

many things in the name of ayurved. But I find there is no sincerity in the administration. I earnestly request the hon. Minister and I draw her attention to this; she should be kind enough to see that everything is done with sincerity. Of course we are getting about 3-4 per cent of the allotment for Ayurveda but even that is not properly utilised. That is why I am anxious that the step-motherly treatment should be given up. If whatever we get is properly utilised, ayurved will flourish. In this connection, I may quote what Shri Morarji Desai has said: "If only one-fourth of the expenditure that is made on allopathy by the government is made on ayurved, one-tenth of attention which is given to allopath is given to ayurved by the government, I am sure that all controversies will cease and all will recognise the superiority of ayurved in a very few years." With that hope I request the hon. minister to be sincere and bring the Bill at an early date. So, I ask for leave to withdraw the Bill.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Will you permit us to oppose this motion of withdrawal?

Mr. Chairman: That is not for me to say.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Even if one man opposes the motion for withdrawal, it cannot be done.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I want to oppose the motion for withdrawal and I will take only five minutes—not more than that.

Mr. Chairman: There is no speech allowed at this time. I shall put the motion for withdrawal (*Interruption*).

मैं श्री द्विवेदी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस स्टेज पर हम हैं उस में और किसी मेम्बर को हक नहीं है, सिर्फ जो इस के मोहरिक यानी मूवर हैं, उन को ही हक है कि वह क्या जवाब दें उस का जो माननीय मंत्री ने कहा है। इस लिये इस बारे में अब आप के कुछ कहने का मबाल पैदा नहीं होता।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी: मैं एक बात कहना चाहता था कि श्री शर्मा इस को विड़ा करना चाहते हैं लेकिन अब यह विधेयक सदन के सदस्यों के हाथ में है। सदन के सदस्य ही कह सकते हैं कि इस को विड़ा किया जाये या नहीं—अगर आप मुझे इस पर बोलने का मौका न देना चाहें तो न दें, लेकिन मैं इना तो कह सकता हूँ कि इस मंत्रालय की ओर से कोई कदम आयुर्वेद के लिये नहीं उठाया गया।

सभापति महोदय: मेहरबानी कर के आप प्रोमीजर को अच्छी तरह से समझा कीजिये—सवाल यह है कि जब मिनिस्टर साहब ने तकरीर की तो उस के बाद सिर्फ मूवर को ही हक होता है कि वह क्या कहे—बोटिंग का आप को अख्तियार है कि आप करें या न करें—लेकिन मिनिस्टर साहब के बाद अब आप के बोलने का मौका नहीं है—

I am putting the question now to the vote of the House. Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw the Bill?

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

15.48 hrs.

CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT BILL

(*Amendment of Seventh Schedule*)

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 14th November, 1966."

As I embark upon a few introductory remarks on this Constitution Amendment Bill, I want to pay a very hearty tribute to the statesmanship and farsightedness of the hon. Education minister who adumbrated the

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

need for bringing about concurrence both in letter and in spirit, both substance and in law and who gave, I think, a pioneering stimulus to this kind of thinking in the country. I am glad to say that he has done the right thing by accepting in principle the motion which I have just moved an hour ago and in doing so he has placed under a debt of gratitude. I say this because I feel that although a large number of States have declined to accept the move for making higher education a concurrent subject, there is very strong and widely shared feeling in the country at large that education should be a concurrent subject. Sir, the constitutional amendment which I seek to be circulated for eliciting public opinion is not designed to place education in the exclusive jurisdiction of the Union Government. What I seek to do is to make this a concurrent subject in the 7th schedule.

Mr. Chairman, there are any number of documents, any number of opinions by educationists in this country, who have held that bringing higher education into the concurrent list would help the cause of education and would help the cause of emotional integration of the country. Indeed, I would like to go as far back as the report of the Radhakrishnan Commission which strongly recommended that there is need for concurrency. This is what the Commission had to say:

"We may say at once that we agree with the majority in thinking that the All-India aspects of university education, the repercussions and interchanges necessary and desirable between universities and the need for a national guarantee of minimum standards of efficiency, make it impossible for university education to remain a purely Provincial subject. No doubt the simplest way of securing these objects would be to make it a Central subject. But we see

two serious objections to this, which on balance seem to outweigh the advantages. First, it would tend to produce a stereotyped uniformity which we by no means desire. In the contrary, we wish to see local initiatives far more general and more enterprising than it has hitherto shown itself. Secondly, it would create an awkward hiatus at a critical stage in the educational system if the Centre became solely responsible for university education while basic and secondary education were a Provincial responsibility. We consider that the necessary safeguards can be achieved by Concurrency, and we now proceed to state what these safeguards are and the ways in which they can be maintained."

Dr. Radhakrishnan, and the Commission which he headed, came to the conclusion that after mature consideration of the whole matter and its manifold aspects. The view was shared even by the report of the Committee on Emotional Integration, headed by Dr. Sampurnanand who, at a later date, came to oppose making higher and university education a concurrent subject.

This is what the Committee on Emotional Integration has to say:

"If the discussions we had with the representatives of State Governments are any guide, we are afraid we do not fully subscribe to this claim. It is common knowledge that we have not succeeded during the last fifteen years, in evolving a national system of education. Many policies in common suggested by the Centre to the State Governments have not been implemented. Modifications and amendments have been made at the stage of implementation to many other policies suggested. Most of the policies and program-

mes suggested on the recommendations of the numerous committees and commissions appointed by the Government of India from time to time since Independence remain unimplemented for one reason or another."

The same report goes on to emphasise that if necessary there should be necessary constitutional changes.

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): What is the report that the hon. Member is referring to?

Dr. L. M. Singh: The report of the Committee on Emotional Integration headed by Dr. Sampurnanand who has come, at a later stage, to voice some opposition to make this a concurrent subject. Sir, the report of the Emotional Integration Committee itself sets up an irrefutable case for making higher education a concurrent subject. They have said it in so many words by saying that necessary constitutional changes should be brought about.

I need hardly invite the attention of the House to the report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on higher education headed by our much-honoured and esteemed colleague, Dr. P. N. Saprú, in the other House. This Committee also came to the conclusion that it would be proper and appropriate to put higher, university education, on the concurrent list. It is true that before this Committee, when Dr. D. S. Kothari, a distinguished educationist in our country and the Chairman of the University Grants Commission had appeared, he had felt that it was not necessary to amend the Constitution for placing higher education on the concurrent list. His feeling was that, in the first place, we should utilise the existing powers available to the Union for bringing about a uniformity and concurrence in substance. This is also the view which finds expression in the report of the Education Commission which says that the matter should be reviewed after 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasise here that I have the greatest respect for the Education Commission and its report, but in this particular matter, I would beg to disagree with the recommendation; that we should wait for 10 years to review the situation, although many of the suggestions made by the Education Commission cannot, in fact, not be implemented unless you make higher education a concurrent subject. As a matter of fact, as I said earlier, I go further than some of my colleagues who want only that higher, university education should be placed in the concurrent list. I feel that the time has come that in the interests of emotional integration and unity of the country, it is incumbent upon this Parliament to initiate a measure for a constitutional amendment to place education as a whole in the concurrent list so that the Government of India would be able to exercise a unifying impact which it is necessary to do, while the State Governments would still have powers within the framework of concurrency.

I started by saying that we owe a debt of gratitude to the Union Minister of Education for having initiated this turn in the thinking in this country. He is a man with foresight; it was an act of constructive statesmanship and patriotism to suggest that education should be made a concurrent subject, at least university and higher education should be made a concurrent subject. There are many statements which he has made, but I should like particularly to refer to a few of them. On April 11, 1965, he is reported to have said at Mussoorie:

"It was a great mistake to make education a State subject and not a Union subject."

He said that it was part of the British legacy and showed that sufficient importance was not attached to education in those days. There is another statement to which I shall invite the

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

attention of this House. He said on the 13th December in New Delhi:

"The Union Minister, of Education, Mr. Chagla, stated in the Lok Sabha today that in order to promote national integration and achieve a uniform educational policy, he proposed to take up with the State Governments the desirability of making education a concurrent subject. Mr. Chagla had a complaint about All-India Conferences convened by the Centre to bring about a uniform policy in the various aspects of education in the country. He said that at every conference held in Delhi the Chief Ministers and Education Ministers agree that there should be an all-India uniform policy. When the conference is over and when the Ministers go back, they forget that resolution."

Here is the distinguished Education Minister of this country who comes forward with the difficulties with which he is confronted in executing the national consensus in this respect. He brings before the nation the difficulties he has in bringing about emotional integration through the instrument of education. He places before the country his difficulties about using education as a unifying influence for the country and he also places his difficulty because education is not a Union or a concurrent subject without which, he has pointed out that the Government of India cannot improve the standards and efficiency of education in a significant measure.

I think that in view of all this, it is incumbent upon the House to take the initiative to create sufficient public opinion in this country, to ensure that education would be made a concurrent subject if not today or tomorrow, at least by the next Parliament. I am not so optimistic as to hope that the States will overnight change their opinion in the matter. I am not so credulous as to entertain

the expectation that the States will reverse their position in respect of their opposition to this idea, but I am confident that given the time, given the effort, given the dedication to this particular idea, the idea will get accepted in our country and that this idea will be implemented through a constitutional amendment.

Time and again, we are told that there should be an all-India Secondary Education Commission, an All-India Educational Service and so on. Time and again, we are told that model schools should be opened in every district by the Central Government if possible. The hon. Minister of Education himself suggested that he would like to have model schools for every district in the country. Time and again, this Parliament has voiced its concern about private schools and their standards. But alas! that expression of concern remains unimplemented in any practical way.

16 hrs.

I think purely by an accident in the Constitution-making or because it was not fully anticipated at that time what the consequences would be, education happens to have been placed in the State List and the States are taking advantage of it. Are the States providing necessary resources for education? If it were so, I would have no quarrel with them. Have they taken sufficient interest in the cause of education? The fact of the matter is, education in this country has gone to dogs largely because of the interference of small-time politicians in the States. They have done nothing to improve the quality of education and to lift it from the low standards into which it has fallen. This can be done only if there is national concern in the matter and if education is made a concurrent subject.

Very recently a question was inscribed in this House on 27th July and in the Rajya Sabha on 5th August 66

limited to making higher education a concurrent subject. The question was asked whether in view of the opposition of the State Governments, the Government of India is contemplating to give up this idea finally. The Education Minister said,

"Ultimately and reluctantly, we may have to come to that conclusion. But so far, we have not."

Again it was asked:

"May I know what are the reasons put forwarded by the State Governments to justify their stand in not agreeing to make it a concurrent subject?"

Mr. Chagla said:

"My hon. friend will understand it. When you have got power, you do not want to give it up."

Any detached and dispassionate analysis of the subject will convince any practical man that concurrence not only in substance but through a constitutional amendment has become a prime necessity. I feel this concurrence should be extended to all segments of education, because a truncated kind of power in the hands of the Union Government will not work. After all, concurrence does not mean that the Central Government would have exclusive powers and jurisdiction. It really means that the Central Government will be able to stimulate education and give the leadership and direction needed very much in the field of education, to bring uniformity in standards and quality of education, to make educational planning effective and meaningful in this country. It is for these objects that I plead with the House that it should agree not only to circulate the Bill, for public opinion, but to lend its strong support to this idea, so that sufficient public opinion is built up in this country for making education a concurrent subject.

I have already mentioned that some of those who have at a later date opposed the idea of concurrency have on earlier occasions supported it. I cited the example of Dr. Sampurnanand, who headed the Emotional Integration Committee, which came specifically to the conclusion that necessary constitutional changes should be made to implement the idea of giving a leading, stimulating, central role to the Government of India in the matter of education.

It is true that the States by and large have not accepted this idea of concurrence even in the limited field of higher education. Should we be deterred by this rejection by the State Governments? I feel in this matter the State Governments are pursuing a short-sighted, selfish and self-centred policy. If only they were to realise what it would mean to the future of India, to emotional integration and unity of the country, to the quality of education in the country, they would be compelled to accept the idea of concurrence. The idea may mean a partial parting with power which they enjoy at present. But essentially that power is enjoyed by the Centre now, if it so wishes, because it holds the purse strings. Why should the State Governments insist that the Centre should use its coercive power and not have the necessary constitutional sanction to use it? As a matter of fact, if you look at the various education budgets in the States, every Chief Minister allows the axe to fall on education in the first instance. Education seems to have been the most neglected field in our social welfare State. We have the constitutional directive of making free, compulsory, universal primary education available to the young boys and girls in this country. We have not been able to fulfil that directive. There was the policy of improving the quality of secondary education, which has not been achieved largely because there is such a dilution of controls in

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

the field of higher secondary education. That is why various educationists have said that there has to be a central commission to coordinate higher secondary education throughout the country. That coordination is the substance of concurrence.

In the field of university education, of course, the Constitution has conferred certain powers on the Central Government. The UGC functions under an Act of this Parliament. These powers of coordination are already there. However, there should be a fuller, ampler constitutional sanction for making the whole subject of education a concurrent subject.

I should like that the country articulates itself on this question of such great importance to our future, to our national prosperity and survival and progress. I hope that the public opinion which would be generated as a result of circulating this Bill would be so considerable that the State Governments might consider a change in their stand. If they do not, history will not spare them; history would classify them as Governments which were interested only in regionalism and continued enjoyment of vested, entrenched interest which they happen to have under the present Constitution, which they were not prepared to part with, in spite of the fact that the objective of such concurrence is to promote national unity, emotional integration and better quality of education at all levels.

I commend my motion for circulation of the Bill for public opinion to the House.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 14th November, 1966."

Shri Vishwa Nath Pande (Salem-pur): I beg to move:

"That in the motion,—

for "14th November, 1966"

substitute—

"31st October, 1966".

मैं इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ —

श्री श्री० चं० शर्मा (गुरदासपुर) : हम भी कुछ कहना चाहते हैं "हम भी मुंह में जवान रखते हैं, काश पूछो कि मुद्दा क्या है।"

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am accepting the circulation motion. May I say a few words?

Shri D. C. Sharma: We also want to make some observations.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have to go to the Rajya Sabha. Therefore, with your permission, may I say a few words?

I congratulate my friend, Dr. Singhvi, for bringing this Bill before the House. I must confess that he is much more ambitious than I am, I confined myself to the narrower vision, viz., to make higher education concurrent. Dr. Singhvi has a wider horizon, he has seen further ahead and he wants the whole spectrum of education to be made Concurrent.

I quite agree with him. It has been my view that we made a serious mistake when we drafted the Constitution, in making education a State subject. That was the legacy which we received from the British, and without thinking about it we accepted it and inscribed it in our Constitution. The British Government were not seriously interested in education. They were interested in education only to the extent that they wanted clerks and administrators in the country. The only professions that were open to us in those days, when I was a boy, was law and medicine—ICS came later. Except those no other field was open to us. They never thought of national integration, they never

thought of a national policy of education, they never thought of various things that we are now thinking in regard to education. Therefore, I agree that a very strong case can be made out for the whole subject of education being made a Concurrent subject.

But I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that both the Radhakrishnan Committee and the Sapru Committee confined themselves to higher education. As far as I am aware no authoritative report has so far suggested that we should make the whole of education a Concurrent subject. But the Education Commission does, in a sense, support Dr. Singhvi, because what the Education Commission says is that education should be integrated and therefore higher education should not be made Concurrent, but if you do not disintegrate education and keep education integrated then I take it the Education Commission would not have any objection to it in principle.

People are sometimes apt to forget what the meaning of Concurrence is. When I go to the States and discuss this question with the ministers there they seem to think that Concurrence means taking over the powers to legislate on education. They seem to think that we want to make education a Union subject. But as Dr. Singhvi rightly points out, Concurrence does not mean that you exclude the power of the State; it only means it gives us the power to intervene, to give leadership, to bring about uniformity, to give financial aid and to do many things which we cannot do today.

Education in our country must serve various important purposes, it must serve the purpose of emotional integration, it must serve the purpose of national unity and it must bring about a band of young men and women who will be able to raise our country to higher standards. Education cannot play that narrow role which it did before independence.

1255 (A) Ls—10.

We must look at all aspects of education. We must think of the vista that is opened up by education becoming a Concurrent subject.

My hon. friend Dr. Singhvi is quite right, the States today have not the means, the resources to finance education. Whenever there is economy, education is the first casualty. I am sorry to say, that is not only true of the States, very often it is true of this Government also. Whenever they want to use the axe, the first subject to be axed is education. The mistake is this, that education is looked upon as expenditure, and when people talk of economy they say, save expenditure and, therefore, they say, save spending money on education. But they forget education is not an expenditure, it is an investment. That is the greatest investment we can make. There is one thing in which our country is very rich. It is rich in many things, but it is certainly rich in human resources. We have 460 million people. These are our human resources—perhaps one may say there are too many, but there they are. And, we have to invest in these resources. If you really invest in these resources, we can make our country a very great country. Therefore, if you look at education as investment and not money spent on it as expenditure, our whole outlook on education changes.

Dr. Singhvi is conscious of the constitutional difficulty. Even if this Parliament were to pass the amendment unanimously, this House and the other House, unless the majority of States agree the Constitution cannot be amended. This is what is known as "entrenched provision" of the Constitution and, therefore, we have got to carry the States with us. The position so far is this. I have written to every State. I have tried to persuade every State. I have bagged of every State. That is only with regard to higher education. As I have told so often in this House, barring Punjab—all credit to Punjab—no other State has agreed. Only ten States have replied. Six States have not even sent a reply to my letter and constant reminders I

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

have sent. Therefore, the present position is that the States are not likely to agree to making education a Concurrent subject. It is precisely because of this that I am accepting Dr. Singhvi's motion, because we have to educate public opinion, we have to bring pressure upon the States—a legitimate pressure—through public opinion. After all, we represent the whole of India. Our voice goes out or should go out to every corner of the country. If this Bill is circulated for public opinion and in every State public opinion asserts itself and clamours for this change or calls upon the State Governments to agree to this, well we will get what we want. Therefore, after giving some thought to my hon. friend, Dr. Singhvi's amendment, I feel that Government should agree to it.

All that I want to make clear here is that so far as policy is concerned, we have gone as far as higher education. But if the States are prepared to go even further, speaking for myself, I would welcome it. But I would like to point out one thing, finally, that although we have no concurrence in law, we have in fact, concurrence in substance today. We have the Education Ministers Conference. We have the CABE meetings where we call the Education Ministers. We come together and we pass resolutions where the States agree to carry out our policies even in primary and secondary education. They are financed to a certain extent by the Centre. Therefore, the States should not be so reluctant to accept concurrence in law after they have agreed, to a large extent, to concurrence in substance.

The position is quite different in the United States. To a certain extent the position in India and the United States is alike. Both are federations. In both countries education is a State subject. If you know the history of the United States—I am sure Dr. Singhvi's knows it—you will know that the States in the United States have strongly and strenuously resisted any inroads by the federal government into

the area of education. That is a historical matter into which I do not want to go. But recently the whole outlook has changed, and the United States Federal Government is doing more and more for education than what it did before. Since the time of President Kennedy and also the time of President Johnson the Federal Government is giving a lot of money to the States for education. There was a time, in the United States, when the States even objected to any money being spent by the federal government. In our country the States want money from us, but they do not want the law to be changed. At least I can understand the attitude of the States in the United States which is logical where they say, do not interfere with us, we do not want your money, we have enough money and we will look after ourselves. But our States say, give us more money, we will carry out our own policies, we will not allow you to mould the policies of education. Therefore, without taking much more time of the House, I welcome the motion. I hope it will, if nothing else, educate the public opinion.

Shri D. C. Sharma : Sir, do you not think that other hon. Members should also be permitted to speak on this motion so that it will strengthen the hands of the hon. Minister?

Mr. Chairman : Perhaps, hon. Members will be a little bit surprised with the procedure that I am following because it is slightly different. Even though the hon. Minister has accepted the motion all the same, hon. Members will not be deprived of their opportunity to express their opinion within the time allotted for this subject. As the hon. Minister has some other urgent work to attend, he has been permitted to intervene in the debate a little early.

Shri M. C. Chagla : I am very thankful to you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman : Shri Jyotishi. He will have five minutes

श्री उवा० प्र० ज्योतिषी (सागर) :
सभापति महोदय, मझे इस बात की खूशी है

कि आपने मुझे यह मौका दिया कि मैं इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार व्यक्त करूँ। अभी अभी शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने यह बतलाया कि स्टेट्स इस बात में बड़ी रिलेक्टन्स जाहिर कर रही हैं। मैं आपके इस विचार को एप्रीशियेट करता हूँ। आखिर स्टेट में भी समझदार आदमी हैं, शिक्षा के बारे में उनकी अपनी भी जिम्मेदारी है, उत्तरदायित्व है। आपकी इस नीति के साथ इस देश का बहुमत क्यों नहीं जा रहा है? आपने बतलाया कि केवल पंजाब ही एक ऐसी स्टेट है जिम ने आपकी नीति का समर्थन किया है, केवल 10 स्टेटों ने जवाब दिया है और इन दसों ने आपकी नीति को स्वीकार नहीं किया 6 स्टेटों ने जवाब ही नहीं दिया। मेरे सामने एक बड़ा प्रश्न यह है कि आखिर इसकी वजह क्या है? मेरी केन्द्र सरकार के विचारवान लोग जब कोई नीति निर्धारित करते हैं, उसे स्टेटों के पास भेजते हैं, तो उसे स्टेट्स स्वीकार करने के लिये राजी क्यों नहीं हैं।

मैं स्वयं इस ख्याल का आदमी हूँ कि निश्चित रूप से इस देश के लिये बहुत हितकर बात होगी कि शिक्षा के मामले में या इस देश से सम्बन्धित सारे प्रश्नों पर, बनियादी प्रश्नों पर इस देश के विचारवान लोग बात करें, मैं समझता हूँ कि मेरे विचार से इस देश के बहुत से लोग सहमत होंगे और विचार करने के बाद ही हम कोई परिवर्तन करें। अगर इस देश का वास्तविक निर्माण आप करना चाहते हैं, तो वह शिक्षा से ही हो सकता है, शिक्षा से ही शुरू होगा। भौतिक निर्माण आप कितना ही कर दें, लेकिन यदि शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में कमी है, उस का ठीक तरह से निर्माण नहीं हुआ है तो वह निर्माण स्थायी निर्माण नहीं है, ये सब चीजें खत्म हो जायेंगी, इस का मुझे खतरा है।

मेरा खुद केन्द्र सरकार से एक झगड़ा है, और वह झगड़ा इस बात का है कि आपके हाथ में भी कुछ संस्थायें हैं, आपने उन संस्थाओं में क्या आदर्श रखा है। बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी की हालत क्या है? अलीगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी की हालत क्या है? मैं समझता हूँ कि स्टेट को

यह खतरा तो नहीं है। आज हम लोग भी अगर स्टेट पर दबाव डालें तो किस आधार पर डालें। हमारे हाथ में जो संस्थायें हैं उन संस्थाओं को हम अपने आदर्श तक नहीं पहुँचा सके हैं। अगर हमारे हाथ की संस्थाओं में गुन्डागर्दी चलती है, अगर हमारी केन्द्र की संस्थाओं में विचारार्थी पढ़ने की तरफ नहीं जाते हैं, तोड़ फोड़ की कार्यवाहियों में जाते हैं, आसाम हो बनारस हो, अलीगढ़ हो, वहाँ तोड़ फोड़ में लगते हैं, अध्ययन की तरफ नहीं जाते, तो हमारे पास कौनसा मुँह है कि हम उन से कहें कि तुम हमारी बात को मानो। हम सही रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं स्टेट को हमारी बात माननी चाहिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक महत्वपूर्ण कारण है, जिस पर हम को ध्यान देना चाहिये।

मगर जहाँ तक इन्टीग्रेशन का ख्याल है, इस देश को एक बनाना है और मैं बहुत आवश्यक समझता हूँ कि स्टेट्स हमारी इस बात को मानें, हम बहुत गम्भीरता पूर्वक बैठें और इस पर विचार करें कि इस सारे देश की शिक्षा किस तरह की हो, हमारे भावी लड़के किस तरह के बनें, भारतवर्ष का भावी नागरिक किस तरह का हो। इस पर विचारवान लोग जो निर्णय करते हैं उस निर्णय की दिशा में सारी स्टेट्स अपना योगदान करें। मैं समझता हूँ कि भाषा के प्रश्न ने लोगों को बहुत परेशान किया हुआ है। वे समझते हैं कि कानफेरन्स के कारण केन्द्र की जो भाषा नीति होगी, उस भाषा नीति को मानने के लिये हम मजबूर होंगे तथा शिक्षा के मीडियम के सम्बन्ध में केन्द्र जो फैसला करेगा, उस फैसले के मुताबिक हमें अपने यहाँ पर काम करना पड़ेगा। एक्वाइन्टमेन्ट्स के सम्बन्ध में भी हमारे स्टेट्स के भीतर हम जिस तरह से अपना काम चलाना चाहते हैं, उस में भी रुकावटें आयेंगी, इनकी कुछ मिस, मिश्रण होनी चाहिये।

हमें पूरे देश के लिये ऐसी नीति बनानी है जिस से नई तरुणाई एक सही दिशा में जा सकेगी और वह परिवर्तन शिक्षा से ही हो सकता है। आज एक स्टेट का आदमी दूसरी

[श्री जवा ०प्र० ज्योतिषी]

स्टेट में जाता है, एक जगह एक किस्म की शिक्षा है और दूसरी जगह दूसरी किस्म की शिक्षा है, इस में बड़ो कठिनाई आती है, निश्चित रूप से यह तकलीफ की बात है, यह दूर होनी चाहिये हमारी हर जगह एक पालिसी हो, एक करीकूलम हो परन्तु यह बात मच है कि उसका अपने तरीके से विधिवत निर्माण होना चाहिये। यदि इस सम्पूर्ण देश का विधिवत निमां हो सका तो इस देश के नागरिक सब एक तरह के होंगे और उन में मिलजुल कर भाई चारा हम अपने अन्दर ला सकेंगे।

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Chairman, our hon. Education Minister and Dr. L. M. Singhvi have been talking in terms of constitutional propriety and have been saying that we should put the stamp of constitutional sanction on this, I think it is nothing of the kind. We are only accepting a fact which already exists. We are only trying to put the stamp of approval on something which is already existing. I think education is a con- current subject in substance, though not in name.

What does education mean? Education means, first of all, the upkeep of the standards of education. What does the Central Government do? It appointed the Mudaliar Commission, so far as secondary education is concerned. It appointed the Radhakrishnan Committee, so far as university education is concerned. There was the Kher Committee, so far as basic education was concerned. Now there is the Education Commission which deals with education all along the line. So, if education means the upholding of high standards of education, the Central Government is already the conscience-keeper, not only of the States but of the teachers and students of India.

Secondly, education also means the welfare of teachers and the service conditions of teachers. So far as the primary school teachers are concerned, 50 per cent of their salaries are met by the Central Government. So far as

secondary school teachers are concerned, 50 per cent of their salaries are paid by the Central Government if they are upgraded in schools. So far as university education is concerned, if the recommendation of the Education Commission is accepted, cent per cent of the salaries of the private college teachers, State university teachers and Central university teachers should be met by the Central Government.

Therefore, I say that it is a question of accepting a fact. If they do not accept the fact, they are like a pigeon which shuts its eyes in the presence of a cat. Of course, I do not say that the States are pigeons and the Central Government is a cat. I do not say that. But I say that they are trying to be blind to what already exists. Of course, the hon. Minister talked about the Central Board of Education, Inter-University Board and other things. They are there. But I think in substances the States have conceded that already, and I do not see any reason why we should not put the stamp of approval on it.

Then, we have established about 300 or more Central higher secondary schools. Why have they done it? Why cannot the States establish them? There are so many public schools. Of course, they are not established by the Central Government. But still, they are there.

So, I think that it is not a question of giving constitutional validity to this proposition which Dr. L. M. Singhvi, the great constitutional expert in this House, has brought forward. It is only accepting a fact which already exists.

My hon. friend talked about Banaras University and Aligarh University. I want to ask him, what about Delhi University; what about Visva Bharati University; what about these universities? There are two eggs which are not particularly good; there are other eggs which are very good. Therefore why do you talk of the rotten eggs and not of those eggs which are sound?

He talked about the language. The language formula which the Madhwar Commission gave has been accepted by all the States and I think the language formula which the Education Commission has given may not be accepted by all States. Therefore what is this language business? Why do you bring in this language business again and again when we talk of education? I think, we have accepted the proposition that education should be imparted to students from beginning to end through the medium of the mother tongue. That is there. How are we going to interfere with the language of the people?

Then, I will take only one minute and I will sit down. You are a very kind-hearted man and I appeal to your spirit of generosity.

One Member mentioned appointments and that is the trouble because there are some States which which was brought forward by some of the countries in Europe whose names I do not want to mention. What was that theory? Sons of the soil, you must give a chance to the son of the soil. If you want a Ph. D. and the son of the soil happens to be a matriculate, give the son of the soil, a matriculate, a chance and turn down the Ph.D who comes from some other State. If this is what appointments mean, I think, the sooner we get rid of them the better.

The hon. Minister was quite right when he said that even in USA, where the States are very very jealous about their rights, privileges and prerogatives and where they are always trying to fight the Federal Government, they have accepted the proposition of taking federal help for education. I think, one of the good things which President Johnson has done is that he has tried to give much money for education. I do not want to go into those schemes.

Therefore I say that it is a pity that Dr. L. M. Singhvi, a cautious optimist, a cautious reformer, a slow-going reformer, should have said that this Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion.

“कौन जीता रहे तेरी जुल्फ के सर होने तक”

Who will live to see when this Bill will come back after the opinions have been acquired? I think, if he had been a bold man—the Rajasthanis have ceased to be bold men now—he would have said, “Let the Bill be accepted today”.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Rajasthanis are bold and they are also wise.

Shri D. C. Sharma: We would have all endorsed it. Then there would have been no trouble about it.

I support this Bill because my federation, the All-India Federation of Education Associations, of which I happen to be the President, had always been supporting this theory. I therefore, thank Dr. Singhvi for bringing forward this Bill, but I wish he had had the courage and the daring of the Rajputs and said, “Let us have this subject as a concurrent subject today”. All right, is he wants it to be circulated, I have no objection. But I may tell you that if this thing does not happen now when Shri M. C. Chagla is the Union Education Minister, I think, it can never happen. Therefore we should make hay while the sun shines.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not think Dr. Singhvi is a very cautious reformer. Sometimes he goes pretty fast. But, anyhow, he has done a good service in bringing forward this measure before the House and I am very happy that Mr. Chagla has responded in a statesmanlike manner and, I think, there is a right lead which we expect from the Education Minister of India.

What did he say in the other House? Mr. Chagla is reported to have said that we have received replies from the State Governments but that only one State Government has supported it. I think, that is Punjab—all credit to Punjab—and I am sorry that other States have not responded. The Minister said that nine State Governments, that is, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat,

[N. C. Chatterjee]

Kerala, Madras, Maharashtra, Mysore, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, have opposed the recommendation of the Committee. I am sorry that this has happened. But let us be quite frank. Do you want India's integration or not? Actually, the country today is in danger. We see so many disruptive tendencies operating. We must build up India on proper lines. How will you build up India?

The image of our education is going down. The other day, I went to Lucknow and one Dean of the Faculty—I will not name which Dean—came to me and invited me to address the University students. Next day, another Dean came to me saying, "I am the real Dean. That Dean is a bogus Dean. Therefore, kindly accept my invitation and come to address students." This is very amazing that there are two Deans of the same Faculty in the same University. Everywhere there is trouble.

Then, I had the privilege to represent the Banaras Hindu University professors in the Supreme Court case which ultimately the professors won. I was amazed to find a good deal of trouble in that University. A good deal of discontent in the teaching staff was due to the regional politics being brought into operation in the running of the University.

Sir, it is high time you should not allow educational standards to go down. There is too much of stagnation today. There is too much of shabby regional politics operating in the academic field. You should rescue our Universities from this. It is not merely the Aligarh Muslim University, it is not merely the Banaras Hindu University, but this is happening everywhere. It was pointed out that when All-India Education Conference meets in Delhi or in other places, they all talk of integration, they all talk in a different strain, they talk of uniformity, they talk of raising standards and they talk of all-India pattern, but when they go back,

when these Ministers and the educational authorities go back to their States, they are infected with regional and local politics and local pulls.

I think, a good deal of this unfortunate linguistic trouble could be avoided if we had education as a Concurrent subject. I am not pleading that it should be made a Central subject. We must dispel fears here and now that 'Concurrent' does not mean domination; that 'Concurrent' does not mean taking away the autonomy of the University but that Concurrent means an effort for self-improvement on a national plane, a proper integration on an all-India basis and a proper restoration of India's image. It is absolutely essential. Otherwise, the provincial pulls will be there. Why do you go to the United States of America? After all, our Constitution is different; our genesis is different. There, the sovereign States parted with some portion of their sovereign authority and built up the Centre. But our case is different here. The Centre is here, the residuary of all sovereign power under the Constitution.

It is quite proper that having regard to what has happened in recent times, we should put our own house in order. If the Central Minister of Education cannot function properly unless he is clothed with authority and that authority must be the authority under the Constitution, in the interest of India, in the interest of our national integration, in the interest of our emotional integration, you should accept this measure and, the sooner the better, if all impediments are removed, all different regional pulls are obviated and crushed completely, provided we give sufficient powers in the hands of the Centre. I do not want to make the Centre all powerful. But this is not meant to make the Centre despotic but to clothe them with that authority which will enable the Centre to have an all-India standard prescribed and to enforce the standard

throughout the country, from north to the south and from east to the west.

I welcome the Bill and I think that we should immediately accept Mr. Chagla's suggestion. I am quite sure that the country, the people, will be educated and will rally round this demand which is reasonable, just, fair and proper and in the national interest.

श्री शिव नारायण (वांसी) : मुझे डा० सिधवी के इस बिल को देख कर बड़ी खुशी हुई है, मैं एजुकेशन स्टैंडिंग कमेटी का मँम्बर था। तब मैंने एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर को एक सुझाव दिया था। मैंने कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान में शिक्षा को गवर्नमेंट नेशनलाइज कर दे तो बड़ा उत्तम होगा। आज उसी लाइन्ज पर आप अग्रसर हो रहे हैं। इसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूँ।

स्टेट्स हम से पैसा लेती हैं और हमारा ही एजुकेशन पर कंट्रोल न रहे यह नहीं हो सकता है। एक शिक्षक होने के नाते मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क में सबसे बड़ी कमजोरी, सबसे बड़ी कमी डिस्प्लिन की है। नैपोलियन ने लिखा है :

"Those who will obey can give orders; those who will not obey cannot give orders."

डिस्प्लिन की आज बड़ी कमी मुल्क में है। डिस्प्लिन हो तो व्यक्ति योग्य बनता है, डिस्प्लिन से ही देश में एकता स्थापित हो सकती है। जब एक सूत्र में हमारी शिक्षा बंध जाए, एक ही हाथ में हमारी शिक्षा हो जाए, एक ही की निगरानी में हो जाए तो इससे उत्तम बात और कोई नहीं हो सकती है। साथ ही साथ प्राथमिक शिक्षा से लेकर, प्राइमरी शिक्षा से लेकर उच्चतर शिक्षा तक सब राष्ट्रीय हो जायें, गवर्नमेंट के कंट्रोल में

आ जाए, यह मैं चाहता हूँ। आप जानते ही हैं कि अमरीका में इंग्लैण्ड में, फ़ारेन कंट्रीज में शिक्षा जो है यह प्राइवेट हाथों में है। गवर्नमेंट उस में हेलप नहीं करती है। हमारे मुल्क में भी डेमोक्रेटिक सैट अप है जिस तरह से कि डेमोक्रेटिक सैट-अप इंग्लैण्ड में है। लेकिन वहाँ उन मुल्कों में पब्लिक वाले ही शिक्षा को चलाते हैं, पब्लिक ही उनको रन करती है लेकिन हमारे मुल्क में गवर्नमेंट शिक्षा चलाती है। अगर आप इसको करना चाहते हैं तो कर सकते हैं। हमारे चागला साहब एक प्रतिष्ठित व्यक्ति हैं, योग्य एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अपने कार्यकाल में, अपनी जिन्दगी में वह इस चीज को कर जायें तो बहुत सुन्दर होगा। इससे देश में एकता आ जाएगी। जो झगड़े हैं वे समाप्त होंगे, डिवाइड एण्ड रूल की पालिसी खत्म होनी चाहिये। इस देश को हमें उठाना है। अंग्रेज जिस लैंगेसी को छोड़ गए हैं, उसको हमें समाप्त करना है। हिम्मत करके और बोलबली हम को राष्ट्रीय भाषा पर, एक नेशनल लैंगुएज पर जोर देना चाहिये और यह तभी हो सकता है जब आपका इस पर कण्ट्रोल हो। यह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की ड्यूटी है क्योंकि इस पार्लियामेंट ने राष्ट्रीय भाषा के बारे में एक साहसिक निर्णय लिया है, उसको माना है। हमने माना है कि हमारी एक राष्ट्रीय भाषा हो।

उसके साथ साथ हमने यह भी माना है कि हम श्री लैंगुएज फ़ार्मूले को लागू करेंगे। इसमें हम तभी सक्सेसफुल हो सकते हैं जबकि एजुकेशन पर आपका कण्ट्रोल हो और स्टेट्स अलग अलग रास्तों पर न चलें। आज होता यह है कि काश्मीर अलग से नीति अपनाता है, बंगाल अलग से, उत्तर प्रदेश अलग से। इस तरह से आप इस राष्ट्रीय भाषा के मसले को और श्री लैंगुएज फ़ार्मूले को अमल में नहीं ला सकते हैं। यह तभी हल हो सकता है जब हम स्टेट्स से शिक्षा के विषय को अपने हाथ में ले लें।

[श्री शिव नारायण]

मुझे बड़ी खुशी हुई जब मैंने शिक्षा मन्त्री को यह कहते हुए सुना कि जो हम शिक्षा में इनवैस्ट कर रहे हैं यह सबसे ज्यादा यूजफूल इनवैस्टमेंट है और इसका हम को फल अच्छा मिलेगा। हम आशावन्त हैं कि हम को अच्छी सन्तान मिलेगी, अच्छे-अच्छे विद्वान् मिलेंगे। मैं शर्मा जी की बात से सहमत हूँ कि यह जो थ्रिकिंग चल रहा है कि अपनी ही स्टेट का मैट्रिकुलेंट बाहर के पी० एच० डी० से बेहतर है, यह गलत है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। जो काबिल है उसको ही वह स्थान मिलना चाहिये। जहां तक हरिजनों का सम्बन्ध है मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इम्तिहान हो जाए, हरिजन और ब्राह्मण साथ-साथ उस में बैठ जायें, जो पास हो जाए, जिसके 65 परसेंट या जितने मार्क्स आपने प्रेसक्राइव किये हैं आ जायें, उसको आख बन्द करके ले लिया जाए। लेकिन आज होता क्या है? होता यह है कि हरिजन का लड़का जब 65 परसेंट मार्क्स ले भी लेता है तो वह जब इंटरव्यू के लिए जाता है तो उसकी छंटनी कर दी जाती है इस वजह से कि वह काला कलूटा होता है। मैं इस बात का पक्षपाती हूँ कि हम शिक्षा के स्तर को, शिक्षा के पैमाने को ऊंचा करें और उस पैमाने पर जो खरा उतरे उसको ही लें। हमें अच्छे विद्यार्थी चाहियें, अच्छे स्कालर चाहियें, हम को अच्छे पंडित चाहियें, अच्छे विद्वान् चाहियें, अच्छे डाक्टर चाहियें। आज हमको क्लर्कों की जरूरत नहीं है। देश की बागडोर जो सम्भाल सकें उनकी हमें आज जरूरत है। हमें देश को बनाना है। आपकी बदौलत अगर अच्छे शिक्षक हम को मिलेंगे तो देश आपको धन्यवाद देगा। आप हैं जो देश को द्रोणाचार्य जैसा गुरु दिला सकते हैं, अभिमन्यु पैदा कर सकते हैं, राम और कृष्ण जैसे लाल पैदा करके दे सकते हैं। जब आप ऐसा करें तभी देश में एकता आएगी और हम समझे कि शिक्षा का स्तर ऊंचा हो गया है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री विश्वनाथ पांडेय: हमारे डा० सिधवी साहब ने संविधान में संशोधन करने वाला जो विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया है, वह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है और एक गम्भीर विषय को उन्होंने इसके द्वारा इस सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है। उन्होंने सुझाव दिया है कि इस विधेयक को जनता की राय जानने के लिए प्रचारित किया जाए। ऐसा करना आवश्यक भी था। उनका सुझाव यह है कि शिक्षा के विषय को प्रान्तीय सूची में से निकाल कर समवर्ती सूची में डाल दिया जाए। इसका अर्थ यह है कि जो प्राथमिक शिक्षा है, जो माध्यमिक शिक्षा है, जो उच्चतर शिक्षा है और जो विश्वविद्यालयी शिक्षा है, यानी जो सारी शिक्षा है उस पर केन्द्र का अधिकार हो। यह एक गम्भीर विषय है। हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि उन्होंने विश्वविद्यालयी शिक्षा, उच्चतर शिक्षा को समवर्ती सूची में शामिल करने का प्रान्तों को सुझाव दिया था लेकिन बहुत से प्रान्तों ने उनके इस सुझाव का जवाब तक नहीं दिया और इस में वह समर्थ नहीं हो पाए हैं। पंजाब को छोड़कर बाकी कोई इस पर राजी नहीं हुआ है। मैं समझता हूँ कि शिक्षा का विषय ऐसा है जिस पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार होना चाहिये।

हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री साहब ने राधाकृष्णन् कमेटी के प्रतिवेदन का हवाला दिया है। एक सप्रू समिति बनी थी, उसने भी इस पर अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। लेकिन किसी ने ऐसा नहीं कहा है कि सारी जो शिक्षा है वह स्टेट के हाथों से निकाल कर केन्द्रीय सूची में रख दी जाए। फिर आप देखें कि जिस समय हमारा संविधान बना उसको बनाने वाले भी बड़े विद्वान लोग थे, होशियार लोग थे, काबिल लोग थे। उन्होंने इस बात को समझा था कि शिक्षा प्रान्तीय सरकारों का विषय रहेगा तो शिक्षा का विस्तार अधिक होगा। लेकिन देखने में आया है कि अभी तक उन्नीस बरस में जब से हमें स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त हुई है, शिक्षा के

क्षेत्र में उतनी उन्नति नहीं हो पाई है जितनी होनी चाहिये थी, शिक्षा का उतना विस्तार नहीं हो पाया है जितना होना चाहिये था। अभी तक 24 प्रतिशत लोग ही साक्षर हो पाए हैं।

यह भी देखने में आया है कि जहां तक अध्यापकों का सम्बन्ध है, प्राथमिक, माध्यमिक, उच्चतर अध्यापकों का सम्बन्ध है, उनके वेतन और सुविधायें भिन्न भिन्न हैं, उनमें बड़ी भिन्नता पाई जाती है, वे एक समान नहीं हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश का जो प्राथमिक शिक्षक है उसको उतनी तनख्वाह नहीं मिलती है जितनी कि बम्बई में शिक्षक को मिलती है या मध्य प्रदेश में मिलती है।

अगर यह विषय समवर्ती सूची में आ जाए तो सम्भव है कि देश में एकता स्थापित हो जाए, भावात्मक एकता आ जाए और जो कमियां शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में दृष्टिगोचर होती हैं और जिन को केन्द्रीय सरकार तथा प्रान्तीय सरकारें दूर करना चाहती हैं, वे दूर हो जायें। लेकिन इस में जो कठिनाई है और जिस को मैं महसूस कर रहा हूं यह है कि प्रान्तीय सरकारों के जो लोग हैं, जो शिक्षा मंत्री हैं वे समझते हैं कि ऐसा होने से हमारे अधिकारों का हनन हो जाएगा। शिक्षा आयोग ने भी इसके ऊपर अपना विचार प्रकट किया है। लेकिन उसने यह नहीं कहा है कि सारी शिक्षा जो है वह केवल अधिकार में ले लें। उसने विभिन्नता का जिक्र किया है। इस वास्ते यह एक गम्भीर प्रश्न है। इसका सम्बन्ध 48 करोड़ जनता से है, शिक्षा विशारदों से है, विश्वविद्यालय के उप-कुलपतियों से है। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूं कि इस पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार किया जाए और तभी कोई निर्णय लिया जाए। इसलिए मैंने अपना संशोधन दिया है। मैंने कहा है कि इस में अधिक समय न लगाया जाए, थोड़ा लगाया जाए और जल्दी से जल्दी लोगों के विचार मालूम किये जायें। मैं समझता हूं कि जब तक

शिक्षा का स्तर ऊंचा नहीं किया जाएगा तब तक अनुशासन देश में नहीं आ सकता है, विद्यार्थियों के अन्दर नहीं आ सकता है। अगर यह समझा जाता है कि प्रान्तीय विषय न रख कर इसको केन्द्रीय विषय बना देने से अनुशासन आ जाएगा तो यह धारणा भी निराधार है। इसका कारण यह है कि अलोगढ़ और बनारस विश्वविद्यालय जो कि केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालय हैं वहां पर भी अनुशासनहीनता पाई जाती है। जहां तक अनुशासन कायम करने का प्रश्न है वह तो सक्रिय कदम उठाने से ही कायम हो सकती है, सही निर्णय ले कर और सही तरीके से उसको कार्यान्वित करके ही कायम हो सकती है।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो डा० सिधवी जी का जो प्रस्ताव है कि इसको प्रचारित किया जाए, उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूं।

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : इस बिल को पेश करने के लिए सिधवी साहब हमारी बहुत बहुत मुबारकबाद के मुस्तहिक हैं। शिक्षा मंत्री जी ने भी उनकी इस बात को माना है। लेकिन कहने से कुछ नहीं होता है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि कोई सक्रिय कदम उठाया जाए ताकि पता चले कि आप कुछ करना चाहते हैं।

रुड़की यूनिवर्सिटी आज दुनिया की सब से बड़ी यूनिवर्सिटी है। संसार भर में कोई इंजीनियरिंग यूनिवर्सिटी इतनी अच्छी तालीम नहीं दे रही है जितनी अच्छी वह दे रही है। उस यूनिवर्सिटी को आपने उत्तर प्रदेश के हाथ में छोड़ रखा है। आज हमारे शिक्षा उपमंत्रि महोदय यह संकल्प लें कि उस यूनिवर्सिटी को हम आज से ही अपने हाथ में लेते हैं। केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा जब वह अनुशासित होगी तब उसका नाम और भी ऊंचा होगा। आज संसार के किसी दूसरे कोने में इतने एफिशेंट इंजीनियर पदा नहीं हो रहे हैं।

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री भक्त बर्षन) : उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार को तो पटाइये।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने क्या आप सारे काम पूछ कर करते हैं। क्या उससे हर बात में मशिवरा ले कर आप चलते हैं? आप टैंक्स बढ़ाते हैं तो क्या उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार से मशिवरा ले कर बढ़ाते हैं? शराब खुलेआम मिल रही है इसको बन्द करने के लिए, शराबबन्दी लागू करने के लिए तो आप उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार से मशिवरा नहीं लेते हैं और इस अच्छे काम को करने के लिए आप उससे मशिवरा लेना चाहते हैं?

यह वह यूनिवर्सिटी है जिस का इतिहास यह बताता है कि आज तक डिसिप्लिन के खिलाफ वहां एक पत्ता तक नहीं हिला है। उस यूनिवर्सिटी का इतिहास यह है कि सौ साल में—वह यूनिवर्सिटी तो अभी बनी है, लेकिन थामसन कालेज आफ इंजीनियरिंग को बने सौ साल से ज्यादा हो गए हैं—आज तक वहां इतना भी नहीं हुआ है कि कहीं कोई नारा भी लग जाये या कहीं कोई शोरो-गुल हो जाये। सारे संसार में उस यूनिवर्सिटी की प्रतिष्ठा है। हम ने हर एक फ़ॉल्ड में लोग पैदा किये हैं। उड़ीसा के गवर्नर, श्री खीसला, हमारी यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस-चांसलर थे। अमरीका, इंग्लैंड और दुनिया के दूसरे देशों में कोई ऐसा लाइन नहीं है, जहां हमारे ग्रैजुएट्स काम नहीं कर रहे हैं।

शिक्षा मंत्री जी यह संकल्प लें कि वह आज से ही इस बात की कोशिश करेंगे कि इस यूनिवर्सिटी को सेंटर के मातहत लिया जाये।

उस यूनिवर्सिटी के यशस्वी वाइस-चांसलर, श्री घनानन्द पांडे, ने यह वादा किया है, यह संकल्प किया है कि एक साल के बाद हर एक टेक्निकल नालेज हिन्दी में दिया जायेगा। यह सब से बड़ा काम है। आज तक कहा जाता था कि टेक्नालोजी की शिक्षा हिन्दी में नहीं दी जा सकती है। लेकिन हमारे वाइस-चांसलर ने एलान किया है कि प्रत्येक टेक्नालोजी की शिक्षा हिन्दी में दी जायेगी। अब मेरी समझ में आ रहा है कि अगर इस

देश के लोग कदम उठावें, तो एक साल में श्री भक्त दर्शन की इच्छा पूरी हो सकती है। लेकिन इच्छा करने मात्र से क्या हो सकता है। जिस तरह से हमारे वाइस-चांसलर कोशिश कर रहे हैं, उसी तरह से गवर्नमेंट भी कोशिश करे। जब तक एक भाषा में शिक्षा नहीं दी जायेगी, तब तक सरकार किस तरह से सार्वदेशिक सत्ता कायम कर सकती है? सार्वदेशिक सत्ता तभी कायम हो सकती है, जब कि एक भाषा में शिक्षा दी जाये।

आज हमारी शिक्षा की स्थिति यह है कि अगर बी० ए० और पी० सी० एस० इत्यादी परोक्षाओं में बैठने वाले लड़कों से पूछा जाता है कि वे विनोबा भावे के बारे में क्या जानते हैं, तो वे जवाब देते हैं, कि गांधी जी की धर्म-पत्नी का नाम विनोबा भावे था। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी की शिक्षा एक्सैटिक है। अंग्रेजी की शिक्षा शरीर पर निकले हुए फोड़े, नासूर या जखम के समान है। अगर हमारे देश में अंग्रेजी की तालीम नष्ट होगी, तब यहां पर सुधार होगा, वरना हमारा देश अधःपतन को ओर चला जायेगा।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य उस विषय के बारे में बोलें, जो कि हाउस के सामने है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : अगर हमारा देश एजूकेशन को सार्वदेशिक जवान में ग्रहण नहीं करेगा, तो यहां पर सार्वदेशिक सत्ता कायम नहीं हो सकेगी। हमारे यहां अलग अलग डफलियां बजती रहेंगी। पांज हजार मील दूर की जिस जुबान ने हम को ढाई सौ बरस तक गुलाम बनाए रखा, जो आज भी एशिया को गुलाम करना चाहती है, अगर वह जुबान इस देश में रह गई, तो हम यहां पर सार्वदेशिक सत्ता कायम नहीं कर सकते हैं।

श्री भक्त दर्शन से मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस देश में आर्थिक विकास और बच्चों का विकास तभी हो सकता है, जब कि हमारी

तमाम योजनायें देश की भाषाओं में आयें । इस लिए हमारी शिक्षा और अन्य सब काम देश की भाषाओं में किया जाना चाहिए ।

मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सेंटर की यूनिवर्सिटीज, बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी और अलीगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी, का डिस्प्लिन दूसरी यूनिवर्सिटीज से अच्छा नहीं है ।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय उस विषय पर बोलें, जो कि हाउस के सामने है । वह विषय यह है कि इस वक्त तालीम का मसला कुछ रियासतों के पास है और कुछ केन्द्र के पास है और माननीय सदस्य यह चाहते हैं कि एजुकेशन को कानक्रेट लिस्ट में रखा जाये ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : अगर सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अपनी इन दो यूनिवर्सिटियों में सुधार कर के दिखा दे, तो सारा भारत अपनी सब यूनिवर्सिटियों को ब्रेडइक सेंटर के हाथ में सौंपने के लिए तैयार हो जायेगा । आज दोनों यूनिवर्सिटियों का डिस्प्लिन खराब है । वहां पर जलूस निकलते हैं । वहां पर पुलिस पड़ी हुई है । यूनिवर्सिटी कैम्पस का वह हाल है, जो कि डाकुओं के घरों के आस-पास होता है । ऐसे मालूम होता है कि जैसे वाइस-चांसलर डाकुओं के बीच में एड्रेस करते जाते हैं । इस हालत को बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जा सकता है ।

सब से पहली जरूरत इस बात की है कि इस बारे में गुडविल का परिचय दिया जाये, क्योंकि हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने वहां पर जा कर गुडविल के बचन कहे थे । यह सरकार पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में कहती है कि हम उस के साथ ताशकंद स्पिरिट में काम करेंगे । वह चीन के बारे में यह कहती है कि हम उस के साथ पंचशील स्पिरिट में व्यवहार करेंगे । नागा होस्टाइल्ज के बारे में यह सरकार कहती है कि उन के साथ प्रेम-भरा वर्ताव किया जायेगा । लेकिन यह सरकार अलीगढ़

यूनिवर्सिटी के बंगुनाह लड़कों को फांसी देने के लिये तैयार है । दो साल से उन को तालीम खराब हो रही है, उन के कैरियर खराब हो रहे हैं । जैसा कि मैं ने अभी कहा है, सरकार को वहां पर गुडविल का परिचय देना चाहिए ।

अन्त में मैं यह कहां चाहता हूँ कि सरकार सारी यूनिवर्सिटीज को अपने हाथ में ले, ताकि देश में सार्वदेशिक सत्ता कायम हो जाये और एजुकेशन को केन्द्रीय सबजेक्ट बनाया जाये ।

Shri Warior (Trichur): Did Shri Yashpal Singh support the motion?

Mr. Chairman: He can ask him later.

श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़ (फतेहपुर) : सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, डा० सिधवी, जो इस विधेयक को लाए हैं और माननीय मंत्री, श्री चागला, ने जो उस का समर्थन किया है, उस के लिए वे दोनों ही बधाई के पात्र हैं ।

यह विषय काफी दिनों से इस सदन में उठाया जा रहा है । हमारे देश में कभी भी एक राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा-प्रणाली नहीं हो सकती है, अगर उस का नियंत्रण केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा न हो । अगर श्री चागला वाकई सच्चाई और ईमानदारी से इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करते हैं, तो मैं उन को एक मुझाव देना चाहता हूँ । इस वक्त सीभाग्य से देश के सभी प्रान्तों में कांग्रेस का शासन और मुख्य मंत्री हैं । अगर इस विषय के बारे में पार्टी स्तर पर, उस की उच्चतम संस्था, वर्किंग कमेटी या हाई कमांड में, निर्णय कर लिया जाये और फिर प्रान्तों को इस सम्बन्ध में अंकुश जारी कर दिया जाये, तो यह काम आसानी से हो सकता है । अभी हाल ही में हम लोगों ने देखा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के अध्यक्ष, श्री कामराज, ने पंजाबी सूबे के बारे में वर्किंग कमेटी में एक निर्णय लिया और उस के बाद सरकार ने उस निर्णय को माना ।

[श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़]

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में टेक्निकली जो बाधा पड़ रही है, वह यह है कि प्रान्तीय सरकारों के द्वारा इस सुझाव को मानने के प्रस्ताव पारित नहीं हो रहे हैं। हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री ने स्पष्ट कहा है कि केवल एक प्रान्त, पंजाब, को छोड़ कर सब प्रान्तों ने इस प्रस्ताव को मानने से इन्कार कर दिया है। मैं यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर शासक दल के द्वारा कोई निर्णय ले कर प्रान्तीय दलों को अंकुश दिया जाये, तो इस सुझाव को कार्यान्वित किया जा सकता है। इस में कोई दो रायें नहीं हैं—सारा सदन इस से सहमत है—कि देश में एक राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा प्रणाली तब तक सम्भव नहीं है, जब तक कि शिक्षा पर केन्द्र का नियंत्रण न हो।

माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री ने यह कहा है कि हम तो कांफरेंसिज आयोजित करते हैं, जिन में राज्यों के शिक्षा मंत्रियों को बुलाते हैं। उन कांफरेंसिज में प्रस्ताव पारित होते हैं, लेकिन वे सभी प्रस्ताव पारित हो कर केवल कागज पर रह जाते हैं और स्टेट्स के द्वारा कभी भी उन पर अमल-दरामद नहीं होता है।

अभी डिग्री कालेजों और यूनिवर्सिटीज के अध्यापकों के वेतन के सम्बन्ध में डा० कोठारी की रिपोर्ट आई। मुझे बड़े दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि बहुत सी स्टेट्स ने यह कहा है कि चूँकि हमारे पास धन का अभाव है, इस लिए हम इस रिपोर्ट की सिफारिशों को कार्यान्वित नहीं कर सकते हैं। अगर शिक्षा को कान्फ्रंट लिस्ट पर रखा जाये, तो वह बाधा दूर हो सकती है, जो कि माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री जी ने बताई है, अगर शासक दल के द्वारा इस बात पर निर्णय ले कर प्रान्तों को अंकुश भेज दिया जाये।

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): I congratulate Mr. Singhvi on bringing this Bill. National integration is the call of the day. Without that I do not think our nation

can survive for long. We must have our roots in the soil of this land, and the Centre cannot escape its duty over the States, when it finances them, of using its control, if I may say so, in shaping the future of India.

The future lies with the youngmen of India. After ten years we may not be here. If we want to build up India, we must bring up the youngsters in a proper and fundamental way, so that the future of India may be built.

At the present day I am sorry to note that our youngsters everywhere are not following discipline, and I am afraid to think what will happen after ten years if these children are brought up in an undisciplined atmosphere and without a national way of thinking.

I am a believer in our heritage. We should not lose our living contact with our heritage. If proper guidance of our heritage is given to our children, I am quite sure they can be as proud as we are today of our nation. The country has enough equipment in knowledge to meet the many challenges of life; only it has to be given in the right way and a proper spirit of love and affection.

What we have noticed very lately in Kashmir, in your own State. Mr. Chairman, is that certain textbooks were given in a different shape, and that has brought out a challenge from the House. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri had also brought it to the notice of the State Government, and the Government of India has taken note of it. So, if there is control of the Union Government over all these State matters, National integration can come out as desired.

My own State of Gujarat is opposing the study of English. It is a very debatable point. If there is a uniform policy all over the states I do not think the students of my state will suffer for lack of education of English. Though English is a language of the

world and it opens the windows to knowledge, we must have a proper national language of our own. We cannot escape from our duties because no where in the world, be it in China or Germany, training in English language is given to them. They have their own language and they are proud of that. It is time we had a national language like Hindi. We are behaving like imps and monkeys having lost our traditions. We must liquidate ourselves from that thought. National integration through education is the only medium for building up India and therefore I suggest that this Bill be circulated for eliciting opinion. I am quite sure the hon. Minister will take note of this and insist on some sort of legislation for all the States of India.

श्री पद्मानाथजी सास्त्री (बिजनौर) :

समापति जी, जिस उपयुक्त समय में डाक्टर एम० एच० सिन्घवी ने आज यह विधेयक सदन में प्रस्तुत किया है उसके लिए सचमुच ही वह हम सब की ओर से बधाई के पात्र हैं। राष्ट्रीय एकता का प्रश्न आज देश के सामने है और राष्ट्रीय एकता के लिये शिक्षा में एकता बहुत आवश्यक है। डाक्टर साहब ने इस विधेयक को प्रस्तुत करने न केवल देश के शिक्षा शास्त्रियों का अपितु भारत सरकार का भी ध्यान इस ओर आकषित किया है। साथ ही बधाई के पात्र हैं वर्तमान शिक्षा मंत्री श्री चागला भी जिन्होंने डाक्टर साहब के इस विधेयक को स्वीकार करके अपनी सहमति व्यक्त की। पर एक बात समझ में नहीं आती कि जब केन्द्रीय शिक्षा मंत्री श्री चागला इस विधेयक की भावना से सहमत हैं तो फिर उनके मार्ग में रुकावट क्या है? श्री चागला की सहमति से एक ओर बात प्रकाश में आती है और वह यह कि प्रान्तीय सरकारें आज इतनी हावी हो गई हैं केन्द्रीय सरकार पर जो केन्द्रीय सरकार किसी अपने निर्णय को या अपने मन की बात को प्रान्तीय सरकारों से नहीं मनवा पा रही है। उसका एक सब से

बड़ा प्रमाण यह है कि शिक्षा को जिस को कि केन्द्रीय सरकार चाहती है कि प्रान्तीय सरकारें उसके साथ मिल कर केन्द्रीय विषय बनाने में योग दे, प्रान्तीय सरकारें उससे सहमत नहीं हैं। केवल एक छोटे से राज्य पंजाब को छोड़ कर। और पंजाब ने भी जिस समय सहमति दी थी उस समय पंजाब का आकार प्रकार दूसरा था। नहीं कहा जा सकता कि आज का पंजाब उससे सहमत हो सकेगा या नहीं हो सकेगा? परन्तु शिक्षा को केन्द्र का विषय न बनाने से हानियाँ क्या हो रही हैं, इस के दो तीन उदाहरण विशेष रूप से मैं देना चाहूँगा।

अभी कुछ दिन पहले की बात है, उप शिक्षा मंत्री श्री भक्त दर्शन जी को अच्छी तरह से स्मरण होगा, उन्होंने इस विषय में कुछ प्रयास भी किये। उत्तर प्रदेश के शिक्षकों की स्थिति आर्थिक दृष्टि से सारे देश में सब से अधिक दयनीय है। उसके लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार को यह कहा कि आर्थिक दृष्टि से जितनी भी कमी रहेगी केन्द्रीय सरकार पूरा करेगी उत्तर प्रदेश के प्राइमरी स्कूल के अध्यापकों को सौ रुपये से कम वेतन न दिया जाये। इसी प्रकार हायर सेकेंड्री स्कूलों के अध्यापक थे, विश्वविद्यालय स्तर के अध्यापक थे उनका वेतन मान सम्भालने के लिये भी पूरे सहयोग का आश्वासन दिया, लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकारके आश्वासन देने के बाद भी अभी उत्तर प्रदेश के अध्यापकों की दयनीय स्थिति है। उसका ही कुछ परिचय आने वाली 22 तारीख को इसी संसद भवन के सामने होने वाले प्रदर्शन से मिलेगा। इससे पता चलता है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के भरोसा देने के बाद भी प्रान्तीय सरकार केन्द्रीय सरकार का साथ नहीं देना चाहती। कुछ दिन पहले आपके ही राज्य, काश्मीर के बारे में चर्चा हो कर चुकी है। 18 साल से किस प्रकार की पाठ्य पुस्तकें काश्मीर राज्य में चलती रहीं? किसी ने किसी प्रकार का ध्यान नहीं दिया। अब से कुछ समय पहले

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

एक युवक एडवोकेट ने इन पुस्तकों को जला कर इधर ध्यान आकर्षित किया। काश्मीर सरकार ने बजाय इसके कि उस युवक को बर्खास्त देती, या उसकी आभारी होती, डी० आई० आर० में उसे अरेस्ट किया। बहुत कुछ प्रयत्न करने के बाद वह भाग तो हटा दिये गये। लेकिन कोई क्लास इस समय वहाँ ऐसी नहीं है कि जिसमें ऐसी पुस्तकें न पढ़ाई जाती हों जिनमें कि प्रत्यक्ष अथवा अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से भारत के विरोध की भावना या साम्यवाद को प्रोत्साहन देने की भावना न हो। इसी से अनुमान लगा सकते हैं कि शिक्षा के विषय में किस प्रकार की स्वच्छन्दता होती जा रही है।

ऐसी ही स्थिति मद्रास राज्य में भी है। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने त्रिभाषी फारमूला लागू करने के लिए राज्य सरकारों को लिखा। लगभग सभी राज्यों ने सहमति व्यक्त की। लेकिन मद्रास सरकार केन्द्रीय सरकार के इस निर्णय से आज तक सहमत नहीं हो सकी। ऐसी स्थिति में यदि डाक्टर सिवबी सरकार को कहते हैं कि इस विधेयक को परिचालित ही न किया जाय बल्कि इस विषय में दृढ़ता से निर्णय लिया जाये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि राष्ट्रीय एकता की दृष्टि में बहुत बड़ा कार्य कर रहे हैं।

एक अन्तिम बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि कम से कम उच्च शिक्षा तो केन्द्र का विषय तत्काल होनी चाहिए। कुछ दिन पहले जैसा मैंने सदन में एक विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया था कि संविधान बनाने समय हम से दो भूलें हुईं। एक भूल तो यह हुई कि शिक्षा को राज्यों का विषय बना दिया और दूसरी यह हुई कि हमने राज्यों का भाषावादी निर्माण स्वीकार किया। अगर हम प्रारम्भ से ही यूनिटरी फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट बनाते और केन्द्र की दीवारों के अन्दर यह देश होता तो जो यह प्रान्तों के तर-इतरह के

झगड़े हो रहे हैं, उन से राष्ट्रीय एकता न टूटती। मुझे विश्वास है कि सरकार पहले न सही, अब ठोकर खाकर इस विषय में भी अवश्य ही गम्भीरता से विचार करेगी।

Shri Warrior: Mr. Chairman, Sir I would not have intervened in this debate; seeing that there is all-round support to Dr. Singhyi's suggestion in the Bill, and the attitude of the Government also who have accepted it, I felt very apprehensive about the whole situation. I would not have for that matter opposed something coming from such a distinguished friend as Dr. Singhyi. He is the most harmless man in this House. But I would venture in all earnestness to suggest that such things should not be rushed through in a hurry. Although Dr. Singhyi and friends like him are young in politics, we had the bitter experience of rushing certain things in the pre-Independence spirit, the bad and dangerous effects of which and the most dangerous effects of which the present generation is just now experiencing.

It is a very basic question. When Shri Prakash Vir Shastri touched upon that, then my apprehensions grew tenfold. The Constitution provides three different lists: one the Union list, the second the concurrent list and the third the State list. When planning came, it has become defunct as far as the States are concerned. Inroads after inroads are made into the autonomy of the States in one way or the other. After all, the superstructure is finance and economics. And everything has to revolve round that pivot: social or educational or cultural or any other activity of human beings simply revolve round that pivot. We cannot avoid it. It became unavoidable for the progress of the country. We accepted that, but that does not mean that India is going to dogs if all the States are keeping their autonomy in their own sector or sphere. There is a very

dangerous tendency in India for more and more unitary system of government and eating into the vitals of the federal concept.

I quite agree, sitting in this Central Parliament, when everybody is so protected and is immune from all such things and so I can also agree and say, let us have national and emotional integration, this integration, that integration and all that. But some of us are very sick of these slogans. Everywhere, in season and out of season, all these things are brought in. Why? India is more proud of its diversity in unity; of its unity in diversity. If there is any attempt, either open or hidden, to change this pattern all of a sudden, I must tell you that they are the enemies of national integration, of emotional integration and national unity. So, do not take such a step hurriedly. Let us consider it.

It is a fact, as Mr. Chagla himself has said, that many of the States except one or two are against education being made a concurrent subject. I know that the teaching staff in the higher rungs of education are all for it becoming a concurrent subject, simply because they have no left or right. They just want higher salaries. But shall that be the overriding consideration in making a new departure from the accepted concepts of a federal Constitution for India? I think that is very dangerous. I give this warning that unless we carry the States along with us, we should not rush things like this making it possible for the separatist and fissiparous tendencies to raise their ugly heads over and over again on the destinies of the country.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Sir, I am in entire agreement with my friend who has just spoken. I have been wondering for some time why it was that since this new Education Minister has come, he has begun to toy with this idea. He was good enough to admit frankly in one of his pub-

lic meetings that most of the States do not agree with him and he did not wish to force their hands. It would be very dangerous indeed if we get into this habit of changing the Constitution first of all so very frequently. It is very unfortunate that so many of our colleagues go on thinking in terms of amending the Constitution only and not amending so many other laws from which so many evils have arisen. Anyhow, since this Bill has been brought forward, I wish to go on record that I for one am very much opposed to this suggestion. It is wrong in conception. It is wrong to the Constitution itself.

Many things can be said against this proposition, but I would be content with saying that if we do not want the language problem to be turned into a devil, an agency for disintegration of this nation, if we do not want our educational curricula to be so developed as to become a brain-washing machine from the top, if we do not want our educational services to become once again as in the past a kind of spiritual and intellectual dictator, the present system is the best and we should not tamper with it. There are the legislatures and cabinets in the States. They have had an opportunity of considering this matter even after the Constitution has been passed. As the Minister himself has said, they are unwilling to accept this suggestion from the Centre. Therefore, even the Education Commission did not dare to suggest that it should be made a concurrent subject in spite of the attitude of the States.

Under these circumstances, I would advise the Government not to rush in where angels fear to tread.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Sir, at the far end of the debate, some of my esteemed friends have raised a voice which is different from what has been stated upto this time. I want my friends first to see what the motion before the House is. The

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

motion is to circulate the Bill for public opinion. The Bill only seeks to make higher education a concurrent subject; it does not seek to take away the jurisdiction of the States over this subject. If it is made a concurrent subject, the Central Government will have the power to deal with it along with the States also; it is not that the States jurisdiction is taken away.

My main reason for supporting this Bill is this. If education is to be given, especially higher education, it should be given with a purpose. What I want among the boys who have the benefit of higher education is that they should develop a certain trait or character. They should believe in the integrity of India as a whole. They must also have a wider outlook and not a partial or parochial outlook, because they have to acquire knowledge for the sake of development of their own country. Therefore, a wider outlook is necessary if we have to get benefit out of them. We have heard it many times, said on the floor of this House, that whenever the Government suggests that certain doctors are required to go and practise in the mofussil districts they are not willing to do that. They do not know how to do that. They are brought up in such a way that they have not developed in them any real love for the people or service of the people. They only go for education for the sake of making it a career for themselves and nothing else.

We want to keep India a self-respecting nation in the world. For that, our young boys who get education should realise that it is their responsibility not as members of certain States but as a part of the bigger State of India. In order to create that kind of attitude in them, it is better that they are brought in contact with those administrators and those public men who have got a broader outlook. If you make education a Concurrent subject, then you

establish a contact with those institutions and people who have got a wider outlook. In that way not only the standard of education will go up but you will also create a certain character, a certain outlook, an outlook to look upon others with a brotherly feeling. That attitude has been lacking in this country. I believe this is a first step that we can take.

I congratulate Dr. Singhvi for having brought this Bill. I also congratulate the Minister of Education for having agreed to accept the motion for circulation of this Bill. I believe when the Bill comes back there will be a number of suggestions. Then it will be time for Shri Ranga and Shri Warior to discuss those things with others.

श्री बाल्मीकी (खुजा) : सभापति महोदय, डॉ० मिश्र के इस विधेयक का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। इस विधेयक के माध्यम से हमारे देश के शिक्षा शास्त्रियों का तथा देश के नेताओं का शिक्षा पद्धति व दशा की ओर ध्यान तो आकर्षित होगा। यद्यपि शिक्षा आयोग ने कुछ सिफारिशें दी हैं और उन सिफारिशों का एक प्रभाव भी होगा, लेकिन शिक्षा आयोग की सिफारिशें कुछ ऐसी हैं कि जिन्हें मैं बहुत शक्तिशाली नहीं कह सकता हूँ। उनमें लंगड़ापन है। कम से कम इस विधेयक के द्वारा कुछ विचार जाने जायेंगे और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसे जन साधारण की राय जानने के लिये भेजा जाना कोई बुरी बात नहीं है। संविधान की जिस भावना को प्रकट किया गया है, मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि कोई उसमें विशेष अन्तर लाने की बात है। केवल इतनी सी बात है कि कम से कम शिक्षा का जो स्तर आज गिर रहा है उसमें उठाव और उच्चता आ सके और शिक्षा की भावना को ऐसे प्रदर्शित किया जाए जिससे देश की सभ्यता-संस्कृति और विचारधारा की ओर नहीं बल्कि इस प्रकार से वे जो कुछ भी विचार-परम्परा देश में लाना चाहते हैं

उसे ला सकें, और प्रकट भी कर सकें। साथ ही साथ देश की जो एकता है, देश की जो भावात्मक एकता है उसको दृढ़ से दृढ़तर बनाने के लिए शिक्षा व शिक्षा पद्धति का इस्तेमाल किया जा सके और उसको एकरूपता की दृष्टि से कैसे लाया जा सकता है, इसके बारे में भी विचार हमारे सामने आ सकेंगे।

मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि इस समय प्रश्न विद्यार्थियों और शिक्षकों का है। प्रश्न दोनों अलग अलग हैं। विद्यार्थियों में भी एक उच्चत्व आए, शिक्षकों में भी एक जीवन धारा आए, इसका हमें ध्यान रखना है। आज की शिक्षा पद्धति से हमारे विद्यार्थियों में वह आचरण, वह मदविचार जो आने चाहिये अपनी सभ्यता और संस्कृति की महानता के बारे में, देश माता के प्रति भावना को देखते हुए, वे नहीं आ रहे हैं। शिक्षकों के अन्दर भी वह भावना जो एक प्रकार से अपने शिक्षार्थियों के प्रति होनी चाहिये, नहीं है और न ही पैदा हो रही है।

इस बिल को पब्लिक की राय जानने के लिए प्रचारित किया जा रहा है। मेरे मित्रों ने कुछ विचार सदन के सामने रखे हैं और उन पर अवश्य विचार होगा, ऐसा मैं महसूस करता हूँ। मैं अब केवल इतना चाहता हूँ कि शिक्षा का विषय राज्यों और केन्द्र का साझा विषय हो। कुछ विषय जो इसमें प्रदर्शित किए गए हैं, उन में कोई अन्तर नहीं आता है। मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि शिक्षा के स्तर की ओर भी आपका ध्यान जाए और उसको ऊंचा उठाए जाए। जो प्राइमरी शिक्षा है, जो माध्यमिक शिक्षा है वह राज्य का विषय हो लेकिन उच्चतर जो शिक्षा है, उच्चस्तरीय जो शिक्षा है वह केन्द्र का विषय हो। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि उच्चस्तरीय विद्यालयों के जो शिक्षक हैं,

उनकी जो दशा है, उसमें भी सुधार होना चाहिये। उनके अन्दर जो असन्तोष पाया जाता है, उसको दूर किया जाए और ऐसा करने के लिए कोई प्रभावी कदम उठाये जायें। मंत्री महोदय यहां बैठे हुए हैं। वह स्वयं जानते हैं कि उनके अन्दर असन्तोष है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उनके इस असन्तोष को दूर किया जाए।

जहां तक प्राइमरी शिक्षकों का सम्बन्ध है उनको सी रुपये से कम वेतन कहीं भी नहीं मिलना चाहिये। इस प्रकार से माध्यमिक विद्यालयों के शिक्षकों के जो वेतन क्रम हैं वे भी बढ़ाये जाने चाहियें। उच्चस्तरीय शिक्षकों के अन्दर वेतनक्रमों को लेकर जो असन्तोष है, उसको भी दूर किया जाना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं यह अवश्य चाहता हूँ कि इस विधेयक के माध्यम से सरकार अपना ब्रैन वाशिंग करे। सभ्यता और संस्कृति की महानता को दृष्टि में रखते हुए, भावात्मक एकता को दृष्टि में रखते हुए, उच्चतम प्रतिभाव और देश माता के प्रति सम्मान व प्रेम प्रदर्शित कैसे हो, इसको दृष्टि में रखते हुए, क्या हो सकता है और आगे क्या कदम उठाये जा सकते हैं, इस पर विचार करें और उन कदमों को सुचारु रूप से उठाये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate. I am particularly grateful to Shri M. C. Chagla, who has supported the underlying principle of the Bill and who has supported the motion for circulation of the Bill for public opinion.

Today there is a chaotic situation which prevails in the field of education and this is very aptly underlined by the hon. Members who have

[Dr L. M. Singhvi]

spoken. Indeed, I was sorry to find that my hon. friend, Shri Warrior and my hon. friend, Professor Ranga, chose to strike a somewhat discordant note in this debate. I think it would have to be conceded that it is too late in the day for the States right in their pristine form to prevail in our country. It is too late in the day to claim that any citizen in this country is sick of the slogan of emotional integration as indeed my hon. friend, Shri Warrior, I regret to say, did claim.

Shri Warrior: What it is dragged in, in season and out of season.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I am sorry to say that perhaps this opposition from Professor Ranga and Shri Warrior was actuated by wrong assumptions. This Bill does not seek to dispense with the federal framework of government in this country. This Bill does not seek to do away with the States as units of political organisation in this country. This Bill does not even seek seriously to undermine their functioning powers in the field of education. All that it does is to bring about concurrence in the field of education which in substance already obtains.

My hon. friend, Shri Warrior, said that this country has always prided itself on diversity in unity but he forgot to emphasise the claims of unity in diversity because the slogan of this country has always been, the basic adherence of this country has always been to unity in diversity and diversity in unity. Too long have the claims of diversity prevailed. Let there now be an occasion for the claims of unity also to prevail in this country.

I do not think that it was right for my hon. friend, Shri Warrior, to say that we are rushing into this piece of legislation. Indeed, cautiously, carefully, I thought it best to move a motion for its circulation for public opinion so that the issues are properly

ly formulated, the democratic process of debate in the market-place in this country, in the segments where it is necessary to have such debates, takes place.

I think that it is not enough for this country or for this House or for the Education Minister to accept the underlying principle of the Bill. As a matter of fact, we will have to crusade for the acceptance of this Bill here and elsewhere. I think it is very necessary to do so if we are to evolve an integrated education plan in this country if we have to bring about that unity of the country which the founding fathers of our democratic republic had dreamed of.

I would like to conclude by saying that I hope that the collective responsibility principle would be appreciated by the Government as a whole and that obligations that flow from collective responsibility will be appreciated by all members of the Government. If that principle is properly understood, I hope that Shri Chagla's acceptance of the underlying principle of the Bill will be accepted and canvassed for by all members of the Cabinet. If that is so, I have no doubt that the Bill will ultimately be accepted in the country as a whole.

It is necessary that the massive monolithic power of the Congress Party in this country is used for the good of the nation, in this particular respect for securing concurrence in the field of education. This is what the burden of the song of Shri Chagla is. Let this be his abiding and enduring contribution to the cause of education in this country. Let this be our distinct contribution to the cause of education in this country.

I hope that the House will support the motion that I have moved for circulation of the Bill for eliciting public opinion.

Mr. Chairman: Before I put this motion to the vote of the House I have

to ask Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey if he is pressing his amendment.

Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey: I do not want to press it.

सभापति महोदय : क्या मैं समझूँ कि एवान विदड़ा करने की इजाजत देता है ?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : जी हाँ ।

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman: Now, the question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 14th November, 1966."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: We will take up the next Bill. Dr. Mahadeva Prasad. He is absent. Shri Kamath.

17.30 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of Article 352)
by Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Mr. Chairman, I rise to move:

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

This Bill seeks to amend article 352 of the Constitution.

The consideration of this Bill today is, I have no hesitation in saying, singularly appropriate because the Emergency which was proclaimed by the President on the 26th October, 1962 continues in force even today when the Government has even partially given up the powers that the State Governments and the Central Government got under the Defence of India

Act and the Rules which flowed from the Proclamation of Emergency.

It baffles my comprehension as to why, when the situation has changed radically, when there is no active aggression on our frontiers, when the danger that beset us in October, 1962 is less grave than it was before, this Proclamation has not been revoked. It is true that we are preparing ourselves against the aggression by China and Pakistan, as we learnt from the statement of the Defence Minister the other day. But article 352 of the Constitution whose amendment we have before us stipulates that only when there is an external aggression or an internal disturbance, the President is empowered to proclaim Emergency. We readily granted all the powers that the Government needed in November, 1962, when the Defence of India Bill was passed by the House, and assured the Government that, God forbid, if there was an aggression again from China or Pakistan or jointly by China and Pakistan, the Parliament will have no hesitation and will readily grant all the powers to the Government that they might need.

Sir, it is against the conscience of the Government, against the needs of the times, that the Emergency should not be revoked today, 3½ years after it was proclaimed. This matter has been broached in the House times without number—I do not remember how many times—during the last year or more. It has been brought in the form of Questions, it has been referred to in the course of debates, and yet the Government has consistently and uniformly refused to give any valid reasons, satisfactory reasons, convincing reasons, as to why the Emergency proclaimed in October, 1962 should not be revoked.

The executive does clothe itself with extra-ordinary powers, comes to Parliament for extraordinary powers. It did so in November, 1962 when Pandit Nehru himself moved the historic Resolution, and then also the Defence of India Bill which was passed by