

tance by the Central Government to the Kosi Project has not yet been decided.

already. You have now five minutes more.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION ON THE CONTINUANCE OF PROTECTION TO THE MACHINE SCREW INDUSTRY AND PAPERS CONNECTED THEREWITH.

12 P.M.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIES (SHRI N. KANUNGO) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers under sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951:—

- (i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Machine Screw Industry.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 18 (D-T.B./55, dated the 2Srd August, 1955.
- (iii) Government Notification No. 18 (D-T.B./55, dated the 23rd August, 1955.
- (iv) Statement under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents referred to at (i) to (iii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section. [Placed in the Library. See No. S-290/55 for (i) to (iv).]

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER ON KASHMIR PRINCESS CRASH

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ANIL K. CHANDA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a Statement by the Prime Minister on Kashmir Princess Crash. LPlaced in the Library. See No. S-295/55.]

RESOLUTION RE COMMISSION ON PRIMARY EDUCATION—continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. D. Nara-yan. You have taken ten minutes

श्री दुर्बकीनन्दन (मुम्बई): सभापति महोदय, मैं गत वक्त यह कह रहा था कि सार्वीयक प्राथमिक शिक्षा के लिए जो सबसे बड़ी कमी हमारे प्रदेश की सरकारों को मालूम होती है वह पैसे की कमी है और जब तक केन्द्रीय सरकार से राज्य सरकारों को इस काम के लिए खास मदद नहीं मिलेगी तब तक यह काम आगे बढ़ने वाला नहीं है। यह बात १९५३ से चली आ रही है, उस वक्त भी मरहूम श्री गोखले जी ने यह कहा था कि जहाँ तक इस सवाल का सम्बन्ध है राज्य सरकारें इस काम को बिना केन्द्रीय सरकार की मदद के आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकती हैं। आज क्या हो रहा है? हो यह रहा है कि प्रदेश सरकारें इस सार्वीयक प्राथमिक शिक्षा का बहुत कुछ काम डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड्स, लोकल बोर्ड्स और म्युनिसिपैलिटियों को सौंप देती हैं। आप जानते हैं कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड्स और म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड्स की क्या हालत है और यही कारण है कि लोकल बोर्ड्स और म्युनिसिपैलिटिज अपने शिक्षकों को न तो ठीक तनखाह दे सकती हैं और न वक्त पर तनखाह दे सकती हैं। राज्य सरकारों ने जो तनखाह निश्चित की हैं वह तनखाह बहुत से डिस्ट्रिक्ट और लोकल बोर्ड्स दे नहीं पाते हैं। सबब यह है कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट और लोकल बोर्ड्स का अपने काम से इतनी फुर्सत ही नहीं होती कि इस तरफ ध्यान दें, दूसरे उनके पास पेंडाइश कम है और तीसरे आपस के भगड़ हैं। शायद ही ऐसा कोई लोकल बोर्ड होगा जिसमें कि भगड़ा न हो, इसलिए अगर आप म्युनिसिपल बोर्डों और लोकल बोर्डों के कब्जे में प्राथमिक शिक्षा जैसे महत्वपूर्ण काम को दे देते हैं तो आप निश्चित समझें कि उनसे कोई काम आगे बढ़ने वाला नहीं है। इसलिए मेरा यह सुझाव है कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्डों और खास कर म्युनिसिपैलिटियों से प्राथमिक शिक्षा का काम निकाल लिया जाय।

दूसरी बात जो मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ वह दुःख की बात है। वह यह कि शहरों में प्राथमिक शिक्षा का जितना प्रचार है उतना

प्रचार गांवों और दुहातों में नहीं हैं। आज जो ६ से ११ वर्ष तक के लड़के स्कूलों में जाते हैं उनमें यह दुहाता जाता है कि सों के पीछे २५ गांवों के हैं और ६२ शहरों के हैं। जहां पर इस शिक्षा का खासकर के प्रसार होना चाहिए वहां कम निगाह दी जाती है और जहां और तरह से भी यह शिक्षा मिल सकती है यानी जहां खानगी तौर से भी अपने अपने स्कूल खोल सकते हैं और खुले हैं वहां भी सरकार अधिक लक्ष्य देती है और अधिक पैसा खर्च करती है। यह दुःख की बात है। इसलिए मैं यह कहूंगा कि यदि आप वहीं प्री और कम्पलसरी प्राइमरी एजुकेशन शुरू करना चाहते हैं तो वह पहले दुहातों में करें और बाद में शहरों में, शहरों का नम्बर बाद में आए।

तीसरी बात जो मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में कहनी है वह यह है कि जितना लक्ष्य लड़कों की प्राथमिक शिक्षा के ऊपर दिया जाए उससे कम लड़कियों की प्राथमिक शिक्षा के ऊपर नहीं दिया जाना चाहिए। मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि इस सम्बन्ध में लड़कों से लड़कियों की शिक्षा पर ज्यादा तवज्जह दी जाय।

श्री रघु० सु० तन्ना (उत्तर प्रदेश): लड़कियों के ऊपर क्यों ज्यादा तवज्जह दी जाय?

श्री दंबकीनन्दन: आज हालत यह है कि मदर्स में जाने वालों में लड़कियों की तादाद लड़कों की तादाद से बहुत कम है, यहां तक कि स्कूल में पांच लड़के हैं तो तीन लड़कियां हैं।

श्री किशोरी राम (बिहार): बहुत ज्यादा है?

श्री दंबकीनन्दन: आपकी निगाह से ज्यादा हो सकता है पर गांवों में देखा जाय तो वहां लड़कियों की तादाद बहुत ही कम है, अगर ५ लड़के होंगे तो लड़की एक होगी। इसलिए हमारा कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि यदि आप प्राथमिक शिक्षा को एक आवश्यक चीज समझते हैं तो हमें प्रथम लड़कियों से शुरू करना चाहिए क्योंकि लड़कियां ही आगे माता होने वाली हैं और माता के ही जिम्मे बच्चों की शिक्षा का काम होता

है। मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा के शिक्षकों का काम खास तौर से स्त्रियों को ही दे दिया जाए, प्राइमरी स्कूलों में पुरुष शिक्षकों के बजाय स्त्री शिक्षक हों क्योंकि शुरू से उनका ही बच्चों से सम्बन्ध रहता है। यदि शिक्षकों का काम बहनों को दे दिया जाय तो मुझे उम्मीद है और आशा करता हूं कि बहनें उस काम को वनिस्वत पुरुषों के बेहतर तरीके से कर सकेंगी।

गत वक्त एक बात यह कही गई थी कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा के ऊपर केंद्रीय सरकार का कुछ कंट्रोल हो। मैं इस बात को अच्छी तरह नहीं समझता क्योंकि प्राथमिक शिक्षा खासकर गांवों तक पहुंचेगी और यदि गांवों की शिक्षा का कंट्रोल दिल्ली से करना चाहें तो वह किसी प्रकार से चल नहीं सकता और वह हितकारी नहीं हो सकता। इसलिए मेरा तो यह सुझाव है कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा के बारे में जहां तक हो सके उसमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहयोग शिक्षकों से लिया जाए। यही बेहतर हो सकता है। हम देखते हैं कि मजदूर कहते हैं कि मिलों के व्यवस्था के काम में उनका हिस्सा हो। बहुत सी जगह यह शिक्षा-यत पेश की जाती है कि जो कारखाने होते हैं, जो मिलों में काम होता है उसमें वहां के काम करने वालों को, मजदूरों को, वहां के कामकाज में, वहां की देख रंख में, हिस्सा नहीं दिया जाता है। उसके लिए मांग की जाती है तो जहां तक इन प्राइमरी शिक्षकों का सम्बन्ध है, जिन्होंने कि शिक्षा के काम में अपनी उम्र गंवा दी, जिनमें बहुत से विशेषज्ञ भी हो सकते हैं, बहुत से शिक्षण शास्त्री भी हो सकते हैं उन लोगों को इस प्राथमिक शिक्षा की व्यवस्था में किसी तरह का रिप्रेजेंटेशन, प्रतिनिधित्व का हक न दिया जाय यह मैं अच्छा नहीं समझ सकता।

(समय की घंटी)

मेरा तो सुझाव यह है कि मंत्री महोदय यह कांशिश करें कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा की व्यवस्था में शिक्षकों को प्रतिनिधित्व दिया जाए और उनका उनके शिक्षा काम से ज्यादा सम्बन्ध रखा जाय और उनकी सलाह से, उनके परिचय से, यह काम आगे बहुत कुछ बढ़ा सकते हैं। अगर ऐसा

किया जाए ताँ काम ठीक हो सकेगा एँसा में मानता हँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do. Dr. Raghbir Singh.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): Mr. Chairman, in 1944, when the tide of invasion through the planes that were air-bombing England was retarding, England thought of reconstruction and postwar education, and a White paper was then presented to the Parliament, which actually began as follows:—

"Upon the education of people of this country the fate of the country depends."

And this warning was given to the nation when England was since more than half a decade spending a sum equivalent to Rs. 33/2 per head. Now, Sir, even today, we are spending not more than Rs. 5/4 per head. In India, the population is predominantly rural—82.7 per cent

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Literacy is again 16-6 per cent. Among females, it is just 7.9 per cent which goes down to 60 per cent among the rural areas. The number of children of school-going age receiving primary education, Sir, is not more than 41.9 per cent. And then, Sir, the number of girls receiving education is only 24.0 per cent. The First Five Year Plan has failed to make much headway. It was expected to increase the number of such children to 60 per cent. But it is not likely to touch even the figure of 50 per cent. Sir, we are in the throes of the preparation of a new Plan, and more than half of the period allowed under article 45 has elapsed. The time has now come when the situation needs to be carefully and thoroughly reviewed. It is for this reason, Sir, that I strongly support the Resolution that is before the House.

Sir, the first and foremost question that needs to be decided by the Commission is about the system to be followed in respect of primary education. I am sure my eminent friend there will say that the question has been settled, and a definite lead has already been given by the Avadi Congress Resolution on the basic education. I do not dispute that. In my opinion, Sir, today as many as three different systems of basic education are prevalent. There is, first of all the Nai Talim System which was enunciated by Zakir Saheb. Then the other system is the one that was initiated by Sir John Sargent in the Sargent Report. Thirdly, the most prevalent one is what I would call the current type which varies from place to place depending on the fads and fancies of the interpreters of the system. I know the Central Advisory Board of Education in March 1952 gave a lead by defining what the basic system is. But I am afraid that has not solved the problem, for no one else than Shri B. G. Kher, who was one of the architects of the Basic Education System, has had to say 'tis in his last address to the Primary Teachers' Conference. He says:

"One of the things about our education which has struck me is that there is no clear national policy and no definite objective, no uniformity of any kind in regard to 'the free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of 14 years' which is to be provided for according to Article 45 of our Constitution. Each State has its own policy or lack of it, and the nation drifts along according to the views of the person in charge for the time being."

Sir, lately, we find that a new interpretation of the whole system is being made and this I would call the "Saiyidain interpretation".

AN. HON. MEMBER: What is "Saiyidain interpretation"?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Saiyidain originated it.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: No, no. It was Zakir Saheb, not Mr. Saiyi-dain.

Sir, I find all this confusion is mainly due to three reasons. Firstly, the entire system is yet in its primitive stage or still in the making. I would say it is very necessary now that the details should be settled, remaining principles still in outline or theory be worked out and all the essentials should be duly explained. The Basic Education System Assessment Committee which has been recently set up by the Government has got its scope very much restricted. It has been asked to go about and see as to how the educational system has developed. But, it is not likely to find out or to suggest as to what should be done to bring about uniformity in the system.

Then the other thing is that there is an absolute lack of trained teachers and it is that thing because of which the whole scheme is unable to make any progress. The fact is that, while I admit that the basic system may be the best, what is definitely as the best is often the worst of all. In inefficient hands it definitely deteriorates into something worse than what we have always complained of about the very much condemned present primary system. I am not saying all this just from imagination. I have seen facts. I know of schools that have deteriorated under these incompetent, incapable teachers and that is why I press the demand that something should be quickly done for this system.

Supply of good trained teachers is a matter of time and cannot possibly be made good in all haste. Now, Sir, the Deputy Minister told us here in this very House the other day, in answer to a question, that even after the next Five Year Plan has been completed and it has been fully worked out, no more than one-fourth

of the existing schools will be turned into basic schools and the number of students in the primary school* would not rise more than 50 per cent or 60 per cent at the most. Now, the question is: Are we going to think of everything or nothing? Is it the idea of the Education Ministry that either they will have the basic system only or they will allow the present system to go on? Obviously enough we have got to let the present system also continue, I believe, as somebody too said: we want more and more schools in rural areas. I daily see more and more schools being opened more often than not under the scheme of finding employment for the educated unemployed. Now, these new schools are coming into existence and a satisfactory system is wanted for all these new schools. If we are not going to improve the present system, I think much of the money that we are going to spend on it is going to be nothing more than a waste. Therefore, the most essential thing I would say is that the present system should be improved and a way out should be found by which, even if we are not able to convert all the schools that are going on now into basic system schools, we can improve the existing system so that it will be possible to give some education to the students.

Finally, there are a few other questions also that will have to be taken up by this Commission. No. 1 is the question as to whether these primary schools should continue to remain in the hands of the local bodies. I may remind the House that a Committee was appointed by the Education Ministry in 1951 or 1952, by whom this question was discussed in detail. It was presided over by Shri B. G. Kher. It presented a report with a dissenting note. I do not know what Shri B. G. Kher thinks on the question, because the dissenting note says that Shri Kher's view was very much different from that of the majority, for Mr. Kher was unable to be present in the last few days. But, Sir, I have got with me here a note under "Current Topics"

[Dr. Raghbir Singh.] from "The Times of India" dated 31-5-55 which says: "Unbelievable thought it may sound, the period of the First Five Year Plan is likely to end in U.P. with fewer primary schools than there were when the Plan went into operation in 1951." Then again it says: "In 1956, there will be nearly a thousand primary schools fewer than in 1951." Finally it is said: "The experience of U.P. once again emphasises the need for State Governments to take over the primary schools themselves for direct management."

Now, I do not say that it is correct. But what I point out is that it is a very live question and must be examined in detail and satisfactorily solved.

Then, again, there is one other question—a really major and very important one—the question of the wages of these primary teachers. As the House knows very well, there have been good many cases of these primary teachers going on strike and the Education Ministry had to intervene when there was a strike in the Punjab. There have been strikes at some other places also. Therefore, this matter has got to be set right, for, as far as I can say, the primary teacher is above all an integral factor of what may be called the National Educational Service and he cannot be completely ignored, especially when the Central Advisory Board of Education has laid down a minimum salary for the primary teacher. I think the Central Education Ministry cannot just let it go after that.

Now, I only want to say one thing and that is this: I am sure my friend there would be thinking in his mind that he can just brush aside what I have said by saying that this is not a State subject and he has got nothing to do with it.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Do not anticipate.

SHRI RAGHUBIR SINH: Well, Sir, you are a lawyer, he is a lawyer and he too must be well aware that lawyers must anticipate.

Now, Sir, the question is.....

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA (Madhya Bharat): We are law makers.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Yes, we also see what law-breakers will think of.

My submission to the Education Ministry is that this matter of education is vital and I do not say that the Central Ministry should control it, but it is very necessary that it should duly supervise. When I ask for this, I say that it is not unconstitutional, because we give grants-in-aid and they can be used for establishing supervisory authority. In that respect I think everybody knows that federalism is most strongly entrenched in the United States of America and this is what has happened in U.S.A. I quote from a Book called 'The Growth of Constitutional Power in the United States':

"As a direct result of federal grants-in-aid and as an indirect result of the lack of a comparable amount of initiative on the part of the States, the federal government has become in many matters the architect of the policy administered by the States."

Then again in U.K.

M-K. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Dr. Raghbir Singh, Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is in a way a very important Resolution and I think we should speak on it and express our point of view with regard to primary education. Article 45 in the Directive Principles of our Constitution 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."

This is what the Constitution lays down. Over 54 years have passed since this Constitution came into force and today in the sixth year of the Constitution and also at a time when the First Five year Plan is coming to its completion, we are confronted with the question of reviewing the position of primary education. We should ask ourselves today as to where we stand *vis-a-vis* the objective of free compulsory education for our children until they complete the age of fourteen. *Now* I would only give you certain facts to impress upon the House the state of affairs that exist today. It has been stated in the Draft Recommendations for the Second Plan by no other than Prof. Mahalanobis as follows : —

"Of children in the school-going age, less than half attend primary stage and less than one-fifth the secondary stage."

This is what he said. But from the reports of the Primary Teachers' Association, the picture would appear to be still more dark than what is depicted here because they say that only 40 per cent of the children of the school-going age ever attend our schools. It means that sixty per cent do not have the opportunities in life even to cross the threshold of primary school. As you know, those who are fortunate enough to go to a primary school don't pass beyond the elementary stage and their education is cut short even before it had hardly begun. Then, what does it mean? It means that the Directive Principle in the Constitution is more observed in its violation or disregard than in its acceptance. This is what I want to say.

If we look at the reports of the Second Five Year Plan that we get from time to time, the picture would be even clearer than what I have said. You will find that the targets for the Plan are 38,059 additional primary

schools and 40 lakh additional primary students today. That is stated in the First Five Year Plan as the objective. As far as elementary and basic education is concerned, the target is 9,471 additional schools and 27 lakh additional students. Thus, taking the primary and the basic education schools together, we should have at the end of the First Five Year Plan period 47,500 additional schools and 67 lakh additional students both in the primary and in the basic education schools. What do we find from the reports themselves? In the first 3 years only 16,226 primary schools were opened and the number of students went up by 9 lakhs. Now even according to the First Five Year Plan we should have in this period of three years at least 22,000 additional primary schools and 24 lakh additional students in the primary schools. The latest report— I have in mind the report covering the period April-September 1955—that report avoided giving certain relevant figures. Even there what you find is this. There, if we take all these figures into account and judge as to what we have done in the first 3½ years of the Plan the picture is as follows. Only 20,000 primary and basic education schools were opened in the first 3½ years of the Plan as against 47,500. I have already stated that the number of additional students in primary as well as secondary schools for the period is only 23 lakhs as against the Plan target of 67 lakhs. This is the performance under the First Five Year Plan. If you go into the figures a little deeply and analyse them, then you will find the actual number would be much less than 23 lakhs. We have got reports from Malabar for instance, which say that a number of primary schools under the District Boards are being closed down for various reasons. This is true of many other States. The progress reports of the Plan of course I don't take these into account. Only the credit is shown and the debit is not shown at all. I don't know how the balance will stand out but assuming for argument's sake that no school has closed down, even so, we find that

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] we are far far behind the targets that we have set under the First Five Year Plan or the target that should have been fulfilled in the 3½ years of the Five Year Plan.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : You will get a deficit balance.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, we have deficits in so many things. We are living in a deficit regime. It is no wonder therefore that between 1951 and 1954 only 48'8 crores out of the estimates of 73 crores had been spent on primary education. In this period this comes to about 43 per cent of the total expenditure that is supposed to be incurred in the five year period. We should have spent in three years at least 60 per cent of the total estimated amount. It is very interesting that when it comes to primary education and expenditure on account of that, we find that we are not in a position to spend even the money that is little surplus for the Government. At the same time when it comes to police and other bureaucratic administration, time and again we are presented with Supplementary Grants not only to meet the expenditure that is earlier sanctioned but also to meet additional demands. It does not speak well of those people who call themselves democratic and speak of building what they call a Welfare State. Here again I would like to point out that last year the President of the Gujarat Primary Teachers' Association wrote a letter to the President of the Congress, at that time it was Jawaharlal Nehru, and his Secretary in reply to that letter which was published also, stated that the Prime Minister was greatly interested in the question of teachers and primary education because that education was important and was the basis of all education. I think he was quite right in taking that view of the matter. Then in that letter it was also said that the Government, in the Planning Commission, were, to quote the words, "seriously considering the whole question of primary education."

Then in this House, in reply to a question by Shri Mazumdar, the Minister said as follows:—

"The Government of India are aware of the present unsatisfactory salary standards of the teachers and have under examination the general question of the revision of the teachers' pay-scales."

All these things happened about a year ago and, therefore, I hope the Government will kindly explain to this House what exactly they have done in the course of this one year. Since the Prime Minister was greatly interested, and the Planning Commission was greatly concerned and since the Ministers were making admissions about the frightful state of affairs in regard to primary education. I think we are entitled to ask the Government after a period of one year, what has been done to fulfil some of the objectives that they had set before themselves, and to give an account of their sincerity in this matter, for, as the saying goes, the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

It is very important, as I said, that this question of primary education should be gone into and here are a few points to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government in particular. First of all, primary education must be made free and compulsory, as is laid down by the Constitution. I say this, because in our country it is not possible to have primary education of a universal character until it is made free, for the simple reason that the majority of our people are **not** in a position today to find the wherewithal to give their children primary education. There are many facts here with me which I might give, but I will only refer to one statement occurring in the recommendations of Prof. Mahalanobis about the Second Five Year Plan Draft. There he has said:

"Half of the population of India or 195 million persons spend less than Rs. 13 per month on consumer goods and possibly half of this amount is consumed in kind or in the form of home-grown food or home-made articles."

Sir, when such is the condition, when such is the appallingly low standard of living of the people, you cannot expect them to find the money to make arrangements for educating their children. Therefore, Government should find more money; they should allocate more funds for the expansion of primary education. That is point number one.

Secondly, it has been suggested by the teachers' associations that at least 15 per cent of the Central Budget and 25 per cent of the State Budgets should be ear-marked for education and a good part of that should go to primary education.

Then changing the pattern of education is also of vital importance. But looking at the syllabus in the schools and the curricula there one finds that nothing has changed in India, for we find the same old type of text books, teaching the same sort of things as of old, which are completely out of place at present. Our students, Sir, should be imparted with a sense of national pride and their patriotism should be roused and their education should be brought into line with present worldly life and it should meet the requirements of the national reconstruction of our country. This matter of syllabus and curricula should never be left in the hands of a set of vested interests who carry on business rather than impart education to our coming generation.

Sir, the next question that I want to refer to is that of the teachers engaged in our primary schools. Sir, primary education in our country will never advance until we take into account the condition of the teachers there and make their lives at least a little better, a little more bearable than it is today. Sir, I have got a lot of figures, but I need only say that even according to the findings of the Central Advisory Board, it appears that the average earnings of a primary school teacher come to about Rs. 27. There have been cases where he gets only Rs. 8/3 per month. From my

experience of what happens in West Bengal I may say that the highest paid primary teacher there, the headmaster who is a matriculate and a trained teacher gets only Rs. 50 per month as his basic wage and together with the allowances he gets only Rs. 62/8 in all. Those who are lower in the rung get less and the lowest gets only Rs. 20 as his basic wage and if you add the allowances also, in all he gets about Rs. 40/8. What does it mean? It means that the primary teacher, the highest paid among them, gets Rs. 40/8 per month as against Rs. 4,000 per month of a Secretary of the Government of India or, if I may say so.....

(Time bell rings.)

I will finish in another two minutes, Sir. Therefore, it would seem that they get about one-hundredth of what a Secretary to the Government of India gets and only about one-twentieth of what hon. Members of Parliament get. Sir, I think this does not require any more comments. In Orissa and other places, the story is the same, in Madras and in your part, Sir, it is the same. Therefore, no one can expect that primary education in our country will advance when those men who are given the responsibility of moulding the character of the coming generation at a very formative stage are made to live under sub-human conditions and on the borderline of starvation. Is this the way to build up primary education in our country? It cannot be done.

In conclusion, Sir, I would only give two or three suggestions. One is that a commission should be appointed, a Primary Education Commission. This, Sir, is a very legitimate demand. Then the second is that the Central Government should not wash its hands clean of its responsibility. The Centre should undertake its task of supervising and helping in every way the primary education system in our country, specially of providing cash. At the same time, it is necessary for the Government to see that teachers themselves are associated at all levels with

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] the running and management of educational centres. It is these people who are running your schools and it is these people who are to be brought into leadership in this matter. I think this is a very legitimate demand.

Then, as I have already said, primary education should be made free and the salaries of teachers should be increased. Also the text-books should be improved. Indeed they should be re-written in the light of what we are trying to achieve. Air, such are some of the many demands which I would like to place before Government. In conclusion I would refer the Government to the publications of the All-India Primary Teachers' Federation in which many demands have been set forth and I do hope the Government will give attention to these demands and see that at least a little bit is done for implementing and carrying out the Directives of our Constitution which are before us, that these principles are not violated, but are observed.

BECAM AIZAZ RASUL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it has been said that the first essential for successful educational effort is that the community as a whole should have a true estimate of the nature and value of education. The value of education in a democratic State cannot be minimised. The question of the nature of education is, of course, before the country. It will take some time for us to settle down to new conditions. And as was said by my hon. friend Dr. Sinha in his speech we have several kinds of primary education in our country, this being so, I rise to support this Resolution, because through it we can tackle this problem for which there is a crying need in the country.

Sir, according to our Constitution, education is mainly the concern of the States. But the Centre has the overall responsibility for co-ordinating and guiding the work of the States so

that national policies can be evolved. The Centre, therefore, cannot give up its responsibility in this respect. That the Centre also realises its responsibility is borne out by the fact that committees have been appointed to go into this question and in the year 1951, the Central Advisory Board of Education appointed a committee to go into the question of the relationship between the State Governments and the local bodies, in the administration of primary education. This Committee in its Report has said:

"The principle of federal responsibility for primary education is supported by several weighty considerations. To begin with, federal aid for primary education is claimed on the ground of financial equity. Usually, the Federal Government is assigned the best and the largest financial resources of the country and collects its revenues in all parts of the country. This is particularly true of India. It is, therefore, urged that the local areas and the States have a right to demand that some of the funds raised by the Federal Government in their areas should be floated back through a system of grant-in-aid in order to enable them to undertake development programmes like universal compulsory education."

It goes on to say, "But now it is discovered that, like the communities, the States themselves are unequal not only in educational achievement but in the capacity to support a programme of compulsory education as well. It is, therefore, urged that unless the Federal Government steps in, accepts financial responsibility for compulsory education, and institutes a proper system of grants-in-aid, equality of educational opportunity cannot be provided at the State level. Lastly, it is pointed out that the Constitution of India definitely supports federal aid for education. Article 45 provides that the 'State' shall endeavour to provide universal compulsory education and the word 'State' is explicitly defined to include the Federal Government, the

State Governments, and the local bodies. The Federal Government is thus clearly made responsible for universal and compulsory education and obviously, the one effective way in which it can discharge this responsibility is to provide federal aid for primary education." Sir, I may be excused for again quoting this Report. Dealing with the important matter of Central responsibility towards primary education, the Report says, "To sum up: We recommend that the Union Government should assign specific grants for universal and compulsory primary education in the States; and that such grants should be based on the principle of equalisation; and that a preliminary investigation to ascertain the nature and extent of such grants should be undertaken without delay. * * * *

"Since the Federal Government has taken no effective steps to fulfil its responsibilities in this respect and as the local bodies are unable to make a large contribution to the support of primary education, the main responsibility for financing primary education falls upon the State Governments at present. It also appears that this position will remain substantially unchanged for some years to come".

It will be seen that there is a vast difference in the method and advance of compulsory primary education in the different States in India. Our first Five Year Plan says, "The existing educational facilities are obviously inadequate. They provide only for 40 per cent of the children in the age group 6—11, 10 per cent in the age group 11—17, and 0.9 per cent in the age group 17—23, whereas the Constitution requires that within 10 years of its commencement free and compulsory education should be provided for all children up to the age of fourteen." This was implicitly laid down in our first Five Year Plan but then it goes on to say:

"The Commission recommends that a serious attempt be made to achieve the following broad targets

subject to such modifications as may be required to suit local conditions:

(1) By the end of the period covered by the Five Year Plan, educational facilities should be provided for at least 60 per cent of the children in the age group 6—11. These should be extended as early as possible to cover the age group 6—14. The percentage of girls in the age group 6—11 should be raised from 23.3 in 1950-51 to 40 in 1955-56."

Therefore, Sir, the necessity for these things is entirely recognised. I find that in 1950-51 there were 2,10,112 primary schools all over India with a total number of 18,352,383 students and the expenditure on these primary schools was to the tune of about 36.71 crores of rupees. In some States compulsory education has been in existence for the last five or six years. In certain parts of Assam, West Bengal, Bihar, Bombay, M.P. Orissa, Punjab, U.P., Madras, Mysore, Delhi and Travancore-Cochin, students in the age group 6-11 are receiving compulsory primary education. According to the Progress Report for the year 1953-54, the total amount spent for the period 1951-54 was Rs. 40.8 crores, that is in 1951-52 it was Rs. 12.1 crores, in 1952-53 it was Rs. 13.0 crores, in 1953-54 it was Rs. 15.7 crores that gives a total of Rs. 40.8 crores for the period 1951-54. The revised estimates for primary education for the period 1951-56 is now put at Rs. 73 crores; that means that an additional sum of about Rs. 20 crores would have been spent from 1954-56. The Progress Report also states, "The plans of all the States put together would, if successfully implemented, lead by 1955-56 to the opening of 38,059 additional primary schools as against 16,276 primary schools attended by about 9 lakh pupils opened by the end of 1953." I am quoting all these figures in order to show that there has been increase in the expenditure on primary education in the States, in fact it is nearly double but I do not find any aid having been

**[Begam Aizaz Rasul.] given from the
Centre for primary education.**

As I have not got much time, I will not take up other issues or quote facts and figures but the Report called 'The seventh Year of Freedom' gives facts and figures regarding primary education and we find a very appreciable increase in the number of institutions for primary education. One hon. Member specifically mentioned the case of U.P. I would like to tell him that U.P. has increased very appreciably the number of primary institutions and the number of students that are receiving education.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: I did not vouch for its correctness but it was a statement in "The Times of India".

BEGAM AIZAZ RASUL: I would like to say also that the U.P. Government has made a stipulation that there should be a change in the system of primary education. Government issued directions to every primary school that from the commencement of the academic session, every school—especially in view of the agricultural aspects of the country—should have attached to it a farm of 5 acres. This was also to ameliorate the conditions of the teachers and the boys of the primary schools. I need not go into the figures of the States but I would like to draw the attention of the House to the proceedings of the 20th and 21st meeting of the Central Advisory Council of Education in India.

There was a very important memorandum that was submitted to this Board and that was to consider the progress of free and compulsory education in the country and the special measures to be devised to achieve the target of providing compulsory and free primary education by 1960 as provided in article 45 of the Constitution and it requested the Ministry of Education to urge the Planning Commission to make more adequate provision for education, particularly for universal free and compulsory education during the second Five Year Plan.

The Board was of the view that special consideration should be given to the States that were economically or otherwise less developed. It has also dealt with the Directives of the Constitution and the duty of the States.

So all these points that I have brought out show that the duty of the Central Government is implicit and although it is being recognised by the Education Ministry, they have a very great responsibility in this matter of primary education.

As I said, Sir, in a democratic State it is more necessary even because our people should at least be able to read and write, at least be able to read newspapers to find out what is happening in the world day by day and also be able to cast their votes properly. The necessity of this has been emphasized through ages.

I would have also supported Mr. Sarwate's amendment, but the reason why I do not support it is not because I do not realize the necessity and the importance of it but because I find that it is not possible at this stage to implement it. We should first of all have at least compulsory free primary education in our country before we think of other things. I know that money will have to be found for these things. The second Five Year Plan has said in its tentative proposals that the number of pupils in schools between the ages of 6 to 14 will increase from about 29 millions in 1955-56 to about 46 millions in 1960-61. So we have to realize the financial implications of the whole thing, but in spite of that, as I have said, the Centre must allocate some funds for primary education in the States.

SHRI B. M. GUPTE (Bombay): **Sir**, being one of the persons who had sponsored this Resolution I, of course, support it. It can very well be argued that this Commission is overdue. In fact it should have preceded the University Education Commission and the Secondary Education Commission

because, as has been emphasized by all the persons who have preceded me, primary education is of vital importance to our infant democracy. If our country is to be spared the trouble, the expense and the risk of an illiterate democracy, the spread of primary education has to be speeded up very rapidly. It was with this view that the Directive Principle was inserted in our Constitution about providing within 10 years primary education to all school-going children up to the age of 14 years. Now we are half-way through the period and we are far from the goal. Even at the time of the Constitution-making there were some of us who objected to setting the limit of ten years, but at that time it was believed that there ought to be some driving force and a definite time limit would provide that driving force, and therefore caution had to yield to enthusiasm. I personally do not mind if we are not able to keep to the schedule and the period is extended by a few years more. But the problem is not there. The real problem is the question of finance and the question of finance is practically dependent upon the question of the remuneration of the teachers and the improvement of the quality of teaching in rural schools, because in the case of primary education the teachers' salary is the major portion of the cost of that education. Although I sympathise with the demand of the teachers for better pay, I can point out that in my State at least, that is, in the State of Bombay, much has been done in this respect. In another States however much remains to be done. Though I sympathise with this demand, it must be admitted that if by increasing the salaries of the teachers to a pitch where we shall make it impossible financially to spread the education, then, of course, the teachers must reconsider the position. As I said, I sympathise with them and certainly not only more schools should be opened but the teachers must be made more contented. That is quite true because while a discontented servant is always a nuisance a

teacher is a danger, not only a nuisance but a danger, because we place our children in their hands at an impressionable age and if the teachers do not carry out their duties in the proper spirit, then naturally the rising generation would not rise to the stature we expect of it. It is the teacher that counts. I can just give an example though it happened a long time ago. At the very outset of my career I was the president of a *taluka* local board and I often visited the villages for the inspection of the works of the board. Then at that time when I was going to the villages it sometimes happened that as soon as the children spotted me they began to run to their school. I accosted them, I called them and enquired why they were running to the school. They said that their teacher had told them, "As soon as you see an outsider or visitor you come away to the school. Till then you can go on playing." And then when I went to the school I found the teacher dozing. I told him: For God's sake don't do this. You can hold the classes for a fewer number of hours: you can hold the school for a fewer number of days, but for God's sake don't teach them falsehood from the very beginning. I therefore say that this is an important task that they should be made contented and they should be made to discharge their duty in the proper spirit, but at the same time I realize the difficulties of finance. However, anyhow those difficulties and the demands of the teachers must be reconciled. A Commission would not be necessary for the purpose if it were a question of finance only. The Commission is necessary for the purpose of determining the kind of primary education that is to be imparted. In this connection I find that there is a divergence in the principle* or in the policy followed by the Centre and in the implementation of that policy in the States. As far as I see, the Centre has resolved that basic education should be the pattern of our primary education' for the future. But in the States this policy is being implemented in a very half-hearted and haphazard manner. Any good

[Shri B. M. Gupte.] policy, if it is not followed vigorously and if it is not followed zealously, then it cannot yield the desired results, and that has happened in this case. In most of the States the personnel of the Education Department are against basic scheme; if they are not definitely hostile, at least they are apathetic. Such is the case with some Ministers also. When one Minister comes with enthusiasm about basic education, then he starts new schools, starts a training college for basic school teachers, and later on another Minister comes in his place, and if he does not believe in it, then he allows all those institutions to languish and in my own district a basic school has closed down. So all the energy and all the resources are frittered away and they are frittered away at a time when we have not adequate resources for our purpose. I therefore think that the time has come when once for all this question must be settled whether we go in for basic education or not. I do not propose to go into the merits of the case today as the Resolution before us does not require a discussion on whether we should adopt the scheme of basic education or the orthodox scheme, but anyhow one scheme must be adopted and vigorously applied throughout the country. The slipshod manner and the half-hearted manner in which the basic education scheme is being implemented today is yielding no results; on the contrary it is frittering away our resources. As far as the basic scheme is concerned

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : May I make a suggestion here that we sit through the lunch hour? In view of the fact that we have spent one hour in Question time—normally on a Friday there is no Question Hour—we may sit through the lunch hour and make up for the time lost. Moreover this is a very important Resolution and many would like to speak. There are the other Resolutions also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Can we have this one hour beyond 5, that is, up to 6 p. m.? Or this can be carried to the next day. There is another non-official day.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : It can be carried over to the next day if the debate is not finished.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND (Madhya Pradesh): It is not fair to the other Resolutions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I suggest that we have the rest of the day today and if necessary we can carry it over also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, we can't have both. Is the House willing to sit through the lunch hour?

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL (Uttar Pradesh): Not during¹ the lunch hour.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Those who do not want to sit, they can go.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then it will be carried over.

The House then adjourned; for lunch at one of the clock.

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

SHRI B. M. GUPTE: Sir, when we adjourned, I was referring to the point that it is not necessary for the purpose of this Resolution to go into the merits and demerits of the basic education scheme but at the same time I feel that there is a very sound idea behind that scheme and that idea is learning through doing or education through;

work. It is universally accepted principle and even such high authorities as the University Commission and the Secondary Education Commission have both endorsed it. But it is one thing to have a good principle behind a scheme and it is another thing to have the principle properly worked out. Of course, it is admitted that merely teaching of a craft does not make a basic school; but I must confess that I have not yet seen one school which is a proper basic school, that is, a school in which the teaching of all the subjects like History and Geography is integrated into the teaching of the craft, where these subjects are taught through a craft. I have not seen it but I do not mean to say that therefore it does not exist; for, I have not gone in search of it with a determination to find it. May be, it is existing, but at the same time it must be admitted that many schools that pass for basic schools are not of a genuine variety and when we adopt a principle unless we have got a genuine variety we shall not reap the advantages expected of that scheme. I therefore submit that it should be the business of the Commission to study this problem taking into consideration all these facts and all these practical difficulties and the attitude of the Department through which the scheme has to be worked out, and also the financial implications. Gandhiji expected that the scheme would pay for itself but it was later on found that it was not so. So if the basic school becomes so costly that the spread of primary education is retarded, then we have to abandon it. After all the number of people who would benefit by it is the real criterion. Therefore I submit that it should be the business of the Commission to enquire into all these matters and once for all determine whether we go in for basic schools or whether we go in for ordinary orthodox primary schools. Once that is determined, then it should be the policy of the Centre to see that it is vigorously and consistently followed. It is no use following a policy in slipshod, half-hearted and

haphazard manner. However good a policy may be, if it is implemented in an anaemic way, then it will not yield the desired results. With these observations I, Sir, would support the Resolution and I hope that the Government will appoint a Commissioner without any delay.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-INT
AND: Mr. Deputy Chairmat, I have no hesitation in saying that this Resolution focuses attention on a very important question and I would naturally expect the Government to give some assurance, even if as usual it says that it would not be possible to accept the Resolution, that it will take all steps to allay the anxiety that hon. Members and people of this country feel over this matter. At the same time, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am sorry that I am not able to support the demand that a Commission should be appointed for this purpose because I feel that we have more than enough data with us already and the appointment of a Commission would only be a delaying factor. Sir, it was said formerly in the days of the British that if you want to postpone a decision, on a matter, the best way to do that would be to appoint a Commission and, to some extent it does happen even today, because the Commission must take some time to prepare and study the terms of reference, go on tour meet people and then prepare a report. Again, we have already had two education Commissions, the University Education Commission and the Secondary Education Commission. And all that has happened is that we go on perpetually asking questions why a certain recommendation is not accepted or what is being done with regard to certain other recommendations. We all know that the various Education Ministers are meeting in conferences—several times a year, sometimes twice or thrice; then the Chief Ministers are meeting and the Vice-Chancellors and Head Masters too; then there is the all-India Educational Conference,—and on all these occasions all the three categories of education are discussed. And what is more, members of the—

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] Education Department often go and preside at conferences and they are able to hear the views of the people in different spheres. If I may point out, the hon. the Deputy Minister himself was presiding over a section of this Education Conference at Calcutta while Mr. Saiyidain was the President of the whole conference. So the Government and the country are fully seized of this question. They are aware of the various problems and there are also before us many suggestions for solution. So what is the thing that the Primary Education Commission proposed to be set up will be able to point out anew, which is not known already?

Then there is another objection to appointing a Primary Education Commission at this stage. We would be setting a bad example by appointing it now. When we appointed the Secondary Education Commission after the University Education Commission we were criticised and people remarked ironically whether the next step would not be the appointment of a Tertiary Education Commission. Moreover, the terms of reference of the Secondary Education Commission of necessity included various matters* concerning primary education and those who have seen the evidence and studied the questionnaire and themselves replied to the questions will be able to see how the various vital problems* connected with primary education had also to be considered along with secondary education in order to make connected and concrete suggestions with regard to that. Of course, the question of primary teachers' salaries is a separate matter and was not covered by Secondary Education Commission. There are some other questions too for instance, if you were to look at the textbooks etc. which are being prescribed for the small children and at the note books and other paraphernalia required even for a first or second grade primary school student, you would be staggered at the cost which a parent has to bear. Apart from making primary

free, we have planned it in such a way that the cost of education to the parent has become almost prohibitive. Barring that question—which I think the State Governments are very competent to tackle—I do not see what other thing is there which it is not possible for the Government and the people to appreciate and to know through these various means mentioned already. As I have said, there is hardly anything which is already not in existence but which the Commission would be able to find out. Sir, education is one of the subjects on which there are various organised bodies and institutes through which opinions are always being expressed. The press also is one of the means through which the reports of these conferences and other grievances are always being perpetually ventilated. So, from that point of view I feel that a Primary Education Commission at this stage will not be of much use. It will only add to the expenditure. And then in this House we will come forward and ask questions as to what the cost was which the Government incurred over such and such a Commission and why it was that much and so on, as we are doing with regard to the other Commission in this respect, that is, the Secondary Education Commission.

Moreover, there are other practical difficulties which though they are rather unfortunate I have to mention so that we have a realistic picture. With the present poverty in the country and the economic conditions we all know that the mortality statistics of children up to 12 shows that as many as fifty per cent and of the children do not reach the age of 12 i.e. almost half of the children do not reach that age.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Are you sure?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I am sure it is some very staggering figure, so, for the time being in the villages at least, rather than this Commission recommending compulsory education, I would suggest

that for the next ten years the education resources should be directed towards social education. That would be more useful to the majority of the people. That does not mean that the present expenditure on programme has to be slackened.

Then, Sir, it has already been found that even if we wanted to make primary education compulsory to fulfil article 45—Directive Principle of the Constitution, it would be impossible to find the required teachers to give education according to our present ideas of giving education. That is, we do not believe in doing anything which is in any way less than the standard prescribed. And in this connection unless we decide to do that—that can be decided only at the State level—it would not be possible to give compulsory primary education with the availability of trained teachers today. Are p teachers educated enough to meet the demand? Besides that, there is another question. Even if the Centre decides to give help for primary education to States, the problems of different States in this respect are different according to their own development. For instance, the problems of Bombay State, Madras State or Travancore-Cochin State would not be the same as those of Madhya Pradesh, Vindhya Pradesh or Assam. These latter States being backward comparatively will require certainly more attention and as such these problems can be solved, I feel, by the States themselves. These States are themselves appointing and have appointed Commissions for this purpose and they have decided to follow their own policies. From what little I know of the attitude of State administrators towards subjects which are entrusted to them, I can say that they certainly will not like to hand over this particular question to the Centre. Even if they take the money from the Centre would like to follow their own policy, because I have heard certain State Ministers and State authorities saying that they would do just what they like in subjects on the State list. If the Centre wanted to interfere too

62 RSD.—4.

much, the Centre could keep its own money. So, this consciousness of managing their own affairs according to their own needs and requirements is so deep that a Central policy about education may not necessarily be liked or followed. As such I feel apart from taking up this question at the different levels which are available to the Government—such as the central Advisory Board of Education, and other conferences that are held in the country on different types of education—University, Secondary, and Primary—there would not be anything very much that would be gained by the appointment of the Commission.

I would not like to be misunderstood that I am not aware of the gravity of the situation viz. the deplorable condition of primary education. But I feel that the way of tackling the situation would certainly not be through the appointment of a fresh Commission, but through seeking solution through various other channels. And for that all the representatives of the people in the various Legislatures—be they at the Centre or in the States—will have to strive in this direction, by creating an urge for education, more than what they are doing today and then alone the question would be solved. Thank you, Sir.

श्री गांधीकृष्ण विजयगीरे (मध्य भारत) :
उपसभाधीन महोदय, श्रीमती सौता परमानन्द ने
जो कौटुम्बिक कमीशन कायम करने के मार्ग
में स्तलायीं, वे मुझे कुछ अच्छी नहीं। मेरा ख्याल
यह है कि जिस प्रकार संकेदी एजुकेशन के लिये
कमीशन कायम हुआ और यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन
के लिये भी कायम हुआ, जिसकी रिपोर्ट भी
निकल गई है वैसे ही एलिमेंटरी एजुकेशन के बारे
में भी अगर एक कमीशन कायम हो जाय तो
उससे बहुत फायदा होगा।

बैसिक एजुकेशन का प्रयोग कहीं जगह हो रहा
है और अलग अलग प्रान्तों में अलग अलग ढंग
से बैसिक एजुकेशन का काम चल रहा है। इस
विषय में कोई खास सिद्धांत या तरीका तय हो
जाना चाहिये और यह काम सभी हो सकता है

* [श्री गांधीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

जब केंद्र की तरफ से एक कमीशन कायम हो। कमीशन तो केवल सलाह देगा और उसली बातों को डिस्कस करेगा। इससे हम कोई खर्चा केंद्र के ऊपर नहीं ला रहे हैं। जो उसकी जिम्मेदारी को आर्गेनाइज करने की और गाइडेंस देने की है, उतनी ही जिम्मेदारी केंद्र पर आती है। इस लिये कमीशन कायम करने में कोई कीटनाई होगी, ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता। इस विषय में मिस्टर सरवट ने जो संशोधन रखा है वह भी उचित है कि प्रि-प्राइमरी स्टेज में या नर्सरी स्टेज में भी जो बच्चों के लिये तालीम हो उसकी ओर भी विशेष ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। इन दोनों वर्गों में जो शिक्षा हो वह किस प्रकार की हो, क्या हो, इसके लिये मैं ख्याल में यह उचित है कि एक कमीशन कायम किया जाय। इस विषय में सरकार को कीटनाई में डालने की मेरे विचार से किसी भी मंत्री की मंशा नहीं है। इसलिये एक्जंक्शन के सम्बन्ध में जैसे और कमीशन कायम हुये वैसे ही प्राइमरी एक्जंक्शन के लिये भी कमीशन कायम किया जाय। और यह जो प्रस्ताव है इसको अगर मंजूर कर लिया जाय तो अच्छा है। बस मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO (Andhra): Sir, I support this Resolution wholeheartedly. I do not want to go into the aims of primary education and all those things because the time is limited. But I want to bring to the notice of the House what some eminent educationists have also stressed. A committee has been formed by the Andhra Government, called the Elementary Education Committee. They have said that the primary education is directly related to the economic conditions of the masses. This is what the committee says:

"Unless the homes of the industrial and agricultural workers are enriched, there is very little scope for the advancement of our country. The chief means of such enrichment is through primary education, giving proper facilities for the children and

fundamental education, giving proper facilities for the adults."

Again, the Committee continues and says:

"The proper development of the individual depends upon the provision of suitable environment for his growth. The need for the proper environmental facilities becomes imperative for the children who are coming from the backward homes. These homes are poor not only economically but culturally and socially. Consequently, any beneficial system of education should provide for the best kind of environment for as long a period as possible for the children coming from such backward homes."

If you look into the figures of boys and girls going to these primary schools, you will find that they are large in the first and the second standard. But as they proceed to the third and fourth standard and upwards, the figure gradually decreases. I can quote some figures relating to Andhra. They are very revealing figures. Between the ages of 6 and 11 years, the number of boys and girls attending schools is 63.3 per cent. and between the ages of 11 and 14 years, their number is only 8.4 per cent. That shows that a great majority of the boys and girls who desire to be educated cannot pursue their studies because of the poor economic condition of the masses. Therefore, if we really want to promote primary education, it is quite necessary that proper facilities be given to them. We know that the great majority of our people in the villages are peasants and agricultural labourers, and their condition is so poor that even the children have to assist their parents in their daily living. Therefore, unless we relieve these poor people of these difficulties and provide proper facilities for their children to be able to attend their schools, primary education cannot make any advance. It is very necessary to provide mid-day meals, free books and other things, to the

children. In this way, these children have to be helped and encouraged. Thus, their parents also will be encouraged to send them to the schools. There may be innumerable schools in the villages, but they exist there only for name sake. And how horrible the condition of those schools is will be known from the Report itself. Sir, the Report says:

"We found one school in Guntur District managed by the District Board located in a cattle-shed, one-third of the shed being occupied by two buffaloes, and the other two-thirds by 97 children. The buffaloes had more space between them than the children. We learnt that this was a rich village. We were aghast to see about 30 children of the tender ages of 6 and 7 sitting on nearly two inches of dust in an aided-school in Visakhapatnam municipal area."

So, Sir, this is the condition of the primary schools. It is, therefore, clear that unless the Government comes to the aid of these villages, the promotion of primary education cannot proceed.

Sir, I would draw your attention to another thing. Why is this primary education not making any quick progress? One of the reasons for that is that the selection of the language used for educating these small children is not proper. There is a great controversy about the language question, especially in my part of the country. The question is which language should be used—whether it should be colloquial or whether it should be classical, whether it should be *Grantham* or *Vyavaliarikam*. There has been a long controversy over this question, and it has not yet been settled. And even in the elementary stages we find that the language used is highly classical which cannot be understood, not only by young boys and girls, but even by adults. So, it is quite necessary that this language should be simplified. It should be such that the young children can easily understand everything

Then, Sir, there is a lot of wastage going on. I have already quoted some figures of the children who attend the schools. A majority of the children of the school-going age do not attend the schools. I do not wish to go into this aspect of the question, but the point that I want to bring to the notice of this House is that the money spent on educating these boys up to the first and the second standard is, more or less, wasted, because proper facilities are not being given to them so that they can prosecute their studies further. So, a lot of money is being wasted in this manner. And that is one of the remarks made by the Elementary Education Committee also. Therefore the Government should see to it that all the children of the school-going age are properly educated. And more and more financial aid should be given to such children.

Sir, there is one more thing that I want to bring to the notice of the House, and that is about the deplorable service conditions of the teachers. This point has already been dealt with by some of the speakers who spoke before me. But I have also to say something with regard to it, from the experience that I have gained with regard to my State, the State of Andhra. Sir, generally, there is a saying there that whoever has got no living can take up this profession and become a teacher. Hence we find that a large number of untrained people also have taken to this profession of teaching, because they have no other living.

Sir, in Andhra, we find that a great majority of the schools run are what are called aided-schools. The number of the Government-run schools is 660, the number of the District Board schools is 6,799, and the number of the aided-schools is 9,578. They are more than 50 per cent, of all the elementary schools in the entire State. But what are the living conditions of the teachers in these elementary schools, and particularly in the so-called aided-schools? The salaries that are given to the teachers are very very low.

[Shri N. D. M. Prasadara] This fact has been admitted by even Prof. Humayun Kabir who said in the All-India Primary School Teachers Conference that these elementary school teachers should be properly paid. He expressed his personal opinion by saying that a higher grade school teacher should be paid Rs. 65 per month, and a secondary grade school teacher should be paid Rs. 75 per month. Recently also a conference was held—of the Secretaries of the Education Departments and the Directors of Education of the various States—where a salary of Rs. 50 was recommended for the trained teachers. But what do we find in Andhra? We find that the school teachers in the aided-schools are paid only Rs. 27 to Rs. 30 with an increment of half a rupee, and the school teachers in the Local Board schools are paid only Rs. 30 to Rs. 45 with an increment of one rupee, and the school teachers in the Government schools are paid Rs. 30 to Rs. 50 with an increment of one rupee. These figures show the horrible conditions of our teachers; and even these small salaries are not being paid to them properly. The number of the District Board schools is not small—it is more than 6,000.

3 P.M.

The Committee says:

"On the other hand, the teachers working in the District Board schools bitterly complained regarding delays in payment of salaries in time. We found, in some places, that even in the last week of the month the teachers had not received the salaries of the previous month."

So, this is the condition of the teachers of the District Board Schools.

if we look at the fate of these school teachers of the aided schools, it is much worse. I say that the teachers of these schools are mere slaves of the managers of the schools and on the authority of this Committee itself, I can say that these managers take away most of the grants that are

given by the Government. And the Committee also have said that they are not really grants-in-aid schools, but Government schools, because the managers do not pay even a single pie from their pockets towards the maintenance of the schools, but run the whole show with the money grabbed from the Government itself and even from that money these managers take away something. This is what the Committee says:

"Individual teachers have complained that they are forced to pay the institutions as well as the individual managers Rs. 3 to Rs. 5 and some times even as much as Rs. 10 out of the grant. The management deducts this amount and pays only the balance."

So this is the condition of the school teachers.

In such circumstances, how can we expect them to take proper care of the children and their education? Therefore in many cases, you will find that the school teachers will take up some other profession also, some other side-earning. In many places, you will find that they become touts or clerks or do something else. So, for the most part of the day, they do not sit in classes, but go out and work. When there is inspection, they will collect some children. Therefore, it is quite necessary, as the Committee has also recommended, that all the schools, at the primary stage, must be taken over by the Government and run by them.

Sir, apart from this, there are certain other demands of the school teachers. Generally we find in the case of Government servants

(Time bell rings.)

Two minutes more. Sir. Certain amenities are provided for them by the Government, like Provident Fund, Pension and such other things. But the school teachers have got nothing of that sort. So the teachers demand, and rightly so, that these facilities

which are given to Government servants should also be given to them. Similarly, they demand that the scales of pay recommended by the Pay Commission should also be given to them.

Sir, I come to the last point that all the text-books, we find, are generally changed year to year or once in two or three years and in doing so, there takes place a lot of corruption, a lot of bribery and other things. Generally, whoever is in power will recommend the text-books to be prescribed, which are to be published by particular companies. Sir, recently, this has become a scandal and even the Ministers have not escaped from this blame. Recently some cases have been reported in the press also about some Ministers in Andhra /corrupting about some books published by the Kaviraja Publications of Tenali or the Jacobine Publications of Tenali and ordering that text-books be published by them and they have compelled the Special Officers also to do that. Therefore, this thing can be ended only when the Government itself takes over the publication of the text-books. Thank you, Sir.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated¹): Sir, I wish I had been present at the last meeting, because then I would have moved an amendment to this Resolution. But it is too late now. Therefore, I will confine my remarks to what I would have said and what amendment I would have moved if I had been present then.

We all know—know it very well—that the present educational system is a wasteful; it is inadequate. But what to my mind appears to be the greatest evil is our confusion about what we want. Today, there are, to my mind, two systems in existence, both competitive, and two other systems, just on the door-step, pressing that they should also be recognized. There is the ordinary primary system with lower primary and upper primary, with lower middle and upper middle and so on. There is again this, so-called—I call it so-called—basic

education, junior and senior. There is the Rajaji Scheme which I would call preparatory basic education for the common man. That is also there, and we cannot ignore it. It is there. It has some importance and it has significance also. Even as it is, there is the Wardha type, there is the Jamia Milia basic, there is the Gandhigram type basic and the actual basic which is only just paying a few *charkhas* and putting them in the store-room. That is the most common type of basic education.

There was also a type of scheme suggested by Mr. Deshmukh, the Deshmukh Scheme, for the Madhya Pradesh. It did not come to us, but it was there. It was also knocking at the door for admission. It was an important scheme.

Our minds are not quite clear as to what we want and today there are two rival schemes and two others are trying to enter. We do not know what we really want. Therefore, I say that a Commission is absolutely necessary to remove our confusion and bewilderment as to what we actually want. It is not good as it is. It is not enough. But what do we want? That I do not know and I am not sure whether the hon. Member who opposed it knows it himself.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: I am not opposing it.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I mean the Minister. Excuse me. I should have been very clear about this. I mean the Minister. I do not think even the Minister is clear.

I come to the point again. What amendment would I have introduced to this Resolution? This Resolution to my mind, is not half as good as the provision in the Constitution.

It says under article 45:

"The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, free and compulsory education for all children

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.] until they complete the age of fourteen years."

It is the age of 14 years. But it is also the words 'ten years'; it is very definite. It is very clear. But what type of education? That is what we want to know. I prefer this article very much more to the Resolution that is before us. The Resolution is very vague; but on the important and material point—what kind of education—it is silent. What period? Within what period is it to be introduced? 'Ten years'; and the course to last for how many years? Up to fourteen. This too is not clear.

But I would say that the most important function of such a Commission would be not to tell us the pattern of education. I think Government is sure of the pattern. There seems to be not a 'basic system of education' but a pattern of the basic system. I would say 'pattern' because it has become more fashionable. We do not say 'Socialism', but 'Socialistic pattern of society.' So, we say 'basic pattern of education' so that it will have flexibility. And I am quite serious about it for the reason that there can be a number of varieties of the pattern; there can only be a variety of a set pattern. There would be a variety for rural areas and a variety for urban areas. They must be of the same pattern, but with a different variety, with a different emphasis. There would be a variety, say, for the Tribals. I think Rajaji has said something extremely wise on this, as he always does. He has said that there are millions of children in families called the 'under-privileged' who do not know any type of education. It is a new thing for them. My own children were born to it.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJEE (Nominated): The fundamentals or education are universal.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: But there are varieties of a universal. He said that the approach to different classes

should be different. The approach to a child from an un-privileged class should be different. The approach to Malkani's child or Ranga's child will be different. So also, in basic education, whether the emphasis will be on spinning or whether it will be spinning intensive, I want to know. In Wardha there is something called spinning intensive; somewhere else is agriculture intensive; somewhere else there is no intensive. I would therefore want the Commission to go into these matters, but not to tell us the pattern. The pattern is already there. There must be a directive to the Commission, as was given to the Kher Commission, that Hindi is to be the official language and how, when and in what progression we must have it. They must go into it. We say here that the pattern should be basic education but what, when, of what variety and in what circumstances of the State etc. We must find out and therefore we want the Commission because our brain is completely confused about the variety. Mine is confused and I want to know exactly the different kinds of approaches and the different varieties of basic pattern of education. For instance, take girls' education. Again what would be the place of Hindi in that pattern of education and where is it to start? I read a few days ago what Gandhiji said. He said that it was to be from the fifth year of the child. Now perhaps it is too fast. It is breathless and even I thought it was rather breathless and I think Prof. Ranga too has gone off his breath. I have made up my mind. I would say that the child's mother-tongue is something different—not Hindi. I don't know, it may be the sixth or the seventh year. For the South it may be the seventh and for another region it may be the sixth year, but I would like the Commission to tell us what it should be for different kinds of children in the different regions. It may be the third class for some and it may be the second class in other regions. Now I think of the Sindhi child. A Sindhi child, if he is put to Hindi in the second class i.e., in the sixth year, would take to it

very easily because he has no other language. Sindhi language is dying. There are a number of points also about what kind of school we should have. Is it going to be a one-teacher school or a two-teacher school or a three-teacher school? Today the one-teacher school is growing up so wildly. It gives no education at all and it is unequipped, unfurnished, and has ■untrained teachers. One-teacher school is no school at all. I think it is to the great credit of the Social Welfare Board that they found by experience that even in a village very much in the interior there is not one girl worker, not two girl workers but there are three girl workers in a village of only 500 persons to work intensively. They are sensible and they have taken lessons from the experience of the Kasturba Trust. 5ne girl will be lost in such a village. There should be three and then multiply it so that the three girls will feel that there are other three girls in a neighbouring place. The one-teacher schools are wildly growing without any use. The Commission must say that there shall be no one-teacher school. Whether they should be two-teacher schools or three-teacher schools and whether they should be basic or ordinary schools and whether they should be 10 miles away from each other—these things I don't know. They have to tell us these and other ♦hings. There are a number of such things and a large number of things. Even then we say that they should be of the basic pattern. What varieties they are going to be they must tell us Vmly and they must say "This shall not be so."

Quite a number of excrescences have grown up in this Department. T think it is a very unprogressive Department, which should be the most progressive Department. Today we are progressing on all lines—excuse me if I say so—except on this line, and to my mind today the greatest need in India is the growth of personality, the evolution of the person, the character of the child and the personality of the teacher. If the teacher

.s nothing—today he thinks he is a contemptible creature, I am very sorry to say so, he himself thinks so and when a man does not respect himself, how will society respect him— if the teacher is like that, how do we expect him to build up the character of the children and the character of the little ones which goes to build up the nation. It is the saddest thing today, the tragedy of India, that the little children at the most important age when we can build up character, are going to pieces because we are neglecting the teacher so the Commission is very badly needed, with a directive that there shall be a basic pattern. But they should give the variety and give us the 'dos' and 'don'ts' of this variety; we don't want anything else.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in discussing this Resolution much of the discussion has centred round the defects of the present system of elementary education. I don't think anybody is more conscious about the defects of the system than the Government themselves. The several pamphlets which were issued from time to time and the several Conferences which they have convened, and including those which the hon. Minister of Education has addressed, the Central Advisory Council, they have all gone into this question and have admitted that the primary system of education is defective and that it should be improved upon. So in discussing this Resolution we should not give the impression that the country is not making progress in primary education. We are making progress in primary education. I will just point out a few figures and indicate what progress we have made since we attained independence. In 1947-48 we had nearly 1J lakh schools in the country. By 1952-53 this grew to nearly 2,20,000 and the enrolment of Student population was about 1,10,000 in 1947-48. By 1,952-53 it rose to nearly 2 crores.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What was the increase in the population in this period? You must keep it in view.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes. everybody knows it—much more your self. The expenditure in 1947-48 on primary education was about Rs. 18 crores or Rs. 19 crores and by 1952 it went up to Rs. 43 crores 70 lakhs. That means there is no comparison between the position of the primary education.....

DR. RAGKUBIR SINH: Meanwhile the rupee has been devalued.....

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: That also everybody knows, I suppose. There is no comparison between the stage at which the primary education then was and the progress that we have made, and the Education Department also have not been sitting idle over it because the First Five Year Plan seeks to achieve a definite target. They seek to achieve by the end of the First Plan the target that 55 to 60 per cent, of the school-going age children should be put in school, and the schools themselves to increase by about 40 per cent. Then they also seek in the Second Five Year Plan, to increase the number of school-going children by fifty per cent, and also the number of schools by about the same number. They have different schemes. For want of time I am not going into them. But the question is, we want a Commission according to the Resolution. The Commission is to go through the system of primary education. Whatever the progress may be in the system of primary education, is it the pattern of education that we want? Is it the pattern of education that under the circumstances of the country would help the proper growth of citizenship and the leadership in the country, or do we want a different system? Government have taken a decision, unfortunately, and the decision is that by gradual stages, all the primary schools are to be switched on to basic schools. They have programmed to reach this goal by gradual stages. But what is this basic education? Sir, I agree with Mr. Gupte that we are not now certain of what pattern of basic education we should have in the country. There is the pattern of basic education that is there

in Wardha which was evolved by Mahatma Gandhi and later on it is being experimented on at Sevaeram and those being practised by the pioneer State of Bihar and elsewhere in the country widely differ. Apart from theory, on the question whether basic system of education is the right type of education or the correct type of education to be followed at the primary stage, educationists have not agreed. Educationists have differed on the practicability of the basic system of education, on its utility and its suitability in the present circumstances. Considering the circumstances existing in Indian society, if we believe in the principle that schools should be linked up with the surroundings, with things round about in that society, then we have to evolve some type of basic education system. I do not think there will be any dispute about that. But about the successful implementation of this system there are very serious doubts and whether it can be applied universally in the country, on that also there are doubts. I am myself running a school of about 180 students and it is a full-fledged basic school and nearby there is a basic teachers' training college. I myself have been a student of basic education and I have also tried to teach it myself. But I have found it difficult, almost impossible, to carry-out or implement it to the letter. Specially that one aspect of basic education, that is the correlation of teaching with doing, is a thing which even experts cannot do efficiently. I have had discussions also about basic education with experts on this aspect and they have also admitted that correlation of teaching is a very difficult thing to achieve. Sir, if the essence of basic education depends upon this factor, that some craft and teaching should go together, that teaching should go round a particular craft, and if it is difficult to correlate-knowledge with the actual craft, then the question arises, whether we can find sufficient number of teachers to teach this in the correct way and whether we can universally apply this. Taking the present situation into con-

sideration. it must be said that we have very few basic education teachers. There are, of course, a number of teachers, the so-called basic education teachers—who are put in charge of basic schools. But these people do not know and they have not understood what basic education is and they have not been trained properly. The Education Department itself admits that basic education as it is taught is not effectually taught and that both from the point of view of teacher material as well as the technique, the present system falls far short of the necessities. Though the Government have taken the decision that primary education should be on the pattern of basic education system, when these difficulties are there, the difficulty of getting proper teachers, apart from the difficulty of the teaching system itself, how can the Government succeed in achieving their objective? This at least, if not for any other consideration, needs examination. They all admit that in order to build up the country, we have to get a proper system of education. In one of the pamphlets issued by the Ministry of Education I found this passage:

"The future of this great land is being forged not so much in factories and big hydro-electric projects, or even in Assemblies or the Parliament, but in the lakhs of schools, big and small, well-known and obscure, in which millions of our children are being educated. Anything that we can do to improve the efficiency of these schools and that of the teachers and to give them contentment and peace of mind will be repaid a hundred fold."

Sir, if this be so, what is the use of linking it up with a system of education which we cannot implement? That is the question. Therefore, I hope the Education Ministry also will admit that they have to examine this question. No doubt, they have taken a decision, but they can examine it again. The Ministry has come in for a lot of criticism,

because the country is now looking to the Centre for everything and whatever defects there may be in the country in the primary education system, that is attributed to the Education Ministry. This is not a correct appreciation of the situation. As some hon. Members pointed out the Constitution lays the task of bringing about compulsory free elementary education for children between the ages of six and fourteen at the door of the Education Ministry. It is their task. But what are their powers? Primary education is a State subject. Also, what are the resources available to make elementary education free? The Education Ministry, I am sure, is suffering for want of resources. I will not be wrong if I say that the Education Ministry is the Cinderella in our country. They need resources, but they do not get them. I am told that the Second Five Year Plan visualises an expenditure of about a little over a thousand crore of rupees.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. It has been cut since.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Whether we can, with the other commitments that we have, impose this expenditure also is a question which we cannot answer now. Anyway, there is no point in insisting upon the Education Ministry's sticking to the letter of the Constitution when the implementation of it in this respect is almost impossible within the time stipulated in the Constitution. Therefore I am not blaming the Government for not implementing it. But I would ask the Government why they have not taken a step towards it? Till today they have not tried to direct the States, to give directions to the States so as to have a uniform pattern of education which they could do in order to achieve this universal compulsory primary education. Although Government may say that they have taken a decision, still, on account of the difficulties that I have already pointed out and which have been pointed out by other hon. Members also,

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] Government will have to admit that there is a case for going into this question of the pattern of primary education.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is -time to conclude.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: If it is time, then I will end up, Sir. Therefore, I would only say that I do not want the Education Ministry to take the technical stand on this matter and say that they have already taken the decision and therefore, there need not be any Commission, or that a Commission need not be appointed at all. Of course, the hon. Member Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand said that a Commission may instead of achieving the result, put off the result. I will just read out a sentence that I came across and then finish my observations. The hon. Member was referring to Royal Commissions. Well, the sentence says:

"Referring to Royal Commissions was a recognised method of postponing decisions on matters which appeared to be embarrassing."

Sir, I hope that at least this will not be the tradition of our Government.

श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, मेरे लिये श्री मलकानी श्री भूषि गुप्ता तथा श्री रंङ्डी जैसे आज्ञास्वी वक्ताओं के बाद बोलना एक बड़ी घाट की सी बात है। मेरा एक छोटा सा प्रस्ताव है और वह यह कि हम स्त्रियाँ कुछ थोड़े से ही विषय के अन्दर विशेषज्ञ होती हैं, या तो एजुकेशन या स्वास्थ्य या सोशल वेलफेयर ये हमारे खास विषय हैं, तो हम लोग यह आशा कर सकती हैं कि कम से कम इस तरह के जब कोई विषय आये तो हम लोगों को बोलने के लिये प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिये। आप कहेंगे कि रिजर्वेशन और सोशल रिजर्वेशन का समय अब चला गया, पर मेरा निवेदन इतना ही है कि जब तक इस सदन के अन्दर स्त्रियों की संख्या इतनी बेचर माइनोरिटी में रहती है तब तक मैं समझती हूँ कि कम से कम इस

प्रकार के विशेष प्रतिनिधित्व और विशेष कंसेशन की मांग हम कर ही सकती हैं।

श्रीमन्, विषय पर आते हुये मुझे तो यही कहना है कि आज के प्रस्ताव ने एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय की ओर हमारा ध्यान खींचा है। समस्त शिक्षा के अन्दर जो प्राइमरी शिक्षा है वह सब से महत्वपूर्ण स्थान रखती है, ठीक ऐसे ही जैसे कि इमारत के अन्दर नींव का, फाउंडेशन का स्थान होता है, वही स्थान शिक्षा के अन्दर प्राइमरी शिक्षा का है और खासकर जब कि हमारा प्रजातंत्र राज्य है, हमारा प्रजातंत्र का देश है तो प्राथमिक शिक्षा तो एक तरह से हमारा मुख्य आधार है, यह तो हमारी जान है। इसीलिये मेरा कहना है कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा की तरफ आज तक हमारा जो ध्यान जाता रहा है वह बहुत ही कम है। सब से महत्वपूर्ण विषय होते हुए भी यह सब से अधिक नंगलेक्टर्ड रहा है, उपेक्षा का पात्र रहा है। जितने भी उन्नत देश हैं वे सब से पहले अपनी प्राथमिक शिक्षा की ओर ध्यान देते हैं लेकिन हम अब तक सेकेंडरी एजुकेशन और यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन पर कमीशन बैठा चुके हैं परन्तु अभी तक प्राइमरी एजुकेशन का नम्बर नहीं आया है। आज का यह प्रस्ताव उस आवश्यक स्थिति की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करता है इसीलिये मैं इसे बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण समझती हूँ।

मुझे तो श्रीमती डा० सीता परमानन्द का जो सुझाव था उसको सुन कर आश्चर्य हुआ। उन्होंने कमीशन का विरोध किया। मैं उसकी गहराई में नहीं जाऊंगी क्योंकि उसका उत्तर श्री मलकानी जी ने तथा और बन्धुओं ने बहुत अच्छी तरह से दे दिया है। मेरी समझ में प्राइमरी शिक्षा का विषय ऐसा है और यह समस्या इतनी जटिल है और इतनी ज्यादा संदिग्ध अवस्था में, कन्फ्यूजन की हालत में, सब कुछ है कि न तो जनता के सामने और न ही हमारी सरकार के सामने अभी प्राथमिक शिक्षा की बहुत सी बातों के सम्बन्ध में कोई स्पष्ट चित्र उपस्थित है।

इसलिये कमीशन का नियुक्त किया जाना एक बड़ी आवश्यक सी बात है।

श्रीमान्, अभी तक अपने दश के अन्दर दुर्भाग्य से प्राथमिक शिक्षा को बहुत ही कम महत्व मिलता रहा है, उसका कारण यह रहा है कि यहां विदेशी शासन था और अंग्रेजों की नीति प्राथमिक शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में बहुत ही उपेक्षा की रही है। उनका तो एक विशेष उद्देश्य था और वह यह कि वे तो अपने शासन को चलाने के लिये थोड़े से चन्द आदमी चाहते थे जो कि अच्छे पढ़ लिखे हों और इसलिये उन्होंने ऊंची शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध किया। उनका कहना था कि यह ऊंची शिक्षा जो है वही छन कर नीचे आयेगी। इसको परकोलेशन थ्योरी कहते हैं, यानी शिक्षा छन कर ऊपर से नीचे की ओर आ जाय। तो इस प्रकार से देखते हैं कि अंग्रेजों के राज्य में प्राथमिक शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में हमेशा उल्टी गंगा बहती रही है। लेकिन आज जब कि हमारा दश स्वतंत्र है और जब कि हमें एक स्वतंत्र भारत का निर्माण करना है तब हम छत के ऊपर से बनाना प्रारम्भ नहीं कर सकते। हमें तां नींव से इमारत को उठाना पड़ेगा और अपनी राष्ट्रीय इमारत को, राष्ट्रीय भावना को नींव से ऊपर उठाना पड़ेगा, छत के ऊपर से बनाने से कोई लाभ नहीं है। यह प्रसन्नता की बात है कि दश के अन्दर जैसे जैसे राष्ट्रीय चेतना का उदय हुआ है वैसे वैसे हमारा ध्यान प्राथमिक शिक्षा की ओर धीरे धीरे गया है। महात्मा गांधी पहले व्यक्ति थे जिन्होंने मुख्यतया अपने अध्ययन का विषय, अपने विचार का विषय, प्राथमिक शिक्षा को बनाया और इस शिक्षा के ऊपर बड़ी बड़ी कॉफ्रेंसें हुई हैं, बड़ी बड़ी योजनाएं बर्धा में हुई हैं, जाकिर हुसैन कमेटी और दूसरी कमेटियां स्थापित हुई हैं और उसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि हमें एक शिक्षा पद्धति मिली जिसको बुनियादी तालीम या बर्धा शिक्षा प्रणाली कहा जाता है। इसके भी कई रूप हैं और कई प्रयोग हैं, जैसा कि

श्री मलकानी जी ने बताया, लेकिन बहुत से संशोधनों के बाद, बहुत से परीक्षणों के बाद हम एक ऐसे फाइनल स्टैंड पर, एक ऐसे अन्तिम स्तर पर, पहुंच चुके हैं जिसको हमारी सरकार ने मान लिया है और अब यह माना जाता है कि प्राइमरी शिक्षा क्षेत्र में बौंसिक शिक्षा प्रणाली ही हमारा एक मुख्य ध्येय है। लेकिन इतना ही चुकने के बाद भी आज दश के अन्दर एक नहीं अनैक प्राथमिक शिक्षा पद्धतियां चल रही हैं। एक शिक्षा पद्धति तो यही है जो कि अंग्रेजी जमाने में शुरू हुई, जिसको कि किताबी शिक्षा कह सकते हैं। इसको एकडेमिक एजुकेशन भी कह दिया जाता है लेकिन वह शब्द उतना ठीक नहीं जितना कि शब्द 'किताबी शिक्षा' ठीक है। यह शिक्षा प्राइमरी के क्षेत्र में इतनी रफ़्तारी तरीके से चल रही है कि इसका भार डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड्स और म्युनिसिपैलिटीज के हाथ में है और इनके पास न धन है, न अबल है इस शिक्षा को चलाने की। इसके दोषों का विवेचन करने के लिये मंरे पास समय भी नहीं है और बहुत कुछ कह भी दिया गया है। दूसरी जो शिक्षा प्रणाली है वह बौंसिक शिक्षा प्रणाली है। यद्यपि वह सरकारी तौर से एक अपनी निश्चित शिक्षा मान ली गई है लेकिन उसका स्वरूप भी इतना ज्यादा अव्यवस्थित है, इतनी शांचनीय हालत में है, इतनी असंतोषजनक हालत में है कि उसके बारे में जितना भी कहा जाय उतना थोड़ा है। बहुत से बन्धुओं ने उस की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित किया है। जितने भी शिक्षा विभाग के डायरेक्टर्स और इंस्पेक्टर हैं उनका न तो इस तरफ ध्यान है और न इस शिक्षा प्रणाली पर विश्वास है, जो स्कूल और कालेजों के प्रिंसिपल्स हैं उनकी इसमें आस्था नहीं है और बौंसिक शिक्षा के जो पढ़ाने वाले टीचर्स हैं उनके अन्दर इतनी प्रतिभा नहीं है कि वे इस चीज को समझ सकें और अपने विद्यार्थियों को समझा सकें। उसका नतीजा यह है कि आज बौंसिक शिक्षा प्रणाली का जो रूप हमारे सामने है वह बहुत ही अव्यवस्थित और चिन्ताजनक हालत में

[श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल]

हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त जो तीसरी शिक्षा प्रणाली प्राइमरी के क्षेत्र में चल रही है वह हमारे पब्लिक स्कूलों की है, कानवेंट के नाम के स्कूलों की या पब्लिक स्कूलों की है। आज हमें बड़े दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि यह शिक्षा प्रणाली वही है जिस का कि हम विरोध करते आये हैं। ये जो पब्लिक स्कूल हैं इनका वातावरण अभारतीय है, अराष्ट्रीय है। ये तो एक प्रकार से इस तरह के विद्यार्थी पैदा करते हैं जो कि देश में तो हिन्दुस्तानी हैं लेकिन जिन का दिल व दिमाग अंग्रेजियत से भरा हुआ है। लेकिन मुझे इस बात का आश्चर्य होता है और अफसोस भी होता है कि हमारे समाज की जितनी इंटेलिजेंशिया है, जो क्रीम आफ सांसाइटी है, वे अपने बच्चों को पब्लिक स्कूल में भेजने में गर्व समझते हैं और वे समझते हैं कि जो चालू प्राइमरी शिक्षा है, जो बौंसिक स्कूल है, वे गरीबों के लिये हैं, वे जंगली लोगों के लिये हैं और वे जिस तबके के लोग हैं, अपने बच्चों में जिस कल्चर को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं उस कल्चर को, उस शिष्टाचार को, उस क्वालिटी आफ एजुकेशन को वे स्कूल नहीं दे सकते इसीलिये वे उसे बिल्कुल उपेक्षा की दृष्टि से, धृणा की दृष्टि से देखते हैं और हमारे बड़े बड़े नेता, जिन को राष्ट्रीयता में बड़ा विश्वास है, भारतीयता में बड़ा विश्वास है, वे अपने बच्चों को पब्लिक स्कूल में भेजते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार की जो नीति है वह भी कुछ अजीब है। जो पब्लिक स्कूल खोले जा रहे हैं उनको, निश्चित रूप से मैं कह सकती हूँ, हमारी सरकार का प्रोत्साहन प्राप्त है। बहुत से मिडिल क्लास के लोगों को स्कालरशिप दे दी जा रही है ताकि वे अपने बच्चों को पब्लिक स्कूल में भेजें। इससे पता चलता है कि सरकार की जो नीति है वह अभी प्राइमरी शिक्षा के बारे में साफ नहीं है। श्री मलकानी जी ने कहा है कि जनता भ्रम में है, मैं कहती हूँ कि सरकार के सामने भी कोई साफ

तस्वीर नहीं है और हमारे दिमाग में भी नहीं है कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा किस प्रकार चलानी चाहिये। इसके अतिरिक्त एक और विचार शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में है, और वह है क्रोएगिजस्टैंस का, सहशिक्षा का सिद्धांत। कुछ लोगों का यह विचार है कि हमारे देश के अन्दर दोनों शिक्षा प्रणालियाँ, अर्थात् जो कि पुरानी शिक्षा है अंग्रेजी तरीके की शिक्षा है और जो बौंसिक शिक्षा है, वे दोनों साथ साथ चलनी चाहिये। इस प्रकार की विचारधारा, इस प्रकार के सिद्धान्त अपने देश के एक महान् शिक्षाविज्ञ, विज्ञान के शिक्षा-विज्ञ, डा० अमरनाथ भा द्वारा कुछ दिन हुए समाचारपत्रों में प्रकट हुए थे। उनका कहना है कि जिस प्रकार पोलिटिक्स के अन्दर दोनों विरोधी विचारधाराएँ रह सकती हैं उसी प्रकार शिक्षा क्षेत्रों के अन्दर भी दो विचारधाराएँ, चाहे वे जुदा जुदा ही क्यों न हों, क्यों न रहें। इससे पता चलता है कि अपने देश के शिक्षाविज्ञों को अभी तक बौंसिक प्रणाली पर अधिक विश्वास नहीं है और यह जो विचार है इसके खिलाफ तो यही कहा जा सकता है कि बौंसिक शिक्षा तो एक प्रकार से जा चली आ रही शिक्षा प्रणाली है, उसके प्रतिक्रिया रूप में, उसके जवाब में, पैदा हुई है। इसलिए दोनों का एक साथ रहने का कोई मतलब नहीं हो सकता है क्योंकि एक पद्धति ने दूसरे को रिप्लेस करना है। इस तरह की जो भिन्न भिन्न विचारधाराएँ देश में चल रही हैं उसके सम्बन्ध में मेरा तो यह विचार है कि हम सब को मिल कर इस विषय पर छानबीन करने की आवश्यकता है।

श्रीमन्, इस विषय पर विचार करने के लिए जो बातें अत्यन्त जरूरी हैं जो कि कमीशन के कार्यक्षेत्र के अन्दर आनी चाहिए वह इस प्रकार हैं। पहला तो यह कि अपने देश के अन्दर एक प्रकार की शिक्षा सब बच्चों के लिए होनी चाहिए। अपने देश के कुछ अमीर बच्चों को कोई शिक्षा मिले, गरीब बच्चों

को कोई शिक्षा मिले, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में एक प्रकार की शिक्षा प्रणाली हांजी चाहिए और सरकार को यह निश्चित कर देना चाहिए कि वह कौन सी शिक्षा प्रणाली होगी। श्रीमन्, हम आज सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी लाना चाहते हैं। मेरा यह कहना है कि हमको सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी को समाज में लाने से पहले शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में उसे लाना होगा।

मेरा दूसरा सुझाव उसी प्रकार है जैसा कि अभी मेरे एक बन्धु ने दिया है। वह यह है कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा का अधिकांश हिस्सा महिलाओं के हाथ में होना चाहिए। आपको मालूम है कि जितने भी संसार के देश हैं, उनमें प्राइमरी शिक्षा ज्यादातर स्त्रियों के हाथ में है। उसकी वजह यह है कि महिलाएं जितनी अच्छी तरह से बच्चों के मनोविकास को समझ सकती हैं उतना पुरुष नहीं समझ सकते। इसलिए हमारे देश में शिक्षा के इस भाग, प्राथमिक शिक्षा, में हमें स्त्रियों को ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन और स्थान देना चाहिए और सरकार को अपनी नीति का एक आवश्यक हिस्सा इसको बनाकर घोषित कर देना चाहिए। जैसा कि बेसिक शिक्षा प्रणाली के सम्बन्ध में घोषणा की गई है वैसे ही यह भी घोषणा कर देनी चाहिए कि सारी शिक्षा प्रणाली, जहां तक हो सकेगा, स्त्रियों के द्वारा चलाई जायगी।

श्रीमन्, तीसरा सुझाव मेरा नर्सरी एजुकेशन के सम्बन्ध में है जिसके ऊपर किसी माननीय बन्धु द्वारा संशोधन लाया गया है। वह इस प्रकार है कि प्राइमरी शिक्षा का नर्सरी एजुकेशन एक आवश्यक अंग हो जाय। अपने देश की अवस्था दिनों दिन परिवर्तित होती जा रही है। अपने देश के अंदर संघर्ष दिनों दिन कठोर होता चला जा रहा है; और आज स्त्रियां, जो पहले केवल घर में ही बैठना जानती थीं, अपने पुरुषों की अपनी कमिटी की इनकम को सप्लीमेंट करने के लिए उस

बढ़ाने के लिए व्यवसायों के अंदर काम कर रही हैं। शायद अपने देश के अंदर कोई भी ऐसा प्रोफेशन नहीं होगा कोई व्यवसाय नहीं होगा जहां पर स्त्रियां काम न कर रही हों। इसलिए यह राष्ट्र का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि जो बर्किंग मदर्स हैं, जो काम करने वाली माताएं हैं, उनके बच्चों का उचित पालन पोषण हो और उन्हें उचित शिक्षा दीक्षा दी जाय। दूसरे देश इस क्षेत्र में बहुत आगे बढ़ चुके हैं, हम अभी बहुत पीछे हैं। इस लिए मेरा यह कहना है कि सरकार को नर्सरी स्कूलों खोलने के सम्बन्ध में भी अपनी नीति को निर्धारित करके उसे घोषित कर देना चाहिए।

मेरा चौथा सुझाव यह है कि बेसिक एजुकेशन के स्वरूप को स्थिर करने के लिए उसे ऊंचा बनाने के लिए सरकार को चाहिए कि एक तो रुपये ज्यादा खर्च करे और दूसरे मॉडल ढंग के स्कूल-जैसे कि अंग्रेजों के जमाने में मॉडल स्कूलों खोले जाय करते थे, उसी पद्धति से बेसिक शिक्षा के लिए सरकार की ओर से खोले जाने चाहिए, जिनको देख कर, जिनका अनुकरण कर के दूसरे स्कूल भी अपनी पद्धति उसी तरह की बना सकें। श्रीमन्, इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि प्राइमरी शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में अभी बहुत सी समस्याओं पर हमें विचार करना है गम्भीरता के साथ और बहुत से विचारों की सफाई होना बाकी है। इसलिए यह कार्य कमीशन ही ज्यादा अच्छी तरह कर सकता है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करती हूँ।

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I feel a little diffidence in speaking on a subject in which so many eminent educationists have spoken, in a House which abounds in many educationists. My only excuse is that I happened to be for a very long time Chairman of district and municipal boards and in that capacity had to handle this problem of primary education at the ground level to which it belongs.

[Shri J. S. Bisht.] That is why I wish to express a few opinions of a layman on this subject.

While listening to the learned speeches of many of my hon. colleagues here I was impressed by one fact, namely, that we seem to have got a little infection of what is called totalitarianism. We forget often that ours is a federal Constitution, that the Central Government has certain limited powers, that Parliament is not supreme and sovereign in all matters, that it is supreme and sovereign only with regard to the subjects that are mentioned in List I of Schedule Seven, that the State Governments are equally sovereign and supreme in List II of that Schedule and that List III relates to concurrent subjects. As far as I remember this subject of 'education' is entirely the subject of State Governments. I have also heard certain very derogatory remarks with respect to the functioning of district boards and municipal boards. In fact the learned lady Member who just sat down did not wish to speak on that subject. Probably she was too full of these derogatory remarks about them. But the fact really remains that in a federal constitution the federating States are independent in home affairs and the local self-governing bodies within those States—be it a town or a district—within their respective jurisdictions are also equally sovereign with respect to the subjects that are entrusted to them.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Sovereignty is indivisible. Autonomy is different from sovereignty.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Let us remember please that we have not received the light of Heaven to the exclusion of everybody else in this land, that there are equally patriotic men, equally hardworking men at all levels of our society, that there are men working in these district and local boards at great personal sacrifice, who are equally patriotic, who are equally anxious as we are to raise the level

of our people there and to spread education wide. So let us not assume that what we think here is something which exclusively belongs to us.

With regard to this we are all anxious that there should be compulsory primary education throughout this land as quickly as possible for the simple reason that a free democracy cannot exist among a people where there is 85 per cent illiteracy. There is no difference of opinion on that point at all. The point only is with regard to this particular form of the Resolution that is put in here which says that a Commission should be appointed to examine the kind of primary education that obtains in the country and to recommend suitable measures with a view to making it available to all children of school-going age.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, you have experience of the law courts and there is a principle there observed in all the civil courts that no civil court will grant a decree which cannot be executed and that is exactly what we are asked to do here. The Central Government is asked to appoint a Commission on a subject which is under the exclusive jurisdiction of State Governments and the implementation of which belongs to the local self-governing bodies throughout the length and breadth of the country. Supposing you appoint this Commission today and it makes certain recommendations, have you got any power to compel any State Government to observe and implement those recommendations?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): How did they appoint the Secondary Education Commission?

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But what has been the fate of those recommendations—may be implemented anywhere. I say: They make a recommendation

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): I may

inform hon. Members that the majority of their recommendations are already being implemented.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Does the hon. Member mean to contend that the Central Government has no power to issue directions?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him continue.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: I think so many minutes lost will not be deducted from my share. They are unnecessarily interrupting me. Then there is another difficulty about it. My friend Mr. Malkani who has got extensive experience in these matters was complaining in regard to certain confusion that is in our minds as to the form this compulsory primary education should take. That is very natural because when we have got such a vast sub-continent with 26 States and about 300 to 400 districts there are bound to be difference. Every region is developing its education according to its own genius and according to the circumstances which suit it best.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Many educationists have told me that they want directives, and that no directive was forthcoming. The Government does not know its own mind.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Sir, I am sorry I seem to be treading on delicate ground. The point is this. Why should the Centre lay down a certain uniform rule and say that this will be the form in which education should be given from Travancore-Cochin to Kashmir and from Assam to Kathia-war? How are we to know that these five or six gentlemen who will constitute this Commission will have some sort of heavenly light and what they recommend is the only formula that is suitable to the entire country? Why should we not allow people to develop themselves according to their own

lights and in this free play of ideas the best will survive. That is the right way. Even in England where the population is hardly five cmres, there is no uniform system of primary education. In Wales it is different; in Scotland it is different; in England it is different. Why should we have this sort of imposition from the Centre, some uniform system forced down our throats and why should it be laid down that all the children should be brought up in one uniform manner? Sir, in fact the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Dr. Sampurnanand, who is an eminent educationist and has been himself the Minister for Education, has said that it is wrong to dabble in such radical experiments in the matter of education just to suit the passing fancies of politicians. Education is a very serious subject which is undergoing a certain evolution. In fact the educationists are trying, the teachers are trying, the Vice-Chancellors are trying and the Directors of Public Instruction are trying to find out the best way of bringing up children and giving them education on sound lines. If experiments are made in different places and if some very good system is discovered by the genius of some men, naturally it will survive and it will then be copied and imitated everywhere else. There is no system which is perfect in this world and in this matter of education the last word has never been written and no last word will ever be written at all. It will always be a process of evolution and the States are quite competent to deal with this problem. After all, they have got Assemblies which are elected by the same electorate that elects this Parliament. In fact, this particular House should be very anxious to preserve the rights of the States instead of trying to have something imposed on them from the Centre. This is the Council of States and it represents the interests of the States. Therefore it should be the first concern of the Council of States to see that the rights of the States are not affected in such vital matters. Then there is another difficulty with

regard to this education. So far as

[Shri J. S. Bisht.]

cities are concerned, compulsory primary education is being enforced practically by all Municipalities leaving aside small towns and other areas. The difficulty arises with regard to the District Boards. In big rural areas on account of the paucity of funds there is great difficulty. Now, you have already got with you all the data. My hon. friends here, both ladies and gentlemen, quoted chapter and verse and gave various figures. What do they want a Commission for? You have got all the data in your possession. You know how many schools are required, how much material is wanted and all that. What else is this Commission going to find out? Sir, the only question is of rupees, annas, pies—the question of funds to finance a system of education so that it can be enforced throughout the length and breadth of the country. This is the main difficulty which we have in our own districts in this matter of education. My hon. friend Prof. Malkani was very angry with one-teacher schools. If you close these one-teacher schools you will deprive those children even of this education.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I did not say so.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Because in small villages where communications are bad you have got one teacher under whom about 30 children learn their lessons. If you abolish those schools even those children will be deprived of that education. You cannot have two teachers because there are no funds. They depend on land revenue, cess and whatever little grants they are able to get from the State Governments. In Uttar Pradesh, for instance, the educational budget is far more than the police budget. It is now quite the reverse of the position which used to be in 1946 when the education budget was not even one-third of the police budget. Today it is far more; in fact, it is one and a half times the police budget. Even so, the money is not sufficient to cover

the vast area of 49 districts with lakhs of schools and so many teachers. This difficulty can be minimised to some extent if our educational experts were to relax the rules a little. For instance, there are rules laid down that the teachers should be trained to such a standard; the school should have so much accommodation; there should be so much material and so many children and so on. If you relax all these rules for the time being and encourage local people, that is to say, people who are available in the village and who earn their livelihood through farming, that is, those who need not have to go elsewhere, if such people are encouraged probably you can push the pace of compulsory primary education. If, on the other hand, you strictly adhere to the formula that has been laid down by the educational authorities whereby a certain standard has to be observed, then it will take some time. It may not be possible to complete this within the prescribed period of ten years. It will take a little more time. It may take another five years. But the difficulty will remain there as long as we are not able to find out how this is to be financed and where the money is going to come from. Merely making speeches will not help in any way. We may get the sympathy of people and some cheap popularity but actually it is not going to serve any useful purpose.

This is not merely with education alone. Take the Bhoré Committee's Report with regard to medical facilities. We have not been able to do anything at all, again because of the question of funds. We have got to implement many plans. We want Five Year Plans to be got through; we want to have heavy industries; we want to have cottage industries; we want railways; we want roads; we want education. We want so many things. After all, it is a question of priorities. There are no unlimited funds. We have only limited funds and out of that limited capacity you must see how much can be spared for this

purpose. Education is undoubtedly-important and we must provide some funds for it. Unless we can say where the money is going to come from, the problem cannot be tackled. This Commission is not going to supply us with all the funds necessary. The Taxation Enquiry Commission's Report has said that the way to get money is by levying taxes. It is for the Government to take courage in their hands and tax the people. But remember, you will have to face the electorate when the election comes. So, Sir, with all the sympathy that I have for the compulsory primary education to be made universal in this country as quickly as possible, I humbly beg to submit that no useful purpose will be served by the appointment of a Commission by the Central Government because you will be putting the Central Government in a very embarrassing and awkward position. Because, supposing this Commission makes some recommendation and the State Governments have some objection to it, you will be putting all these Governments in a false position, as if to say that you want the spread of education but they do not want it. With these remarks I submit that the hon. the mover will be well advised to withdraw his Resolution.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I feel happy in having to rise after the speech of my friend Mr. Bisht. His speech almost reminded me of the great Ma-bap Governmental Ministers of the pre-freedom days. During the British rule they advanced these very theories, which my friend Mr. Bisht has advanced today, when great patriots like the late Gopala Krishna Gokhale made eloquent plea on behalf of the ignorant and illiterate people of the land. Sir, the question of finance was raised even then but it used to be accompanied by tons and tons of sympathy.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: The hon. Member has been a Finance Minister. I hope he will enlighten us as to how to finance this

i

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am sorry the time before me is extremely limited.

Sir, I expected my friend Mr. Bisht who is an able lawyer to have applied his mind a little better to the Constitution of India. Sir, item on Inquiries is in the Concurrent List and it is one very valuable contribution and help which the Centre should render to the States and a help which they should warmly welcome. It is a question of undertaking an enquiry on behalf of the whole country and that, Sir, is item 45 in the Concurrent List. I suppose that article is sufficient answer to Mr. Bisht that this Resolution is perfectly in order. That is enough to dispose of my friend, Mr. Bisht.

4 P.M.

Then, Sir, I would like to say a word about the hon. lady Member Dr. Seeta Parmanand. I am glad that one lady Member, Shrimati Chandravati Lakhnapal who followed, of course, demolished most of her arguments. She followed a similar argument like my friend, Mr. Bisht and said, why should we appoint a Commission, what is the use of it. There are so many other important things to attend to and she almost treated this as a very inconsequential affair. That was the greatest surprise to me. I am not worried if a friend like Mr. Bisht adopts a cavalier attitude to this, but a mother and a lady should take that attitude surprised me.....

DR. R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): She is not a mother.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I used it in the general sense. The reason is this. We talk of succession; we talk of marriages; we want Hindu Code reform. And all for what purpose? To see that we can build up a fine posterity. How is she going to handle this posterity? By neglecting.....

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: It is not her worry.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA:..... and think ing about so many things. This to me seems to be an extraordinary attitude and I for my life would never understand the position which some hon. Members have taken with regard to this Resolution.

Then, Sir, I would like to deal with some of the specific points, but I am only sorry that there is not enough time. My friend, Mr. Bisht hails, I think, from Naini Tal, northern part of U.P.....

SHRI J. S. BISHT: I thought you had disposed me off!

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I have disposed of one or two points and I am trying to take some other point. I am surprised—here is the census about education and curiously enough of these six zones: West India, South India, East India, North West India, Central India and North India—North India has the least amount of literacy, 10-8. This is 1951 census, West India and South India have the highest, about 23-8 and 22-8

SHRI J. S. BISHT: I may inform him

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I can very well understand with such enthusiastic and public citizens like Mr. Bisht.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA:..... literacy has attained the magnificent level of 10-8—being the lowest in India. Let us not tinker with this question.....

SHRI J. S. BISHT: I may correct him that in Kumaon it is the highest. He is taking the whole of U.P. together.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am only taking the whole of U.P.—India, that is Bharat, that is U.P.

Sir, then there are certain things which do necessitate a more serious approach to this problem, apart from

the number of things which I have already referred to. I do not want to repeat them. Take the question of literacy in the country—the urban and the rural; the agricultural and the non-agricultural. I will give you only one instance to show how the things differ so widely and we must go into the root causes of these, and see that this kind of inequality does not exist in the land. It is extremely unfair, I think. For instance, the agricultural classes have a percentage of literacy of 12-1; while the non-agricultural classes have 29. I think that is a very unfair position. I want to know whether my friend, Mr. Bisht, is going to justify it on the plea that we are helpless. If that is all the counsel, that he can give to the country, I think we would do well to resign and make room for people who will be able to handle this affair.

Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand said that the Secondary Education Commission had already dealt with this question. I happen for the moment to have the various recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission and they are about the main ones which are enumerated here in this Book "India, 1955". I do not find anything about primary education. What is this kind of misleading I should say—to use the mildest term—the House that the Secondary Education Commission has dealt with this? There is no such thing as that.

Then, Sir, there are other problems. I wanted to refer in particular to what my friend, Prof. Malkani, said. He has anticipated it, and that is with reference to the most important question, namely, that Hindi must become the real *Rashtra Bhasha* of this country and it must become the State language, the official language, within fifteen years as laid down in the Constitution. How are we going to beat achieve that result? I have had talks with great education ■ experts who are advising my friend, Dr. Shrimali. I have had very instructive talks with some- of them and I have gathered

this: that it is wrong, educationally I speaking, psychologically speaking, for children to be taught a language the meaning of words in which they do not readily understand. I say having regard to the experience in India, if there is any time when a language I can be most easily learnt, it is when a child is young. I am not exaggerating it. I think you can easily ask a child to learn three or four languages at a time when it is very young. But you try the same joke with some of us here. It will be a very difficult thing. I am at the head of a Hindi institution. Each time I went to jail, I would start with a primer and end with that. So, it is an ordinary psychological truth that a child can more easily pick up these languages than when it becomes an adult. This is a question on which we would like to have a direction from the Commission.

So, also, with regard to the cost, I will only lay this proposition before the House. My friends were talking of basic education; pre-basic education; post-basic education, and all kinds and varieties, and my friend, Prof. Malkani, pointed out the confusion prevailing. I suppose we had that confusion becoming worse confounded. The main consideration should be as to whether we are justified in talking about the nature of education when millions and crores in our land have no education whatever. I say it is a crime that we are committing to postpone the day when we can make the people literate—howsoever it may be. Out of 36 crores of people there are, I think, six crores of literates. And what kind of literates? Out of six crores literates, five crores are hardly able to read and write. And with this state of affairs, are we going to have this democracy? We seriously suggest that we must make some further experiments. As I said, it does not matter so much whether we have these other special institutions or not. First, let them learn at least the three 'R's. Now everybody is being taxed, and everybody is filling the coffers of the State. I ask: Is there any justification in preventing a child from

having education, when the family is paying tax to the coffers of the State? I say, it is an untenable, an immoral and an irrational position. As I said, it is the biggest crime. Sir, it all depends upon the attitude that we take. There are countries where the education department is held by the most important Minister in the land. Well, my friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy, described it as Cinderella, more or less. That is very unfair. Sir, recently I had been to Turkey, and Turkey, today, is one of the most powerful nations. And what did Kamal Pasha do in addition to making his nation strong, that nation of soldiers? The first thing that he did was that he started teaching alphabets to the children. He changed the whole script. He started the teaching himself along with his own colleagues.

Therefore I say that it is up to us to put this tempo into the whole movement for mass education and see that democracy is not endangered by the people who do not know what democracy means. Well, Sir, I do not think I should take more time. I think I have convinced my friends, Mr. Bisht and Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand. But I will say one thing more and finish

I have got my own doubts. Judging from the way in which the Ministry is going on, I doubt very much whether it means any serious business with regard to this matter. I am afraid the Government may not favour the acceptance of this Resolution. It means a great obligation; it means a great deal more of sympathy, and a great deal more of pumping in money to the States. There is no doubt about that. I think it is the States that must implement the programme. I am afraid, the Ministry has not got the same tempo as some of us have, and Dr. Shrimati said that there are many difficulties coming in our way, and all that. My friend, Mr. Bisht, said that Mr. Vaidya would do well to withdraw the Resolution. Well, it does not matter whether my friend.

[SW H. C. Dasappa.] Mr. Vaidya, withdraws the Resolution, or whether he is going to press it. But the world at large is going to judge the Central Government today by the amount of interest that they are going to take in this vital question of introducing literacy in every nook and corner of India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Savitry Nigam.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): Sir, I have not sent my name. I may say a few words, if you permit me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have already called upon Mrs. Nigam. There are two more speakers who have given their names earlier.

श्रीमती सावित्री वृषी निगम (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, यह प्रस्ताव जो आज सदन के सामने है उसका मैं हार्दिक समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ी हुई हूँ। माननीय दासप्पा जी ने श्री बिष्ट और मिसेज परमानन्द को काफी जवाब दे दिया है और मेरा काम बहुत कुछ हल्का हो चुका है। किन्तु, प्राइमरी एजुकेशन सर्वसुलभ बनाने का सवाल एक बड़ा ही अहम सवाल है, इसीलिये इस सवाल पर विचार करने में हम लोगों को बड़ी गम्भीरता और बड़ी समझदारी से काम लेना है।

श्रीमन्, गांधी जी का मत था कि जिस प्रकार जल और वायु पर सभी व्यक्तियों का समान अधिकार होता है उसी प्रकार शिक्षा को भी निःशुल्क बना दिया जाना चाहिये ताकि वह हर एक बालक के लिये, हर एक देशवासी के लिये सर्वसुलभ हो सके। इसके अतिरिक्त उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि बालक का वह जन्मसिद्ध अधिकार है कि उसकी शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध वह समाज करे जिसमें कि उसने अन्म लिया है। अभी बिष्ट जी ने कहा कि इतना धन कहाँ से आयेगा, कहाँ से इतना रुपया आयेगा। इसके पाने हैं कि वे भी

इस बात का समर्थन करते हैं कि जरूर कमीशन नियुक्त हो और वह इस बात पर विचार करे कि यह रुपया कहाँ से लाया जाय और किस प्रकार से काम हो। इसमें संदेह नहीं है कि यह प्रश्न हम सभी लोगों के सामने है कि कहाँ से इतना यथेष्ट धन लाया जाय जो कि देशवासियों की शिक्षा के लिये यथेष्ट हो। किन्तु, श्रीमन्, यदि हमने शिक्षा क्षेत्र में इतनी बड़ी गलती न की होती और १९३९ में बापू ने जिस प्रस्ताव को रखा था, जिसका सर्वसम्मति से समर्थन हुआ था, जिस का देश के ही नहीं बल्कि विदेशों के बड़े बड़े शिक्षा शास्त्रियों ने पूरी तरह से समर्थन किया था, उसको अर्थात् बुनियादी तालीम की वह रूप रखा अपनी सरकार के द्वारा पूरी तरह से अपना ली गई होती तो आज देश का दर्जा ही बदल गया होता और देश के लिये जो शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में आज आर्थिक कठिनाई उपस्थित है वह कभी न हुई होती। यह सब एक बड़ी दुःखद कहानी है। तब से लेकर अब तक बुनियादी तालीम के साथ जो खिलवाड़ हुआ है उससे यहाँ हम सब लोग भली भाँति परिचित हैं। छोट से लेकर बड़े से बड़े अधिकारी तक ने, सब ने, बुनियादी तालीम का उच्च स्तर से बराबर समर्थन किया है। एक ओर उच्च स्तर से समर्थन करते हैं और दूसरी ओर कथनी और करनी में इतना अंतर रहा है कि बुनियादी तालीम हमेशा उन लोगों के हाथों में रही है, उन्हीं लोगों ने इसकी जिम्मेदारी संभाली है जो कि बुनियादी तालीम के बारे में कुछ जानते ही नहीं हैं। यदि मैं यह कहूँ तो अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी कि बुनियादी तालीम के शिक्षु की कोमल गर्दन हमेशा उन शिक्षकों, अधिकारियों और डाइरेक्टरों के हाथ में रही है जो कि बुनियादी तालीम की परिभाषा पश्चिमी शिक्षा प्रणाली के शिक्षा शास्त्रियों हेलवीसियस, ऑबेन हैंवर्ड और केंडोल्य आदि की पुस्तकों में ढूँढते रहे हैं और अब तक वे समझ ही नहीं पाये हैं कि बुनियादी तालीम है क्या और किस प्रकार इसका प्रसार देश में किया जा सकता

हैं। इसलिए मंत्र सरकार से अनुरोध है कि वह शीघ्र ही एक कमीशन की नियुक्ति करे जो कि विभिन्न प्रान्तों में नई तालीम के क्षेत्र में होने वाले प्रयोगों का बड़ा सूक्ष्म निरीक्षण कर के, उनका विशेष अध्ययन और विश्लेषण कर के, एक सर्वश्रेष्ठ बुनियादी तालीम की रूप रखा बना ले और उसको पूर्णतया मान्यता दे दे ताकि एक यूनिफॉर्मिटी सार्व दृष्ट में आ सके और सार्व प्रान्तों में शिक्षा प्रसार के क्षेत्र में पूरी प्रगति हो सके। श्रीमन्, अब वह समय आ गया है कि ये प्रयोग शीघ्र ही खत्म किए जाएं और वह प्रयोग तब तक खत्म नहीं किया जा सकता है जब तक कि इस बार में एक कमीशन की नियुक्ति नहीं होगी और इस बार में पूरी तरह से जांच पड़ताल नहीं की जाएगी। दूसरा मंत्र यह अनुरोध है कि वह कमीशन इस चीज की भी जांच करे इन स्कूलों में, जो कि बुनियादी शिक्षा के आधार पर चलाये जा रहे हैं, कितना मौकसम आउटपुट होना चाहिये। वह इसको भी निर्धारित कर दे क्योंकि जब यह निश्चित हो जाएगा कि विभिन्न प्रान्तों में स्कूलों का मौकसम आउटपुट क्या होना चाहिए या किस मात्रा तक वे स्वावलम्बन प्राप्त कर सकते हैं तब, मैं सावधानी दे कि, कार्यक्रम में भी और पाठ्यक्रम में भी एक समानता आ जाएगी। तीसरी बात जो कमीशन के विचार करने की होगी वह यह होगी कि जो मौजूदा डाइरेक्टर्स और बड़े बड़े पदाधिकारी शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में बैठे हुए हैं, जिनको कि बुनियादी तालीम की ए, बी, सी, डी, भी नहीं आती है उनको किस प्रकार प्रशिक्षित किया जाय कि वे उस ढांचे में फिट इन हो सकें क्योंकि मैं यह सलाह तो नहीं दूंगी कि मौजूदा अधिकारियों को सरकार निकाल कर फेंक दे। इसके बाद, चौथी बात जिस पर इस कमीशन को विचार करना चाहिए वह यह है कि किस प्रकार हर ग्राम में ऐसी एक बुनियादी पाठशाला कायम की जा सकती है जिसके पास जमीन भी हो और जो नवभारत के लिए एक प्रयोगशाला का रूप धारण कर ले, जिसमें आ कर बालक हस्तकला, गृह विज्ञान आदि की शिक्षा ले और खेती भी करे और साथ ही साथ अपनी जरूरत की सारी चीजें,

जो कि ग्राम्य जीवन के लिए आवश्यक होती हैं, उनका उत्पादन करना भी सीख लें। यह सब निश्चित करने का काम कमीशन का ही होगा। इसलिए कमीशन की नियुक्ति अत्यधिक आवश्यक है। जो एक सब से बड़ी बात कमीशन को विचार करनी है वह यह है कि जैसे कि आवड़ी संशोधन में हमने सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सांसाइटी का जो रजिस्ट्रेशन पास किया है उसे शिक्षा क्षेत्र में भी किस तरह लागू किया जाए। किस प्रकार इस अन्तर को मिटाया जाए कि आज एक प्राइमरी स्कूल का शिक्षक २० रुपया महीना पाता है तो यूनिवर्सिटी का शिक्षक तीन हजार या चार हजार रुपया पाता है। तो कमीशन को यह निश्चित करना होगा कि यह जो बलगर डिस्पैरिटी है उसको किस प्रकार दूर किया जाए।

श्रीमन्, आप बजट पर भी एक मिनट के लिये दृष्टि डालें कि कुल १८ करोड़ २१ लाख रुपया पूरी शिक्षा के लिये निश्चित किया गया है, जिसमें से २ करोड़ ५ लाख विश्व-विद्यालयों के लिये हैं, और जहां २० करोड़ लोगों को शिक्षित करने के लिये ८ करोड़ २२ लाख रुपया है, वहां १० करोड़ रुपया उन ७ करोड़ लोगों को शिक्षित करने के लिये है जिनको कि शिक्षा की बदहजमी करा कर शिक्षित बंकारों की बस्ती में बँठाया जाना है। क्या यह शिक्षा क्षेत्र में बहुत बड़ा अपव्यय नहीं है। मैं बिष्ट साहब से पूछना चाहती हूँ, कहां से यह रुपया आया ? वही रुपया जो अन्धाधुन्ध फेंक कर गंवाया जा रहा है, वही यदि प्राइमरी शिक्षा की तरफ डाइवर्ट कर दिया जाय तो फिर हमें धन की अधिक कमी नहीं रहेगी क्योंकि जो लोग यूनिवर्सिटी में शिक्षा प्राप्त करने जाते हैं, उनमें से अधिकांश लोग शिक्षा का व्यय भार भी उठा सकते हैं।

श्रीमन्, बस दो एक बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करना चाहती हूँ। जब तक शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में इस प्रकार का शोषण बन्द नहीं होगा, कभी भी प्राइमरी शिक्षा आगे बढ़ न सकेगी और ग्रामीण न सकेगी। इसलिए मैं चाहती हूँ

[श्रीमती सावित्री देवी निगम]

कि यह कमीशन पूरी तरह पर्यवेक्षण कर के यह हमें बताये कि किस प्रकार के शिक्षा क्षेत्र में उन पब्लिक स्कूलों और बुनियादी अधिकार स्कूलों को लाया जा सकता है। यह जो बुनियादी तालीम है वह एक महान् संदेश लाने वाली है जीवन का, क्योंकि यह एक ऐसा तरीका प्रस्तुत करती है जो कि विश्व शांति को जन्म देने वाला है।

श्रीमन्, जैसा कि हमारे कई एक और भी वक्ताओं ने कहा कि शिक्षा को म्युनिसिपल या डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड आदि के ऊपर ही छोड़कर हमें निश्चिन्त न हो जाना चाहिए क्योंकि उन्होंने जो सफलता पायी है उसके लिए हम लोगों के हृदयों में सिखाया गया के और कुछ नहीं हो सकती, उसके साथ साथ मैं इसका भी पूरा समर्थन करती हूँ कि प्राइमरी एजुकेशन का क्षेत्र सिर्फ स्त्रियों के लिए ही छोड़ दिया जाना चाहिए क्योंकि मातृत्व के जिन गुणों की प्राइमरी स्कूल के बच्चों को सिखाने में आवश्यकता होती है वह केवल वात्सल्यमयी नारी में ही पाये जा सकते हैं।

श्रीमन्, कमीशन को एक बात और बताना होगा। उसको एक अवधि मुकदर कर देनी होगी कि इस अवधि के अंदर अंदर जितने ये माँजूदा एंग्लो इंडियन या एंग्लो हिन्दी स्कूल हैं उनको परिवर्तित करके बेसिक स्कूल बनाया जा सकेगा। उसको इसका निर्णय भी करना होगा कि किस प्रकार शहरी शिक्षा और ग्रामीण शिक्षा का अन्तर दूर किया जा सकेगा क्योंकि जब तक यह न हो सकेगा, कभी भी प्राइमरी एजुकेशन आगे नहीं बढ़ सकेगी।

श्रीमन्, इसके अतिरिक्त यह कह कर मैं समाप्त करना चाहती हूँ कि सरकार को यदि सच्चे तरीके से सही ढंग से बुनियादी तालीम को देश में प्रतिष्ठित करना है तो उसके लिए एक बहुत बड़ी अनिवार्य आवश्यकता यह है कि वह इस बात की घोषणा करे कि

१५ साल बाद या दस साल बाद जितने भी सरकारी नौकरियों के पद होंगे वे उन्हीं लोगों को दिये जायेंगे जो बुनियादी शिक्षा पर तालीम पाये हुए होंगे। तभी यह सम्भव हो सकेगा कि बुनियादी स्कूलों की शक्तें बढ़ सकें, उनको सब लोगों का सहयोग प्राप्त होगा, बड़े से बड़ा आदमी भी अपने लड़कों को उन स्कूलों में पढ़ाने को तैयार होगा और इस प्रकार बुनियादी शिक्षा सही रुख अख्तियार कर सकेगी।

मैं एक बार फिर इस कमीशन की नियुक्ति की मांग का अनुरोध करती हूँ।

SHRI H. P. SAKSKNA: Sir, if I were to play to the gallery, I would also say that I recommend the formation of a Commission for primary education. I express my sympathy with my hon. friend, Mr. Bisht, who was subjected to an unnecessary persecution at the hands of some hon. Members—persecution of which he was made a victim. I quite understand it. But I have not yet been able to understand what moral, legal or constitutional right the hon. lady Mrs. Savitry Devi Nigam has got to speak on a subject like Education and to say that my friend, Mr. Bisht was wrong. This is a place, Sir,—the House of Parliament—where anybody can speak on any subject whether he knows even the A.B.C. of the subject or not. What experience has she got of teaching, excepting that of having taught her own children in her own home?

SHRIMATI SAVITE\ DEVI NIGAM. I pity your ignorance.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: That is all There is no other experience of education.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena, no personal attacks.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: Shame, shame.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I wanted to know of her experience, Sir. I beg

of you not to misunderstand me, because I simply wanted to make a query. That is all.

Now, Sir, so far as the illiteracy of our country is concerned it is stupendous and it is a matter of shame that one of the greatest countries on earth should have such an alarming scale of illiteracy in it. I do not know of any other country—any civilized country on the face of the earth—which has got such a huge amount of illiteracy in its population as India has. The only thing that has got to be done is to remove this illiteracy. That is the first and foremost thing. As my hon friend, Mr. Bisht said, it is a thousand times better to have schools with one teacher only than to wait for three teachers to be appointed and meanwhile, to give no education with the help of one-teacher schools in our country. Now, as I understand it, Education is in the Concurrent List and it is the primary and necessary duty of the States to give education to their people. Happily enough, I come from a State which is self-contained and very progressive in the matter of education also like so many other departments. Therefore, I am not in a hurry so far as the spread of education is concerned. It is only seven or eight years since we became free and we have to put Education as the first and foremost necessity for our development. The Five Year Plan is there and we hope to achieve very great things through the agency of that Plan. But then to hustle up things and to bring forward resolutions which take us nowhere is, to my mind, most un-national.

Let us bestow some thought upon the problem and try to look at it from a national approach. I say we can very easily make use of these Panchayat Ghars that have been established all over the country, make them the school-buildings and select a few educated, half-educated, partially-educated people living in those very villages and give the facility of imparting education to people. In this

way, instead of waiting for a huge sum of money to fall from Heaven when we shall be able to start schools for the education of the entire population, we can make a very good beginning in that respect.

Now, a lot of things have been said about the inadequacy of funds and about the amount of salaries that we are giving to the teachers. But nobody has ever made a single remark as to the stuff that we have necessarily to employ for teaching purposes. The stuff is very very bad. They are the spoilers of the young children, not their educators and those who will give us boys' and girls who will form our future society. It is not only the money that is paid to a teacher that makes him a good teacher. What stuff he is made of, what qualifications he has got, what is the standard of his efficiency—these things have got to be taken into consideration.

Now, Sir, one thing is that I am in great personal attachment with the Ministry of Education and the Head of the Ministry of Education. I don't, think it is wise and proper for us to be saddling the Ministry of Education with additional burdens. It is already over-busy and over-worked. Therefore no additional burden by the appointment of any Commission or whatsoever should be put on it and to expect any guidance from the Centre is to hope for the moon. There is no need for asking anything to be done by the Central Government. It is all very well, exalted in its glorified position and doing the things that that Ministry thinks ought to be done for the country. With this hope all our aspirations and all our expectations are being fulfilled, will be fulfilled and therefore there should be no worry about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your five minutes are over.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I beg leave of you and request you that the country should not spend its

[Shri H. P. Saksena.] energies and money on these Commissions which lead us nowhere.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the first place I must thank the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and have made very valuable suggestions. If we were to enumerate the evils of the present system of education and its defects, we could go on *ad infinitum*. The Government of India and the State Governments are fully aware of the evils of the present system. We must remember that this is a legacy of the past and educational systems are not transformed over-night. It is a colossal task and will require years before we can really reconstruct the whole system. So, though I am in general agreement with many remarks which have been made with regard to the present system of education, I am afraid I cannot accept the Resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend Shri Vaidya.

Sir, with regard to the pattern of education, through the various Committees, Conferences and the meetings of the Central Advisory Board of the Government of India, we have come to a decision and the decision is that basic education will be the pattern of national education.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Resolution, as it is worded, does not deal with the pattern at all.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It says:

"This House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Commission immediately to examine the kind of primary education....."

I thought when the hon. mover is referring to the kind of primary education

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It says "kind of primary education that obtains in the country"—that is at present—and the effective portion is "and to recommend suitable measures 'with a view to making it available.....'"

It refers to the kind of education that now obtains in the country. There is no question of improvement on it. The Resolution is very unhappily worded. I don't think that is the object of Mr. Vaidya.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Resolution, I thought, was very unhappily worded. I thought it also referred to the kind of pattern.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants the Commission to suggest suitable measures to spread the same system of education—that is not his object.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, that was not his purpose. It was the intention of the mover that the Commission would examine the kind of primary education that exists in the country and would suggest suitable measures for its reconstruction. That I think was the purpose of the Resolution.

There has been a lot of discussion on basic education. I think we have already told several times in this House and I might repeat here again that as regards the pattern of education is concerned at the primary stage, the Central Advisory Board of the Government of India, where all the State Governments are represented, have agreed that basic education will be the pattern of national education. The only hurdle which the Government of India have to face in implementing the scheme of basic education and in making up free and compulsory is lack of adequate funds. I do not agree with Members when they say that we have made no progress in the expansion of basic education. Figures have been quoted by Members and I need not repeat them. If you only look at them you will find that there has been considerable progress in the expansion of basic education. We are not satisfied with the progress made and if we had more funds available, we would like to utilize them for the purpose of expansion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it then the contention of the Government that the expansion of education at the primary level is not possible because of lack of funds?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, that is the greatest hurdle. The lack of adequate funds is the greatest hurdle in the implementation of the Directive of the Constitution. Our new democracy at present is confronted on the one hand with the pressure for expansion. Democracy cannot succeed unless we can bring all the school-going children to the educational institutions and give them free education. During recent years, there has been a great consciousness among our people and there is a demand for education. People have awakened to the need of education and the Government, with their limited capacity, are meeting this pressure, pressure of expansion, but at the same time if our democracy is to succeed, we must also improve the quality of education. So at the present moment we are confronted with this great problem. On the one hand, there is the problem of expansion of education—there is a great desire on the part of the people to have more educational institutions—and rightly—and on the other hand we feel that unless we also improve the quality of education we shall not raise the quality of our citizens. These are the two great pressures at present on the Government and a democratic society like ours, having accepted the great ideal of socialistic pattern, must simultaneously meet both these demands. On the one hand we must continuously improve the quality of education, and on the other hand we must go on expanding education so that we make it accessible to every child in the country.

I shall not deal with all the points that have been raised during the course of the debate. But there is one point to which I think I should refer and that is with regard to the salary of the teachers. Sir, unfortunately in our country, the teacher has occupied 3 very low position. In ancient India

62 RSD.—6.

the teacher was adored. He was held in high esteem, he was respected but during the recent past, when we were governed by a foreign power, unfortunately the status of the teacher was considerably lowered. He not only lost his prestige, but also his economic status. I entirely agree with hon. Members that unless we improve the scales of pay of our teachers, we shall not improve the quality of education. We cannot give first-rate education by keeping discontented teachers who

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): I hope my hon. friend will dissociate himself and the Government from the two unfortunate expressions about teachers—"contemptible" and "spoilers of children" which were used here?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It is there fore absolutely necessary

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They are a fine set of people.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that we must improve the quality of teachers. Of course, the teachers are working under very difficult conditions and in spite of that, they are doing a good job.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Since the hon. Minister is on that point and he appreciates it, may I ask him what steps Government contemplate taking, with a view to increase the salaries and the earnings of these teachers?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Government of India are very keen to see that the salaries of teachers, their scales of pay are raised. Recently we have started with university education and we have increased the scales and made some contributions to the universities to increase the scales of teachers. As I said, if more funds are available in the next Five Year Plan—and we are trying for it—we hope that the scales of pay of teachers at the primary stage and the secondary stage will also be improved.

SHRI D. NARAYAN (Bombay): So you have started with the highly paid people.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, the reason for that is that the whole educational system is interlinked. Unless you have better university teachers, you will not get good teachers in the secondary schools and unless you have better secondary schools you will not get good teachers for the primary schools. So it is not possible to isolate one stage from the other. The Government of India and also the State Governments are, with in their limited resources, trying to tackle this colossal problem. But, ultimately, Sir, the question is whether we shall have adequate funds to improve the educational system and to expand it at the same time. If we look at the figures, we will find that we have 4-5 crores of children between the ages of six and eleven and 24 crores of children between the ages of eleven and fourteen. Their total will be about 6-9 crores or approximately 7 crores of children. If we spend on an average Rs. 20 per child, we would require approximately Rs. 150 crores per year. Is the country prepared to spend this much amount at this stage? We have also to remember that we have at the same time to spend some money on secondary education and also on university education. We cannot starve them. This is the hard fact which the country must face. Are we prepared to pay more taxes? Are we prepared to make some sacrifices ourselves? If we are prepared to make sacrifices, if we are prepared to pay more taxes, we can introduce compulsory free education tomorrow. But I am afraid the resources of the country

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is most unfortunate that the hon. Minister should be posing this question of raising more taxes, for money can be found from other sources.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not disturb.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: In the First and in the Second Five Year Plan the aim has been to develop the natural resources of the country and every effort is being made by the Government to exploit all the possible resources. We cannot consider education in isolation. We have to link up education with the general economic and social structure. As our economy develops and as we have more resources available for education, we shall expand and improve the quality of education.

Sir, I shall just quote a few figures to show that in spite of these limited resources, the State Governments and the Central Government have made some progress. I am not satisfied myself and I do not say that anybody in the country, in the Government or outside the Government, can be satisfied with the progress that we have made. But we cannot ignore the fact that during the last five or six years of our independence, we have worked under extremely difficult conditions. My hon. friend Dr. Raghbir Singh referred to conditions in England at the time of the war. Here there has been no war, but the country had to face various difficult problems in order to maintain and stabilise the new democracy and therefore.....

(Interruption from Dr. Raghbir Singh).

Sir, I did not interrupt the hon. Member when he was speaking and I may please be given an occasion to explain my point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: If he wants to speak, I am prepared to yield.

PROF. G. RANGA: No, not necessary, you go ahead.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, the country had to struggle against heavy difficulties and in spite of these difficulties, we have made some progress. Let us look at the figures. I do not know wherefrom my hon. friend here got his figures for U-P. for as far as

my information goes, the progress has been satisfactory all over the country. I do not know from where my hon. friend was quoting. The number of primary schools in 1947-48 was 1,40,794. In 1952-53 it was 2,21,082. Enrolments in primary schools was 1,10,68,273 and in 1952-53 it was 1,92,96,840. The expenditure on primary schools in 1947-48 was Rs. 18,90,05,064. In 1952-53 it was Rs. 43,70,89,002. Anybody who studies these figures would admit that there has been some progress.

With regard to the amendment which was moved by my hon. friend Shri Sarwate, I would like to say one or two words. There is no denying the fact that pre-school education is important. The pre-school period is the most impressionable period for the formation of character. I do not in any way wish to underrate or minimise the value of education at the pre-school stage and if the country had resources we would like to have more of nursery schools. In fact, we have already been giving some grants to the State Governments to introduce a few nursery schools. In the first Five Year Plan period, Government gave grants to the State Governments for the development of pre-school education; the grants are paid on a matching basis, the Centre bearing 66 per cent, of the non-recurring expenditure and also a share of the recurring expenditure on a sliding scale. During 1954-55, the States of West Bengal, Punjab, Coorg, Travancore-Cochin, Rajasthan, Bihar and Assam were sanctioned total Central grants amounting to about Rs. P48 lakhs. This is not a very big amount but the Central Government do realise the value and importance of pre-school education. They have already formed a National Committee on Early Childhood Education and this Committee has made certain valuable recommendations. Government are already trying to implement those recommendations.

In the end, I would like to say one word with regard to the work that

has been done by the Education Ministry. We can never be satisfied with education. A country has a right to ask for more and better education and a democracy which is continuously developing—a democracy like ours—must continue to have a dynamic system of education. We cannot be satisfied with static things and I agree with hon. Members that we must move very rapidly towards the expansion of education and the improvement of education.

Having accepted the basic education as the pattern of national education, the Government of India have adopted several measures for the improvement of basic education. We have now, in most of the States, a pilot project where experiments are being conducted for the improvement of techniques and methods of basic education. Some people have raised the objection that basic education is probably an expensive education. Good education is expensive; we cannot give good education and at the same time make it cheap. If we want to have good education, then we must have better equipment, better buildings and better teachers. When people say that basic education is an expensive education, I shall reply to them that if the country wants to have a better type of education, then it must be prepared to pay more for education.

It was also said that there was a lot of confusion. My hon. friend Mr. Malkani said that there was confusion; there is no confusion in my mind and there is no confusion in the mind of the Government of India with regard to the type of education that we want. We are quite clear about our goal and about our objectives. We have only to find the means and resources to realise our objectives. Our objective is to develop a sound system of basic education which might prepare citizens for our new democratic society. We want to have a dynamic system; there cannot be any rigidity even in basic education. The broad outline of national education must be there in every country but

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.] in a democratic society there can be no rigidity. There must be diversity from place to place. You cannot have one uniform system all over the country; the environments differ, the circumstances differ, the local conditions differ and if we wish to give education and at the same time relate it to life, then, Sir, education must differ as conditions differ. Of course, there must be a general national framework and that has been laid down by the Father of the Nation and the country has accepted it and Government have accepted it.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Please do not misquote him.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I was, in my own humble way, trying to interpret what Gandhiji had said. I do not think even he has said that the final word has been said about basic education. Gandhiji himself was a seeker after truth and he wanted to make his whole life an experiment with truth. He never laid down a rigid system. Before the country can evolve a national system, a lot of experimentation must be done and that process is going on now.

In view of what I have said, I hope my hon. friend Mr. Vaidya will withdraw the Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to ask one question, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No more questions; there is no time.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA: What about the Constitution? The hon. Minister said nothing about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Leave alone the Constitution. What about the Resolution?

श्री कन्हैयालाल दाँ० वैद्य (मध्य भारत) : अगर सब लोगों की राय हो तो मैं कुछ भी न बोलूँ। केवल दो मिनट बाकी रहे हैं। क्या इसी में पूरा करना है ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you are withdrawing the Resolution, you need not make a speech but if you are pressing the Resolution then you will have to make a speech.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA: I have to reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let the hon. Member reply; then, if he likes, he can withdraw the Resolution.

श्री कन्हैयालाल दाँ० वैद्य : उपसभापति महोदय, मैंने सदस्यों की बहस सुनी और जो स्थिति इस रजोल्यूशन के विवाद में सामने आई है उसको देखते हुये मैं इतना ही कह सकता हूँ कि विधान के अन्तर्गत एक बहुत बड़ी जिम्मेदारी हमारी सरकार के ऊपर है। सरकार ने अपनी कठिनाइयाँ बताई हैं कि धन नहीं है। अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा कि क्या टैक्स के द्वारा धन वसूल करके हम इस कार्य को करें ? मैं सरकार को यह सुझाव देना नहीं चाहता कि टैक्स लगा करके शिक्षा के कार्य को आगे बढ़ाया जाय क्योंकि जनता की स्थिति इस लायक नहीं है कि जो दूसरे कार्यों के लिये उससे टैक्स मांगा जा रहा है वही वह दे सके। फिर भी शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में यह आवश्यक है कि संविधान की पवित्रता की रक्षा की जाए अन्यथा मेरा यह सुझाव होगा कि विधान की धारा को ही बदल दिया जाय। आज देश के करोड़ों बच्चे जवाहरलाल जी की तरफ देख रहे हैं और उनको अपने पापा के रूप में मानते हैं और वे भी देश का भविष्य बच्चों में देखने हैं। ऐसी दशा में जो देश के करोड़ों बच्चे बिल्कुल निकम्मा और पशुवत जीवन बिता रहे हैं उनको शिक्षित करना इस सरकार का कर्तव्य है और यदि सरकार इस कर्तव्य को निभाये तो बड़ा अच्छा है। इन सारी परिस्थितियों में इस रजोल्यूशन पर सदन ने जो विचार व्यक्त किये और जिस प्रकार इस रजोल्यूशन का समर्थन किया, उसके लिये मैं सब सदस्यों का बहुत आभारी हूँ। इसके साथ साथ सरकार के सामने इन विचारों को रखते हुये मैं आशा करता हूँ कि सरकार इस विषय

में उचित निर्णय करंगी और जो देश की आकांक्षाएं हैं उनकी पूर्ति करंगी। इस वर्तमान परिस्थिति में मैं इस प्रस्ताव को आगे प्रेस करना नहीं चाहता।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has he the leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution?

(*Wo hon. Member dissented.*)

The Resolution was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

**RESOLUTION *RE* RESTRICTION
ON PRODUCTION OF CLOTH BY
MILLS**

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

"That this House, having taken into consideration the recommendations of the Textile Enquiry Com-

mute, is of opinion that production of cloth by mills should be limited to 5,000 million yards per year and that after the year 1955-56 all additional production should be by the handloom sector."

In 1952, Government appointed a Textile Enquiry Committee. That Committee worked for nearly two years and submitted its Report in September 1954. Shri N. Kanungo who is now a Minister was the Chairman of that Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue on the next non-official day.

The House stands adjourn^d till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 5th.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 5th September 1955.