

श्री लोबो प्रभु कहते हैं कि यह कानून बहुत सख्त है और श्री बनर्जी कहते हैं कि इसमें रखी गई सजा बहुत कम है। लेकिन हमने न उनकी बात को माना है और न इनकी बात को तसलीम किया है, बल्कि हमने बीच का रास्ता अख्यार कर के, एक वाया-मीडिया निकाल कर, एक ऐसी सजा रखी है, जिस पर अमल किया जा सकता है। हमारा मकसद यह है कि जहां कानून के तहत सजा दी जाये, वहां कानून यह भी देखे कि जुर्म करने वालों का आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता समाजी तरीके से सुधार भी हो।

With these words, I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, and to continue the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 1964, for a further period be referred to a Select Committee consisting 21 members, namely :—

Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Bibhuti Mishra, Shri Rup Nath Brahma, Shri C. K. Chakrapani, Shri J. K. Choudhury, Shri V. N. Jadhav, Shri Mushir Ahmad Khan, Shri D. K. Kunte, Shri Mohan Swarup, Shri Jugal Mondal, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Nihal Singh, Shri Kashi Nath Pandey, Shri D. N. Patodia, Shri Bhola Raut, Shri N. K. Sanghi, Shri Sharda Nand, Shri Shashi Bhushan, Shri S. Supakar, Shri G. Viswanathan; and Shri Mohd. Shafi Qureshi

with instructions to report within a week."

The motion was adopted.

16.03 HRS.

MOTION RE : REPORT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION AND REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT ON EDUCATION—*Contd.*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House will now resume further discus-

sion on the motion regarding the Report of the Education Commission and the Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on education. Shri Madhok.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am glad that after all, education has come back after the lapse of many weeks.

AN HON. MEMBER : Speak in Hindi.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I would like to speak in English for the benefit of my friends who do not know Hindi.

DR. MAITREYEE BASU (Darjeeling) : I had not concluded my speech on that day, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am sorry. She may continue her speech.

DR. MAITREYEE BASU : Sir, it was such a long time ago that you do not even remember that I was speaking. So, I may be forgiven if I forget what I said on that day and there is some repetition.

16.04 HRS.

[SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA *in the Chair.*]

First of all, I would like to say that the purpose of education is not to quarrel over the language issue, but it is to give the child the knowledge of life—how life functions, what life is, the mysteries of life, the facts of life, etc. In that case, life-centric education is needed for the children. Basic education as enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi has been given a sort of lipservice by our present educators. Actually speaking, I do not feel that basic education has been really studied by our educationists nowadays. It is not something which is static. It changes from time to time. It has to be re-interpreted, and the main thing is that it is a life-centric education. Unless education is

[Dr. Maitreyee Basu]

life-centric it is useless. The facts of life, the mysteries of life, how life functions, how life grows, all these things have to be made known to the children, and basic education as enunciated by Gandhiji can do that. There is no fetish about it. It has to be interpreted, it has to be adjusted from time to time and according to the places where it is to be taught. I would like to draw the pointed attention of the Minister-in-charge to this one point.

The second point is that the present system of education, I am glad to mention, has been criticised by the Education Commission. They have recommended neighbourhood schools and abolition of public schools. I agree with this idea and I welcome it. Public schools today, as they exist, are only for maintaining and perpetuating the social stratification which is at present prevalent in our country. That is what they aim at also. All the big people's children read in public schools. Whatever hon. Members may say here, most of the big officers, big politicians, ministers and big leaders of the country send their children to these public schools to perpetuate the present social stratification which is completely at variance with the idea of socialism as propounded by the ruling party. This is another aspect of education to which also I would like to draw special attention of the hon. Minister of Education and his Ministry.

These are the two things on which I feel very strongly. I have written about them, I have spoken about them and I am glad that I have been given this opportunity to speak on this subject in this august House also. This is a thing which must be remembered. The whole thing is not a materialistic one. The whole thing is not to be looked at like this, that the British masters forced it upon us. In this connection, I would like to mention that the Education Ministry circulated a very unworthy booklet called *Aaro Bhalo Seekha*. It is a mean little booklet. I hang down my head in shame for such a booklet.

In this booklet it is said that English language was introduced in our country with the sole object of creating clerks. Whoever wrote that book had forgotten that the father of modern India, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, really introduced English language in this country and that is why the country has progressed so much and it became one nation. Why call English a foreign language? The language that I speak is certainly not the Queen's English or Shakespeare's English or the language of the Bible. The language that I speak is Indian English. There are only two or three members in this House, perhaps, who can claim to speak in Queen's English, or Shakespeare English or the authorised version English of the Bible. Most of us, including myself, speak a language which is Indian English, and this English is not a foreign language. We have learnt it and we do not want ourselves to be bogged into this controversy, the language controversy of Hindi and English, specially when it is related to education. That is one of the things I would very much like to mention here.

Then, I would like to request the Education Minister, through you, Sir, to withdraw that unworthy booklet, that shameful booklet, which has been circulated in Bengali. I believe it has been circulated in other languages also. I know about the Bengali version because I hail from Bengal.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION
(DR. TRIGUNA SEN) : May I know the name of that book?

DR. MAITREYEE BASU : *Aaro bhalo seekha*. I hope the Education Minister knows Bengali.

AN HON. MEMBER : We also know a little of it.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : What is the English translation of that name?

DR. MAITREYEE BASU : "Still better Education". I find that my English is not understood even by members. So, my English is Bengali English, which

is not a foreign language. In the end, I would appeal to the House not to get bogged into any controversy, at least so far as education is concerned.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, education is the most important constructive activity that the State has to undertake, because it is through education that we mould the mind of men, of those who ultimately make the nation and make its policies. Man is the most important factor in all human affairs, it is the ultimate factor, and that which makes man, that is the most important and most constructive activity, and that is the role of education.

Unfortunately, in this country, education has come to be treated as the most neglected subject and it is a stepson in this House. Nobody is giving any attention to it.

When the British were here, they gave us a system of education which was not suited to our needs at all. Those who are conversant with Lord Macaulay's Minute on Education know what was the objective of the educational system they gave. Their objective was not to educate the people of India not to develop India culturally, socially or economically; their aim was to create a class of Indians who will be Indians in blood and colour, in bone and flesh, but who will be English in mind. Their object was to create a *manasputras*, mental slaves of the British, and also to create clerks to run the administration. To that end, Lord Cornwallis announced in 1784 that only those who know English will be taken into the service of the East India Company, and that way a motivation was created through which English came to be imposed on the whole country. The aim was not to educate the common people. It was argued that education will infiltrate, will percolate, to the lower rungs; because they were not interested in educating the common people at all. Because they were not interested in educating the common people, so the language of the country had no place in it and English was imposed that way.

Now, during the last one hundred years of British rule this system of education continued. If we look at the Convocation Addresses delivered by eminent national leaders during that period, in every address this system of education and the retention of English as medium of instruction was condemned and it was stated that we should have education through our own languages. And if this educational system did not succeed completely in de-nationalising India, the credit does not go to this system of education, the credit does not go to the Britishers, but the credit goes to the great Indian culture, the great savants of India like Rishi Dayanand, Lok Manya Tilak, Hahadev Govind Ranade and Aurobindo Ghosh. While getting the best of the Western Education through this system, they maintained their roots in India's soil and her great cultural past.

It was this blend that they created which was able to give a new life to this country. But the British did succeed partially. They were able to create a new class also which was more English than Indian. Just as Lokmanya Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh and Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee represented the class which had the best of the West and at the same time maintained their roots, we had Pandit Nehru who was only English and nothing Indian at all. Therefore we had two classes.

Now, if any good has come out of it, it is not because of those Indians who were the products of Macaulay but because of those Indians who, in spite of Macaulay, remained Indians and continued to have their touch with Indian culture and life.

When the British were gone and India became free we thought that now at least a national system of education will be evolved. But, unfortunately, during the first 19 years of our freedom our education remained in the hands of people who were anything but Indians. I say it with full sense of responsibility. Maulana Azad might have been a great man but he did not know anything about Indian education; in that matter

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

he was more Arab than an Indian just as Pandit Nehru was more English than an Indian. In these people's hand, therefore, education could not make progress. Those very things which were condemned during the British rule came to be praised as something noble during these 19 years. I am happy that for the first time we have an Education Minister who is a real Indian and a real educationist. He knows India; he knows India's cultural heritage and he knows what is education. Therefore for the first time we are evolving a national policy on education.

The Kothari Commission Report is a big one. It was there before us for a long time but, I think, it was a very laudable decision to appoint a committee of Members of Parliament to go into it and make a considered report on it. That is what we call the national policy on education which we are discussing today.

I wish the same course is adopted in other matters also. In this country we do not have a national foreign policy or a national economic policy. Policies are evolved by a group of people who really do not represent the people. In fact they are cut off from Indian life, but because somehow they manage to have a majority in this House and pass it they think that what they decide is a national policy. Actually, these policies are not national at all. If national policies are evolved in the way in which an attempt has been made to evolve a national policy on education, I think, many of the ills in the economic and other fields also could be removed.

What does the statement on national policy on education that has been circulated to the Members of Parliament, say? It deals with all the aspects, of education and clearly defines its aims. One is that education should aim to build up the nation, to create in the new generation a spirit of nationalism and patriotism so imbibe in them moral values and prepare them to face the challenge of the modern times in the field of science and technology. It

must suit the new social conditions and economic needs of the country while maintaining the cultural and moral climate. It must preserve the genius for which India has been known all through the ages.

For that purpose four main recommendations have been made. One is that the status of the teacher should be improved. I do not think there can be any two opinions about that. In our country all through the ages the teacher has not been known for his riches. The brahmin, according to *Manu Smriti* may have anything but he should not be rich; a rich brahmin becomes worse than a *bania*. Therefore a teacher whose role has been that of a brahmin has never been a very rich man; he has never been given very high emoluments. But he enjoyed a status in the country. Everybody respected him. But during the last 20 years, because we have polluted our own moral values and have been talking too much about materialism, the teacher who is poorly paid has lost even that status. The result is that today the teacher has neither food nor status which could somewhat compensate for not having food. Therefore it is very important that the teacher must have enough to eat and he should enjoy a status in society. For that purpose a number of recommendations made in the report need to be carefully considered and implemented.

In this respect, I would lay stress particularly on one thing and that is housing. We have teachers who go to long distances for teaching; they do not have any place to live there and they have to come back 8 or 10 miles. This is not fair to them, considering their poor emoluments. Wherever a school or college is made, we must see that the living quarters for the teachers are also made, so that the teacher can devote his leisure to studies and his time is not wasted in walking long distances. This is a thing which is particularly very necessary in metropolitan towns.

The second recommendation that we have made is about the reform in the system of examinations. The examina-

tions that we have now are just a sort of machine and the real worth of the student can be seldom judged through it. If a boy can use a key effectively or can cram effectively, he can always get through very well. Therefore, this system needs to be improved. In this Report we have suggested that some kind of internal assessment also should be taken into consideration and the results should be declared on the basis of internal and external assessments. This is a recommendation which should be given some fair trial and I think, through it, we will be able to improve our system of assessment of the boys.

The third recommendation that we have made in this Report is about neighbourhood schools. We have recommended in this Report that in the primary stage at least, all the boys coming from a particular neighbourhood or a particular area should go to the school of that area; whether they are rich or poor, whether one is the son of Shrimati Indira Gandhi or the other is the son of the peon of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, they should be able to go and read in one school, so that they can understand that Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her peon belong to the same country, though one was born with a silver spoon in his mouth and the other was born with an earthen spoon in his mouth. This is very important and this is also in keeping with the slogan that has been raised in this country so often but which has never been acted upon, the slogan of socialism. If we want to create a sense of unity in our younger people in the society, it has to be imbibed in their hearts first before, and this can be done only through education. But unfortunately some of the people who talk too much about democracy and Constitution have said that it will go against the Fundamental Rights. I wonder what they mean by Fundamental Rights. Here is the Constitution of India and in the very Preamble, we have said that we, the people of India, solemnly resolve to secure to all our citizens equality of status and opportunity. We want the equality of status and opportunity. But where can there be equality of status and opportunity

when the son of a rich man can go to a school where he gets a special treatment and the son of a peon, a poor man, cannot afford to go to a better school? No rich man will send his son, no Minister will send his son, no Secretary will send his son to an ordinary school and, therefore, the standard of these schools goes on falling further. They say that St. Columbus School gives good education. Why? It is because every parent pays handsomely; whenever they want donations and every pupil has to pay Rs. 100, or more as monthly tuition fee. If the rich people of a particular area give the same attention to their own Municipal School or Government School, give donations to it and meet its needs, then that school can also be improved. In the area in which I live, namely, Rajendra Nagar, I find that in the early morning hundreds of boys get ready to go to far-off schools. I ask them, when there are so many primary schools, why don't they send their children there? They pay high fees also. I often tell the parents that if they spend a fraction of the money that they spend on their wards reading in missionary and public schools, on the school of the locality we can improve that school. That is the only way of doing it. If that is not done and if some people say that it will infringe on the Fundamental Rights, then the rich will live in Heavens and the poor will live in the purgatory for all times, and this, the people of India are not going to tolerate. Therefore, the system of neighbourhood school is a very commendable thing and it must be implemented without any further delay or hesitation.

I am happy to say that the Administration of Delhi, which is in the hands of my Party, has already started acting upon this principle. We have some good schools to which boys used to come from all parts of the city and, therefore, only good boys could get into such schools and the boys who did not come from happy families or rich families in the neighbourhood could not get admission in those schools. Now we have laid down that the schools must give preference to the boys of neighbour-

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

hood and only when boys from the neighbourhood are not available, should they admit boys from distant areas. The result is that the boys of poor families with lesser marks can also go to better schools and improve their qualification. We have tried this system in Delhi and it can be tried in all the cities. This is a problem mainly of cities and I see no reason why this should not be tried in all other cities as well.

I can understand the opposition of men like Shri Anthony because for them it is a commercial proposition. They run schools in which rich boys come and pay high fees. If neighbourhood school system comes into being, their business will not run. It is none of our business to see that the business of some people is run properly, at the cost of the community as a whole and at the cost of the future of our younger generation. Therefore, I think we should not pay any attention to the argument that Shri Anthony put forth the other day.

Sir, the most important recommendation of this Commission has been that we should switch on to the regional languages as media of instruction. I say, Sir, it is the most unexceptionable thing that the world all over has adopted. I am a teacher of long standing and I know that we cannot educate our children through a foreign language, like English, which is perhaps the most ticklish of them. There was a time when we had a few students in the colleges and schools, we had teachers who had been foreign-trained and who could impart better instruction in English. Now, when we have mass education, the standard of teaching English is falling very very fast. You look at the results of any school or college in Delhi. You will find that most of our boys fail in English. Even though as many as 18 periods a week are provided for instruction in English and only 6 periods for Hindi. If these 18 periods are not imposed on them and they are distributed to the study of Hindi and other subjects I think, our boys will do much better.

Sir, I have gone all over the world and I have discussed the question of Indian students with the leading educationists in other countries and I find that Indian students are second to none in intelligence, rather, they are better, I was glad to see them doing very well. But why are they not able to make any original research? The simple reason is that no real genius can flower through a foreign language. If this imposition of English goes, then you will see that the Indian boys will make a mark in all fields. Look at the original papers that are published every year. The share of India is not even 1% of the original papers in the scientific subjects that are published. The reason is not that the Indian boys are less intelligent, but because they cannot do that original research in a foreign language. The moment you switch on to Indian languages, all these things will go.

My friends in the DMK and others are unhappy over this switch over and they want that English in any case should continue. My appeal to them would be that English is neither their language nor my language. It is a foreign language. English was imposed on this country by our colonial rulers.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon'ble Member might conclude now.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I am concluding, Sir.

I know there are difficulties in the South. They cannot switch on to Hindi immediately, but they can switch on to Tamil and Telugu immediately.

AN HON. MEMBER : We are doing that.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : We do not want that Hindi should be imposed on any State.

AN HON. MEMBER : Thank you.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Let people study in their own language and if they feel the motivation, let them read Hindi as well. I hope they will read Hindi. In any case I would make

an appeal to them : 'Don't impose English on others who are sick of it and are suffering for it'.

The Language Bill that will be coming before the Parliament soon seeks to impose English on others.

AN HON. MEMBER : No, no.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I would submit : let us adopt a rational and national approach. Let us impose neither Hindi nor English on anybody. Let us make provision for teaching of both Hindi and English and let there be no compulsion about the knowledge of Hindi and English for entry into Government service. Any one who wants to enter Government services should know either English or Hindi, preferably both. And if we do that, I think, in course of time, the Indian genius will automatically evolve a system in which all these difficulties which we find at the moment can be removed.

Some difficulties are bound to come up when we switch on to regional languages. To meet them we have suggested that there should be a common dictionary of technical terms and such technical terms should be drawn from all the Indian languages and whenever textbooks are prepared in Tamil, Kashmiri or Bengali or any other language the technical terms should be the same. Secondly, we have suggested that the Central Government should open Central Schools and Colleges in which education should be given through English and Hindi so that the people serving in the Armed forces and other Services who are transferable from one place to another, do not find any difficulty in educating their children. Thirdly, we have said that in the institutions of higher education like the Central Institute of Education or Central Institute of Medical Sciences here in Delhi or elsewhere, the medium should continue to be for some time Hindi and English. Fourthly, we have suggested that even in the matter of admission into public Services, we should have these languages as the media of examination so that no-

body suffers because of this change-over. If these precautionary measures are taken I do not think that switch over to Hindi or the regional languages will pose any danger to Indian unity. In fact, those who think that Indian unity has been there because of English are sadly mistaken. It is not English which unites India. It is geography that unites India. It is our great culture which unites India. India was one when there was no English. We always have had a *lingua franca*. That role was played first by Sanskrit and then by Pali and Prakrit for some time, and that role has been played for the last few hundred years by Hindi. Hindi is the *lingua franca* of our country. I am not saying so in a partisan spirit. In fact, my mother-tongue is not Hindi but Punjabi. In fact, I have as much complaint against the Hindi enthusiasts as my other friends. An important thing to note is that the *khadi boli* Hindi which we have adopted as the official language is not spoken in any part of the country except perhaps Delhi and the nearby areas. Therefore, those who think that the adoption of Hindi will give advantage to people of certain areas are mistaken; it would not give any advantage to me, nor would it give any advantage to any people from the other so-called Hindi States.

Therefore, in the matter of the change-over to the regional languages as the media of instruction, I think the recommendations of this commission must be accepted by all without any reservations or fears.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the UGC, whose report also we are considering. So far, it has played the role only of doling out grants-in-aid to different universities.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That may be discussed when the UGC report is taken up for consideration.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : That is part of this discussion. We are discussing the UGC report also.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He should try to conclude now because there are many others very anxious to speak.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I want to give just a few suggestions.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are others who are more anxious to give their suggestions and they have also got to be accommodated.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I have not exhausted the time allotted to me yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has exhausted it already.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I shall just give my suggestions. Firstly, we should cut down expenses on buildings. We are spending too much on buildings now, and we can have simpler buildings instead.

Secondly, we should scrap the system of preceptorials. The preceptorial system which has been introduced in some universities and colleges is just a waste of time and money. That money could be diverted for opening more colleges.

My third suggestion is that we should not go on multiplying autonomous institutions. For example, in Delhi we have the School of International Studies which has the status of a university; then, we have the Jamia Milia which has again the status of a university; then, we have the Institute of Humanities at Simla which enjoys an autonomous status. Why should we have so many autonomous bodies? We are going to open the Nehru University in Delhi. All these institutions should become part of the Nehru University, and that way not only money can be saved but proper co-ordination of their activities can also be ensured.

Then, new universities should be opened only in those areas where there are special situations which warrant

such a step. For example, in the hill areas of Himachal Pradesh and U.P. we need a separate university. Then, there is a suggestion for the opening of Dayanand University at Ajmer. Ajmer is a very big educational centre which has been neglected all these years by the Rajasthan Government. So, we should have a university at Ajmer.

Lastly, I would suggest that Government should cut down the expenditure on and intake of engineering colleges so long as they cannot provide employment to the engineers coming out of the existing colleges and institutions.

In conclusion, I would say that we should set up a permanent committee of Members of Parliament who will supervise the working and implementation of this national policy on education. It should not be a policy which will lie only in the archives, but it should be a policy which will be worked, and, therefore, I suggest that for supervising its proper implementation, a permanent committee of Members of Parliament should be set up.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta, North East) : We have procrastinated a long time over the Education Commission's report, and the report of the Committee of Members of Parliament in regard to educational policy has also been buffeted about, and our friend the Minister, for the crime which he is supposed to have committed of trying at long last to introduce some absolutely essential changes in our educational system, has particularly been buffeted about. He has had to appear rather apologetic to fellow academicians for no fault of his own except that he was trying to do something very important and so long neglected in the realm of education. It all shows how in the government family, education is still the Cinderella. But as in the fable Cinderella turns out to be a queen, I do hope that some sense dawns on people in authority, and the importance of education, underlined by my hon. friend, Shri Madhok, is really recognised.

It is a pity we are having this discussion in dribblets and the integrated atmosphere in which only such questions can be discussed is not there. It is a pity also that dark clouds seem to be in the atmosphere over the Official Languages Bill which we are going to discuss tomorrow, and the reflections of that darkness might be coming also in so far as this particular discussion is concerned. But it is about time that we put first things first and here Government is committed through the mouth of the Education in regard to an education policy, and particularly in regard to the question of the medium of instruction at every stage of our educational structure.

Even though it might rather look like flattering ourselves, I would take the liberty of saying that the Committee of Members of Parliament, assisted very notably by the Minister himself and his staff, have produced a document which has not received the attention which it deserved from the country, and certain suggestions which were put forward have been clouded over by all kinds of irrelevant arguments put out in certain quarters. I am afraid we cannot rectify the position which exists in our country today, but I do hope that some at least of the recommendations of the Education Commission and of the Committee of Members of Parliament in regard thereto would be salvaged, and at least in regard to some basic matters like the medium of instruction Government would go forward without any delay.

Shri Madhok has referred to the question of the neighbourhood schools, which almost all of us supported in the Committee of MPs. I have heard it said—and one of the notes of dissents points out—that sometimes in the hope of something better what is already good is destroyed and the promised better does not ultimately materialise. None of us claims that the very special schools which are run by very special people are not good institutions as far as they go. But we know at the same time that they are not part of our country. There is no getting

away from it that these very special schools have created a hierarchy in our society which has got to be broken. We have got to realise that these special schools have many points which surely are admirable, which should be followed in other similar institutions. But to go on with these special schools functioning in a privileged atmosphere is something which will bring no good to the country. And when we are told that the very fine system of education which prevails in these wonderful English medium schools is something which we should all adopt, I would like to apply a simple criterion. Who and what are the people and the achievements about which we are proud in this country? Our writers, our artists, our thinkers, our philosophers, our scientists—how many of them have yet been produced by these English medium schools? Rabindranath Tagore never went to any school whatever. Did Jagdish Chandra Bose, Prafulla Chandra Ray and Chandrasekhar Venkataraman ever go to these English medium schools? They never did. Did Sarat Chandra Chatterjee go to an English medium school? Did Subramanya Bharati in Tamilnad go to an English medium school? Did Shri Sri in Andhra go to an English medium school? Did Vallathol in Kerala go to an English medium school? Did Amarendranath Tagore, Nandal Bose, Jamini Roy, Abdur Rehman Chughtai, Venkatappa and so many other artists go to English medium schools? Who are the people we are proud of? Did Ram Mohan Roy go to an English medium school? He learnt English when he was over 30 years of age. Who are we proud of? Our people, the real people who matter, went to ordinary, common schools. It was only the elect who sent their children to English medium schools.

I know it is sometimes said that most of the people who talk against English medium schools themselves went to English medium schools. I do not want to talk about myself, but just in order to put the matter straight, I went to a Bengali school, the Taltola School. The very name sounds absolutely disrepu-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

table to many aristocratic ears. My children, all my brothers and sisters have gone to that kind of school.

It is not true to claim that these English medium schools have contributed to the greatness of our country. They may have produced a few people, eminent in certain spheres, no doubt about it. Today, when things are becoming somewhat cosmopolitan, when technological education can perhaps be imparted in a cosmopolitan atmosphere, may be they would be producing some good alumni but, as a matter of fact, these English medium schools have made hardly any contribution as far as our country is concerned.

Lok Manya Tilak, Swami Dayanand, Mahadev Govinda Ranade, name anybody you like, they never went to that kind of school. Arobindo Ghosh was educated in English, but he went over to another kind of existence altogether. Those are the people of whom we are proud.

Why do we talk about these wonderful institutions which we must cherish like the apple of our eye? Because without them we cannot go ahead in today's world. That is not true. Why do we keep up this hierarchy? Why should it be possible for rich people to send their children to schools which have equipment which can be acquired at a lot of expense? Why do you deny the other schools this advantage which these very special schools are getting? Therefore, it is time we make turn. I do not say abolish those institutions altogether. I say make the facilities available in those institutions accessible to the generality of our people and make a beginning. That is why I say, do not abolish them, and the committee does not say abolish them, but utilise them, and, keeping in mind the rights of minorities, whether it is the Anglo-Indian minority, or the Muslim minority operating somewhere with Urdu as its own language, keeping in mind the rights of minorities in regard especially to their own kind of schools, let us have all over the country neighbourhood

schools open to everybody in the land, whether, as Mr. Madhok pointed, it is the child of the Prime Minister or the child of a peon who works in the office of the Prime Minister—a very important thing which we have got to do.

We have referred also to teachers and pupils and their problems. I have no time to refer to them now. They are more or less known. We are always talking about them.

Then there is the important matter of the medium of instruction. When at long last, shall we try to make our education a part of our life? How is it that even today the Minister has to go to the Vice-Chancellors' Conference and plead with them: for God's sake let us have our own languages as the medium of instruction. Is it not our desire to unite our language with our thought, and our education with our life? And if that is so, we can only do it on the basis of our own languages.

The Education Commission reported quite some time ago, and the Education Panel of the Planning Commission met under the chairmanship of my good friend Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao more than a year ago. At that point of time, the academicians of our country were agreeable to the idea of a switch-over, the medium of instruction being our own languages. But then, when they found that the going was not too tough for them, they came out of their lair and they began shouting for English, against our own Indian languages. Why should this kind of thing happen?

And if these people want the views of foreigners, here is an article contributed to the *Statesman*, a very sensible article, by Dr. V. V. John, on the 11th September, where he has quoted Sir Michael Sadler and a more recent person, Sir Eric Ashby, who have commented on the price we have paid in self-confidence and the quality of our life by learning everything through a language that is not our own, that we have at best used English for receiving

knowledge, it has not served us as a tool for thinking and for generating knowledge.

So, it shames us to find out, and we realise it in every bone of our being, that we have become a secondary, a derivative and unoriginal people, because through the medium of a foreign language, because so much of our spiritual energies are expended in the acquisition of a foreign language which is alien in every sense of the term. I know I am twitted sometimes because I can talk English somewhat quickly but I know English well enough to know that we cannot learn English well enough, and I know it also, and that this is the realisation of everybody—that howsoever well we might learn the foreign language, we cannot express our deepest thoughts, our deepest imaginings and our deepest aspirations and our most creative ideas in that foreign language. Why should we continue to have this incubus? It is not a sentimental matter; this is a matter which goes right to the root of one's being. Why should we have this incubus of a foreign language? Is it because there are difficulties? Which matter in the world is free of difficulties? Was freedom free of difficulties? How did we get our freedom? We were told in the British days that for India to be free is to be bristling with difficulties, as far as this country was concerned. Difficulties are there to be surmounted. Of course, there would be difficulties. That is why we have said in the Committee of Members of Parliament that we want five years. Five years is the time-limit. If you want to extend the time-limit you can do it on the basis of the experience to be gained, but plunge into the water because we have got to learn to swim. Therefore, let us try to swim.

In the meantime, there are problems; of course there are problems. According to our recommendation, when a student passes the graduation stage, he is bound to be a trilingual person. There is no doubt about it. In a multilingual country like India, every student who goes in for higher education

is bound to be at least a trilingual person. Therefore, in the interim period, there might be a continuation of English and Hindi or other Indian languages.

16.47 Hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I envisage a time when in the universities, lectures would be delivered in different languages and in English certainly because historically speaking, English has got a certain position in our country and we can have exchange of professors and other people from one university to another to advise us; the students would be in a position to understand the lecture; the students would be in a position to read all such books and understand the content of those books. And, as the Committee has suggested, and as the Education Commission has repeatedly emphasised, we want that all our students should be well-up not only in a foreign language like English but also in many other languages.

I have quoted already from the article by Dr. V. V. John. I will quote another small extract where he puts this matter in a nutshell. He says :

“These difficulties are not unknown even today. In a multilingual nation like ours, one need not expect easy and tidy solutions for such difficulties. In every State, there will be a minority of students whose mother tongue is not the regional language. To some extent, the three-language formula will eventually solve the difficulties of such students. It is also to be expected that in the larger cities there will be colleges or sections in the same college that use different media to suit the multi-lingual composition of the urban population. Since all students will be expected to know English, teachers who can teach only through English (who may include distinguished foreign scholars) should be free to use English as the medium.

[Shri H. N. Kukherjee]

What is now contemplated is hopefully not an inflexible system."

We are not having an inflexible system; it could be adjusted to the circumstances. But we have got to begin our job; we have got to plunge into the water. Otherwise, we shall never learn to swim.

I know that cheap ridicule has been sought to be poured upon us by certain people, who say, "Your Indian languages are no good." My friend Shri Frank Anthony is not here. He said in a very sneering, superior language, that our Indian languages are not good enough and for any conceivable period we shall never be able to produce the kind of literature that we need for our education.

Well, I can understand this : my hon. friend Mr Anbazhagan is not here. Tamil is a language with a wonderful past. I can understand why they are so devoted to this language. And who says that a language like Tamil or Marathi or Bengali for that matter even though it is my own language, is not well-fitted even at this stage for the dissemination of knowledge? And who says that we shall depend only upon a multitudinous list of translations? Why can't we go ahead to write our own books straightway, at least to begin the job of doing so? We do not need to translate everything, in the library, books in English and in other languages which should be accessible to our students because there are trilingual students at the graduate and post-graduate stage. Therefore, all this cheap sneer about our Indian languages which are condemned for all eternity to be second class or third class languages in the comity of nations has got to be forgotten.

I know this matter has been discussed at great length perhaps earlier when I was not here, but this matter has hung fire for so long that some definite decisions have got to be taken. I ask Government to remember that they had made a commitment before the House

that on the 15th August—a very memorable day—they were going to announce a national policy in regard to education. This Government has made a commitment in this House which they cannot wriggle out of, namely, in regard to the problem of medium of instruction, at every stage our own languages would be introduced, in the quickest possible time. Let this Government come forward now, supported by the generality of Members of Parliament and the generality of the people of the country, with a national policy on education in regard to the medium of instruction and in regard to such questions as the neighbourhood school, the position of teachers and the problems of students and other matters which have been discussed in the report of the Committee of Members of Parliament.

Sir, I know the time of the House is very limited and therefore I would conclude by saying that the manner in which the Education Minister began his job, the manner in which he showed that he was serious about this business, the manner which provoked many people of different shades to put him in jeopardy and put him in a very embarrassing situation, that manner makes me rather apprehensive in regard to the future. But I do hope that the Government comes forward categorically to say that at least in regard to the commitments made in Parliament, those commitments would never be disregarded.

MR. SPEAKER : I think we should conclude the debate today.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : We will be guided by your opinion and we will agree to conclude the debate today.

MR. SPEAKER : We have already spent a considerable time on this. The DMK has got 20 minutes left. Other parties have spoken but the Congress Party has some time left.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai): We have not spoken at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister needs at least half an hour for reply. If the Congress Party agree to forego its time, I will call one or two more members from the opposition and then the minister will reply at 5.30.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: What about the half-hour discussion?

MR. SPEAKER: That will be taken up at 6 and concluded at 6.30.

I am just suggesting this for the sake of convenience. We have been discussing this for 12 hours.

MR. RAMAMURTI: He may conclude in 10 minutes.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: In that case, I will forego this opportunity provided you give me a little more than our scheduled time on the other Bill which is coming up.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. The same subject is coming up in the shape of a Bill. Hon. members will have another chance.

SHRI S. D. SOMASUNDARAM (Thanjavur): Sir, during the past 70 or 80 years, a number of committees and commissions were appointed to suggest means of improving the educational system. After independence, there was a commission under the chairmanship of our ex-President, Dr Radhakrishnan to study university education. After that, there was one commission under the chairmanship of Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar to study the subject of secondary education. Now we have the report of the Education Commission headed by Prof. D. S. Kothari and of the Committee of the Members of Parliament on Education. Thus we had Commission after Commission on education; we received report after report on education. These reports were full of good ideas and suggestions. In spite of the expert suggestions,

nothing happened to change the educational system to make it suitable for Indian economic and social conditions. This is because there was no enthusiasm and effort on the part of the leaders, administrators and educationists to implement the suggestions. In this connection, I am sorry to say that even if we appoint hundreds of commissions, publish hundreds of reports and spend crores of public money to study the educational problem we shall not be able to achieve a suitable educational system unless we have enthusiasm and sustained effort to implement the good ideas.

Mr. Speaker, now let me draw your attention to some of the drawbacks of the Education Commission's Report. I submit for a careful consideration of the House that we are expanding the educational facilities, particularly at college and university level, without taking care to assess the impact of education on the economy and society. It is my firm belief that the resources are misallocated and as a consequence we are facing a crisis in education, namely, mass-scale educated unemployment, threat to law and order and potential threat to the peace of the society. This is not only uneconomical from the society. This is not only uneconomical society's point of view but also misery from the individual's point of view.

Let me try to substantiate the hypothesis that the resources are misallocated. I shall do so from three different angles: (1) by analysing the costs and benefits of education at different levels, (2) by analysing the estimates of manpower required for the economy's further pattern of development, and (3) by comparing our educational achievement and effort with other countries.

We can estimate the costs and benefits of education from two different angles. First we can look at these costs and benefits from the point of view of the society and second from the point of view of the individuals. I am concerned with them from the society's point of view. From the point of view of the society, the expenditure data provided in the official publication are under-estimates. They do not include the costs of all the resources that are

[Shri S. D. Somasundaram]

employed in the educational sectors in a year. If we include all the resources—namely, books, stationery, travel etc., rent and depreciations of the physical assets like building, equipment etc., and the income foregone by the mature students—the costs of education may be more than doubled. The measurement of social benefits of education is still crude and, of course, it should be used with care. The excess of earnings of educated persons over the earnings of uneducated persons are treated as the benefits of education. By comparing the costs and resultant benefits, namely the excess of earnings, we can calculate the rates of returns to investment in education. One of such studies in India indicates that the rates of return to education are not quite profitable when compared with rates of return to physical capital. The rates of return to investment in different levels of education are as follows: primary education 17 per cent, middle school education 12 per cent, high school education 10 per cent, bachelor degree education 7 per cent and engineering education 10 per cent. The estimates of rate of return to physical capital worked out varies from 11 per cent to 19 per cent. Except elementary education, the rates of return to education are lower than those to physical capital. Economic rationality suggests that we should attach more importance to physical capital formation, and within the educational sector to primary education.

17 Hrs.

The Report of the Commission rightly suggests that education after elementary stage should be linked with manpower needs of the future economic development. The pattern of education should be determined primarily by the manpower requirements of the economy. In this qualitative sense it is a success and let me congratulate the Members of the Commission, for this. But how far has the Commission succeeded in implementing the recommendations? I am afraid that it has failed miserably here. The method it adopted to work out the future manpower needs is extremely crude and the assumptions

are quite unrealistic. The starting point of the project work is 1961 Census analysis of labour force and National Sample Survey Reports. Implicitly it assumes that in 1961 the educated labour force is fully employed and that their education and training are optionally used for the social and economic development of the nation. This is far from the reality. We see around us that M.A.s and M.Sc.s are employed as lower division clerks and assistants, for which education upto matriculation or intermediate is enough. Many of the engineers are doing the routine work which can easily be done by diploma-holders. There is under-employment to a great extent. I said that M.A.s are employed as lower division clerks. What is it due to? Is it because we are producing graduates in excess of the demands? Is it because the quality of graduate and post-graduate education has gone down that the education imparted to them is just enough to make them lower division clerks? I would prefer to attribute this present sorry and wasteful state of affairs to over supply and lack of demand. Even doctors and engineers are reported to be in live register of the employment exchanges. Doctors and engineers are trained for particular professions. The fact that we are producing more educated persons of all types than what the economy could absorb.

One can argue that people demand more of higher education and in a democracy the government should provide the facilities to fulfil the people's demand. I do not deny that the people's demand should not be denied. But I should like to emphasise that those who want to have more education should pay for it. At the same time, we should see that the poor and intelligent students should not be denied chance of higher education on account of financial difficulties.

More attention should be given to expand and improve the education at elementary stage. The Constitution directs that free and compulsory education should be provided to all children up to the age of 14. The aim should have been achieved within ten

years after the Constitution came into force. But I am sorry to say that even 20 years after independence we are far behind the objective. This, I think, is mainly due to the neglect of elementary education and too much emphasis on higher education.

The Parliamentary Committee Report states that "India has a special responsibility for the promotion of Sanskrit". It has not given any reason why Sanskrit study should be promoted. Probably, they might have assumed that Sanskrit is a source language for understanding India's ancient culture and civilization. If this is the reason, Tamil has more powerful claims for special study because Tamil is an equally, if not more, ancient language. In addition to that, Tamil is a living language whereas Sanskrit is a dead language. Tamil is a source language for understanding ancient and present culture and civilization. So, the Central Government should give special attention for promoting Tamil.

According to the Report of the Parliamentary Committee :

"However, it is desirable that a pupil should, before he completes his school education, acquire some knowledge of three languages—regional language/mother tongue, Hindi, and English or any other language."

According to the statement, the student from Hindi region will learn only two languages—one mother tongue, that is, Hindi and the other English—but in the case of the non-Hindi students, they will have to learn three languages. This is discrimination against the non-Hindi students. When there is such discrimination, how can we expect national integration? On the other hand, it will lead to national disintegration.

There is one State in our country which is law abiding and peace loving. It is the State of Tamil Nad. It cannot be denied. But in 1965 the entire State was boiling with emotion. There was violence also. It was condemned by all,

But all of us were able to sympathise with the anti-Hindi agitation of 1965.

It is not as if we are against Hindi as a language. But I am proud to say that we are against Hindi being made the sole official language. My Party, the DMK, reflected the views of the people, when it decided to stage a black flag demonstration when Nehru visited Madras in 1960. Everyone of the DMK is an admirer of Nehru for his scholarship and democratic outlook. It was because of that, we, the DMK, decided to wave the black flag in front of him, so that he would know the feelings of the people of Tamil Nad over the language issue. When it did not produce the desired effect, the DMK Party organised anti-Hindi Conference at Kodambakkam, Madras and decided on waving black flag demonstration in front of President of the Union.

Realising how strong the people of Tamil Nad felt over the language issue, the late Prime Minister Nehru gave an assurance that Hindi will not be the sole official language and English will also continue to be the official language until the non-Hindi people desired a change. But, unfortunately, the next Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri did not care to carry out the assurance of Pandit Nehru. Unfortunately, January 26, 1965 was declared as the day on which Hindi was to have become the sole official language. The DMK and the student community of non-Hindi States warned the Centre of its negligence in carrying out the assurance.

The students of Tamil Nad formed an Action Council and began demonstrating to the distant Delhi that they shall not be satisfied until the assurances were given in the form of a constitutional amendment. The DMK also announced that it would mourn the day when Hindi would be made the sole official language. The leaders were all arrested. The peace-loving and law-abiding people were prepared to sacrifice. Many committed self-immolation. Delhi sensed the danger and sent Shrimati Indira Gandhi to Madras. She

[Shri S. D. Somasundaram]

went to Madras and came back to Delhi and said that the language policy needs re-thinking.

Sir, I conclude my speech with a quotation from the speech of our proud Chief Minister, Shri C. N. Annadurai, on the floor of the Assembly on the 29th of the last month. He stressed three aspects of the language issue and said :—

"In a multi-lingual country like India it was not possible to make any one language the link language for the whole nation. Secondly, it would be unjust and unfair to non-Hindi speaking people to elevate Hindi to the status of the sole link language. Thirdly, they were already having a common language, English, which did not exclusively belong to any one section of the people and was eminently suited to become a link language."

MR. SPEAKER : I would like to ask Mr. Amiyath Bose whether he would like to speak for five or ten minutes now on this Motion or on the other Bill which is coming up tomorrow. On both the occasions, he may not get a chance. The other Bill is coming up tomorrow. I would suggest that it will be useful for him to take a chance tomorrow because that is a more purposeful and a regular Bill. Therefore, I would suggest to him that it will be in the interest of his own convenience and usefulness to take a chance tomorrow when the other Bill is coming up.

SHRI AMIYATH BOSE (Arambagh) : I am entirely in your hands, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : He can take his chance tomorrow.

SHRI AMIYATH BOSE : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : The Education Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. TRIGUNA SEN) : I am grateful to the hon. members who have participated in the present discussion on the Reports of the Education Commis-

sion and of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education. I can assure all of them that the Government will earnestly examine their support as well as their criticisms of the recommendations of the Reports. This will be of immense use for us in arriving at a final decision. One of the major recommendations of the Commission is :

"The Government of India should issue a statement on the national policy on education which should provide guidance to the State Governments and local authorities in preparing and implementing educational plans in their areas."

The State Governments were all in favour of this recommendation and the Government of India decided to give the widest possible opportunity to all concerned to express their views and opinions and after examining them critically, to issue a comprehensive statement on the national policy on education.

Ever since the submission of the Report of the Education Commission to the Government, in June 1966, its recommendations have raised a sustained, nation-wide debate on all important problems of educational reconstruction. The Report has been discussed in the Press, public platforms, universities and teachers' organisations. It was discussed with the State Governments in a Conference of State Education Ministers in April last. The Committee of Members of Parliament representing all important political parties in the country discussed it and submitted its Report thereon in July, 1967. The Central Advisory Board of Education discussed it in August; the Vice-Chancellors discussed it in September, the Rajya Sabha discussed it in its last session and we have just concluded the discussion in the Lok Sabha.

It is true that some of these discussions have been heated and controversial, but I welcome the churning of ideas to which it has led. It will enable us, the Government, to start a fresh and vigorous programme of educational reconstruction, more closely oriented to

the realities of the situation and the needs and aspiration of the people.

I must deal with two specific issues that have been raised in this context. The first is the point raised by Mr. Masani and Mr. Anthony that the Report of the Commission should not have been referred to a Committee of Members of Parliament. I am afraid, I cannot share this view. In a modern developing society, indeed in any society, developed or developing, the proper conduct and organisation of education is impossible today without political decisions of one kind or another on fundamental educational issues. If I referred the report of the Commission to the Committee of M.Ps., Sir, it is because I believe in democracy and because I wanted the full support of Parliament in implementing the recommendations of the Commission. In any case, if this is the advice they had in view, they should have tendered it at the time when this Committee was being set up. After having sent their representatives to work on the Committee, Sir, it is grossly unfair to raise the issue at this late stage. Sir, I wonder if they would have adopted the same attitude if the report had been more to their liking.

Sir, regarding the second point raised by Mr. Masani and Mr. Viswanathan who objected to the present discussions in Parliament and to the issuing of a statement on National Policy on Education on the ground that Education is a State subject, I humbly beg to differ from them on this point also. The Constitution vests certain important responsibilities such as Central Universities, Institutions of national importance, co-ordination and maintenance of standards of higher education in the Central Government. It must also perform the essential federal functions of clearing house, co-ordination, provision of stimulating but non-co-ercive leadership and financial assistance. Education is thus a working-partnership between the Centre and the States. This is the reason why we entertain questions, resolutions and discussions on educational matters in the Parliament. This is the reason

why this House has been consistently devoting a great deal of its time to educational matters. Sir, in fact, the one justification for the sustained interest of this House in education is that education is a national concern. This will be more so when we begin to use it effectively for the purposes of national development. I have, therefore, no regrets for bringing the report of the Education Commission before Parliament, nor do I offer any apology for our decision to issue a Statement on the National Policy on Education. Such statement would guide the State Governments, local authorities and by educating public opinion on right lines, Sir, I believe, will assist in the effective implementation of educational plans. It can, to my mind, also form the basis of a Central aid for education and, Sir, as I have said earlier, the State Governments who have always to be kept in the very centre of picture, enthusiastically welcomed it the mere.

Sir, I will not take the time of the House in discussing basic issues in education or the main recommendations of the Education Commission. As I have said earlier, there has been general agreement, as mentioned by Prof. Mukerjee and Prof. Madhok, on most of these problems and it is probably for this reason that the House has preferred not to discuss them. I shall, therefore, deal in some detail with the language problem which has figured as prominently in our debate.

Sir, it is so unfortunate that this problem has become a hump in our educational progress. But the only way to get over it, to my mind, is to put this controversy behind us, by taking clear and unequivocal decisions and by implementing them in a firm and sustained manner.

A Bill to amend the Official Languages Act has already been introduced in this House and will become law some time. I am sure the apprehensions of some of our friends that Hindi is sought to be imposed on them would thus be put at rest. This will also enable the

[DR. TRIGUNA SEN]

country to consider the proposal of adopting the regional languages as media of education at the University stage on merits. Let me state it categorically that we support the proposal purely on merits and that no one has any intention to use it to impose Hindi by back-door or for any other ulterior purpose.

My hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani raised an issue that Parliament had no right to interfere with or legislate in regard to the medium of instruction in universities. I humbly beg to differ from him. In the famous Gujarat University case to which he had referred, this issue was discussed in detail, and the Supreme Court held that Parliament and Parliament alone had the authority to legislate on the subject of the medium of education. It said :

"It is true that medium of instruction is not an item in the legislative list. It falls within item No. 11 of the State List as a necessary incident of the power to legislate on education. It also falls within items Nos. 63 to 66 of the Central List. In so far as it is a necessary incident of the powers under item No. 66 of the Central List, it must be deemed to be included in that item and therefore excluded from item No. 11 of the State List. If there be Union legislation in respect of co-ordination and determination of standards, that would have paramountly over State law by virtue of the first part of article 256 (1). Even if that power be not exercised by the Union Parliament, the relevant legislative entries being in an exclusive list, a State law trenching upon the Union field would still be invalid."

The second point raised by Shri M. R. Masani was that Parliament should not discuss the problem of medium of education because it fell strictly within the autonomy of the universities. I am myself a great believer in university autonomy and will yield to none in my support to that principle. But I cannot share the absolutist view of uni-

versity autonomy which is implied in Shri M. R. Masani's observations. The universities can no longer live in an ivory tower of isolation. They have to provide leadership in social, economic, political and cultural spheres and the more they try to do so, the more would they be required to interpret their autonomy in the larger context of their obligation and responsibilities to the nation.

The Education Commission has observed :

The universities have to share their decisions with lay agencies or authorities outside the system just as they have to share them with one another or with organisations within the university system itself. It is particularly in such problem that issues of university autonomy have to be handled with great skill and imagination and it becomes necessary to develop attitudes and conventions which will do justice to university autonomy as well as to the valid claims of society.

I submit that language is a very important issue whose implications go far beyond education and the decisions on this problem will have to be the decisions of the nation as a whole of which university system only forms a part. In other words, universities will have to respect and rise to the aspirations of the people, about their languages just as the nation will have to respect the experience and wisdom of universities in organising teaching and research. In the recommendations of the Education Commission, this delicate balance between the imperatives of a national policy and the fundamentals of university autonomy has been fully maintained.

I now come to a discussion of the merits of the proposal. I have clarified my stand on this subject on several occasions in the past. Moreover, I find that the proposal has received overwhelming support from all sections of the house. Even Shri Masani does not object to the adoption of regional languages as media of instruction, his main

point being that the issue should be decided by universities and not by Government. Shri Anthony also does not object to the proposal, his only major point being that English should also continue as associate medium of education. I therefore do not think it necessary to renease the view of Government in any great detail once again. I shall make only a few general observations.

The proposal to adopt regional languages as media of education is based on irrefutable grounds. I am fully convinced that this is a change in the right direction and has to be welcomed. There are well-known academically irrefutable grounds for the adoption of regional languages as the media of education. It has also the support of all great national leaders like Tagore, Gandhiji and Rajaji. I cannot resist the temptation of quoting from Rajaji's address, perhaps for the benefit of my hon. friends of the Swatantra Party. Addressing the Convocation of Osmania University, Rajaji said :

"Osmania University is unique in all India in that the imparting of the highest scientific education as well as the teaching of the humanities is done here through an Indian language, the rich joint product of Muslim and Hindu contact. It is unique because every other University throughout India uses the English language and from what one can see, has no intention of using any other medium within a measureable distance of time . . . I am one of those whose confirmed opinion is that the student's mother tongue is the best and most fruitful medium of instruction . . ."

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : On a point of clarification. I want to know from the hon. Minister if this is the opinion of Rajaji now? He is raisquoting.

MR. SPEAKER : He is not yielding.

L92LSS/67—11

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : Delivering the Convocation Address of Calcutta University on 3 October 1947, Rajaji gave expression to similar views. He said :

"I now come to the question of the medium of instruction. Friends, we have been told that the die was cast in favour of Bengali 27 years ago. This decision, though taken 27 years ago, has not yet fully been acted upon and English still continues to be the medium of instruction in the University. The English language sits on our thoughts even as this academic robe sits upon me. This robe may be beautiful and may sometimes protect one against the weather, but it is on the whole an inconvenience. Just so, the English language may be beautiful, but it sits heavily on our thoughts and does not let them grow or move about freely".

In his own home State, delivering the Convocation Address of Madras University on 24 August 1948, Rajaji said: among other things—I would quote this for the benefit of my hon. friend, Shri Lobo Prabhu.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : I did not like to interrupt the hon. Minister . . . Is he yielding?

MR. SPEAKER : If he is yielding, will he yield also to Shri Lobo Prabhu?

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : "As for language, it is no good trying to impose a medium of instruction on young people which is not their mother tongue. In the past, parents preferred their children to undergo the disadvantages of the English medium because, against the drawbacks of a foreign medium, the advantages in life of superficially anglicised culture were great. They deliberately allowed their children to learn language through subjects, rather than subjects through language, because facility in the use of English language

[DR. TRIGUNA SEN]

The Minister of Education, Maulana Azad said in Parliament, and I quote :

helped one very largely and covered many defects. These advantages must now soon disappear, and the drawbacks in using the foreign medium will be more and more obvious as we go on. Nothing is gained by depriving young boys and girls of the advantage of the mother tongue or some language near to it."

I hope these quotations from Rajaji have not unduly embarrassed my Swatantra friends.

Pandit Jawaharlal Lal Nehru in a note to the AICC in 1940, said :

"The policy governing State education should be that education is to be given in the language of the student. In each linguistic area, education from the primary to the university stage will be given in the language of the province . . .

"The medium of instruction for university education will be the language of the linguistic area."

A committee was appointed, as mentioned by Prof. Mukerjee, on the medium of instruction at the university stage in 1948. The Members of the Committee included Dr. Tara Chand, Sir C. R. Reddy, Shri M. Ruthnaswamy, Dr. D. S. Kothari, Acharya Narendra Deo, Sir Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar, Prof. Humayun Kabir, Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, Dr. Zakir Hussain and others. After discussion, it was resolved by the Committee—I quote :

"(1) English as the medium of instruction at the university stage should be replaced during the next five years by Indian languages.

"(2) Universities should within this period adopt the language of the State or Province or Region as the medium of instruction and examination. After the period of five years (from 1948) English will cease to be the medium of instruction and examination."

"We have accepted the recommendations of the University Commission (the Radhakrishnan Commission) that higher education be imparted through the instrumentality of the regional language as the medium of instruction for some subjects or for all subjects.

"We would like the medium of instruction to be the regional language in course of time.

"Eventually regional languages would become media of university education."

Dr. K. L. Shrimali, the Minister of Education, said in Rajya Sabha in April, 1960 :

"As far as the medium of instruction is concerned, it has been the policy of the Government, which I would only like to reiterate, that the regional languages should be the media of instruction. There can be no two opinions about this matter."

Lastly, Mr. M. C. Chagla, Minister of State said in the Lok Sabha in December, 1964, when Mr. Frank Anthony was present :

"I have been accused of having changed Government policy. Whatever policy I have been enunciating has been the policy of Government and continued to be the policy of Government.

"Let me enunciate what is the policy about the medium of instruction. The Government has agreed that ultimately the medium of instruction in the universities will be the regional languages. That must be the logical evolution of our policy. Once we introduce the mother tongue in the secondary schools, it must follow that the best system of education should be to impart to them education in universities in their own mother tongue."

And I do not recollect Mr. Frank-Anthony having protested against it.

Sir, Shri Frank Anthony referred to the report of the Emotional Integration Committee and in doing so, the correct picture was not presented. He is a very able member of the Bar, but I am afraid the Bar is unfortunately full of dust and it is the custom to throw dust on the jurors; and they tried to do the same thing in this House. He did not give a correct picture of its view-point. May I with your permission quote it fully? It said :

“The importance of having Indian languages as media of instruction from the lowest to the highest stage of education is a matter of profound importance for national integration. There is urgent need to remove the gulf that has existed between the masses of the people and the intellectual elite. For centuries, Indian intellectuals had to work in some common language, first Sanskrit, then Persian and recently, English. The gulf between them and the masses of the people has, therefore, persisted. Only the adoption of regional languages as media of instruction right up to the university level will help to remove the gulf. . . . We are not unaware of the practical difficulties involved in the switch-over to regional languages at the university level. Safeguards have to be devised to prevent the lowering of standards. The change-over must be preceded by preparation of text-books and arrangements for translation from English and wherever possible, other modern world languages. In order to maintain inter-university and inter-State communication, special attention must be paid to the teaching of the link languages English and Hindi—when the change-over to regional languages is accomplished. We

on Education (Ms.)
 would, however, like to point out that, in the name of safeguards, the switch-over should not be delayed indefinitely. It is unfortunate that even after fifteen years of Independence, the country has not progressed for in this direction. The time is overdue for breaking down the barriers that have existed for long between the intellectuals and the masses.”

I would also like to point out and emphasize that the change-over to the regional languages as media of education has already started. As of today, 36 universities in the country allow a regional language as a medium of examination. In nearly 15 universities, the proportion of students opting for regional languages as the media for this level is 90 percent or more. In 17 universities, the regional languages can be used as media of education at the post-graduate stage also. The process of change-over is being quickened by several factors such as the keenness of the State Governments to effect it as early as possible, the adoption of regional languages for administrative purposes in the States, and the virtual breakdown of English as a medium of education in many places. This process, you will understand, is irreversible.

The only unfortunate part of this process is that this change is being brought about in an *ad-hoc* and casual manner. There is no plan behind it; no sizeable attempts to produce the necessary literature; no programme to strengthen simultaneously the teaching of English to enable the student to have direct access to the growing knowledge in the world; no interest in orienting and re-equipping the teachers for the new responsibilities and so on.

The question before us is not whether we shall have the regional languages as the media or not. That question has already been settled. The only choice before us, to my mind, is, shall we drift into the change-over under the pressure of unacademic forces, without a plan, without adequate preparation and with-

[DR. TRIGUNA SEN]

out the essential safeguards? Or, shall we take the trouble of carefully planning the change. The choice, of course, is obvious. We must bring about a planned change with a view to raising the standards of our education. This is precisely what the Government is trying to do.

Of the various criticisms of this proposal, I shall try to reply to only one which I consider significant. It has been often said that the adoption of regional languages as media of education at the university stage will disintegrate the country. I stated in the Central Advisory Board of Education that if this policy were to pose even the slightest threat to the unity of the country, I shall be the first one to oppose it. Regional language or no regional language, the unity of a nation is of paramount importance. But I cannot share these fears of some of my colleagues. Before independence many were the gloomy prophets who said that this country will never be able to hold together once it becomes free. But we have held together. When the country was reorganised on a linguistic basis, again we heard similar forebodings. In fact, prophecies of doom have not died down completely as yet. But the manner in which the entire country stood up as one man against the Chinese aggression in 1962 and again in the conflict with Pakistan in 1965, has clearly given the lie to such fears. I have no doubt whatsoever that our unity is strong enough to survive the change-over to regional languages as media at the university stage. In fact, I am convinced that our unity will be stronger for this change.

Still the big gulf between 90 per cent of the masses and the 2 or 2.5 per cent of the English-oriented intellectuals exists. The regional language, I am sure, will immediately bridge the gulf and unity in the real sense of the term will pervade in our national life. I realise the need for a common language or languages for communication between different parts of the country. I also feel seriously concerned about the

fissiparous tendencies that are coming to the surface in our country at present. But with all humility, I submit it is an over-simplification of the problem to believe that a single medium of education at the university stage is the answer to all these evils.

AN HON MEMBER : It is one of the answers.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : A common language of communication does help national unity I believe, but it is not necessarily a guarantee against disunity and dissensions. A language can be used for quarrels also. If it is a powerful language like English, it leads to powerful quarrels. My own approach to the problem is to emphasise the content of education rather than its medium for purposes of national unity. I fully share the view of my hon. friend, Shri Madhok, who said that the major objective of the educational system should be to promote national consciousness and a sense of national responsibility. If this were to be done and if we elders can set a good example to the younger generation by our own behaviour, the unity and progress of this country will be far stronger and greater even in the midst of multiple media of education at the university stage. On the other hand, if we fail to see these essential points and adopt appropriate measures, we shall be deemed to disintegration in spite of the continuance of English as the sole medium of education at the university stage.

I have been designated as a great reformer as also a disruptor of national unity, as an idealist educator and also as the destroyer of good education, as a bold enunciator of a new educational policy and also as an innocent abroad who has been taken for a ride by the politicians. Sir, may I humbly submit that I seek no credit for the praise and I am equally undisturbed by the adverse comments? All my life, Sir, I have tried humbly to follow two principles. The first is that my decisions should be guided by my loyalty to my country, to education which is a powerful instrument for its development and to the students and the younger generations

whom I love. The second is that I should practise what I am convinced about or I believe. In this matter also the same two principles have guided me.

I believe the adoption of regional languages as media of education at the university stage is a programme which will help this country greatly in expediting its development, and as one entrusted with the responsibility of guiding educational policies I shall try to implement this decision.

Another issue which has received some attention and on which differences have arisen is that of neighbourhood schools—mentioned by Shri Masani and others. Here also there is agreement on the objective that the social segregation which now takes place in our educational system is to be avoided and that common school system of public education which will promote social cohesion and national integration has to be brought as early as possible. I fully support this objective. I believe that the social revolution we need can be brought about most quickly through a programme of this type. In fact, I call it the cornerstone of an educational system intended to promote socialism. But differences however arise with regard to the manner in which the objective is to be attained. My hon. friend of the Swatantra Party, in particular, opposed the idea of compulsion put forward by the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education and he would prefer to reach the objective by improving standards of common schools and a large-scale programme of scholarships. What I would emphasise in this context is a unanimous agreement on the objective. After giving necessary goodwill and the democratic spirit of give and take, I am quite sure some satisfactory method for reaching this objective can be devised, and it can be ensured that the transition to the new system is so planned that in the process of change-over existing good schools are not only conserved but multiplied. A variety of approaches have been suggested. I take note of them and I can assure the hon. Members

that we will do whatever is possible keeping these safeguards in view.

Sir, I thank once again the hon. Members of this House who have given me the benefit of their views by participating in the present debate. Unfortunately, most of our time was taken by language problems although there was a little discussion about problems like economic and social status of teachers, student unrest, improvement of textbooks and a few other things. I wish it had been possible for the House to consider these other important recommendations. However, I assure this House that the suggestions made by hon. Members will receive careful consideration while forming the statement. I thank the hon. Members once again for their co-operation.

MR. SPEAKER : There are two separate motions. Each motion has got one amendment. Shri Yashpal Singh is not here but I will have to put his amendment to the vote of the House.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : Sir, I want to seek one clarification. The hon. Minister has been quoting from various statements. May I enquire from him whether it would not have been more expedient to rely on his own deductive processes instead of on statements torn from their context? With reference to Rajaji, I would like to ask the Minister one simple question. May I know whether in honesty he will say that Rajaji holds that regional languages should be enforced in the universities? He has, I hope, been reading what Rajaji has said. If not, I shall be very glad to furnish him with a copy. The second thing I would like to ask.

MR. SPEAKER : Not so many.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I have a right to get a clarification.

MR. SPEAKER : No right. He wanted to ask a question and I permitted him.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : Is the hon. Minister aware that Rajaji has changed his view just because of the fact that

[SHRI LOBO PRABHU]

the very university to which he was referring to, Osmania University, had failed in its experiment and given up teaching in Urdu medium? Another point of clarification is, he has been very easily assuming that Shri Masani has agreed with him about the introduction of regional languages in the universities. I wish he would see the script. The point he made was, and I want the Minister to answer it, that there should be no term fixed. The third question is, if the Minister is willing to accept the independence and integrity of the universities, will he affirm in this House that the universities will take the decision and not the Government. I want a reply to all these questions.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now take up the amendment.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : Sir, this is not fair.

MR. SPEAKER : He has answered all the questions.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : He has not answered all the questions. Sir, you must respect the rights of the opposition parties.

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister will only repeat what he has already said.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I have asked three specific questions and I hope and expect that he will answer them. Let him say "Yes" or "No". Sir, I would like you to have some consideration for the views of the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER : He has answered those questions.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : He has not answered. These are specific questions.

MR. SPEAKER : After all, it is left to the Minister. He feels that he has clarified all those points.

Now, I will take up the amendment of Shri Yashpal Singh. Though he is not present here, I have still to put it to the vote of the House, because it has been moved. So, I now put the

amendment of Shri Yashpal Singh to the vote of the House.

The amendment was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now I will put the main motion to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Education Commission 1964-66, laid on the Table of the House on the 29th August, 1966."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : Now we will take up the second motion. There is an amendment moved by Shri Lobo Prabhu. I will put that amendment to the vote of the House.

The amendment was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now I will put the main motion to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967) —National Policy on Education, laid on the Table of the House on the 25th July, 1967."

The motion was adopted.

17-55 hrs.

*MAHAJAN COMMISSION REPORT

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the House would take up the half-an-hour discussion but before beginning it may I point out the procedure? Every day I am getting into some difficulty because a number of Members want to put a question or make a speech. The Rules are very clear. Those who would like to put a question should give notice before 11 O'clock and if there are more than five Members who have given such notice and who want to participate in the discussion, lots will be drawn and the five names selected; otherwise the half-an-hour debate would become a one-hour or two-hour debate.

*Half-an-Hour Discussion.