

areas and plans for redevelopment are being drawn. After the plans for redevelopment are finalised and the proposals approved, demolition of the existing houses and reconstruction of new ones will be taken up in phases, spread over a number of years. Suitable alternative accommodation will be provided to the residents of the existing houses at appropriate time.

OBITUARY REFERENCE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to draw the attention of the House to the passing away of Shri Indra Vidyachaspati yesterday evening. He was till recently a Member of this House and also the Vice-Chancellor of the Gurukul at Hardwar. Some twenty years ago, I had the privilege of addressing that University. You find there an institution which insists on self-restraint and discipline as well as intellectual progress. The attitude adopted by that Institute towards our culture is one of trust in the ancient ideals tempered by criticism. His passing away is a great loss to the public life, to the educational life and to the country at large. May I ask you to stand for a minute as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased?

(Hon. Members then stood in silence for one minute)

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

THE SALT (RESERVE STOCKS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1960

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, a copy of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Notification G.S.R. No. 932 Ess. Com./Salt(3), dated the 6th August, 1960, publishing the Salt (Reserve Stocks) (Amendment) Order, 1960. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2296/60.]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS ACT, 1952

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Labour and Employment:—

- (i) Notification G.S.R. No. 718, dated the 17th June, 1960, publishing the Employees' Provident Funds (Amendment) Scheme, 1960.
- (ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 919, dated the 29th July, 1960, publishing a corrigendum to Government Notification G.S.R. No. 718, dated the 17th June, 1960.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2297/60 for (i) and (ii).]

AMENDMENTS IN THE DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) RULES, 1955.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF REHABILITATION (SHRI P. S. NASKAR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, a copy of the Ministry of Rehabilitation Notification G.S.R. No. 881-R/Amdt: XLV, dated the 23rd July, 1960, publishing further amendments in the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2311/60.]

THE DELHI PRIMARY EDUCATION BILL, 1960—continued

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned on Thursday, when we last considered this Bill, I was submitting that clause 12, which had been introduced by the Joint Committee, is against the spirit of the Constitution

as incorporated in article 43. Sir, the Constitution definitely envisage that every citizen in India must have elementary education and training so that it may be possible for him to discharge his duties as a citizen of India.

It is well known, Sir, that when the Constituent Assembly was considering the question of franchise, there was pressure from some quarters that adult franchise should not be incorporated in our Constitution because the people of India are still not ripe to exercise this franchise with a sense of responsibility. The Constituent Assembly, in my opinion, rightly turned down this plea and incorporated the principle of adult franchise.

While incorporating that principle, Sir, they also provided for preparing our citizens to discharge their responsibility as responsible citizens of India by providing that every child within the age-group of 6 to 14 should compulsorily undergo training in the institutions that will impart primary education. The idea of compulsory education, therefore, was coupled with the idea of adult franchise being exercised later on. And because there was no distinction made between a citizen and a citizen, as far as the exercise of the right of franchise was concerned, it was contemplated that there should be no distinction between a family and a family as far as the provision of compulsory primary education was concerned.

Now, Sir, it is this principle which is now supposed to be toned down by clause 12 of the Bill which provides that in certain circumstances a child must be exempted from the compulsion of acquiring primary education in a full-time institution.

Sir, we have been told again and again that the world is entering a technological age and that India also should imbibe as much of this new spirit as possible—the spirit of technology, the spirit of new ideas, the acceptance of new values—so that

it will be possible for this country to stand in competition with any other community in the world. May I, Sir, ask the Education Minister, who, I am afraid, is not here . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shah Nawaz Khan is taking down notes.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: May I ask, through him, the Education Minister how he thinks that a child, who is not able to get even elementary primary education, will be in a position to imbibe the new idea, the new values . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There the Education Minister comes . . .

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: . . . which a modern citizen is called upon to imbibe. Unless every child in India get the necessary education, gets the necessary training, it will not be possible for us to make the people of India accept the new spirit, the new values and the new ideas which we all wish our people should accept.

We are told, Sir, that while this idealism is good, we should take the realities of social and economic life into consideration. What are those realities? Is it not a fact that those children who would like to be exempted under clause 12 of the Bill would be the very children who will have no family literacy background, that they will be coming from families which have had not the advantage of getting even the most elementary education for ages past? And, if that be so, will it be possible for that child to imbibe primary education in a short period in the part-time institutions in which education is sought to be imparted to him? Is it not a fact, Sir, that a child with little or no literacy background finds it more difficult to imbibe primary education than a child who has got a literacy and educational background. How will it be possible for a child who has no literacy background to get even the most elementary education in the part-time institutions for which provision is sought to be made in clause 12 of this Bill?

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.]

Then, Sir, there is the question of economic situation. Is it not a fact, Sir, that in modern conditions it will not be possible for any person to stand in competition with other citizens of India unless he has got some education, at least primary education? Is it suggested that because a particular child comes from a poor family, that child should be condemned to penury for the rest of his life? Is it not the duty of the State to see that it is these children who are given real primary education compulsorily so that it may be possible for them, when they become adults, to stand in competition with the other citizens of India? Is it not, Sir, a fact that even when there is not nepotism, even when there are no outside considerations and even when strict tests are held regarding the competence of students, it is generally found that only those children who have got good educational background are in a position to compete and to pass successfully and to get entry into institutions that give higher education? On the one hand, Sir, we are told that we are going to restrict entry to higher education by insisting on certain standards, because we haven't got enough facilities for higher education. On the other hand, Sir, we are denying to some of these children even primary education. Then how are they going to compete with others and hope to get into certain higher institutions by passing strict and competitive examinations? Again, Sir, do you want to perpetuate this distinction that is today existing in our country by denying the poor this benefit of compulsion in the matter of primary education?

Sir, after all it is a question of children between the ages of 6 and 11 at the present moment. We have been definitely told that during the Third Plan period it would not be possible to give free and compulsory primary education to children in the age group of 11 to 14. Therefore, Sir, at the present moment we are concerned only with those children who are in the age group of 6 to 11.

Am I to understand, Sir, that a child who is 6 years old is expected to earn for the family and to provide for the family? Am I to understand that this primary education is denied to this child on economic considerations, on considerations that this child might be able to add to the income of the family, when that child is only 6 years old or at the most 11 years old? Perhaps I can understand this argument when we come to the age group of 11 to 14. There may perhaps be some child in that age group who may be compelled to earn something for the family, because the family is extremely poor and has no other source of income. But we are not considering that age group at the present moment at all. If this particular Bill is meant for the entire period of 6 to 14, could not a provision have been made in the Bill that as far as the age group of 6 to 11 was concerned, there would be compulsion and that these cases might be reviewed after 11 years, so that at least a child could get some background, some training, some maturity during this period of 6 to 11 when it would have to go in for compulsory education?

What will be the effect of this clause 12? It is the girls who will be denied this right of compulsory primary education in full-time institutions. It will be very easy, Sir, for a family to prove that a girl who is in the age group of 6 to 11 is doing some domestic work which is indispensable and, therefore, that particular girl should be exempted from attending the full-time primary education institutions. The only result of this clause would be that there would be a distinction between compulsion as administered to a boy and compulsion as administered to a girl, although we desire that this type of distinction should not be entertained at least between the ages of 6 and 11. This is, Sir, as far as the concept of compulsory primary education is concerned.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Then, Sir, there is also the question of free primary education. Once we

have decided that education should be compulsory, it logically follows that it should be free. Now, Sir, as far as free education is concerned, there is a clause, clause 15, which states that no fee shall be levied in the institutions where these children are going, and if a particular child has to go, because of certain circumstances, to some specialised institution, then the State will take care to see that no fees are charged there also. To my mind, Sir, this concept of free education is also a toned-down concept. Does education consist merely in going to an institution and hearing a teacher who has got certain instructions to impart to the child? Is not education also consisting in reading text-books and of using writing materials? Is it not a fact, Sir, that education cannot be had unless we have got elementary writing materials and the indispensable text-books. If these writing materials and text-books have to be paid, for, how can we say that education is free? Again, Sir, I know that in clause 25(2) there is some provision regarding certain rules to be made in order to see that in suitable cases free writing materials and free text-books are provided. I would submit that it is desirable that we should write in the law itself that as far as the writing materials are concerned and as far as the text-books are concerned, they should be provided in as free a manner as instruction itself, because free education does not merely mean getting instruction free but it also means getting the necessary wherewithals for the purpose of getting this education quite free. Therefore, Sir, at least as far as these writing materials and text-books are concerned, it should be written in the very law itself that these also will be provided free. I can understand that as far as the midday meals are concerned, the matter may perhaps be left to the rule-making authority. Not that I am in any way not giving enough or due importance to the question of midday meals, but for the sake of logic and for the sake of translating into some kind of law the intention of

the Constitution, we are called upon to give only free and compulsory primary education, and as far as free and compulsory primary education is concerned, perhaps that matter regarding midday meals cannot be incorporated into that concept. Therefore that particular part might be left to the rule-making authority. But even here, Sir, all attempts should be made to see that children are given midday meals. Specially, Sir, in regard to those children who come from under-nourished families and from poor families and who do not get enough nourishment at home, it becomes necessary for us to give them nourishment in schools and other institutions. In a recent report, Sir, it has been computed that if this compulsion of midday meals is introduced all over the country, it would cost something like Rs. 144 crores per year. To my mind, Sir, this is not a very big sum, provided the Government, the various States, the local bodies and the community at large undertake the responsibility of feeding our children. Sir, all over the world today, in all civilised communities there is a growing realisation of the necessity of giving every child sound nourishment and sound training. It has been realised, Sir, that if a community has to compete successfully with other communities in the world, every citizen in that community will have to be given enough nourishment and enough training. Only a sound body and a sound mind can make it possible for a man today to stand in competition when the pressure of the modern world are so great and so heavy. It is, therefore, desirable that we should not tone down this concept of free and compulsory primary education and we should see that our child gets enough nourishment when it is in a growing condition, so that we may be able to build up a community of strong men, informed men, men with maturity and men who have got sufficient strength to discharge the heavy responsibilities of modern life. Sir, I thank you.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM
CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]

Chairman, this Bill is a very important one, because it has been claimed that this is going to be a model Bill. Sir, the Joint Committee has made many improvements in this Bill. The definition of 'primary education', for example, is practical and it also gives scope for enlarging the area of primary education in the future. Amendments to clause 17 and some other clauses are certain other improvements in the Bill. In any case, Sir, if a local authority fails or does not wish to frame a particular scheme, then the State Government can frame such a scheme itself. That is also an improvement in the Bill. There are some other minor improvements also. One other improvement is the continuance of private schools as one agency of primary education. What has been provided in clause 15 is this, namely:

"No fee shall be levied in respect of any child for attending an approved school which is under the management of the State Government or a local authority."

The private schools that are there at present happen to be of the better class of schools under the present set-up. In many cases they are examples to the schools conducted by the Municipalities and Corporations. To that extent they are contributing a great deal towards education. So it is good that we keep these good schools, though I should think a time should come when all primary education should be free, but in the circumstances in which we are situated, I think it is an improvement to keep the private schools going as they continue to be the better type of schools. These are some of the improvements that are being made in the Bill.

There are, in my opinion, one or two retrograde amendments. I would refer to one aspect which has been mentioned so much by the hon. Speaker before me. I refer to clause 12. I must confess that it is difficult for me to accept the clause as it stands. To me it seems that it is a

dangerous provision because possibly the Bill itself may be sabotaged by that class. I must thank the Adviser on Primary Education, who happens to be here, for the discussion I have had with him on this matter. While doing so, the Government has done well in getting a man of his type for administering primary education, a man who comes with a fresh mind, who is not going according to the official routine rut and who has had vast experience in the field of primary education. The case for clause 12 was put before me by him very effectively indeed. He said—and there is something in what he said—that we see two defects in our primary education. One is stagnation and another is wasting. Stagnation is in the ages of 6 plus and 5 plus. In the first and second standards, in which the children are sent to school because the parents think that they are safe in the school and they do not want the nuisance of those children in the house. The result is this that the stagnation is mostly in the first year stage, that is, at the age of 5 plus and many States have introduced 6 plus but usually when a child becomes 5 plus, generally people say 'Let him go to school'. That is one defect in the administration of primary education.

The second is wastage at the age of 9 when people begin to withdraw their children from the schools after 2 or 3 years' education because at 10 or 11 or 12, the children become useful in doing household duties, perhaps in certain cases in earning a little by grazing cattle, etc. What shall we do to avoid this wasting? The provision of clause 12 is to meet the needs of those children but what will really happen? Let us take the consequences of clause 12. While our intention is good, the result will be, a boy or a girl who works for such a major amount of time in the day, will go to a school in the evening. Usually the schools will be between 6 and 8. As a social worker, I have experience of night schools. The attendance in the night school is the worst that can happen as far as my experience goes, so much so that in the statistics you will find that a

night school which existed in January may not exist in February and the strength in January may not be there in February because they are so vacillating. We have found it by experience that, except the very old people, who keep awake, in the case of children especially, they usually go to sleep very early in the evening. So in these evening schools, the capacity of the children to keep awake is limited. So the capacity to run those schools for 2 to 3 hours is also pretty limited. Number two is, you know, the other schools run for 5 hours whereas the evening schools run only for two hours. What will be their standard? The standard is bound to be lower because it cannot be equal to that of the ordinary school which runs for 5 hours. What happens? If these children want to join the Higher Secondary Schools, they can never be up to the standard of those schools. So what are we doing? These schools are intended for the people or for the parents of children who are really backward. Are we doing a service to them by providing these evening schools? I know that there are difficulties and I know the difficulties of the parents, when these children can earn a little but I can also see the difficulty in the scheme of compulsory education. The idea of compulsion, which is the basis of this Bill, will be watered down considerably because of the evening schools for various reasons. The first is that the schools will not be run properly. The second is, the standard of the school is bound to be very much lower. The third is, the community or people whom we want to serve by compulsion will not benefit. The higher communities do not require compulsion, the middle-classes do not require compulsion, the upper middle classes do not require compulsion because they are very well aware of the benefit of education but those very people who are not yet aware of the benefits of education, those very people whom we want to benefit, by compulsion, it is they who will go to the watered-down type of education, namely, the evening school education. The compulsion is not for the people who are already going to

school. In fact, they pay and go. In Madras, the officials pay heavily to the schools and send the children and so there is no compulsion necessary for them. For the middle classes no compulsion is necessary because they know without education there can be no betterment but the poorest classes who earn, who, because of their poverty and low grade of life, are not able to understand the benefits of education . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated):
They want good education.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: . . . it is for them that the compulsion is intended. It is in those cases that we want to give these exemptions, and I say, Sir, that we are defeating the purpose of the Bill. While there is something in whatever has been put in, that is, people who cannot send their children have got to be accommodated, I think the way in which it has been done is something which will defeat the purpose of compulsion. Sir, I cannot do better than refer you to the Minute of Dissent which Mr. Govinda Reddy has appended to the Report of the Joint Committee. He has written it with facts and with feelings; coming from the rural areas as he does and knowing the conditions of the poor children round about, what he has said is substantially true. I do not like to repeat what he has written with emphasis; it is something in print and it has been circulated with the proceedings of the Joint Committee. I would like Members to go through that Minute of Dissent. I think the reasons have been very succinctly put. So, Sir, I am rather diffident about clause 12. The practical question is, what will happen to these children. If they complete their education in these evening schools, their education will be of an inferior standard because it is only for about one or two hours daily. A child desirous of getting admission in the I Form or the 7th class will not be admitted because that child's standard will be lower. So, provision of education for these backward

children is not by this means and it has got to be by some other means. I will say, do not give alternative schools but make the schools attractive; make these people feel that they can get food, books and dresses. In my opinion, we should give such inducements for this particular class of children. It has got to be done not by giving them an inferior type of education but by giving the children an inducement. As I said while the Bill was being referred to the Joint Committee, the problem of elementary education is not a mere question of providing schools; it is a question of providing facilities and inducements for the children as, for example, the provision of mid-day meals, school uniforms, schools in every locality and so on. You must have schools in every locality. That is the way of inducing these children to come to schools, but then, Sir, the problem of elementary education is not so simple. As I was talking with the Adviser, there are various questions. In a place like West Bengal, the problem is of teachers; 87 per cent. of the children go to school and the problem is of teachers; in Uttar Pradesh, where only 17 per cent. of the girls go to schools, the problem is to provide schools for girls. In Madras, we issued orders that up to the age of ten, till the elementary stage, boys and girls will read in the same schools; in fact, we abolished separate girls' schools. In Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, where because of certain prejudices, they want separate schools, the problem is of providing separate schools. It is a problem of providing trained teachers. In Bengal, it is a question of providing teachers, and so, Sir, the problem differs from State to State. The problem of providing education to these backward children cannot be solved by opening evening schools; it can be solved only by providing inducements. In this connection, I would like to place a few facts before you. My friend, Mr. Anwar, has got fresh memories about it. We have in Madras

what are called School Improvement Committees. Mr. Anwar has got some experience, and I would like to share his experiences with you. In the matter of education, the public is prepared to help us cent. per cent. It is a matter of the Government going about their duties properly. Merely issuing orders would not do. What do the education officers do? By merely having penal provisions, you cannot solve these problems. What is happening today is a surprising thing, and it has surprised us, people who are in the field, because we did not expect this much. In the last two or three years, nearly five crores of rupees worth of things have been added; making allowance for some exaggeration—Government calculations are always exaggerated; they always exaggerate things—at least two crores of rupees' worth has been added by these School Improvement Committees. They have said that sums could be earmarked for a chair, for a table and for anything, even for a clock. One item may be a clock worth Rs. 15; another may be a chair worth Rs. 10 and people can give either in cash or in kind. Out of about 23,000 elementary schools in Madras, in about 9,000 schools, we have these School Improvement Committees. During mid-day, they give *cholam*, jawar or ragi. Sometimes, they give rice also. The result of all this is that there is a new consciousness among the people. The poorest people feel that the school is their own. Previously they were strangers there but now they feel that it is their own and that they should contribute to its working. In many places school buildings have been put up by the villagers themselves. You know that when the village people build these buildings the cost will be one-third of what the P.W.D. would charge. These people, the villagers, can build much better because they are interested in keeping the buildings for ever whereas a contractor is not interested in the building remaining for ever. In this matter of primary education, I am full of hopes provided we adopt the proper attitude. If the Government servants go about asking for co-operation instead of merely

issuing orders, if they go about asking for conveniences for the children, I have no doubt in my mind that we can get a tremendous amount of co-operation. It has happened in Madras, and if it can happen in Madras, it can happen in any other State. I have no doubt about it. The officials should go about with the non-officials. The Deputy Inspector of Schools goes about with the non-officials, and this has created a tremendous amount of co-operation. A very good atmosphere has been created in the schools in the villages; every parent feels that the school is his own. The only thing that we have said is that the funds collected will not be used for giving teachers their salaries because this will be a dangerous thing, to get the parents to pay for this. This has resulted in a great deal of enlightenment and co-operation. The Madras Government pays six pice per mid-day meal per boy and the schools have got to contribute four pice. A large number of schools have adopted this scheme, and about thirty, forty or fifty poor boys are given mid-day meals. It is by these means of inducement that you must induce the children to come to school rather than have an exemption clause or a separate set of schools.

Let me, Sir, come now to another aspect of the matter. My friend, Prof. Malkani, has given notice of an amendment to the effect that all primary schools must be basic schools. Sir, this is another thing which I would like to point out. I do not know about the other States but the basic schools in the Madras State—many of them—earn about Rs. 1,500 to Rs. 2,000. It is not slave driving or anything of the kind; they do basic teaching properly. In the School with which I am connected, in the Vidyalaya about Rs. 2,000 are earned and 173 pupils—apart from the contribution for mid-day feeding—were given clothes.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Were given what?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: They were given clothes—uniforms. Girls were given skirts

and boys were given shorts and shirts. This is being done because previously what is earned had to be remitted to the State but now we have said that whatever earning comes in, whatever little it may be, it will go to the children and the result is that if a school is run properly, these things can be done. I know it is very difficult to run a basic school; it requires higher devotion and better type of teachers. And provided you can give that better training to the teachers then with this introduction of a little craft activities—limited though it may be; limited as it should be to suit the aptitude and abilities of children—you can contribute something towards clothes for the school children and mid-day food. I think the possibilities of providing such conveniences are immense. But in the Secretariat what happens is this. If somebody says we must give mid-day food, then the cost of each meal is multiplied by the number of children and then it is said we must have, say, Rs. 150 crores for providing mid-day food. We know how the Finance Department works, how the Government Departments work. Because it will cost so much, the scheme is rejected outright; it is not looked into. If there is any question about this, then they reply that it costs so much that it cannot be done. That only shows lack of imagination. This sort of reply, this sort of calculation, this sort of attitude, this sort of trying to solve the country's problems by sheer mathematical calculations shows lack of imagination. If you enlist people's co-operation, you can get things done. And the way in which we have to go about it is that our officers should have the social purpose—and not be merely administrators for the sake of running the administration—and once they have it, I am sure they will be able to achieve a great deal.

Now, I come to another aspect.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time is limited and I have got a long list of speakers.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I am not anxious to waste the time of the House.

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]

Sir, while the hon. Minister was introducing the Select Committee Report, he said that till 1918 England had some of these part-time courses. Sir, 1918 is far behind; we are now in 1960. Let us not take examples of 1918 and say that England had part-time schools in 1918 and so in 1960 we must have these courses here. I do not think that such a simile should be trotted out as an argument for retaining clause 12. If this Bill is to be really good—and there are many good aspects in this Bill which have already been mentioned and which other Members will point out—I hope that provision for mid-day feeding and other things will be incorporated so that this will have a purposeful and effective use. Thank you.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is impossible for me in considering this Bill not to think of a Bill introduced about fifty years ago by Gopala Krishna Gokhale in the Imperial Legislative Council to persuade Government to make a beginning in the direction of compulsory and free primary education. It was a Bill for a limited purpose. Its object was to authorise local bodies to make primary education compulsory for children between the ages of six and ten if they fulfilled certain conditions. Nearly fifty years have elapsed since then and it is now only that we have made up our minds to spread primary education throughout the country by the end of the Third Five Year Plan. Besides, the enthusiasm among the people for education of all kinds is much greater now than it was in Mr. Gokhale's time and I hope, therefore, that we shall meet with much greater success in our efforts to root out illiteracy than could have been expected at that time.

Now, Sir, I congratulate the Education Minister on the Bill that we are discussing particularly as it forms part of a scheme for introducing free and compulsory education throughout the country in the near future. But there are certain matters relating to the Bill

that I should like to make a few observations on. The Bill provides for compulsory education for children, that is, for boys and girls, between the ages of six and eleven. I have tried to find out from the Education Ministry and from other sources the number of children receiving education in primary schools in Delhi that is, in Delhi State, and I find that about a little over 1,31,000 boys and about 94,000 girls are attending school between the ages of six and eleven. I also find that there are about 59,000 boys and about 33,000 girls attending school between the ages of eleven and fourteen. This means that the total number of children of school-going age who are attending school is about 3,18,000, or, say, 3,20,000.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Is that for the city of Delhi or for . . .

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I am speaking of the Delhi State. Now, the figures that I have placed before the House are the result of a house-to-house census conducted by the Education Ministry towards the end of last year. There is every reason to feel, therefore, that the figures on the basis of which we are proceeding are the latest figures and the most reliable figures that we have. Now, the House would like to know what the total number of children of school-going age at the present time is. I understand that it is 4,43,000. This means that the percentage of school-going children to children of school-going age is about 72. As the number of children in the schools in Delhi is increasing rapidly every year, we may take it that this percentage is now 75. This means that three children out of every four are already attending school between the ages of six and eleven. Why should Government, therefore, content itself with efforts to provide free and compulsory education for children between the ages of six and eleven only? Why should it not go forward and provide this kind of education for children between the ages of six and fourteen? Now, I know that the hon. Education Minister said the other day that this Bill was a model Bill which the other

States might follow with the modifications required by their circumstances. Nevertheless, if in the Delhi State, we can proceed faster than we can in the other States, is there any reason why we should slow down our pace merely in order to march in step with the other States? This is possible under the Bill before us. In clause 2(e), the definition of a child given includes children between the ages of six and fourteen. It is legally possible, therefore, to provide free and compulsory education for children up to the age of fourteen. It is stated in the Financial Memorandum attached to the Bill as it was introduced in this House that provision was being made for the enforcement of compulsion only in the case of children between the ages of six and eleven. The total financial provision according to the present estimates will be Rs. 1,88,00,000 immediately and Rs. 50 lakhs later annually. Now, Sir, I am quite certain that the additional sum of money required for including the group between the ages of eleven and fourteen within the scope of this Bill will be very small. I hope, therefore, that the Education Minister will agree with me that it is desirable at least in this Union territory to provide free and compulsory education for children up to the age of 14 and that he will be able to persuade the Planning Commission to give him the small sum that will be needed for an extension of the scope of the Bill, not in theory but in practice.

Now, Sir, I come to clause 12 which has received a great deal of attention in this House. It is certainly odd that at the very time when we are trying to make primary education compulsory, we should think of providing exceptions to the rule. After all, if we are trying to make education compulsory, it is because there is some unwillingness on the part of the parents to send their children to school. If parents voluntarily sent all their school-going sons and daughters to school, there would be no need for a measure of compulsory education. There is, therefore, this illogicality in the provision made in

clause 12 for certain children to be exempted from attendance at normal schools. I know that they will be given part-time instruction, but part-time instruction cannot take the place of full-time instruction. There is, I admit, that defect in the Bill. But it will be apparent to anybody who is acquainted with the history of education that there is hardly any country where some exceptions were not made in the beginning. I know, having worked with Mr. Gokhale or at the bidding of Mr. Gokhale in connection with his Resolution on Primary Education and his Bill on Primary Education, that both in America and in England, exceptions were made in the beginning and were kept enforced for ten or twenty years. It was only later that these exemptions were done away with and every child, no matter to which class he belonged, was compelled to attend school. Apart from this, as I have already stated, three-fourths of children of school-going age are already going to school. Then, we have to consider the enthusiasm amongst the people for primary education. Need we fear, in these circumstances, that clause 12 will be taken advantage of by a large number of parents in order to keep away their children from school? I do not think that this is at all likely, at least in Delhi territory. This need not, therefore, disturb us a great deal. I should have been happier if clause 12 had not found a place in the Bill. But considering the facts I have placed before the House, I am not unduly perturbed by the exemption granted by clause 12. I know that—it is everywhere, not merely in Madras but in the U.P., in the Punjab and in other States—the first thing that the people want, the villagers want, is more educational facilities for their children. It is surprising that wherever you go, they ask first not for a dispensary or good water supply, but for a school. In the U.P. too there are many places where the villagers have built school houses in the hope that later on the Department of Public Instruction will make use of these houses to start schools there.

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.]

I have only two points more to place before the House. The first point that I should like to refer to is the efficiency of the schools that were established. When Mr. Gokhale introduced his Primary Education Bill, we were anxious that the number of children attending schools should increase. We had no regard then for the quality of education given in the schools. But during the half century that has elapsed since then, we have come to realise that the magnitude of our effort should be such as to enable us not merely to give some kind of education to our children, but education of the kind that will pass muster in the more advanced countries. Those sheltered days of 1911 have passed away never to return and we cannot think of proceeding as slowly as we could fifty years ago. In the world of today we have to think of the quality of education. Now, the quality of education depends in part on teachers. I understand that in that respect there is no difficulty in Delhi, because the salary scales being higher here than in the neighbouring States, teachers both from the U.P. and Punjab are always anxious to come to Delhi when they have some prospect of getting a post here. I have no doubt, therefore, that Delhi will be

1 P.M. able to get trained teachers. But what I am thinking of is the basis on which Government is going to proceed. Is it still going to adhere to the idea of having basic schools everywhere or, profiting by the experience gained by us in practically every State, be more practical and proceed on the basis of an educational system which may not have this name but which will be able to give effect to the purpose of the basic school scheme more easily? You go, Sir, today and speak to the villagers and ask them whether they want to receive ordinary education or basic education. I doubt whether even one-third of the villagers will be in favour of basic education. Whenever you put any question to them, they say, "We want an education of the

kind that your children are receiving. Do you send your children to basic schools? Why do you want to give an education to our children inferior to that received by your own sons and daughters?" I do not know, Sir, what answer can be given to that question. I think we ought to realise the feeling among the people and also profit by our experience and modify our educational system so as to make education more effective and more easily assimilable by the children.

There is only one more question that I want to deal with. I have no doubt that a suitable syllabus has been devised or will be devised by the education authorities for these schools. But these schools are not an end in themselves. Plenty of boys and girls after going through the primary stage would like to attend secondary schools and later on receive higher education. We have, therefore, to see that the primary education that we give our children is such as to fit those, whose economic circumstances permit them to proceed further, to go to secondary schools and colleges. Now we find—and this is not very complimentary to us but the fact has to be recognised—that at the present time if we want to educate our children, we have to teach them in a foreign language. In the colleges and universities we cannot get on without it at all. But our experience tells us that even in secondary schools the standard of education improves when proper instruction is given in English. Both the Education Minister and I have been connected with an important school in Rajasthan since its inception, and we can say from our personal experience not merely of this school but of other schools that, if you want to have an efficient secondary school, you must make provision there for the efficient teaching of English. I mention English, Sir, because we can teach this foreign language much more easily than we can teach any other foreign language. I hope, therefore, that in the Third Plan the teach-

ing of English in the primary schools will be commenced in the Third Class. Educationally I understand it would not be wrong to introduce it even in the First Class. Wherever the Soviet system prevails, school children begin to learn Russian in the First Class of the primary school.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): Do they learn English also in Russia?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Yes. They first learn Russian. My hon. friend has not understood the position. I am speaking of those areas under the U.S.S.R. where the mother tongue of the children is not Russian. You take the Central Asian Republics. The mother tongue of the people there is not Russian. Nevertheless in primary schools the children have to learn a European language compulsorily, and that European language is Russian. But even in Russia great importance is attached to the teaching of English in the secondary schools. Though it has not been made compulsory for the students to learn English, I understand that 80 per cent. of them learn English. In India we cannot teach our boys and girls Russian. We know English. We have facilities for teaching English, and it is natural therefore that we should ask that the teaching of English in the primary schools should be begun at an early age.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: When would you teach Hindi in non-Hindi speaking areas?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I would ask my hon. friend to read the broadcast of a Canadian neurologist, who came to India, in the All India Radio. He spoke on this question and what he said has been circulated throughout the country. Copies of it, I am sure, can be had either from the Education Ministry or from the Planning Commission. He will find from it

that it is much easier for children to learn new languages than for grown-up people. All of us were not so old as we are now. We were children some time or other. When I was a child, I learned Hindi, Urdu and English. Later on Urdu was given up and I learned Hindi, Persian and English. So I learned three languages, and I am not aware, Sir, that this imposed any kind of strain on me or on my brothers who were in the same boat with me. We need not therefore feel that an intolerable burden will be imposed on the children in non-Hindi speaking areas if they are asked to learn both Hindi and English from the very beginning. In fact the school-going age is the age when children can learn new languages easily and well.

Sir, this is all that I wanted to say. I am not so inexperienced as to feel that what I have said will be accepted by the Education Minister. Perhaps his leanings will be towards what I have said, but circumstances may prevent him to give effect to what he himself wishes. But if he makes even a small beginning in this direction, I shall be satisfied for the present just as he has satisfied us with his present Primary Education Bill which provides an exemption for certain children from attendance at school.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are still eight speakers, and we have already exceeded the time. So, I would like the hon. Members to take about ten minutes each. Dr. Raghubir Singh.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not going to speak on the Bill at length, but I only want to speak on certain particular aspects . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any point.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: . . . which have been under much discussion before the House.

Sir, I deem it my duty to dwell at length on one particular point, that is clause 12 which has come under much discussion and criticism in this House. When the Bill went before the Select Committee, there was no clause in the Bill similar to the present clause 12. When we were discussing the Bill in the Select Committee, there were placed before us the model rules and I found that a definite provision was being made in them for some sort of part-time education. After much thought and consideration, I felt that instead of putting this item regarding part-time education in the rules, it should have been duly and definitely provided in the Bill itself and I think I must plead guilty—if I am guilty of it—of having pleaded with the Select Committee for this provision.

Sir, I would like to put before the House the other side of the question as to why this proposal was made and why it was included in it. Mr. Rohit Dave on the other side as also some Members here have stressed the fact that it is a model Bill and as such, it should not contain any such clause. In this connection, I would like to bring to the notice of the House that a model Bill need not be an ideal Bill. This is an ideal which, in the words of a poet, is a consummation devoutly to be wished for but that Utopian ideal cannot possibly be enforced at all times under all conditions. Therefore, if a Bill is to become a model Bill which can be enforced under a variety of circumstances and conditions, it is

necessary that it should contain provisions which may be enforced successfully without being abused even in the backward areas and States. Sir, it was felt necessary that there should be part-time education to meet the requirements of education in areas where the conditions were backward. And any such Bill has to be based on the existing actual conditions. Mr. Chettiar said that it was in 1918 that the question of part-time education was given up in England. It is true that time has moved on. But the conditions in India in 1960 have not in any way greatly advanced. Even the economic conditions are not similar to the conditions of England before 1918. Therefore, if we say that we will have a Bill of this nature, I think it would only be a Utopian Bill and it will not meet the present-day conditions.

Mr. Chettiar referred to the note of dissent written by Mr. Govinda Reddy. Sir, I have great respect for Mr. Reddy. He says in his minute of dissent:—

“In my opinion, this clause is well-meant but misconceived.”

I want to say that it is not misconceived but it is conceived in the right spirit. First of all, the point that he has raised is that the main purpose of compulsion will be defeated by the inclusion of this clause and has pointed out that compulsion has to be enforced for all sorts of people. He says that compulsion is needed either for those who are ignorant of the blessings of education or for those whose poverty does not afford them the means to equip such children for school going. I should like to differ from Mr. Reddy, because if at all there is any hesitation among the poor in sending their boys to schools, it is not necessarily because of the ignorance of the people. As Dr. Kunzru said, there is real enthusiasm among the common masses today for education. So, we cannot say that even the poorest of the poor or even a villager in a distant, re-

mote area is ignorant of the advantages of education. He is not ignorant of the advantages of education. But as Dr. Kunzru again rightly pinpointed, the difficulty is that the sort of education that is being given these days especially in the village areas is not one which would in any way be found beneficial to the villagers. The villager is always feeling that if the boy continues in the school after a certain standard, he will not have any linking or desire thereafter to take part either in agriculture or in any of the professions by which the parents or the forefathers of the boy had been earning their livelihood. Therefore, the parents feel that if they have to send their children to any of these schools, they will become averse to their parental profession or to their means of livelihood at home and they think that by allowing their boys to continue their education further, they will only be doing a disservice to their family as well as to their profession. I am not so much in favour of providing an inducement by way of midday meals to persuade or, as Mr. Chettiar himself said, to attract boys at least in the rural areas so that they may attend the school. I think we have many ways of attracting boys. If you are going to give them midday meals just to attract them, you will find that they will come just for the meals and disappear thereafter. They will just come in for the mid-day meal. So, merely providing mid-day meal will not be the answer. The education will have to be so orientated that it is suited to the people and the farmer thinks that the education is going to solve his difficulty. Therefore, I would beg of the Education Minister that whenever and whatever education you are going to bring to the villages, make it attuned to the requirements of the people.

Dr. Kunzru very rightly pointed out the misapprehensions the people have for the basic system of education. I may be rather putting it very bluntly, but the villager sometimes

feels that the basic system of education is another intrigue of the urban people to keep the boys from rural areas backward. As Dr. Kunzru very bluntly said, they ask, "If this system of education is good, why are the Ministers' sons not there? If this system of education is good, why is this not being introduced in full in the urban areas? Why is it being put only in the rural areas?" Therefore, what we feel is that this is not the system of education that he wants and I do not think it will attract the attention of the people unless and until you introduce a system of education which assures the villager that his interest and good lie in taking that education.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, education is a nation-building activity and it makes an impact on the mind of the student-child at an early stage which is the primary stage. Therefore, it is rightly said that the material and spiritual well-being of a country depends upon how the growing generation is reared and educated. Therefore, no effort or expense can be considered too great for this activity. Today this needs to be stated when independence and its attendant power are mistaken for licence and gain, the higher callings of life are progressively fading away. That is why I welcome the Bill as it comes from the Joint Committee.

Sir, the Bill under consideration is not an all-India measure. It could not be so because education is a transferred subject, but it is intended to be a model one. If it does, it will at least help us a good deal in that there would be some uniformity in approach and method. Today each State goes its own way and the result is that a Bombay boy may find himself completely amiss in a Delhi school and the Delhi boy in some other schools.

There has been some discussion on the pattern and method of education. There was some discussion in the

[Shri Lalji Pendse.]

Joint Committee also and Prof. Malkani is going to move an amendment to the effect that primary education should be of a basic pattern. Now, considered from all standards it is the best, and under the guidance of the Mahatma the foundations of what is known as the Wardha Scheme of Education were laid twenty-five years ago, though no progress has since been made. True, there has been some effort here and there locally but the pre-requisites that it needs are not still present. Firstly, we need an army of trained teachers. Secondly, we need enough buildings for the schools and their workshops, with tools and other implements that this education involves. Above all, our concept of basic methods has to be modernized. So far the vocation through which the basic education was sought to be given was the spinning wheel or the simple implements of carpentry or handicraft. But we must remember that we are developing our country on modern industrial lines. Not only the heavy industries, but our plans include small-scale and middle-scale industries in the rural areas. These must be related to the agricultural projects that we plan.

We will be manufacturing agricultural implements, cables, tools and wire and the supply of the personnel for these small-scale industries must come through basic education. That is why it is not so much the spinning wheel but the lathe which is the most essential thing for basic education. But the way in which we are planning, I am afraid, it will take longer to accomplish this than I hope to live. Therefore, until these pre-requisites are made ready, it is only idle to talk of this pattern or that pattern which will lead us nowhere but to chaos. In the circumstances, when our Education Minister declared in the other House a few days ago that he was intending to gear up the whole education on basic lines in a few years' time, I thought that the was a bold man. I, therefore, request Prof. Malkani to consider his amend-

ment anew and to see that it is not in tune with the realities of today.

There are some other amendments to some of the other clauses of the Bill. Shri Harihar Patel has two amendments in his name. To line 14, on page 3 of the Bill, which reads:

“‘approved school’ means any school in any specified area within the jurisdiction of a local authority imparting primary education”.

he wants to add “fulfilling the normal conditions prescribed for approval of such a school”. I suppose the addition is superfluous. In fact, it attempts to over-simplify what is implied.

Then by another amendment he wants the words “or economic disability” to be inserted at the end of sub-clause (k) at page 4 of the Bill which reads:

“‘special school’ means any institution which imparts such primary education as is in the opinion of the State Government suitable for children suffering from any physical or mental defect;”.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not on amendments; we are at the consideration stage.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: True, but I would not have a chance to speak again. So, I was trying to cover them with a view to appealing to him to . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right, but the time is very limited.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: If I get another chance to speak, I would not refer to them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us see whether he moves them or not.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): He wants a commitment from you.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: He told me that he would move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any-way, you can finish.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: By this amendment he wants to bracket economic disability with physical or mental defects. This particular sub-clause which I read just now relates to crippled or otherwise defective children such as those of unsteady mind or mentally backward or abnormals or some such thing. Since they cannot pull as fast with normal children their progress may be slow. But a child suffers from poverty may be as sound or sounder still mentally than the average normal child. Therefore, Sir, to huddle him with the physically defective is to retard his progress, which is his due. Therefore, I request Mr. Patel not to move these amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. Ten minutes are over.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Then I am very sorry; I should not have spoken. Thank you, Sir.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a well-known fact that education is the need of the hour. That is a fact which nobody can dispute and that is true especially in regard to this country which has as its objective education for all. In view of that, I am happy that the Education Ministry has launched this Bill for the Union territory of Delhi for children in the age group of 6 to 11. I would like its extension to be made possible in the case of those in the age group of 11 to 14, but probably financial considerations and the suggestions made in the Third Five Year Plan have not made that possible. Still, Sir, especially in that regard I agree with Dr. Kunzru's plea that in the Union territory of Delhi, education should be imparted to those beyond the age of 11. I

think that would not be impossible in Delhi. I find, Sir, that this is a wealthy area and therefore with the co-operation of the public this should be possible.

Then, Sir, I find that this Bill has gone through the stage of the Joint Committee of both the Houses. The Joint Committee has paid a great deal of attention to it and has scrutinised it and has also made certain amendments. I am glad that now the Bill is before us for consideration. While I congratulate the Education Minister on having brought forward this very necessary Bill, I would like to make certain observations which, I hope, will be considered by the hon. Minister and some adjustments will be made in the Bill.

Sir, I would like to say a few words about clause 12(1) on page seven, regarding special provision for part-time education in certain cases. As has already been pointed out, Sir, if this clause is retained, it will cut at the very root of this Bill and its objective. We want free and compulsory primary education for all within a certain age group. If you read this clause, you will find that it excludes a number of people and even those richer classes who can afford to give education to their children would like to take shelter under this clause; and a part-time school is not to be encouraged at all. I would like that this clause be deleted, if possible. In this connection, Sir, I would like to quote what Shri Govinda Reddy has stated in his Minute of Dissent. He says:

"It is true that many parents cannot afford the expenses of the primary education for their children in the sense of equipping them for school going and it is also true that there are many who cannot afford to lose their services which such children do give to them. The local authorities or the State in such cases has to create a machinery with their own and also voluntary efforts to overcome these difficulties and help such parents to

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]

give their children full-time primary education at least. This should be the endeavour rather than to allow such difficulties to triumph over and to perpetuate illiteracy or poor literacy in this country. As long as clause 12 is there financially embarrassed local authorities and State authorities and poor parents who are in difficulties would take shelter under the clause, and should this be so, the title of the Bill will have little meaning and the Bill itself will not have much good to give, to the vast illiterate masses."

"There can be no argument more forceful than the one contained in that Minute of Dissent. Therefore, Sir, I would request the hon. Minister to consider and see whether the Bill cannot be revised and this clause, if possible, deleted in the interests of that very class of people who want these children for various avocations in life and who are going to use them for various jobs and thus deny them the facilities provided in respect of education by the State. Therefore, Sir, I feel that it will be doing injustice to these children. We have started various social service organisations and other organisations to root out this evil—employment of children in their early years by parents for various kinds of work to help the adults at home. No doubt we have to create conditions even to enforce the Bill as it stands and we have to undertake the responsibility of removing economic distress and we have to create such circumstances for various classes of people who are unable to look after their children of that very important group, namely, children under 6 years of age. We have to make use of these social service agencies in this connection and the State has to give facilities for coping with this group of children with creche—Balwadis, etc. There are also social welfare organisations like Nursery and Montessori schools that can look after children between

the ages of 3 and 6. And I cannot understand why they—parents—keep these elder children—6 to 11 age group—at home and want a part-time school in order to look after the younger children. Specially, 3 P.M. in the case of girls, they have to look after the young children and this will retard their progress in education. When the State is stepping in to spend so much money on various schemes, I think education should not suffer and it should find the ways and means to provide financially all the facilities that would enable the children from the middle-class and the lower class groups to avail of the fullest benefit of education that it is going to provide under this Bill and other Bills of a similar nature that might be launched in our country. As you say, this is going to serve as a model, but some States have set models already, Sir, which this Bill can incorporate, for example, Madras. I am sorry that from one Member I heard about the provision of midday meals, that children come just to have a meal and then they go away. I have been in the field of education for several years and I can speak with authority that where even students of colleges had formed Social Service Leagues, where they had contributed money to form such Leagues, and where they had spent money on various ventures like Harijan uplift, and schools for the depressed and the oppressed and for doing various ameliorative services to the poor, etc., even they had not found this. They have found that the children come because, as Dr. Kunzru said, there is the zeal and enthusiasm for education among them. The children cannot come to schools because of family or economic circumstances, because of poverty and not because of other reasons. It is not that they want to eat a meal and run away. In fact we have a proverb: "From the mud grows the lotus". I have discovered in my own experience, very many lotuses springing up from out of these classes of people who have come to the schools, not to take one meal but to avail of

all that is available and all that our students had put before them, that the social service agencies had put before them as education. I would further say: 'Let us take a leaf from the psychological approach of our old generations'. There were the Pial schools. How the master attracted all the children to that school and how we paid our way to that school by giving in kind like a bitter gourd or a snake-gourd and some other vegetable and cereals. We loved those schools. The same can be said of the Lutheran Mission schools, whatever we might say against the Missions.

So I am glad that this Bill is allowing the voluntary, private schools run by the social service organisations. Those Missions attracted us by placing before us even little stipends and gifts, by encouraging us in our education and made the whole place—the schools—so attractive that we wanted to run to those schools in spite of our parents' instructions not to go there. So we must also create such attractive centres in the schools, and have not teachers who sleep, not teachers who are half-famished, not untrained ones, not like the Hindi teacher who came the other day to me and when I asked him the meaning of a word, he began to narrate the story of how he came to Delhi, etc. So we have to get teachers who are fully trained, who have the love of the subject, who have dedicated their lives to this work as the Pial school masters and our Gurukula *gurus* had and thus give knowledge to these vast millions of pupils who come thirsting for knowledge and not for a petty meal. It will be derogatory to the dignity of children to have said so.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I stand to welcome this Bill because even though belated in its efforts, it seeks to translate into action at least one Directive in our Constitution, that is, to make primary education free and compulsory. But there is also one thing sad

about the Bill. It does not reveal a spirit of determination on the part of the Government to discharge its responsibilities itself. After going through the Bill, you find that all attempts have been made to shift this burden of making primary education free and compulsory to the local authorities. I do not think it to be a proper attitude. The Government should not fight shy of its task. It should take the responsibility on its own head to make primary education free and compulsory. This shifting of burden is not commendable.

Another thing which cannot be appreciated is that the Bill contains no provision to raise the standard of teaching in the primary schools nor any directions to make those institutions attractive to the children who will come there. We cannot make primary education compulsory simply by legislation. We cannot ask the parents to thrash their children and force them to attend these schools. The institutions should be attractive to the children themselves so that they would go there of their own accord. There is a sub-clause explaining what an 'approved school' is. It says:

"(b) 'approved school' means any school in any specified area within the jurisdiction of a local authority imparting primary education which—

(i) is under the management of the State Government or the local authority, or

(ii) being under any other management, is recognised by the local authority as an approved school for the purposes of this Act."

Now I have looked into the rule-making power. That clause says that this scheme, submitted under this Act has to include particulars relating to supply of food, refreshments, writing materials, etc., but all the same, I have an apprehension that unless something is put in this clause itself explaining 'approved schools', some

[Shri Harihar Patel,]

schools may be approved just because they are managed by the Government. That should not be so. All the primary schools should be of a very good standard. They should have good buildings, playgrounds, etc. and should thus attract the children. That should be included in the clause itself. So I have moved an amendment and I hope the Minister will consider it.

There is another clause regarding special schools. There is provision for children suffering from any physical or mental defects. I have sought to add the words 'or economic disability'. Naturally I do not mean the child but the parents as suffering from economic disability. An hon. Member pointed out that this amendment is bad because children suffering from physical or mental defect and children suffering from economic disability cannot be put together. It is not my intention.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you are speaking on your amendment, I take it that you will not speak later.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: I will cut short. Special schools may be for children suffering from disabilities and also for those suffering from mental defects. These two types cannot go together, I agree. What I mean, naturally, is that there should also be special schools for children coming from families suffering from economic disability. There are poor people who may not send their children simply because of poverty. It will be an irony of fate if mentally defective children will get opportunities and at the same time children quite capable but suffering from poverty do not get the opportunity to learn.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Maharashtra): Then it will cease to be a special school.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: It will be special in the sense that there may be arrangement for food, clothing

etc., and for bearing the responsibility to see that the children have food, clothes, etc., besides their lessons.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Then the amendment has to be differently worded.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: We will see to that but that is my intention. Then I would express my agreement with the views of Shri Rohit Dave regarding clause 12. I do not think the clause is desirable because in its consequence, I feel that it will hard-hit the girls. Generally, girls between 6 and 14 are retained by their mothers at home to help them in their work and if this clause is there, I do not think any girl will come for primary education. Secondly, many parents might take advantage of this clause and send their children to part-time schools and thereby the children will not learn anything and thus the clause will have a tendency to perpetuate illiteracy among the poorer and backward classes in the society.

Another point is about the opinion of Dr. Kunzru regarding inclusion of English teaching in the primary schools. Now I do not like to express any opinion about the suggestion because it requires a lot of time but I would draw his attention to the fact that it is laid down by the Constitution that primary education has to be in the mother-tongue. As such, . . .

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Nobody says that it should not be in the mother tongue, but you can teach other subjects too.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: We have to examine whether we can add another burden of learning another language in the primary stage. Even if that subject is added in the primary course, I will submit that in the backward regions of the country, it may be very difficult. There are non-Hindi speaking children and in their cases, they will have to learn possibly English first and then Hindi. If

Hindi is also taught, then they will have to learn three languages at the same time which, I think, is a very heavy burden on a child of six or seven.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The parents are anxious to teach English to their children.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: Maybe, but not in all parts of the country.

In conclusion, I would request the hon. Education Minister to see that Government takes upon itself the responsibility to make primary education free and compulsory.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I consider this Bill as a very important one, and I do so because this Bill really is a model Bill, not only for Delhi. It is a model Bill for the whole of India. It is in that setting that the Bill must be considered. If it were about Delhi only, I would not very much bother about it or waste my energy but would say, "All right, go ahead", but it is a model Bill for the whole of India, and one has to be very serious about it. In the Second Plan we had an item about the Community Projects. They professed to cover the whole of the country, and they professed also to work for the welfare of all classes and all communities. They hope to cover, two years later, the whole of the country, but they have made mistakes and they realise them; they have not been able to touch the weaker sections of the community. They know it very well and they are trying to rectify that mistake; the weaker sections have been left not high and dry but low and dry. We are repeating that mistake again with regard to education; we are forgetting the weaker sections as we forgot them when we initiated the Community Project schemes. We need not deliberately forget them again when we bring in this question. Take this clause 12 which has been put in. It has been put in there with good intentions, pious intentions; the intentions are not

bad, they are good, but where do they lead us? They will lead us to this: the differences that exist now between the educated and the uneducated, between the literate and the illiterate, will persist in a different form, and you will have literates and semi-literates or demi-literates. It will come to that. The literates will later on become highly educated and the semi-literates will wallow in the mud all the time; they will remain where they are; they will not come even to the secondary stage, not even come to the stage for what is called 11 to 14 age group. They will remain where they are and they will not make any progress whatsoever. In regard to the Community Projects, we have realised the mistakes and are trying to correct them by having panchayats, co-operation and so on, but how will you be able to cure this vital basic evil of cutting off people at the very bottom, not because of their fault but because of our fault, not because they do not want education? Everybody wants education even in the rural areas, as my friend, Dr. Kunzru, said, and I know it very well too because I have been to the villages. After food, or even before food, they want education; what you say is literally true, they thirst for it. It is not their fault but it is our fault. So, this approach is wrong, the analysis of the situation is wrong. They want to be educated; they want good education. Everyone wants to have higher education. But they are poor and they are limited by their means. We must then find out a proper answer to it. We have got to find out a proper answer. We are forgetting Gandhiji always. I say that now and then we must remember him. I have a small booklet in my hand. Gandhiji has put 27 points about education, and mainly about primary education, on page 101 of "Ashram Observance In Action". I wish the hon. Minister, who is now having a little gossip, could be a bit more serious about it and read those 27 points. The time has come when he should read them. It is not any kind of education that we want; we want primary education of the right

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

type. It was said just now that we are building up an industrial India. Very good; industry is basic to the growth and development of India; very right, but then, what is the kind of education that you are giving at the secondary stage? What is the kind of education that you are giving at the elementary stage? Is it intended to build up, what is called, the new India, the modern India, the industrialised India? No, it is the same academic thing, the same bookish thing, something which cuts off the child from life in the villages or life in the towns, and it was his intention, Gandhiji's, as is evident from the book which I referred to earlier, not to cut off the child either from home or from the village but to make the school as a home and the village integrated in the rural areas, and to integrate the home and the school and the surrounding environment in the urban areas? We have cut off, separated and isolated them. Just now, when we are taking a big step, a very vital step and a very important step, we must consider as to what type of education, what pattern of education we will impart to our children. Will it help to industrialise India? Will the children learn the use of hands, eyes and the senses? Will they develop good hands, hands which will work, hands which will love to work or will they be ones which will love to go to the town, read books, any book, which have no meaning so far as life is concerned? This question is basic to the whole policy.

Sir, I want to remind you of another thing. I was in the Wardha conference, the very first, which was held in 1937, and I participated in that. Gandhiji's idea was this: If it was intended to take education to everybody in the country, the State will not be able to meet the expenditure. He did not think of Swaraj and independent India. He never thought of your giving Rs. 300 crores for, "free and compulsory education", and that is why he said that every child must be taught some productive industry

so that he is able to pay off to some extent, not the full, not even the major part, but partially, the cost of his education. The time has come just now to think over it again very seriously. There are poor people and we must not exploit their poverty. We must not insult them because they are poor. We must help them, as my friend, Mr. Chettiar, has said. We must give them incentives. Why incentives? Give them aid and help. It is only the capitalists who want "incentives". If you give them help, it will be all right. You can introduce this basic pattern full-blown as Gandhiji wanted, if you have the courage, if Dr. Kunzru has got the courage; Dr. Kunzru has not got the courage, the Minister has not got the courage to give us full-blown basic education—he is not ready, never will be ready, and it seems that nobody will be ready for the next twentyfive years—then, why can't you think of this scheme, the modified scheme of elementary education by the Education Department of Madras, a scheme which was framed by Shri Rajagopalachari

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): But it was rejected by the Madras Government itself.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: By the Education Department.

... discovered by and put into force by Rajaji when he was the Chief Minister. Of course, the scheme did not come into operation for various political reasons, not educational reasons. I have read it again, I have read it several times. There are many features in the scheme which are very important, which are far more important than clause 12 of this Bill. This clause 12, according to me, is an insult to the poor man. You are telling him, "You are a poor man. I will give you some inferior education". This modified scheme requires reconsideration. I do not wish to go into the details of the scheme because I am given only ten minutes for no fault of

mine. So, I say, there are features in the scheme which are most important. Take something, I would say much; if you cannot take the whole thing, take something from Gandhiji, take something from Rajaji. They are our greatest men, greatest thinkers and greatest educationists—education not only of children but adults also including the Minister himself. Shall we reject them at the crucial moment when we want them very badly, when we are putting into force a system of education which is to be primary, which is to be basic, on which you will build up secondary education, on which you will build up higher education? Is this the foundation that you are laying? Your foundation is a rotten foundation if I can say so without being impertinent. If you wish to have good secondary education, if you wish to have sound higher education, if you wish to have sound technical education, your foundation has to be sound and strong. But your foundation is kucha, useless. This foundation will not do. The issue today is, either have basic education, even a modified basic education or reject it, if as Dr. Kunzru says, people do not want it. But people are not the persons who can decide what they want. They can only suggest what is bad. They can't say what is good for them. It is for the minority, it is for the select thinkers, it is for Gandhiji and Rajaji to say what people want. It is not for the people to say that. People do not know. The people today are just indulging in whatever exists which should not exist and which everybody feels is rotten. They have to be pushed up and the time has come just now for the Minister to take courage in both hands and give a little push. I know he believes in basic education but he just does not have the courage to give that push. I wish he gives that little push and I am sure it will go through. Or if you don't believe in it, you reject it. But he will neither be in hell nor in heaven; that will not do. Kindly select something you believe in and do it. If you can reject it, I will be

happy. At least there will be no more hypocrisy about it.

Then, what about the quality, as Dr. Kunzru said, of these schools? Will he only give them books or only industry? Again I will draw your attention to these 27 points of Gandhiji. There he says somewhere—I do not want to read it because the bell has gone—that religious instruction or a religious atmosphere is “indispensable” in the primary stage. It is not at the later stage that you can give it. When you go to the university you can then have comparative religion on an intellectual basis. But it is at the primary stage when the child is so tender, when the child is so sensitive to so many things, that you should have this religious atmosphere. I take my little grandchild of three years to the temple. She wants to go there; she takes me there—that child of three years because she wants to go there to ring the bell. I lift her up to ring the bell. What everybody does, she also does. If somebody drops flowers, she does it too and I do it because she does it. Sir, it is at that stage when a child is 3 years or 2½ years, that the child becomes religious-minded, religiously conditioned, religiously inclined. Don't forget that.

Now, you have got fine Reports. The Education Ministry luxuriates in fine Reports. I read them with great interest and put them down with great disappointment. Things do not happen. Therefore I do again plead that this is not a small thing: It is not a joke, this Primary Education Bill. It is a very big thing, a very important thing. It is not a debate on foreign affairs; this is more important. I say, lay your foundation well on a sound basis and lay it strong.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): A debate on foreign affairs is not important according to you?

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: It is not so important as the debate on Primary Education. Excuse me for my bluntness.

श्रीमती सार्वभौम (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपसभापति महोदय, बड़ी प्रतीक्षा के बाद आज सदन के समक्ष जो प्राइमरी एजुकेशन बिल आया है, उसका मैं हार्दिक स्वागत करती हूँ। पर इस विधेयक को आदि से अन्त तक पढ़ने के पश्चात् मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ और मैं समझ नहीं पाई कि इस वरदानमय विधेयक को इतना कम्प्लीकेटेड बनाने का क्या उद्देश्य है। यह बिल्कुल सीधी सादी सी बात थी, यह ऐसा प्रश्न था जिसका एक एक व्यक्ति ने स्वागत किया और इसमें कोई ऐसी अड़चन नहीं थीं जिनके कारण इसको इतना कम्प्लीकेटेड बनाया जाता, लेकिन मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि क्यों इसको तीन चार पेज के बजाय काफी लम्बा चौड़ा बनाया गया।

क्लाज १२ को लेकर के सदन के अनेक सदस्यों ने बहुत जबरदस्त आलोचना की है। यह कहा गया है कि यह गरीबों का अपमान है। यह भी कहा गया कि जिन लोगों को लाभ पहुंचाने के लिये यह विधेयक आया गया है, उनको इससे लाभ होने के बजाय अधिक हानि होगी। जहां तक आदर्शों का प्रश्न है, आदर्श सचमुच बहुत आकर्षक होते हैं, परन्तु जब वे वास्तविकता की चट्टान से टकराते हैं तो वे कभी-कभी सब के सब चकनाचूर हो जाते हैं। दवे साहब ने कहा कि ६ से ११ वर्ष का बच्चा भला क्या काम करेगा, अपने मां बाप के लिये वह क्या लाभदायक सिद्ध हो सकता है, उसको कौनसा उद्योग धंधा या कौनसी नौकरी मिल सकती है। लेकिन मैं उनसे कहूंगी कि वे जरा दरिद्र नारायणों में जाकर देखें और यदि वे दूर नहीं, यही आस पास रिज के चारों ओर जो झुगियां पड़ी हुई हैं उन्हीं में जाकर देखें, तो वहां पर वे देखेंगे कि छः सात वर्ष का बच्चा बैठा होगा और उसकी छोटी बहन उसके पास बैठी होगी और वह बच्चा उसको खेलाता होगा। वह मां बाप जिनकी दिल्ली में इस महंगाई के जमाने में एक डेढ़ रुपये रोज की कमाई है, वे अपने बच्चों को स्कूल कैसे भेज सकते हैं? यदि वे अपने बच्चों

को स्कूल भेजते हैं तो उनके छोटे बच्चों को देखने के लिये घर पर एक आदमी चाहिए। इसके अतिरिक्त यदि वे चलें तो मैं उनको दिखाऊंगी कि गरीबी के कारण कितने ८ या ९ साल के बच्चे दूकानों और दूसरे स्थानों पर छोटी-छोटी नौकरियां करते हैं। यह कहा गया कि यदि ११ वर्ष के बच्चे नौकरी करेंगे तो यह गरीबों का अपमान है, लेकिन मैं उनसे यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि अनुभव के आधार पर वे देखें कि यू० पी० और बड़ौदा में क्या हुआ। असलियत में जब प्राइमरी एजुकेशन कम्पलसरी होगी तो जो लोग अपने बच्चों को स्कूल नहीं भेज पायेंगे उनको ही राहत देने के लिये क्लाज १२ इन्क्लूड किया गया है। यू० पी० में क्या हुआ? यू० पी० में प्राइमरी एजुकेशन कम्पलसरी बनाई गई और लाखों रुपये का जुर्माना हुआ। लेकिन जिनके ऊपर जुर्माना हुआ, जब जुर्माने की कुर्की लेकर लोग उनके घरों में गये, तो उनके यहां टूटे-फूटे बरतन और चीथड़ों के अलावा कुछ नहीं निकला। इस प्रकार हर साल बहुत सा रुपया खर्चा हुआ और हुआ यह कि पहले जुर्माना किया और बाद में उसे राइट आफ किया। वास्तव में उनकी जीविका का प्रश्न उनके सामने आ जाता है, इस लिए वे अपने बच्चों को स्कूल भेज नहीं सकते। उनका छः वर्ष का बच्चा एक वर्ष के बच्चे की देखभाल करता है और जब वह बच्चा आठ वर्ष का हो जाता है तो वह चौका बरतन या ऐसा ही कोई छोटा-मोटा काम करके अपने मां बाप की कुछ आर्थिक सहायता करने लगता है।

एक भाई ने यह भी कहा कि वे बेचारे कैसे कम्पीटीशन कर पायेंगे। जिन बच्चों के घर की इतनी खराब हालत है, क्या आप यह समझते हैं कि वे आई० सी० एस० और पी० सी० एस० के कम्पीटीशन में बैठेंगे या वे हायर सैकेंडरी या यूनिवर्सिटी में दाखिल होंगे। उनमें जो ब्रिलियंट लड़के होंगे उनका दाखिला तो टीचर ही अच्छे स्कूलों में करा देगे।

अभी हाल में मैं खुद मल्कानी जी के पास दो एक बच्चों को ले गई थी और उनसे कहा था कि ये बड़े ब्रिलियंट लड़के हैं, इस लिए यदि इनको थोड़ी मदद आप दें और थोड़ी मदद हम दें तो ये आगे चल जायेंगे। इस तरह जो ब्रिलियंट लड़के होंगे उनके टीचर्स भी अच्छे स्कूलों में दाखिल कराने में सहायता करेंगे और उनके मां-बाप की भी रुचि उनके प्रति अधिक हो जायेगी। लेकिन जो आर्डिनरी बच्चे हैं, जिनको आगे चल कर चपरासी, खोचवाले या साधारण कारीगर आदि बनना है, उनको यदि दो तीन घंटे रोज की शिक्षा पांच छः साल तक मिल जाती है और वे रामायण या अखबार पढ़ने लग जाते हैं, तो इससे उनमें थोड़ी जागृति आ जायेगी। ये स्कूल इसी उद्देश्य को लेकर खोले जा रहे हैं। इनका उद्देश्य यह नहीं है कि गरीबों का एक अलग क्लास बना दिया जाय और अमीरों का एक अलग क्लास बना दिया जाय। जैसा कि मल्कानी जी ने कहा, मैं भी मानती हूँ कि गरीबों में भी बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं जो भूखों मरते हैं लेकिन वे चाहते हैं कि उनके बच्चे जरूर पढ़ जायें। ऐसे लोगों के लिये इसमें कोई रोक नहीं लगा दी गई है। यदि वे नहीं चाहते हैं तो वे दो तीन घंटे वाले स्कूलों में अपने बच्चों का दाखिला नहीं करायेंगे। यदि किसी ग्रंथी विधवा का बच्चा है या किसी बच्चे का पिता बीमार है और मां उसकी सेवा में लगी रहती है और बच्चे को कुछ कमा कर लाना पड़ता है, तो ऐसे बच्चों के लिये इन स्कूलों का बहुत बड़ा महत्व है। इसलिये सारी बातें सुनने के पश्चात् और फिर यू० पी० और बड़ौदा का जो नमूना है उसको देखने के बाद कि पहले जुमाना किया जाय और फिर उसको राइट आफ किया जाय, अन्त में मैं इसे एक तरह की ईविल समझ कर जिनकी हालत बिल्कुल गिरी हुई है उनके बच्चों की भलाई के लिये इस क्लाज का समर्थन करती हूँ।

श्रीमन्, जब प्राइमरी एजुकेशन कम्पलसरी बना दी जायगी तो सेंसस में प्रति वर्ष

लाखों रुपया खर्च होगा और हर एक बच्चे का रजिस्ट्रार, हर एक बच्चे के माता पिता का नाम, ये सारी बातें रखनी होंगी। मैं सोचती हूँ कि जितना रुपया प्राइमरी एजुकेशन में लगने वाला है उसमें यह बात जरूर ध्यान में रखनी चाहिये कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सेट-अप पर कम से कम खर्च हो। यह न हो कि सेंसस में ही दस लाख रुपया प्रति वर्ष खर्च हो। यह दिल्ली इतना बड़ा है, लाखों बच्चे पढ़ने वाले हैं। इसलिये मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगी कि बजाय इस तरह सेंसस लेने के, खूब जोरों के साथ जगह जगह अनाउन्स किया जाय, हर जगह पैम्फलेट वगैरा बांटे जायें और चिपकाये जायें।

इसी तरह, श्रीमन्, क्लाज के बारे में मैं सोचती हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी को स्वयं एक एमेंडमेंट लाना चाहिये था और इस प्रकार का एमेंडमेंट बहुत ही आवश्यक है। श्रीमन्, इसमें लिखा हुआ है, पेज ६, क्लाज ८, लाइन २४ पर—

“....that he is under an obligation to cause the child to attend an approved school with effect from the beginning of the next academic year.”

श्रीमन्, इस विधेयक का उद्देश्य यह नहीं है कि बच्चे स्कूल एटेंड करें। इसका उद्देश्य यही है कि बच्चा एजुकेशन रिसीव करे। इसलिये मैं सोचती हूँ कि यह एक छोटा सा माइनर एमेंडमेंट है कि बजाय इसके कि “एटेंड दी स्कूल” हो अगर “टू रिसीव्ह एजुकेशन” कर दिया जाय, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस विधेयक का जो यह क्लाज है वह बहुत ही स्पष्ट हो जायगा। दूसरे यह कि लोगों की समझ में यह आयेगा कि हमारा एक प्रकार का कंपलशन लाकर बच्चों को स्कूल भेजना ही उद्देश्य नहीं है बल्कि उनको शिक्षा दिलाना हमारा उद्देश्य है। इसलिये जो बच्चे हैं डीकैण्ड

[श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

होंगे या वैसे होंगे उनको दूसरे स्कूलों में भेजा जायेगा, उनको वहां शिक्षा दिलाई जायगी, यह नहीं कि बच्चों को वे किसी न किसी स्कूल में, उस प्यूनिटिन्ह क्लाज से बचने के लिये, भेज दें चाहे उनको शिक्षा मिले या न मिले। इसलिये मैं सोचती हूं कि यह एक माईनर एमेंडमेंट जो है इसको स्वीकृत कर लिया जाये।

जहां तक नाइट स्कूलों का संबंध है, मेरे मन में हमेशा चार्ल्स डिकेंस के नाइट स्कूल्स और उनके हीरोज ओलिवर ट्विस्ट वगैरह सामने आ जाते हैं। उसमें नाइट स्कूल्स का काफी जिक्र आया है। तो आप ही यह बताइये कि सारे दिन बच्चा जो काम करेगा वह कैसे इस योग्य रहेगा कि वह जाकर नाइट स्कूल्स में पढ़ सके। तो नाइट स्कूल में छोटे छोटे बच्चों के पढ़ने की इस प्रकार व्यवस्था हो उससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूं। अगर बच्चा पूरे घंटों स्कूल अटेंड नहीं कर सकता तो तीन चार घंटे अटेंड करे। अगर सुबह नहीं कर सकता तो शाम को करे। लेकिन श्रीमन्, छोटे छोटे बच्चों के लिये नाइट स्कूलों की कल्पना भी उचित नहीं है क्योंकि नाइट स्कूलों का जो स्वरूप अब तक मैंने देखा है उसको, देखते हुये मैं जरूरी नहीं समझती कि नाइट स्कूलों की आवश्यकता है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : वह स्कूल ही कैसा है जिसमें अटेंडेंस कम हो। अटेंडेंस भी होनी चाहिये।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : मैंने इसे साफ कर दिया है कि दो, तीन घंटे के स्कूल के समर्थन में मैं हूं। सवेरे के बजाय शाम को रखा जाय उसके भी समर्थन में मैं हूं।

श्रीमन्, यहां पर सेकंडरी एजुकेशन की पालिसी के विषय में बहुत कुछ कहा गया कि कैसी होनी चाहिये। मैं नहीं समझती कि इसका सेकंडरी एजुकेशन से कोई संबंध नहीं

है। मैं मल्कानी जी से पूरी तरह सहमत हूं कि बेसिक एजुकेशन की एक पालिसी गवर्नमेंट ने स्वीकार कर ली है। वह एक स्वीकृत पालिसी है और उसके बारे में ज्यादा तरक्की होनी चाहिये। (*Time bell rings.*) मैं एक बात पूछती हूं। हम लोगों को देखना चाहिये कि कुछ चीजें ऐसी होती हैं जिनमें प्रेक्टिकेबिलिटी का ध्यान रखना होता है। इस विधेयक के आने पर मशरूम ग्रोथ की तरह सारे बच्चों को एकमोडेड करना होगा, जगह की तंगी होगी और ऐसी हालत में थड़ा-थड़ा स्कूल खोलना कहां तक संभव है। जो बेसिक स्कूलों की पालिसी मल्कानी जी के दिमाग में है वैसे बेसिक स्कूल खोले जाना क्या इतनी जल्दी संभव है। वैसे बेसिक स्कूल अगर खोले जायेंगे तो वे नाम मात्र के स्कूल होंगे। बेसिक स्कूल की, बेसिक एजुकेशन की जो एक विचारधारा है, उसको भी हम इससे धक्का पहुंचावेंगे। तो मैं यह कहती हूं कि न इतना परसोनेल है, न इतना इक्विमेंट है और न इतना स्थान है कि अर्बन एरिया में छोटे छोटे स्कूल खोले जा सकें। इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि बेसिक स्कूलों के लिये दिनों दिन खतरा उत्पन्न हो जायगा। मैं चाहती हूं कि बेसिक एजुकेशन आये तो पूरी समग्रता के साथ, पूरी व्यापकता के साथ आये, जैसा गांधी जी ने कल्पना की थी और जैसा कि नयी तालीम संघ का बेसिक पैटर्न है।

इतना कह कर मैं इस विधेयक का हार्दिक स्वागत करती हूं।

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, one of the Directive Principles of State Policy, in article 45 of the Constitution of India, says:—

“The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years.”

It is a matter of deep regret that in spite of the Directive Principle in the Consitution, we have not been able to provide free and compulsory education to our children within the age group of six to fourteen years. If we take the history of education in the Western countries, we will find that attendance at school of children belonging to the age group of six to fourteen years had been made compulsory long before. For example, in Belgium the attendance was made compulsory in 1914, in England in 1888, in France 1936. Not only that. We find that in Denmark compulsory primary education was introduced as early as 1814. Of course, we know that the Western countries are advanced countries. What about the Asian countries? It is well known that the Asian countries, from the educational point of view, are slightly backward. If we take into consideration the progress made by certain countries in South East Asia, we will find that our Government has not discharged its responsibility fully in providing free and compulsory education for our children. For example, in Burma a scheme was formulated in 1951 to provide free and compulsory education for the age group of 6-11 and by 1955 the scheme was completed and every child within this age group was receiving free and compulsory education. In Ceylon the attendance was made compulsory in 1939. In Japan we find that education for nine years has been made compulsory for children in that country. from all these facts it is quite evident that in our country we have not been able to make much progress in this respect. Of course, now the Government is making a modest effort by bringing forward this Bill. But I must say that according to certain provisions in this Bill we are not providing education to all the children within the age group 6-14 years, because whenever a scheme is to be formulated by the local authority, discretion is to be given to that authority to fix the year or the age group, for example 6-11 or 6-14 and the standard of education which will be made compulsory for the children. In my opinion, this is

not proper. There should be no discretion left to the local authorities. In this Bill we must make provision that education shall be free and compulsory for all children who are within the age group of 6-14 years. There should not be any difficulty. As Pandit Kunzru has pointed out, from the figures that are available we find that there are about four lakhs children, who belong to the school-going age group. Out of this, three lakhs are going to schools actually. There are only one lakh children who are not going to school. It comes to about twentyfive per cent. From the same statistics we find that the average expenditure for the education of each child comes to Rs. 67 per annum. If we want to give education to one lakh more children, we will have to spend only Rs. 67 lakhs. Am I to understand that our Government is not in a position to provide the amount of Rs. 67 lakhs for making education compulsory for all the children within the age group of 6 and 14? Sir, in this connection I may kindly be allowed to quote Professor Humayun Kabir. He has said in his book "Education in New India" that education for the children must be the first call on the nation's resources. Therefore, there should be no difficulty in providing free and compulsory education to all children within the age group of 6 and 14.

Sir, another point I would like to make is about clause 12. It seems to be a most controversial clause. Some have advocated that there should be part-time teaching, and some of the hon. Members in this House have opposed the provision. So far as my personal views are concerned, I oppose this. There should be no provision for imparting education on a part-time basis, because, if we take into consideration the objectives of education, then we will realise that the basic and fundamental objective of imparting education to children is to inculcate in them proper attitude, proper behaviour, good morals, etc., so that they can become responsible

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]
citizens of this country. Therefore, before deciding this question we must first ask ourselves the question of what the objectives of education should be. Is it the objective of education to make those people only literate, or are we trying to make them responsible citizens of this country? What is the purpose? I will read out from the Report of the UNESCO a statement on the objectives of primary education. It has been mentioned that the objective of primary education should be—

“to give an adequate mastery over the basic tools of learning;

to bring about a harmonious development of the child's personality by providing for his physical, intellectual, social, emotional, aesthetic, moral and spiritual needs;

to prepare children for good citizenship;

to develop in them a love for their country, its tradition and its culture, and to inspire in them a sense of service and loyalty;

to inculcate a scientific attitude;

to inculcate a sense of dignity of labour; and

to prepare children for life through the provision of worthwhile practical activities and experiences including work experiences”.

If we take into consideration all these objectives, can the hon. Minister say here that by making provision for part-time teaching we can inculcate all those qualities in the children? I must emphatically say that we cannot, and therefore there should not be any such provision. I am rather surprised when people say that there are certain children who, because of the poverty of their parents or because of some domestic difficulties, are not able to attend any school. I

cannot understand this argument. Sir, today education is not compulsory. Even then we find that 87 per cent. of the children are attending the schools. Only 13 per cent are not attending school, and that also may be because there may not be any school within a short distance of their residence. If we establish schools within their localities, then I am quite sure that those 13 per cent of the children also will be attending school, and if we make education compulsory, there might be only one or two per cent of children who will not be attending school. So, only for the sake of one or two per cent. of children, are we going to make this provision for part-time teaching? Sir, in my opinion it will be a complete farce and mockery of free and compulsory education.

So far as other aspects of primary education are concerned, there are three of them. There should be universal provision, universal enrolment and universal attendance. When we are making this scheme for compulsory education, we should see that there are proper facilities for schools, game activities, school buildings, well trained and qualified staff, and so on. Apart from that there should be universal enrolment.

Sir, I have been going through the statistics and I find that our Government has completely neglected the education of our womenfolk. These are the figures of boys and girls in primary schools:

	Boys	Girls
1954-55	21,403	5,211
1955-56	23,345	5,732
1956-57	26,341	6,876

Then what about the amount spent on the education of boys and girls?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Khobaragade.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I am just finishing. Sir, if we take into consideration all these statistics, I must point out to the hon. Minister that no proper attention has been given to the education of girls, and if we want to make education free and compulsory, we must see that this scheme is made applicable compulsorily to girl also.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi): Sir, I want heartily to congratulate the Minister of Education upon having brought this very good and useful measure for the benefit of the people of Delhi and making education at the primary stage free and compulsory for the children of Delhi. It is a very useful and beneficial measure, and I am sure that the people of Delhi would appreciate it very much, particularly as Delhi happens to receive the first attention of the hon. Minister. It is to be a model Bill and it is to be applied to or taken up for use by other States in India, and then in the course of the next Plan the whole of the country would be covered by compulsory education.

Sir, while we are making a model Bill, while efforts have been made that it should be a model Bill, I would refer to one thing which Mrs. Nigam also pointed out, and it is this definition that a parent may cause a child to attend school. This definition and many other provisions of the Bill have been taken from similar enactments of England, America and other countries of Europe where primary and compulsory education has been obtaining for many many years. But even in England from where we have taken most of the provisions of this Bill, this particular definition was amended almost half a century back when they replaced the words "may be caused to attend the school" by the words "may be caused to receive education". Our aim is that a child should receive education. Our aim is not that he should attend school. When he receives education, we are sure that he is learning something,

getting some education. But a boy or girl may attend school and may not learn anything. You may be familiar with cases of children who go to school but do not learn anything for years and years and years. I have seen children who have spent four years in school but still do not know the alphabets. Not that they are crippled or handicapped but they are not willing to learn. They are fairly normal children, but they are so mal-adjusted and so backward emotionally that they cannot learn. You may also be knowing of cases of people spending eight years in a Law College but not getting the Law degree. I cannot say whether you really feel that by spending eight years in the Law College they really learn much. But what I say is that the receiving of education should be the aim of the Primary Education Bill rather than the attending of school. A child may be very well educated by his maker at home or a child may be receiving education in a school. He may be receiving education in a school for the handicapped or the crippled or the deaf and dumb.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: You may take the horse to water but cannot make it drink.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Therefore, my suggestion is that our aim should be that the child should receive education whether it be by his mother or by a school or by a school for the handicapped or the crippled or the deaf and dumb. Why should we want his attendance? We are concerned with his education. Therefore, If we take the more modern and up-to-date definition which was taken by England also, we may be more up to our times. Otherwise, it seems like a Bill which is out of date.

Another thing which seems a little out of place to me is that we want a socialistic pattern of society and in this Bill, while the local bodies may start schools which are not to charge

any fees at all from the parents, all the private schools can charge fees from the parents for the education of their children and really two sets of schools will function. I know that the private schools are very good, that they are doing a very good work and nobody would want to take away their contributions and stand in their way. We appreciate the good work that is being done by these private educational institutions which are recognised. But the fact remains that there are children who cannot afford to pay fees and who would be sent to government schools where definitely the standard is poor and is not as good as that in the private schools, and they have to come to these schools for education. Only the well-to-do people will be sending their children to these private schools paying high fees. Therefore, the idea of equality is not there because one set of children will go to government schools where there is a poor standard and another set of children will go to private schools by paying fees. When our idea is to make primary education free, we should not encourage this kind of separate schools.

Sir, the local bodies are supposed to enforce primary education and make it compulsory. Clause 8 says that the attendance authority will make out a list of the names of the fathers and the particulars of their children, their age, mother-tongue, etc. and write to every single parent that his child is supposed to attend school under clause 4 which makes it compulsory that all the children between the ages of six and eleven should attend the school. So, our effort should have been only to notify the parents who are not sending their children to school, and we should not bother about others who are already sending them to school because if the attendance authorities have to write about one and a half lakhs of letters saying that the parents are supposed to send their children to school, it involves a lot of expenditure, time and energy. These things may be announced

through the Press, through conferences, through the *panchayatdars*, through the *sarpanches* and through the *panchayat* officers. These people may inform the people in the villages that primary education has become compulsory now and that every child between the ages of six and eleven must go to school. This can effectively be done by the Block Development committees which are really effective in their respective areas. But you are asking the local authorities to collect all this data about the child, his age, his mother-tongue, his parents, his residential address and so on, and there are at least 1½ lakhs of such children in Delhi, and this would involve a large army of clerical staff to collect all these materials and write all the letters. A lot of stationery and postage in correspondence back and forth will be wasted. When you pass a law, you expect the people to follow it. You can do this by the beat of drums and by announcement in the newspapers. The people are supposed to know the law and follow it. Ignorance of law is no defence. Therefore, I do not know why every year the Education Department should spend a lot of time, money and energy in collecting all this information and writing to each of the parents or guardians wanting them to send their children to school. We should naturally pursue those parents who are not sending their children to school and not waste our energy on those who are already sending their children to school, and in towns it is a very small section of the people who do not send their children to school. This is a big problem in the villages. The children do not go to school there, especially the girls are not sent to school and quite a large percentage of them is bound to stay at home. And therefore it has to be made known to them through the *panchayats* that education has been made compulsory now and this fact would get known throughout the village, and no letter or correspondence would be necessary. Of course, those who do not send their children to school need to

be pursued and it is to be seen, that they are persuaded to send their children to school.

Sir, it is suggested that a scheme may be prepared and it may be sent to all the State Governments—in the case of the Delhi Territory, the Central Government is the State Government—for information as to how many schools are existing there, how many are to be opened, how many children are there, etc. It does not seem to me necessary that all this information should be sent to the State Government for approval. In any case if something is to be started or expenditure has to be incurred in Delhi Territory, the sanction of the Government of India has to be obtained. Therefore, to put it in the body of the Bill does not seem necessary at all. It only makes it more cumbersome and we should not leave any loopholes in the Bill at all for litigation. It is not necessary for us to know who is going to open schools and how many. Why should the New Delhi Municipal Committee or any other local body give all these details to the Central Government? You have asked them to enforce compulsory education at the primary stage. Leave it to them to do it, and you keep to yourself certain provisions, as you have done in this Bill, to make the local bodies enforce this measure. Apart from that, all these details are not necessary as to how many schools will be opened, etc. Every year, they always open about twenty or twenty-five schools and roughly about thirty thousand children get admission into those schools.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Is it not necessary for the purpose of clause 5 of the Bill? Will you kindly look into clause 5 regarding grant-in-aid?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Of course, Delhi is always short of money and the Central Government always makes up for any deficit in Delhi. It is because there is a lot of expenditure in Delhi because it is the seat of the Government of India; otherwise,

some of the expenses would not have been necessary and such deficits are made up by the Government of India. So, I do not see any reason why the Government of India should not help them in meeting the financial responsibility for some of those measures. In this matter, actually there is no choice except that the Government of India make up the deficit. And even the cost of living has gone up so much because it happens to be the Capital of India. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that you help them. You cannot have compulsory primary education in this State unless the Central Government comes forward and gives some money and makes up the deficit. It has to be shared between the Government and the local bodies because the sources of the local bodies are not enough and, actually I want the Central Government to pay all the deficits that they may incur in enforcing this Bill because the local bodies have a very limited amount of money with them. The increase in population in Delhi is one lakh per year and at least twenty or thirty thousand children get admission every year. Therefore, the Government of India should make up the deficiency rather than leave it to themselves to determine what should be their share in this case, because the local bodies are not in a position to pay.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is really a matter of great national pride that a step like this has been taken—none too soon anyway—and it really heralds an era of light and sweetness. Therefore, this Bill is a great welcome feature to the entire country. In this context, it is not perhaps very necessary to emphasize how important primary education is. But we cannot escape the two pivotal points in the scheme of primary education. First of all, the central figure around whom the entire structure of this primary education has to be built is the teacher. Of course, it is said that we are woefully lacking in the number of teachers, especially

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

trained teachers. Without a proper teacher, all our schemes and all our dreams might get shattered. Therefore, it is necessary that we pay the utmost attention to this problem of providing a proper teacher. It was only the other day that Pujya Vinoba Bhave, in his article in the Independence Day Supplement of 'The Hindu' published on the 15th August, said that the most important point was the teacher, the *guru*. If he is a man abounding in ideas, is resourceful and is zealous, then the problem of primary education can easily be solved.

If he is a mercenary, it is sure 4 P.M. to fail. Our objective, as the other friend said, is not merely to educate, is not merely to provide the three R's but to make a full man, a man who is capable of taking the full responsibilities of a free Indian citizen. Such a man we are supposed to produce. After all, "the child is the father of a man." Any amount of attention that is bestowed on this child is worth while for the sake of the nation's security, for the sake of the country's future and for the sake of the great part that this country is called upon to play in the comity of nations. Therefore, Sir, it is said—of course, in the bigger context of the introduction of compulsory primary education all over the country—that we require about four lakhs of additional teachers to train up these children. But the rate at which we are going, probably three, four or five Plans are necessary. I do not know how these two things can be reconciled.

Now, there will be an enormous demand for trained teachers for the introduction of compulsory education. Whether we have bestowed proper attention upon this requirement is the question that we are facing today. If we have not yet, at least we must do it now.

I am also wondering what sort of training we are giving to these teachers, whether they are at all fit to take up the responsibilities that they are expected to take up. I am

still having some doubts in my mind. in my own humble experience, an untrained teacher, may he be an Intermediate or a Graduate, who comes to give private tuition to the children seems to be doing his job much better than the trained teacher, under whom pupils undergo instruction for about four or five hours a day. After all, if it is only a question of the three R's, we may not have to insist so much on this. The need is so great that every enthusiastic person who is fit enough to impart education should be drawn into the field. Our necessity is too great. It cannot wait for all the training that has got to be given. After all, education is the question of one's own zeal. I invite the attention of the hon. Minister of Education to this problem and I am sure he will whip up the State Ministers, his counterparts in the States, to see that immediate steps are taken on a national scale to provide the required number of teachers. After all, this country is supposed to have a huge number of educated unemployed. Still what is the idea of saying that we are not having enough number of teachers? Of course, these teachers must be equipped, as I have already said once before in this House, to take care of the child entirely from every point of view. Right from his health, his habits, his education, his three R's, his instructions in the matter of vocation, everything must be a complete job in itself. It is a very terrible job and for this we have to prepare the teacher.

The second thing is the school. The school has got to be made, according to our ambition, a community centre of the village. I am talking in this respect mostly about a village because this compulsory primary education is intended for the villager. The school has got to become the community centre, and a teacher has got to be a friend, philosopher and guide of the Vidyalaya, even according to Shri Vinobaji. How are we going to do it? The more I think about it, the more I get lost whether we are at all tackling the problem properly.

Then, Sir, there is the question of the poor man because this compulsory primary education is intended only for 25 per cent of the very poor people who cannot afford education for their children. The provision of mid-day meal is nothing. Shri Vinobaji once again said—he quotes from Bhagavata—Krishna was a prince and Sudama was a poor Brahmin's son but both the children attended the same school, under the same teacher, ate the same food, underwent the whole thing. What more?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Go to the schools and you will find that everyone has become Krishna and Sudama.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Therefore, it calls for the attention of our hon. Minister to see that those unfortunate Backward Classes' children, whose parents cannot afford even food for their children, should be given not only the midday meal but also a wholesome meal which is so essential for the upkeep of their body, keeping their body and soul together. The **Madras experiment** is there before us, an illustrious example of what the community can do for the downtrodden children of our country. They shall not remain any more downtrodden, for everyone, starting from the Centre to the State, the local authorities and the community, has got to apportion the expenses. I am sure that under the decentralised system of our education proper attention will be given to compulsory education and the country's progress will be maintained on right lines.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am happy that I listened to ever so many speeches on the floor of this House in defence of universal elementary education. But the time has now come not for speeches but for action and I have to give you here an example of what a people's movement can do in the field of education.

It is easy, Sir, to have this Act on the Statute Book; that is only the beginning of our problem, but, then, how are we to infuse the flesh and blood of public co-operation into the dry bones of this legislation? Only twelve days ago, the President of India was at my District Headquarters of North Arcot, Vellore where I had the opportunity, in co-operation with so many non-official agencies, to have organised what now appears to be a crowning glory of the People's Movement in Madras State. The Conference, Sir, was planned only a month ago and you cannot believe it but truth is stranger than fiction, we collected gifts from the people of only 560 villages in that district to the tune of Rs. 23 lakhs. in thirty days! The President of India was most pleased to compliment us for this People's Movement. In fact, not only at the Conference but long afterwards, even in his Farewell Message to the people of Madras State while leaving the State, he complimented the People's Movement and undertook the responsibility to see that this example would be adopted by the entire country. I am equally happy to reveal to you that the Prime Minister, the other day, also evinced wonderful interest in this People's Movement.

Of course, the enthusiasm of the people for the cause of education can very well be evident to you from the number of invitees we had. It was my privilege to extend invitation to something like 45,000 people and the response was more than 1,25,000. I do not think that ever before was there a bigger conference on matters of education. We had the gifts displayed before the audience, gifts of every kind for school improvement, including midday meals for which rice and dal were gifted by the people. You know, Sir, clothings, slates, books and other basic amenities for the poor children of our society were contributed by tens of thousands in the aggregate. It far exceeded our hopes, a sight which, I believe, only those who had seen can very well appreciate. Well, Sir, what does it mean?

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

As Pandit Kunzru has rightly said, in this particular field of education our people are very enthusiastic; they are out to give us every kind of co-operation, if only we could establish mass contacts, something which Mahatma Gandhi had said and which Vinobaji has been repeating quite often. Actually many of us have been living in ivory-towers and trying to level accusations of mass inertia against our own masters. Ingratitude cannot go further! But really that inertia is not there; it is somewhere else. We have not been able to establish our contacts with the masses. For that movement, Sir, 560 villages were allotted to our jurisdiction and there were many schools, new and old. So, many amenities including buildings, playgrounds, benches, tables, chairs, almirahs, library, lavatory, etc., had to be provided for by the people of those villages. As that great educationist from my State, my learned friend, Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar, has himself testified to it, all over the State, during 30 months, there were a series of 123 conferences, which worked out to four conferences every month and this movement had been able to secure public co-operation and enthusiasm in terms of cash and kind to the tune of Rs. 591 lakhs! I wonder whether any other part of India can give this money. It was being claimed here that this statute would be a model for the country. Well, so far as legislation goes, I accept it; I do not want to dispute it, but the real model is right over there, in Cape Comorin, not here in the capital of India, but down at the foot of this country, that most wonderful State of Madras, which I have got the honour and privilege to represent here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Somebody else must say that.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Somebody else will never say that, I know, because he has not seen it. Mr. Deputy Chairman, the cause of education is the first call to duty, and I can tell

you that the village communities were so enthusiastic about it that as we went from village to village, from hamlet to hamlet, we never witnessed any frown; we never witnessed any serious faces. On the contrary, Sir, there was a series of smiles and smiles and smiles and that delighted us so much. In fact, the problem that we had to face was about the sweet dishes of hospitality which they provided for us even at dead of night when we entered their village or hamlet.

THE MINISTER OF REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (DR. B. GOPALA REDDI): Were you a vegetarian or a non-vegetarian?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Well, I have the good fortune of being both—vegetarian by convenience and non-vegetarian by conviction.

Now, Sir, I want that before we could implement this legislation, we should see that we seek public co-operation and enthusiasm. We have absolutely no political controversies. Those people, irrespective of caste, creed or colour, were determined to see that their village was equipped with the best school possible and naturally, they evinced interest in the school as their own school. Well, Sir, the co-operation that we enlisted was not so much from the rich few only but it was from the masses and even those people who, due to penury, had their soul suppressed, came forward and tried to contribute the few coppers which they could spare from their earnings for the day. That way, Sir, we have established a record of people's movement in that State. I only wish that the Ministry here will take care to study how that people's movement has been working such miracles in that State. I am also very hopeful that that people's movement will spread all over the country, because we expect our people in this land of Mahatma Gandhi to rise to the heights of cultural glory which, everybody understands, has the highest educative value. Thank you, Sir.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, after having heard so many hon. Members here on this Bill, I have really very little to add to what they have already said. It seems to me that we are all agreed on the necessity for a Bill of this sort and actually whatever differences of opinion there seem to exist are really only superficial. There is an inner unanimity of opinion with regard to the necessity for a Bill of this sort.

Some hon. Members—Shri Dave, Shri Chettiar and Prof. Malkani—for whom I have very great respect, have entertained a number of doubts with regard to the utility of clause 12 of this Bill. If you kindly refer to Mr. Govinda Reddy's Minute of Dissent, you will find, in the last sentence of his note, all these various apprehensions being summed up. He says:

"As long as clause 12 is there, financially embarrassed local authorities and State authorities and poor parents who are in difficulties would take shelter under the clause, and should this be so, the title of the Bill will have little meaning . . ."

Now, Sir, this is the apprehension which every one of these very learned gentlemen has felt with regard to the utility of this clause, clause 12. Now, Sir, with great respect for them, I feel that they have completely misunderstood the real import and the real necessity of this clause. After all, Sir, we have to make a distinction between a clause which is meant for exceptional circumstances and a clause which is meant for ordinary circumstances. Clause 12 is really meant to cover exceptional circumstances. We must after all distinguish between an exception and a rule. The apprehension that these hon. gentlemen seem to have felt is that this exception will, in the ultimate analysis, eat away the rule itself. Whatever that may be, after all, Sir, these things do happen and it is a good thing that these apprehensions have been ventilated on the floor of this House that will guide the Adminis-

tration. But what I would like to say in reply is this: One English poet has said that whatever is administered best is best. I would like to say that the apprehensions which have been ventilated on the floor of this House will surely guide the Government and the various authorities concerned with this Bill and they will see that this clause, clause 12, is not misused or this clause is not abused. I think that is quite enough so far as clause 12 is concerned.

It seems to me, Sir, that after all whenever we frame a Bill, we ought to see that it applies not merely under the circumstances as they ordinarily exist but also under certain exceptional circumstances. We have to see that our society is a changing society; it changes from moment to moment and we have therefore to see that the frame of the Bill has got to be such that it will apply not merely under the conditions as they exist here and now but also under the future changing circumstances. The various clauses of the Bill have got to be very adjustable so that they will be able to cover new circumstances, new environments and so on. Several Members have said a good deal about the amenities that will have to be provided to the students. I entirely agree with the spirit with which they have said all this. With regard to the midday meal, for instance, I entirely agree. I go further and say: "Why midday meal only? Why should not the students be fed completely? In a socialistic State, why should not this happen?" But the whole point is this. After all, we cannot have this Utopia in a day and because we cannot have Utopia, should we not have anything at all? If that is the attitude to take up, then it will be very difficult. We all want Utopia, we want the best of things in our country but surely there is the gap between Utopia and our present conditions and we have to see to it that this gap does not really come in our way or in the way of our day-to-day progress. The provisions in the Bill are not really concerned with these Utopian matters but they are

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]

really concerned with the day-to-day happenings and difficulties. Therefore I suggest with very great respect that most of the misapprehensions that the Members have felt are really misplaced.

So far as the various amendments are concerned, it seems to me that most of the amendments are either unnecessary or are misconceived. Take for instance . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not on amendments just now.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Then I will speak at the time of the amendments.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, first of all I must thank the hon. Members for having given such a warm welcome to this measure. Pandit Kunzru reminded us about the Bill which was introduced in the old Assembly, nearly half a century back. At that time Shri Gopal Krishna Gokhale made a prophecy. I will read his words:

"My Lord, I know that my Bill will be thrown out before the day closes. I make no complaint. I shall not even feel depressed. I know too well the story of the preliminary efforts that were required even in England before the Act of 1870 was passed either to complain or to feel depressed. Moreover, I have always felt and I have often felt that we of the present generation in India, can only hope to serve our country by our failures. The men and women who will be privileged to serve her by their success will come later. We must be content to accept cheerfully the place that has been allotted to us in our onward march. The Bill thrown out today will come back again and again till on the stepping-stones of its deadself a measure ultimately rises which will spread the light of knowledge throughout the land."

These were the prophetic words which Shri Gopal Krishna Gokhale uttered nearly 50 years ago and it has fallen to our generation to realise the dreams which he dreamt.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) The Bill comes after 13 years of Independence.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It is true that it has come after 13 years of Independence but it has come after all and I would have been very happy if I could accept the suggestion of Pandit Kunzru to make it compulsory for the age group of 6 to 14 and in this way, fulfil the directive of the Constitution.

Sir, the present measure has a limited scope. It is for Delhi and it is confined to the age group of 6 to 11 but it will be our constant endeavour to increase the age-limit and bring it up to 14 so that if not by the end of the third Five Year Plan, by the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan, we may be able to fulfil the Directive of the Constitution. As far as Delhi is concerned, I think by the end of the Third Five Year Plan even for the age group of 11 to 14 we will be having nearly 75 per cent. of children in the schools. This is much better than the all-India figure which will be about 27 per cent. and 3 per cent. more on part-time basis. There has been a good deal of discussion on clause 12 with regard to part-time education. The House would remember that in the original Bill there was no provision for part-time education but it was our intention to open part-time schools under rules and regulations. This matter was fully discussed in the Joint Select Committee and it was felt that unless this provision is made in the Bill itself, we would not be able to implement the provisions of this Bill. I saw the force of the argument of several Members. In fact one of the Members who was a Member of the Select Committee said that he would not have become a Member of Parliament if he had not attended a

part-time school. In this connection we have to remember the experiment that was carried out in Baroda because that was the first place where a systematic experiment was carried out. When this experiment was reviewed, some conclusions were drawn and these are the conclusions:

"Besides the socio-economic factors, the following purely economic difficulties come in the way of full enrolment:

(i) Both parents are away from home during the day-time earning in the field; there is a small child left at home. The older child of school-age has also to stay at home to take care of the infant.

(ii) Owing to the poverty of the parents, the child also has to go out to earn something in order to help the family to maintain itself.

(iii) The cattle have to be sent out, the poor agriculturist does not have sufficient fodder close to his house. Grazing is available only in selected plots by the roadside. Someone, usually a child of school-age, must look after the cattle while they are grazing."

Sir, what is true about Baroda is generally true about the whole country, particularly the rural areas. In this connection I would also like to draw the attention of hon. Members to a recent study made by the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics. This is a very thorough investigation into primary education in the Satara District, done by Mr. D. R. Gadgil and Mr. P. M. Dandekar. I would draw the attention of the House to page 158 wherein it has been stated that 13.44 per cent. of children cannot attend schools because they are employed at the farms, and 7.26 per cent. children cannot attend because they are employed in the families but in non-agricultural occupations. 4.67 per cent. of the children cannot attend because they are employed outside the family; 29.25 per cent. cannot at-

tend because they tend cattle, sheep or goat. This means, nearly 54.62 per cent. of the children have to leave school for one reason or another because they have some kind of work, either in the family or outside. The age group is 9 to 11. We have, therefore, to look into the social and economic conditions of our country. If we look at the legislations introduced in other countries, it would be found that this is not something uncommon, the measure that we are introducing. I had already quoted the example of the U.K. For a number of years, I think nearly for forty years, they continued to have part-time education. Part-time education in England was introduced in 1870, and they continued to have part-time education right up to 1918.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: You propose to do the same thing here?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Let me finish my argument, and then I will answer all questions which my hon. friend may put.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Sir, we took a leap and went ahead of other nations in granting universal adult franchise. Why should we now look up and go back to the British part-time education of 1870 for our educational plans today?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: We have to look to the actual conditions. In the State of Massachusetts, which was one of the first States to introduce compulsory education, the law allowed students to attend part-time schools. Massachusetts permitted children under thirteen to engage in certain types of work for pay even during school hours provided they had attended school for at least twenty weeks as required by law during the year preceding such employment. Children between thirteen and fourteen were given permission to work in factories, workshops, mercantile factories or elsewhere provided they had attended school for twenty weeks. The only educational require-

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]
 ment for youths under fourteen seeking a work permit was that they have the ability to read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language. It is true that in more recent years, part-time education has been done away with in England; there is no part-time education now, but when we are introducing any legislation, we have to take into account, the actual conditions in which our people are living, the social and economic conditions. I do not think we can completely ignore them. If we ignore these conditions, then it would be difficult to make this legislation effective, and, therefore, I think that part-time education is absolutely essential. Of course, it should be our endeavour to make part-time education also effective. We should ensure that part-time education is real education. Now, Sir, some Members have the apprehension that by accepting this system of part-time education, we will be doing great injustice to poor children and that we would be giving them an inferior type of education. I am afraid hon. Members have not understood the whole approach of this Bill. Our efforts would be to set up whole time schools in Delhi and in other parts of the country also, but wherever we find that there are people who cannot send their children to the wholtime schools, part-time education will be provided for such children. It is not that we are keen to provide part-time education for poor children, but because of certain conditions in which they are living, some kind of arrangement, which I expect will only be temporary, an interim arrangement, will have to be made, otherwise, this Bill cannot be enforced.

Now, Sir, Mr. Malkani spoke at length about the system of basic education, and he regretted that in this Bill we have not made it clear as to whether our education will be of the basic pattern or not. He is fully aware that the concept of basic education itself has undergone considerable

change. In the first Wardha conference which he attended, education was envisaged to be self-sufficient, and it was to be compulsory for a period of eight years. All these things have not come true unfortunately. All the experiments that have been carried out in the country lead us to the conclusion that education cannot be self-sufficient, and we only deceive ourselves if we think that basic education can be self-sufficient.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Self-supporting

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Self-supporting, yes; "self-sufficiency" was the word used by Gandhiji, I think.

Now, as far as the philosophy behind basic education is concerned, I think it is generally accepted that education must be related to life; education should be centred round work and there should be no divorce between education and real-life situations. These are all sound educational principles which have been accepted by everybody and by us also, but should we confine ourselves to some static concepts which may have developed in our mind? Education is a dynamic concept; education cannot remain static, and as our society undergoes changes and transformation education must also undergo transformation and change. Education must reflect the changes that are going on in the society, and, therefore, with all due respect to my friend, Mr. Malkani, I am afraid I cannot agree with him that the concepts that we had developed twentyfive years back should hold good today. As I said, the idea and the philosophy underlying basic education is sound, but basic education will have to undergo considerable change and transformation if it is to meet the needs of the changing society.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Put it in your terms; put it in your words.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am saying this on the floor of the House.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: In the Bill.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Chettiar made reference to the community effort that was being made in Madras, and I think Anwarsaheb also praised highly the work that was being done in Madras. We have had very good reports about the participation of the community in the implementation of the School Improvement Programme and the provision of midday meals. I am in general agreement with the principle that if this free and compulsory education programme is to be effective, we have to make provision for midday meals, for school uniforms, for text-books for poor students and so on. Unless we do these, the whole purpose of the Bill would be defeated. Now, how is it to be done? That is the whole point. Is it possible to make provision in the Bill itself? The State cannot obviously take this whole responsibility upon itself, and it should be our effort to mobilise all the community effort for the provision of midday meals, text-books and school uniforms. Millions of our children live in semi-naked semi-starved condition, and, therefore, community participation will be absolutely essential for the implementation of this scheme.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What will the State do?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: In Delhi, we have already made provision for providing milk to the school children.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the State going to do in this matter?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Madras State is an example. In Madras at present, there is provision for midday meals. We are giving assistance to the State; the State is also giving assistance and then there is community effort also. In this enterprise there has to be full partnership between the State and the community and if this partnership is there, I am quite sure that we shall be able to make the whole programme effective.

Sir, there were some other points which were raised in connection with the amendments. One or two points were raised by Dr. Kunzru. With regard to the teaching of English, in Delhi I am glad to say that the standard of English is very good. They start English in Class VI and I think we can say with pride that in Delhi the standard of English would be the best in the whole country.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Madras excepted.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: And if we find it necessary we will start the teaching of English at an earlier stage also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Minister is coming to sweeping conclusions.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: These are the main points raised in the course of the discussion. This Bill has a certain significance because it fits in in the general scheme which we propose to have for the whole of the country. As I said in my introductory remarks, this is going to be the model Bill and as soon as this has been passed, other States have informed me that they will introduce similar legislation in their States and I am hoping that by the end of the Third Five Year Plan we shall have free and compulsory education for all children in all the States.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for free and compulsory primary education for children in the Union territory of Delhi, as reported by the Joint Committee of the Houses, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill

Clause 2—Definitions

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: Sir, I move:

3. "That at page 3, line 14, after the word 'area' the words 'fulfilling the normal conditions prescribed for approval of such a school' be inserted."

Sir, I am not moving my amendment No. 4

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I move:

6. "That at page 4, line 22, after the words 'not beyond the eighth class or standard' the words 'and not below the fifth class or standard' be inserted."

The questions were proposed.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I am not accepting the amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about your amendments?

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: Sir, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I would also withdraw mine.

Amendment Nos. 3 and 6 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—Schemes for Primary Education

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I move:

7. "That at page 4, line 35, after the words 'compulsory primary education' the words 'of the basic pattern' be inserted."

Sir, in this connection . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already spoken.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Yes; I want this to be inserted because the principle has been accepted by the hon. Minister that the pattern has to be basic. I do not say, 'have a fixed pattern'. I do not say you must have one pattern of 1960. It may change. But somewhere in the body of the Bill you must say this clearly. Rather than opening all kinds of schools and then converting them, you must have this clear pattern. You intend to convert them later on. I do not believe in this conversion; it is a superficial conversion. If you believe in the pattern, put it in here somewhere.

Now, coming to contributions, it is very important. The State should contribute; the community should contribute. It is very good but there you have stopped. Why not the pupils? The community will contribute more and more generously if the pupils also contribute. You put in the community but you simply forget the students. That is to say, you lack faith in what you are doing. I do really think that it must go in somewhere.

The question was proposed.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I do not think that it needs any reply. I have explained the position fully and I thought that I had been able to convert Prof. Malkani.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: You see how difficult it is to convert me; it would be all the more difficult to convert your schools.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The position is, we have to take primary education as it is understood by everyone. Basic education is there; Montessori system is there. There are various systems of education. It is a matter of details as to what pattern should be there, what syllabus there must be and all that.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Basic education is also a matter of detail?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes; it is a matter of detail and I would request Prof. Malkani not to press his amendment.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: May I say a word about it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister has already replied.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: What I merely say is, it is all very good; what Mr. Malkani says is quite all right but need it find a place in this Bill? That is the whole question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what the hon. Minister has also said. Are you withdrawing your amendment, Mr. Malkani?

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I shall persuade myself to withdraw.

**Amendment No. 7 was by leave withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—Primary Education to be compulsory in areas covered by schemes

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I move:

**For text of amendment, vide col. 2150 supra.*

5. "That at page 5, line 32, after the words 'within such age group' the words 'and up to such class or standard' be inserted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 4, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 5 to 11 were added to the Bill.

Clause 12—Special provision for part-time education in certain cases

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two amendments and both are barred. They are negative amendments.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Sir . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already spoken.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I know that I have spoken, but I can oppose the clause. What I want to say is this. Nine Members have referred to this clause in the course of this discussion. Three of them have approved the clause while six of them have opposed it. I am giving you the sense of the House.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: All the silent Members have approved it.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Now, I would like to point out two things with regard to what Dr. Shrimali said. Now, even in Massachusetts it is not a part-time school but it is 20 weeks' attendance in the same school. Am I right?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: That is right. So it is not what is intended in clause 12. What is done in Massachusetts is that the number of days to be attended has been reduced and 20 weeks' attendance has been imposed. There is no separate part-time school; it is the same school which is being conducted.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It becomes part-time all right.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I can understand his saying that the number of working days that a child has to attend has been fixed by rules. But that is different from the provision in clause 12. So the example of Massachusetts quoted by him does not support clause 12. So the example of Massachusetts it was there for a long time. It is true but very much will depend upon the work in future, on what percentage of the pupils goes into the part-time schools and when the education becomes ineffective and so on. I hope even if this Bill is passed with this clause, it will not do harm to the real compulsory pattern of the scheme.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have already dealt with this clause at length and we have not said in detail as to what the part-time institution would be. It is possible that it may be two to three hours; it is possible that we may exempt a child for some time. The whole thing will have to be worked out in greater details.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 12 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 13 to 26 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE TAXATION LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960

THE MINISTER OF REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (DR. B. GOPALA REDDI): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Ind an Income-tax Act, 1922, the Wealth-tax Act, 1957, the Expenditure tax Act, 1957 and the Gift-tax Act, 1958, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The provisions of the Bill are by now well known to all and I hope that the Bill would be welcome to all the hon. Members of this House. I do not want to take much time of the House in explaining the various provisions therein and will confine myself only to the salient points. As I have already explained before the other House, one of the objects of the Bill is to give effect to the Government's decision to relax the secrecy provisions of the direct taxes Acts for the purpose of publishing the names and other particulars of various types of tax offenders and for the purpose of disclosure of information regarding the amount of tax payable by assessees. I should explain here that the decision to relax the secrecy provisions was taken by the Government even before the Report of the Direct Taxes Administration Enquiry Committee was received by the Government, but its implementation was deferred till after the receipt of the Committee's Report, because the Committee was also considering similar questions. This Bill is, therefore, not intended to give effect to any particular recommendation of that Committee. All the recommendations made by that Committee are under the