August, 1967, killed two armed police and injured others; and

(b) if so, the steps taken in this matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): (a) There was no attack on a camp of the Central Reserve Police in August '67. But there was an encounter between a patrol of C.R.P. and a gang of Mizo/Kuki hostiles on the 14th August, 1967 in Churachandpur Sub-Division of Manipur. In the encounter two constables were killed and one was wounded.

(b) The area in Manipur has been declared as Disturbed Area under Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers Act, 1958 and the Army is combing the area. The Security Forces' posts have been strengthened and patrolling has been intensified.

15-YEAR STUDY COURSE

- 413. SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA: Will the Minister of EDUCATION be pleased to state:
- (a) whether the Central Advisory Board on Education has accepted a 15-Year structure of study upto the first degree; and
- (b) If so, the stages and sub-stages of the 15-Year study course envisaged ?

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. TRIGUNA SEN): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The first stage of school education would cover ten years and be designated as the high school stage. The division of this stage into different sub-stages may be done to suit local conditions and traditions.

This stage would be followed by a higher secondary stage of two years of general education (the vocational courses at this stage may vary in duration from one to three years).

Then would come the undergraduate stage which would include a three-year course for the first degree in arts, commerce and science.

SIRMUR SUCCESSION

414. SHRI C. C. DESAI: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 595 on the 5th April, 1967 and state:

Written Answers

- (a) whether the non-recognition of the son adopted by the Maharani of Sirmur was influenced by reason of the son not having been adopted by the deceased ruler of Sirmur as alleged to have been required by Canning's Adoption Sanad:
- (b) Whether the matter was referred to the Ministry of Law or Attorney-General;
- (c) the criteria adopted for arriving at the present decision of non-recognition of the adopted son of Maharani of Sirmur for succession in the background of (i) lapse of Sanad by the Indian Independence Act, 1947; (ii) Agreement of Merger which guarantees succession; and (iii) precedents in British time of adoption of sons by the widows of the rulers:
- (d) whether Government have received the memorial submitted by forty Members of Parliament regarding Sirmur and Akalkot Gadis: and
 - (e) If so, the decision taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) (a) to (c), President had decided not to recognise any person as the Ruler of Sirmur under article 366 (22) of the Constitution after a very careful consideration of all aspects of the case.

The Ministry of Law was consulted. All claims to the Gadi were examined in the light of the facts of the case, the provisions of the Merger Agreement and other relevant circumstances. Under the provisions of the Constitution it is not necessary that the President must recognise a successor in every case of the demise of a Ruler. Each case is carefully considered on its merits. Attention is invited to the reply given to the unstarred question No. 595 on 5th April, 1967.

(d) and (e). A memorial was submitted to the President by 26 M.Ps.

The memorial was very carefully considered, and the conclusion reached was that the decision not to recognise a successor should stand.