

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : My amendment is for referring the Bill to the Select Committee because the Government is taking quite a long time.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Do you press that it should be put to the vote of the House ?

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : I press my amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That the Bill to provide machinery for fixation of wages and for improvement of working conditions of workers in the Film Industry, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 15 members, namely :—

Shrinati Mukul Banerji, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda, Shri H. R. Gokhale, Shri Samat Guha, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Nihar Iaskar, Shri V. Mayavan, Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra, Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsii, Shri Ramsahai Pandey, Shri S. C. Samanta, Shri Arjun Sethi, Shri Nawal Kishore Sharma ; and Shri B. K. Daschowdhury.

with instructions to report by the first day of the next session.”(1)

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Subodh, are you pressing you amendment ?

SHRI SUBODH HANSDA (Midnapore) : In view of the Minister's assurance, I am not pressing my amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Has the Hon'ble Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment ?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

*Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn*

MR. CHAIRMAN : From the concluding remarks, I understand that Mr. Pandey is withdrawing the Bill.

The question is :

“That leave be granted to withdraw the Bill”.

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI R. S. PANDEY : Sir, I withdraw the Bill.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL  
(Amendment of Seventh Schedule) by Shri S. G. Samanta

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, we go to the next item.

Mr. Samanta.

SHRI S. C. SAMANTA (Tamluk) : I beg to move :

“That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration.”

In this Statement of Objects and Reasons I have clearly put why I want education to go to the Concurrent List.

This Bill is being discussed throughout the country, especially the educationists of the country. So many Committees and Commissions were formed but the Government could not come to a definite conclusion whether education should be brought to the Concurrent List.

Education is a matter of national concern and should be treated from that point of view. The role of the Government of India in the development of education should be judged in that context. In the Union List, that is, in List I of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution, Entries 63 to 66 and Entry No. 25 of the Concurrent List enumerate the only subjects relating to Education where the Union Government has the power of legislation and direct control. Barring this limited field, the Government of India has not been vested with any specific responsibility in the matter of education and the vast field of education has been left to the exclusive domain of the States.

The result has been far below our expectation. The radical reconstruction of the educational structure recommended by experts and expert committees including the Education Commission has not been brought about. I know that the Education Commission did not favour the idea of inclusion of education in the Concurrent List. The Commission indeed recommended as follows. I quote :

“An intensive effort should be made to exploit fully the existing provisions of

[Shri S. C. Samanta]

the Constitution for the development of education and evolution of a national educational policy. The problem may then be reviewed again after, say, ten years "

Sir, this is on page 453 of the Report of the Education Commission.

Sir, the Commission did not summarily reject the proposal for treating the subject of education as a Concurrent subject. I think that any further delay in considering this vital matter would be prejudicial to the cause of education and would therefore harm the wider interests of the country. The Centre should be vested with power through the Constitutional amendment proposed by me, to shape and to control the educational policy and educational development of the country.

The Committee of the Members of Parliament of Higher Education, presided over by Shri S. N. Sapru had recommended that at least Higher Education should be included in the Concurrent List. I am emphatically of the opinion that the whole of the field of Education should be placed in the Concurrent List.

Sir, there is no justification for non-implementation of the Directive Principle regarding Free and Compulsory Education for all children upto the age of 14. This Directive Principle should be implemented by suitable Constitutional Amendment.

Sir, here we must remember that 25 years have passed after our independence and we have provided in the Constitution that within 10 years children upto the age of 14 will be educated. How far have we proceeded? Is there any difficulty? So many Committees and so many Commissions have been established. Have they not given thought about this? Is it a fact that the States cannot spend so much as is necessary for fulfilling those promises we have made in the Constitution? The Centre alone cannot do this. The Centre has to come in and the Centre can come in in the Concurrent List, taking the responsibility by sharing it.

The regional imbalances in the matter of educational development in different States are too glaring to escape notice. Different sections of the nation, particularly the weaker sections, are in varying stages of educational development. Education is primarily a State

subject but the States again with their meagre resources cannot be expected to bear the cost of proper development of education.

The Centre should extend all co-operation to the States in bearing the burden of the cost of educational development of the States.

On the other hand, with all the best intentions and efforts of the Central Government, it cannot effectively tackle the national educational problems unless it is vested with adequate power. Many committees have made excellent recommendations. Many conferences of Ministers have held out brilliant promises. Many of these have remained as pious wishes confined to paper. This state of affairs should not be allowed to continue.

The Centre alone can think about a desirable improvement. The Centre should be placed in a place of authority to supervise, direct and control the entire field of education while leaving the States to develop according to local needs.

This is my proposal, and I have moved a motion for acceptance and passing of this Bill. But some of my friends have given amendments to the effect that this Bill may be referred to a Select Committee or it may be circulated for eliciting public opinion thereon. If the House and the Government want that it should be so done, then I have no objection.

Sir, I move that this Bill be taken into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration".

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pali) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 8 Members, namely : Shri Arvind Netam, Shri Subodh Handa, Shri Vikram Mahajan, Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh, Shri Arjun Sethi, Shri Rajaram Shastri, Shri B. R. Shukla and Shri Ram Chandra Vikal with instructions to report by the 1st August, 1972".

SHRI SUBODH HANDSA (Midnapore) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 23rd October, 1972".

MR. CHAIRMAN: These amendments are also before the House.

\*SHRI S. P. BHATTACHARYYA (Ulu-beria): Mr. Chairman, Sir, my respected friend Shri Samanta has introduced this Bill. The objective of this bill is to help the spread of education and also to make up the retardation that has taken place in the sphere of education in our country. He has talked about primary education and he has suggested that education should be included in the Concurrent list of the Constitution.

I have some objections to the above proposal. Shri Samanta has tried to argue that the States do not have enough resources but the Centre has and unless the Central Government takes over the responsibility, the spread of education in the country cannot be fully achieved. I differ with him on this point. Why education could not be spread? It is true that the States do suffer from paucity of funds for propagating the cause of education and we have to find out how we can make more funds available to the States so that they are able to perform their responsibility properly and adequately. On the other hand if we take away the initiative from the States and vested in the Centre, then I feel, Sir, it will not further the cause of education. Not only that the initiative of the States will be killed in this process the national unity and the culture of the country will also be affected adversely. Therefore, my submission is that the Central Government must ensure that the role of the States in regard to spreading of education is not stifled and the Centre should make available all the funds that the State Government may need for such purposes. From our experience I can say Sir that in West Bengal we could have made primary education free and compulsory but it was because of the paucity of funds that we could not do it. How is it that Centre should concentrate all the financial resources in its hands while the States should be made to starve for funds? It is indeed an untenable position. The Centre must ensure that the States are provided with necessary funds and their efforts to spread education among the people are not frustrated for want of money. I do feel that the Centre can play a meaningful role in coordinating different

aspects of education and bring about rapport between the different agencies for diffusion of knowledge but the initiative to propagate education must essentially vest in the States and they should be given adequate funds to pursue their plans successfully.

There are many backward areas in the country. The Centre has to pay special attention and make available adequate funds to meet the educational needs of the people of these regions. The Centre should also ensure that primary education is made free in all the States in the shortest possible time and the implementation of such a scheme is not hampered for want of funds. In case if any State Government finds any difficulty or fails to achieve this objective then the Central Government should come to their rescue. There is not a village in India where the people would not like their children to be educated, and there is not a single State Government which would not like to give free education to its people. But if despite all their earnest desire they have failed to achieve their ambition it was mainly because of the fact that they had no funds or not enough funds to implement their schemes. Therefore, Sir, I have already stated the States should be given more funds and they should be given freedom of initiative to spread education in their own jurisdiction. If we are able to do it, then only we would be able to further the cause of education and help enrich our culture and heritage.

For these reasons Sir, I oppose the Bill which has been introduced by Shri Samanta.

SHRI SUBODH HANSDA (Midnapore): Sir, I have moved my amendment and would like to say something about it. In this very House, on the 6th March, 1962, a resolution was moved by Shri Siddheshwar Prasad, recommending that education which is now a State subject should be made a Union subject. Opinions were expressed in favour of the view that the Union should assume a greater responsibility in the field of higher education and that the country should have a uniform pattern of education.

A Committee was formed at that time with Members of Parliament, which Mr. Samanta has mentioned the Sapru Committee to consider the constitutional provisions in all the aspects relating to the co-ordination and determination of standards in the institutions for higher studies including research, scientific

\*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

[Shri Subodh Hansda]

and technical education. The Committee went deeply into the matter and made a number of important recommendations. One of the main recommendations was that the university and higher education should be transferred from the State list to the concurrent list.

In the States there are various types of educational institutions with different standards and different syllabus. The standards of technical, vocational and medical education also differ from university to university. Similarly, amenities like pay-scales of teachers also differ from institution to institution, university to university and from State to State. There are other problems like the payment of matching grants which also is not done properly.

If we are to overcome these problems and have a uniform and better type of education, I think the Centre should come forward to take over the entire system of education. The States could be entrusted with executive power to implement the directions of the Central Government. Various States have at present various educational policies, not only the manner but even the standards vary, the result is that there is no uniformity and it tantamounts to discrimination among young nationals of India. There are convent schools in our country which are not within the reach of the common people. Very few parents can afford to give such education and this is a serious handicap to the vast masses of our people, as with better type of education they get more employment opportunities. This discrimination could not be removed unless there is one uniform system of education in our country.

States have meagre resources at their disposal. Service of experts of finances. They depend upon the Centre for this. If the Centre pools up all the resources of all the States I think it can succeed in having a uniform system of education suited to the needs of the country. This is a matter which concerns the general public as well as the national interests at all levels. That is why I suggested that it be circulated for eliciting public opinion by the date which I have mentioned. If such steps are taken they will strengthen the hands of the Government of India in improving the educational system and in enabling us to have a sound system of education all over the country. I therefore request that my amendment be accepted.

**SHRIG VISWANATHAN (Wardiwash)**  
I rise to oppose this Bill introduced by Mr Samanta. The Bill envisages taking away education from the State list and including it in the Concurrent list. The Statement of Objects and Reasons says that educational integration is a prerequisite to national integration. I do not agree with this statement either. In India we have unity in diversity. Integration does not mean having the same food habits all over the country or that 55 crores of people who live here have the same hairstyle or sideburns. If emotional integration is emphasised as the prerequisite of national integration, I can appreciate it.

No doubt our educational system requires far-reaching and drastic change so that it can be improved. At present it is outdated and outmoded and we are manufacturing graduates. We must have more technical education, instead of general education. Subjects taught in schools or colleges whether humanities or sciences should be useful in life. In colleges our subjects are not at all up-to-date. I know there are many graduates in economics, in fact post graduates who could not follow even the budget of a State or of the Centre. I think we have to be more practical in our educational system. Can this be achieved by extending the jurisdiction of the Centre over education? Already there are four entries in List I, i.e. The Union List Nos 63 to 66, which give enormous and wide powers to the Centre. Entry 66 says

“Coordination and determination on of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions.”

So, the Centre is amply empowered to give direction and fix standards for various educational institutions in this country.

When the jurisdiction of the Centre is extended, what happens? This Government is known for its indecision on and inordinate delay leading to injustice, inconvenience, corruption and so on. We can give many examples. There is the classic example of the small canal project in the public sector. Can any minister or member of the ruling party explain why it has taken almost a decade to decide about it? The Bill to regulate the service conditions of film industry workers, moved by the same member previous to this, is pending for 4 or 5 years. The exper-

ience of this country is, if you put too many burdens on the Central Government which is already burdened with too many powers, it is not going to act. Mr. K. Santhanam said, if you give too many powers to the Centre, it will become "incurably weak." I do not want a weak Central Government. Hence it is better to have restricted or limited powers, so that it can function efficiently. If you give too many powers, it is like a soldier carrying a number of guns, which he cannot use at the same time. Already too many powers are concentrated in the Centre and they are unable to use them. This will be an additional burden.

As pointed out by the mover, no doubt the Constitution says that within 10 years of its proclamation, we should give free, compulsory, primary education throughout the country. But there are many things in the Constitution to which we have turned a blind eye, like prohibition, etc. If the Centre wants, it can implement these things. There are several recommendations of several Commissions like the Radhakrishnan Commission, Kothari Commission, etc., on education, especially higher education, which have been put in cold storage. They can ask the State Governments to implement them. Now with the same party in power in almost all the States except one or two, it should be very easy. I do not think it will go the same way as the land reforms policy.

There is the recent controversy about the division of Sapru House Library. It is a very fine library, perhaps the best in the country. They want to divide it and take a portion to Jawaharlal Nehru University, 10 miles away. Many MPs have appealed to the minister to drop the idea, but no decision has been taken yet. The Education Minister is a very reasonable Minister and I hope he will take a decision. I do not know what has happened to him after joining the Treasury Benches. People are alarmed that the library may be divided.

I think it is better to leave the Constitutional position as it is. They have enough powers to send directives to the States to implement the recommendation of the various committees and commissions. With these words, I oppose the Bill.

**PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur)** : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Bill proposed by Shri S. C. Samanta to make education a concurrent subject is before the House, and I approve of it partly. I say partly because I would not like whole of education from the pre-primary to primary and

secondary to university education to be put in the Concurrent List. On the other hand, I would very much like that up to the secondary level, or higher secondary level, education is a State subject and at the college or university stage education is put in the Concurrent List.

There are many reasons for it. I had been writing to the Minister of Education and in reply to one of my letters, the hon. Minister, Shri Nurul Hasan, said that the Education Commission had opposed the inclusion of higher education in the Concurrent List ; he added that the Committee on Petitions of Parliament had also disfavoured this idea. Still, I would like to pursue this matter further.

Here I would like to share with the House my experience as a teacher in a university. There are so many universities spread over the length and breadth of the country and the government have failed to coordinate their activities. It may be said that the UGC is there. But it was there last year also and let us see what happened last year.

Last year there was a crisis in higher education in the three Universities of Punjab, namely, the Punjab University, Chandigarh, the Punjab University, Patiala and the Guru Nanak University, Amritsar. What was the crisis about? Eligibility certificate for those students who had passed the pre-medical examination would not be issued by one university to enable them to join the other university. For three months the students wandered from Chandigarh to Patiala, from Patiala to Amritsar and from Amritsar to Chandigarh, knowing not what to do. I brought this matter to the notice of the then Education Minister, Shri Sidhartha Shankar Ray. He told me that he could not interfere in the matter because higher education was a State subject and the universities were autonomous. As a teacher I felt deep anguish because students were running from pillar to post for no fault of theirs. After all, the students are not expected to know the intricacies of the eligibility laws and regulation. Yet, this plea would not be accepted either by those universities or this House. So, some students sought relief from the High Court of Punjab and the Court ruled that this was a fit case for Central intervention. Later on, Shri Sidhartha Shankar Ray declared that he had talked to the Vice-Chancellors of the three universities and they had decided to accept the suggestion

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

that the students be admitted and the question of eligibility be decided later.

Some time back I asked a question in this very House about the correspondence course, on which there is a big mess. The University at Patiala of the Panjab University was first given permission to start correspondence course in Punjabi only. Later on, a demand was made and English was also allowed as a medium. The Punjab University at Chandigarh started the correspondence course in Punjabi, English and Hindi. As a result, there is a big confusion and the Panjabi University at Patiala resents the inclusion of Hindi and Punjabi by the University at Chandigarh called the Panjab University.

What I want to point out is that there is no coordination at any level although the Patiala University, Chandigarh University and Guru Nanak University, Amritsar are financed by the Punjab Government. Yet, the Punjab Government is unable to find out a solution to this problem.

18 hrs.

Some time back some DAV Colleges ran to the Supreme Court. A teacher has to hang down his head in shame when he finds that a teacher is in the clutches of a lawyer, an advocate fleeces him and a student also runs to a court. This is a very disgusting state of affairs and we would like some uniform policy to evolve at one point or another.

You would agree with me that after the higher secondary stage mobility starts. Students would like to avail themselves of the best opportunity for higher education, may be in medicine or engineering, from Himachal to Mysore and from Mysore to Bengal. Unless there is some uniform policy and there is coordination at any level, this cannot be done, because some universities would scoff at the idea of allowing English to continue.

Way back I went to Nepal and I met a superintendent in a train at Motihari. I asked him where he was going. He told me that he was running away. I asked him, why he was doing so, and he said, because the students were demanding that there should be no paper in English and they would answer questions only in Hindi.

This kind of a picture is a very sad one—some universities in Bihar clamouring for

Hindi; some universities in the South denouncing Hindi; some university at Patiala or Chandigarh clamouring for Punjabi and some others crying for some other medium.

Why is it so? This is because State Governments with their regional interests cannot look to the national interest. I want that at the higher secondary level the regional interest can be fulfilled to the fullest extent. The Chief Ministers can bloom in their best efforts. They can shine in the sphere of Assemblies; they can deliver fine speeches. The Education Ministers of States can do whatever they want up to the higher secondary level.

But so far as the university level is concerned, there is a big explosion of knowledge. All the knowledge that is coming from the latest researches must be made available to your post-graduate students and unless you are able to do some creative thinking, it is not possible. It is not sufficient to translate some books from classical authors into Punjabi, Tamil, Hindi and other languages. There must be some creative thinking. If English is to continue as the library language and if Hindi is to develop as the national language, there must be provision for all the three media at all the universities of the country.

But this would not be done by the Chief Ministers nor by the Vice-Chancellors, who are obliged to the Chief Ministers for their appointments, or by the Education Ministers who have to dance to the tune of their Chief Minister night and day. This can be done by some agency at the Central level, by a Minister of Education of the eminence of Professor Nurul Hasan, who can and does cherish experiences of teaching and who can and does have that national calibre which takes into account not only the studies in Kerala but also the studies in Kashmir, not only the fruits of learning in Viswa Bharati in Shanti Niketan but also in Rajasthan. For all this coordination is necessary. So, what I feel is that placing of education, specially higher education, in the concurrent list is the need of the hour. Without it we cannot do.

There is one very interesting question which I ask myself. How is it that the Government is spending crores of rupees on various colleges, councils, summer institutes, this and that and yet the Government of India is unaware of the simple fact that

results in private colleges and schools are far better than in the Government colleges? You can see any merit list of any university and you would find that students from private colleges or public schools are topping the list. How is it? This is because those people who work there have to work willily with some kind of a result in view. They have to answer for their results. But in Government service everybody is assured of the increment, the grade and promotion. If we do not do, there is a big union that would sly in the face sooner or later and you will be forced to do what you do not want to do. There is this fear also and we have to take this into consideration. The best education that is being imparted in the United States of America is the education given by the private individuals or universities; education is an autonomous subject there.

Having studied a bit of Chinese literature and education I find very interesting parallels. A delegation from India went China. There a professor was interviewed by this delegation. He had been asked to write a book. He was given all the facilities; he was sent to distant corners of the country; he was given a jeep; he was given railway facilities, everything. But after he had done this and published his research in a book form, the book belonged to the university.

Here, what happens, the Government servants, the Government professors and the Government administrators, at the expense of the universities, at the expense of the Government, raise orchard. They write books and sell them like hot cakes in the market. After all, they are professors. At the same time, they are using Government money. We can find a lot of wastage of public funds before our very eyes. When we are whole-time employees of the universities, when we take everything at university level, every book, every encyclopaedia, when everything is available to us, the rich store-house of knowledge being placed at our doors by the universities, what is it that we are doing? We are creating national wealth. If we do not see that they are national properties and we claim them as individual authors, and we went to reap our benefits, thereby hangs a tale.

All these people in the syndicates and senates of the universities are interested only in one thing, in scattering examinership here and there, in interfering in the practical examinations, and these people manoeuvre in such

a manner that education becomes a farce. I am reminded of a college in Punjab about which Mr. Suraj Bhan spoke the other day, where an internal assessment showed that 90 per cent of the students who had failed in written papers had passed in the internal assessment. So, all this is becoming a mess because there is no supervisory agency anywhere.

Education is said to be the best investment. But here is it the best investment? It is a big fraud. The taking over by the State Government of Bihar of all the five universities in the State shows the deplorable mess in which education has fallen. Unless we take effective steps to remedy the situation, we will see the sad day when the universities, like Government colleges, will become the playground for the wishes of regional politicians.

I warn the Government through you Sir, that the standard of education in this country is fast deteriorating. There are courts and syndicates in the universities which have not been completed so far. Examples are shown that for five years, the syndicates have not been completed. There are recommendations that students should be given participation and that they should be allowed to be nominated on the universities, that *karamcharies* should be allowed to be nominated on the universities. What has happened? If a teacher of the university is elected to Parliament, he is not allowed to serve on the university court because there is a stipulation, a regulation, about it. Why? Who frames these hackneyed regulations? They stand in the way. The university is prevented from sharing the experiences of a teacher who has been either elected to the Delhi Metropolitan Council or to the Parliament. Mr. Balraj Madhok had the same fate. He was elected by the Lok Sabha to the court of Delhi University and yet a small regulation, a small rule, stood in his way so that he could not share his experiences as a parliamentarian in the university. A *karamchari* can be elected to the court of Delhi University. A student can be elected to the court of a university. But for a teacher who teaches at the university, there is a rule standing in his way. Mr. Purshotam Goel and Mr. Malhotra, these two professors, teaching at colleges of Delhi University were elected by the Delhi Metropolitan Council to the court of Delhi University. But the same rule stood in their way. The same rule stands in my way. This is very interesting that, on the one hand, we clamour for greater powers to the teachers, for greater

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

respect to the teachers, on the other hand, if the teacher comes up well and he enters the legislature, he is not regarded fit to be a member of the court because a rule stands in his way.

What is a rule? These rules are unimportant. As Mr. Graham Green, the famous English novelist said, in "In the Heart of the Matter." "There are rules and regulations; there are files and cases. But there is not even a single heart that understands that working of the human heart." I warn the Government, through you, Sir, that education in this country is deteriorating. Education was a living experience in India. It was the finest fruit that we could export abroad. The teachers of India taught people from abroad who used to rush down to Nalanda, Takxila and other such places. They received the rich learning in education.

But what is happening today. Instead of being the teacher-centred, instead of being the personality-centred, education in India is becoming regulation-centred. It is the creation of these rules and regulations. A clerk, a bureaucrat, who is sitting at a desk, who has studied upto the matriculation level, is framing the rules that will guide the Vice-Chancellor or a professor who has done some research. A Ph. D. falling at the feet of a despatch clerk for the sake of an interview! Is it not a sorry state of affairs? Dr. Khurana, the Nobel Prize laureate in Physics, was not given the post of a lecturer in a university in the country, and when he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics and he became a citizen of USA, he was honoured with doctorates of science letters, and all that. This is all very funny. I repeat the words Graham Green "there are rules and regulations, a big jungle of them; there is a file, but where is the human heart?" We have forgotten the true spirit of education and consequently the cause of education suffers. It is not any longer child-centred or teacher—or student—centred; it has become regulation-centred. Unless you take it over at the Central level, unless you make a big effort to rescue it from the regional politicians, you cannot save it any longer. A day would come when a man doing research in Kashmir would not be able to follow what a man is doing in Kerala. The fruits of learning would go waste, India would be scattered into 18 States. You may increase them to 20 or 30 or 100. That

would only be disintegration of the country. There was a time when Sanskrit was a living language. There is still a time when English is the link language. And there can be a time when Hindi will be the link language. We should do something; we should take courage in both of our hands and see that the education comes up, that education comes to the top. That is the best investment in man. The investment in dams and railway lines is alright, but investment in man must come first.

Today we had the experience of listening to a member in the Congress Parliamentary Party meeting. He was referring to the disqualifications for appearing at the Public Service Commission examinations. What were the criteria for disqualifications? Number one is education in public school. Nobody educated in a public school should be allowed to appear at any examination conducted by the Public Service Commission. Number two, income above Rs. 1,000 per month. Anybody having a monthly income of Rs. 1,000 or more shall not be allowed to send his child to any Public Service Commission examination. And so on, and so forth.

When we think of these things, our mind quivers. It rather shivers in the fear of the days to come when the country would discriminate on one ground or another, when we would see that this is going to happen or that is going to happen. In Himachal Pradesh we will clamour for one language; and in Rajasthan, another. There may be students who have passed out from one university not being able to get admission in another university. And what would be the ground? This university is located in Punjab or Rajasthan. Were they not the days of glory when Hiuen Tsang came from China and studied in Nalanda? Are we going to stretch the point of regional chauvinism to such an extent that we do not allow a student from a State which is a part of our own country to get admission in another State? If we do that, that is going to be a sad day.

With all these things in view and many other things—I would have spoken longer but because of the limited time I have to finish. I would like to conclude. I support this Bill with the reservation that higher education be made a concurrent subject and secondary education be given to the States and they be

allowed to develop it to the extent that it is possible and the Centre should come forward and look to the cause of education because if education is given top priority, India lives; if education is neglected, India dies.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPAN (Telli-cherry) : I welcome the Bill moved in this House. It has given us an opportunity to discuss certain very important problems relating to our education. I do not agree with the idea of bringing this question merely as a problem of Centre-State relations. I think, it involves certain greater problems, certain basic problems, relating to the basic policies concerning our education. We are after speaking about a national education policy and we always say that education should be made use of as an effective instrument for bringing about a meaningful social transformation. But how will these goals be achieved? As things stand in our country to-day, the education system can jolly-well be described to be in a mess. Everybody is helpless. The Centre is helpless because it often finds that the problems faced are the problems to be dealt with at the State level and the States think that they cannot do anything because they do not have enough resources. So, by bringing about a situation under which the Centre will have more say and that situation will be better because we are living in a society where we believe that an effective Centre should be there to plan the education system as we do planning in our economy.

If you look at the problem from that angle, we could see that the education, the very purpose of education, should be to instil in the minds of the younger generation the ideals of patriotism and also to make him committed to the goal for which the nation stands committed today. We say that the national goals are socialism, democracy and secularism. The education to-day, I do not know, how far it helps the creation of a generation of young people in our country who are dedicated to these causes. When the leaders of the Central Government and the various political parties are speaking about the secular character of the State and also about secularism to be brought about in the national life, where does our education stand on these questions?

I have been pointing out quite often that the content of education and the way history is being taught to the students in our country is very much biased. It has a Hindu bias when it teaches the history of the Mughul

period and it often descends to that extent that it gives an impression that it is teaching about some alien people. That attitude should not be there and in to-day's condition. You take the case of RSS activities about which I know the pronounced policies of the Government. But is the Government in a position to implement its policy in a Central University like the Banaras Hindu University? When the question of RSS menace became so serious and acute, a Commission has been appointed which came out with a concrete recommendation that RSS activities there should be banned. I am referring to the Gajendragadkar Commission and it also pointed out the problems of such organizations, para-military and fascist type of organisations and the problems it might create in the field of education. In UP the Vice-Chancellor of the BHU found himself helpless. He said that neither the Centre nor the State could help him to solve the problem of RSS and now it is being repeated in other parts of the country.

Killing of Students who are secular-minded in the campus of the Universities is becoming a phenomenon. You may go through the memorandum presented by the Youth Congress of Hyderabad-not a Communist organisation-about the killing of George Reddy in the Osmania University campus in broad daylight in the presence of the Police. RSS was doing that-RSS with the patronage of the Chief Minister and the Government there. When I say that, I am sorry to say that it is a fact. The Chief Minister is patronising that. The Government says that we are a secular State, we want to implement secularism everywhere. But when this question will be answered after two or three days in this House the hon. Minister will say, it is a State subject, let the States look after it. I think some interference from the Centre can be tolerated if the Centre will have a progressive policy of implementing the purpose of preserving secularism.

We have to take into consideration another aspect of democracy about which we are proud of. There is the recommendation of the Gajendragadkar Commission on the governance of the universities. Our present Minister's predecessor had promised the house about that. He said that it had been referred to the universities all over the country so that they may express their opinion how far the recommendations can be implemented. Regarding the students' participation, even in the Central

[Shri C. K. Chandrappan]

Universities it has not been implemented, I remember. But there is a State like Kerala where it has been implemented, it has been found successful and I do not know what stands in the way, when we speak of democracy, to bring the students to that level where they would be partners in the affairs of the university which is the recommendation of the Gajendragadkar Commission. By doing that we will be giving a greater sense of participation to the students and this will help to solve many of the problems which we are facing today in the field of education. About the democratic rights to be given to students and teachers there is no uniform policy all over the country. In certain States, there all democratic rights are granted. In certain other States things are being done in a different way, according to the subjective feeling of the administrator, may be the Education Director or the Minister. In some States it so happens that no democratic rights are granted at all. I would therefore say that we must have a uniform policy regarding all these matters to uphold the slogans of the national goal of socialism, secularism and democracy. I think the Centre should have a say even to the extent of legislating so that these things can be implemented. I think Mr. Samanta's Bill would help us to meet some of these purposes.

There is another example which I can point out regarding the standard of education and the text-books which we have prescribed. I remember that some Central efforts have been made to standardise the text books by NCERT and all that, but the States again have got their option, they may select rubbish books and they are free to select whatever text books they may like.

Then again the question of public schools come in. I do not see any reason why the Government should encourage or patronise the continuance of public schools in our educational system. There must be a uniform policy to abolish it. I say this not because I am against higher standards, because I want to make it clear that I am for higher standards, let us have higher standards in all the policies that we formulate and in all the educational institutions. I know about the difficulty involved. I know about the financial implications. You have to look at it from the national perspective. The effort should be to raise the standard of education and the level of

education in every educational institution, but we should not create a new section of the elite, the sons of bourgeois class with all the patronages to learn in schools where they can shower money.

Another question that is often heard in this House is about the capitation fee and its consequences on the students. While answering the question, the hon. Minister last time told us that it is not exactly his subject, but it is related to Health Ministry. But Education is a subject about which he is also concerned, as much as the Health Minister. The university is not coming from the blue without the knowledge of the education authorities. We give permission to the private managements to start a medical college and the management before starting even thinks of the days they will have with the capitation fee and the nice days they are dreaming about and they collect the capitation fee to an intolerable extent and then make a mess of everything, and thereby a situation comes which even the Government cannot stand and even Government cannot defend the collection of capitation fee. Everybody denounces the management then. Then, what happens? What happened in the case of the private medical college in Kerala? They collected capitation fees. The Centre decided or the Medical Council decided not to confer degrees on the students. But that was not the fault of the Students; the fault lay with the authorities, may be the Education Ministry or the UGC or the Medical Council or the Health Ministry. But by no stretch of imagination can you blame the students for joining that college.

Similar was the case of the Pataliputra Medical College. I do not say that this Bill would be a panacea to solve all these problems because it provides for Central intervention, but it will help to evolve certain national patterns and a uniform national policy by which we shall be able to create general standards, and create conditions in the universities whereby the national goals will be upheld.

I think these are certain things about which everybody is concerned. I would like to point out one more thing regarding the medium of instruction to which many hon. Members have referred. I fully agree with the idea of allowing every State to adopt their own mother-tongue as the medium of instruction up to the highest level of education including research. I do not think that

it will bring about any disintegration of our country, if we have a policy to develop our national languages, that is, all the regional languages as well as the link language. This is not a novel idea which I am presenting. It is already there in a country like the Soviet Union. Nobody will say that the Soviet Union has not advanced in the field of education, science and technology. There, the students are taught in their mother-tongues, and they have a very strong and very well developed national link language. We can also have that.

We have a policy of developing the language institutes in the States so that the regional languages will be developed to that extent when education will be imparted in the mother tongue, but this has been a failure because many States are taking only nominal interest in developing the language institutes.

We should also develop Hindi to make it acceptable and to make it a more modern language which can effectively play the role of a link language, and for the time being English

will also remain. If this arrangement can be perfectly made, I think that there will not be any problem which will badly or adversely affect the progress of our education.

With these ideas in mind, I generally support the Bill moved by Shri S. C. Samanta. But I would like that this Bill be circulated so that more thought can be given to this matter and more ideas could be gathered and the Bill can be made more perfect. I generally support the idea with which this Bill has been moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, Shri R. D. Bhandare.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central) : Mr. Chairman, Sir . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member may continue his speech on the next occasion.

18.30 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, May 2, 1972/Vaisakha 12, 1894 (Saka).*