, उनके एजुकेशन का स्तर क्या है, इन सब बातों को जब हम देखते हैं, तो यथार्थ में उनकी स्थिति कुछ नीची सी मालूम पड़ती है। आज इस बात को न केवल आदरणीय सदस्यों ने, बल्कि हमारे केन्द्र के आदरणीय शिक्षा मंत्री ने भी अनुभव किया और उनके दिमाग में भी यह बात है कि शिक्षा का जो स्तर है वह कुछ गिरता हुआ सा है जिसको उठाना उनका

परम धर्म है और उन्होंने इस विषय पर काफी प्रभाव भी डाला है। अब किस स्तर तक वह आगे जायेगा? समय ही इस बात का ठीक-ठीक जवाब देगा कि शिक्षा का स्तर किस हद तक ऊपर उठ जायेगा।

आज हम देखते हैं कि प्राइमरी स्कूलों की संख्या बढ़ गई, मिडिल स्कूलों की संख्या भी बढ़ गई और अब हाई स्कूल भी प्रायः सभी बड़े-बड़े कस्बों और गावों में खुल चुके हैं। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि उन हाई स्कूलों में जिस प्रकार के शिक्षक होने चाहिए उनकी उपलब्धि बहुत कम हो पा रही है। जैसा कि शिक्षा शास्त्रियों ने बताया है कि एक कारण यह भी है कि इन हाई स्कूलों में योग्य शिक्षक प्राप्त नहीं हो पाते इसलिये शिक्षा का स्तर जो है वह गिरता जा रहा है। हम आज यह देखते हैं कि हमारे लड़के हाई स्कूल की शिक्षा प्राप्त करने के बाद जब कालेज में जाते हैं तो कालेज का जो वातावरण है और कालेज का जितना स्टैंडर्ड होना चाहिये, विद्यार्थियों को उस स्टैंडर्ड का जो पूरा-पूरा अनुभव होना चाहिए उसका उनमें अभाव रहता है और इस अभाव को आज श्री श्रीराम रेड्डी ने बताया है और उन्होंने जैसा कि बताया यह अभाव एक ही प्रदेश में नहीं देश के प्रत्येक कोने-कोने में पाया जाता है। मैं भी उनकी भावनाओं से प्रभावित हूँ। मैं भी देखता हूँ कि विद्यार्थी मैट्रिकुलेशन की परीक्षा पास करने के बाद जब अपने जीवन में प्रवेश करता है तो वह उसके लायक नहीं होता और इसके कारण उसको आगे चल कर पग-पग पर कठिनाइयाँ आती हैं और यही कारण है कि उनकी शिक्षा बहुत लाभदायक नहीं हो पाती।

तो मैं देखता हूँ कि प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी कोर्स में जिसे इस समय केन्द्रीय शिक्षा विभाग ने, केन्द्रीय शासन ने और देश के विभिन्न राज्यों ने भी अपनाया है और इसकी स्वीकृति दी है और इसका कार्यक्रम चल रहा है, उससे कालेज का जो पूरा कोर्स है—जिसे प्राइमरी स्टेज में प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी कोर्स कहते हैं—

वह हम पूरा नहीं कर पाते हैं। किन्तु, इससे पूर्व कालेजेज में जो इंटरमीडिएट सिस्टम था उसमें विद्यार्थी हाई स्कूल की शिक्षा प्राप्त करने के बाद समझता था कि वह कालेज की पढाई के लिए जा रहा है और वह वहाँ घिस-पिट कर दो वर्षों में इंटरमीडिएट कोर्स पास करता था। पहले साल जब वह इंटरमीडिएट का प्रथम वर्ष पास करता था तब उसे मालूम होता था कि हाई स्कूल की परीक्षा पास करके वह कालेज में आ गया है और उसका प्रारम्भिक चरण पार कर चुका है और दूसरे वर्ष में उसे लगता था कि हा, मैंने इंटरमीडिएट का कोर्स लिया है और उसकी परीक्षा पास करने जा रहा हूँ। इंटरमीडिएट परीक्षा पास करने के बाद उसे यह लगता था कि हा, मैंने कालेज में अपना एक स्थान रखा है और जब वह थर्ड ईयर में जाता था तब उसे इस बात का अनुभव होता था कि वह कालेज का विद्यार्थी है। आज हम देखते हैं कि जब वह विद्यार्थी प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी कोर्स करने जा रहा है तो वह अपने को हाई स्कूल में ही पाता है। मध्य प्रदेश की बात मैं कहूँ कि वहाँ पर दो वर्ष की परीक्षा और तृतीय वर्ष की परीक्षा एक प्रकार से टैथ की परीक्षा और उसके बाद मैट्रिक की परीक्षा है जिसको कि प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी कोर्स भी कहा जाता है। इस प्रकार से मैं कहूँ तो वहाँ शिक्षा के स्तर में कुछ गड़बड़ी सी पड़ती है और विद्यार्थी इन सब स्तरों को पार करने के बाद जब कालेज के स्तर में जाता है तो उसको एक नया वातावरण मालूम पड़ता है। इसलिये मैं देखता हूँ कि उनकी जो मजबूत नींव पड़नी चाहिए वह नहीं पड़ पाती है और कालेज का स्तर उनके लिए बहुत ऊँचा हो जाता है। हम देखते हैं कि जो उनका स्तर होना चाहिए, जो शिक्षा का मापदंड होना चाहिए उसकी कमी वे महसूस करते हैं। इसलिए आज श्री राम रेड्डी जी ने जो यह विवादप्रस्त प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा है उसकी मैं हिमायत करता हूँ और इसकी दाद देना हूँ कि यह विषय मिनिस्ट्री के सामने विचारार्थ रखा जाय और

[श्री दयाल दास कुर्रे]

नाफा गहन विचार-विमर्श के बाद इसको फिर से सब के विचार करने के लिए रखा जाय।

एक चीज मैं अवश्य कहूँगा कि श्रीमती भार्गव ने अपने भाषण के बीच में कहा कि जब हमारे भूतपूर्व शिक्षा मंत्री डा० श्रीमाली साहब थे तब उनके सामने भी यह समस्या आई थी कि प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी कोर्स किया जाय या नहीं किया जाय और उन्होंने अपनी असमर्थता बताते हुए यह कहा था—जैसा कि उन्होंने अभी कोट किया—कि मेरी तो ऐसी इच्छा थी नहीं पर राज्यों के विभिन्न शिक्षा शास्त्रियों का यह मत है इसलिए मैं ऐसा करने जा रहा हूँ। तो उन्होंने भी इस बात का अनुभव किया था कि इंटरमीडिएट कोर्स कॉलेज की शिक्षा के लिए उपयुक्त है, जैसा कि उनके भाषण से पता चलता है। तो उनको भी ऐसा कुछ लगता था, शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने भी इसका अनुभव किया था कि प्री-यूनीवर्सिटी-कोर्स उतना उपयुक्त नहीं होगा जितना कि यह इंटरमीडिएट कोर्स कॉलेज के लिए उपयुक्त होगा।

इतना कह कर मैं अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

DR M M S SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh) Sir, if we were all one about the purpose as well as the content of the education, it would have been easier for us to divide it into university, higher secondary, primary and pre-primary stages. Unfortunately education has been seen as a subject in tight compartments like university education, higher secondary, primary or pre-primary. There has never been a unified attempt to have a full picture of education as such.

As far as pre primary education is concerned, very little has been done. As regards primary, the less said the better, because the condition is appalling. From there we come to the higher secondary, and all of a sudden by changing the number of years by reducing one and adding one to the university course, we thought the purpose will be served. But has the purpose been served at all? Not at all. The

higher secondary people will say they get bad students from the primary one, and the university says the higher secondary is no good, these boys are immature and they come to the university. Therefore, unless and until we are sure about the contents of what our students have to learn we will be committing the mistakes again and again, and in the name of uniformity in the name of having a uniform standard we will force the universities to adopt one system. If they do not do so, it will be said that the universities are not adopting a uniform system. Has any one prepared the statistics to tell us whether the PUC stage will be equivalent to the Intermediate? Are the students better? Are they better equipped to carry on education in medicine, technology or science or agriculture? In what way have they improved? If they have not improved, then what purpose has it serve? Therefore, it would have been good for educationists to compare statistically the content and the quantum of education that has been imparted and what has been the grasp and assimilation by the students at the Intermediate stage as well as the PUC.

As the Education Minister said, the whole idea was to have 15 years before a person were to receive his degree. Now it is a 14 year course. Why do we not pursue that instead of compromising with having a 14 year course and then not achieving the results? Therefore, it is worth while trying to understand whether today the 11-year course is the right one or whether it should be a 12-year course; call it the higher secondary or the Intermediate it does not matter.

As far as the universities are concerned nobody is able to go to important professional education unless and until he has completed 12 years of training. How is 12 years of education better than the Intermediate? Are the contents better? Is the quantum of education more? Has the person assimilated more? Two educationists who have spoken earlier, Prof. Wadia and Prof. Prasad, have said that the Intermediate course was as good as the PUC. Then why go on spending that much on converting institutions into higher secondary and not getting the benefits of the system?

Therefore it will be worth while for the Education Department to compare by a large survey carried out of the Intermediate students in the universities in the States where the Intermediate course is still being taught and compare it with the P.U.C. I think what was done earlier was to copy the Senior Cambridge, called the terminal stage, from where one parted out for different systems of technology. We have not achieved that and therefore if we fail to achieve that end, the other solution that is sometimes offered, which is a worse solution, is that the Centre should take over Education. We have seen that other universities were forced, pressed, cajoled to take up the three-year degree course and they knew fully well that unless and until the higher secondary stage is completely and fully formed, where there is the strength, it is no use having the three-year degree course. So the first and foremost thing is, we should not think in terms of 'ifs' and 'buts', not in the pious hope that what we wanted has not been achieved but we should realise what we have achieved. If one system is failing at one place, it will be worthwhile that other types of systems are allowed to flourish so that we can compare two or three systems of education in the country. It is no use having a uniform pattern of education in all the States. It is much better to have two or three systems so that we may be able to compare every 5 or 10 years and choose the best and what is possible under the circumstances.

Thank you.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to thank all the participants in to-day's debate for the keen interest they have evinced in the Resolution. I have not got much to say because all the points that have been raised have been discussed fully, but all the same I would like to disagree with the Minister of Education when he said that his main object is to strengthen the secondary education. I have before me the Secondary Education Commission report of 1952-53 where it is pointed out about the state of secondary education in the country as follows:

"The main points of these criticisms are that:

(i) the present curriculum is, narrowly conceived;

(ii) it is bookish and theoretical;

(iii) it is over-crowded, without providing rich and significant contents;

(iv) it makes inadequate provision for practical and other kinds of activities which should reasonably find room in it, if it is to educate the whole of the personality;

(v) it does not cater to the various needs and capacities of the adolescents;

(vi) it is dominated too much by examinations; and

(vii) it does not include technical and vocational subjects which are so necessary for training the students to take part in the industrial and economic development of the country."

I would like humbly to ask what has been done since 1952-53 when these points were highlighted. The grave defects that were existing in 1952-53 have been allowed to exist even today in spite of the fact that hundreds and lakhs of secondary schools have been coming year after year into existence. Without equipping them, without properly staffing, such schools have been coming up, and still to say that there is a possibility of strengthening the secondary schools is a myth which is a thing impossible of achievement not in one five-year plan but in several five-year plans. We will not be able to do and such a thing as this cannot be done. It is enough if secondary education is improved on its own present basis. If part of college education is tacked on to it, neither will it be college education, nor will the college education be perfect. Both of them will be imperfect. Presently the previous Intermediate Colleges, combined with the degree course have complete equipment, complete staffing and they have been good enough to educate the students for the pre-University course. Therefore it is a much easier course to re-introduce the Intermediate and give them all the facilities. After all, it is only extra staff that is required. The equipment is there, the build-

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

ings are there and every possible facility is already there in the colleges which had Intermediate courses previously. Therefore I say, it is much easier business. You cannot certainly do. You cannot bring all the secondary schools—thousands and lakhs of them, I do not know how many of them are there—to the level of the previous Intermediate colleges. Certainly it will be a dream. Nobody can do it. If people have not been able to do with all their earnestness from 1952 till now, after a lapse of nearly 13 years, if things have not improved so far, I cannot hope that things would improve in all the secondary schools. It is a theoretical possibility, it is not a practical possibility. Therefore I beg to differ from the hon. Minister in this respect.

I once again beseech him to see if we cannot take up the question of reviving the Intermediate course, but all the same I want to give time to the Minister. If he can do it, let him see in his own time if he can do it. If he can, let him come to this way of my suggestion.

With these few words, I would like to withdraw my Resolution and give chance to the Minister with this warning

I thank you.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Ram Sahai is absent

Shri Lila Dhar Asthana to move Resolution No. 3.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO SUGGEST WAYS AND MEANS TO DEVELOP AGRO- INDUSTRIES IN THE COUNTRY

श्री लीलाधर अस्थाना : (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं संकल्प उपस्थित करता हूँ कि :

“इस सभा की यह सम्मति है कि और अधिक उत्पादन, सेवा नियोजन और सामाजिक न्याय की दिशा में तीव्रता से प्रगति करने की दृष्टि से देश में कृषि उद्योगों के विकास के लिए

माधन तथा उपाय मुझाने के हेतु सरकार को ससद्-सदस्यों तथा प्रसिद्ध अर्थ-शास्त्रियों को एक समिति नियुक्त करनी चाहिये।”

यह संकल्प बहुत ही व्यापक और बहुत ही आवश्यक है। आप और हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि हमारे देश की आबादी का 85 फीसदी देहातों में रहता है और जब तक हमारे देहात, हमारे गांव स्वावलम्बी नहीं हो जाते हैं और आर्थिक दृष्टि से स्वतंत्र नहीं होते हैं तब तक देश में स्वाभिमान और सम्मान नहीं पैदा हो सकता और हम अपने में साहस भी नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं, जिससे देश की उन्नति हो सके। हम लोग जानते हैं कि अन्न के अभाव से हमको कितने संकट का सामना करना पड़ रहा है, हम दूसरे देशों के सामने जाकर उनसे अन्न की प्रार्थना करते हैं और इस तरह चाहते हैं कि अपने देश के लोगों का पेट पाले। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि कृषि प्रधान देश होते हुए भी हमारी आज तीन-चार वर्षों से यह हालत है कि जितनी हमारी आबादी है उसके लिये खाद्यान्न पैदा नहीं कर पाते हैं और उसके लिए हमें दर-दर मारा फिरना पड़ता है। हम यह भी भूल सकते हैं कि कृषि की उन्नति के लिये सरकार ने काफी उपाय जुटाए हैं, काफी कोशिशें की हैं मगर इसके बावजूद भी हमारी उन्नति नहीं हो रही है। तीन-चार सालों से इसके लिये जो प्रयत्न किये जा रहे हैं वह ब्लाकों के जरिये से हो रहे हैं या कृषि के विभागों के जरिये से किये जा रहे हैं। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जितनी उन्नति की गई है यह सिर्फ कागजों पर रह जाता है। देहातों में वह उन्नति के उपाय नहीं पहुंच पाए हैं जैसा हम सब लोग जानते हैं। हमारे नेता पं० जवाहरलाल जी ने एक मर्तबा कहा था कि हमारा देश किसानों का प्रधान देश तो है मगर रुढ़वादिता से ग्रसित है, उसके पुराने तरीके हैं, पुराने उपाय हैं, जिनको वह नहीं छोड़ता है। हम चाहते हैं जितने हल हैं एक मर्तबा उनको इकट्ठा