

**PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING
OF
THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD
OF
EDUCATION**

Held at New Delhi in August 1967



NIEPA DC



D06227

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
1968

Sub. National Systems **U** mt.
National Institute of Edu cation:
Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New De lhi-110029
DOC. No...D...6222...
Date...8/2/79...

CONTENTS

	PAGES	
INTRODUCTION	1	
II. INAUGURAL SESSION		
<i>Welcome Address by Shri P. N. Kirpal, Secretary to the Ministry of Education.</i>	8	
<i>Inaugural Address by Dr. Triguna Sen, Union Minister of Education and Chairman of the Board.</i>	6	
<i>Vote of Thanks by Shri G. K. Chandiramani, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Education.</i>	12	
III. GENERAL DISCUSSION		
<i>Item No. 1</i>	To record appreciation of the services rendered by those who have ceased to be members of the Board since the last meeting and to welcome new members.	15
<i>Item No. 2</i>	To report that the proceedings of the thirty-second meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education held at Chandigarh in October 1965 were sent to the State Governments and the Union Territories.	16
<i>Item No. 3</i>	To consider the reports of the Education Commission and of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education and to suggest a draft statement on the National Policy on Education for consideration by Government of India.	16
<i>Item Nos. 4, 5 & 6</i>	To consider report of Standing Committees on School and Social Education, Higher Education (including Science Education and Education for Agriculture & Industry) Educational Administration, Finance and Implementation.	17
IV. DRAFT STATEMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY ON EDUCATION—DISCUSSION ON		
Paragraph 1	National Policy on Education	42
Paragraph 2	Transformation of Educational System	44
Paragraphs 3 to 7	Strengthening National Unity	46
Paragraph 8	The Neighbourhood School	46
Paragraph 13	Science Education and Research	81
Paragraphs 14 & 15	Education for Agriculture and Industry	81
Paragraph 16	Work Experience	82

Paragraph 17	Character Formation	83
Paragraphs 18 & 19	Equalisation of Educational Opportunities and Pre-Primary Education	85
Paragraphs 20 to 22	Primary Education	88
Paragraphs 23 to 31	The Ten-Year School; Higher Secondary Education and Higher Education ..	90
Paragraph 32	Part-time and Own-Time Education	109
Paragraphs 33 to 34	Spread of Literacy and Adult Education ..	109
Paragraph 35	Education of Girls	112
Paragraphs 36 to 101	Education of the Weaker Sections of the Community; Education of the Handicapped Children; Programmes of Qualitative Improvement; Teachers : Status and Education; New Methods of Teaching; Curricula and Textbooks; Examination Reform; A Nation-wide Programme of Institutional Improvement; Scholarships; Discovery and Development of Talent; The Universities; The Voluntary Effort in Education; The Educational Institutions Conducted by Minorities; The Local Authorities; The Government of India; The State Governments; A Programme for Immediate Action; Total Expenditure on Education; Essential Conditions for Success. ..	116
Paragraphs 9 to 11	The Language Policy	119
ANNEXURES		
Annexure I	List of Members of the CABE	145
Annexure II	List of officers who attended the 33rd meeting of the CABE held in New Delhi on 22nd-23rd August, 1967.	148
Annexure III	Agenda, Memoranda and Notes ..	152
Annexure IV	Report of Standing Committee on School and Social Education of the Central Advisory Board of Education.	157
Annexure V	Report of the meeting of Standing Committee of the CABE on Higher Education—(including Science Education and Research) held on August 19 and 20, 1967 at Vigyan Bhavan.	180
Annexure VI	Report of the Standing Committee on Educational Administration, Finance and Planning.	188

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The thirty-third meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education was held at New Delhi on August 22 and 23, 1967, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Triguna Sen, Union Education Minister. The following attended the meeting:

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

1. Dr. Triguna Sen
Union Education Minister (*Chairman*)
2. Prof. Sher Singh
Minister of State
Ministry of Education
3. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad
Minister of State
Ministry of Education
4. Shri P. N. Kirpal
Educational Adviser to the Government of India
5. Dr. D. S. Kothari
Chairman
University Grants Commission
6. Dr. B. N. Prasad
Chairman
Standing Commission for Scientific and Technical Terminology
7. Kumari S. Panandikar
Chairman
National Council for Women's Education
8. Dr. K. N. Rao
Director General of Health Services

NOMINATED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

9. Shri A. E. T. Barrow, MP
10. Prof. Samuel Mathai
11. Dr. (Smt.) Durgabai Deshmukh

12. Shri A. R. Dawood
13. Air Vice-Marshal S. N. Goyal
14. Dr. Vikram A. Sarabhai
15. Dr. D. M. Sen
16. Prof. M. V. Mathur
17. Shri Radha Krishna
18. Dr. Mohan Sinha Mehta
19. Shrimati Raksha Saran
20. Shri Anil Mohan Gupta
21. Miss Sitimon Sawian

ELECTED BY THE PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri S. K. Vaishampayan, MP

Lok Sabha

23. Shri Samar Guha, MP
24. Shri Ram Krishan Gupta, MP
25. Shri Biswanarayan Sastri, MP

NOMINATED BY THE INTER-UNIVERSITY BOARD

26. Dr. A. L. Mudaliar
27. Dr. D. S. Reddi

NOMINATED BY THE ALL-INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL RESEARCH

28. Shri S. Rajaraman

NOMINATED BY THE INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

29. Dr. O. P. Gautam

REPRESENTATIVES OF STATES

30. Shri V. Raghavulu
Education Minister
Andhra Pradesh
31. Shri J. B. Hagjer
Education Minister, Assam

32. (a) **Shri Karpoori Thakur**
Education Minister, Bihar
- (b) **Shri Upendranath Verma**
Minister of State for Education, Bihar
33. (a) **Shri Hardwari Lal**
Education Minister, Haryana
- (b) **Shri Maha Singh**
Deputy Minister for Education, Haryana
34. **Shri C. H. Mohmmmed Koya**
Education Minister, Kerala
35. **Shri Dharam Pal Gupta**
Education Minister, Madhya Pradesh
36. **Shri V. R. Nedunchezian**
Education Minister, Madras
37. **Shri M. D. Choudhary**
Education Minister, Maharashtra
38. **Shri M. Kithan**
Education Minister, Nagaland
39. **Shri Pabitra Mohan Pradhan**
Education Minister, Orissa
40. **Shri Lachman Singh Gill**
Education Minister, Punjab
41. **Shri Barkatullah Khan**
Education Minister, Rajasthan
42. **Shri Ram Prakash Gupta**
Education Minister, Uttar Pradesh
43. **Shri Jyoti Bhushan Bhattacharya**
Education Minister, West Bengal
44. **Shri G. G. Mayenkar**
Education Minister, Goa, Daman & Diu
45. **Shri Ram Lal**
Education Minister, Himachal Pradesh
46. **Shri N. Tombi Singh**
Education Minister, Manipur
47. **Shri Manickyavasagan**
Education Minister, Pondicherry
48. **Shri V. K. Malhotra**
Chief Executive Councillor, Delhi

Secretary of Central Advisory Board of Education

49. Shri J. P. Naik
Adviser, Ministry of Education

The following members were unable to attend :

1. Gen. K. M. Cariappa
2. Dr. B. V. Keskar
3. Shri L. R. Sethi
4. Shri V. K. Gokak
5. Dr. Romila Thapar
6. Dr. Gopal Singh, MP
7. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu, MP
8. Shri G. V. Sapre
9. Shri Gordhandas Chokhawala
 Education Minister, Gujarat
10. Shri G. M. Sadiq
 Education Minister, Jammu & Kashmir
11. Shri V. Shankare Gowda
 Education Minister, Mysore
12. Shri K. D. Bhattacharya
 Education Minister, Tripura

A complete list of all members of the Board is given in *Annexure I*, and the list of officers and others who also attended the session is given in *Annexure II*.

INAUGURAL SESSION

WELCOME ADDRESS BY SHRI P. N. KIRPAL, SECRETARY TO THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

"It is my very great pleasure and privilege to welcome all of you assembled here at this inaugural meeting of the thirty-third session of the Central Advisory Board of Education.

'An inordinately long period of 22 months has elapsed since the thirty-second session of the Board was held in Chandigarh at the invitation of the State Government of Punjab. The delay in holding this annual session of the Board is due to a number of factors. This session was originally scheduled for December, 1966. But unfortunately, it could not be held owing to the sudden illness of the former Minister of Education, Shri Fakhru-ud-Din Ali Ahmed. On a suggestion from several State Education Ministers, it was decided to convene this session after the General Elections. It was also necessary to wait for the election of the representatives of the newly elected Lok Sabha which took place only in the session just concluded. This meeting has been convened as soon as the composition of the new Board was completed.

"The new Board which meets today reflects rather drastic changes of personnel without any precedent in the past. Out of the 23 Education Ministers representing various States and Territories, 21 are new members; and only two members from this category, Shri Sadiq from Jammu & Kashmir and Shri Chowdhury from Maharashtra, attended the last session as Ministers of Education. There have been other changes also; and as many as 42 out of the 61 members of the Board are new.

"This remarkable changes in membership is matched by the uniqueness of the tasks before the present session and the changed nature of the Board's responsibilities. Never before in the thirty-two years of its existence was the Board called upon to formulate a national policy for Education. Since the Indian Education Commission appointed by the Government of India in July 1964 submitted its Report in June 1966, there has been a wide discussion on the recommendations of the Commission.

These recommendations have been considered by State Governments by the Conference of Education Ministers and by the Committee of Members of Parliament. The culmination of this nation-wide discussion and the long process of examination by various competent bodies will be the deliberations of this highest educational forum in the country. The deliberations of this August body will mark the transition from thought to action, from discussion to implementation.

"The Central Advisory Board has now acquired an important role in educational planning and co-ordination. At the completion of 20 years of Indian Independence today we are more than ever conscious of the role of education in promoting national development and social integration. The national policies in the field of education must be based on a national consensus, of which the main organ is the Central Advisory Board. With the formulation of a national policy for education and the firm resolve to implement it as a national programme, the Board enters a new phase of authority and functioning.

"The work for the present session has been well prepared by the three Standing Committees which met under the Chairmanship of the distinguished Ministers from Bihar, Madras and Maharashtra.

"Once again I welcome the distinguished members of the Board to this historic session which is expected to chart a new course for the development of education in this great and ancient country, now determined to advance on new paths towards the achievement of the noble objectives enshrined in our Constitution.

"May I request you, Sir, to open the thirty-third session of the Central Advisory Board of Education and deliver your inaugural address?"

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY DR. TRIGUNA SEN, UNION MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

"I join my friend and colleague, Shri Kirpal, in extending a warm welcome to all of you to this thirty-third Session of the Central Advisory Board of Education. This is the first time we are meeting after I took over as Minister of Education at the Centre. What makes me particularly happy to welcome you to this Session is the fact that the

Board is meeting, for the first time, in the changed political situation in the country. In the past, the meetings of the Board were held against the background of a relatively simple, easy and homogenous political situation created by the same political party being in power, both at the Centre and in the States. The Board, therefore, had no great difficulties in coming to 'agreed' conclusions or in selling its advice to the Centre as well as to the States. All this is now changed. The composition of the present Board happily reflects the changed political situation in the country; and many of you represent political parties which had never been in power before. As our former President, Dr. Radhakrishnan said some time ago, it is only after the last general election that democracy has come of age in this country. I am inclined to extend this statement to the Board also and to say that, for the first time, it has now come of age and has the real opportunity of grappling with major educational issues facing the country in terms which cut across political ideologies. This meeting is, therefore, a test for all of us; and I am sure the deliberations of the Board will prove that our first and foremost commitment is to the education of the children of this country and to nothing else.

The Formulation of the National Policy on Education.—

There is yet another reason which makes this session stand out from the earlier ones. You are meeting here to advise Government on the formulation of the National Policy on Education. The first occasion when the Board discussed a comprehensive statement on educational policy was in 1944 when it approved the *Post-War Plan of Educational Development* which suggested a blue-print of over-all educational reconstruction spread over 40 years. A comprehensive discussion of this type has not been held in the Board ever since; and during the least 23 years, we have generally been looking at education in a piece-meal manner, stage by stage or sector by sector. We have also broadly confined ourselves to short-term programmes—annual or five-yearly—and comparatively neglected the long-term policies which should underlie the short-term programmes. It was this realization which made my predecessor, Shri M. C. Chagla, appoint the Education Commission in 1964 to advise Government on the national pattern of education. I take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude for this. I would also like to convey

the gratitude and thanks of the Government to Dr. D. S. Kothari and his colleagues—myself excluded—for having given a valuable report to the country. It deals, as you know, with all stages and sectors of education and includes a blue-print of educational development spread over 20 years—from 1966 to 1985. Since we are meeting to discuss this Report, the Board's session of 1967 promises to be as exciting and as significant as that of 1944.

'In formulating a National Policy on Education, we shall find considerable assistance in the proceedings of the Conference of Education Ministers held on 28th to 30th April'67 and in the Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967) which includes a draft statement on the national policy on education for the consideration of the Government of India. This Committee brought together, for the first time in our recent history, leading members of all the different political parties in the country and made them sit round a table to evolve a national policy on education. You will agree with me that they have produced an admirable document which can help us in our deliberations. I take this opportunity to convey the gratitude and thanks of Government to the members of the Committee for this service which they have done to the cause of education.

'I would also like to clarify that Government desires to give the widest possible opportunity to all the interests concerned before final decisions are taken and a National Policy on Education is formulated. In this Session, you will produce a draft statement on the Policy on Education for the consideration of the Government of India and the State Governments. We propose to send this Statement to the State Governments forthwith; and I am happy to inform you that, in my informal discussion with them yesterday, the Education Ministers of all States and Union Territories have agreed to send me their comments on it before the end of September next. We shall also place this Statement, along with the Report of the Education Commission, before the Vice-Chancellors' Conference which has been convened to meet at Delhi on 11-13 September. The Rajya Sabha has already discussed the problem and the Lok Sabha is expected to discuss it during its next session. In the next two or three months, we also expect the press, the public interested in Education, and the

teachers' organisations to discuss the problem from every point of view. As you are aware, the Government of India was to have announced the details of implementing the decision to adopt the regional languages as media of education on 15th August. We could not do so because the Lok Sabha was not able to discuss the problem. We have therefore decided now to issue a comprehensive resolution on National Policy on Education, including language policy by the end of the current financial year.

Implementation of the National Policy on Education.—

The formulation of the policy on education is important, no doubt. But its vigorous and sustained implementation is of even greater significance. We must therefore take steps, right from now, to see that the policy which we will enunciate in this session is given effect to as early as possible and at the latest from the next financial year—1968-69. From this point of view, I requested the State Education Ministers to identify a programme of immediate action on the basis of the main recommendations of the Education Commission. I made a similar request to the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education also. I was very happy to find that there is a close agreement between the recommendations of the State Education Ministers and of the MPs' Committee on this subject. I was also happy to find that all the three Standing Committees of the Board have endorsed their proposals. I can therefore confidently say that we have been able to evolve a universally agreed programme of immediate action which can help us to make a break-through in educational development.

I discussed this programme informally with the State Education Ministers yesterday and I am happy to inform you that they all agreed to revise their Fourth Five Year Plans in education on the basis of this programme and also to prepare their annual plans for 1968-69 on the same basis. They have also promised to send me these proposals, with all the necessary financial implications and other details by the end of October next. We shall then have a broad picture of how we would like the Fourth Plan to be revised to implement the policy on education which we are now formulating and what steps must be taken to make an effective beginning in the year 1968-69 itself.

'I have been much disturbed at the trend shown by educational planning in the country during the last two years. We started the Fourth Five Year Plan with a demand for about Rs. 1800 crores. It was then successively reduced to Rs. 1300 crores, Rs. 1260 crores and finally to Rs. 1210 crores. But when the actual plans of the State Governments and the Centre came to be finalised, we found that the total allocation to education went down still further to Rs. 1057 crores. However, if the expenditure of the first two years of the Fourth Plan is any guide, we may not be able to get even about Rs. 800 crores for education in the entire Fourth Plan. It is, therefore, very urgent to take stock of the whole position and to approach the Governments and the country with our detailed proposals regarding our minimum needs of educational development. With the cooperation of the State Governments, we hope to be able to do so by November next. We trust that the Governments concerned and the country will give a proper response and help us to take a major step for the development of education on the broad lines which we will be finalising at this session.

An Appeal

'When I see what is happening in education all around me at present, my heart is filled with deep sorrow. I feel very unhappy at the way in which the educational process in the classroom has almost broken down in some areas and is rapidly deteriorating in others. The incidents of student unrest, the continual closure of educational institutions in many parts of the country, the large-scale practice of unfair means in examinations, the steady fall in teaching standards—all these disquiet me not a little. But I am an incorrigible optimist. I regard all these unfortunate signs, which are not confined to education alone, as darkness before dawn and feel confident that we shall soon turn the corner. This does not, however, mean that the improvement of education is something automatic and that it will come of its own accord, as daylight follows night. No! It will need a firm determination on the part of the nation to educate itself, a large increase in the financial and material investment in education and a sustained programme of dedicated work by students, teachers and educational administrators.

'I also feel unhappy because our language problems have become a hump which we find it very difficult to overcome. It is both urgent and necessary to overcome this obsession with language problems. Language, after all, is a tool of education and not an end in itself. I do recognise the need to take clear decisions regarding our language policy which, as all our important academic bodies have recommended, should be based on three unexceptionable principles: the adoption of the Indian languages as media of education at the university stage; the development of Hindi, the link language; and promotion of the study of English—our international link and our largest window on the world. Once these decisions are taken, they must also be implemented firmly. But we must not equate the language policy with the National Policy on Education.

'Let me make it clear that the decision to make the regional languages the medium of instruction is not my personal decision, although I fully support it. This is a decision which has been widely supported by our most outstanding educationists and political leaders. I need not give you the long list of educational commissions and committees and individual leaders including Gandhiji, Tagore and Rajaji who have supported this. My only concern has been to implement the policy. If we believe that the decision to change over to the regional languages is a sound decision, we owe it to the country and to ourselves to implement it expeditiously and with determination. In this country, I find that the best way to become popular is to *talk of noble policies and not to implement them*. I am afraid that this is not *my* philosophy of life.

'I hear sometimes that the switch over will affect our standards. I ask myself—what are our standards! On the contrary, our standards will never attain to anything like what they ought to be, unless we make the switch over.

'I also read these days that the implementation of the policy will endanger the unity of the country. Let me make it clear that if that is the price we have to pay,—indeed if there is the slightest danger to the unity of the country that this decision poses—I shall be the first person to oppose the change. Language or no language, the unity of the country is our most precious treasure and must be maintained at any cost.

"The decision to switch over to the regional languages is based on sound compelling educational considerations. We attained political freedom 20 years ago. We are seriously engaged in the task of winning economic freedom. But to my mind even more important is the mental and spiritual emancipation of the nation. How can we achieve that if our educational system denies to the child his inherent right of instruction in the mother tongue ?

"I must also confess to a feeling of importance. I am most unhappy at the slow pace at which things seem to be moving at present and would like immediately to initiate a large-scale programme of educational development. I do realise that some persons are irritated by this impatience and the other day an esteemed friend asked me in Rajya Sabha whether I had the Alladin's lamp to do the things which I wanted done. I am sorry that I do not have the Alladin's Lamp of the Arabian Nights—and even if I had it, it would hardly serve any useful purpose. But I know of one Alladin's Lamp which can help us to improve education quickly and effectively. It is the Gandhian advice of dedication to the service of the motherland, austerity, sharing of life with the common people and intensive hard work. This is a lamp which each one of us can light in his own heart and life, and if the millions and thousands of students, teachers and other educational workers in the country do so, the future of education in this country, and ultimately the future of the country itself, is safe."

**VOTE OF THANKS BY SHRI G. K. CHANDIRAMANI,
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY MINISTRY OF EDUCATION**

"It is my pleasant duty to propose a Vote of Thanks to the members of the Central Advisory Board of Education and the invitees to this session and to all those who have worked hard for this historic meeting that has just been inaugurated by the Education Minister.

Sir, I shall not take much of your time because my role is simply one of thanking everybody. But I would like to say that this is a momentous session, meeting for the first time after the submission of the Report of the Education Commission. Thanks to the stimulus given by the Commission, there is a detailed discussion of educational problems everywhere; and there is enthusiasm and determination to bring about the necessary changes that

will make the educational system an effective instrument for social change. I have been attending the meetings of the Standing Committees and watching the discussions more than participating in them. The spirit that animated these discussions, the spirit of accommodation that has been shown by the various members in these discussions, makes me feel optimistic that in this historic session that is being held today and tomorrow we shall arrive at conclusions which will take the country forward.

I do not like to mention the long list of persons who should be thanked for making these arrangements and also those who have spent days here. Some of the Ministers from the States and others have come on the 19th and will stay on until tomorrow. It is indeed good and gracious of them to find so much time for considering important matters of educational development.

I shall conclude by saying that I feel very optimistic about the deliberations of this session and hope that it will provide the necessary guidance to take the country forward in educational development."

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

Before taking up the agenda, the Chairman referred to the sad demise of two sitting members of the Board, Shri E. W. Aryanayakam and Shri Radhalal Vyas. He said :

"During the past year, we had the misfortune of losing two of our members, Sri Aryanayakam and Shri Radhalal Vyas.

"Shri Aryanayakam was snatched away from us when he went to his native place in Ceylon for a short visit. On 20th June last, the news of his death came as a shock to the entire educational world in India.

"As you all know, he was born in a Ceylonese family which has given many men to the nation who have distinguished themselves in the service of education and had a distinguished educational career in India, U.K. and U.S.A. He was first associated with Shri Rabindranath Tagore as Secretary and as Head of one of the Institutions at Santiniketan. Later on, he joined Mahatma Gandhi and dedicated his life to the cause of basic education. He was the Founder-Secretary of the Nai Talim Sangh and one

L1MofEdu./68—2.

of the distinguished exponent of Gandhian ideas in education. His dedication to the cause of education and the country was unique and inspiring. In his death, the country, and particularly education, has suffered an irreparable loss.

'Shri Radhalal Vyas, M.P., was a distinguished social and political worker of Ujjain. In the pre-independence period, he participated prominently in the freedom struggle and suffered externment and imprisonment for several years. He was a leading member of the Congress organization in Madhya Bharat area and was associated with several progressive movements. He was a member of the Lok Sabha right from 1952. In his death, we have lost a devoted social worker and a freedom fighter of the Gandhian era.

May I request you to stand up in silence for a minute?"

(The members stood in silence for a minute)

II GENERAL DISCUSSION

PART 'A'

Item No. 1 To record appreciation of the Services rendered by them who have ceased to be members of the Board since the last meeting and to welcome new members.

The Board recorded its appreciation of the services of the following who ceased to be members of the Board after the last session :

1. Shri U. N. Dhebar
2. Shrimati Sarojini Mahishi
3. Shri Frank Anthony
4. Dr. S. H. Zaheer
5. Shrimati Indira Gandhi
6. Shrimati Mafida Ahmed
7. Dr. K. L. Shrimali
8. Dr. A. C. Joshi
9. Shri G. Ramachandran
10. Major Gen. Ranbir Bakshi
11. Shri C. L. Narasimha Reddi, MP
12. Shri P. Muthiah, MP
13. Shrimati Renuka Rav, MP
14. Dr. G. S. Melkote, MP
15. Late Shri Ralhalal Vyas
16. Late Shri E. W. Aryanayakam
17. Shri Banka Behary Das, MP
18. Shri V. G. Garde
19. Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao
20. Shrimati Ranu Mukerji
21. Shri S. K. Mukherjee
22. Shri M. Satyanarayana, MP
23. Dr. C. O. Karunakaran

The Board extended a warm welcome to the following new members :

1. Dr. D. S. Reddi
2. Dr. Durgabai Deshmukh

3. Prof. Samuel Mathai
4. Dr. D. M. Sen
5. Shri Radha Krishna
6. Prof. V. K. Gokak
7. Shri A. R. Dawood
8. Prof. M. V. Mathur
9. Shrimati Raksha Saran
10. Shri A. E. T. Barrow, MP
11. Dr. Romila Thapar
12. Air-Vice-Marshal S. N. Goyal
13. Shri Samar Guha, MP
14. Shri Ram Krishan Gupta, MP
15. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu, MP
16. Shri Biswanarayan Shastri, MP
17. Shri S. K. Vaishampayan, MP
18. Shri Anil Mohan Gupta
19. Shri G. V. Sapre
20. Dr. O. P. Gautam
21. Miss Sitimon Sawian

Item No. 2 **To report that proceedings of the thirty-second meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education held at Chandigarh in October 1965 were sent to the State Governments and the Union Territories.**

The Board noted the action taken. The Board then agreed to the proposal made by the Chairman that the following items may be considered together :

Item No. 3 **To consider the reports of the Education Commission and of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education and to suggest a draft statement on the National Policy on Education for consideration by Government of India.**

Item Nos. 4, 5 & 6. To consider reports of Standing Committees on School and Social Education, Higher Education. (including Science Education and Education for Agriculture and Industry) Educational Administration, Finance and Implementation.
(These have been reproduced in *Annexures IV, V and VI*)

On a request by the Chairman, the Education Ministers of Maharashtra, Bihar and Madras introduced the reports of their Standing Committees and a general discussion followed.

Prof. Samuel Mathai :—This statement speak of the need to emphasize science and technology and a secular outlook and the cultivation of moral and social and spiritual values. A statement like this involves a profound begging of the question. What are the spiritual values that we encourage in our schools and colleges when, as a matter of official policy, we are told that it is perfectly right to “gherrao” somebody? What do we mean by spiritual values in that context? In the early days we thought that it was a value in our national life to respect our elders, something that we called *gurutva*. But how do we tie this up with the new notions of students’ or parents’ rights? I am myself a believer in spiritual values. But what I am referring to is the great uncertainty in my mind as to how science; secularism and spirituality going to be tied up.

Shri Dawood : Mine is a very small point. I was a little upset to find that a proposal that had been more or less rejected by the Education Commission after a battle royal, had been brought in into the Report of the Parliamentary Committee with the same emphasis, the same force and probably the same conviction which was shown in the Education Commission in rejecting it. I am talking now about the neighbourhood school. I am glad that the Standing Committee was wiser than the Parliamentary Committee and that it has reversed the whole thing and its report, as it is presented here, reflects the thinking of the Education Commission better than what has been reported in the Report of the Members of Parliament. But if they have gone with the Commission thus far, I do not see why they stop and hesitate on a minor issue and insist on calling the

system proposed by them as the 'neighbourhood school'. In the Standing Committee paragraph which is an amendment to the Report of the Parliamentary Committee, there is no reference to the neighbourhood school except in the title. My point is that this title is misleading and that it has created a great deal of misunderstanding in areas with which I am familiar and it has roused a great deal of hostility and opposition. We should, therefore, avoid the term 'neighbourhood school' and keep the term 'common school' as used by the Commission.

Prof. M. V. Mathur: I am only trying to refer to a few general points.

This country with its vast population and long history of colonial rule is now trying to come to its own and be an honourable member of the comity of nations. This requires that we should not detach ourselves from our moorings. Indian culture has, therefore, to be preserved in the proper fashion. At the same time we have to modernise ourselves through the injection of the right kind of science and technology. At the same time we have to remember that our resources are limited. Wisdom, therefore, lies in making these limited resources go the longest distance. This requires detaching ourselves from some of the beaten tracks which might have been followed in the developed countries and by us earlier. This is the revolution in education that we need. How to bring about that kind of a change ?

To me, the most important thing is the country's freedom and we have to ensure that nothing is done which could, in any way, weaken it. In order that the country's freedom is properly preserved, we should be in a position to throw up the right kind of persons to man the various kinds of jobs which are needed for the country. We want distinguished scientists, soldiers, politicians, teachers and so on. How to bring about the right kind of persons ? The old *laissez faire* theory is now exploded and it is now agreed that if we want the right kind of persons in future, we have to think right now as to how to get them 20 years hence. This is the thinking which is needed.

There is nothing which is more precious in this nation than the talented people that we possess. It is these talented people who, when they become the leaders in society in various walks of life, will preserve the freedom of the

country and will bring about economic growth. Therefore, we have to inject in the system something by which, at various stages, we might be able to pick out those persons who show talent. Therefore, when I hear about a sort of common school system and all that, all these are good things and you can have them. But I certainly want some very good schools in the public sector. Personally speaking, I am not at all opposed to the good public schools. My opposition comes because good public schools to day are only in the private sector. I would very much like to see good public schools in the public sector and the students who are admitted to them should be the nation's responsibility. I think the State of Bihar has already indicated the way. They have a State public school at Netrahat with Hindi medium, but teaching English. We should try to have that kind of a school elsewhere also so that it might be possible for us to identify our brilliant young people and to prepare them properly. The same process can be repeated at higher stages also.

The language of science is international. Even if science is in various languages, more than half of its terminology will be the same. Therefore, so far as education for science and technology is concerned, the language problem is marginal. But as an educationist, I believe, the people will be able to understand things better in one's own language.

When we come to the field of higher education, several things have been mentioned in the Report. I would only point out that the Central Government has constitutional responsibility for higher education and also the necessary powers. What is needed is an exercise of the existing authority and a proper discharge of the existing responsibilities.

In the Report, it has been mentioned that we should have M.A. in 17 years. Most of the persons are taking their first degree at a level where you require a three-year M.A. course. If we want this kind of a thing, why should it not be possible for the Centre itself, which has the constitutional authority, to promote these programmes? If there is a particular State which does not want these graduate schools, let them not have them. But the Centre can promote them wherever needed. In this fashion it should be possible to develop excellent graduate schools and undergraduate colleges which will provide the nation with the much-needed leadership in all walks of life.

I do not want to discuss the language controversy. But let us not forget the consumer of this system, the student. What is it that he needs? First and foremost, a good job. At present, it is English alone that gives good jobs. Until that situation is remedied, the policy of educating through the regional languages will never succeed. I have seen this for the past 18 years in my University where Hindi is an optional medium. There are good students passing M.A. examination through Hindi medium, but they feel disappointed because, even in the Hindi-speaking States, proficiency in Hindi alone does not give them jobs and proficiency in English is insisted upon. We must, therefore, link the language policy with the employment policy.

The existing system of education, if I may use a strong term, appears to be anti-socialistic. The haves can receive the best of education, but the have-nots are not able to receive it. Therefore, I plead that we should set up a system where the poor but talented children are able to receive the best of education and provide this to all the sections of the society in the country to get an effective leadership.

Dr. Vikram A. Sarabhai: When the Education Commission was appointed, I was asked to give a memorandum. I gave a very short sheet in which I suggested to the Commission that it would be worthwhile to ponder as to why is it that the reports like the Mudaliar Report, Radhakrishnan Commission's Report and the Sargeant Commission's Report which are very eminent reports, had not produced the desired effect, why there was such discontent in the country and I suggested that it would be most worthwhile if the Kothari Commission would try to understand at least this aspect and bring this out in addition to its other recommendations. I find the Kothari Commission's Report very impressive, but I also find this serious omission there. I would suggest that this body here spends a little time in examining what happens, and why it is that these important recommendations do not get translated into action.

It would seem to me that the Members of Parliament who met and spent time considering the Report were not really put a fair proposition by the Government. The Education Commission's Report does not bring out the implications, in economic and other hard terms, of what is desired.

This is a job which only the Government can undertake. If the Government had undertaken that and assigned competent staff to translate the various choices which are implicit in the Education Commission's Report and presented these to the politicians, to the Members of Parliament, then it would have been possible to decide the sacrifice which the country should be willing to make in order to achieve certain objectives—short-range and long-range. In the absence of such quantitative assessment of the implications of the Education Commission's Report, a great deal of new confusion has been created—a whole lot of new desiderata are injected. This does not lead us anywhere. I suggest that this meeting here today is really not put a fair proposition if we are asked to recommend anything like an endorsement of a policy emanating from the Education Commission's Report. I think, we should today discuss the Education Commission's Report and broadly endorse the whole flavour of its recommendations. But this cannot lead us to give any suggestion as to what the Government should do, unless the Government in its turn comes back to us and really brings out the implications of the recommendations. I am afraid if we follow the path which we are following today, we are going to have a flight from the real situation and I am afraid that thereby more damage is likely to be done than any good in this process.

The second point that I would like to make is this. As an experimental scientist, I know that, supposing, I wish to study the effect of various types of fertilisers of irrigation, of water treatment, on the growth of a banyan tree. I would not expect to try to change all my conditions in a period which is short compared to the time taken for the banyan tree to come to a reasonable size. Education is a process which, as every one knows here, is not something which occurs in two or three or even four or five years; it is a process which affects the whole generation and the generation is the time constant in which the educational process can be seen to take the effect. Since Independence we have applied some of the best minds in the country. The most important bodies, including the National Development Council, have endorsed certain principles. Are we really doing the right thing by reopening the question of basic policy every three or four years in the hope of producing a change? Are we, in fact, not really contribu-

ing to complete lack of control in this whole system? It is a bow without its string. This must happen if you do not understand the basic time constant of change in education. I would suggest that, rather than take a flight from the existing decisions, whenever we make decisions and policies, we have to make them work; if there are failures, we have to work for their solutions rather than change the basic premises and then start everything anew. It is the very quality of our decision-making, our whole approach, which appears to the young as the most cynical. If we adopt this approach, I cannot expect anything except growing indiscipline in the whole educational system.

This leads me to the problem of education in a general sense. In education, do we really take the role of an agriculturist? An agriculturist's role is to plant the seed, to create the necessary environment. But it is the seed which ultimately grows; it is the quality of the seed which is going to flourish. It would seem to me that the role of the Government, the role of the State, is one in which we have to create a proper environment. When we talk of socialism or of egalitarian principles. I think it is our job to see that all the environmental conditions are available to every one in this country. Given these environmental conditions, there may be certain seeds, certain plants, which may require a situation in which they have to be stretched. I would suggest that education is a stretching process. If you want to stretch the people whoever they are, this is not an easy task. It is to stretch their fullest resources, so that any system which tries to generalise and tries to produce a common dominator in terms of this challenge of education is likely to be very frustrating to the good students wherever they come from. I would like to suggest that we view it from this point of view.

The language question has been much discussed. What I find difficult is the understanding of whether people are meaning a compulsive or a permissive clause in this regard. I know, for instance, that if any individual wishes to pursue the highest education in his mother tongue, he should be provided the necessary facilities. But we must recognise that the medium of instruction is after all a means to an end in education and that there are a thousand ways of getting to God. This is one of the basic aspects of Indian culture, one which cherish. There can be no dogmatism in this regard that there is only one correct method by

which all the individuals can get education. This applies not only to this situation but generally in India. While in India we may have and we do have a national problem in regard to education, there is no national solution applicable to all the people, to all concerned, to all localities. This is dependent on individual factors.

This takes me to the next point as to what is appropriate for the State to undertake in regard to educational policies. Many times it is urged that the UGC and the Centre should ensure standards of education. How can they do that? It is only the teacher who can do that, nobody else. It is the teacher, interacting with the students who can do it. What we have to do today is to create conditions in which the teacher will be provided with the wherewithal to perform his task. I would suggest that by and large, every man has the need for job satisfaction, and if you do not provide him with the conditions whereby he receives job satisfaction, he would not be able to perform that job properly.

I would suggest that it is in this context that the role of the teacher has to be viewed in terms of the various choices which we have before us. It is the financial implication of giving to the teacher the appropriate role in society which I would suggest must get the first priority. Unless the teacher is taken out from this tremendous hardship which he is going through, particularly teachers of the primary and secondary schools, where they have to do all types of extracurricular, legal and illegal work to augment their income, unless this situation is rectified. I do not see in my own experience any real hope of bringing about a change. If we give the teacher his correct place in society, if we adopt the principles which are so well laid down in the Education Commission where they speak of elasticity and dynamism—which should be the very essence of our approach—we shall have laid the ground for bringing about the much desired change.

Talking of the responsibility of the Centre in regard to this whole educational process, I would think that our main role here would be to examine the cost. This, to my mind, is one of the main contributions of the Education Commission's report, to see that the resources being limited, both in terms of finance and personnel, we should relate our educational pattern to these resources. There are certain choices, hard political choices, and it is exactly in this area

that the Members of Parliament can contribute their most. It is in deciding which of these hard choices we shall have to make that everything depends; they must not come back with the same generalities saying, do this, do that. Once these hard choices are made, they would have to be sold to the country. It would seem to me that it is there where they can help a great deal as they have their contact with the masses. In fact they are the representatives of our electorate.

So it would seem to me that in regard to this whole question dealt with in the summarised recommendations, regarding the financial implications,—whether it is Rs. 50 crores or 100 crores or 200 crores—there is absolutely no point in urging that there should be no quantitative restriction on the growth of education because no such perpetual, unlimited growth is possible.

Having mentioned about this elasticity and dynamism, I would like to read out three small paragraphs from the summary of the report :

A good educational system should be dynamic, flexible and discriminating enough to help institutions and teachers to proceed along different levels of development—the good schools to be free to go ahead on creative and experimental lines while the weaker ones should be supported to gain a sense of security.

Such elasticity and dynamic are possible if the experimenting teacher is supported by the administrative authority, a general atmosphere of reform, the encouragement, of the head of the institution, a mastery of subject-matter, leadership provided by training institutions, and the availability of teaching materials.

Elasticity in a school system will have little value if new practices developed are not diffused to schools and teachers given skilled help in trying out innovations. The educational administration can encourage and hasten the diffusion of new teaching methods by :

- Combining permissiveness with persuasion;
- approaching the new methods in stages according to the ability of schools;
- giving necessary inservice training to teachers;

—providing adequate guide materials which should be constantly revised and improved.

At the same time the administrator has to guard himself against letting any 'progressive' measures setting down into another orthodoxy.

This I would say, should be the beginning of the policy statement and everything should flow from this basic approach towards education. As regards lack of conformism, we are willing in the Indian tradition to accept a thousand ways and we should at least accept this in a field such as this. If there is today a tremendous confusion and controversy, it is because people are trying to claim that there is only one correct way.

Shrimati Durgabai Deshmukh: The policy statement should be a concise statement wherein the objectives and goals are set down clearly and which is primarily meant to be implemented.

I congratulate the Government on their decision to issue such a statement. But we have to remember two things : (1) Several statements were made in the past although in a piece-meal fashion. In fact, there is no dearth of statements. (2) What has to be stressed, however, is implementation. An unimplemented statement is worse than no statement at all.

You have said in your inaugural speech that nothing is more important than the education of children. If anything is to be regarded as a charter of rights for the children, it is Article 45 of the Constitution which lays down that free education should be provided to all children up to 14 years of age within a period of ten years of the commencement of the Constitution. We have not implemented this. If after 15 years of planning, we are not able to fulfil the targets laid down in Article 45, it means something is wrong somewhere.

I was the first Chairman of the National Council for Women's Education. The second Chairman and the present Chairman are also member of the Board at present. The Council has reported shortfalls in enrolment of girls to the extent of 15 lakhs. The whole problem of primary education is the problem of girls' education. Even at the secondary and higher stages, the problem of girls' education is

important because the nation needs, not only man-power but women-power as well. Therefore, the whole problem today is the problem of girls' education. There is great need for training women teachers for teaching in the rural areas. Nothing has been done in this regard. I give this example to show that even when policies are clearly laid down, there is no implementation. We are only trying to improve the policy statement all the time—policy devoid of practical action. Let us not have another policy devoid of action. The people cannot be fooled any longer.

If the Government of India bring out a policy statement, the Centre must assume several responsibilities including finding money for the States. The Centre should treat girls' education as a national problem for some time to come. After a national policy is announced, ultimately we are told that it is left to the States to implement it. When we go to the State Education Ministers, they say, "Do not come unless you bring money with you". I do not know whether the position is going to be different in future.

I realise that all problems are not financial. When good work is done, money will come in search of the worker. That is my own experience. I am very confident that we can bring money; but the bottlenecks are more administrative in character. This is especially so in dealing with voluntary organizations.

Expenditure in regard to education and social services is even today considered unproductive. This makes me feel apprehensive.

I am not talking about the question of the teachers' status. We have talked about it at so many meetings of the Board; but we have not done much beyond the creation of the National Foundation for Teachers' Welfare.

With regard to illiteracy, we have considered this problem in the meetings of the Education Commission and elsewhere but even the administrative machinery has not been set up to this day.

I am not a critic and I am trying to help Government. But I would plead that all difficulties in the way of effective implementation should be carefully examined and there should be a great emphasis on implementation. Otherwise, we will not be able to face the people again with the same old slogans.

Dr. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar : I have been attending the Central Advisory Board of Education for the last twenty years. I have gone back with the impression that while we are very eloquent in all that we say, in the implementation of many of the recommendations, we are hardly in a position to feel satisfied. The immensity of the problems as well as the immensity of the population with which we want to deal are such that there can be no question of one unified policy being followed everywhere. To think of education for 500 million people in one common pattern is as dangerous as to think of feeding 500 million people from one centre. That is my strong conviction. There must be variety and diversity in regard to much of what is being done, but there should be one policy in regard to matters pertaining to education, so that all people can and should be educated in the lines on which they seek to educate themselves.

Today the Central Advisory Board is very differently constituted from what it was on the last occasion I came here. It is, therefore, more than likely that, in some States, there will be diversity in regard to certain of the details of education, I therefore feel strongly that education in its details should be left to the teachers and the parents rather than to Ministers of Education. I hope I will not be misunderstood. These things have got their roots in the teachers and if educationists are to conduct their affairs in the interests of the students, there must be a certain amount of policy making by the educationists themselves.

I have been long in the educational field, more than I care to remember, and I know perfectly well that if teachers are left to deal with the subject in the best manner possible and not regimented, there will be much more of freedom in regard to educational policy and the methods of imparting education. Unfortunately, at all stages there is an attempt to petrify education, more so in the primary and secondary stages. We have dealt with these factors in our reports. From the year 1882, when the Hunter Commission was constituted, right down to the Commission on the Calcutta University, the Radhakrishnan Commission and various other Commissions, we have been discussing and discussing. The main principle has been forgotten, that education must find its roots in the soil. As my friend Dr. Sarabhai said, it is the soil that must be cultivated and

it is the seed that must grow in that soil according to its luxuriant growth. You cannot possibly get a child to educate itself by forcing this or that particular method of education. We have pleaded and pleaded in vain that the greatest drawback is in primary education, that the second greatest drawback is in secondary education. It is no use thinking of the products of the universities as not satisfying the standard because the persons who come to the university are so badly handled in the primary and secondary stages that it is an uphill task, and only a few can develop.

We have asked that, in the primary stage, the teachers must be better educated, better paid, better housed and treated better than the Class IV officials of the Government of India or of any State Government. When primary school teachers get lower emoluments than class-four officials get, you can easily understand the amount of depression in which they work.

Secondly, there should not be so much of regimentation in the primary or secondary stage that everybody should teach the same subject on the same lines during the same hours. I was trained in a *payal* school with one single teacher, in a high school where the headmaster did not care for the timetable, but would spend any amount of time to teach us science, and ask us to learn history and geography for ourselves. I think the teachers in history and geography will not take offence at this, but we did find that he cultivated in us a great interest in the subject which he made his own. This is the change that is required so far as our educators are concerned; freedom to work on the lines on which they ought to proceed and freedom to impart education in the best manner possible, not regimentation of ideas.

Some of the points that have been stated in the Education Commission's Report are very good indeed. But I feel that their implementation will again be a matter of great difficulty. Take this question of neighbourhood schools. The idea evidently is that people are interested in schools in their own area and they will probably help to improve those schools. I will give you an alternate thing that has been tried in the Madras State with great effect—that is, creation of bodies called school improvement bodies. My friend the former director of public instruction is here and

he will bear me out that the school improvement programme has done much more to the area concerned than any regimentation of scholars going to neighbourhood schools. On the last occasion when the Central Advisory Board met in Madras—I am sorry that many of the members, many of the ministers are not here—they were taken to a place about 100 miles from Madras and shown what the school improvement programme can do. That school improvement programme for the district had contributed Rs. 45 lakhs in books, in furniture, in equipment, in school buildings and even in improvement of the school teachers' salaries.

Education is a subject that always gets finances if you go the right way about. As a university man I can tell you that during the last 20 years, 100 colleges have been started by private managements and the total amount spent on this is something like Rs. 12-15 crores, all of private money, not of state money; it is more now perhaps on account of the increased value of land and many other things. If, therefore, we approach education properly there will be no difficulty in getting financial aid. I am much more for that sort of financial aid to be got from the public, the public sector only helping education.

Now I come to the second point. We have been talking so much about the method of education and the medium through which education ought to be imparted. I feel that at this stage when so much is needed for the country, when we are going through a very difficult phase of national evolution, there are certain things which ought to be given priority. There are certain things which, in the best interests of the country, may perhaps be kept low for the time being. I well remember the amount of emotional enthusiasm that overcomes many people when we speak of the language policy. On the other hand, I feel that the true understanding of education means that there should be much less emphasis on one or the other aspect of these policies. Today, all the States believe that the medium of instruction should be in the regional languages. An excellent thing indeed. But we cannot forget the obstacles in the way. Neither can we suddenly develop a condition where it will be possible for us to get the young students change over to this. It is not an experiment which can be tried in a laboratory. Young students are not biological

products to be experimented with. They have their own views about it. At present the young students are in a rebellious mood. The Vice-Chancellor of the Kerala University referred to one aspect of it. Unfortunately, there is a growing tendency all over for students to demand this or that and for the others to yield to their wishes. The educationist is not always supported in this. But I can tell you this after many years of experience with students that if the right approach is made and if administrative authorities do not interfere with the policy of education of the students, there will be less indiscipline than there is at present. That is my firm conviction. We have devalued not only the rupee; we have unfortunately devalued many other aspects of national life. I need not refer to it particularly in this assembly. What is taking place in many places is an eye-opener to us, educationists, as to how we can best afford to keep the students free from all these prejudices.

I am also a member of the unfortunate body called the legislative council and I have been a member for 21 years. I have always stood as a member in opposition to government. I am not sorry for it because I took that role of a member in the opposition to appreciate whenever a good thing is done and to criticise even **strongly when**, in my opinion, a wrong policy is being pursued. If that policy were to be followed all over and our students drawn into the discipline of that policy there will be no case for such experiences as the Vice-Chancellor of the Kerala University had. Above all, in the present conditions when this country is facing grave danger in east, west and north—I do not say south but I never know—danger may come even in the south—I do feel that what is essential is integration of the nation from the point of view of preserving, safeguarding and keeping the integrity of this country and the future of this nation. Let us all strive for getting unity in essentials, diversity in non-essentials and charity above all in everything that we do. If we do so, I am sure that this national policy on education would be so framed as to keep the essential spirit of that unity before all of us.

Smt. Raksha Saran : I would like first of all to congratulate the women and girls of India for the rapid progress made by them in the field of education, in spite of the apathy and neglect shown by the government. Today in Delhi University we find this year more women students joining

on merit than men students. That shows that, given equal opportunities, they can do as well, if not better. That also shows their keenness and determination. The girl students come from all walks of life, rich and poor and all castes and creeds.

There is one big exhibition piece known as the National Council for Women's Education of which some members and the Chairman are here. It has no powers. Its advice is accepted by no one. As a matter of fact the resolutions passed by it every year have become meaningless and everybody laughs at the reiteration of the same old story. So much so, we feel: Why not save this annual expenditure of Rs. 6,500 granted to it for a financial year? This includes expenditure for the meetings of the Council and for the chairman's travelling allowance. Of course, she is not paid any salary. I beg to suggest that the National Council be either strengthened considerably and given adequate status or be abolished. The women of India are no longer satisfied with such show pieces.

Another point I would like to touch upon is about the common schools. I am all for common schools. I would like to see that the standards of the common schools are raised considerably. I feel that this is one sphere where women can contribute a great deal and we have more than a million educated women sitting in their homes. I think the Government must make an all-out effort to see that these women come forward and help. Some of them are trained teachers and others are trained in other fields. Some of them are not trained but they are capable of being given a certain amount of training and can be put to work in the neighbourhood where they live. They cannot afford to have cars and indeed they cannot afford even bus fare. But they would like to come and assist, if the work is within walking distance from their homes and they are given certain assignments. I think that for this reason, the parent-teachers association should be strengthened, and voluntary associations should be encouraged.

So far as teachers and their salaries are concerned, a great deal has been said and a great deal will be said, I know. But, instead of giving a higher salary and more in cash, why not give the teachers some facilities like medical aid, free education to their children, accommodation, etc? This may be better than money payments.

Prof. Samuel Mathai: I want to speak a few words on a specific problem at the university level. We are all anxious that our standards should be raised and that our products from the universities should be capable of handling the many functions that come to them in our developing society. But the reality of the situation in which many of us work is that we have no control whatsoever on how many people will come into our universities and with that qualifications. I speak specifically about the problem that I am dealing with. I am referring to the pre-degree course of the Kerala University wherein boys and girls who are no older than 13 are coming in, so that many of these will take their first degree at the age of 18. Without overstressing the question of age, I think it is a generally accepted educational axiom that within an age-group you cannot, for the average student, attempt much more than is found possible in other places. That is, in other words, a graduate at the average age of 18 or 19 is likely to be intellectually less mature and less capable of dealing with the problems of expanding knowledge than a graduate at the age of 21 or 22.

Dr. Mudaliar referred to the great growth, for instance, in his own university, and I would like to endorse one particular thing which he mentioned: the readiness with which the people are willing to come and help in this business of expansion. In the last three years, in the Kerala University, we have added as many as 50 new institutions, and I would like to say with some pride that, although some of these institutions are sub-standard, the majority of them are very good institutions. The people have purchased land we have laid down a minimum of 25 acres for a college. They have put up really good buildings and made a very good job of equipping these institutions. A few naturally are bad. But we have this problem of rapid increase in numbers. We cannot speak of standards, we cannot speak of experiments or anything of that sort, if our numbers are growing at this rate, and if the pupils who come in are young. We cannot deal with them as young adults, and the standards of behaviour, the whole quality of response to the intellectual stimuli that we are supposed to apply in the university, are affected by the immaturity of the boys and girls. I find that a great many of our teachers are dealing with these very young people as if they were a pack of school boys and girls. They dictate notes to them in the class. These boys and girls have no experience of applying

their mind at all, so that our universities are tending to become, even more than in the past, it seems to me, teaching shops where the mind does not grow. This, I think, is part of the reason why the students respond so readily to outside invitations to gang together and behave like immature people. Therefore, if there is anything that was as a nation can do through the Government of India and bodies like that, it is to make it possible for universities to exercise some kind of control on the purely human aspect of university education. We are frittering away our resources in establishing more and more institutions.

Another aspect is the employment aspect which is also affecting this. If we are going to turn out graduates in this rapidly increasing number, naturally they cannot find jobs. My own Minister is here. He will endorse this, I am sure. Our engineers today cannot find jobs, and now they are all on strike because their salaries are so low. This year, against the 750 seats available in our engineering colleges, there were only 450 viable applications. We have a problem. We expand facilities very rapidly and the quality of the stuff that is brought in is very poor. The seed that Dr. Sarabhai referred to is itself, I think, suffering damage in the course of years. Therefore, I would greatly appreciate some kind of helpful suggestions which we Vice-Chancellors could use. Of course, they must come to us through our Ministers, because we are their servants and we carry out the policies that they enunciate! I do not blame them. They as the people representing the vast community have to say, "please arrange to take this up, or admit a few more" and things of that kind. But we cannot do a good job if we are not enabled to have some kind of autonomy. I do not now mean autonomy in a very large sense of the term, but in the sense that we should be free to decide when we shall select, how many we can manage and how many we can train to a certain standard. If in this matter, we do not have some kind of freedom from interference, I am afraid we cannot do a good job at all.

Air Vice-Marshal Goyal: In the last few minutes, we have been hearing about the devaluation of the qualities of the individual. I suggest that our discussions in this august body should be related to something which will have far-reaching consequences on suggestions about policy.

In the Report of the M.Ps. Committee, on page 1, four clauses are provided in paragraph 1. The last two clauses

are the most important: 'to make the rising generation conscious of the fundamental unity of the country in the midst of her rich diversity and to emphasize science and technology and the cultivation of moral, social and spiritual values.' The Education Minister of Maharashtra mentioned the word 'secular'. No doubt, the word 'secular' has to be introduced in a personal way everywhere. But I may add, we should not introduce it without defining it for general understanding. If I may suggest, the cultural, moral and social values, all have a certain common fibre running through them, i.e., the fibre of character. And character is the most secular thing. We have it as our heritage, in our very being. It can also be easily recultivated: what with the great souls like Vivekananda and Buddha, the soil of this country is the richest in the world for such cultivation. Why not exploit it? Let us then lay emphasis on the formation of character. I am not suggesting any regimentation or discipline which means a different thing in military language. In the language of education, it means that examples should first be set by the teachers. *Gurutva* is important and we have to ensure proper guru-sishya relationships everywhere. How often do we allow a person to continue as teacher when he is not fit to be a teacher! I therefore lay greater emphasis on education of teachers and on the rejection of those not fit to act as good enough teachers in this context.

To elucidate, what is important is not what you teach, but how you teach it. In the entire world, education is the same thing, for though History and Geography may relate to a country, other things like Science and Technology are the same. Here I would suggest a motto: "Character formation is the primary aim of all education". 'Dharma' is dubbed as a religious word, hence I have emphasised the word 'character'. Character leads to mental discipline also.

Lastly, I would suggest, being busy is important. Let the student be busy with his studies or with sports. We have plenty of grounds, but they are not being well used. Students—should also be encouraged in *Shramadan*. 'Shram' is dharma, is a good motto to propagate if possible.

Education Minister, Nagaland: I wish to make comment on four things :

- (1) National policy on Education.
- (2) Neighbourhood or Common Schools.

17 D
S.C. No. P-6227
Date: 8/7/9

(3) Language Policy.

(4) Adult Education—Mass Literacy, etc.

In defining National Policy of Education—words and phrases—‘Secular’, ‘Secularism’, ‘Secular Outlook’, ‘Secular Attitude’, ‘Secular State’ are so much used that its meaning becomes confusing. As the words and phrases have already gained different meanings, I wish that the words “secularism” or ‘secular outlook’ or ‘secular State’ or ‘secular attitude’ should be taken to mean, for purposes of defining national policy of education, active belief in harmonious tribal, communal, national and international relations, unity and respect for religions and faiths of others and working with such definite objectives.

The second point I wish to comment on is about the Neighbourhood or Common Schools. While talking about them, I have no hidden meaning in my mind. I am not assaulting the existing private educational institutions, specially the English medium schools. I am neither jealous nor envious of what some people do in the cause of education and that some parents and guardians can afford to sacrifice for the sake of educating their children. I am only anxious that Government must be able to set up educational institutions of the same standard as those of some private and autonomous bodies so that Government institutions will attract students like some of the existing private institutions. What the Government cannot do some private institutions are doing. All the fee-charging schools should be strictly limited in number from now onwards. All primary schools should be improved in quality and standards. It should be made possible for highly qualified persons to become teachers in primary schools. Teachers in primary schools at present are not as highly qualified as the teachers in fee-charging schools and for that reason, people send their children to fee-charging schools eventhough a number of schools which do not charge fees—government schools—may be near their houses.

The fee-charging non-Government schools should fix their school fees with the approval of Government and not at the decision of the school authorities alone.

Government should extend all possible help to private and fee-charging schools, if only such institutions seek for Government's aid.

It should not be obligatory on the part of any person to send pupils only to non-fee charging or Government schools.

It is a challenge already thrown at the Government by fee-charging schools to improve the quality and standard of education. The challenge is a fair one and Government should accept by improving the quality and standard of education of primary schools. If primary schools are improved, the higher stages of education can be improved as a natural sequence.

On medium of instruction in educational institutions in Nagaland, no other language except English can be used. The regional languages have not been developed yet. English will continue to be the medium of instruction, except in primary schools where the medium is the local dialect—one of the seventeen dialects of Nagaland. A student has to learn these languages—the local dialect, English and one Indian language. At the moment, Hindi is being taught in schools which may have to continue till the Government decides for some other language instead of Hindi. Nagaland cannot introduce the regional language or any Indian language at the moment as medium of instruction in educational institutions. Only English can be the medium of instruction. Nagaland is faced with two problems on this—(a) to have English declared as one of the Indian languages by the Parliament and to have it incorporated in the Constitution of India with reference to Nagaland; and (b) to safeguard the interest of Nagaland to impart teachings in English to Nagaland's students even though Nagaland's students study in other States where the medium of instruction is the regional language till such a time as Nagaland has a university of her own.

To liquidate illiteracy from Nagaland, I do not see any other effective method than enforcing of compulsory universal education up to the age of 14 years or to the standard of class VI whichever is earlier. Compulsory Universal Education should mean—of course—free education—free to the extent of free books, clothing, free rations, free accommodation and free of tuition fee. No other method will ever liquidate illiteracy from Nagaland.

Education Minister, Rajasthan: We had come here to have a broad-based agreement, but the turn of the discussion so far makes me fear if we will come to any agreement.

The educationists think that the villain of the piece is the politician—the Minister. They resent the authority of the Government. They think Ministers come in the way of their freedom. I can assure them on behalf of my friends here that none of us is interested in curtailing your freedom. But freedom should be distinguished from licence. We are elected to see that the freedom is properly exercised and some semblance of discipline is maintained. Either you have freedom from within or from without. If the educationists were so keen to have freedom and discipline, then there would have been no imposition from outside. Let us admit our teachers have failed in certain respects to imbibe the spirit of discipline from within. There the government has a role to play. We want that the education system should improve and teachers should get their due place in society. We also want that teachers should earn their salaries. We do not want regimentation, but let us have some fixed routine. We cannot leave it to the whims of teachers when they will teach and when they will not, when they will come and go or not come at all. If we give that freedom to them, goodbye to the orderly society we want to create.

None of us among the Ministers here is interested in *not* introducing compulsory primary education. That is a wrong impression sought to be created. Probably we want it much more than anybody else. But the limitation is one of finance. A poor country like ours needs different things but it cannot have all of them. Planning is nothing but fixing priorities. We are not sitting here in isolation. We have a broad vision to understand the problems of the country. The increase in population has affected our educational system also. The days Dr. Mudaliar was talking about are no more there—selected students going to selected institutions and subject to discipline. Now a young generation is coming up from all sections of society. They have their social and economic problems, which need proper handling. Such problems need careful planning and they cannot be left to *laissez-faire*, or the sweet will of any individual or group. We must realise that, if we want a good thing like compulsory primary education, we must make the hard decision to forego something else. That is the hard reality.

I do not mind if we who are running the Education Departments in the States are criticised. But I do hope the

educationists will succeed in creating a proper atmosphere in their institutions so that the students will not be indisciplined. While there is autonomy in the universities, while there is some autonomy in the colleges, the largest number of complaints of indicipline we have received are from the colleges and the universities. It is not that the Ministers always insit that you admit a particular boy. My Vice-Chancellor is here and I can assure you that there has not been a single occasion when we have interfered with his affairs. But when a law and order problem is created, should we allow that situation to degenerate further ? We will have to take note of it, because it is our primary duty to see that law and order is maintained. Universities cannot create those conditions where the law of the land is disrupted by the students and then ask us to save the situation. But we have tried to interfere as little as possible.

I can assure Dr. Sarabhai that there can be more than one way to reach our goal. But there must be some desire and some urge to solve our problems. We will not reach the goal through inaction. The goal will require a certain human effort on our side and that effort will have to be put in as a collaboration between the educationist and the administrator.

The financial rules and audit rules imposed by the Constitution cannot be ignored. Much as I would like, much as Mrs. Deshmukh would like, we cannot change the procedure because for every penny that we get from the taxpayer, we have to render accounts, and that too in a proper way. In a democracy, if we have peoples' money raised through taxes, we will have to render accounts in a right and proper manner.

I can assure you that we must understand one thing : an educational policy for the country as a whole is very essential. We just cannot afford to postpone this issue. As I said in the Sub-committee, it will be much better to have a wrong policy and give it a chance so that we can improve it, rather than tinker with the problem every fourth or fifth year. This will only result in creating confusion all over. Let us not create confusion. Let us give to the country a broad-based policy which will incorporate all the various views, all the various conflicting opinions that have been expressed in this country, and I am sure in a country like

ours, we can always give a policy which will be acceptable to almost everyone, provided there is goodwill to implement the policy, provided there is desire to maintain the integrity and unity of this country. Because, as the Education Minister has very rightly stated, the most important thing is that the unity of this country should be maintained and the unity of this country can be maintained if we have solved at least certain socio-economic problems we are facing. Let us solve this language problem. Let us apply our mind to something which can at least give relief to the people and remove the apprehensions from their minds about the uncertainty of the trained educated people who will be ready to take up jobs after four years.

I would, therefore, submit that it is very essential that we should have a broad-based national policy on education. Let us see that we do not enter into a controversy of States versus Union, because their resources are limited and our resources are also limited. Let us pool our resources and, within the limitations imposed by the finances, let us go ahead and do the best we can. Given the goodwill, I am sure we will succeed.

Shri P. N. Kirpal: I should like to speak only on one subject and that is the nature of the national policy statement which, we are all agreed, should be made as a result of this session. I speak now as one who has been very near to the policy-making process for many years. Looking back on this process, I see many difficulties. It is clear that we need such a statement today.

The Education Commission has said that education should be revolutionised. That does not mean that there should be complete uprooting of something which exists in the field. This is impossible. Education is a living organic process affecting the whole life of the nation. We can think of new directions, we can think of new programmes, but there can be no thinking about changing things lock, stock and barrel. It is not possible. So the idea of the growing seed and the soil are important and the Education Commission has emphasised all this. So, when they say in their report that education should be revolutionised, all that it means is that there should be a new concern for education, and this new concern should be reflected in our programme and our actions.

Now looking back at the past experience, it is quite clear that policy-making and implementation have been divorced from each other. I would not go into the reasons; everybody here knows them. But the fact remains that there has been a tragic gap between words and deeds. There has been growth and things have changed. But this growth has been directed by pressures from below rather than from the implementation of pre-planned policies. Moreover, planning cannot be confined only to education; it must be part of the national plan. Some of our failures in action have occurred because somehow our educational plans were not properly related to other sectors (for instance, employment or resources).

I suggest that, as a beginning for our debate on national policy statement we may accept five principles on which such a statement may be formulated.

(1) This statement should be as brief as possible and should define clearly and realistically the new directions of change which we propose for education at all levels in the country.

(2) This realistic and concrete direction of change should be related to immediate measures for action. Any change which we cannot launch immediately should not find a place in the national policy statement.

(3) There should be priorities, hard choices, and these should be related to reasonable assurances of resources. It is no use having magnificent schemes and ideas when we know full well that the resources are not forthcoming.

(4) The statement should be the result of a general consensus of opinion.

(5) This statement should provide for ways and means of implementation, including provision for constant evaluation and review.

If we are agreed on some such principles, it would be clear that what we are aiming at is a broad charter of action allowing for freedom and experimentation and maintaining the primacy of the teacher and the needs of the taught.

In conclusion, I would say that the need for this policy should be related to the tremendous crisis in the country which has been well expressed here. What we need is

unity and strength, unity contributing to strength and strength being made of the moral and material fibre of the people. We should make room, in this policy statement, for the cooperative efforts of all. Such a policy statement may be difficult to formulate in a day or two. But, if we can agree in these deliberations on some such principle, I think, those who may be entrusted with the task of drafting will be well-guided.

III

DRAFT STATEMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY OF EDUCATION

On a suggestion by the Chairman, the Board took up the consideration of the draft statement of the National Policy on Education prepared by the Committee of Members of Parliament,* paragraph by paragraph.

PARAGRAPH I

NATIONAL POLICY ON EDUCATION

The Education Minister of Maharashtra opened the discussion. He observed that, in his opinion, it was high time that we had a statement on the National Policy on Education. He said : What we have been following so far is not a well-planned policy on education, but stray thinking on structure that we inherited from the British and in which we have made some modifications here and there. A long-range and coordinated view was never taken in the field of education. Therefore, I feel, and the Standing Committee on School Education also felt, that it is essential to have a statement on the national policy on education. The Members of Parliament were entrusted with this job and by and large, we felt very satisfied with the document they produced and, therefore, the Committee did not go into so many details about it and thought of making suggestions only to this statement by way of alterations, deletions or additions. It is, therefore, necessary to consider only those paragraphs where changes have been proposed.

The first suggestion to para 1 which the Standing Committee has made is to include, in the last but one line, the words "secular outlook." We have made no attempt to define this; but what we have in mind is what the Education Commission has said.

* Copies of the Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education are available with the Publication Unit, Ministry of Education New Delhi.

Shri A. E. T. Barrow : I do not agree with the definition of secularism given on page 42 in one of the minutes of dissent which is different from what the Education Minister of Maharashtra has just explained. It should be made quite clear that our intention is to use the word in the sense given by the Commission and not in the sense given on page 42 of the M.Ps' Report.

Dr. Vikram A. Sarabhai : I myself had a great difficulty with this section. I find that the grown-ups, in which I include all of us, are expressing a certain hypocritical outlook here. To say such a thing from this body with all the cynicism that goes behind it is one of the most potent forms for spreading indiscipline in this country. I really feel quite strongly about this. The people who speak should have the 'adhikar' to speak. I suggest that we do not have the 'adhikar' to speak about this. I mean, all of us. I am not blaming any particular person. All of us are guilty about it.

Shri A. E. T. Barrow : These are the objectives that we laid down in our own human weakness, with all our faults. They may sound hypocritical to some. But we feel that the younger generation should realise that these are the objectives to be achieved.

Prof. Samuel Mathai : My problem is more fundamental. In fact, what we call 'hypocrisy' is due to intellectual uncertainty about what we mean by these terms. I am not a scientist. But if I have understood the meaning of the words 'scientific revolution', it has brought about, for the first time in human history, a totally new mutation in the evolutionary process of man, and the category that we call 'spiritual' belongs essentially to a pre-scientific mode of education. I feel that as a statement of philosophy this has been poorly thought through and has in it a fundamental contradiction. When we speak about moral and spiritual values especially when we use the word 'moral', it is essentially an affirmative and accepting attitude to life that we have in mind. When we talk about scientific education, we mean essentially a questioning and doubting and sceptical attitude to life. If you are trying to harmonise these two, it requires a much profounder study of things.

Education Minister, Andhra Pradesh : The idea behind the addition of the words "secular outlook" is this : In a country like ours where we have several religions, there

are differences on the surface, but there is a unity underneath. Therefore, we should have a secular attitude developed on the part of the students. I do not mean that we should not profess any religion. By secularism I mean that one should develop a spirit of tolerance towards the faith or the religious beliefs of the other man. That is all that we mean by secularism.

The Vice-Chancellor from Kerala has said that there seems to be some incongruity between science on the one hand and moral, social and spiritual values on the other. I am afraid he is not quite correct.

Education Minister, Bihar: I agree. Vinobaji has spoken of the basic commonness between science and spiritual values. He always refers to the age of 'science and spirituality'.

Decision of the Board

The proposal made by the Standing Committee on School Education was adopted, secularising being defined as in the Report of the Education Commission.

PARAGRAPH II

TRANSFORMATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The Education Minister of Maharashtra moved the following amendment to paragraph 2 as proposed by the Standing Committee on School Education. The following to be added at the end of para 2 :

"Such a transformation will not be achieved unless the process of education at all levels is revolutionized in order to make it more realistic, dynamic and closely related to life and environment. Experimentation should be encouraged to bring about constant improvement of the quality of education. In this connection the principles of Basic Education that are now universally accepted as basic to all good education need to be reiterated".

Chief Executive Councillor (Delhi) : Our experience of Basic education has not been happy. The experience in other areas may be similar. No useful purpose would therefore be served by a reference to Basic education in this place.

Shri Radhakrishna : I do not know if it is too late in the day to raise this humble voice of protest. But I do like to

state that what the Education Commission has done and what the Parliamentary Committee also has said leaves many of us who have devoted considerable time of our life to the cause of Basic education and general education, most dissatisfied. I am not voicing my lonely protest and I am sure that what I am saying is the innermost feeling of many an educationist who has tried to understand Basic education and, in his own humble way, tried to interpret it in his own field of work. The Education Commission has failed to recognise that the name also could mean something of value and significance. I was pained to be informed that, even in the re-arrangement that is going on in the NCERT, the Institute of Basic Education has been closed. It disturbs some of us who have always felt that there is nothing static in Basic education. One should accept Basic education not because Gandhiji preached it but because it enunciates vital principles. Basic education is something valuable and dynamic that could be interpreted in the context of the existing national and social situation. That view has been taken in the Education Commission. But why they have fought shy of giving the name of Basic education, I fail to understand. The Standing Committee had recognised the importance of nomenclature. The Central Advisory Board also should recognise it. I plead for the retention of the name Basic education and incorporation of this in the national policy statement.

Shri Dawood : The problem of Basic education was dealt with at length in many committees. Why should there be so much emphasis on this purely technical term 'Basic education'? The reason why the words 'Basic Education' had not been used by the Commission has been stated in the Commission's report. It is misleading; it creates unnecessary hostility to the ideas and also leads—to use Dr. Sarabhai's expression—to hypocritical behaviour. If we were to accept all the principles which are sound—the principle of correlation, of productivity, of relating education to life and of social service—I think all the items of Basic education have been involved. I do not see the reason for the insistence on the name.

Decision of the Board

The Board decided to retain the addition proposed by the Standing Committee on School Education to paragraph 2, except for the second sentence which was deleted.

PARAGRAPH III—VII

STRENGTHENING NATIONAL UNITY

The Board adopted paragraphs 3-7. The Education Minister of West Bengal suggested that there should be much greater emphasis on the promotion of international understanding than what has been indicated in the present draft. This was agreed to in principle.

PARAGRAPH VIII

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SCHOOL

The Board took up the consideration of paragraph 8 on the neighbourhood school. The Education Minister of Maharashtra said that the Standing Committee on School Education agreed more with the Education Commission than with the MP's Committee on the subject and moved that the following new paragraph should be substituted for paragraph 8 :

"The Neighbourhood School (Common School) : To strengthen social unity and to provide equality of opportunity to the less advanced sections of the society, the unhealthy social segregation that now takes place between the schools for the rich and by those for the poor must end. This can be done only by moving in the direction of a common school system which provides equality of access to all children. The system, when in operation, should maintain such a high standard of education, that parents will not feel the need to send their children to expensive independent schools outside the system.

The common school concept should be adopted as a long-term goal to be reached through a phased programme. A beginning should be made in those areas where public opinion is favourable to the idea, but effort must throughout concentrate on the improvement of primary schools to an adequate standard. Concurrently, steps should be taken to encourage fee-charging independent schools to admit a fair proportion of non-paying students to be selected by the State on merit. To compensate the schools for the loss of income, a suitable method of re-imburement should be devised.

During the transitional period, special emphasis should be placed on developing suitable co-curricular programme which would offer opportunity to pupils from different social strata to share a common life”.

The Education Minister of Bihar then introduced the following comments on the subject made by the Standing Committee on Higher Education :

“With a view to achieving national integration and social unity, equal and adequate opportunity should be provided for all sections of society by improving the existing system of primary schools which should be within the easy reach of every school-going child. The common school concept should be adopted as a long-term goal to be reached through a phased programme. Some members were however of the opinion that the Commissions’ recommendations regarding neighbourhood school should be implemented immediately.”

Chief Executive Councillor, Delhi : Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that both the Standing Committees have, in a way, ignored all the recommendations made by the Members of Parliament. I feel so much amazed. Since the very inception of the idea, there has been opposition to it from vested interests. The question has somehow again cropped up. The revolution we are passing through at present can completely transform our education. When I think of it, I feel as if we are still going backward. If we cannot stick to the right conception, our national educational policy, i.e. guaranteeing equality of opportunity to all, will not be fulfilled. We must think of ways and means of implementing the word ‘obligatory’ used by the Members of Parliament. Public schools in my opinion might be encouraged. If some people are sent there for education, it is not going to make much difference. The idea of neighbourhood schools is not affected by that. What I object to is public schools. These schools produce snobs, a class of privileged people who will never let any national educational policy be successful.

Now that we are deciding about our national education, first of all, we must consider this point. You will forgive me when I say that the officials of the Government of India, the Secretaries and others, whose children study in public schools, will never let this institution die. I fear the most stiff opposition to neighbourhood schools from them. I

know that since the very day we thought of it, efforts have been made to get statements issued on behalf of the Education Ministry and other officials in opposition to this idea. I do not think anything is possible in such circumstances. My considered view is that we must sit down and take a decision on this. We must declare neighbourhood schools as obligatory. Then alone can it be worthwhile, not otherwise.

Education Minister, Haryana : I have gone through the Report of the Education Commission, the Report of the Members of Parliament and also the Reports of the Standing Committees. None of these documents has made me wiser with regard to the step which is actually proposed to be taken.

There are three arguments in the Report of the Education Commission for the establishment of neighbourhood schools. The first is that it will bring about social and national integration of the country. The second is that even the children of the rich will greatly benefit because they will be moving with the children of the common people. The third argument is that since the children of the neighbourhood will be going to the common school in the neighbourhood, the rich and the powerful section of the society will naturally take interest in the improvement of the school and improvement will, therefore, result. These are the three arguments set forth, as far as I have been able to make out.

Taking the first argument, promotion of national and social integration, I am afraid it does not seem to mean much. We have been living these 20 years on slogans. But this is one of the first meetings which has been highly refreshing for several reasons. Firstly, you were very candid in the observations which you made in your inaugural address. Secondly, there have been certain speeches made today which reflect a great anxiety for improvement. We have not been indulging in platitudes and have been speaking out our minds. I, therefore, venture to suggest that we have lived on slogans and catch-words all along. It is all very well to say that social and national integration should be brought about. Who does not like it? As a matter of fact, this is the first thing for us to strive for. But the difficulty relates to the means proposed to be employed. All that this proposal means is that the primary

sections of the public schools, or the independent schools will be abolished. That is all what it will come to; and will it achieve our objective ?

As a matter of fact, the mere use of such words, has always prevented the country, during the last twenty years, from thinking rationally and logically on any subject. Once we say that we need social and national integration and this sort of thing will make for national and social integration, you shut the mouth of everybody because, if anybody opposes it, people will say, "Here is a man who opposes steps calculated to promote social and national integration." So, we should be very clear in our minds. In what way and to what extent will the neighbourhood schools promote social and national integration ?

I am not a student of child psychology. But is it really suggested that if a child is kept among the children belonging to the poorer sections of the people up to the age of eight years, he will be brain-washed for the rest of his life ? As a matter of fact, everybody knows that children up to the age of six and eight years, even those of the rich people, keep on playing with the children of jamadars and chowkidars. But the moment they go beyond that age, the moment they go to private schools, the moment they go to colleges, all that is left behind. I, therefore, feel that the mere closure of primary sections of good independent public schools will not really promote national or social integration.

The second point is that the children of the rich will benefit from their association with the children of the poor. For one thing, can't we leave such things for the parents to decide ? In declaring that the children of the rich should mix with the children of the poor, because that will really promote education or integration, we were taking upon ourselves something which should better be left to the parents of the children. I am not expressing any opinion on merits. I am raising only a question of principle.

The third argument is that the common school will be improved if we compel the children of the well-to-do to attend them. In spite of all the time I have devoted to these documents, I fail to understand as to what part of India the Commission is speaking about. Is it speaking about Delhi or other cities ? The recommendation does

not obviously relate to rural areas. It does not even relate to all cities or towns. I know certain towns in Haryana at least where we do not have many rich people who send their children to public schools. So the common schools are the order of the day in all parts of the country, except the big metropolitan areas. I should like to ask as to what it is which has prevented us from improving these schools so far. Whatever the difficulties in this may be, they will still continue to be with us and will still prevent us from improving the common schools.

All these three arguments do not therefore, indicate that we shall really benefit from this proposal.

I shall now advance the thesis that the conditions of success in improving the primary schools are quite different from what has occurred to the Commission. Such success will result from three things. Firstly, there should be proper and courageous planning with a resolve to bite as much as we can chew. In education, all over the country what has really bedevilled the situation is that we have been spreading our resources thinly over too wide an area and we have already bitten much more than what we have been able to chew.

Secondly, there should be improvement in the pay scales of teachers. As a matter of fact, you have been good enough to help us to improve the pay scales of university and college teachers. But in so far as the question of the improvement of the scales of other teachers is concerned, it is still hanging fire and, I think, it will continue to do so unless the Union Government takes courage in both hands and enables the States to improve the pay scales of teachers. The States, left to themselves, will not be in a position to do so.

Thirdly, we need much deeper interest and more vigorous initiative from government. It is a vain hope that our proposal will compel the rich to take interest in the improvement of primary schools. They may or may not do so; and even if they do, the interest of the well-to-do people whose children will be going to the common schools will not compel the Government or the authorities concerned, who alone can do something worthwhile, to improve these institutions. The improvement in education at that level or any

other level can be achieved only by Government by sound planning and by a resolve to stick to that planning and to implement that planning.

I am also opposed to the proposal on yet another ground, viz., it will discourage private effort in the field of education. We have tried this in Punjab; I do not know whether they have tried it in other States. We took over all the schools which were being maintained by the local bodies and by village communities. The village communities had spent a lot on the schools. At that time, an assurance was given to those people that Government would improve all the schools. But what is the result? The schools today are worse than they were ten years ago, at least in so far as buildings are concerned. The Government here and at the State level should undertake to do only that which they can really do well.

The private agencies in this country have done a great deal to promote education at all levels. It will be a great pity if we take any step to discourage that private effort. The neighbourhood school will, directly or indirectly, amount to an attempt to discourage private effort. I would strongly suggest that we should not do so.

There is yet another aspect of this proposal. There is such a thing as experimentation as opposed to regimentation. There is such a thing as demonstration. A good school can influence so many other schools in the neighbourhood. There is such a thing as competition in education, competition amongst students as also among institutions. So far as this proposal is concerned, we shall be discouraging all competition, experimentation demonstration.

I have another reason, a slightly selfish reason. Haryana and Punjab are the States which have sent so many people to the Indian army. So many of them are on the front all the time. The village from which I come sent out, during the last war, about 849 people to the Army. All those people who go there need some place where they can leave their children.

These are the things that I wanted to mention in regard to this proposal.

Education Minister, Andhra Pradesh: The people are opposed to the public schools because it is not desirable that we should allow the children of rich people to be educated in a public school where they are better looked after, where better individual attention is paid, where better textbooks are given, where better environment prevails. Ninety-nine per cent of the children of the poor people, the men of the soil, are condemned only to common schools. In England, there were (and still are) different kinds of schools, one kind of school for the rich and another kind of school for the poor. We have copied the same system here and some of us want this unjust arrangement to continue. But I am afraid that it is not in keeping with the spirit of the socialistic pattern of society that we should allow a child to grow in isolation, away from the mainstream of national life. Then he will feel like a fish out of water and will be anti-social. We talk of equality of opportunity. But how can there be equality of opportunity between a child which is a product of the public school and a child which is the product of a common school? Suppose, they want to compete for the same examination or they want to appear in an interview before a Board for the same post, will they be placed on par? Their training is different, their equipment is different. Therefore, to bridge the gulf between the masses and the classes, it is desirable to ensure that the admission to good schools is not confined to the children of the rich, but is thrown open to all classes of people. The question of payment on behalf of the poor people can be made by the State Government. This is what has been suggested in the paragraph as drafted by the Standing Committee on School Education.

There is also another aspect. We have been aware of the present bad state of the common schools and, therefore, we have suggested the steps that we should take to improve the environment and instruction in the common schools. If the rich people are persuaded to get their children admitted to the common schools, then they can be persuaded to take interest to improve them. This is what we hope for.

Dr. Vikram A. Sarabhai: On the question of the neighbourhood schools, I can very well appreciate the merits of having a mix of students from diverse backgrounds provided they come with reasonably equal objectives as to what they want to do in school. I think we would make a

big mistake here if we conduct the discussion in terms of public schools only. Nobody thinks of sending students to boarding schools. We do not believe that it is a good thing to send a child to a boarding school at a young age. That is, of course, a different matter.

Now the question that we really have to consider is this: there would be a State educational system. This would have its own flavour about it—every Government has, of course, an appropriate right to see that this flavour conforms to its social and political objectives, at least to its social objectives. Within and *vis-a-vis* such a State system, is there scope for private enterprise? Let us forget the public schools. I think, this is a question which has a very special significance. Perhaps in Delhi and Punjab, they are very conscious of it because it extends to a large number of certain groups. But this is certainly not the case with the rest of India, as far as I know.

It seems to me that the private initiative come not so much from the wealthy but from what I would call the 'intellectual class'. There is a strong group, with the tradition of learning, in certain Brahmin families; it does not matter whether the Brahmin is very poor or rich, but there is a tradition which has been running. We have seen this almost in all the States. There are different professional groups which have kept up certain levels of excellence in education. It would seem to me that these people are concerned about the future of their children, that they also have a desire to conduct excellent schools. Such schools should be encouraged and I think it would serve the purpose which the Education Commission have indicated if we could emphasize that every such school would have something like 30 to 50 per cent of places reserved for those who come on merit alone and whose education can be paid for out of some scholarships or any thing else that you might think of or in lieu of the educational grant that the schools might receive. I know that this has happened in Cambridge and Oxford. This is no longer a place for privileged people. It is a place for people who have got a high standard of attainment. I think, this group of privileged people benefits by a mix with the less privileged section because often the less privileged section have a greater incentive to look for academic attainment and to make good what they do not have in

life than the children of the rich. I would certainly welcome such a plan very much. But I think that it would not at all be a good thing to distribute poor academic standards amongst all the children. If my child is not have the privilege to go to such a school, I would, therefore, suggest that the whole question of neighbourhood schools and public schools has been taken up on a wrong alley by mixing it with the issue of public schools. This is a minority problem and has to be dealt with in that way. Of course, the discussions have served a useful purpose; and if there are some objections, they could be removed.

I do not think that we should agree to this concept of neighbourhood or common schools in this form. But I think that we should make a proposition that every school will have 30 to 50 per cent of seats reserved for children to be admitted only on merit and that the cost of such education will be borne either out of a special grant of scholarships by the State or in lieu of the educational allowance or grant which the State gives.

Kumari S. Panandikar: I would like to say on behalf of the Standing Committee on School Education that, in making this recommendation, it did not have the public schools alone in mind; I had in view all the fee-charging schools, the schools which charge high fees, the schools which charge moderate fees and so on. We certainly had in view the kind of schools that Dr. Sarabhai has just now spoken about and we have suggested that steps should be taken to encourage fee-charging independent schools to admit a good proportion of non-paying students to be selected by the State on merit. So, the Committee did recognise the significant contribution that private schools are making and we were definitely of the view that the time had not come when we would expect these schools to be discarded or to go out of the field. The time will come only when the other schools improve to such a level that the existence of such schools will be considered to be redundant. I would like to make it clear that this is not only with regard to public schools. We have a sort of stratified system of education which separates the children of different classes or different economic status, or with diverse backgrounds. The attempt here is to bring these together without, in any way, sacrificing the quality of education.

Shri Dawood: There are three concepts of neighbourhood schools here. The first is given in the Commission's report and it is not a very revolutionary one. The revolution came in when the Parliamentary Committee, for some reason or other, introduced the element of compulsion. This was definitely a revolutionary—according to me—a reactionary proposal. This point was discussed at considerable length in the Education Commission, the pros and cons were thrashed out and it was agreed that the establishment of the neighbourhood school on a compulsory basis would improve whatever little quality there is in education. It is wrong to assume—I do not know why this confusion arises again and again—that whenever people think of social integration, we think in terms of snobbish boys who go to the public schools. In a city like Bombay, there are hundreds of schools which are not public schools at all and charge very low fees but maintain fairly high standards. The children of the lower middle class go to these institutions. If you force these neighbourhood schools on them, you will be destroying whatever little quality that exists in these good schools. It is very easy to level down quality, but it is very difficult to raise it. This point was considerably discussed and the Commission did not approve of it because the proposal smacked of totalitarianism and because we are not, by and large, prepared to raise all our primary schools to some minimum level. Therefore the idea was accepted in principle and it was recommended that it should be introduced in certain areas as a pilot project. The Standing Committee had modified this proposal still further. There is no objection at all to the concept because all of us are interested in social integration. But it must not be done at the cost of whatever quality there is in education. We have to preserve and nourish that quality. I, therefore, endorse whatever has been stated in the Standing Committee's proposal.

My only objection to the proposal is that there seems to be some inconsistency between the title of the paragraph and the content of it. Nowhere is there any mention of the neighbourhood school concept.

Dr. D. S. Kothari: I feel that the common school system has certain positive aspects in relation to our education and that they should be kept in view. But before I come to that, let me say at the outset that I am in favour of the

views expressed by the Parliamentary Committee, and the reason is this. If we really want to accelerate the transformation of the existing social system in our country or the broad principles envisaged in the Constitution and if we want to provide adequate and equal opportunity to every child and help him to develop and so on, the common school system is an essential element in the country. Personally, I think that nothing else will help in the process of development in India.

Let us recognise that we are recommending the common school concept at the primary stage. This is a stage where, generally speaking, it is difficult to identify the gifted from the average child. But it is between the ages of 3 and 8, that a child's attitude towards society and to life is formed. This is, therefore, the stage where all children in our country should share a common environment, common experience. Otherwise, we will have a division between the privileged and the under-privileged. We want every child in India to feel that the whole country belongs to him and he belongs to the whole country. If we can generate that feeling in every child, we will have generated a great India. If I ask myself which is the single important way in which this can be done to generate this feeling in our youth—there are other ways to do it to some extent—I would say that the common school concept would do it more effectively than others. After three or four years in the common school, the gifted children could be identified and sent to special schools where their talents in music, languages, etc. could be developed.

We want to provide equal opportunity to our children. In the case of the poor, the home environment is such that it does not make a positive contribution to education. Even in a conservative country like England, they are realising this today; if they had done it earlier, perhaps conditions would have been different in England also. In a modern world which is rapidly changing with its base in science and technology, a great country can only be great where there is a feeling of commonness and where the most gifted and the others meet. In order to identify the gifted, it is necessary that to some extent the negative influence of the home environment should be made good by the school. Therefore, the maxim should be that there should be best schools in the worst areas. It is said that in the primary stage, three-fourths is contributed by home life and only

one-fourth by education. In order to counteract the negative influence of home life for these poor people, we must provide the best schools in the poor areas. Here if we go to the schools in Delhi slums, we see a heart-breaking situation in the way the young children are treated.

So the concept would be that, not only there will be common schools, but the best schools will be in areas which are the worst and every effort will be made to give them the best teachers. Some incentives should be provided to the best teachers to go there. It is only on this basis that the whole nation can advance.

Reference was made to Gandhiji. So long as our country thought only of people in the cities and we did not have a wide-based political movement we could not obtain our freedom. Gandhiji recognised this. Similarly, so long as we are concerned only with the education of the people in the cities or of a privileged section of the society, and not of the education of everybody, we will not advance educationally.

So, the common school philosophy is to provide opportunities to our children to develop common attitudes, and identify themselves with the aspirations and interests of the society.

We cannot have the best schools in the worst areas all at once, but an effort should be made to have them over a period of time.

Education Minister, Kerala : There are divergent views and in the present circumstances, the only way is to adopt the document given by the Committee.

About neighbourhood schools, the report of the Parliamentary Committee is objectionable as they are compelling parents to send their children to a particular school. That will something defeat the purpose because, in a slum area, there will be students only from the lower strata of society.

Dr. Kothari said that the best schools should be in the worst areas. Who prevented the Government from doing this? Was it because of the existence of the public schools? There is no public school in Kerala, still public support is not forthcoming for constructing buildings for schools where the rich are attending. We must approach it from a practical point of view.

It was implied that public schools must be abolished. It is easier to level down than level up. It is not a scientific equalisation. It will be better to allow them to continue with representation for the poor sections also. That will be better than these neighbourhood schools. The suggestion made by the Standing Committee on school education is more acceptable.

Education Minister, West Bengal: It would be better if this discussion is placed within the context of primary education. The situation would become somewhat more tractable if we can ensure that primary education is free and compulsory throughout the country. When it is free and compulsory we can no longer talk about the choice of the parent because, since Government will be providing the money for all these free primary schools in the rural or urban areas, it would be a necessity for people residing in a particular area to send their children to the school in that area. If we put this discussion in that context, it becomes clearer. That is why I suggest that we take in right earnest this report of the Parliamentary Committee regarding primary education. They have used the phrase "highest priority". If we mean business, this programme should come first, and if in a couple of years or so, we can really create a situation where primary education has become free, universal and compulsory, this concept will have to come in. There will be no way out of the common school. That is the most obvious consequence of having primary education free and compulsory everywhere.

Education Minister, Rajasthan: Whether we like it or not, the common school idea has come to stay. The demand has been there for a long time. There has been a general feeling that, within the last few years, we have created the worst possible class consciousness in our country because some people can dress their children better and send them to schools where they have better trained teachers. Children in the schools where the teachers are not well-trained are at a disadvantage. Discrimination though it was not wanted by us, has somehow crept in. It must go. It will not go if we bring the standards down. We have to raise the standards up; and we have to see that a proper atmosphere is created all over the country. Today the richman is not bothered about the school in his neighbourhood because he can afford to send his child to some other good school. The moment you make it compulsory for him to send his child to that particular common

school, he will be worried about that school because the future of his child is at stake. I would like to utter only one word of caution. We should try to improve the neighbourhood schools as early as possible. If we do that, I am sure we will not be creating heart burning among the rich or a feeling among the poor that they are being ignored or that only the higher middle class can be in power and get educational services. Let us take it away from the controversy of the government officials and the rich people; let us tackle it as a national problem, as a human problem. It concerns the future of the younger generation of this country. Let us give all the emphasis to it and let us accept the idea of common schools.

Dr. D. M. Sen : I think that different concepts have been mixed up in the discussion. I shall take up first Prof. Kothari's point about common schools. As Chairman of the Commission, he had certain ideas which you see in its recommendations. But, I think he has since advanced in the company of the parliamentarians. As Mr. Dawood pointed out, the emphasis is really on the improvement of the primary school gradually, without any reference to any compulsion. I think the report that has come out in England has influenced his opinion. Even there, I should like to remind the Chairman of the Education Commission that the provisions of the Education Act will hold good. A parent shall educate his child; and as long as the State is satisfied about it, a parent can send his child anywhere, to any good school. The point in the Plowden Report is this. In spite of spending millions of pounds, certain areas do not have good schools of the type they would like to have. Therefore, the recommendation is that in the so-called backward areas, there should be schools with all the facilities which are available elsewhere. Whether these would be the best schools, I do not know. Nobody here would disagree with the idea of improving all the schools at the primary stage to the highest level that you want. The controversy has arisen because it has not mixed up with the idea of the so-called public schools. The Minister from Haryana referred to the public school; it is a composite school from classes I to XII. If you analyse how the schools have come in during the 20 years since Independence, the number of these schools, the seats in these schools—I am not talking about the primary section—they have more than trebled. How is it? After Independence, West

Bengal is teaching in Bengali and Gujarat in Gujarati and Madras in Tamil. There are Indians who do not remain in that territory; they move from place to place; there are people from the Army, the Navy, professional classes. They want a school with a common medium, where they can place their children when they move from one place to another, in a school where the language is not necessarily local. It is not rich people who go in for this. In Darjeeling area, there are schools which charge high fees and actually no rich persons have contributed. Then, why are these schools there? Why is there a long waiting list? In the waiting list are children whose parents could not afford to pay the fees. In fact people mortgage everything and send their children to these schools. They do so because they feel that the educational system is comparatively better in those schools than in other schools which the government have set up.

What I am saying is that we entirely agree with the idea that all the private schools should be levelled up or they should be made the best schools, as Prof. Kothari says. But our difficulty is that you want to compel parents to send their children to particular schools. To that, as educationists, we object. Otherwise, you do whatever you like to improve the system.

Education Minister, Orissa: Till now, we have been beating about the bush. No State will make a law banning private schools. Those schools will continue. A law to compel all children to go to the neighbourhood school or the common school will go against the Constitution. Two Members have already expressed their doubt—Shri S. N. Dwivedy and Shri Dinkar Desai—and I have a doubt if we can make a law to that effect. The only thing we can do, as I understand from the explanation given by Mr. Kothari is that in the worst areas we should establish the best schools to which even the richer persons may be tempted to send their children. I think this is a good suggestion.

Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar: Having heard the discussion so far, I do not know what it is exactly that we are discussing. It seems to me that two fundamental ideas have been brought forward. One is that boys at a particular age should all mix together whether they come from poor families or rich families, so that there can be no

question of distinction at that particular stage by virtue of their birth. With that principle, I entirely agree. The question whether a person comes from a rich family or a poor family should have little or nothing to do with his education. In the olden days there was no such discrimination, because there was only one school or two primary schools to which all of us had to go. Today, however, things are very different.

Apart from that aspect of the question, it has been suggested that, if all the boys and girls can go to a particular school, then that school will give equal opportunities to all the students in the particular manner in which education is being imparted. One fundamental factor is being missed, and that is, if the schools are poor in their quality, the rich parents would overcome that want of quality by engaging private tuition to a very large extent. You can never prevent the rich people from educating their children in the manner in which they want them to be educated. I know hundreds of parents who starve themselves to give private tuition. I know many schools where private tuition is given after school hours for which payment is made by parents. These payments are made not merely by the rich but even by the poor. Therefore, if we say that, by sending all children to a common school, we are going to give equal opportunities to them, we are deluding ourselves. Nothing can hold a parent from looking after the education of his children in the best manner possible. They pawn everything that they have for the purpose of education. This idea of common school is merely to prevent responsibility being thrown fairly and squarely on the Government and the States concerned for not performing their duties. If they perform their duties, then there will be no question of a sub-standard school in any rural area.

Reference has been made to the Plowden Report. It so happened that Lady Plowden was in Madras a few months ago and addressed a large number of teachers. The fundamental thing is that schools are to be upgraded very substantially if they are to give real education. If you abolish all the fees and say that everybody could have free education, that is only a very small manner in which you impart education. I do believe that education has to be upgraded at all levels, particularly at the primary and secondary level by importing into these classes persons who are competent to teach. Have we done that? When the

Panchayati Raj was established in Madras, I spoke with all the vehemence I could that education should not be handed over to the Panchayati Raj. It led to the people in charge of panchayats getting their children privately educated, while the schools were neglected. This fact can be verified. They can say that education is free. But in a class which is supposed to have 40 pupils, they have 60 pupils and the teacher is ill-qualified. He has only passed the third form and undergone two years of so-called training after that. The reports of various Education Commissions have been completely ignored by the governments of the provinces concerned. Let us tackle them at the root. Why is it that in Delhi you have schools without any premises at all, where poor children have to shiver in cold weather. Why do school buildings collapse resulting in the death of children? It is because the conscience of the public and of the legislators has not been roused to the required extent. There is no question of saying that public schools are bad. It is the inevitable phenomenon of the unfortunate spread of education by means other than efficiency. So long as that continues, rich people will find many opportunities to give their children an education which the poor people cannot. If you want to give equal opportunities, it is the State and the Government of India which should take a lead in the matter, not by abolishing what are good schools, but by encouraging every school to be a good school, so that there will be equal opportunity for all. Short of that, all these ideas of neighbourhood schools will never produce the results we have in view, namely, every child, whether born of rich parents or poor parents, must have an opportunity to get the best type of education that can be given by the country. That can be done only if we pool all our resources together and if the Governments at the Centre and in the States realise their responsibilities more fully than they do at present.

Dr. Mohan Sinha Mehta: I find there is no difference of opinion that every child, whether born of rich or poor parents, should have equal opportunities. While this objective is common, there is a great deal of confusion in our minds. One point has been missed throughout the discussion: Will it or will it not require an amendment of the Constitution if you accept the opinion of the Parliamentary Committee? I do not know. But can you compel a parent to send his child to a particular school?

If you oblige the parents to send their children to a particular school, the result will be just the opposite. They will arrange for their own school; they will not ask for your support or recognition. After all, this is the background of the so-called public schools. There will be wider divergence and the richer people will have better opportunities than even what they have now.

I wonder if there is not a confusion in our minds. Listening to Dr. Kothari, I came to know for the first time that he was referring only to primary schools. He said the crucial age is 3 to 8 years. But public schools do not cater to children of that age. Only the preparatory schools do that and their number is much smaller. We think of public schools in the nineteenth century context; and what we say applies only to them. But the Indian public Schools are not the replica of the English Public Schools. Even in England, the public school today is different from what it was 50 years ago. A good proportion of children who go to Oxford and Cambridge go under the scholarship system; they have not been in public schools and they are not children of rich people. So, we should have the latest information about the public schools. Nobody swears by public schools. The question is, are we going to level down or level up? The answer should be that we level up. Take the number of schools and the school-going population in the country and calculate whether you will be able to bring the primary schools to the standard of the public schools. If you cannot do that, what is the harm if some people go to public schools? How can you prevent them? Equality of opportunity should be given, but how can you do it by making some people go to an inferior school and by making others go to a superior school? This should be carefully examined by us. We should go by the main object that there should be no discrimination and poorer people should get better opportunities. It is a very good idea that Dr. Kothari has given that we should provide the best schools for the most under-privileged people. But to bring neighbourhood schools in this is really confusing the issue. You can do it without damaging the educational system as a whole. The legal aspect of this question should be examined. This misleading heading should be removed. The draft which Maharashtra has proposed as the opinion of the committee represents the consensus of opinion on this subject and we should accept it.

Education Minister, Bihar: Mr. Chairman, I have been identified with the idea of common or neighbourhood schools. The degree of identification has been as deep as between God and his devotees.

Mr. Chairman, I do not merely consider that the schools whose standing, status and conditions are bad, should be improved and their standards raised, though this question is an important one. Many learned persons have said that the status and conditions should be improved of those schools which are sub-standard and of lower standard. There can be no difference of opinion on this score and all those who are here whether they are men of letters, Ministers or not, are unanimously of the opinion that the standards should be improved i.e. the schools having a low standard should be raised and improved. But I admit there is an idea which is of more importance and that is of adjustment. Do we today think that the masses in our country belong to a different level and they have not much in common with others? Should we not bring them into line with others? Merely raising slogans would not lead us anywhere. Some practical steps have to be taken in order to make them feel so. It is all a question of feeling. Unless we have a feeling for them nothing can happen. I am here reminded of Mahatma Gandhi's speech which he made in London 1931 at the Round Table Conference. There he had said that he was participating in the Conference as a representative of the entire country, all communities and interests of India and particularly as a representative of the dumb millions of India. This is what Mahatma Gandhi had said.

This Common School system will raise a hope in the minds of these dumb millions. They would feel that schools in the country would not be split into those meant for the poor and those meant for the rich and big people. Most of our schools will cater for the poor and only some for the rich classes. This kind of division will not work. I entirely agree with Dr. Mudaliar who has said that the children of the rich even if admitted to common schools would study at home with the help of private tutors. Neither the Union Education Minister nor the Education Ministers in States can force them not to do so. Therefore, I wonder why there is resistance against the common

schools. If the children of the rich can study at home, why is the idea of the common schools opposed? Every one is free to coach children at home in whatever subjects one likes. There is no law which prevents it.

Some friends have said that there is no provision in our constitution by which we may be able to compel people living in a certain area to send their children to the school located within that area. To this my reply is that if there is no such provision in our constitution, we can frame it. The constitution must follow our ambitions and the law our national targets, and not *vice-versa*. If we accept that our ideals are to follow the law, I must say then that our ideals would be lifeless. I would therefore, like to say that if we make up our minds in favour of common schools for the sake of the feeling of identification among our people, we must own up the common school system.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said here about the standard of education.

The British Prince and the British commoner study together and gain thereby. In our country we do not have merely the lowly in riches but we have also the lowly in mind. Our social organisation is such that our society is split into the rich and the poor. The former high-minded and the latter poor and low-minded. If we want to integrate our people, we shall have to bring these classes together. Not only the poor and the rich, but also the low-minded and the high minded should be brought together. I am reminded here of a couplet by the Hindi poet Sumitra Nandan Pant :

“The world is suffering from extreme pains, The world is suffering from extreme comforts; In this world sufferings can be minimized by equitable distribution of comforts and sufferings among people.”

On one side of the scale, there is extreme suffering and misery; on the other, there are a few people who possess far more than they require. It would be fine if the miserable were to distribute their sufferings and the affluent their comforts among others. Each group will have to distribute among members of the other class what it possesses. Mere practical considerations would not lead to

integration of the people today. We are students of psychology. If we follow only solid facts, leaving feeling and emotion untouched, we shall not be achieving anything. There is no question of unity without touching the hearts of the people.

I do not want to take too much of your valuable time, but would like to say that we should leave aside the question of standard and talk of something else which may bring our people together. When Shri Mudaliar's son and the son of his neighbour, a worker, study together in the same school, the latter will think that he is equal to the former and will thus feel encouraged and go far. It is this feeling which has to be created in the country today. I agree with Shri Mudaliar that there was once a time when the rich associated with the poor and the children studied together. During the last 20 years, the gap between the rich and the poor has increased. Now the time has come when this economic and even social disparity must be removed, so that the Indian nation will become one and our people will be united.

Education Minister, Madhya Pradesh: Mr. Chairman, As I was a member of the Standing Committee on the Higher Education, my views regarding neighbourhood schools are there in the Report of Higher Education Committee :

“Some members were however of the opinion that the Commission's recommendations regarding neighbourhood schools should be implemented immediately.”

My name was not there. From the different speeches delivered here by different persons, two facts have come to light. First we should introduce this system and concept because it is based on sentiment and this sentiment plays a great role in personal as well as national progress and uplift. It is quite correct that everything which is practical and concrete cannot be drawn from the kind of conditions obtaining in India with all its multiplicity and variety in languages, religions and customs. As my friend Shri Thakur has rightly said we cannot bring about emotional integration nor economic prosperity in the true sense without unity. Nor can we be secular in the true sense of the term without subscribing to the system of neighbourhood

schools. Our object is to raise the standard of poor schools and not to lower the standard of those of the rich.

I do not think it is the right approach to force parents to send their children to a neighbourhood school on the plea that putting them into other schools would go against the interests of emotional integration. The great harm which will accrue from it is that schools in slum areas where the poor live will be flocked only by the children of the poor. With the application of this rule, every one will have to send his children to schools which are in bad shape and which we have been trying to improve. Its results would be denial of opportunity even to those children of the poor who can advance now by managing to join other schools.

Much has been said here about the rich and the poor. In my opinion by talking about it here, we are giving impetus to class-conflict. We have said nothing here by way of discouraging this class-conflict. The controversy in which we are engaged here would go to encourage rather than discourage class-conflict. The Chairman has given figures of poor students in educational institutions. I have got figures of Madhya Pradesh which I will put before you. You will be surprised to know that in 1965-66 in all 1624 students got admission in our engineering colleges. Out of these 1025 students were such whose parents' income was less than Rs. 300 per month. Sixty-three per cent of our total admissions in all our technical education were from the income group of less than Rs. 300 per month. 365 students were such whose parents' income was between 300—500 and only 231 students were such whose parents has income of more than Rs. 500 per month.

The number of students admitted in 1966-67 was 2120, out of which the income of 1720 students' parents was less than Rs. 300 and that of 338 parents was more than Rs. 300. This shows how the Government is trying to give the same opportunity to the poor students as to the rich. So, it will be proper and more advantageous to open more schools in the tribal areas or the backward ones, rather than close down the existing schools where students are sent by their parents incurring more expenditure on them.

Secondly, the Central or the State Governments have limited resources and we know that we cannot fulfil the

demands for education with these limited resources. It will be, therefore, a mistake to take any step which may result in the closing down of these schools at this stage where at least some students are receiving education. For this reason also, I am not in favour of closing down the public schools run by the public bodies. By doing this, we will hamper the expansion of education.

I agree with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on School Education that more seats should be reserved for those students who pass with merit and should be admitted accordingly irrespective of the fact whether they come from rich or poor families. This will be more beneficial than closing down their existing institutions.

Shri Anil Mohan Gupta : I am a school teacher myself and have been living in villages for more than 25 years working among the tribal people and the backward communities. I feel that we are discussing the "Common School" concept from the point of view of the learned and privileged few only and not from the point of view of the common man. I am also afraid that we are confusing certain issues.

In the first place I would like to know why we are thinking of common schools for the children of the age between 3 and 8 years only. I think it has been very clearly laid down in our Constitution that all children in our country should receive elementary education up to the age of 14 years. It is a very wise decision. This is all the more important if we want to see their skills and aptitudes being developed, if we want that we should judge their merit on the basis of their all-round development, and not on the basis of mere book-learning. This is exactly what we want. We should, therefore, arrange for universal elementary education up to the age of 14, keep the children together till then and watch them carefully and scientifically.

Secondly, let me give you my experience. When we started our school in a remote village and introduced certain manual activities in the school, the caste people first took away their children. Soon others started to think that, if the caste people are taking away their children, the school must be doing nothing worthwhile. Therefore, they also started taking away their children from our school. It is not always true that parents take away their children

from a school because the school does not have good teachers or because it is not teaching the subjects properly. They also take them away because they do not want their children to participate in the socialistic kind of life envisaged in our Constitution. In my opinion this is the very reason why we should impose common schools on those persons who do not want their children to become the children of India sharing a common life and learning to do certain things in the same manner as others do. What I feel is that all children of the land should share the same kind of life, at least in their schools, throughout the first phase of education in elementary schools i.e., upto the age of 14. It is only after this that they should be allowed option on the basis of their performance.

From this point of view the common school system is of immense importance. In the common schools the children should not only come together and learn together but also live together and work together, share the life of the common people who work and produce. Thus this education will generate active sympathy in our children for the common people. This alone can bring about the national integration of which we are talking so much.

There is one more point which I would like to emphasize. In spite of all our talking the Public schools and English Medium schools are really schools for the rich people. In villages 90% of the people, or even more, do not care for them, very few of them have even heard of such institutions. But they are very anxious that their children should get justice and equal opportunity in regard to employment. They do not understand why their children should be labelled as unintelligent only because they do not know good English or because they have not been able to memorise certain facts, why the English-knowing persons should monopolise all fat-salaried jobs even when they know very little about the jobs they are supposed to do. If in all our institutions of higher education and even in our technical institutions we emphasise on certain very limited items of knowledge, like a good knowledge of English or a particular kind of memory only, and refuse to take other qualities, like industry, honesty, skills in different kinds of activities, attitude towards work etc., into accounts, then the common people will always feel that a kind of advantage is being given to some persons, who do not deserve it,

only because they are well-to do people who can buy a particular kind of education for their children in a special kind of school which have been made inaccessible to the millions. This apprehension is creating a kind of emotional unrest among the village people. For instance, in my area, we have 70% 'C' category teachers, i.e., non-matriculate untrained teachers, teaching in the primary schools. There are only a few English Medium schools in Calcutta, Darjeeling and other places. It is quite evident that the children studying in these English Medium schools get a kind of undue advantage, because of the present type of examinations, over millions of others studying in ordinary schools, only because they are born in a particular area or class. If we really want equality of opportunity for our children we must have the Common School system.

Of course common schools will not mean lowering the standards, it will mean that the standards will be much more broad-based. They will be determined, not on the basis of efficiency in just a few subject areas only. The children of the common people, the down trodden millions, work hard physical and carry on their studies at the same time. Let the children from the higher ranks of society come and work with them, at least during the school hours, and show that, inspite of working together, living together and solving the same problems, they have shown merit in different activity and subject areas. If that is done, we can really say that they are really meritorious and their claims for higher education on merit are really justified. Otherwise the claim of merit is a fiction.

Therefore, in my opinion, Common Work-school system is a must if we want to develop India into a Socialistic Democratic Republic.

Education Minister, Maharashtra : Since yesterday, we have been discussing at length the new idea of the neighbourhood school or the common school system. If I have understood the discussion correctly, everyone who spoke on this item expressed his broad agreement with the principle that, in a free country, equal opportunity for education should be available to all, irrespective of caste, creed, economic position or social status. But doubts were raised on several issues : would it be possible to implement this idea in practice? Would not be implementation of this idea reduce all schools to the average level? Would not

the idea destroy experimentation and lower standards and so on? These different viewpoints were expressed in the school committee also and the effort of the committee was to arrive at a broad agreement. The amendment moved by me represented the general consensus of opinion of the school committee. But if I have to express my own view, I will say in unequivocal terms that I stand for the idea of the neighbourhood or common school system. It is absolutely essential in a free country where we want to rebuild society on the basis of equal status and equal opportunity and where we want to build up a feeling of oneness in the country. Under this system, everyone will get the feeling that there is no discrimination in so far as the education of his children is concerned.

It is argued that, by the introduction of the common school system, we will be going in a direction detrimental to experimentation and that it will reduce the standard of education. May I say that none of those who sponsor this idea is against the quality of education or against experimentation? In fact, everybody is of the opinion that the standards of education should be raised in all our schools. But the pertinent question is whether admission is available to all children in the schools which are for the snobs or the rich people. We are not discussing the question of public schools only. In addition to public schools, we are also discussing schools charging very high fees, thereby debarring the children of the poorer sections of the society. These public schools have experimented with education and maintained standards, but not necessarily because they charge high fees. What is pertinent is that we should have schools which go on experimenting with new ideas and this should go on at all stages and in all schools, not necessarily in a few privileged schools. The standards will also have to be maintained in all the schools. But what happens in that admission is given to those who can pay. We are averse to this idea of education being sold. Even under the new system we are not going to stop creation of special institutions for the talented boys. The State should start such schools. In Maharashtra, we have started four schools to cater for the needs of the talented boys. On the basis of an objective test, talented students from all over the State are selected and are given education in these schools at the cost of the State which comes to Rs. 1600 per student per year. Such institutions can be established

elsewhere also. The question I want to raise is whether the parent should have an opportunity of buying education. I feel that this should not be allowed, at least at the primary stage.

The issue before us is this : How can we implement this idea which we accept in principle without detriment to the standard of education ? I would like to put before this august body the new draft which I have prepared :

“To strengthen social unity and to provide equal opportunity to the less advanced sections of the society, the unhealthy social segregation that now takes place between the schools for the privileged and those for the under-privileged must end. This can be done by moving in the direction of a common school system wherein all children, irrespective of caste, creed, community, religion, economic advantages or social status, are imparted education. The system, when in operation, should maintain such high standards of education that parents will not feel the need to send their children to independent schools outside the system”.

I hope the last sentence meets the arguments of those who scared of the common school idea and ensures the maintenance of standards of education in the common school system.

Shri B. N. Shastri : I fully agree with the draft presented by the Education Minister of Maharashtra. Our cultural tradition is that, in the ancient times, the princes and sons of the sages sat together at the feet of the guru and had their education. Though there was a caste system, in the field of education, there was no distinction. Therefore, if we are to impart our cultural tradition to our younger generation, there should be a common school system.

Secondly, some of the public and private schools are established and run by some outside agencies, and the reasons for sending boys and girls to those schools are many, viz. better system of education which means mainly proficiency in English; better employment possibilities also based on proficiency in English; western way of living and satisfaction of one's ego that one is capable of spending more money than one's neighbour on the education of one's children. This leads to segregation in our society. Therefore, if we want social unity and national integration there

is no way out except the common school system, and therefore I prefer the nomenclature of the common school to that of neighbourhood school.

Prof. Samar Guha: I have a few words to say in support of the draft of the Parliamentary Committee. This draft is really a symbolic expression of the aspiration of our emerging nation. It is a call for the march onward to establish a socialist society in our country.

Socialism is not merely an ethics of economic equality. It is essentially the philosophy of social equality. If socialism is to have an abiding place in our democratic polity, it must be based on a concept of social equality. In other words, it must form a part of our social culture. The concept of the neighbourhood school is a move in that direction. I therefore support the draft of the Parliamentary Committee on this moral basis.

The concept of the neighbourhood or common school may technically contradict the principles of fundamental rights. But we must remember that the will of the people is the ultimate source of sovereign power. It is the will of the people today that all social and caste barriers must be abolished. Therefore, constitutional difficulty cannot stand in the way, ultimately, if any conflict at all arises.

Then, the overall position of primary education in our country today does not offer any major conflict between the neighbourhood school idea and the public schools. A somewhat significant clash really exists between free primary schools and fee-charging independent primary schools. This clash arises only in big cities where quite a number of fee-charging primary schools are found. If Government can afford finance to these independent, fee-charging primary schools, provision can easily be made for admission, on merit, of a considerable percentage of free students in these schools.

The issue of a neighbourhood or common school, therefore, boils down to the problem of making primary education free and compulsory. And that ultimately raises the question of availability of public funds for such purposes. The Parliamentary Committee visualised this difficulty and as such made the suggestion in the last sentence: "Transition to a new pattern should be carefully planned". The

word "transition" is very significant, and the other words are also significant.

The problem before us, regarding implementation of the concept and the scheme of neighbourhood school, is three-fold. First, to make primary education free and compulsory; second, to improve standards of education; and third, to provide requisite public funds for it. I therefore suggest the following few lines to be added to the draft of the Committee of Members of Parliament, to make the issue and its solution more explicit :

"While implementing the programme of the neighbourhood or common school, every effort should be made to improve the standard of primary education. Till financial and other difficulties can be removed for making primary education free and compulsory, fee-charging independent primary schools should be directed (not requested) to admit on merit test, at least 40 per cent free students. For such independent schools, Government should devise suitable means to make up the consequential loss of income."

Prof. M. V. Mathur : I am supporting the draft prepared by the Standing Committee on School Education. The present proposal is similar to that draft but it omits the last two paragraphs. I do want that the two other paragraphs in the original draft should continue. The point which Dr. Kothari mentioned, namely, that this applies to the age-group of 3-8 years is something which must also be stated.

Education Minister, Maharashtra : What has been omitted is the operative part. The idea was that each State can decide upon its own form of implementation.

Prof. Sher Singh : Mr. Chairman, I have two suggestions to make in this regard. It is not enough to say that our schools be such that they do not produce a privileged class and that our other schools should be as good as public schools. My two suggestions are :

Schools in our villages are common schools. Every Tehsil if not every Panchayat Samiti should have at least one such school in which students should be admitted from all primary schools in that area on merit. Every State can do it. In bigger States there will be some thing like 50 or

more such schools and in smaller States, any thing between 25 to 30. Boys getting good marks in primary classes will be able to get admission to such schools. Post-primary education could be conducted in such schools in Tehsils or Talukas. In the same way, there should be such model schools to cater for the needs of common schools in towns also. These schools will not be for moneyed people who can afford to send their children to Public Schools or who can start their own schools. We cannot stop them from doing so. It is for the children of the poor who send their children to common schools that such model schools should be established.

Those students who pass with merit should be admitted to these schools. You should open such schools in the cities also so that poor people can give good education to their children. If you reserve 40 per cent seats for such poor people in costly public schools they will not be able to pay school-fees as demanded by you and thus this proposition would not be feasible. Government alone can do something in this matter and model schools for such students should be opened by the Government. It is natural that Public schools will be opened in cities by rich people, but for poor boys model schools should be opened by the Government. At least one such school where merit-students can be admitted should be opened in every taluka. This will solve your problems and also dispense with the need of public schools. This objective can be achieved only when new model schools are set up for merit-students.

Another thing that I want to say is with reference to what Dr. Kothari said yesterday about the best schools to be situated in the worst areas with best teachers. He had said that all the rural areas are not of the same economic level. There are districts which are roadless, which have no drinking water facilities and which are subject to famines. No good teacher would like to be posted to such a district. Similar variations of level exist in towns also. You will have to provide an incentive of 25% extra salary to teachers in such areas for attracting good teachers.

This is the operative part of our proposal. To implement it, State Governments will have to agree to give 25% additional salary to teachers. Unless this incentive is provided, this proposal will never work and it will remain

a paper-plan. This has to be kept in view in the interest of implementation of the proposal.

Education Minister, Haryana : I propose a slightly less pretensions draft as an alternative :

“In order to provide for those sections of society which are economically and educationally backward the same opportunities for school education as are currently available to the more fortunately situated sections in the so-called public or independent schools, it is proposed appreciably to improve the common school system through various devices, especially the establishment in appreciable numbers of model or quality schools in rural areas.”

This is for the villages. The cities will look after themselves.

Dr. Durgabai Deshmukh : I am in favour of the amended draft presented by the Education Minister of Maharashtra. But I also share the fears entertained by some members who spoke yesterday and who were not in favour of compelling the parents to send their children to common school. It may be argued that Government always has powers to secure this cooperation of parents by legislation or executive orders. But my experience in social fields is that no legislation will be so effective as inducements, appeal for public cooperation and proper communication with the people. I support the amended draft mainly because it is stated that it is only a transitional measure and the attempt is to move in the direction of common schools.

Dr. Samuel Mathai : I am a little worried at what might be called the ideological background in our thinking. If it is our desire that all our children should have equal opportunities to receive the best kind of education that can be afforded, we should be much more flexible in the kind of arrangements we provide. We say, we are a free society. Freedom goes to the very root of the matter—freedom of the individual to grow up in the way he likes. I say, “I will take care of my own education at home.” Is the national purpose served by that or not? Or, would you insist that I should go to an institution which you call a ‘school’ and receive what you call ‘education’? If I have that right, then this whole notion or regimentation which lies

at the back of this seems to be over-stressed. One should have the personal freedom to develop oneself as one thinks best. When you are very young, a good deal of your education and development is thought of by your parents. I would be very sorry if, out of this proposal there emerges a completely regimented and indiscriminate system in which we are going to bring-up all our children in the same manner for all time to come. If that is our notion of equality, then all of us should immediately set about being equal with every-body else. We do not do that. There is a perpetual conflict in human society between the idea of equality and the idea of excellence. The procedure we evolve should ensure that these two seemingly opposite and contradictory principles are somehow reconciled and harmonised so that there is equality and also opportunity for excellence.

Dr. D. S. Kothari: That will be taken into account by adding a preamble to that effect. It would generally be agreed that the first thing we should do is to pay special attention to the improvement of primary education and to making it effective for the first four or five years. Higher priority should be given to those areas which are educationally more deprived than others. We could also say that education at the primary level must generate a feeling of identification with the community. We could also express our conviction that so long as education at the primary level is not of an adequate quality or so long as education in some parts is weaker than in other parts, that weakness should be shared by all. We cannot say that poor education is only for one section and better education is for another section. Somewhere in the preamble we can say that we want to improve education, we want to give the highest priority to the improvement of education. But so long as education is weak in some areas, that weakness should be shared by the entire community. Having said that in this draft, if you like, we may say that we should move in the direction of a common school system. In order to indicate the general view about what this common school system is to be, you can add here "moving in the direction of common schools as envisaged by the Parliamentary Committee."

Shri A. R. Dawood: You cannot improve quality by sharing weakness.

Shri A. E. T. Barrow : My objection is exactly to that. When Dr. Kothari urges with so much of emotion, there must be something. He is a scientist. What he is trying to highlight is that the rich are perpetuating this system at the primary stage. I feel however that it is the State that has perpetuated the system. We are taxed and the taxation is for the purpose of bringing about this socialistic pattern. But when the money is being distributed, what we find is, as Mrs. Deshmukh said, that education is treated as a non-productive sector and we get a very small return for our taxes. When it comes to planning, the Minister has pointed out that from Rs. 1800 crores, we are coming down to Rs. 800. It is the responsibility of the State under Article 45 of the Constitution for providing primary education and the State must, therefore, see that the education is of a high quality. The middle-class people in Bombay, as Mr. Dawood pointed out, are also paying to get better education for their children. This is one of the fundamental rights of the people. You can change the Constitution and remove the fundamental rights if you like. At present, I do not think it can be done. There is a debate going on after the last judgment of the Supreme Court as to whether we can change the fundamental rights and how that can be done. Till that is decided, let us put our feet firmly on the ground and see how we can bring about an improvement in primary education. There is no point in saying, we may compel people to share the weakness when you cannot compel them.

Dr. D. S. Kothari : I think, there is some misunderstanding. In discussing this issue in a short time, it is becoming rather difficult to make this point clear. When I say, so long as education is weak, it is to be shared by the community, I mean that our resources being limited, instead of concentrating those resources in improving the better schools in better areas, the better areas should make a sacrifice and should give priority to the educationally weaker areas. That is what I mean when I say that the privileged class should share the weakness of the weaker section.

Chief Executive Councillor, Delhi : It is not a question of majority policy. Minority cannot hold certain things for all times to come. In Delhi, at present, for every primary school of Corporation, there is a school for the rich in the locality.

In Delhi if there are 500 schools run by the Corporation, the same number exists for the children of the rich also. On one side are schools where the tuition fee is Rs. 25 per month and on the other are the Corporation schools where no tuition fee is charged. If this state of affairs continues you will never have equality of opportunity for all students. It is said that action may be put off to another 20 or 25 years, hence. I would ask whether it is our intention to bring about equality of opportunity at any stage. If we desire it, action must be taken by the Government right now. To put it off to a future date, would be meaningless.

Education Minister, Rajasthan: I whole-heartedly agree with Dr. Kothari for the simple reason that if there is poverty, it has to be shared; if there is shortage of food, it has to be shared; if there is a shortage of sugar, it has to be shared. This country is not for the benefit of a handful of individuals. It is for people as a whole. Unless we are prepared to share all the good things and bad things, we cannot do anything. Everybody is prepared to share good things. But when it comes to sharing the poor man's school, everybody says 'our fundamental rights are touched'. Legally I am sure it can be done. The legal question is not so important on this point, because law can be changed. The important question is : what is going to be our approach to this problem? Is it that everyone who is rich has the right to have a rich peoples' school or is it that the community as a whole should have a common concept in so far as the education of the children is concerned? I know instances where boys from the public schools in Bombay or Delhi go for IAF interview for the first time and realise that India is a poor country. Candidates who, because of their sharpness of intelligence get into the topmost services like IAS, when they go to the villages, realise that majority of people in India do not always eat meat, they sit on the floor to take food, and so on. So, it is very necessary that we should have commonness and oneness in the schools.

Education Minister, Bihar: Weakness should be shared in the real sense of the term.

Dr. Durgabai Deshmukh: I know definitely that in the Constitution, there is an obligation enjoined on the State to find special funds to develop the weaker sections and to develop under-developed areas. Therefore, it is not by

snatching away funds that are due to those areas which are already developed that this objective should be achieved. It is the special responsibility of the States to find additional funds for this.

Shri J. P. Naik : I think we must be very clear in our mind as to what we want. We are not giving education to the poor as a matter of charity. Education is not charity; it is the birth right of the child and the poor man's child is as much entitled to expect good education as the rich man's child. The idea of sharing is different from the idea of charity. We will try to improve primary schools as much as possible. But I will not accept the argument that those schools which are horrible for 'my' children are good enough for 'your' children. We are all sitting here and planning education for 'other peoples' children'. The only way we can bring about the needed mental change is to have the common school which will compel us to think of the education of 'our' children. I demand the common school system as the right of every Indian child.

Dr. D. S. Kothari : It is a part of the common school system that, upto the fourth or fifth year, all children must share the common school in order that one section does not become hostile to the other and all of them share the ethos and the commonness of the country for these years.

So everybody should go to the same school. But, beyond that, when it becomes possible to identify the gifted, in the academic studies, sports etc. which must be determined on a wide basis, they must be sent to special schools maintained by the State as a part of the common school system.

Shri Anil Mohan Gupta : Why should we not extend the common school system to the 14th year i.e., for the entire universal elementary education period? Can we really identify the gifted before that age?

Education Minister, West Bengal : I want to say a few words about compulsion. Perhaps we are making a little too much of this question of compulsion. As far as I can see, the present proposal is not to compel the parent to send his child to a certain school. But I think it will be

far more important to make it compulsory for every school to allow primary education on a completely free basis. The point is not whether a parent shall have the right to send his child to a school which charges, for instance, Rs. 25 per month. The point is whether such a school should be allowed to continue on this basis. I think, it would be perfectly within the Constitution and within our rights and powers, to make arrangements, so that there is no primary school which charges Rs. 25/- or any such figure for teaching children upto the age of 8 or 10 or 14 whatever you might say.

Shri A. E. T. Barrow : This is not possible. Section 20 of the Kerala Bill which tried to do this was struck down by the Supreme Court.

Decision of the Boards

The Board accepted the revised draft moved by the Education Minister of Maharashtra. The concept of the common school was acceptable to all; and the States were requested to devise suitable methods of implementation.

PARAGRAPH XIII

SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

The Chairman proposed that paragraphs 9-12 which dealt with language policy should be taken up in the afternoon and that the Board should first finalise the remaining sections of the Report which were more or less non-controversial. This was agreed to.

Decision of the Board

Paragraph 13 of the Report was taken up for discussion and adopted without any amendment.

PARAGRAPHS XIV AND XV

EDUCATION FOR AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

Education Minister, Maharashtra : In para 14, there is one change proposed by the School Committee and that is, the last sentence in Para 14 may be replaced by the following .

“Agricultural polytechnics providing different courses needed for agriculture or agro-industrial development

should be established. The curriculum in these institutions should aim at building up a spirit of self-reliance and self-employment in the students. The present tendency to depend entirely on government jobs should be discouraged. There is urgent need in the rural areas for suitable centres or institutions providing extension service to the farmers and giving part-time intensive courses to young persons who have left schools and taken to agriculture."

Decision of the Board

The paragraph 14, as amended, was adopted. Paragraph 15 was adopted without amendments.

PARAGRAPH XVI

WORK EXPERIENCE

Education Minister, Maharashtra: This is one of the most important recommendations of the Commission and the Committee felt that we should strongly support the recommendation of work experience. The idea of work-experience should be an integral part of general education at all stages. The Committee has proposed the addition of one word only—modern. If this is agreed to, the last sentence will read as follows :

"This work with hands will help the young to develop insights into modern productive processes."

Instead of 'productive processes', we say, 'modern productive processes', so that whatever is achieved through this work experience will be of utility to the students in practical life.

Education Minister, Bihar: The M.Ps Committee has restricted work-experience to the school stage only. The Standing Committee on Higher Education has made the following comments :

"The concept of work-experience should be extended to higher stages of education also as recommended by the Education Commission. For implementing this programme, suitable guide-lines should be prepared and necessary funds provided."

Prof. Samuel Mathai : I do believe that this is a good idea. But it would be worthwhile to spell it out a little more in detail. I am thinking about the technologically oriented school system in East Germany, where it is a part of the time-table of the school. I do not like work-experience to be spelt out merely as 'work with hands'.

Shri Anil Mohan Gupta : So far as the concept of work-experience is concerned, is it to be placed only side by side with a subject-wise curriculum?

In my opinion, Work-experience must be a medium of Instruction and it must have its impact on examination results. If that is not done work-experience will always be left out of the school programme under various pretexts. You have said that we are going to retain the fundamental principles of Basic education. Work-experience, as to most important medium of instruction, is the most fundamental principle of Basic education. If we accept this concept of work-experience it will mean not merely some manual work somehow done, but it will mean the all-round development of the educand. It will mean not only the development of the Hand, but also of the Head, and, at the same time, of the Heart. We are, all the time, talking as if education of the Emotion is of no importance. But, to me, education of the Heart is, at least, as important as that of the intellect. Many of our difficulties have emanated from the fact that we have neglected the training of the Heart in our educational institutions and human intellect has undergone a disproportionate development. I am of opinion that if we clearly spell out the connotation of the term work-experience and give it its due place in our one-sided subject-wise time-table it is only then that we will be really accepting it.

Decision of the Board

Paragraph 16 was adopted with the amendment that work-experience should be an integral part of education at all stages.

PARAGRAPH XVII

CHARACTER FORMATION

Education Minister, Maharashtra : The School Committee considered this problem at some length and in the back-

ground of the present circumstances, we felt that we should spell out in greater detail what we mean by character formation and what we mean by methods of character formation. Therefore we have redrafted the whole paragraph as follows :

“Character formation is an important educational objective and at no times has the need to emphasise it been greater. People in our times are clamouring for their rights, but have no similar awareness of their responsibilities. This must change. It is true that education alone cannot accomplish this task, but there is no doubt that it has an important role to play. Education faces the major challenge of cultivating a sense of moral and social responsibility in the rising generation. Training in good citizenship must therefore become an integral part of education at all stages. The emphasis should not be on classroom instruction or academic sermonising but on the personal examples of teachers and elders and the opportunity to develop good habits and behaviour in real situations. The quality of reading materials, instruction on the proper study of the humanities and the social sciences including the study of the fundamental truths underlying the great religions and biographies of great men, the rendering of social service to the community and participation in games and sports and hobbies—all these have a contribution to make to the formation of right attitudes and to the development of a sense of social responsibility. Every effort should therefore be made to utilise these factors to the maximum extent in the interest of character formation.”

This is self-explanatory and I have nothing to add to it

Shri Anil Mohan Gupta : May I add just one thing. Should we not say that this objective of Character formation should also be evaluated? The scores obtained in this respect should effectively affect examination results. If we do not do so, it will never get its due place in our educational institutions.

Prof. M. V. Mathur : We emphasise the role of the teachers and elders. It appears to me that so far as our urban areas are concerned, the single most important influence on the young mind is the motion picture. There

is nothing else which influences it more. If there is any, let anybody tell me. That being so, something must be done to see that at least the exhibition/distribution of the motion picture is in the public sector. The production may be in the private sector. If you do not do that, you are not going to influence the minds of the people. The parents have no time to talk to the students; the students do not believe in religion; and the teachers are hungry people. What character formation the hungry people can bring about will be seen in course of time. The only thing which will appeal to the young mind is the motion picture. Let us not live in a fool's paradise by simply writing this paragraph and thinking that we shall bring about character formation.

Dr. A. L. Mudaliar: I know definitely that films are a pernicious influence on student life. In fact, students do not go to their classes if there is a good film elsewhere. And one of the jokes is : "Presence by proxy, attendance at Roxy."

Decision of the Board

The revised paragraph 17 was adopted. The Chairman was requested to take up the points raised by Prof. Mathur with the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.

PARAGRAPHS XVIII AND XIX

EQUALISATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION

Shrimati Durgabai Deshmukh: This is the first time that this subject has been considered by a very high level body and I am happy. One of the great merits of the Education Commission's Report is that they have not confined themselves to only higher or primary education, but have dealt with pre-primary and adult education.

It is said here that the voluntary organisations conducting pre-primary schools should be encouraged, but what is the responsibility of the Government in this behalf?

Pre-primary education should be built into the national system of education. There is a lot of wastage and stagnation in the primary stage. This can be reduced if pre-primary education becomes general.

We are at present considering this problem only on a welfare basis. The education of a child or a woman can be considered both from the educational and welfare angles. Pre-primary education, instead of being a regular stage of education, is now left to the tender mercies of voluntary organisations, not all of which are, to my mind, not good institutions. Therefore, I would plead that, having recognised pre-primary stage of education for all first time, a proper status should be given to it, or it must at least be recognised that this is a necessary stage in the regular plan of national education. Such a decision will necessarily involve that the Government will accept this as its responsibility and commitment and find the necessary funds.

On the question of grants, I do not deny that grants are given today, but they are given on an *ad hoc* basis. Nobody knows whether they go to the really good schools. Of course, one can debar the bad schools in this respect; no grants need be given to them. But take the good schools. The assistance to them varies from State to State and is often inadequate.

I would like to emphasise that in issuing any policy statement on education, you should not make it appear that the pre-primary school is a luxury. On the other hand, it should be considered as a regular and necessary stage of education in the country.

Shri Samuel Mathai: Nursery education will have a beneficial effect in determining where primary education begins. I think our educational system is bedevilled by the fact that there is no insistence on a minimum age of entry. As I said yesterday, students enter the university level at the age of 13 in my State. If somebody could insist that education at the primary level should begin at 5, and anything before that should be designated as pre-primary education or nursery stage, it would be of great help. I support Shrimati Deshmuk's proposal.

Education Minister, Maharashtra: I am yet to move the amendment proposed by the School Committee. In fact, care has been taken, while redrafting this paragraph, to see that the pre-primary schools opened in the rural areas, in the urban slums and for the children of the weaker sections of the community should be given preference. In

fact, it is only for this reason that we have amended the sentence to some extent as follows :

Voluntary organisations conducting primary institutions should receive encouragement and financial assistance, especially when they are working in rural areas, urban slums or for the children of the weaker and socially and economically neglected section of the society."

We feel that greater care for the development of pre-primary institutions is very essential. In fact, it will be most welcome that a pre-primary school should exist wherever there is a primary school. But this will not be possible on financial grounds, and therefore we say that the pre-primary schools in certain areas or for certain classes should receive priority.

Chief Executive Councillor, Delhi: Government must accept responsibility for pre-primary education, especially when it has been envisaged in the Master Plan of the urban cities. It is not only the necessity of the urban slums or the rural areas. It is primarily a necessity of the middle class or lower class people. For instance, after some time, the father, the mother or the husband and wife who are working elsewhere, must have some organisation somewhere which can take charge of the children, and where the children could also study. At the moment pre-primary education is much more costly in the urban areas than any other education. So, something has to be done at the governmental level also. In our primary complex, there are four or five pre-primary schools planned for one primary section because a primary boy can walk about one or two furlongs but pre-primary boy or girl cannot do so; it should be nearest to his home. If government does not come into the field, I do not think this will be done properly.

Shrimati Raksha Saran: Pre-primary education is being neglected everywhere. I am glad that members here are laying great stress on pre-primary education. But what happened in U.P.? 3600 women workers engaged in pre-primary areas are now put on to other tasks; they are going to do welfare or family planning work. Till now, in the villages, they were doing very useful work, running pre-primary schools and were helping women to look after their children properly. I think that this has been a retrograde step.

Decision of the Board

Paragraph 19 of the MPs Report, as amended by the Standing Committee on School Education was adopted. It was also agreed to recommend that the State should accept definite responsibility for pre-primary education.

PARAGRAPHS XX—XXII

PRIMARY EDUCATION

The Education Minister, Maharashtra moved the following amendments to paragraphs 20 and 21. The Minister did not press the amendment proposed by the Standing Committee on School Education to the effect that para 22 should be deleted and it was unanimously agreed that para 22 should be allowed to stand.

(a) Para 20 to read as follows :

“The provision of good and effective primary education on a free and compulsory basis, is the foundation of democracy and national development. It should be given the highest priority and implemented in two stages, namely, lower primary and higher primary. Children who are not yet fourteen years old at the end of Class VII and who do not wish to study further should be retained in the educational system till they complete 14 years of age but should be provided with short vocational courses of their choice.

(b) The brackets including the words—and if possible, even in Classes I-IV—in the third line from bottom of para 21 (page 7) should be deleted.

In the discussion that followed, some important points were raised :

(a) Shri Anil Mohan Gupta pleaded that as the term Basic Education has acquired some definite connotation and as we have decided to reiterate the principles connoted by the term, the same ‘Basic Education’ should be retained. If we do not do so, he argued, it may give rise to some confusion in the minds of the general public and even in the minds of the educationists who may think that we have rejected the principles themselves.

In view of the decision taken earlier, this was not agreed to.

(b) Shri Gupta raised another point. He pleaded that the period of education from 6 to 14 should be treated as an integrated whole and that it should not be divided into stages. It was pointed out that the stages were necessary on financial grounds but that, inspite of them, the curriculum of the entire period of primary education could be treated as one unit.

(c) If funds are short, Shri Gupta pleaded, we may introduce University Primary Education for the age group 11-14 first and then take up the age group 6-11. In view of the fact that we have accepted the total development of the child and not mere book-learning, as our objective, at this stage, he argued, it is essential to keep children at school till they are 14. The question of maturity is of utmost importance here.

It was agreed that this view could be brought to the notice of the State Governments.

Decision of the Board

Paragraphs 20-22 as amended by the Standing Committee on School Education and subject to the understandings indicated above was adopted.

The Education Minister, West Bengal, moved a resolution on primary education. He said :

"The resolution that I propose to move with your permission is not an alternative to the draft. I want to make it an additional, independent resolution. All of us agree that this is a very important area and yet we have been lagging behind in this matter. While we were discussing the question of the neighbourhood schools, the importance of free and compulsory primary education was felt very acutely. My resolution reads :

"The Central Advisory Board of Education is of the view that the provision of free and compulsory primary education throughout the country should receive the most urgent attention of the government. The Board notes with satisfaction that the State Education Ministers' Conference held in April this year and the Committee of Members of Parliament have both laid very great emphasis on this. The Board recommends that

the Government of India take immediate steps to enable all the State Governments to make primary education free and to extend facilities for primary education so as to universalise it. Such steps should include : (1) crash programme for establishing new primary schools in all areas which do not have them and the provision of buildings wherever necessary; (2) A programme for assistance towards maintenance, repair and improvement of the buildings of primary schools; (3) immediate and effective action for implementation of the recommendations of the Kothari Commission regarding pay scales of primary teachers; and (4) a special programme for providing effective incentives for education of girls at the primary stages."

This resolution seeks to bring together several points relating to primary education which are scattered and seem to be lost in a crowd of other matters in the policy statement or the report of the parliamentary committee. It seeks to bring together the pay scales of primary teachers and also the incentives for education of girls. Something has to be done, say, within two years.

Decision of the Board

The resolution was adopted.

PARAGRAPHS XXIII—XXXI

THE TEN YEAR SCHOOL, HIGHER SECONDARY EDUCATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The Board took up the consideration of paragraphs 23-31. The School Education Committee had no comments to offer. The Higher Education Committee had observed as follows :

Structure of Education : The Committee accepted the recommendations of the State Education Ministers' Conference, April 1967 with regard to the structure of the educational system.

Selective Admissions : The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the Education Commission regarding selective admission to universities. Adequate arrangements should, however, be made for strengthening the existing school system and adequate vocational and technical courses in the post-school stage provided to equip students for gainful occupation in life. These steps would divert

a large number of students who normally seek admission to universities”.

Shri Anil Mohan Gupta : So far as the secondary stage is concerned, I would like to raise some fundamental questions regarding the changes suggested by the Education Commission and offer a few suggestions. The Mudaliar Commission wanted secondary education to be a complete unit, and not a preparatory stage, and recommended a diversified four-year course. The Kothari Commission has rejected the entire idea. I feel that the recommendations of the Mudaliar Commission deserve more critical consideration than they have been given. The Mudaliar Commission has held that, in view of the fact that education up to age of 14 has been made free and compulsory under the Constitution, students with a very wide variety of talents will be seeking secondary education in future; this postulates that our secondary schools can no longer remain the old single-track institutions and that they should offer diversified educational programmes calculated to meet the varying aptitudes, interests and talents which come into prominence towards the end of the period of compulsory education. I consider that this basic approach is sound and suggest that secondary education should be refashioned on the following lines :

(1) Secondary education should be treated as one unit and should not be subdivided into lower and higher, general and vocational etc. But we should have ordinary and enriched courses at this stage.

(2) We should introduce diversification after the period of compulsion. We should begin with a three-year integrated course to be gradually replaced by a four-year one.

(3) Education and Rural industries streams should be included in higher secondary courses. Core subjects should be more emphasised and become examination subjects. Wider choice of optional subjects, as suggested by the Kothari Commission should be allowed.

(4) Schools must not be allowed to work in isolation. The idea of the school complex should be so extended as to include 5 to 10 school complexes suggested by the Kothari Commission. One multipurpose higher secondary school should function as the Central School of the unit and should have a Research and Extension wing.

(5) Experimental schools, as suggested by the Kothari Commission, should be opened immediately.

(6) Above all, the new pattern of evaluation must be introduced without any further delay. It has been admitted again and again, in all seminars and conferences on the subject, at all levels, that the system of examination prevailing in our country today, is neither valid nor reliable, neither adequate nor scientific; and, yet, it is this examination that is dictating and directing our studies and even our methods of teaching and learning. If we are really serious about bringing in any significant change in our educational pattern we must, first of all, dispense with this type of misleading examinations. Our examinations must not only be objective but also objective-based. This must attract our serious and immediate attention and we must bring about the long over-due change with courage and determination.

Dr. A. L. Mudaliar : I am most grateful to my friend who has just preceded me for bringing in the Report of the Secondary Education Commission. I thought, that has been completely forgotten and buried. We are all the time having new commissions and with every new commission, there is revision of the ideas that have been expressed before. I welcome evolution but not revolution of ideas in matters of education. What did the Secondary Education Commission say about secondary education? It laid great stress on the fact that secondary education should be complete in itself and that it should not merely be a stepping stone to higher education. It must lead a man to life; and also provide him with opportunities for higher education if he felt that he had the capacity to do so. It must be an education which will not merely be a stepping stone to the university but an education that will give diversified courses so as to fit students into various walks of life. These were the fundamental considerations.

On that basis, we felt that the period of secondary education should be increased and that the period for higher education should also be increased. The Secondary Education Commission visited different parts of the country. For instance, they found in most States a two-year period of what was called 'Intermediate' and a two-year period of a degree course. The fallacy of the Intermediate course

was that it had no correlation with the degree course. For the sake of giving something of science, something of humanities, something of languages, it was so conducted that the Intermediate stage did not give the students any good approach to higher education and the degree course. The Secondary Education Commission felt that, in most colleges, at least in some parts of the country, education was given more to fit the students to occupy a place in the class than for a final sort of set-up in university education. The other complaint that was made was that the university should not dominate secondary education. That was the fact. Everything in secondary education was so based that it led the students only to university education. It was felt that secondary education should be an end in itself and only such persons who felt the necessity for either technological education or higher education could go in for university education.

The idea of multi-purpose schools was emphasised because of the experience we had gained by visiting some of the multi-purpose schools. We went to Kashmir and found an excellent example of a multi-purpose school. In the same campus students went to technological courses and academic courses and there was correlation between these two, a certain number of academic studies being common to all. That made the young man feel that he was not taking to something which was unacademic, that he was taking an academic course and that, when he went to technological course, he had something practical to do. We speak of agriculture. We speak of the necessity for agricultural schools; we speak of the necessity for technological schools; we speak of the necessity for various types of schools suited to the talent of the people. How is this to be achieved? After he has finished secondary education, a student cannot use his fingers. That is why we wanted multipurpose schools where all the boys will see that it is creditable for students to do farming, to sow the seed, to till the land, to reap the harvest or to take up any other work. That is the purpose of the multi-purpose school.

Now, I come to the question of 10 years, 11 years and 12 years. We have discussed it *ad nauseum* at all our meetings of the Central Advisory Board. The final conclusion arrived at was this: it did not matter so long as it was a 12-year period of training before one enters the degree course; *MoE Edu.* 68-8

the degree course should be of three years. What does it matter if it is 10 plus 2 or 11 plus 1 or 12? The idea would be to put all the 12 years in the secondary schools. Whatever secondary schools are not in a position to take up this 12-year course, it will be ruinous at present to add this particular one year or two years to the secondary schools. In Madras, when the Secondary Education Commission Report was published, the then Chief Minister said that he would adopt every one of those resolutions. The Chief Minister then was no other than Shri Rajagopalachari and I was a Member of the Council who moved that the Secondary Education Commission Report should be taken into consideration. There were only about 300 schools and we could then easily have, within two years, made them higher secondary of 12-year pattern.

Let me come to this 10 or 11 or 12 years. Why is it that it is 10 years in some States and 11 years in others? We found the greatest difficulty with regard to West Bengal. They had a 10-year schooling which had been accepted as equal to 11-year schooling of Madras and the other States in the South. We, therefore, felt that it would be an additional burden on such schools to add two more years. They started a little late at 6 whereas we started at 5 and 5 plus, so that the real difference was at the primary stage; at the primary stage they had a 4-year schooling and we had a 5-year schooling. The 6 years were more or less common to all the schools. That is an important thing and not that there should be a 10-year schooling or 11-year schooling; the content was given at a little later period of age.

Now there has been a lot of criticism as to why the pattern should not be uniform. What is necessary is to have a uniform standard of achievement. We felt that in those schools where there was 11-year schooling in Madras, we should add one year. But, as I told you, the conditions were not propitious for efficient training to be given and, therefore, the idea, as a transitional measure—mind you, as a transitional measure—of having one year, calling it as pre-university stage was conceived. A great deal of comment has been made on one year being as a pre-university stage. The idea of pre-university has caught up in Madras State for the excellent reason that the pre-university is combined with the degree college, so that those teachers who teach at the pre-university level are the teachers

who teach the degree classes, highly qualified people; only M.As and M.Sc.s are allowed to be teachers in the Madras University for degree colleges. If they teach the pre-university boys, whatever may be the subject, Physics or Chemistry or Language, I venture to say that that training is much better than what is being imparted in high schools by teachers who have taken their degree at the third attempt and who have spent just eight months to get their L.T. Degree. So, that is the fundamental fact to be kept in mind, that is, how the training is to be improved. We feel that in Madras, in spite of the shortness of the period of one year, we still have an opportunity for them to be so trained and there is no difficulty in stepping into the three-year degree course. We could have made it 11 years plus 2 or 3 years. As Chairman of the Commission I was in favour of it, but there was tremendous opposition in all the States to increase the number of years for schooling. They said they could not afford it financially. You know perfectly well—with all the eloquence that has been displayed here—that this is the one bed-rock on which education flounders today and will ever flounder so long as the attitude of our States is what it is today; education will never get an adequate grant. We can build huge palaces, tourist homes, etc. and we could have a number of buses to roll about. We can provide money for these, but when it comes to education, whether it is primary or secondary stage, finances are not available. Nobody is able to press forward and say, "Stop all your construction and divert it to the educational field; train your men and they will produce more and you will then not have Rs. 6,000 crores as foreign debt." India was a State where many people came to shake the tree, the pagoda tree. Today many people are giving us alms. We go about begging to 22 countries in the world to get the finances that we want. For what purpose? I am not talking politics. I am talking as a man who has been in the educational field for 50 years, who has been at the helm of a university for 25 years. For every penny we have to beg. The University Grants Commission came to our rescue. Its finances were slashed. You have come and we hope for better things. But I know that your hands are tied. But I cannot say that your feet are tied. I hope not. Therefore, when you come to secondary education, think of the problem. They say : why should we not increase it? Why should they? If people are satisfied with 10 year schooling, by all means go ahead. If, I think that

11 years are necessary for me, let me have 11 years. Let me tell you that it is not the idea that this 11-year schooling should push you into a university. We want to prevent people who are ill-equipped from rushing into a university. Therefore, at this stage, there are a dozen opportunities in the State for people—pre-technical courses have been established, polytechnics have been established, schools for fine arts have been established, schools for music have been established, schools for dance have been established. There are various types of schools. Therefore, my plea is this: do not try to impose what you think is good in your own State. Leave it to the States. They are not so bankrupt in their intelligence or capacity to do what they want; they have their own advisers; allow them to do what they feel is necessary.

The Vice-Chancellor of the Kerala University said that students entered the university at the age of 12 and 13. Why do they come? In the University of Madras and in the other universities of the State, nobody can appear for the matric or the SSLC Examination unless he is 14 years and 6 months old on the 15th July when he wants to join the college. If he is not of that age, he has to wait for one year more. We have done it for the last 35 years and nobody has raised his finger of scorn at it. If you want education to prosper, there must be a definite direction, a definite mandate from the educational authorities. If you want to mix up political influence with education, will never prosper. I have seen enough of the political influences unfortunately, even with the best of intentions, ruining the whole educational system. That is another side of the story. I do not want to suggest to any of my friends that I am criticising them.

We speak of common schools. So far as colleges are concerned, no matter whether it is a poor man or a rich man, he goes to a college in Madras State where the minimum conditions are safeguarded. No management can start a college in a rural area without 40 acres of land; no management can start a college without Rs. 10 lakhs—Rs. 5 lakhs for buildings and Rs. 5 lakhs for endowment which is deposited with the university. No college can be started unless the minimum qualifications of teachers are complied with—M.As. or M.Sc.s, first or second class. Therefore, there is no necessary to say that the slum area boy

should have a different college. These are the essentials that you have to provide. The responsibility for ensuring equality of opportunity rests with the Government more than with anybody else and you have to discharge your duties to give equal opportunities for all sections of people. Touch your heart and see whether you have done the right thing or not. I do believe, although I do not want to take much part in this common school endeavour, that it is the frailty of the Government that makes it necessary for all these sorts of schools to spring up. Why have they sprung up in Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta? There are very few in Madras State. Madras State has made secondary education free to all; there are no restrictions at all; no school can impose fees if that school is to be recognized by the Department of Public Instruction. If a school is not recognised by the Department of Public Instruction, it has no value at all. Of course, there are some schools which may train privately. That is why I say that we forget the duties that we owe to our children. In our anxiety to make it appear that we are introducing socialism and equality of opportunity for all, we are trying to bring down the values of education. My appeal to you in particular—because for once I have got an educationist of great repute at the helm of affairs, is this: upgrade education in every sphere of activity, do not have one uniform level either of education or of a standard or of opportunity except it be equal opportunity to the poor and the rich. I am told that after 2 years and 3 years everybody should be at the level of a graduate. Does it happen like that? In Scotland, three years after the basic matriculation a man is called M.A. In England, he is called B.A. These words do not matter. You can always assess the work of the M.A. of Scotland and the B.A. of Cambridge. Leave it to those who are competent to do so.

Therefore, if there is one field more than another where experimentation is necessary, where diversity is also necessary, where a certain amount of strategic approach is necessary, it is in the field of education. Do not for goodness's sake petrify education by ideas of what may be called, in other words, of levelling down everybody so that all are equal. If in the areas referred to in Assam and other places, education is poor, it is both the responsibility of the State Government and the Central Government. It has been emphasised in the Constitution that these tribes

must be given special protection to come up. If the Central Government does not do it, if the State Government does not discharge its responsibility, then the fault is theirs.

Let me add that school education is the responsibility of the States. I do not agree that the Centre should establish school in the States by whatever name they may be called. It is really a sort of public school which the Centre is maintaining. If it wants to establish schools for the army, I have no objection. Otherwise, I do not feel that the Centre should enter into the field of school education. The States should know their responsibilities and discharge them.

Dr. D. S. Kothari: I want to express, first of all, my gratitude as well as that of my colleagues to Dr. Mudaliar and others, for the observations they have made. I fully endorse what Dr. Mudaliar has said and I think this should find a reflection in the policy statement we prepare. Let me add immediately that the policy statement should, instead of going into details, concentrate on broad policy issues, leaving out the details and a good deal of flexibility to the States.

But in the policy statement on education, we should in the beginning say something about education. The parliamentary committee's report talks about social objectives and so on but does not speak of upgrading the quality of education. I am glad that Dr. Mudaliar has said that in our policy statement, the very first thing we should say should be that we should do everything possible to upgrade the quality of education. Why? Because it is only education of good quality that can serve as an instrument of social progress. What we need desperately in India today is to raise the quality of education so that education can do various things that we shall enumerate later.

Referring to the issue raised about schools by Shri Gupta, I think it is partly based on perhaps lack of clarity in the Commission's Report. As he said, we all recognise—even in advanced countries of Europe—something like 50-60 per cent of students leave the schools at the end of the compulsory age. In England, 70-80 per cent leave schools and enter the world of work. In India, this will happen to a much greater extent. That is the reason why

in our school system we have emphasised what we call general education. This education must be such as will make it easier for the student to enter the world of work and hence work experience becomes an integral element of education.

So we are using the word 'general education' more in its contemporary sense. When we talk of general education, it includes a good ideal of vocational education, which means literacy, numeracy and work-experience. It is in that sense that this word is used, not vocational in the sense of specialised vocational education which will come after 10 years of general education. So I agree with the sentiments expressed therein.

As regards flexibility, it is not a question of tinkering with duration. In lengthening the duration, we shall be wasting our resources. Even in existing conditions we do not make full use of the duration. If we do not make full use of the 10 years at the school level and 3 at the university level, by adding a year we merely lengthen the period of ineffective education—instead of 10 you make it 11 and make it worse than it would otherwise have been. Inefficient education of a longer duration is worst than inefficient education of a shorter duration. So the real thing that must be done is to increase the efficiency of education.

On the question of resources, I think this conference should make a specific reference to it. Let us not deceive ourselves that education can be improved without providing resources. If the nation really wants high priority education, it must provide the necessary resources. This conference should resolve that the governments at the Centre and in the States should provide much bigger resources for education than they have been doing so far. If they do not do that, it will not be possible to improve the quality of education. Not only that; every year the resources should be augmented by 10 to 20 per cent over the previous year, more so because the value of money goes down, more so because more students are there, more so because the whole world is contributing to the growth of knowledge and in consequence the cost of education tends to rise—what is known as the sophistication factor. I think somewhere in our recommendations this should find a very high place.

Prof. Samuel Mathai: I welcome the idea that we should have a flexible arrangement—indeed I proposed it myself. But I do not think we should come to the conclusion that a certain amount of determination of size and shape is not necessary. Indeed there would be no purpose in our getting together and talking about a national system if there was not a recognisable similarity of pattern in the various States. So while supporting this, I would not go to the length of saying it does not matter. It does matter. We have very serious problems of mutual recognition, of mobility of our students and teachers, directly related to questions of length, duration, etc. So while I do not want an absolutely regimented system, there should be a well-understood recognition of equivalent arrangements between States and between the Universities.

Education Minister, Maharashtra : For the last so many years, we have been discussing about the pattern of education and the duration of courses. Several reports have been produced, but unfortunately we have not come to any broad uniformity. I agree with Dr. Mudaliar, a revered educationist of the country, that there should be flexibility in the field of education; there should be flexibility given to educationists to have freedom to experiment, to plan curricula, etc. But should we not, once and for all, say what we mean by primary education, by secondary education and by higher education, the stages they indicate? Otherwise, the same confusion which has continued for years together will again continue. Should we not bring some uniformity in these terms, so that the layman can understand what is meant by them? Within that framework we can certainly have flexibility, but by and large national policy is not merely the ingredient of education but also its structure.

I am a layman, but charged with the responsibility of administration, as a representative of the people. When we talk of education, every time it is made out as if all the ills in education are because of the administrators. Let me say frankly that the educationists in this country have not been able to give any firm direction to education, and it is because of this that so much remains to be done in the field of education. We may have differences of opinion. When we are sitting in such an august body, let us come to some conclusion and some decision. I

do not mean regimentation. But there should be some decision. Let Dr. Mudaliar with his experience of fifty years guide us, as also Dr. Kothari and so many other educationists here. I will urge upon this body to give some definite and broad principles on the pattern of our education.

Dr. D. S. Kothari: Let us consider this point about duration. The modern trend everywhere, in the Soviet Union or the USA, is to give a given amount of education to attain a given standard in the minimum possible time. There is a 12-year school system in the USA but in good schools, students are encouraged to do a part of the college work so that having completed 12 years, they get advance placement—that means, not in the first year of the degree course but in the second year. In the Soviet Union there is the 11-year school system and they have switched over to 10 year system—not ten years everywhere. Where you have good schools and you can cover the same course in ten years, it is allowed. Where the schools or teachers are not of that standard, it is desirable to maintain 11 years. We should aim at a certain national standard. That is what we have said in our Education Commission Report. At present you can achieve a standard in 11 years in Delhi; that cannot be done in some other places as schools are not so well organised or are equipped and teachers are not so well trained. On the other hand to add one more year to Delhi students to arrive at 12 years would mean a waste of time. So, there is a certain flexibility. Even in England, a small country, the system is sometimes different in Scotland from what it is in England. What we should aim at is to try to reach a certain national standard at the school stage. Having done so, let us not go after mechanical uniformity.

Shri A. E. T. Barrow: I am greatly confused. I claim to have been in the field of education for about 35 years. When we say that we will set a national standard it becomes a very vague term. What is the national standard? We can understand when we say that we will aim at 12 years school and this will be the standard that will be reached in the 12 years school. We want to have something concrete. We should say that the child should have so many years of education before he goes into the university. Then you can lay down your standards. We cannot

say in a policy statement that a child ought to know the binomial theorem by the time he reaches the 11th standard; we say that a boy must be in the school for 12 years before he goes to the university. You must have an age limit for the university. Let us lay down that no boy should enter the primary school till he reaches 5 plus; he will not enter the university till he reaches 16 plus. Some sort of a direction must be given.

Shri A. R. Dawood: The Commission has allowed flexibility only for the ten-year period. That is split up into 7 plus 3 or 8 plus 2 : 5 plus 2 plus 3, or 4 plus 3 plus 3. The variations that exist in the States at present may be maintained. That flexibility has been given in the report and it has been endorsed here. But as far as the next stage is concerned, I think there is no such flexibility. I just wanted this clarification.

Kumari S. Panandikar: We have to fall back on duration because we have nothing else to go by. The recommendation is that we should make a serious attempt to define what we mean by national standards. You know that, in the Education Commission, we did try to define the national standards. We have again to fall back on something. The time that was at our disposal was short. I agree that there is a great deal to be said on this. May I suggest that we recommend to the National Council of Educational Research and Training or to any other suitable body to make a serious attempt to define the national standard of general education, at the end of 10 years and at the end of 12 years? I agree to the structure proposed here because we have nothing else to go by. It leads to a certain amount of rigidity. But then we have no alternative. So, if we adhere to this long duration, you take it for granted that the teachers and the curricula are all good, or would be good, and we feel that 11 years will be better than 10 years and so on. But I do not think it is absolutely acceptable.

Shri Samar Guha: I agree that the M.A./M.Sc. should be taken two years after honours course and three years after pass degree. I have in mind what is done in the Jadavpur university.

Dr. D. S. Kothari: Only those will be admitted to the M.A./M.Sc. who have attained the honours standard, either

by joining the honours course from the very beginning or by taking the pass course and then taking an extra examination.

Dr. A. C. Joshi: The Education Commission honestly started exploring the possibility of building up a common pattern of education in the country. They found that, except in Assam and Nagaland which require 16 years' education to get the first degree, a little more than half the number of States require 15 years education and there are some States like U.P. which require 14 years. They thought it would be easy to build up a common pattern if they recommended 15 years' study for the first degree. They found further that, almost in all States, three years degree course has been established except in U.P. and in the University of Bombay. So, it will be an odd thing to disturb it now and say there should be a two-year course and something like an intermediate examination. It will confuse the country. Three-year degree course is already established in the country. U.P. can be made to fall in line with this pattern. You can give them some time and money which they require for this purpose.

I fully support the recommendation of the Education Commission that there should be 10 years of schooling, followed by two years of higher secondary education and three years for the degree course. There is some force in the argument that it would be impossible for a long time to get highly qualified teachers to teach in schools. There is a certain stigma attached to it and M.As and M.Sc.s do not want to come and teach in schools, even though in Punjab, the M.As. teaching in schools are paid the same salary as those teaching in colleges. So, for these two years, we should have a flexible approach—it can be a pre-university course in a college affiliated to a university or it can be done in a junior college. This was the broad recommendation of the Sampurnanand Committee and that should be accepted as an easily workable arrangement.

Shri J. P. Naik: I invite attention to the difference between the main statement which we are considering and the higher education committee's recommendation. About 10 years of schooling and 2 years of higher secondary, the two recommendations are identical. The difference arises at the first degree stage. The M.P.s. Committee Report,

endorsed by the School Committee, insists on three-year degree course. In the other committee, a two-year pass course has been introduced. The question is whether this should be permitted or not. Personally I am happy that the three-year degree course has come to be well established. We should not tinker with it now. Even where there is 14 years period for the first degree, please do not disturb your three year degree course, but have a phased programme for raising the duration of the school stage to 12 years. If the higher education committee would have no objection I would appeal to them to accept the School Committee proposals so that we can have a broad agreement.

Dr. D. S. Kothari : One does not know what will be the final shape of the document after it passes through so many committees. Wherever there is a fundamental difference, it will be better to stick to one document, which should be the Education Commission's Report. We should say, we endorse broadly the recommendations of the Education Commission. That becomes easier for the other conferences which would consider this matter.

Shri J. P. Naik : Taking India as a whole, let us see the point we have reached. Today the position is that out of 17 States, half the States have 15-year period. For them, it is a comparatively easier matter to fall in line with this pattern. In seven States, it is 14 years, and the adoption of this new pattern will mean the addition of one year. What is recommended by the Education Commission, M.Ps' Committee and the Education Ministers' Conference is that ultimately these States will have to add one year and they will have to prepare suitable programmes for phasing over, but the phasing over should not disturb the three-year degree course. In U.P., which is the only State where this problem arises, they would keep the 12-year school course intact and change the two-year degree course into a three-year course. In those States where they have three-year degree course, they should not reduce it to two years, because that would be a retrograde step.

Education Minister, West Bengal : I would once again raise the question of the transitional period. It seems to me that 20 years is hardly the transitional period. It is a period in itself. I will elaborate this because we are faced with a practical problem in West Bengal. Fifty per

cent of our schools were raised to higher secondary stage. When do we raise the other 50 per cent to the 12th standard? If it is four or five years, it will be all right to ask the schools to wait until all the schools come to the same position. But if the transition period is 20 years, I think it is a generation that we are talking about. So, I think it would be advisable to come to a general agreement or understanding that the 12th class will be introduced some time in 1971.

Shri J. P. Naik: There would certainly be agreement on the general principle that transition should be brief. But it will be very difficult for this body to take a decision now whether it should be in the year 1970 or 1971. It would be very difficult. I am afraid the position may vary from State to State. Some may take a longer time to implement it.

Education Minister, Maharashtra: If it is in the interest of the nation, why not fix a time-limit for implementing the recommendations and if any financial assistance is required, why should not the Central Government come forward with financial assistance, because this unity is essential? If it is difficult for the States where the 14-year pattern is in existence to adopt this new pattern, why should not the Centre come forward to meet the expenses for that one year?

Chief Executive Councillor, Delhi: In this respect, the question of employment should also be taken into consideration, in addition to other things. If after passing B.A. in 14 years, one gets the same facilities which a boy from other States gets after 15 years, it is but natural that the former would be in an advantageous position. Therefore, it has to be decided whether there should be a 15-year degree course throughout the country, otherwise there will be confusion in the country. If a phased programme of 20 years is chalked out, many would like to adopt it in the end.

Dr. A. C. Joshi: I would like to speak on two points. One is the cost of change-over. In Madhya Pradesh, for instance, when they introduce the 11-year school course, the 10 plus 2 pattern, there will be an examination after the 10th class. Some students will fail. After the examination some will take vocational courses, such as agricul-

ture, polytechnic or teachers' training. So, the number of students in class 11 will get reduced and so will that in class XII be. Therefore, so far as the total number of students is concerned, it will be much less. Hence the cost of change-over to the new pattern would be marginal because of the reduction in number of students. Secondly, it would be a good thing to fix the year by which the change could be brought forward. We can say by about 1975. U.P. is a tricky problem for us to solve. It would require a lot of money. But by 1975, this change should be brought about.

Prof. M. V. Mathur : To fix a final deadline would involve, really speaking, commitment on your part to upgrade the institutions. So, we should say that wherever the three-year degree course exists, it should not be disturbed. The other is the point just now raised by the representative of Delhi State about recruitment to Government services. If after 14 years of study and getting a B.A. pass degree, a person finds the gates of employment open to him, as it is for a person with 15 years study, then all people would do it in 14 years. Really speaking, a university degree should not be necessary for getting this kind of employment in government service, but that is besides the point here. Since you have already accepted paragraph 26, I do not want to say anything on that score. But we should not hurry up from 14 to 15 years, unless we are prepared to finance it from the Central Government. Otherwise, let it take its own course.

Chairman : As Dr. Joshi has suggested, we can say that by 1975, by the end of the fifth Plan, it should be achieved.

(At this point the question of financing the programmes of educational reconstruction adopted by the Board came up for discussion.)

Chairman : I think that the stand of the Education Ministry is well-known. On the very first day, I requested the State Education Ministers to go back and revise the fourth Five Year Plan according to the programme of immediate action and also to revise the budget estimates for 1968-69. When we get all these requirements, we can sit together and iron out what resources we can plough back for education. With that aim in view, we started this dis-

ussion. As a matter of fact, I have been here for five months and I have been consistently maintaining the stand that every effort has to be made to implement the Commission's Report. You will remember, when the first time I met you, I wanted you to help me to define the areas where you want to develop education. I went with the same idea to the Parliament. When you all agree that these are the areas where I should pay more attention and help with resources, when you make up your mind, it will be easier for me to implement the programme. At least let the Education Ministers of all States tell the Government of India what their minimum requirements are in order to effect a transformation of the educational system as suggested by the Commission.

Dr. D. S. Kothari : It is not a point *vis-a-vis* the Education Ministry. We all recognise that the Education Ministry is entirely with us. But the question is whether the Government, both the Central Government and the State Governments, and the nation as a whole has really recognised the full implications of the revolutionary transformation in education.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : May I draw your attention to one fact? When we fixed the original estimate as Rs. 1210 crores, it was reduced, not at our instance, but at the instance of the National Development Council where all the State Chief Ministers met. There, the Chief Ministers agreed to allocate the major expenditure in the field of education by the State Governments. Therefore, you will have to slash it down. You keep this in mind. We are all one here. The Central Government has been saying that the Education Commission's Report must be implemented. For that, the present allocation is not enough. Now, it will be seen that there is an allocation of Rs. 800 crores and we must make efforts to raise it substantially. Please do not insist only on Central Government doing it. All of us will have to go to the National Development Council of which all the Chief Ministers are members. The Education Ministry wants that all the schemes before us should be implemented. It is not only a question of Central Government doing it; it is a question of all of us going to the National Development Council in which you gentlemen and your Chief Ministers have to decide the allocations to education in different sectors. We

at our end will try our best to match the grant. But at your end, you have to decide the allocation to various sectors. That is important.

Education Minister, Bihar: Agriculture and education should get the highest priorities.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We agree.

Education Minister, Maharashtra: The question is of changing the attitudes. I do not think that there is any disagreement on this point in this august body that education requires more money. I wonder whether a mere change of Government will get more money or resources. So, what is necessary is a change in outlook towards education. We all agree, particularly we who are here, agree that education, if it is to be transformed completely, requires more financial assistance. The difficulty is neither at our level nor at your level. We must accept that you have been very helpful; you have a very progressive view on this particular aspect of financial assistance to the States and finding finances for education as a whole. The main point is educating the national leaders who are at the helm of affairs and educating the State leaders who are at the helm of affairs in the States. May I, therefore, request that we all make a common ground here to make our Chief Ministers and also the Finance Ministers understand that education should get priority next to Defence. Agriculture and industry have importance and priority. We want our stomachs to be filled. But much more important is Education and, therefore, next to the Defence of the country, Education should get the priority. It is the building up of the country which requires priority and, therefore, Education requires priority. Therefore, the day before yesterday I proposed that a Conference of Prime Minister, the Finance Minister of the Government of India, Chief Ministers, the Finance Ministers of the States and the Education Ministers should be convened where we should be in a position to convince them and build up an outlook which is congenial for better financial allocations for education. What is necessary is only this.

Decision of the Board

The pattern 10+2+3 should be adopted by 1975. An intensive effort should be made to get additional support for education during 1968-69.

PARAGRAPH XXXII

PART-TIME AND OWN-TIME EDUCATION

Education Minister, Maharashtra : In para 32, there is a small amendment and that is only about the approach. The sentence here is : "In particular greater emphasis has to be laid on the development of correspondence courses". Instead of this, it has been suggested to substitute the following : "In particular, possibilities of developing correspondence courses not only at the university level but also at the secondary stage for teachers, for agricultural, industrial and other workers should be explored. Further facilities, both to men and women, to study privately and appear at the various examinations conducted by the Boards of Education and the universities should be available."

Decision of the Board

The proposal was agreed to.

PARAGRAPHS XXXIII—XXXIV

SPREAD OF LITERACY AND ADULT EDUCATION

Education Minister, Maharashtra : Paragraph 33 should be amended to read as follows :

"The liquidation of mass illiteracy and promotion of functional literacy is essential not only for accelerating the programmes of production, especially in agriculture, but for quickening the tempo of national development in general. Plans to accelerate the spread of mass literacy as a break-through on the lines of the Gram Shiksham Mohim of Maharashtra should therefore be prepared and intensively implemented on several fronts. Such programmes are also necessary to reduce wastage and stagnation among primary school children. Particular attention should be paid to follow-up action to prevent relapse into illiteracy. With a view to reducing new additions to the ranks of the adult illiterates, part-time literacy classes should be organised for grown-up children, that is, age group 11—17 who did not attend school or have relapsed into illiteracy."

After this the Committee has proposed that the following new paragraph should be added :

“Functional literacy has a direct bearing on productivity. Moreover, the entire programme of adult education and literacy requires coordination between a large number of agencies, governmental and non-governmental and direction of top leadership for this purpose and for finding adequate resources. It is necessary, therefore, that the National Development Council should concern itself with the implementation of programmes for the promotion of functional literacy and integrally relate them to the growth of agricultural and industrial production.

The Committee has thus no comments to offer on paragraph 34.

Dr. Mohan Sinha Mehta : The main thing is that during the last 40 years we have been talking of literacy in the sense of three Rs. This concept should be discarded. We want to go to the second stage of ‘functional literacy.’ This should be built into our programme for the eradication of illiteracy.

My second point is that the words used by the Education Commission should be incorporated in our draft. I shall read the passage : It is —124 of the summary of recommendations, paragraph 202, Chapter No. XVII. This is what I strongly urge on you and on the Board for acceptance :

“Every possible effort should be made to eradicate illiteracy from the country as early as possible and in no part of the country, however backward, should it take more than 20 years”.

Education Minister, Maharashtra : This was discussed in the Committee. But by and large, we felt that we need not mention a time-limit.

Shrimati Durgabai Deshmukh : It is a good thing that the Education Commission has, for the first time, recognised and given a place and status to programmes of adult literacy and adult education. Not only that. I must congratulate them on setting a time-limit. The Commission has suggested that the percentage of literacy should be

raised to 60 per cent by 1971, to 80 per cent by 1981 and that illiteracy should be liquidated in a period not exceeding 20 years from the time the Report has been made. Our President, Dr. Zakir Husain, for the first time, while inaugurating the Silver Jubilee Celebrations of the Indian Adult Education Association brought this urgency very vividly before the country and suggested a kind of time-limit and programme from year to year or on a five-year basis to bring about this result. Therefore, I am very happy to find that the Commission has worked out a phased programme.

They have also recognised the concept of functional literacy. Literacy is an instrument to reach a goal which is development. It has a bearing on social and economic development. All these years we have been regarding literacy for the sake of literacy; therefore, that sense of urgency or emphasis has not been there. We must now strive earnestly to implement these recommendations.

Shri D. P. Nayar : If a time-limit is feasible, we should mention it. Otherwise it becomes dangerous. We should bear in mind that during the last five years, literacy has increased by six per cent. So, unless we have a full idea of the total resources required and that the country can spare them, it will not be safe to lay down a date. Our earnestness should be reflected in devising programmes which can bring this within reasonable financial limits. At present I think we do not have the resources to do this programme within the stipulated period.

Education Minister, Maharashtra : We have conceived of the programme of adult literacy in two stages. The first stage is the break-through programme, and introducing the illiterate to the art of reading and writing. The second stage is functional literacy.

For the first stage, we have to involve the whole community, and we have seen that a very paltry amount is required for it, because it can be done with the help of the village teachers, village heads and students all participating in it. Therefore, in terms of money not much is required.

Money will be required for the functional literacy stage. So, we should not be scared of fixing a time-limit.

So far as Maharashtra is concerned, we have fixed the target that, by the centenary celebration of the Father of the Nation, we should try to liquidate adult illiteracy, and complete at least the break-through programme.

Decision of the Board

The revised draft proposed by the Standing Committee on School Education was adopted.

PARAGRAPH XXXV

EDUCATION OF GIRLS

There is a short amendment to this paragraph. The sentence 'the education of girls on a priority basis' should be replaced by the following :

"The education of girls should therefore receive special emphasis and the funds required for its advancement, particularly for the implementation of its special programmes, should be provided on a priority basis. The funds for girls education and special programmes should be earmarked so that there is no possibility of their being diverted into other uses."

The Committee has also proposed that the following two paragraphs should be added after this paragraph :

"35(a). While it is recognised that the gap between the enrolment of boys and girls is being bridged in the field of general education it is noticed that the gap is actually widening in the field of vocational education for lack of adequate facilities of vocational education for girls. It is urgently necessary to expand and improve the programme of vocational education for girls by organising I.T.Is. and polytechnics for women, offering suitable courses leading to jobs or to self-employment.

35(b). Condensed courses for adult women should be organised on a large scale and it should be ensured through proper coordination among different agencies and Government departments that women who complete the courses are suitably employed. This is one important way of meeting the present shortages of women personnel."

Shrimati Durgabai Deshmukh: It was the National Committee on Women's Education appointed by your Ministry some seven years ago that had made this recommendation. The diversification of courses is very important, desirable and necessary for girls at every stage of their education. A committee was appointed with Mrs. Hansa Mehta as Chairman which has suggested how the curriculum and the studies can be made suitable for girls at every stage. But then, they have also made a very strong recommendation about the establishment of polytechnics. As a result of that and as a result of our efforts which proved very successful, we were able to get a provision of nearly Rs. 5 crores for the implementation of the programme.

After all, providing education for girls in the polytechnics is not an end by itself. We have found to our disappointment that trained girls are not able to find employment after coming out of the polytechnics. Delhi should not be taken as an example because there are so many opportunities here. But in other places, 95 per cent of them are not able to find employment. Perhaps the courses designed in the polytechnics are not suitable. In the Kamala Nehru Polytechnic in Hyderabad, there is a subject called foodcraft. Girls passing with that subject cannot find employment. So, before we think of expansion, we should have an evaluation of the employment opportunities. This evaluation cannot be left to the National Council on Women's Education because they have no money left to make the enquiry. It should be done by the Ministry.

I made a plea before the Education Panel of the Planning Commission that there are a large number of educated women who are housewives and who are available for part-time employment. According to 1961 Census, over 7 lakh women with qualifications of matriculation and above are working as housewives. I have got a report which shows the number of B.Sc. and M.Sc. women who are available for part-time work. They are married, but they say they have got three hours spare time after looking after their husbands and children. They do not want any salary they only want conveyance. On the one hand, we say that there is shortage of women science teachers. Within two furlongs of Jama Masjid, two dozen women with science degrees are available. But they are not taken up

because they cannot work on a full-time basis. Is it not a challenge to us to make use of this unutilised women-power? I have got a complete report about this and I am passing this on to you.

Kumari Panandikar : We have requested the Programme Evaluation Organization of the Planning Commission to take up a review of the polytechnics in India and they have agreed to do so. Very soon they will undertake this.

Shri G. K. Chandiramani : Apart from that, the State Governments should survey the possibilities of their absorption and start courses only in those fields where they can be absorbed. They need not necessarily be guided by any pattern that may be laid down from the Centre.

Chairman : Before we start more polytechnics for women, we will have to take this aspect into account.

Education Minister, Kerala : Our experience is that, in courses like electronics, all the girls trained are absorbed. But in courses like garment-making, catering, etc., they are not absorbed. About correlation of enrolment to employment opportunities, it is not mentioned anywhere in the draft. The States must be allowed to modify the courses to suit their needs.

Smt. Raksha Saran : I would like to make two points very briefly. The first is finance which we discussed this morning. The Ministers of States were all very worried and agitated about finance. When we come to the Government of India, the first axe falls on the subject of education.

Chairman : Mr. Chaudhuri has drafted a suitable resolution. The amendment he moved is only to ensure that the States do not divert money allotted for women's education.

Smt. Raksha Saran : I am glad and proud of the fact that men do the fighting for us!

Then I come to the point made by Shrimati Deshmukh. Many educated women are not doing anything of course, they are doing a great deal for their homes, husbands and children but not for the country. But they have talent. They should be registered and utilised in the primary schools in those areas where they are willing to give time.

They should be given a fair chance because they want to give their time. They can be called 'neighbourhood volunteers'.

Kumari S. Panandikar : I want to make a plea for implementing the special programmes of offering incentives to girls and women teachers. We find that while as many as 93.39 per cent of the boys are in schools in the age group 6-11, in the case of girls, the percentage is only 54.70. In certain States, where enrolment in the case of boys has reached cent per cent, in the case of girls it is as low as 25 per cent and so on. So, there is a great need for the implementation of special programmes. In the early days, when the Constitution was framed, there was a sense of urgency about the enrolment of boys and girls and it was considered to be a very basic foundation of democracy. Then somehow the enthusiasm began to peter out and the education panel of the Planning Commission in 1956 accepted very practicable targets and the enthusiasm was roused once again. Now that the CABE and the Education Commission have dealt with the same problem we should pay more attention to it and tackle it with greater enthusiasm. Among the special programmes, I would like to stress specially hostels for girls and quarters for women teachers.

Whenever I have proposed that you should give assistance to the special programmes and so on, you have been most encouraging, not only by saying "Go ahead and do it" but by actually providing funds. The National Council for Women's Education was started with a provision of Rs. 5,000. It has been raised to Rs. 6,500. It is going up to Rs. 8,500. You have also tentatively agreed—I want to let others know it—to some of our investigations and research schemes. So, I would request the State Ministers of Education to give serious attention to special programmes for girls' education in those areas where it is lagging behind.

About the utilisation of services of qualified women, we really had planned for a study quite elaborately, I consulted the Chairman of the Women's Organizations Committee, a committee which has 95 women's associations affiliated to it. We would have liked this Women's Organisations Committee to carry out this survey. But the rules very often come in our way. Though the person in charge of this organisation is a well-qualified woman who, in her own

time, had done research investigations of very great value, the Planning Commission consider that Women's Organizations Committee cannot be considered to be an authoritative body for taking up research. They say that it must be done by a research institute. So, I have the unpleasant task of trying to persuade either a research institute or a university to take it up.

Decision of the Board

The proposals made by the Standing Committee were agreed to.

PARAGRAPHS XXXVI—C.I:

EDUCATION OF THE WEAKER SECTIONS OF THE COMMUNITY; EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED CHILDREN; TEACHERS: STATUS AND EDUCATION; NEW METHODS OF TEACHING; CURRICULA AND TEXTBOOKS; EXAMINATION REFORM; A NATION-WIDE PROGRAMME OF INSTITUTIONAL IMPROVEMENT; STUDENT SERVICES, WELFARE AND DISCIPLINE; SCHOLARSHIPS: DISCOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT OF TALENT; THE UNIVERSITIES; THE VOLUNTARY EFFORT IN EDUCATION; THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS CONDUCTED BY MINORITIES; THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES; THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA; THE STATE GOVERNMENTS; PRIORITIES; TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION; ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS.

..

Education Minister, Rajasthan: May I make a proposal at this stage? The paragraphs from 36 to the end are mostly non-controversial. The only controversial issue is that of teachers participating in elections and you know our views on that. The problem of language will be discussed in detail during the rest of the day. I therefore think that we should broadly adopt the rest of the paragraphs from 36-101, subject to the suggestions made by the Standing Committees on School Education and Higher Education and Administration except for the proposal regarding elections. I hope the Board will accept this suggestion.

On this basis, I move the following resolution :

"Considering the recommendations of the Education Commission, the recommendations of the Tenth Conference of State Education Ministers, the Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967), and taking into account the discussions during the thirtythird session of the Board, and the Reports

of its Standing Committees, the Board requests its Chairman, the Union Minister of Education, to formulate a draft statement of National Policy on Education. The Board further requests its Chairman, the Union Education Minister, to transmit this draft statement to the State Education Ministers as early as possible so that their comments are available for the finalization of the Government of India's Resolution on the National Policy on Education."

Shri P. N. Kirpal : We have distributed, along with the Resolution, a short statement which gives five criteria to guide the drafting of the policy statement. These are what we had discussed yesterday. I may read these criteria.

(1) The Statement should indicate the main new directions of change in the educational system in concise, and realistic terms.

(2) The recommendations contained in the policy statement should be such as can be introduced immediately, although the programmes concerned may take a much longer span of time for completion. Essentially, it should be a document for a programme of immediate action in the context of the long-term objectives.

(3) There should be a reasonable assurance about the resources, both financial and organisational, being made available.

(4) The statement should be based on a broad consensus of opinion among the States and the Centre, and as far as possible it should command general acceptance in the country.

(5) The Statement should also provide for constant evaluation and review.

Prof. Samuel Mathai : I should like to say a word about the policy statement which we hope will emerge from you as a result of this discussion. I am a little distressed to find that we have not brought to bear, upon our discussions, an active sense of the reality of the situation in which our education is being carried on in this country. Everywhere, there are strikes and classes are not being held. There is large-scale cheating in our examination halls. Students are cutting examinations saying that the papers are difficult

and so on. This is the reality in which we are working and I feel that so much of our discussion is just like sitting at home and moving armies on a map.

I am speaking quite frankly. I do not know what real use I can make of all the wisdom that has come here when I go back to my situation where classes cannot be held and there are large-scale bad practices going on in many of our colleges. No student can get admission unless he pays a capitation fee. It may be the failing of the Government or it may be the failing of the University. I am only saying, when we are talking of development in education in our country, let there be a fairly clear idea of what is actually happening in the field.

Shri Radha Krishna : In the preamble of the national policy statement, we can include an appraisal of the present situation. It may be good to state the things so that we remind ourselves as to where we are.

Education Minister, Uttar Pradesh : Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the educational system which is in vogue in India suffers from many drawbacks, such as lack of close relations between teachers and the students. It requires re-consideration. The feeling of mutual respect which was in evidence ten or twenty years ago, is now diminishing because in higher classes the teachers have to deal with a large number of students, and thereby they are not able to take adequate interest in the students. Secondly, our present examination system encourages the spirit of getting certificates and diplomas by any means in order to ensure a good future rather than the spirit of acquiring knowledge. Therefore, the examination system needs a great change.

Thirdly, as has been said in the Education Commissions Report unless we raise the emoluments of primary teachers, we cannot attract the best persons as teachers for primary education, and that is the reason why we cannot improve the standard of education. These are a few things on which we have to think deeply and our decisions on these points will have a bearing on our standard. The rest of the things are for expansion. They are necessary for development. If we pay more attention to these things, then only perhaps we can improve our standards.

Decision of the Board

The resolution moved by the Education Minister of Rajasthan was unanimously adopted.

PARAGRAPHS IX—XII

THE LANGUAGE POLICY

Chairman: Now we take up paragraphs 9—12 which alone remain undiscussed. These deal with—

- (i) Adoption of Indian languages as media of education at all stages;
- (ii) The teaching of languages;
- (iii) Hindi, the link language; and
- (iv) Sanskrit.

I think, the Standing Committee on Higher Education has made certain recommendations. So also the School Education Committee.

Education Minister Bihar: We have suggested this:

“The Committee has agreed that the regional languages should be the media of instruction at the higher stages of education. In order to achieve this objective, concerted effort should be made to produce within five years the requisite literature and textbooks required for this programme in all the subjects. Divergent views were, however, expressed regarding the fixation of time-limit for change-over to the regional languages. There was general agreement that in the all India institutions the medium of instruction should be Hindi and English. The Education Minister, Kerala, expressed his view that in addition to English and Hindi, facilities should also be provided for instruction in the language of the region where the institution is situated.”

Education Minister, Maharashtra: The Committee on School Education broadly endorsed the suggestion made by the Committee of Members of Parliament. It is very essential that a proper language policy is announced by the Government of India to strengthen national unity. The medium of education at all stages, we feel, should be the mother-tongue or the regional language, so that all the creative energies of the people are released for the building up of the nation and the gap between the classes and the masses is also reduced. Therefore, our Committee has

broadly supported the suggestions made by the Committee of Members of Parliament. Our Committee only thought that it would be advisable to take certain precautions when we would be switching over to the regional language as the medium of instruction at the college and university stages. Therefore, the following sub-para has been proposed to be added at the end of para 9 on page 3 :

“Necessary safeguards must also be provided to ensure that switch-over to the regional media of instruction does not disrupt the intellectual and corporate life of the universities and institutions of higher learning.”

It is the demand of the times that we introduce the regional language as the medium of instruction. I know this is a controversial issue and there are people who hold exactly the opposite view. In the recent past, there has been a tendency among the antagonists of this policy to attribute personal motives. I will mention an editorial in the *Statesman* today. It is an injustice to us also. If State Ministers are accused of being purchased by the Union Minister by offering some bribes for the development of languages, we feel it is time steps were taken by the Central Government. It is to the credit of your stewardship at the Central Education Ministry that such a revolutionary and overdue step is being taken. Instead of complementing us, motives are attributed. We resent it and express our disapproval of it. I would also like to point out that we took this decision in April last, long before you announced the grants. I am sorry. Vested interests are trying to vitiate the atmosphere. We should not be deterred in our determination by that.

I would only stress a point which was made in the Conference of State Education Ministers that the switch-over to the regional languages should be preceded by two or three very important things. Unless we take these steps, the switchover may go against the interests of the students. These are production of literature and books on a very large scale, regional languages to be given a place of honour in UPSC examinations and doing away with the glamour of English with a simultaneous effort to raise the standard of English. I am not against English; I am for it as a library language. But it should be stripped of the glamour which it has unnecessarily attained in our national life.

Education Minister, Madras : So far as Madras is concerned, it is the view of the State Government, all political parties and educationists that regions language should be the medium of instruction at all stages. But the time fixed for it is not enough. The consultative committee in which all political parties and educationists are represented have come to the conclusion that the medium of instruction should be the regional language, Tamil. In the high school stage, we have already introduced Tamil as the medium of instruction. In the pre-university course also we have done it, so far as humanities are concerned. We are going to introduce this medium in the humanities in B.A. also from this year.

We have printed some textbooks through the Bureau of Tamil Publications. In the Tamil Development Department, we have a wing working on this. The Bureau has published 180 books so far. We are going to expand it. The only hitch is finance. That is why we want the Centre to subsidise.

According to the Madras Government, the five-year limit will not do. It should go stage by stage.

Education Minister, Andhra Pradesh : As I have already said, after consulting the Vice-Chancellors, educationists and other academicians, we in Andhra have decided to switch over to the regional language as the medium of instruction for collegiate education but as has already been highlighted by Shri Chaudhuri, we should be very careful about phasing the programme. I entirely support the points made by him. So far as textbooks and publications are concerned, unless the Centre comes to our assistance financially in a big way, I may not be able to do justice to it in spite of my anxiety to expedite the procedure.

So far as terminology is concerned, I think we will have to use the international terminology side by side with regional terminology during the transitional period. As regards post-graduate courses in science, engineering, medicine etc., we have taken the decision that we should continue the present medium of instruction for the time being.

Education Minister, Kerala : In Kerala, Government feel that the switchover need not wait for the texbooks to be prepared. That is what some experts say. Otherwise, for

five years nothing can be done. If we make an honest attempt, we can go ahead.

Mine is a State which exports manpower. We have certain other problems also. In the Parliamentary Committee Report, the definition of all-India institutions is not very clear. They define them as those which admit students from all regions of the country. If this is so, all the Universities in India become all-India institutions.

There are certain institutions like the IITs. All the States have not been fortunate to have these so-called all-India institutions. Those States will not have any opportunity to impart education through the medium of Hindi and English. Therefore we in Kerala, which is the most advanced State in Education, feel that simultaneously with Malayalam, which will be the language in which the majority of students get instruction, there must be English medium classes, at least for some time to come. Otherwise, we will find it very difficult. Hundreds of our graduates are sent to Ethiopia and other countries as teachers. Many of our people travel all over the world and if we switch over to Malayalam and our graduates and post-graduates learn everything in Malayalam with the present standard of education in English, the people will be confined to the State alone. So, taking into consideration this peculiar problem of Kerala, we want, at least for sometime, parallel English-medium schools and Hindi-medium schools.

Dr. A. L. Mudaliar : I have listened to the debate on language policy on more than one occasion. Sometimes, it has taken an aggressive turn, sometimes it is more polished. I recall a meeting of the Central Advisory Board, when Mr. Kamalapati Tripathi, Minister from U.P., said he would speak only in Hindi in spite of requests to speak in English. Then, Mr. Pattabhirama Rao, Minister from Andhra, spoke in Telugu and said that, since Mr. Tripathi would not speak in English, he proposed to speak in his own mother-tongue. The Chairman, Dr. Shrimali, was very much perplexed, but we finally persuaded Mr. Rao to speak in English.

This question of language has to be understood from its broad outlines. A great deal of sentiment is undoubtedly associated with it. When anybody says: how can you speak

in or learn in a language other than your own mother-tongue, people are naturally very much perturbed. Perhaps any disinclination to be rigid is due to the fact that, although I was a Tamilian, I was born and brought up in a Telugu State and graduated with Telugu as my second language. Therefore, it gives me a little more of mobility to think of language as a means and not an end in itself.

We are in a state now when we have to make great progress. One of the things that has unfortunately given us this feeling of exclusiveness is this Himalayan blunder of linguistic States, which has led to fighting for borders, for rivers and various other things. I fully endorse the view that the medium of instruction in the State should be the language of the State up to a certain extent and every effort should be made to encourage this.

The University of Madras has been closely co-operating with the Government of Madras up to a certain stage. We have introduced Tamil as the medium for the humanities in the pre-university class, we have even introduced Tamil as the medium in the degree colleges. We have also said that a student can be taught in English but can answer his papers in Tamil for facility of expression in humanities. Progressive realisation of this and the progressive methods in which this can be done would be useful up to a certain extent. But we also feel that it will be suicidal to leave out English which is a window to all modern knowledge. It is not a question of loyalty. As the Minister from Kerala said, we have to see that our boys and girls come up to a level of education and reach the highest goals which for a long time will be only through a medium of a language which is considered foreign, but is yet essential.

In Madras, all boys and girls up to the school-leaving age are given free education. We are trying to make it compulsory as soon as possible, but two languages are taught to them, their mother tongue from the very beginning, and English from the third standard. This was taken up by the previous Government and is being followed by the present Government, so that in course of time in the State of Madras, there will be cent per cent English-educated students, able to understand and follow English. I would plead with my own Government that in their anxiety to push Tamil to the utmost extent, they should

not forget that there are several impediments even to a well-developed language like Tamil, because switching over in education is very different from switching from high to low current, etc.

Statements have been made about translations. I am convinced that no translation is worth anything unless the author himself is the translator. In 1929, we had an inter-university conference. Sir Akbar Hydari, who was then the Prime Minister of Hyderabad, showed us an exhibition of 1,500 books on engineering, medicine and many other subjects, all translated into Urdu, but they were at least 15 years ante-dated. So long as technology is proceeding at a high speed, we cannot dream of the mathematics or the physics that we learnt in our days.

If we want to keep these standards, translations cannot do. Let us have authors who can do this work and then we will readily agree to take those books which we should have as text-books for the students. In a very minor way, I wrote a book in my own speciality. It has gone to the 7th edition within the last 20 years. I have a collaborator with me now because I know that the book must be kept up every three years. Therefore, to say that we have got 1500 books translated is not to say that we have books of sufficient merit and adequacy for the students in general. I am not trying to say that things should not be done in that way. But when you talk of five years or ten years, I really feel that we are talking without a realistic appreciation of what is to be done.

An article was contributed recently to a journal called Bhavan's Journal. It is a very famous journal and I think the Hon. Minister from Bombay knows much about it and it is published by our esteemed friend, Mr. K. M. Munshi. In the June issue of Bhavan's journal, an article written by a person of great eminence appeared. He has been a Minister in the undivided Madras; he was a Minister and Chief Minister in Andhra Pradesh. He was a Cabinet Minister with extensive responsibility at the Centre and he was the President of the All-India Congress Committee for two years. He is now the Speaker of the Lok Sabha. I beg members to read that article and to read it over and over again to see what a person of his stature has to say in an unbiased way. He says that it will take 100 years for Hindi to become a universal language in India. I do

not say that. I say: let every language progress. We will gladly see that Hindi progresses as well as any other language. But if you make it a rule that unless you speak in Tamil, you are an anathema to the audience, unless you speak in Telugu, you are not wanted in Andhra Pradesh or in any other part. I feel that this country is going to be one of the unfortunate examples of divide and rule in all spheres of activity. The other day the Vice-President speaking at a function after referring to linguistic divisions, said: the only thing I am glad of is that the army is also not being divided. If the armies had been given to the States, State would have fought against State. It is unfortunate. I do feel that in this question of language policy, heart must speak to heart and the tongue must be curbed. The more you curb the tongue, the better for all of us. If, therefore, we can speak with that detached, unemotional sort of manner in which we ought to speak when educational problems are being considered, we shall understand each other better.

I am not against any language; I have no hatred of any language. In my own university, thirteen languages are being taught up to the certificate level and degree level; in other cases up to the highest level. When we were reforming the education system, Mrs. Hansa Mehta asked: why is Gujarati not a subject? We included Gujarati. There were a few students. We have Bengali for students who have Bengali as their language. There should be no language denied in an educational institution for a minority who seek to learn that language, whether it be as a medium of instruction or the study of a language. I feel that for a long time to come, if we are to remain knit together and keep together, we must, in spite of all the difficulties and emotional strains, keep up the international language.

I remember a discussion many years ago when the Education Minister at the Centre came to address an audience at a dinner meeting and he was saying that it was very easy to teach in Tamil or in any other language. All that we have got to say is: take (in Tamil) Sodium Chloride. That is not teaching physics or Chemistry. It is much more fundamental to make people to learn and imbibe all that is best in any particular subject.

Let me remind you—I do not think I need remind you—but then let me bring to the notice of the people here a

discussion that took place two years ago when your predecessor Mr. Chagla was Education Minister. I was by your side and felt very proud as I always do when I am by your side. You, Sir, would not allow the discussion to proceed further till a resolution was passed that in all technical and technological institutions and professional institutions, English must continue as long as it was necessary. I am sure that Vice-Chancellor Triguna Sen will not speak in a different tone as Education Minister Triguna Sen. I know that you speak according to your convictions and that you are not going to be changed simply because you occupy a different position now. All that I can say is we all agree with you. We must encourage regional languages. We must encourage any other language. We must not say: thus far and no further. I am very anxious that in the State of Madras as much encouragement should be given to the other southern languages: Malayalam, Kanarese and Telugu as is given to Tamil. We are encouraging Hindi. Leave it at that. Do not try to force the pace of Hindi. Hindi has been used as the third language. Leave it at that. And what is the language for? There are three senses in which you can use a language. One is spoken language. By all means cultivate the habit. If my friend Mr. Tripathi wanted to teach me something of the spoken Hindi, I would welcome it. The second thing is the written language. When you go to a State where Hindi is being talked about, learn to read and write Hindi, whether it is in government offices or whether it is in other spheres. But when you go to the third sense, that is the aspect of the medium of instruction, all my senses revolt at the idea that you should force a language as the medium of instruction which is not wanted.

You may ask me: why are you asking for English to be the medium? I do not ask for all time to come. People ask: how long are you going to keep English? Is there anything finite in this world? The very composition of this Central Advisory Board has changed beyond conception. Did we imagine it last year? Nothing is conclusive. As time rolls on and as changes are made, different interpretations will come.

Reference has been made by my friend, the Vice-Chancellor of the Kerala University, to the condition in which student life at present is being led. I am sorry that

there has not been as much attention paid to it as ought to have been. I have enjoyed a great deal of fruitful sleep because I have not had this worry except for a short period, two years ago. I know and you know what had happened. Students in one State are easily influenced by what is happening in other States. When there is a great deal of demonstration, when the examiners are actually assaulted in the streets as soon as they come out of the examination halls, when police protection is necessary to conduct examinations, when as a matter of fact question papers are openly sold in the bazars and streets, we have all of us to consider what is happening to the student population. An elaborate definition about the policy on education is good. But the implementation of that policy must be in the hands of teachers and the taught. We have to see what we can do for the taught to give them once more the ancient ideal of Guru-Shishya. That has been lost completely in India. I am sorry to say, as a person of advancing age, that I do not think I can ever see that sort of homage being paid. Still, if we can keep within bounds, if we can see that we do not interfere with the students, if we can see that the students are not organised for political purposes and conduct political elections—I am sorry I have to speak very frankly—if we can keep away from interference in the students unions, and interference with the Presidents that are to be elected to the students unions, if we do not make a fetish of university degrees for all sorts of appointments to be made, making education subservient only to jobs, we shall probably have made some progress in the direction in which this country ought to progress.

Times without number, in most appointments that have been made by the Government, we have requested that steps should be taken to see that a degree is not a qualification required for many jobs. In England, it is not the degree. Anybody can appear for any examination. The only consideration, as you know, is age: recruitment at 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22. Even for the highest examination—the home civil service—no degree is required. I can tell you of an instance. When we were speaking of this common school system, I was reminded of it. There was one Collector by name Gelatti, an Italian who had naturalised in England and come in the ICS, the home service. His son did not go to any school. He finished all his education at home. And then for a year he went to Cambridge and

appeared at the ICS examination. When the final list was referred to, it was found that he headed the list of all the ICS candidates; he was the first among the whole series of the Indian Civil Service candidates in the home examination there. A degree is a pernicious thing. Students go in for the degrees only because they think that jobs can be obtained and now it has become infinitely worse, because the degrees vary in standards and all sorts of degrees are considered equivalent. No progress will be made in the educational ladder unless some steps are taken to see that there is at least a minimum of achievement before the degrees are awarded. Why have all these institutions come into existence? We have now in some universities the correspondence courses. They come to get degrees for a job! We have evening classes and I welcome it. We are having them in our university also in many colleges, and we hope to expand it. That is knowledge for its own sake. But when it comes to the question of finding jobs, it must not be a government job merely; you must have a job anywhere. And the man that knows more, who has the manner of utilising his talents, whatever his attainment in the educational field, he will earn much more as we find in all these various forms of labour.

I will conclude by saying this: let us by all means eagerly devote all our attention to the interests of improving the various languages. Let us not have a hatred for any language; let us realise that language is only a means to an end and not an end in itself. What is wanted is knowledge, wisdom, and what comes of knowledge and wisdom. It is not confined to any one language; that is not confined to any religion; that is not confined to any section of the society.

The wisest people in our country have been those who have never had university education. And, therefore, as one who has had a long spell of university education, I would say, let us realise that it is not the degree that count, but wisdom that is gained through any language, by any means and under any atmosphere. All that I have got to say is let us follow a policy of *festina lenti*—or proceed slowly. If you hasten in anyway, you will utterly ruin the very cause that you love. That is all that I have got to say. I thank you for giving me the opportunity.

Prof. M. V. Mathur : Mr. Chairman, I would like to add just a few words to what Dr. Mudaliar has said so very well. I agree with him that the essential need for giving a special position to our various regional languages today arises on account of the formation of linguistic States. If that were not so, things might have been somewhat different. But that is a fact and we have to recognise it. Not only this. I would also like to mention another point. In our Constitution, we say that every citizen would be provided an opportunity to seek employment anywhere and the State Governments are required to so formulate their policies that the fact that a person comes from another State does not stand in the way of seeking employment. This also leads to a situation whereby you have to recognise certain languages other than your own. And as languages stand today, by and large, it is the regional language plus English so that whether it is English and Hindi somewhere or English and Bengali or English and Tamil elsewhere, the common factor remains English. I do not know when that common factor, English, will be replaced by some other language. But this is very important because ours is a country which is suffering from chronic unemployment. At the end of each plan, we find that the number of unemployed persons is larger than what it was at the beginning; and the point at which this process may be arrested is not yet in sight. Therefore, the people who go out from the universities in this country look for employment not only in their States but outside also. We should take steps to see that this freedom is not restricted.

In so many centres today, the only medium of higher education is English. This position must necessarily change because the other medium, that is, the regional language or Hindi, should be permissible. If we say, "No; it should be the regional language only", then again it is a step which we shall be taking in the same fashion—today we insist on English and tomorrow we may insist on another language. Therefore, there should be the possibility of three languages, namely, the regional languages—Hindi and English—supplementing the media of higher instruction.

Dr. Mudaliar did mention and I would very much like to suggest to this assembly that they must pay very special

attention to this, namely, that it should not be necessary to have a university degree even for the highest governmental job of a non-technical character. If you do not remove it, the only language that is going to prosper in the present context will be English, and no other regional language. You can try out anywhere and give alternative medium: you give Hindi and English, and Tamil and English, and Bengali and English; the people will come to the English medium, because it is the language that gives employment. So, it is the language that gives employment which alone can click as the language of higher instruction. That has been so in our history. Sanskrit was the *lingua franca* of India; when it gave employment, it became the important language. So was the case of Urdu and Persian. So was the case of English. Even today, not more than two per cent of the people in this country know English, but the people run after it because it gives employment, and in a country with such a vast population and such large unemployment, it is the language of employment which is going to click. Therefore, we should see to it that while we do all that we can to promote the regional languages, this factor should not be forgotten. It has also been mentioned in our various reports that the UPSC should promote all these languages. But at what stage? Do you expect the UPSC to make use of these languages in their examinations after the persons have taken their M.A. or M.Sc. degree? It is going to lead to complete chaos. But it is certainly possible to organise these things soon after the higher secondary stage and you can have bulk recruitment for the all-India services right from IAS to the Central Secretariat Services Class II. There may be marginal errors when recruitment is made through fourteen languages. But after they have been recruited, they will be probationers and they should be given good and liberal education for 3 or 4 years in the union languages which they will be using in the future in their work.

With regard to making preparation for the changeover, I would like to emphasise two aspects. Even today, we find that State Governments do give preference to English and continue to use it as the language of administration. If your employment policy is different from your education policy, it will not work. So, the State Governments must use their regional language for their administration. This must precede the change-over. The second is the need

for journals, apart from preparation of routine text-books. Changes are taking place very fast and we should keep track of them, even though there may be some time lag of six months or one year. That will be possible only if we have good academic journals—3 or 4—in each subject in each language. Our university has been trying for years to persuade the Union Ministry to support that kind of thing, without success. I hope now it will be possible to do it.

I find from the papers which have been circulated to us that an all-India institution is one which is being financed by the Union Government. This is not proper. An all-India institution is one which opens its doors to students and teachers from all over the country. There will be several such institutions which are not financed directly by the Government of India. In my university, there are students and teachers from all over the country. In a particular science course, it so happened that 12 out of 15 seats were filled by students from other States, because admission is made on merit. I do not know whether such universities would be classified as all-India institutions or not.

If regional languages are the media in all universities, perhaps it is a natural corollary that there should be one university in each State which would use the union languages. Otherwise, even your scheme of central schools will be set at naught. Your argument for central schools applies to the higher stages also.

If a person who comes to the university level does not know English even as a library language, it would be a calamity. The Education Commission has therefore emphasised the use of English as a library language. If you say that there is no need to learn English at the university level and the higher secondary knowledge of English is enough, there will be difficulty. We shall not be able to have that type of international standard in university education which is our ideal. That danger should be avoided. Therefore, knowledge of English should be essential, at least as a library language, if not in its present form.

Dr. Smt. Durgabai Deshmukh : In my public life of three decades, I have not found any problem raising such anxiety in the minds of the people as this question of media of

instruction at all levels. Even people outside India are watching anxiously what is going to happen here. I have met many intelligent housewives in our country who are very exercised on the question of medium of instruction because when the children return from school, they go to the mother and the mother helps the child in the lessons. The statement made by the Education Minister setting a time-limit of 5 or 10 years for the change-over to regional languages has agitated many minds. Many universities have gone ahead and already introduced or are going to introduce the regional languages as the media of instruction. Even in the National Integration Conference held long ago, when the three-language formula was adopted by all Ministers, the people were trying their best to switch over the medium of instruction to the regional languages. But the whole question is about the time limit. I do not want to repeat the arguments advanced by either Dr. Mudaliar or Professor Mathur but I want to put it from one point of view, namely mobility. I would like to be enlightened or educated as to what we propose to do about the question of mobility of the teacher. It is not a question of one language but 15 languages. If at the university level the medium of instruction is in the regional language, how do we tackle the problem of mobility? That is the question which is agitating millions of people. Even if one is well qualified in one subject, how can he teach it in a different language? I know the capacity of people is enormous and they can learn more languages. But it is difficult to teach subjects in so many languages. So, the question of mobility of teachers and students is exercising my mind.

It is said that translations may be undertaken. But consider how costly that is. By the time you are able to translate one book and it comes out, several things would have happened. Already we are several miles away. All these things will constitute so many difficulties.

While I say this I should not be misunderstood as being pro-British or pro-English or enemy of Hindi. I can make a beautiful speech in Hindi. Even when I was 13 years old, I was teaching Hindi in Madras. If the Southerners begin to learn Hindi, even the Hindi-speaking people will not be able to compete with them. I was a member of the Constituent Assembly where we spent months and months.

literally years, on this question of Hindi being the *lingua franca*. We had no difficulty in agreeing. But when the Hindi-speaking people began to insist that even the numerals should be in Hindi, then came the opposition. It is from that time that Hindi began to experience great opposition from the Southern States. Because till then, they were voluntarily learning Hindi. Literally, hundreds of people used to appear for the examinations of the Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha. It is from this time that opposition to Hindi started in the South. So, there should be no great hurry about it. You should let this language grow and develop; may be five years or even earlier. I must frankly say that I felt very happy when Parliament decided to postpone this discussion and wait for a better consideration. With regard to the question of timing, perhaps 5 or even 10 years may be too short a period.

So, my points relate to mobility of teachers and students, if there are 15 languages and the cost of translation. There will be enormous difficulty in the availability of teachers for teaching in all the languages. Till then what are you going to do? By this, you are not bringing national unity but national disunity.

Chairman : I want to make a clarification. Mrs. Deshmukh said that the Union Education Minister had declared a limit of five years. The statement I made in this regard has been circulated to you. It will be seen from it that, what she said is not correct. The Conference of Education Ministers, which met in April and the MPs Committee have talked of five years. As Education Minister, I have not yet said anything about the time-limit. What I said in the Lok Sabha is in your hands as item No. 7, paragraph 4 on page 9. I said : "The Government of India have accepted *in principle* that the Indian languages should now be adopted as media of education at all stages." I have never said 5 years or 10 years. It is wrong. People are putting it in my mouth.

Dr. Smt. Durgabai Deshmukh : Certain papers have brought it out. I am very happy to hear it from you.

Education Minister, Orissa : Since I come from Orissa, my regional language is not Hindi but it is Oriya; nor am I averse to English. I represent here the feelings of the

people of my State, the people of some parts of Bihar and Madhya Pradesh because I generally move in that area. I accept *in toto* what has been decided in the Standing Committee, that the three-language formula should be given effect to and that the medium of instruction up to the university stage should be the regional language. If there is any apprehension that science teaching through the regional language would be imperfect or it would take more time, it is not correct. Take the case of Russia, where scientific subjects are taught in Russian and not in English, German or French. So also in China, which has become the third great power; they are not teaching their children in English but in Chinese. So also in Japan, which is a small but very advanced country. Therefore to say that science cannot be taught except in the English language is not correct. Our boys are no less intelligent than the boys of those countries and they can acquire perfect knowledge in science, medicine and other subjects more quickly and more easily if they learn in the regional language. So, there should not be any apprehension that if the regional language becomes the medium of instruction, science teaching or acquisition of knowledge in science will be hampered or there may not be any development. I do not accept that proposition.

Regarding the national and emotional integration, it is said that English is the basis of the unity of India. It is true that today English is the only language throughout the length and breadth of India in which we interchange our ideas. How long is it to continue? What percentage of people interchange their ideas in this language? The people who are quarrelling among themselves are the intelligentsia, the politicians, the people in the administration and some businessmen. It is only a small fraction of the people who are in favour of English. They quarrel among themselves whether English should be the *lingua franca* of India or not and there is another section that advances the cause of Hindi to be the *lingua franca* of India. Of course, these people mould public opinion to some extent and influence the public. How long will they do it? I apprehend that they cannot do it for long.

When you go to the villages, when you go to the rural areas and take the opinion of the people, there is a demand that education must be imparted through the regional

language. In almost all States, at least in Bihar, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, and in some other States, the people are demanding that the official language must be the regional language. If the official language in Orissa, in Bihar, in Madhya Pradtsh, in Uttar Pradesh, in Gujarat, in Maharashtra or even in Tamilnad and even in Kerala, is made the regional language, the people will welcome it. Why do the people of some States have so much love for English? We love English because of the employment in the services and in the administration. As Mr. Mathur has rightly said, we read English, we have love for English language not because it is a library language but because it gives employment, it gives bread, to the people. If in all the States the regional language is made the official language, then all those persons who are employed in the States do not require the knowledge of English language to such an extent as is required today but only the working knowledge of it. The working knowledge means the writing of letters, the exchange of ideas and all that.

Let me voice here the opinion of the people in certain areas. We have love of English only for the purpose of employment in the States and at the Centre. If you look at the employment in the Central Government, you will find that the people from certain areas are not at all represented. Today, the feeling is that employment in the Central Government should be according to the population of the various States. If the people of a particular area of India demand or think that because they have read English or because they have read Hindi, they will be employed to a greater extent in the Central Government, that is not going to come into being. The people will not allow this to happen.

I am here going to call a spade a spade. In regard to Orissa, I do not find our people in the employment of the Central Government. Even in Rourkela, our people are not employed. There, the people are quarrelling, the students are quarrelling and there are walk-outs in the Assembly. So also in Bihar. The people of Bihar are not adequately represented in the Central Government. So also the people of Assam, the people of Uttar Pradesh, the people of Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Rajasthan and to some extent also Maharashtra. There may be some people from Bombay but not from the entire State of Mahartshtra.

Let us consider all this. You may continue English for eternity. I have no objection to that. But let us apportion the employment in the Government of India according to the population of the States. I have the hope that the moment employment in the Government of India is apportioned according to the population of the States, not to an exact number but in a rough way, the next day all our quarrels about English or Hindi will be over.

Chief Executive Councillor, Delhi: The impression should not be formed that the majority of the people are opposed to this. In fact, all the Education Ministers are agreed on this point.

Shri Samar Guha: In the present context of the aggressive mood of linguism, we are perhaps, in this Conference dealing with the most explosive issue. With our collective wisdom here and with the collective wisdom of the Legislatures in the States and the Parliament, we should be able to evolve a reasonable solution in a way that the sacred image of our national unity is not tarnished.

With this preface, I want to support wholly Pandit Nehru's formula of three languages. I want to say categorically that the three-language formula must be accepted without any 'if' or any other language in place of English as has been done.

I also want to add a word about the confusion created in regard to the mother tongue. I will give you a concrete example. In West Bengal, 18 lakhs of non-Bengali families who are living there do not speak the regional language—Bengali. The protagonists of abolition of English, who offer the plea that English, being a foreign language, should be banished, should not forget that this language is a gift of history to India and has become a part of Indian life. The spirit of synthesis of Indian life has adopted in several ways the various aspects of Western culture and English is only one particular colour in that spectrum. To single out English as the seal of slavery is either adopting an ostrich attitude or a camouflage with certain ulterior designs. Hindi should develop in a natural and cordial atmosphere of national acceptance to assume an all-India role. But even at the stage of final consummation, English national and international means of communication continue as one of the link languages along with

Hindi. Let us recognise the fact that monopoly of patriotism does not lie embedded in one particular language only. There is no controversy regarding the use of mother tongue in the school and college levels as the medium of education. But, for higher education, English should continue as the medium of instruction for the present. A review of the whole situation should be made after the school and college education through mother-tongue has been more or less perfected and its impact on the system of national education and other spheres of national coordination observed. Only then should a final decision be taken on the issue of the medium of higher education.

At this stage of national development and confusing relations between different regions, when there is high linguistic chauvinism in various parts of the country, the holding of examinations in regional languages, including Hindi, it is likely to disarrange the administrative services in a dangerous manner, undermine the standard of examination, introduce malpractices in evaluation and even tend to regionalise administrative services.

Finally, I shall deal with some technical aspects. The adoption of common terminologies for all regional languages in science, technology, etc., should be considered as an essential pre-requisite and a 'must' in order to combine the effect of introducing regional languages as media of instruction with bringing about integration and putting the whole educational system on a national basis and to ensure inter-communication between different Indian languages. For this, international terminologies widely used in many Western and Asian countries should be naturalised in our country and adopted as Indian terminologies. Mere adoption of the terminologies in the Indian languages will create serious barriers in the way of evolving a national system of education. If an international system of terminologies is adopted, it will go a long way to remove the difficulties for all-India institutions and will facilitate the mobility of teachers and students and will also obviate very largely the possibility of regionalism in education.

Yesterday perhaps a glossary of words was introduced. I have a little experience as I have written a book on Chemistry which is in the ninth edition. I have particularly used international terminology in most places. I have found that even the Indian terminologies are as equally

Greek to the students as the international terminologies. In all our languages we are trying to devise terminologies of our own. Why should we not adopt the international terminology as our own in science, chemistry and other subjects? In Japan and many other countries, they have done so. If we do it, it will be one single aspect which will go a long way in the integration of education in our country. I would emphatically suggest that international terminology should be used in rendering books in science, engineering and other technical subjects.

Shri Anil Mohan Gupta : There is one aspect of this language problem which has not been touched upon and which, as a villager, I should point out. We are trying to make a nation think in a foreign language. This is an absurdity. At the very beginning when our boys and girls are taught English, in thousands of our villages, in the 3rd, 4th, or 5th classes, by persons who know very little about the language, we are stifling the ability of these children to think. Enormous amount of time, which should have been devoted for developing their ability to think and to reason out problems, is diverted for cramming insignificant facts. This is how we are weakening the very foundation of their thinking ability. In our schools, colleges and universities our young people find that they are required to care more for mastering a foreign language than for understanding and absorbing the subjects they are supposed to specialise in. Today, when 'explosion of knowledge' has become a constant and all-pervasive factor, this is suicidal. We are, thus killing our national genius at the very root and are always depending on secondhand knowledge for our intellectual development. In this manner we can never catch up with other advanced nations because we are always depending on knowledge filtered through another language. I would not have said anything on this topic nor would I have dared to differ from Dr. Mudaliar after his masterly treatment of the subject had not my experience been corroborated by persons like Gandhi and Tagore. They had pointed out again and again that while thinking of education we are always thinking of few cities and we almost always equate our nation with a few learned persons. We have never been able to pull together all our resources. If we allow our young people to learn and think in their own natural languages, a great obstacle, stifling their ability to think

and to express vigorously, shall be removed and our nation will come of age. It is only when the dumb millions of our country begin to contribute to the pool of our national thinking, when we have boldly given up our abject dependence on a foreign language as the only vehicle of our higher thinking and expression, that we can really march ahead with long strides and catch up with the most advanced nations as some other nations have done during the recent years. Because we are not thinking and expressing in our own languages our best minds are not contributing their best and our average minds are contributing nothing at all. Without this cooperative and coordinated endeavour it will never be possible for us to reach the goal. A complete switch-over may require some time, as Dr. Mudaliar has suggested. But we must make the beginning without any further hesitation.

Chairman : The Commission has quoted extensively from Tagore. The Education Ministers took account of all these things and decided unanimously that the regional languages should be the media. We all agree that regional languages should be developed. We all agree that we should write books in a big way. The question is whether it is possible to do all this within a given time. At the same time, when we think of the medium of education, nobody has suggested that the boys and girls will not be taught English. We are mixing up the learning of English as a library language with its use as a medium. There is also the view that Hindi should also be taught as the link language. The three-language formula is thus agreed upon. The only question is whether we will be prepared to switch over by a specific date. This was also discussed by the Education Ministers and it was decided that there would be a reviewing committee which will, at the end of every year, review what development has been made, how far we have proceeded in writing books, adopting terminology and so on. The main problem to be considered now relates to the details of implementation. We shall have to satisfy ourselves not only that standards are not diluted as a teacher, I cannot agree to this—but that they are effectively improved. Similarly, we will have to ensure, not only that the unity of the country is not weakened, but that it is actually strengthened. I repeat again that, if by adopting these regional languages, we are convinced that we are going to break the unity of India, I will stop this whole business.

As I have said, I will place before the Vice-Chancellors the opinion of the M.Ps Committee, of the Ministers of Education, and also the Education Commission's Report. They are best judges to come to a decision on that; and I will be guided by their decision.

It has been said that in this country, the policy on education changes with every new Education Minister. I want to tell you emphatically that I am not going to initiate or enunciate a new policy of mine, underline the words 'of mine'. I will be guided by the decisions of the Education Ministers of the different States. Though education is not a concurrent subject, I want to work with them jointly in a spirit of cooperation. I will be guided by the decisions of the educationists and the wishes of Parliament. I will never introduce a new policy of mine so long as I am here

Education Minister, Bihar : Since yesterday we have been considering different subjects. On many subjects we are unanimous and on no important subject has any difference of opinion been expressed. But there are two or three subjects on which we have different opinions. Since we all believe in democracy, we have exchanged our views freely. I am one of those who believe that when there is difference of opinion on a particular issue, we have a right to express our views independently and honestly. But it does not mean that what one says is always correct. It is just possible that in a certain context and on a particular occasion what others say may be correct and what we say is not correct. In any other context it may well be otherwise. But when we accept democracy, it is natural that on certain issues there would be two different views and after mutual discussions we arrive at a decision considered to be beneficial for the whole nation.

Since yesterday we have discussed many problems. Till now we have seen, after discussions and exchange of views, our decisions have been based on unanimity.

We were just now discussing the language issue. Yesterday we were considering the question whether there should be a national policy on education. Since the Education Commission has stressed the importance of the medium of education and looked upon it as an instrument of national integration, the natural conclusion is that there should also be a national policy on education. If no national policy on

education is decided, education could hardly serve as an instrument of national integration. This House has endorsed the proposal of the Education Minister of Rajasthan that there should be a national policy on education. This House has, therefore, been authorised to declare its policy on a suitable occasion.

We have just now discussed the language issue. We are happy that in this House we are generally unanimous that the medium of instruction for higher education should be the regional languages. Our country being so large, inhabited by 51 crores of people, difference of opinion is not unnatural. It is felt that generally those who work on the land and those who work in schools, colleges and universities, those who run the administration, generally are of the opinion that the medium of instruction even for higher education should be the regional languages.

Now the question arises what should be the position of English? I am least embarrassed in this matter. The question is whether English should continue to be a compulsory subject in our country. There are many who say that English should not be a compulsory subject of study in this country. There are many, who believe that it is as unnecessary to retain the English language as it was to have retained the British here. I will not be sorry if English goes and I believe many will share my feeling. The British have left this country, though a few Englishmen are still living here. They have not gone. We had objected to the British Raj but not to the Englishmen. We have our own views about English. It has come here with Englishmen. They had come here as rulers and we did not like it. But if English stays here to rule over us, we shall object to this too. We are of the view that English as a compulsory subject must go, though we are not opposed to it as an optional subject in this country. That would not affect the mobility of people in this country. People come to Bihar from Kerala and from Tamilnad to Uttar Pradesh and those who would so desire, would continue to come in future too. There can be no objection to it. But Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that people going from Kerala to Mauritius, Africa or to Europe, constitute a small minority. So are the Tamilians going out of India. These people may gladly study English. Let them study it as well as they like and let them go out of India as our unofficial Ambassadors. We greet them and

offer them our best wishes. But it does not mean that 95 to 97 per cent of people of Kerala or Tamilnad who do not go out of the country should also be forced to study English. The horse may well be taken to the stream, but cannot be forced to drink water. Such people of Kerala, Mysore, or Tamilnad or Bihar or for that matter of any State who do not desire to go out, should not be forced to study English. Let the people of Andhra study Telgu, those of Tamilnad Tamil, of Mysore Kannade and the people of other States their respective regional languages. Why must they be compelled to study English? That would be doing injustice to crores of people. Therefore, when we oppose English, we really oppose its domination.

In the end, let me mention the third point. Should India have a national language? Provision for this has been made in our Constitution, but leave that alone. May I ask what the learned and the experienced gathering thinks of it? Should we not have a national language? If Russia has a national language and so have China, Japan and all other nations of the world their respective national languages, must India do without one? If we too must have a national language, what can it be? We had taken a decision about it long ago—before we became free and again after independence. We do not desire to impose anything on any one. You will recollect the Education Ministers' Conference had decided some time ago that if a State did not want to introduce the teaching of Hindi in its schools for any reason or reasons, it must not be compelled to do so. All luck to them. Just like during the festival of Holi everyone is expected to go gay, but if one does not like to play with colour or participate in the fun and frolick, there is no quarrel with him. We worship nationalism and Indianism. We worship the Ganga and the Yamuna and other rivers of the country like the Godawari, the Krishna, Tapti, Cauvery etc. If we feel proud of Tulsidas, Surdas and Kalidas, we also take great pride in Shankaracharya. We bow before all the Rishis and preceptors we have had in India whether they hailed from Tamilnad or Kerala, Bengal or Assam.

We are proud of our rivers, mountains, forests and similarly we are proud of our languages. We take all the 14 languages as our national languages and we love each one of them. Mr. Chairman, when it was decided to have the regional languages as media of instruction, we felt very

happy. But there must be one National language also. In case someone does not accept any particular language, then it should not be imposed. We cannot inculcate love and integrity, if we try to impose any language. Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude with these words that if any person does not accept one National language, there is no harm but the deportation of English is necessary and it should be done. At least on this point there should be unanimity in the country.

Mr. President, I wish to thank you for the manner in which you have decided to take such concrete and revolutionary steps with immediate effect. We had come and attended conferences and had long talks, but whenever the atmosphere became too serious, you by your tact and affability have entertained all of us. The manner in which you conducted the business of the conference is really worthy of praise and commendation. Therefore on behalf of all our friends whom I have the honour to represent, I offer you my thanks.

We hope that it would be possible to decide the language question unanimously as we have taken decisions on all other subjects almost unanimously. If any difference of opinion still persists, we shall get over that and adopt a unanimous policy on education so that we can achieve our targets of national integration, development, awakening and raising of standards. With these words, I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and all my colleagues who are present here.

I beg your pardon for any inadvertent remarks which I might have made during my speeches today and yesterday. With these words, I conclude my remarks.

Chairman : Friends, may I thank you all for your kindness and cooperation in this important session of the Board? This has been my first session. As you know, I am an engineer by profession and am not trained to talk. You must have noticed in these two days that I could not talk as well as my friend Mr. Mathai. Please forgive me for my mistakes, or if I have hurt any one or done anything wrong.

Believe me, I am keen on two things; first, we must identify a broad policy on education and second, we must implement it in a vigorous and sustained manner. If I fail

to implement the unanimous decision on vital issues, for the transformation and development of education, I feel strongly it is no use my staying in this chair. We are almost ready to complete the first of these two tasks and to begin the second. We are now at the end of August. By about three months, we will go to all the forums which I mentioned—the State Governments, the Vice-Chancellors and the Parliament. But I do not like to sit quiet for these three months. My Ministry is eager—I and all my friends and the officers also—to try to implement some of the decisions we have taken.

We know that the stake before us is very great. The entire future of the country depends on what we now do in education. And everyone of us wants a big change in education. This is our joint responsibility, in the States and the Centre, and success can only come if we work together. Believe me, by working with friends like you in Parliament and again during these two days here, I am confident that I may be able to do something. I have received every cooperation and help from you in the past, and I am quite sure that we will continue to work together with the same affection, understanding and determination.

I can only say, "Bless me and help me to serve you and serve the cause of education". I am quite sure we shall succeed, and that too very soon. I thank you all.

Dr. A. L. Mudaliar : Before we disperse, as one of the oldest members of the Central Advisory Board, I express to you our sincere thanks for the manner in which you have conducted the proceedings for the last few days. I know it has been a difficult task, but your equanimity of temper and your softened voice have made us all feel that we are under one who will understand all our feelings and guide the destinies of this country aright. Thank you.

Chairman : Thank you all. The session is over.

ANNEXURE I

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF EDUCATION IN INDIA

(As on August 22, 23, 1967)

Ex-officio Members

1. Dr. Triguna Sen
Education Minister (*Chairman*)
2. Shri P. N. Kirpal
Educational Adviser to the Gov-
ernment of India
Ministry of Education
New Delhi
3. Dr. D. S. Kothari
Chairman
University Grants Commission
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi
4. Gen. K. M. Cariappa
President
All India Council of Sports
Roshanara, Mercara
Coorg (Mysore)
5. Dr. B. N. Prasad
Chairman
Standing Commission for Scien-
tific and Technical Terminology
C/o University Grants Commis-
sion Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi.
6. Dr. B. V. Keskar
Chairman
National Book Trust
23, Nizamuddin East
New Delhi
7. Kumari S. Panandikar
Chairman
National Council for Women's
Education
8, Garden Homes, First Road
Khar, Bombay
8. Dr. K. N. Rao
Director General of Health
Services
New Delhi

9. Shri L. R. Sethi
Chairman
Central Board of Secondary
Education
17-B, Indraprastha Marg
New Delhi

Nominated by the Government of India

10. Shri A. E. T. Barrow, M.P.
13-A, Feroz Shah Road
New Delhi-1
11. Prof. Samuel Mathai
Vice-Chancellor
University of Kerala
Trivandrum
12. Dr. (Smt.) Durgabai Deshmukh
'Rachana', Bagh Amberpet
Near Engineering College
University Road
Vidya Nagar, Hyderabad
13. Shri A. R. Dawood
General Secretary
Anjuman-i-Islam
93, Dr. A. N. Road, Bombay-1
14. Air Vice-Marshal S. N. Goyal
Commandant
National Defence Academy
P. O. Kharakvasala (Poona)
15. Dr. Vikram A. Sarabhai
Chairman
Atomic Energy Commission
Appollo Pier Road, Bombay
16. Dr. D. M. Sen
Vice-Chancellor
University of Burdwan Rajbati
Burdwan (Eastern Rly).

17. Shri V. K. Gokak
Vice-Chancellor
Bangalore University
Bangalore
18. Prof. M.V. Mathur
Vice-Chancellor
University of Rajasthan
Jaipur
19. Shri Radha Krishna
General Secretary
Serva Seva Sangh, Rajghat
Varanasi
20. Dr. Mohan Sinha Mehta
Seva Mandir
Udaipur (Rajasthan)
21. Smt. Raksha Saran
59, Sunder Nagar
(Ground Floor)
New Delhi-11
22. Dr. Romila Thapar
19, Kautalya Marg
Chanakyapuri
New Delhi.
23. Shri Anil Mohan Gupta
Nityanand Trust Committee
Vill. Ergoda
P.O. Parhati
Distt. Midnapore
(West Bengal)
24. Miss Sitimon Sawain
Umsohsun
SHILLONG (Assam)
25. Vaccant
Elected by the Parliament of India
26. Dr. Gopal Singh, M.P.
Grand Hotel, Simla-1
or
62, South Avenue
New Delhi
27. Shri S. K. Vaishampayan, M.P.,
37, North Avenue,
New Delhi
or
H. No. 27/2, Aurangapura,
Aurangabad (DN), C. Rly.
- Lok Sabha*
28. Shri Samar Guha, M. P.
123, South Avenue
New Delhi-11
or
60-A Raja Subodh Mullic Road
Calcutta-
29. Shri Ram Krishan Gupta, M.P.
14, Windsor Place, New Delhi
or
Charkhi Dadri (Haryana)
30. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu, M. P.
25, Western Court
New Delhi

Chateau De Lou
Mangalore
31. Shri Biswanarayan Shastri, M.P.
202, South Avenue
New Delhi
or
"Ritayn" or Navagiri
Chandmari, Gauhati (Assam)
- Nominated by the Inter-University Board*
32. Dr. A. L. Mudaliar
Vice-Chancellor
Madras University
Madras
33. Dr. D. S. Reddi
Vice-Chancellor
Osmania University
Hyderabad
- Nominated by the all India Council for Technical Education*
34. Shri S. Rajaraman
Director of Technical Education
Trivandrum, Kerala State
35. Shri G. V. Sapre
Director of Technical Education
Government of Maharashtra
Elphinstone Technical School
Dhobi Talao, Bombay

Nominated by the Indian Council of Agricultural Education

36. Dr. O. P. Gautam
Dy. Director General (Education)
Indian Council of Agricultural
Research
Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road
Krishi Bhavan
New Delhi

Nominated by the Medical Council of India

37. Vacant

Representative of States

38. Education Minister
Government of Andhra Pradesh
Hyderabad
39. Education Minister
Government of Assam
Shillong
40. Education Minister
Government of Bihar
Patna
41. Education Minister
Government of Gujarat
Ahmedabad
42. Education Minister
Government of Haryana
Chandigarh
43. Education Minister
Government of J & K
Srinagar/Jammu
44. Education Minister
Government of Kerala
Trivandrum
45. Education Minister
Government of Madhya Pradesh
Bhopal
46. Education Minister
Government of Madras
Madras
47. Education Minister
Government of Maharashtra
Bombay
48. Education Minister
Government of Mysore
Bangalore
49. Education Minister
Government of Nagaland
Kohima
50. Education Minister
Government of Orissa
Bhubaneswar
51. Education Minister
Government of Punjab
Chandigarh
52. Education Minister
Government of Rajasthan
Jaipur
53. Education Minister
Government of Uttar Pradesh
Lucknow
54. Education Minister
Government of West Bengal
Calcutta
55. Education Minister
Government of Pondicherry
Pondicherry
56. Education Minister
Government of Tripura
Agartala
57. Education Minister
Government of Manipur
Imphal
58. Education Minister
Government of Himachal
Pradesh
Simla-4
59. Education Minister
Government of Goa, Daman
& Diu
60. Chief Executive Councillor
Delhi Admn., Delhi.

Secretary of Central Advisory Board of Education

61. Shri J. P. Naik
Adviser
Ministry of Education
New Delhi

ANNEXURE II

LIST OF OFFICERS WHO ATTENDED THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF EDUCATION HELD IN NEW DELHI ON 22ND/23RD AUGUST, 1967

Andhra Pradesh

1. Shri N. Ramesan, Education Secretary
2. Shri M. V. Rajagopal, Director of Public Instruction
3. Shri L. Bullayya, Director of Higher Education
4. Shri T. R. Dass, Director of Technical Education

Assam

1. Shri S. M. Rahman, Education Secretary
2. Shri S. C. Rajkhowa, Director of Public Instruction

Bihar

1. Shri M. Alam, Education Secretary
2. Shri Shantaprasad, Deputy Director of Education
3. Shri A. P. Shrivastava, Deputy Director of Education

Gujarat

1. Shri S. M. Dodani, Education Secretary
2. Shri K. G. Badlani, Director of Education

Haryana

1. Shri B. L. Ahuja, Education Secretary
2. Shri D. I. Lall, Director of Public Instruction

Kerala

1. Shri K. C. Ramakrishna Pillai, Deputy Secretary (Education)
2. Shri P. K. Umashanker, Director of Public Instruction
3. Shri S. Rajaraman, Director of Technical Education

Madhya Pradesh

1. Shri M. H. Rao, Education Secretary
2. Dr. A. Misra, Director of Public Instruction
3. Shri A. L. Swamy, Director of Technical Education

4. Shri V. P. Sheth, Deputy Secretary, Education
5. Shri M. C. Dubey, Deputy Director of Public Instruction
6. Shri P. S. Parihar, Deputy Director of Education

Madras

1. Shri S. Krishnaswami, Education Secretary
2. Dr. M. D. Paul, Director of Secondary Education
3. Shri T. Syed Yakub, Director of Higher Education

Maharashtra

1. Shri S. E. Sukthankar, Education Secretary
2. Shri E. R. Dhongde, Director of Education
3. Shri C. D. Deshpande, Additional Director of Education (Higher)
4. Shri D. M. Sukthankar, Deputy Secretary Education
5. Shri V. B. Parulkar, Deputy Secretary Education
6. Dr. (Mrs) Chitra Naik, Director, State Institute of Education

Mysore

1. Shri S. V. Jevoor, Director of Public Instruction

Nagaland

1. Shri Yajen Aier, Director of Public Instruction

Orissa

1. Dr. B. Samantrai, Director of Public Instruction

Punjab

1. Shri Prit Mohinder Singh, Education Secretary
2. Shri S. S. Bedi, Director of Public Instruction

Rajasthan

1. Shri Anil Bordia, Additional Director of Public Instruction

Uttar Pradesh

1. Shri R. K. Talwar, Education Secretary
2. Shri S. N. Mehrotra, Deputy Secretary Education
3. Dr. C. M. Bhatia, Director of Education

West Bengal

1. Dr. Bhabatosh Dutta, Education Secretary
2. Shri P. C. Mukerjee, Director of Public Instruction
3. Dr. C. M. Bhaita, Director of Education

Delhi

1. Shri B. D. Bhatt, Director of Education

Goa

1. Shri Manohar Sardesai, Deputy Director of Education

Manipur

1. Shri N. B. Sinha, Director of Education

N.E.F.A.

1. Shri S. L. Soni, Director of Education

Pondicherry

1. Shrimati Anjani Dayanand, Education Secretary

Planning Commission

1. Shri A. C. Joshi, Adivser
2. Shri D. P. Nayar, Sr. Specialist
3. Shri A. H. Hemrajani, Director (Education)
4. Dr. S. N. Saraf, Director (Education)
5. Shri J. L. Azad, Assistant Chief (Education)

Inter-University Board

1. Dr. Amrik Singh, Secretary

University Grants Commission

1. Shri K. L. Joshi, Secretary
2. Dr. P. J. Philip, Joint Secretary

N.C.E.R.T.

1. Dr. S. K. Mitra
2. Dr. S. N. Mukherjee

Asian Institute of Educational Planning & Administration

1. Shri R. K. Kapur
2. Dr. S. Shukla

C.S.I.R.

1. Shri J. P. Mittal
2. Shri B. K. Nayar, Director of Science and Technical Personnel

Ministry of Education

1. Shri G. K. Chandiramani, Additional Secretary
 2. Shri G. P. Pandey, Joint Secretary
 3. Dr. A. M. D'Rozario, Joint Secretary
 4. Dr. P. D. Shukla, Joint Educational Adviser
 5. Shri L. S. Chandrakant, Joint Educational Adviser
 6. Shri A. B. Chandiramani, Joint Educational Adviser
 7. Shri N. D. Sundaravadivelu, Joint Educational Adviser
 8. Shri Veda Prakasha, Deputy Educational Adviser
 9. Shri R. S. Chitkara, Deputy Educational Adviser
 10. Shri J. C. Bose, Deputy Educational Adviser
 11. Dr. (Miss) Kaumudi, Deputy Financial Adviser
 12. Shri B. N. Bhardwaj, Deputy Secretary
 13. Shri M. P. Jain, Deputy Educational Adviser
 14. Dr. S. M. S. Chari, Deputy Educational Adviser
 15. Shri G. N. Vaswani, Deputy Educational Adviser
 16. Miss S. Rajan, Assistant Educational Adviser
-

ANNEXURE III
AGENDA, MEMORANDA AND NOTES

AGENDA

PART 'A'

- Item No. 1* To record appreciation of the services rendered by those who have ceased to be members of the Board since the last meeting and to welcome new members.
- Item No. 2* To report that the proceedings of the 32nd meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education held at Chandigarh in October, 1965 were sent to the State Governments and Union Territories.
- Item No. 3* To consider the Reports of the Education Commission and of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education and to suggest a draft statement on the National Policy on Education for consideration by the Government of India.
- Item No. 4* To consider the Report of the Standing Committee on School and Social Education.
- Item No. 5* To consider the Report of the Standing Committee on Higher Education (including Science Education and Education for Agriculture and Industry).
- Item No. 6* To consider the Report of the Standing Committee on Educational Administration Finance & Implementation.
- Item No. 7* To take note of the Union Education Minister's Statement in Parliament on adoption of Indian languages as media of instruction at the university stage.

PART B

- Item No. 8* Central assistance for the implementation of Recommendations of Kothari Commission with regard to pay scales of school teachers and supervisors.
(Haryana and Orissa State Governments)

- Item No. 9* Quality Improvement in secondary schools in the Fourth Plan.
(Orissa State Government)
- Item No. 10* Uniform pattern of grant-in-aid Rules.
(Orissa State Government)
- Item No. 11* Suggestions regarding (a) Starting higher institutions of Technology, (b) Equipment position in technical institutions, (c) Post-graduate course in Engineering & Technology. (d) Reorganisation of Junior Technical courses, (e) Diploma courses in Fisheries Technology, (f) Aeronautical Engineering courses, (g) Pre-vocational Centres.
(Kerala State Government)
- Item No. 12* Government of India National Loan Scholarship.
(Orissa State Government)

PART C

- Item No. 13* To take note of Report of the National Council for Women's Education for the period February 1966 to March 1967.
(Ministry of Education)
- Item No. 14* To take note of a paper on Cost Reduction in School Buildings.
(Central Building Research Institute Roorkee (U.P.))
- Item No. 15* Any other item with the permission of the Chairman.

(There were no papers for item No. 1. The papers for item Nos. 2 and 3 were circulated but are not reproduced here. The reports of the Standing Committees for item Nos. 4, 5 and 6 are given in Annexures IV, V & VI.)

MEMORANDA AND NOTES

Item No. 7: To take note of the Union Education Minister's statement in Parliament on adoption of Indian languages as media of instruction of the University stage.

The proposal to adopt the Indian languages as media of education at the university stage has been before the country for almost a hundred years. The first demand for this was put forward on 1st August, 1867 in a memorial submitted by the British Indian Association of the North-Western Provinces (the present Uttar Pradesh) to the Viceroy and Governor-General of India. This was not accepted on the ground that the necessary literature was not available in the modern Indian languages. This question was also raised on several subsequent occasions. But the decision was always the same: there was not enough literature in Indian languages to use them as media of education. Consequently, English continued to be the exclusive medium of education at the university stage till 1947.

2. A frontal attack on this policy was launched by our great national leaders in the twenties of this century. Rabindra Nath Tagore pointed out that in no country of the world, except India, was the language of education divorced from the language of the students and that the use of English as the medium of education in universities confined higher knowledge and culture to a select section of the citizens instead of making them universally available to the people. Mahatma Gandhi wrote frequently and strongly on the subject. "I must cling to my mother tongue as to my mother's breast, in spite of its shortcomings. It alone can give me the life giving milk", he said and added: "I am certain that the children of the nation that receive instruction in a tongue other than their own commit suicide. It robs them of all originality. It stunts their growth and isolates them from their home. I regard, therefore, such a thing as a national tragedy of the first importance." Gandhiji also stressed the need to make this

change-over as quickly as possible. "The medium of instruction", he wrote, "should be altered at once and at any cost, the provincial languages being given their rightful place. I would prefer temporary chaos in higher education to the criminal waste that is daily accumulating". It is also important to note that all the national universities that were started at his period and the Indian Women's University used Indian languages as media of education.

3. The problem has been receiving growing attention in the post-independence period and the demand for the adoption of Indian languages as media of education at the university stage is continually growing. The *University Education Commission* (1948-49) recommended that "higher education be imparted through the instrumentality of the regional language with the option to use the federal language as the medium of instruction either for some subjects or for all subjects. The *National Integration Council* (June 1962) supported this view and observed: "the change in the medium of instruction, is justified—not so much by cultural or political sentiments, as on the very important academic consideration of facilitating grasp and understanding of the subject matter. Further India's university men will be unable to make their maximum possible contribution to the advancement of learning generally, and science and technology in particular, unless there is continuous means of communication in the shape of the regional languages between its masses, its artisans and technicians and its university men. The development of talent latent in the country will also, in the view of the Council, be retarded unless regional languages are employed as media of instruction at the university stage". The *Committee on Emotional Integration* (1962) endorsed these recommendations and observed: "We are not unaware of the practical difficulties involved in the switchover to regional languages at the university level. Safeguards have to be devised to prevent the lowering of standards. The change-over must be preceded by preparation of textbooks and arrangements for translation from English, and wherever possible, other modern world languages. In order to maintain inter-university and inter-State communication, special attention must be paid to the teaching of the link languages—English and Hindi—when the changeover to the regional languages is accomplished. We would, however, like to point out that in the name of safeguards,

the switchover should not be delayed indefinitely. The *Vice-Chancellors' Conference* (1962) generally endorsed the recommendations and observed : "We are not aware of the Emotional Integration Committee. The *Education Commission* (1964-66) made a strong recommendation on the subject and said : "We suggest that the UGC and the Universities carefully work out a feasible programme suitable for each university or a group of universities. The change-over should take place as early as possible, in any case within about ten years. What is required is to formulate a clear policy, to express it in unambiguous terms and to follow it up with firm, bold and imaginative action." The proposal has also been supported by the Tenth Conference of State Education Ministers (April 1967) and by the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967). But they would prefer the change-over to be brought about in five years.

4. In view of all this weight of academic and public opinion and the fact that Indian languages have already been adopted as media of education almost universally at the school stage, the Government of India has accepted in principle that Indian languages should now be adopted as media of education at all stages and in all subjects, including agriculture, engineering, law, medicine and technology. Government is convinced that, unless this is done, the creative energies of the people will not be released, standards of education will not improve, knowledge will not spread to the people and the gulf between the intelligentsia and the masses will not be bridged. The details of the implementation of this most important educational decision of a century of struggle are being worked out and will be announced on 15th August, 1967.

Item No. 8 Central assistance for the implementation of Recommendations of Kothari Commission with regard to pay scales of school teachers and supervisors.

(Haryana & Orissa State Governments)

MEMORANDUM BY GOVERNMENT OF HARYANA

The teachers in this State are repeatedly pressing for the implementation of the grades as recommended by the Kothari Commission. The additional expenditure in respect of persons in the school cadre numbering about 38,000 with details regarding their present emoluments and the revised emoluments works out to be Rs. 2,37,42,632 as per annexure attached. The resources of the State Government are very limited and it is hardly possible for the State to bear the additional expenditure required for the implementation of the recommendations of the Kothari Commission. The discontentment among the teachers due to non-implementation of the recommendations of the Commission is on the increase. The State Government also feels that in order to give proper status to teachers, their emoluments should be enhanced, but is handicapped due to financial stringencies. It is, however, pointed out that some States, with better financial resources have implemented the recommendations of the Commission. This has further resulted in heart-burning among the teachers of this State. In order to get out of this difficult situation and to meet the demand of the school teachers, numbering about 38,000, it is essential that the Central Government should come to the rescue of the State which is financially weak. The annual education budget of this State is Rs. 989,67,220 and it is not possible for this State to accept the additional recurring liability of Rs. 2,37,42,632 from its own resources.

In case of college staff, Government of India have accepted to share the additional liability of the tune of 80%. The number of college staff, however, does not exceed 400 in this State. This Central help in this connection is, therefore, much limited and it benefits a very

L1Mof Edu./68—11

small section of the instructional staff. The State Education Department will be in a very awkward and unenviable position if the grade of college staff are revised and the school personnel are left out.

In view of the above it is requested that Central Government should share the additional liability in respect of the school personnel to tune of 80% as has been done in respect of the college staff.

*Financial Implications—Revision of Salary Scales of Teachers in
Schools and Inspection Cadre*

Sr. No.	Designation of posts	No. of posts	Existing grade (Haryana and Punjab)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			Rs.
<i>Government Schools</i>			
1.	J.B.T.	20270	60/175
2.	C & V/ JAV's/ JST's/ Tailoring mistresses	5311 5126 140 45	60 /1201 (50%) 120/175 (35%) 140/220 (15%) 80/250 70/150
3.	Masters	1192	110—250 (85%) 250—300 (15%)
4.	Lecturers (1st and 2nd class)	300	200—500
	3rd Class	237	180—450
5.	Headmasters/ Principals/ Field Officers (Class II)/ Asstt. Directors/ B.E.Os' /Dy. D.E.O's etc.	H.M. 343 Principal Filed Officers/ (Class II) (130) CHOS DEO'S/ Asstt. Directors (Class I(4)	250—330 250—750 350—1200

Kothari Commission	Revised grade (on pb. norm)	Additional expenditure 1967-68 (1-11-66 to 28-2-67)	Addl. Expenditure 1967-68	Additional expenditure on account of service benefits		Ex-1967-68
				1966-67	1967-68	
(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
125—250 (85%) 250—300 (15%)	125—300	20,87,808	63,44,504	8,10,800	24,32,400	
125—250 (85%) 250—300 (15%) No recommendations for SAV'S, JST's and Tailoring mistresses.	125—300	2,62,650	8,09,194	2,12,440	6,37,320	
220—400 (85%) 400—500 (15%)	220—500	15,26,080	46,11,776	1,67,680	5,03,040	
300—600	300—600	—	6,000	12,000	36,000	
—	250—550	9,480	37,920	9,480	28,440	
As under column (6)	1. 300—600 (60%) 290	29,000	92,800	13,720	41,160	
	2. 400—800 (25%) (121)	27,100	1,13,720	32,880	88,640	
	3. 700-1100 (15%) (72)	84,800	2,58,780	1,280	3,840	
TOTAL		40,26,918	1,22,74,694	12,60,280	37,80,340	
(B) (Non-Government Schools) (On Ad hoc Basis)		6,00,000	18,00,000	—	—	
GRAND TOTAL		46,26,918	1,40,74,694	12,60,280	37,80,340	

MEMORANDUM BY GOVERNMENT OF ORISSA

The Indian Education Commission have in their recommendations in Clause 3,16 (*vide* Chapter-III on Teachers Status of the report of Education Commission) suggested the following scales for Primary Schools Teachers. Commenting on this they have said that—

(1) There should be no teacher at the primary stage who has not completed the secondary school course and has not had two years of professional education.

(2) In so far as teachers who have completed the secondary school course are concerned, we recommend the following scales of pay:

- (a) The minimum pay of a primary School Teacher who has completed the secondary school course should be Rs. 100 and this should be raised to Rs. 125 within a period of five years.
- (b) The minimum pay of Primary School Teachers who have completed the secondary school course and are trained should be Rs. 125 and within a period of five years it should be raised to Rs. 150.
- (c) The following scales of pay should be adopted, as soon as practicable and at any rate not later than the first year of the Fifth Plan, for all Primary school teachers who have completed the secondary school course and are trained.

	Rs.
Starting salary	150
Maximum salary (to be reached in a period of 20 years) ..	250

No mention has been made of other category of Primary School teachers who have not completed the Secondary School course. In the State of Orissa, as in some other States, there are still quite a large number of teachers who are not qualified according to the standard fixed by the Commission. Some indication should have been made of the pay scale to be admissible to such teachers as they are likely to continue for some time even beyond the Fifth Plan period. At present we have the following pay scales

prescribed for the teachers of various categories qualification-wise in the State of Orissa :

Scale of Pay and D. A. of Government Primary School and Junior School Teachers

Qualification	Scale of Pay
	Rg.
1. Trained Matriculate Teachers (Matric C.T.)	100-155
2. Untrained Matriculate Teachers	80-135
3. <i>Higher Elementary Trained Non-Matric Trained Teachers</i>	80-3-110
4. Head Pandits of Primary Schools	80-135
5. Untrained U. P. Teachers	60-75
6. Non-Matric E. T./B.T. Teachers in Basic Schools	80-3-110
7. Non-Matric Basic School Teachers having both E. T. & B.T. qualifications	80-3-120
8. Post-Basic Pass Certificate holders (Non-Matric)	80-135
9. Post-Basic Pass Certificate holders (Matriculates)	100-155
10. Lower Elementary Trained Teachers	65-85
11. Untrained M.E. Teacher	65-85
12. Pre-Basic Trained Teacher	65-85
13. Basic Trained Non-Matric Teacher	70-95
14. Non-Matric E.T. with one year Basic Training	80-110

Dearness Allowance

Rs. 47	For pay up to Rs. 81
Rs. 61	For pay from Rs. 81 to 151
Rs. 76	For pay from Rs. 151 to 210

Scale of Pay and D. A. of Non-Government Primary School Teachers

Qualification	Scale of Pay
	Rs.
1. Trained Matric Teachers	100-4-120-5-130-E.B. 5-150
2. Untrained Matric Teachers	80-3-115-EB-5-125
3. Ninth Standard Trained Teacher	75-1-84-2-90
4. Ninth standard untrained Teachers and Trained English & M.V. Teachers	70-1-79-2-85
5. Untrained M.E. & Trained U.P. Teachers	70/- (Fixed)

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 6. Untrained U. P. Passed Teachers - .. | 50/- (Fixed) |
| 7. U.P. Trained Teachers of Ex-State areas who by virtue of long service were drawing the Pre-revised scale for trained M.E. or M.B. Passed Teachers viz. Rs. 40-1-50/- on 31st March, 61 .. | 70-1-79-2-85 |
| 8. Non-Matric teachers with E.T. and B.T. qualification | 80-3-110 |
| 9. Madhyama Passed teachers (the same scale as for trained M.E. Teachers) .. | 70-1-79-2-85 |
| 10. Prathama Passed teachers (same scale as for untrained M.E. Passed Teachers) | 70/- (fixed) |
| 11. Matric E.T. Teachers | 90-3-120-EB/5-150 |
| 12. Part-time Music Teachers | Rs. 50/- (Fixed) |

Dearness allowance

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. Untrained M.E. Passed Teachers and Trained U.P. Passed Teachers .. | 27/- |
| 2. Other teachers | 37/- |

Since no other pay scales have been recommended by the Commission, the All Utkal Primary School Teachers' Federation has while observing the All India Primary Teacher's Demand Day on October 1st demanded that all inservice teachers irrespective of qualification should get the scale recommended by the Commission for Primary School Teachers.

As under-qualified teachers are inservice, even in some advanced States the C.A.B.E. may be requested to fix up some standard scales for teachers of various categories as mentioned above at the time of taking decision on the various recommendations of the Education Commission, so that the Primary School Teachers may know what exactly is the decision at the National level for teachers with their qualification.

Item No. 9 : Quality Improvement in secondary schools in the Fourth Plan

(Orissa State Government)

At the end of the Second Plan, there were about 450 high schools and 1,200 M.E. Schools in this State. At the end of the Third Plan, the number of high schools increased to 1,000 and the number of M.E. Schools increased to 3,000. In the Third Plan, there was provision for 100 high schools and 500 M.E. Schools. Against this provision, 550 high schools and 1,800 M.E. Schools were opened in this State. It is eminently desirable that in the Fourth Plan the opening of new high schools and new M.E. Schools should be restricted and schools that have already been opened in the Third Plan should be given adequate financial assistance for improvement of staff, buildings, equipments, game field and game articles, library and such other requirements. The State Government have not got adequate funds for the purpose. The Centre should offer the required financial assistance.

Item No. 10 Uniform pattern of grant-in-aid Rules.

(Orissa State Government)

The grant-in-aid rules of private high schools and M.E. Schools are getting more and more cumbrous in this State. There is provision of minimum grant-in-aid to the high school @ Rs. 900 per year and to the M.E. Schools @ Rs. 360 per year. There is provision for giving grant-in-aid to high schools and M.E. Schools @ two-thirds of the net deficit. There is provision for giving grant-in-aid to high schools and M.E. Schools at full net deficit. There is also provision for giving grant-in-aid on two-thirds of the net deficit on the pre-revised scales of pay and three-fourths of the net deficit on the difference between the pre-revised pay and revised pay. The managements of private high schools and M.E. Schools are perpetually in need of money as a consequence where of all sorts of economy measures including temporary discharge of teachers, appointment of unqualified teachers, payment of less amount than the prescribed salary are taken recourse to. It is high time that these anomalies be done away with and all private high schools and M.E. Schools be given full grant for payment of salary to the employees of the schools. Full grant would mean the expenditure calculated on the basis of

maintenance of qualified staff minus the fee-receipts. Over and above this, they may be given 15% of the expenditure on staff as contingencies—Non-recurring grants should be restricted and the managements of private high schools and M.E. Schools should be allowed to levy the development fee not exceeding half the prescribed tuition fee per month from each student. The funds thus realised should remain at the disposal of the managing authorities of the schools and they should take up the improvement projects like acquisition or purchase of lands, construction of buildings, provision of equipments etc. on the advice of the concerned Inspector of Schools or the District Inspector of Schools. In special case, Government may sanction some non-recurring grant if they are satisfied that the funds available with the management are not adequate to meet the requirements.

In order to equalise the grant-in-aid rules in the States, it is necessary that Centre should offer the required financial assistance to this State, which does not possess adequate finance for the purpose.

The above formula may apply mutatis mutandis in the cases of all private high schools and M.E. Schools for boys and/or girls in the State.

Item No. 11 Suggestions regarding (a) Starting higher institutions of Technology, (b) Equipment position in technical institutions, (c) Post-graduate course in Engineering and Technology, (d) Reorganization of Junior Technical Courses, (e) Diploma courses in fisheries Technology, (f) Aeronautical Engineering courses, (g) Pre-vocational Centres.

(Kerala State Government)

(a) Starting Higher Institute of Technology at Cochin

A note explaining the claims of Kerala for the establishment of the Higher Institute of Technology at Cochin which is ideally suited for the purpose, in view of its being an air, naval and rail (both broad and metre gauge) link and the enormous industrial development which has taken place, has already been furnished to the Government of India.

Though the Working Group provided Rs. 155 lakhs for the Second Year of the Fourth Plan for 'Technical Education' of Kerala yet in view of the financial limitations Government reduced this provision to Rs. 85 lakhs. Even in this provision, as no provision was made for buildings during 1966-67, a major slice has now gone for building construction so that the provision under Equipment is very limited.

A telegram has been received from the Ministry of Education requesting to intimate the budget provision under 'Equipment' during 1967-68 for Government Engineering Colleges and Polytechnics to assess the distribution of the 12 million dollar assistance for Equipment from the United States. It is reported that the provision will be Rs. 7,63,800 for Engineering Colleges and Rs. 6,29,000 for Polytechnics. In view of the position explained above, the share of assistance that this Government will get for Equipment on the basis of the budget provision will therefore be negligible.

It is, therefore, essential that in view of the limitations imposed, upon the provision required for Technical Education Department, this Government should not be denied our legitimate share. This Government would therefore like to press once again for the establishment of the higher Institute of Technology utilising this assistance by way of equipment which is now available.

(b) Equipment position in Technical Institutions in Kerala State

Most of the Technical Institutions in general and the Private Institutions in particular are not equipped to the desired extent for want of finance and foreign exchange. Due to limitations of finance, only the absolutely minimum provisions are made in the budget for Equipment. Many other States get the advantage of running Summer Institutes and Advanced Courses and incidentally foreign equipments obtained for this purpose are made available to those States. This State had not had the benefit of running any Summer Institutes, Advanced Courses, or even Teacher Training Programme. Hence the Scheme of U.S. assistance for equipment will have to be liberally made applicable to this State, otherwise many institutions may have to continue with under equipped laboratories.

(c) Post-graduate Course in Engineering and Technology in Kerala

Post-graduate Course in Engineering is run only at the College of Engineering, Trivandrum. Even in the sister States of the Southern Zone, these are run at more than one Institution. It is, therefore, felt that, Post-graduate Courses will have to be introduced at those Institutions which are well-equipped and in the order of preference given below :

- (1) Engineering College, Trichur.
- (2) Regional Engineering College, Calicut and/or T.K.M. College of Engineering, Quilon.

(d) Reorganisation of Junior Technical School Courses

In order to make the 'Craft content of the Junior Technical Schools on a par with the I.T.I. Course, this State is keen on taking up the reorganisation of the Junior Technical School Courses. When this question was raised sometime back, we were informed that a Committee appointed by the Government of India is going into the question and we may wait till their report is made available. We have waited for a long time and still their report is not available. In the meanwhile, certain States appear to have taken up reorganisation independently. It is, therefore, requested that either the advice of the Government of India in this respect be made available immediately or alternatively the State Government be permitted to reorganise the Courses. After chalking out the reorganisation proposals, expansion of Technical Education at this level by opening more Junior Technical Schools can be thought of.

(e) Diploma Course in Fisheries Technology

With a vast sea coast, our fishing industry has not yet developed on scientific lines. We may consider establishment of an Institution offering Diploma Course in Fisheries Technology of three years duration after SSLC, covering subjects relating to rearing of Fish, suitable environment, preservation processes, mechanical processes for fishing, boat building, fundamentals of Mechanicals and Electrical Engineering, air-reconditioning and refrigeration, quality control and marketing, etc. State Director of Fisheries and the Director of Technical Education are in favour of

introduction of such a course. The institution can be run by the Directorate of Technical Education as in the case of Food Craft Centre in its early stages. This question may be discussed and if the programme meets with the acceptance of the C.A.B.E., detailed report can be prepared in consultation with the Director of Fisheries and a suitable place for the starting of the Institution decided upon.

(f) *Aeronautical Engineering Courses: College of Engineering, Trivandrum*

This State has absolutely no facility in any Engineering College for Aeronautical training. Considerable facilities exist at Madras (both in the I.I.T. and the M.I.T.), Bangalore (Indian Institute of Science) and even in Hyderabad. With existence of the Flying Club at Trivandrum, introduction of Aeronautical Engineering Diploma Course at the College of Engineering, Trivandrum can legitimately be preserved for.

(g) *Pre-Vocational Centres*

At present there is only one Pre-Vocational Training Centre attached to Junior Technical School, Attingal (of three years duration with vocational bias after fourth standard). It is better to divert some students even after the fourth class to a few pre-vocational courses. Hence we may introduce more pre-vocational Centres as adjuncts to Junior Technical Schools. This may be examined at the Session.

Item No. 12: Government of India National Loan Scholarships

((Orissa State Government))

As per instructions of the Ministry of Education, National Loan is paid to a loanee upto the end of February in every financial year. Again, this payment has to be made month by month in different instalments. This procedure causes the following inconveniences to the loanees:

1. The academic session covers the period from June to May every year. As payment of loan is made only upto the end of February in a particular academic session, the loanees experience extreme difficulties in meeting their

expenditure for the months of March and April (for March, April and May in the case of Medical students) in the remaining part of the academic session.

2. The balance amount for the remaining three months of March, April and May has to be paid in the next financial year. But Government sanction order placing funds at the disposal of the Directorate for the purpose is not received before July or August in the next financial year. Consequently, many of the loanees take transfer and get themselves admitted in other institutions by the time their dues for the remaining three months of the last session are remitted to the institutions where they had studies in the previous sessions. This causes further delay and inconvenience to the loanees in receiving payment of their remaining dues of a particular academic session.

3. As the institutions concerned do not have sufficient staff, it is not possible for their offices to make payment of loans to the loanees in regular monthly instalments.

4. The work-load in the State Directorate has considerably increased in the course of last four years. As the State Government is not in a position to create additional posts of assistants for the purpose, the scheme cannot be run smoothly.

In view of the facts stated above, the following suggestions are offered in order to run the scheme smoothly and make it really beneficial to the loanees concerned :

- (1) National Loan for the whole session, that is, from June to May, should be paid within one financial year and should not be spread over two financial years. Secondly, payment should be made in one instalment and not in monthly instalments. Both these practices are prevalent in the scheme of State Loan Stipend awarded by the Government of Orissa which have made it very popular among the students who do not like to take National Loan for the difficulties stated above.
- (2) As the State Government is not in a position to supply additional staff, Government of India should bear the cost of additional staff which are urgently necessary for implementing the scheme smoothly and successfully.

Item No. 13 Report of the National Council for Women's Education for the period February 1966 to March, 1967

(Ministry of Education)

NOTE : This Report has been printed as a separate publication and its copies are available with the Publication Unit, Ministry of Education, New Delhi.

Item No. 14 Cost reduction in School Buildings

(Note submitted by Central Building Research Institute, Roorkee (U.P.)

In any programme of school improvement, a suitable school building is a prime necessity. The present expansion of education and high rate of growth of school going children demand large number of school buildings. The high cost of building construction and limited financial outlay is one of the greatest obstacle standing in the path of extending school facilities to more children. The large requirement of school buildings cannot be met by the conventional methods and a slightly radical change in outlook and approach both in teaching and design must be conceived to achieve functional and economical school buildings. All concerned have to ensure that no unused spaces are including in the future plans of schools and all available existing spaces are used to their maximum.

Use-Efficiency of School Spaces

The study and experimentation of use-efficiency of school spaces by CBRI Roorkee has indicated a great scope of cost reduction in school building. The study has further indicated that the existing pattern of primary schools in the country are being used for about 52 per cent of school time, while some spaces are used only for 25 per cent of the time. To achieve economy in buildings, the increased use-efficiency of school buildings can be attained by eliminating less used spaces and by rational distribution of teaching periods in the school plan.

In an effort to achieve optimum use of class room spaces, the existing curriculum was analysed and rearranged. The

rational application of the revised time table to school building plan indicated that a primary school of 200 enrolment could well function within three class rooms only. It increased the use-efficiency to 85 per cent and economised to the extent of about 40 per cent in the overall teaching space requirements.

To arrive at a final conclusion the experiments were conducted in large number of schools for a few months which included a number of rainy days. It was observed that for a primary school of 200 enrolment (a) three class rooms with a sheltered space were adequate. (b) optimum use of spaces was attained with 85 per cent use-efficiency. (c) students learnt more activity programme, which though included in the curriculum is not adopted in practice, and (d) students took more interest in their lessons.

Development of School Building Plans

On the basis of the above study, several alternate plans for schools of various enrolments, both for rural and urban areas and also for different climates have been developed. For further economy, rationalised construction design and specifications have been worked out on the basis of locally available materials. For self-help projects, possibilities of partial prefabrication have also been exploited. School building plans for rural areas have been prepared with due consideration of technical know-how, limited financial provision and locally available materials.

Estimated Cost

The cost will vary from locality to locality depending upon the cost of materials and labour in those places. In Roorkee a school based on the recommendations of CBRI has recently been constructed by the Roorkee Municipal Board. It covers a plinth area of 2,000 sq. ft. and has been constructed for Rs. 14,000.00. It provides for an enrolment of 200 students with furniture in class rooms 20×24 ft. in size. If the same school is designed for squatting the class room sizes can be reduced to 16×20 ft. and cost of construction can be kept within Rs. 10,000.00.

ANNEXURE IV

Report of Standing Committee on School and Social Education of the Central Advisory Board of Education

The School and Social Education Standing Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Education met on the 19th and 20th August, 1967 in Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi, under the chairmanship of Shri M. D. Chaudhari, Education Minister of Maharashtra.

The Committee welcomed the decision of the Government of India to issue a statement on national policy on education. Subject to the following amendments, it broadly endorsed the report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967).

1. The last two lines in para 1 (page 1) of the report to read as follows :

“emphasize science and technology, a *secular* outlook and the cultivation of moral, social and spiritual values.”

The following to be added at the end of para 2(p. 1) :

“Such a transformation will not be achieved unless the process of education at all levels is revolutionized in order to make it more realistic, dynamic and closely related to life and environment. Experimentation should be encouraged to bring about constant improvement of the quality of education. In this connection the principles of Basic Education that now are universally accepted as basic to all good education need to be reiterated.”

3. Para 8(page 2) dealing with the Neighbourhood School be replaced by the following :

“The Neighbourhood School (Common School)

To strengthen social unity and to provide equality of opportunity to the less advanced sections of the society, the unhealthy social segregation that now takes place between the schools for the rich and those for the poor must end. This can be done

only by moving in the direction of a common school system covering all parts of the country, and which provides equality of access to all children. The system, when in operation, should maintain such a high standard of education that parents will not feel the need to send their children to expensive independent schools outside the system.

The common school concept should be adopted as a long-term goal to be reached through a phased programme. A beginning should be made in those areas where public opinion is favourable to the idea, but effort must throughout concentrate on the improvement of primary schools to an adequate standard. Concurrently, steps should be taken to encourage fee-charging independent schools to admit a fair proportion of non-paying students to be selected by the State on merit. To compensate the schools for the loss of income, a suitable method of re-imbusement should be devised.

During the transitional period, special emphasis should be placed on developing a suitable co-curricular programmes which would offer opportunity to pupils from different social strata to share a common life."

4. The following sub-para should be added at the end of para 9 (page 3) :

"(g) Necessary safeguards must also be provided to ensure that switch over to the regional medium of instruction does not disrupt the intellectual and corporate life of the universities and institutions of higher learnings."

5. Para 10 (para 3) to read as follows :

"Classes I-X : (It is desirable that) before completing his school education (Class I—X), a pupil should have knowledge of three languages. viz.

- (1) Mother-tongue/regional language;
- (2) Hindi/any other language in the Eighth Schedule not opted under (1) above;
- (3) English or any other language not opted under (1) and (2).

To enable this, facilities for the teaching of three languages should be provided in all secondary schools. The stages at which the teaching of languages other than the mother tongue should be introduced is a matter to be left to the State Governments. Effective methods of teaching languages should be evolved.

6. The words "In practice" in the first sentence of para 11 (page 4) should be deleted. The amended sentence will read as "Hindi is already largely in use as a link language for the country."

7. The last two sentences in para 14 (page 5) to be replaced by the following :

"Agricultural polytechnics providing different courses needed for agricultural or agro-industrial development should be established. The curriculum in these institutions should aim at building up a spirit of self-reliance and self-employment in the students. The present tendency to depend entirely on Government jobs should be discouraged. There is urgent need, in rural areas, for suitable centres or institutions providing extension services to farmers and giving part-time intensive courses to young persons who have left school and taken to agriculture."

8. The last sentence in para 16 (page 5) should read as follows :

"This work with hands will help the young to develop insights into modern productive processes and use of science and inculcate in them respect for manual labour and habits of hard and responsible work."

9. Para 17 dealing with Character Formation on page 6 to be replaced by the following :

"Character development is an important educational objective and at no time has the need to emphasize it been greater. People in our times are clamouring for their rights but have no similar awareness of their responsibilities. This must change. It is true that education alone cannot accomplish this task; but there is no doubt that it has an important

role to play. Education faces the major challenge of cultivating a sense of moral and social responsibility in the rising generation. Training in good citizenship must, therefore, become an integral part of education at all stages. The emphasis should be not on classroom instruction or academic sermonising, but on personal example of teachers and elders and on the opportunity to develop good habits of behaviour in situations. The quality of reading materials, the stress on the proper study of the humanities and the social sciences, including the study of the fundamental truths underlying the great religions and the biographies of great men, the rendering of social service to the community, and participation in games and sports and hobbies—all these have a contribution to make to the formation of right attitudes and to the development of a sense of social responsibility. Every effort should, therefore be made to utilize these factors to the maximum extent in the interest of character-formation.”

10. The second sentence in para 19 (page 6) to read as follows :

“Voluntary organisations conducting pre-primary institutions should receive encouragement and financial assistance, especially when they are working in rural areas, urban slums, or for children of the weaker and socially and economically neglected sections of the community.”

11. Para 20 (page 6) to read as follows :

“The provision of good and effective primary education on a free and compulsory basis, is the foundation of democracy and national development. It should be given the highest priority and implemented in two stages, namely, lower primary and higher primary. Children who are not yet fourteen years old at the end of Class VII and who do not wish to study further should be retained in the educational system till they complete 14 years of age but should be provided with short vocational courses of their choice.”

12. The brackets including the words—and if possible even in Classes I—IV—in the third line from bottom of para 21 (page 7) should be deleted.

13. Para 22 (page 7) should be deleted.

14. The last sentence in para 32 (page 9) to be amended as follows :

“In particular, possibilities of developing correspondence courses not only at the university but also at the secondary stage for teachers, for agricultural, industrial and other workers should be explored. Further facilities, both to men and women, to study privately and appear at various examinations conducted by the Boards of Education and Universities should be available.

15. Para 33 (page 9) should be amended to read as follows :

“The liquidation of mass illiteracy and promotion of functional literacy is essential, not only for accelerating programmes of production, especially in agriculture but for quickening the tempo of national development in general. Plans to accelerate the spread of mass literacy as a break through on the lines of the Gram Shikshan Mohim of Maharashtra should therefore be prepared and intensively implemented on several fronts. Such programmes are also necessary to reduce wastage and stagnation among primary school children. Particular attention should be paid to follow up action to prevent relapse into illiteracy. With a view to reducing new additions to the ranks of adult illiterates, part-time literacy classes should be organised for grown up children, age group (11-17) who did not attend school or have lapsed into illiteracy.

16. A new para should be added after para 34 on page 10. The new para (34A) should read as follows :

“Functional literacy has a direct bearing on productivity. Moreover, the entire programme of Adult Education and Literacy requires coordination between a large number of agencies, governmental and non-governmental and direction of top leader-

ship for this purpose and for finding adequate resources. It is necessary, therefore, that the National Development Council should concern itself with the implementation of programmes for the promotion of functional literacy and integrally relate them to the growth of agricultural and industrial production."

17. The sentence "...The education of girls....." on a priority basis" in para 35 of page 10 should be replaced by the following :

"The education of girls should, therefore, receive special emphasis and the funds required for its advancement, particularly for the implementation of its special programmes, should be provided on a priority basis. The funds for girls education and its special programmes should be earmarked so that there is no possibility of their being diverted into other uses."

18. Two new paragraphs should be added after para 35 (on page 10). These should read as follows :

35(a) While it is recognised that the gap between the enrolment of boys and of girls is being bridged in the field of general education it is noticed that the gap is actually widening in the field of vocational education for lack of adequate facilities of vocational education for girls. It is urgently necessary to expand and improve the programme of vocational education for girls by organising I.T.Is and Polytechnics for Women, offering suitable courses leading to jobs or to self-employment.

35(b) Condensed courses for adult women should be organised on a large scale and it should be ensured through proper coordination among different agencies and Government departments that women who complete the courses are suitably employed. This is one important way of meeting the present shortages of women personnel.

19. Present paragraph 38 (page 11) should be brought forward and made para 36. Consequently, paras 36 and 37 (page 10) should be renumbered as paras 37 and 38, respectively.

20. The following penultimate sentence in the present para 36 (page 10) should be deleted :

“Care must also be taken to ensure that the educated persons from these classes are suitably employed.”

21. The last sentence in para 39 (page 11) should read as follows :

“It is necessary to coordinate the activities of different agencies in the field including Government departments and voluntary organisations.”

22. The title of para 41 should be amended to read as “TEACHERS : STATUS”.

23. Present sub-para (7) of para 41 (page 12) should be made sub-para (6) and should be replaced by the following :

“The academic freedom of teachers to pursue and publish their studies and researches and to speak and write about significant national and international issues should be protected. Teachers should enjoy civic rights. However, considering the lofty ideals of his profession which is of utmost importance in the life of a nation, the key role that he has to play in the educational system and the healthy influence that he has to bring to bear on the young generation, the teacher should not, as a matter of healthy convention, take part in active politics or participate in elections except in teachers’ constituencies. To do justice to his noble profession and to maintain its ethics and high standards, the teacher should accept this restriction as a self-imposed discipline.”

24. Sub-para (6) of para 41 (page 12) should be made para 42B (see below 26). The second word “training” in the first sentence of this sub-para should be replaced by “professional preparation.”

25. Para 42 (page 12) should be followed by a new para to be called 42A. TEACHERS : EDUCATION. The professional preparation of teachers, being crucial to the qualitative improvement of education should be treated as a key area in education development and adequate financial provision should be made for it, both at the State and national levels.

26. As mentioned above, present sub-para (6) of para 41 (page 12) becomes a new para after 42A and may be numbered 42B.
27. The word "NEW" in the title of para 43 should be replaced by the word "EFFECTIVE". The new title will, therefore, read "EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING".
28. The word "progressive" should be added before the word "adoption" in the last line of para 49 (page 14).

ANNEXURE V

Report of the meeting of Standing Committee of the C.A.B.E. on Higher Education (including Science Education and Research) held on August 19 and 20, 1967 at Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi

A meeting of the Standing Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Education on Higher Education was held on August 19 and 20, 1967 at Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi. The following were present :

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| (i) Shri Karpoori Thakur
Deputy Chief Minister, Bihar | Chairman |
| (ii) Shri Barkatullah Khan
Education Minister, Rajasthan | |
| (iii) Shri Hardwari Lal
Education Minister, Haryana | |
| (iv) Shri C. M. Mohammed Koya
Education Minister, Kerala | |
| (v) Shri D. S. Gupta
Education Minister, Madhya Pradesh | |
| (vi) Shri Upendra Nath Verma
State Minister of Education, Bihar | |
| (vii) Shri Ram Krishan Gupta, M.P. | |
| (viii) Shri B. N. Shastri, M.P. | |
| (ix) Dr. D. M. Sen
Vice-Chancellor
University of Burdwan, West Bengal | |
| (x) Dr. Mohan Sinha Mehta, Rajasthan | |
| (xi) Dr. B. N. Prasad
Chairman, Commission for Scientific
and Technical Terminology | |
| (xii) Shri S. Rajaram
Director of Technical Education
Government of Kerala | |
| (xiii) Shri G. P. Pandey
Ministry of Education | Secretary |

The following officers also attended :

- (i) Shri Prem Kirpal
Secretary, Ministry of Education
- (ii) Shri G. K. Chandiramani
Additional Secretary
Ministry of Education
- (iii) Shri J. P. Naik
Adviser, Ministry of Education
- (iv) Shri A. B. Chandiramani
Joint Educational Adviser, Ministry of Education
- (v) Dr. P. D. Shukla
Joint Educational Adviser, Ministry of Education
- (vi) Shri K. L. Joshi
Secretary, University Grants Commission
- (vii) Shri M. Alam
Education Secretary, Govt. of Bihar
- (viii) Shri N. Ramesan
Education Secretary
Government of Andhra Pradesh
- (ix) Shri M. H. Rao
Education Secretary
Government of Madhya Pradesh
- (x) Shri R. K. Talwar
Education Secretary
Government of Uttar Pradesh
- (xi) Shri O. P. Gautam
Deputy Director General (Edn.)
I.C.A.R.
- (xii) Shri L. Bullayyan
Director of Higher Education
Government of Andhra Pradesh
- (xiii) Shri T. R. Das
Director of Technical Education
Government of Andhra Pradesh
- (xiv) Shri Santa Prasad
Deputy Director of Education
Government of Bihar

- (xv) Shri O. P. Srivastava
Deputy Director of Education
Government of Bihar
- (xvi) Dr. S. N. Mehrotra
Deputy Secretary (Education)
Government of Uttar Pradesh
- (xvii) Dr. B. Samantrai
Director of Public Instruction, Orissa
- (xviii) Shri J. L. Azad
Assistant Chief, Planning Commission
- (xix) Shri B. S. Chitkara
Deputy Educational Adviser
Ministry of Education
- (xx) Shri Triyogi Narain
Under Secretary
Ministry of Education

2. The Committee considered the recommendations on Higher Education, including science education and research agriculture and technology, of the Education Commission, as also those of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967). The Committee generally agreed with the principles underlying the recommendations contained in the two reports and welcomed the suggestion for a National Policy on Education.

3. The Committee would like to stress that it is important and urgent to improve and expand the existing system of education in order to strengthen national unity, promote social integration, accelerate economic growth and general moral, social and spiritual values. For achieving these objectives appropriate steps will have to be taken by the Central and State Governments to organize programmes at all stages of education.

Strengthening National Unity

4. The Committee agreed with the following recommendations of the Committee of Members of Parliament :

- (i) Education should deepen national consciousness, promote a proper understanding and appreciation of our cultural heritage and inspire a faith and confidence in the great future which we can forge for ourselves. These objectives should be achieved

by a carefully planned study of Indian languages, literature, philosophy and history and by introducing students to India's achievements in the positive sciences, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, dance and drama.

- (ii) All students should be given appropriate courses in citizenship which emphasize the fundamental unity of India in the midst of her rich diversity. These should include a study of the Freedom Struggle, the Constitution, the noble principles enshrined in its Preamble, the problems and programmes of national development.
- (iii) National and social service, including participation in meaningful and challenging programmes of community service or national reconstruction, should be made an integral part of education at all stages, and suitable projects for this purpose should be designed and carried out in the context of local conditions and available resources.
- (iv) Efforts should be made to promote greater knowledge understanding and appreciation of the different regions of India by including their study in the curricula; by the exchange of students and teachers and by giving them opportunities and facilities for educational and study tours; and by the maintenance of all India institutions which bring together students from different regions.
- (v) Curricular and co-curricular programmes should include the study of humanism based on mutual appreciation of international cultural values and the growing solidarity of mankind.

Neighbourhood School

5. With a view to achieving national integration and social unity equal and adequate opportunities should be provided for all sections of society by improving the existing system of primary schools which should be within the easy reach of every school going child. The 'community school' concept should be adopted as a long term goal to be reached through a phased programme. Some members were, however, of the opinion that the Commission's recommendation regarding neighbourhood school should be implemented immediately.

Adoption of Indian languages as Media of Education

6. The Committee agreed that the regional languages should be the media of instruction at the higher stages of education. In order to achieve this objective, concerted efforts should be made to produce within 5 years the requisite literature and textbooks required for this programme in all subjects. Divergent views were, however expressed regarding fixation of a time limit for change over to the regional languages.

There was general agreement that in All-India Institutions the medium of instruction should be Hindi and English. Education Minister Kerala however, expressed his view that in addition to English and Hindi facilities should also be provided for instruction in the language of the region in which the Institute was situated.

Science Education and Research and Education for Agriculture and Industry

7. The recommendations, of the Education Commission in regard to Science Education & Research and Education for Agriculture and Industry were accepted.

Work Experience

8. The Committee felt that the concept of work experience should be extended to higher stages of education also as recommended by the Education Commission. For implementing this programme suitable guidelines should be prepared and necessary funds provided.

Structure of Education

9. The Committee accepted the recommendations of the State Education Ministers' Conference, April 1967 (Appendix) with regard to the structure of the educational system.

Selective Admissions

10. The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the Education Commission regarding selective admissions to Universities. Adequate arrangements should, however, be made for strengthening the existing school system and adequate vocational and technical courses in the post-school stage provided to equip students for gainful occupation in life. These steps would divert a large number of students who normally seek admission to universities.

Teacher : Status and Education

11. The Committee were in full agreement that urgent steps should be taken for improving the status and conditions of service of teachers as recommended by the Education Commission

12. The Committee also agreed that teachers should have freedom to pursue and publish their studies and researches and to speak and write about significant national and international issues. They should not, however, participate in active politics and elections, except where there is specific provision for teachers' constituencies under the Constitution. Some members were, however, of the view that the recommendations made by the Education Commission and the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education on this subject should be accepted.

Financial Assistance to States

13. The Standing Committee are conscious that it will not be possible to achieve the educational revolution envisaged by the Education Commission unless a much higher priority is given to education and adequate finances are provided for the purpose. The resources of the State Governments are far too inadequate to implement the programmes of educational reforms. As such the Central Government must come forward in a big way to assist the States in this task. The Committee strongly urge upon the Central Government to allocate adequate finances to meet the challenge of educational reforms.

APPENDIX TO ANNEXURE V

**Resolution of the State Education Ministers' Conference
April, 1967 on Structure of Educational System**

The Conference considered the structure of the educational system recommended by the Education Commission and the various comments thereon received from the State Governments and others. It recommends the following pattern for general adoption :

- (1) The educational structure should have the pattern of 10-2-3.
- (2) The ten years school (to be designated as the High School) should be adopted in all States. This will provide a common programme of general education and specialisation will be postponed till after Class X. The standard to be reached at the end of this course would broadly be similar to that which is reached at the school leaving stage at present.
- (3) The division of this stage into sub-stages should not be rigid and freedom may be permitted to the States to adopt a sub-division most in keeping with local conditions and traditions.
- (4) The next stage of two years (to be designated as the higher secondary stage) should include two years of general education. The vocational courses at this stage (these would broadly cover 50% of the total enrolment) would be spread over varying durations (1-3 years) depending upon the nature of the course concerned. The general education courses at this stage may be located to begin with, in selected secondary schools or attached to colleges.

The vocational courses at this stage will ordinarily be provided in special institutions which will, where necessary, work in close collaboration with the industry concerned. The experiment of 'Junior Colleges' which will provide both general and vocational courses at this stage may also be tried.

- (5) There should be an attempt to define national standards to be reached at the end of the 10 year school of general education and again at the end of the 12 year school of general education. The different States should try to reach these standards at least.
- (6) The duration of the courses for the first degree in arts, commerce & science should be 2 years after the higher secondary for general courses. It should be three years for general (Honours) and special courses.
- (7) The duration of the MA/MSc/MCom. courses should be two years after the general (honours) or special courses or three years after the general course.

The adoption of this pattern should be made on all-India basis and all the States should agree and implement the programme.

Adequate Central assistance should be available to the States to implement this programme.

ANNEXURE VI

Report of the Standing Committee on Educational Administration, Finance and Planning

The Standing Committee of the Board of Educational Administration, Finance and Planning Committee met in the afternoon of 20th August in Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi under the chairmanship of Shri V. R. Nedunchezian, the Education Minister of Madras.

The Committee welcomed the decision of the Government of India to issue a statement on National policy of Education. Subject to the following amendments it broadly endorsed the report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967).

1. Para 73 (page 18) to be amended to read as follows:
 "Voluntary organizations have played a very important role in the development of education in the past. In the days ahead also, they can make a useful contribution at the school and university stages and in the field of adult education. It should therefore be an objective of educational policy to encourage and to make full use of all assistance that can come through the voluntary efforts of the people."
2. Para 74 (page 19) to be modified to read as follows:
 "The system of grant-in-aid should be simplified and made more liberal. While undersirable practices in aided institutions should be firmly curbed, encouragement should be given for new initiatives and healthy experimentation in institutions doing good work, even in academic matters and in day-to-day administration."
3. A new para to be numbered as 74A should come after para 74. This should consist of the last two sentences of the present para 74 (page 19).
4. The last sentence in para 77 (page 19) should be replaced by the following:
 "The matter was further considered at the meeting of Chief Ministers of States and Central Minister in

August, 1961 and by the National Integration Conference in September—October of the same year. As a result a number of important recommendations bearing, among other things, on educational safeguards for the linguistic minorities at the primary and secondary stages and the affiliation of institutions using minority languages, for purposes of examination have emerged.

5. Para 79 (page 19) to be replaced by the following :
 "It is desirable to bring the school and the community together in a programme of mutual service and support. The immediate plan to be adopted in all parts of the country is to associate the village panchayats and the municipalities with the primary schools in their areas through the creation of local schools committees with specified powers and responsibilities."

6. The word "boards" in the first sentence of para 80 (page 20) to be replaced by the word "authorities".

7. The penultimate sentence in para 84 (page 21) should be modified to read as follows :

"The Govt. of India, should in consultation with all the State Governments, formulate the national policy on education and revise it if

8. The following sentence to be added to para 85 (page 21).

"The manner in which funds are determined in the Central Sector are to be determined in consultation with the States."

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

National In
 Planning
 17-B, SIA
 DOC. No.

017/9/

NIEPA DC



006227