

[Shri S. K. Patil]

replies to Hon'ble Members on the points raised by them, where they were not already covered by the reply to the debate on the floor of the House.

Instead of sending written replies direct to each individual member, I think it best to place in the Library of Parliament, for perusal, a consolidated set of all such replies so that the information supplied is not limited only to the member who had raised a particular point but is available for perusal to all others who may be interested. I must, however, add that no remarks have been offered on suggestions or observations of a general nature which do not call for a specific reply. Such suggestions are, of course, taken note of, for whatever action is possible, thereon.

I have accordingly arranged for two copies of these replies to be placed in the Library of Parliament for perusal by Hon'ble Members interested.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification. While welcoming this statement initiating a new procedure, may I request you to direct other Ministers also to emulate the Railway Minister in this respect. Most of us have often found that the questions or the points remain unanswered or are ignored or forgotten till the whole thing comes up again in the next budget debate. So, I hope that the other Ministers will emulate this fine example set by the Railway Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** Dr. Aney.

**Dr. M. S. Aney** (Nagpur): May I ask the hon. Minister whether this new procedure, as an additional thing, is being followed, and whether the old practice of giving intimation to the Members concerned will also continue along with it.

**Shri S. K. Patil:** It is a better procedure, because as many as 830

different questions have been raised, and instead of the information being limited to the hon. Member concerned, we thought it would be better if the matter is printed in a form in which we have printed them and make them available to everybody, not only to the Member concerned but also to other Members.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** Is it in addition to the existing practice?

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Tulshidas Jadhav.

**श्री तुलसीदास जाधव** (नांदेड़) .  
 अध्यक्ष महोदय. यह जो प्रथा अब शुरू की गई है, इसके लिये मैं धन्यवाद देता हूँ। साथ में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट में जब बजट सेशन होता है तो हम लोग बहुत से प्वाइंट्स रोज करते हैं। जैसा कहा गया उनके सम्बन्ध में हमको लिख कर भेज देना चाहिये, वजाय लाइब्रेरी में रखने के। कई डिपार्टमेंट्स की रीति यह है कि जब हम कोई प्वाइंट्स रोज करते हैं तो हमको उत्तर भेज दिया जाता है जिसमें बार-बार यहाँ पर देहराने के वजाय हम को उन से इन्फॉर्मेशन मिल जाती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जितने भी डिपार्टमेंट्स हैं उनमें यहाँ प्रथा चाल की जानी चाहिये।

**Shri A. P. Sharma** (Buxar): As suggested by Dr. M. S. Aney, I also want to know whether this facility of making the information available to all the Members is an additional one? Will the Members who have raised the point be informed also separately about it?

**Mr. Speaker:** He says that it is in substitution.

12.33 hrs.

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY  
 (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up further consideration of the

following motion moved by Shri M. C. Chagla yesterday. Out of four hours, 3 hours and 15 minutes have already been taken. The motion reads as follows:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act 1915, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th November, 1964 and communicated to this House on the 27th November, 1964 and resolves that the following 30 members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely: Dr. M. S. Aney; Shrimati Renuka Devi Barkataki; Shri A. E. T. Barrow; Shri Bhakt Darshan; Shri Yudhvir Singh Chaudhary; Dr. Panjabrao S. Deshmukh; Shri Madhavrao Laxmanrao Jadhav; Shri Gauri Shanker Kakkar; Shri Harekrushna Mahatab; Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra; Shrimati Savitri Nigam; Shri Tika Ram Paliwal; Shri Sarjoo Pandey; Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel; Shri S. B. Patil; Shri P. S. Nattaraja Pillai; Shri S. K. Pottekkatt; Shri D. D. Puri; Shri Raghunath Singh; Shrimati Renuka Ray; Shri Bal Krishna Singh; Shri Krishnapal Singh; Shri Rajdeo Singh; Shri Ramshekar Prasad Singh; Shri Sinhasan Singh; Shri N. M. R. Subbaraman; Shri Kamal Nath Tiwari; Lt. Col. Maharajkumar Dr. Vijaya Ananda of Vizianagram; Shri Ram Harkh Yadav, and Shri Ram Sewak Yadav."

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** (Kanpur): The time should be extended by one hour.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is only a reference to the Joint Committee. It will come back again.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** There is the Commission's report also. Please consider our wish to extend the time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the Minister like to say anything?

**The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla):** As you also have observed, Sir, the Bill is going to the Joint Committee and every detail of it would be discussed there. Then it will come back to this House, but if they want a little more time, I have no objection.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** We can continue with this till 1.30 at least.

**Mr. Speaker:** Private Members to continue till then and then the Minister should be called? That would be difficult. All right; I will call the hon. Minister at 1 O' clock.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): With regard to the arrangement of business for today, I wish to make one submission now, because at 3 O' clock you may not be in the Chair. I wish you are in the Chair then but I am not sure if you will be in the Chair then. At 3 O' clock the motion by my hon. friend Shri Ranga on defence production will be coming up. You will realise and the House as a whole will agree—hon. Members on both sides of the House—that it is an important matter in the present day—the question of defence production—and therefore, I would request that the time allotted for that motion should be extended by at least one hour if not more. At that time you may not be in the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker:** Whoever is there, he has the authority to do it.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Unless you issue a directive now, whoever is in the Chair then may not respond favourably to the suggestion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Jadhav.

**श्री तुलशीदास जाधव** (नांदेड़): अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी बिल है उस में जो दफ्तर रकबी गयी है मैं उस को सपोर्ट देने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ यह जो बिल बना है उस के स्टेटमेंट आफ ग्रान्जेक्ट्स एंड रीजन्स में जो यह बात लिखी गई है

[श्री तुलसीदास जाधव]

वह बहुत अच्छी है। उस में लिखा हुआ है :

"The report of the Banaras Hindu University Enquiry Committee appointed by the President in his capacity as Visitor of the University to enquire into the state of affairs of the University had revealed certain disquieting features and unhealthy influences which had been undermining the discipline of the University"

यह उन का मुख्य उद्देश्य है जिस से कि इस यूनिवर्सिटी के अन्दर ऐसे खयालात न फैलें, कोई रेन्टी सोशल एलिमेंट्स न हों, जिन से कि एन्वैजेशन के अन्दर डिस्टर्बेंस हो, या दबाव हो। इस के लिए यह बिल यहां लाया गया है। मैं इस को सपोर्ट करते हुए यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आजकल जो यूनिवर्सिटी के विद्यार्थी होते हैं, चाहे कालेज के हों, चाहे यूनिवर्सिटी के हों, उन के अन्दर वायोलेंस की प्रवृत्ति बहुत बढ़ रही है। आप ने देखा होगा कि उड़ोसा के अन्दर विद्यार्थियों की तरफ से बड़ी भारी तादाद में डिस्टर्बेंस हुए, जिस में उन्होंने जा कर गवर्नमेंट बिल्डिंग्स पर हमला कर दिया। यह क्यों होता है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर यह हालत ज्यादा से ज्यादा बढ़नी जाती है। इस के लिये मेरी राय यह है कि गवर्नमेंट यूनिवर्सिटी में या कालेजों में इस रीति से शिअन दे कि जो समाज की नीति होनी चाहिये, जिस तरह से समाज को चलना चाहिये, उस को बल मिले। इस रीति की एकेजेशन आज बहुत कम है।

जब हम लोग बचपन में पढ़ते थे तब छः घंटों में से एक घंटा ऐसा होता था जिस में हम को नीति की शिक्षा दी जाती थी। लेकिन आजकल किसी भी हाई स्कूल में, किसी कालेज में या किसी यूनिवर्सिटी में ऐसा नहीं होता है। उस वकत एक और बात थी

कि जो टीचर हम को पढ़ाते थे, उन का जो आचरण होता था, उन का जो बिहेवियर होता था उस का विद्यार्थियों पर असर होता था। लेकिन आजकल किसी कालेज में, किसी यूनिवर्सिटी में जा कर देख लीजिये, प्रोफेसर या प्रिंसिपल जो होते हैं उन का व्यवहार अलग होता है और कहने में कुछ और होता है। उस का असर कभी विद्यार्थियों पर अच्छा नहीं पड़ सकता। इस चीज को ठीक करने के लिये आप एक ऐसा प्रोग्राम रखिये जो कि कम्पल्सरी हो। जितने घंटे विद्यार्थी स्कूल में रहते हैं उन में से ही आध घंटे के लिये या एक घंटे के लिये ऐसा प्रोग्राम रखा जाना चाहिये जिस से कि विद्यार्थियों के दिल पर असर पड़े और वे अपने व्यवहार में हर जगह पर कंट्रोल से, नियम से और संयम से रह सकें।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारे यहां इतने राज्य हैं। अभी कुछ समय पहले हम ने उन राज्यों में देवनागरी लिपि को रखने के बारे में अलग अलग रयें मुनीं। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर अलग अलग विचार के लोगों को, अलग अलग रीति रिवाज के लोगों को एक जगह पर लाने के लिये ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये जिस में कि उन में एक समभाव पैदा हो।

हम देखते हैं कि बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी के नाम में आज तक भी हिन्दू लिखा हुआ है। जिस समय यह यूनिवर्सिटी आरम्भ की गई थी उस समय अगर हिन्दू नाम का इस्तेमाल किया गया तो ठीक था। मालवीय जी का दावा देने की मेरी मंशा नहीं है। लेकिन अब इस नाम की जरूरत नहीं है। कल माननीय सदस्य श्री भट्टाचार्य ने और कई माननीय सदस्यों ने सुझाव दिया कि इस का बनारस सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी नाम रखा जाये।

वह जो सुचना है वह मंजूर हो। वह कौन करे ? या तो गवर्नमेंट कोई दूसरा नाम उस में ढूँढ लाये जिस से नाम पढ़ने में ही लोगों को यह मालूम हो कि यह भारत और इंडिया का एक चित्र उस के सामने आता है लेकिन अभी जो उस का नाम बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी है तो उस की आंखों के सामने यह आता है कि बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी यह खाली हिन्दुओं के लिए है और वहाँ जो एपाएंटमेंट्स होंगे प्रोफेसर्स और प्रिंसिपल के, वह भी हिन्दू लोगों का ही होगा। अगर हिन्दू नाम रहने दिया जाता है तो फिर खाली हिन्दू तक ही यह चीज खत्म नहीं हो जानी है बल्कि हिन्दू मात्र के अन्दर भी अलग अलग भेद खड़े हो जाते हैं। हिन्दुओं के अन्दर भी सब एक ही विचार के नहीं होते हैं, कोई चातुर्यवर्ण के होते हैं जैसे ब्राह्मण, क्षत्री, वैश्य और शूद्र और फिर उन में और भी अधिक जाति के आधार पर छोटे छोटे टुकड़े हो जाते हैं। हिन्दुओं में आगे चल कर इतने भेद जातिपात के हो जाते हैं और वे एक दूसरे से इतना अलग हो जाते हैं कि तथाकथित ऊँची जाति वाला नीची जाति के हिन्दू को छूना तक भी गवारा नहीं करता है। यह जो हमारे वहाँ जातिपात के आधार पर एक पृथक्त्व की भावना घर कर गई है इस हटाया जाना चाहिये और इस नाते यह उचित ही होगा अगर बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी में से यह शब्द हिन्दू निकाल दिया जाय और उसके बदले कोई दूसरा नाम रख ले।

इस के अतिरिक्त मेरा यह सुझाव है कि यह ठीक ही है कि प्रोफेसर्स आदि मैरिट के आधार पर वहाँ रखे जायें। मैरिट को उन का चुनाव करते वक्त अवश्य ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए लेकिन मैरिट के अलावा ऐसा भी कोई एक कौलम चुनाव करने के लिए रखें कि जब उम्मीदवार इंटरव्यू आदि के लिए आता है तो यह देखा

जाय कि उस का कंडक्ट कैसा है और बाहर उस ने अभी तक कैसा आचरण किया है ? बाहर अलग रीति से बर्ताव हो लेकिन एजुकेशनल मैरिट पर अगर उस की नियुक्ति कर ली जाय तो मेरे विचार में वह एपाएंटमेंट ठीक नहीं होगा। जिस तरह से कि जब पुलिस व फौज के अन्दर लोगों को भरती किया जाता है तो उन का बौडी, कद आदि देखा जाता है सीने की चौड़ाई नापी जाती है, उसी तरह से मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रिंसिपल और प्रोफेसर्स जब रखे जायें तो यह देखा जाये कि अभी तक उन का कंडक्ट कैसा रहा है, समाज में कैसा उन का आचरण व स्थिति रही है और इस को देख कर ही उन्हें नियुक्त किया जाय।

**श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय, बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के बारे में जो संशोधन बिल आया है उस को देखने से पता चलता है कि इस में भी बहुत कुछ सरकार का आश्रय लिया गया है। मेरी समझ में अगर इस में सरकार का आसरा न लिया गया होता और इस को पहले की तरह ही स्वतंत्र छोड़ दिया जाता या तो विद्यार्थियों की स्वतंत्रता के ऊपर छोड़ दिया जाता तो कुछ अच्छा होता। लेकिन इस में भाई भतीजावाद की बू आती है।

इस पर कल से चर्चा चल रही है। कल हम ने कुछ मित्रों को यह कहते सुना कि इस के नाम में से हिन्दू शब्द निकाल देना चाहिए लेकिन मैं अपने उन मित्रों से कहूँगा कि ऐसा करना उचित व न्यायसंगत नहीं होगा। उन मित्रों को यह नहीं भूल जाना चाहिए कि इस विश्वविद्यालय का निर्माण पूज्य महामना मालवीय जी ने सन् 1915 के अन्दर किया था और उस वक्त में कैसी परिस्थिति थी और उन्होंने किस दृष्टि से उस का नाम बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय रखा था उस को उन्हें देखना चाहिए। अब आज तो मेरे उन मित्रों को

## [श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा]

यह हिन्दू शब्द उस विश्वविद्यालय के नाम में से निकाल देना बहुत अच्छा दिखाई देता है लेकिन क्या वह उस समय को भूल गये जब पालवीर जी ने यह शब्द हिन्दू उस के आगे रक्खा था तो कितनी बहादुरी के साथ रक्खा था ? क्या उस समय इस हिन्दू नाम के कारण कम खलबली मची थी ?

इस युनिवर्सिटी के काम में तब गड़-बड़ी मची जब सन् 1957 के अन्दर कुछ इस तरीके का काम, छ्रष्टाचार तो क्या कहना चाहिए, लेकिन भाई भतीजावाद उस में पनप गया और उस के पनपने के बाद में कुछ ऐसी नियक्तियां कर ली गईं जोकि न्यायसंगत नहीं थीं। डा० बी० एस० झा की नियुक्ति कर दी गईं हालांकि उन को केवल तीन ही मत मिले थे और जबकि डा० गोपाल त्रिपाठी को 5 मत मिले थे लेकिन पांच मत को उन्होंने नहीं माना और तीन मत जिस को आये थे उन डा० बी० एस० झा को नियुक्त कर दिया। तब से यह झगड़ा चल गया। इस झगड़े के चलने के कारण क्या हुआ ? हुआ यह कि सन् 1958 में मुदालियार कमेटी इस बारे में बैठी। वह दरअसल युनिवर्सिटी के बाहर रही। वह वहां जा कर मजे में प्रोफेसर्स के यहां दावतें उड़ाते रहे। उन्होंने विश्वविद्यालय के एक भी प्रोफेसर से वहां युनिवर्सिटी में जा कर नहीं पूछा, युनिवर्सिटी व कालिज के किसी एक भी लड़के या प्रोफेसर से नहीं पूछा कि दरअसल मामला क्या है। बस उन्होंने ने बाहर ही रह कर और दावतें उड़ा कर जैसा उन्होंने ने क्ला अपनी रिपोर्ट लिख दी और यही कारण है कि कई सालों तक और आज तक भी बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय संगीनों की छाया में चल रहा है और उन के आतंक के अन्दर चल रहा है। कोई किसी तरीके की मीटिंग नहीं कर सकता और न अपने विचार स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक रख

सकता है जबकि पहले लोगों को अपने विचार स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक प्रकट करने देने के लिए कई एक कमेटियां व मीटिंग्स हुआ करती थीं। लेकिन आज आतंक इतना फैला हुआ है कि उन के मुंह बन्द कर दिये गये हैं। प्रोफेसर्स के दिलों के अन्दर यह भावना इतनी गहरी घर कर गई है कि उस का निकलना मुश्किल हो रहा है। यह ठीक है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने इस की ओर कुछ ध्यान दया और बनारस हिन्दू युनिवर्सिटी एक्ट में आर्डिनेंस के द्वारा संशोधन किया लेकिन उन का वह संशोधन भी मेरे मत में कुछ न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होता।

इस बिल के पेज 18 पर वाइस-चांसलर के बारे में यह लिखा हुआ है कि उस की नियुक्ति एक समिति करेगी जिसमें दो सदस्य एक्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल नियुक्त करेंगी और एक सदस्य विजिटर नियुक्त करेंगे और वह समिति तीन आदमियों का पैनल भेजेगी और उस पैनल में से जिसे वह चाहेगी उसकी नियुक्ति करेगी। वह तीन सदस्य कौन होंगे ? वह सदस्य वही होंगे जोकि उनके आसपास के पड़ोसी और भाईबंद होंगे। वह उसे नियुक्त करेंगे और विजिटर को यह अधिकार भी होगा कि वह अगर चाहे तो त्रिनों के नाम वापिस कर के और रिजैक्ट करके दूसरे नाम मंगा सकता है। अब इस तरह का अधिकार उन को देकर एक भाई भतीजावाद नहीं पनपा रहे हैं तो फिर यह क्या है ? वाइस-चांसलर का चुनाव अगर विजिटर के द्वारा इस तरीके से किया जाय तो यह भी अच्छी बात नहीं है।

इस बिल में चांसलर और वाइस-चांसलर की अवधि तीन से पांच साल रखी गई है लेकिन आप ने यह एक शर्त और लगा दी है कि जब तक नये चुनाव न हो जाय तब तक वह अपने पद पर काम करते रहेंगे। अब आप

नगरपालिकाओं को ही ले लीजिये । अगर उसका प्रधान अथवा मेयर किसी एक ग्रुप अथवा पार्टी का बन जाता है तो वह अपने पद पर जमा रहता है और तीन साल से छै साल तक जमा रहता है लेकिन वह वहां पर चुनाव नहीं होने देता है । होता यह है कि कभी उनको ऊपर की शरण हूं जायेगी तो कभी मिनिस्टर्स की शरण मिल जायेगी और वह चुनाव को टाल कर इस तरह से अपनी अवधि को बढ़ाते रहेंगे और इसका परिणाम यह होने वाला है कि दूसरे जो बंचारे बैठे हैं उनको कभी मौका आगे आने का नहीं मिल सकता है ।

इस में लिखा है कि कोर्ट युनिवर्सिटी की सुप्रीम एथारिटी बनाई जा रही है और वह युनिवर्सिटी के आमतौर पर सुधार और विकास आदि के बारे में देखेगा और अपनी सिफारिशें देगा लेकिन वह कोर्ट युनिवर्सिटी की एक्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल के रोजमर्रा की कार्यवाही में हस्तक्षेप नहीं करेगा । लेकिन यह जो उसके द्वारा साल भर का लेखाजोखा करने का प्राविजन है वह फिर क्या मायने रखता है ? जब उस कोर्ट की साल भर में मीटिंग होगी एक तो उस कोर्ट को यह लेखाजोखा देखने का अधिकार देने की जरूरत ही क्या है ? यह तो ठीक है कि वह रोजाना के कामों में हस्तक्षेप नहीं करेगा लेकिन अगर साल भर के बाद उसने हस्तक्षेप किया तो फिर वह हस्तक्षेप तो हुआ ही । मेरा कहना है कि कोर्ट की शरण इसमें क्यों ली जाय ? ऐसे ही प्रोफेसरों के बारे में है कि कोर्ट उन के बारे में तय नहीं करेगा, ग्राम पंचायतें तय करेगी । अब ग्राम पंचायतों का मतलब क्या है ? यह ग्राम पंचायतें बनी कैसे होंगी ? कहां के मेम्बर्स होंगे और कौन-कौन उन में होगा ? मेरा कहना है कि वह सब इस तरह से अपने भाई भतीजावाद को पनपा रहे हैं क्योंकि इसमें महज कोर्ट से अधिकार लेकर ग्राम पंचायतों को दूसरे हाथ से दिया जा रहा है । इस तरह की

बंदिश लगाना मेरी समझ में तो उचित नहीं है । आखिर यह प्राविजन केवल बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय पर ही क्यों लागू किया जा रहा है, इसे दूसरे विश्वविद्यालयों पर क्यों नहीं लागू किया जाता है ? हमारी सरकार इस तरह से बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के पीछ क्यों पड़ी हुई है ? यह दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय, इलाहबाद विश्वविद्यालय और बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में इस तरह से अलग अलग दो रूल्स रखने की क्या वजह है ? सब युनिवर्सिटीज के साथ एक सा कानून होना चाहिए । एक जगह अमेंडेंट किया जाय और दूसरी जगह न किया जाय यह न्यायसंगत बात नहीं है । क्या सरकार इस बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का नाम ही मिटा देने पर तुली हुई है जो यह सब कर रही है ? मेरा कहना है कि इस तरह से नहीं होना चाहिए ।

पहले यह था कि जो डाक्टर था वही रीडर हो सकता था लेकिन अब जो बाहर से एम० ए० पास कर के आया वही रीडर बन गया । इस तरह से जो जो पुरानी नियुक्तियां हैं उन सब का चांस मारा जा रहा है । इस बिल के अन्दर कहीं भी यह नहीं लिखा है कि पुराने जो डाक्टर होंगे वही रीडर बनाये जायेंगे । होगा यह कि कोई व्यक्ति एम० ए० पास कर लेगा और उनकी सिफारिश हो जायेगी और कोर्ट उनकी रीडर के पद पर नियुक्ति कर देगा । कोर्ट में अगर तीन सदस्य भी उसकी तरफ हुए तो फिर उसके हक में फैसला हो जायेगा । इसलिए मेरा यह कहना है कि वह जो पुराने डाक्टर्स हैं उन्हीं में से रीडर्स बनाये जायें और वे सीनियारिटी और जूनियारिटी के आधार पर रीडर बनाये जायें । सात साल से हम जिस माडल युनिवर्सिटी बिल का इन्तजार कर रहे हैं, अच्छा होता कि एक सप्ताह और उसका इन्तजार कर लिया जाता । लेकिन ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि शायद उस माडल युनिवर्सिटी बिल में कुछ ऐसी भवनायें हैं,

[श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा]

जो कि सरकार के बिल्कुल विपरीत हैं और जो शायद विश्वविद्यालय की फ़ेवर में हों। प्रश्न यह है कि इस सम्बन्ध में इतनी जल्दी करने का कारण क्या है और इस विश्वविद्यालय पर इतना नियंत्रण क्यों किया जा रहा है। मैं प्रवर समिति के माननीय सदस्यों से नम्रतापूर्वक यह निवेदन करूंगा कि इस बारे में जो भी फ़ैसला किया जाये, वह माडल यूनिवर्सिटी बिल को देख कर और माडल एक्ट्स कमेटी की सजेस्टियन्स को देख कर किया जाये, क्योंकि मुदालियार कमेटी की रिपोर्ट बिल्कुल एकतरफ़ा थी और उस में कहा गया था कि इस विश्वविद्यालय के प्रोफ़ेसर, छात्र, वाइस-चांसलर आदि ऐसे हैं, वैसे हैं। इस को बिल्कुल मिटा देने के लिए इस बारे में बिल्कुल एकतरफ़ा कार्यवाही की गई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस विश्वविद्यालय को स्वतंत्रता दी जाये। एक मन्दिर में तो आदमी बग़ैर रोक-टोक के चला जाता है, लेकिन इस विश्वविद्यालय के अन्दर जाने के लिए पासपोर्ट लेना पड़ता है, जैसे कि किसी को पाकिस्तान जाना हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का, जो कि हिन्दुस्तान में स्थित है, इस प्रकार सैनिकों की छत्रछाया में चलना उचित नहीं है। आख़िर दूसरे विश्वविद्यालयों के लिए ऐसा बिल क्यों नहीं पास किया जाता है? मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि परमात्मा के लिए इस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय को बख़्शा जाये और इसके "हिन्दू" नाम को मिटाने का प्रयत्न न किया जाये, क्योंकि अगर आज हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का नाम मिटाने का प्रयत्न किया जायेगा, तो मुझे प्रतीत होता है कि शायद कल हिन्दुस्तान का नाम भी मिटाने का प्रयत्न किया जायेगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री शर्मा।

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : मैं दो सजेस्टियन्स दो मिनट में रखना चाहता हूँ।

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा (बक्सर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में दो एक बातें इस सदन, शिक्षा मंत्री और सिलेक्ट कमेटी के विचार के लिए रखना चाहता हूँ। बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के साथ जिन कालेजिज का एफ़िलिएशन होगा, एक तो मैं उस के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। दूसरे, यदि वहाँ पर सविस कन्डीशन्स के प्रश्न पर मैनेजमेंट और शिक्षकों तथा दूसरे कर्मचारियों के बीच में कोई विवाद खड़ा होता है, उस के बारे में जो व्यवस्था रखी गई है, मैं उस का भी जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ। इस बिल में जो व्यवस्था रखी गई है, वह मेरे दृष्टिकोण से ठीक नहीं है।

बनारस में उदयप्रताप कालेज और हरिश्चन्द्र कालेज दो और कालेज हैं, जो कि गोरखपुर यूनिवर्सिटी से एफ़िलिएटड किये गये हैं। आप इस बात को सोच सकते हैं कि बनारस शहर में ही ये दो कालेज हैं और उनका एफ़िलिएशन उनकी मर्जी के खिलाफ़ गोरखपुर यूनिवर्सिटी के साथ किया गया है। पहले कानून के मुताबिक यूनिवर्सिटी को यह अधिकार था कि वह किसी कालेज को एफ़िलिएट कर सकती थी, लेकिन इस बिल में यह लिखा गया है :

"Provided that no such college or institution shall, after the commencement of the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Act, 1964, be admitted to any such privilege of the University."

इसके माने ये हैं कि अगर अब तक इस बात पर विचार किया भी जा सकता था कि उन कालेजों की तकलीफ़, परेशानी और दिक्कतों को सामने रखते हुए उन का एफ़िलिएशन हो सकता है या नहीं, लेकिन इस एमेंडिंग बिल के द्वारा उन को हमेशा के लिए वंचित कर दिया गया है। इस सम्बन्ध में राज्य सभा में हुई बहस का शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय ने जो

जवाब दिया, मैं ने उस को पढ़ा है। इस विधेयक के नियमों के मुताबिक भी एक स्पेसिफिक एरिया में जितने भी कालेज हैं, उन का एफिलिएशन यूनिवर्सिटी के साथ किया जाता है। मंत्री महोदय ने अपने जवाब में दो एक बातें कारण के रूप में बताई कि इन कालेजों का एफिलिएशन क्यों नहीं हो सकता है। पहली बात उन्होंने यह बताई कि महामना मालवीय जी का विचार था कि जो इंस्टीट्यूशन उन्होंने स्थापित की हैं, केवल उन्हीं का सम्बन्ध बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी से होना चाहिए। दूसरी बात उन्होंने यह कही कि उस यूनिवर्सिटी का रेजिडेंशियल कैरेक्टर बिगड़ जायेगा, इसलिए और कालेजों का उसके साथ सम्बन्ध नहीं हो सकता है। मैं बहुत अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर मालवीय जी का यह इन्टेन्शन होता, तो जो कानून इस से पहले बना हुआ था, उस में इस का जिक्र होता, लेकिन उस का कोई जिक्र नहीं है। यदि भविष्य में कभी इन दो कालेजों का सम्बन्ध बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय से हो सकता था, वो भी इस बिल के पास होने के बाद वह बात हमेशा के लिए खत्म कर दी जायेगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि सेंटिमेंट की बात को सामने रख कर कि महामना मालवीय जी का ऐसा विचार था इन दो कालेजों को एफिलिएशन से वंचित न किया जाये।

बल्कि मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह अमेंडिंग बिल इस उद्देश्य से सदन के सामने लाया गया है कि बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी अपने पुराने आदर्शों पर चले, वह राजनीति का शिकार न बने और पार्टी-पालिटिक्स उसमें न प्रविष्ट हो। इन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए यह जरूरी है कि इन दो कालेजों को भी इस यूनिवर्सिटी के साथ एफिलिएट कर दिया जाये, क्योंकि अगर अभी तक इनका एफिलिएशन नहीं हुआ है, तो पार्टी-पालिटिक्स की वजह से नहीं हुआ है।

इसके अलावा इसका और कोई भी कारण नहीं था कि कुछ लोग यह नहीं चाहते थे।

बनारस शहर में दो कालेज और हैं—सेंट्रल हिन्दू कालेज और विमेन्स कालेज, जो कि यूनिवर्सिटी के कैंपस में नहीं हैं, बल्कि बाहर शहर में हैं, लेकिन उनका एफिलिएशन इस यूनिवर्सिटी के साथ हुआ है इस बिना पर कि मालवीय जी ने उनकी स्थापना की थी। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है, साथ के साथ कारण यह दिया जाता है कि बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी का रेजिडेंशियल कैरेक्टर मेन्टेन करने के लिए बाहरी कालेजों का एफिलिएशन नहीं होगा। तो मैं कहे चाहता हूँ कि ये दो कालेज—सेंट्रल हिन्दू कालेज और विमेन्स कालेज—बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के कैंपस के भीतर नहीं हैं, वे बाहर शहर में हैं। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि यह दलील ठीक नहीं है और इसलिए जिन कालेजों का मैंने जिक्र किया है, उनको इस यूनिवर्सिटी के साथ एफिलिएट किया जाना चाहिए। इससे उसका रेजिडेंशियल कैरेक्टर किसी भी प्रकार बिगड़ता नहीं है।

सैटलमेंट आफ डिस्पूट्स के बारे में इस बिल में यह कहा गया है :

“The decision of the Tribunal of Arbitration shall be final and shall not be questioned in any court of law.”

कोर्ट आफ ला में क्वैस्टियन न किये जा सकने की बात को इस बिल में जोड़ा गया है और यह बात पुराने कानून में नहीं थी। पुराने कानून में यह कहा गया था कि आरबिट्रेशन का जो कुछ भी फैसला होगा, वह फाइनल होगा। यह बिल्कुल ठीक है। आरबिट्रेशन का फैसला फाइनल होना चाहिए। लेकिन आरबिट्रेशन का कोई भी फैसला-ट्राइब्यूनल का कोई भी फैसला कोर्ट में भी क्वैस्टियन किया जा सकता है। शिक्षा मंत्री और सिलेक्ट कमेटी को इस बात पर विचार करना चाहिए कि इस बिल में जो

[ श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा ]

नई व्यवस्था रखी गई है, वह न्यायसंगत नहीं है।

आखिर में मैं एक बात और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। यहां पर बराबर इस बात का जिक्र किया जाता है कि छात्रों में काफी अनुशासनहीनता आ गई है। देश में भिन्न भिन्न जगहों में इस तरह की बातें की जाती हैं। मैं कोई चीप पापुलेरिटी हासिल करने के लिए नहीं, बल्कि अपने दिल की बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम लोगों के बीच में अनुशासन कायम करना चाहते हैं, उनके बीच में चरित्र-निर्माण की बात करना चाहते हैं, तो जो हम शिक्षक या नेतागण हैं, इस देश के पथ-प्रदर्शक हैं, जो इस बात के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं कि इस देश में ऐसा वातावरण हो, ऐसी हवा और फिजा पैदा हो कि लोगों के बीच में अनुशासनहीनता न फैले, तो सब से पहले हमको अपने आचरण से लोगों को यह विश्वास दिलाना होगा कि हम जो कहते हैं, उस को करते हैं।

आज हालत यह है कि हम में से बहुत से लोग जो इस बात का दावा करते हैं और कारेक्टर इत्यादि की बात करते हैं, उनकी वाणी और कर्म में बहुत फर्क होता है। हम कहते कुछ हैं और करते कुछ और हैं। आज ही इस सदन में देवनागरी स्क्रिप्ट के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा हो रही थी। मुख्य मंत्रियों के साथ सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट का परामर्श हुआ है और कुछ फैसला हुआ या। उस फैसले का इंटेंशन गृह मंत्री द्वारा यहां बताया गया है। जब एक बार फैसला हो जाता है तो उस फैसले का जब इंट्रप्रेशन होने लगता है, जब लोगों के हाथ में यह पावर दी जाती है कि वे उसका इंट्रप्रेशन करें तो उसके माने अलग अलग लगाये जाने लग जाते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ तब वाणी और कर्म में भी फर्क आ जाता है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। जिस उद्देश्य को लेकर महामना मालवीय जी ने इस यूनिवर्सिटी की स्थापना

की थी अगर उसकी पूर्ति करनी है और यूनिवर्सिटी को ऐसे ऐसे लोग पैदा करने हैं जो देश के नेता बन सकें, देश के निर्माण में अग्रणी हो सकें न कि केवल डिग्री ही हासिल करें जैसे और यूनिवर्सिटियों में होता है, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति इस तरह से नहीं हो सकती है।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जो सुझाव मैंने दिये हैं उन पर शिक्षा मंत्री जी तथा ज्वाइंट सिलक्ट कमटी गंभीरता से विचार करेगी।

13.01 hrs.

**Dr. Sarojini Mahishi** (Dharwar North): Mr. Speaker, Sir, consequent on the appointment of the Banaras Hindu University Inquiry Committee which was appointed by the President in his capacity as the Visitor, certain amendments were introduced in the Bill. The Committee disclosed or brought to light certain unhealthy features existing in the University and the chaotic state of affairs that was there in the Banaras Hindu University. The Ordinance was issued by the President and subsequently an amending Bill was also introduced in the House. Now, this is an amending Bill to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915 and this Bill seeks to incorporate certain amendments and other measures for the betterment of the administration of the University.

Sir, in 1958, the crisis was such that it was a culmination of a number of factors, action and inter-action of a number of factors, which were quite unhealthy. The Report has disclosed these factors. The very nature of the University as a residential University was no longer there. The students were allowed to stay wherever they liked. The Divisional Commissioner has remarked that it was very unfortunate that students lived in very bad places and of very bad reputation. He also said that the students behaved very rudely whenever the police officer went there to investigate into the crime. If the state of affairs had reached to this ex-

tent within the premises of the University why was there delay in taking administrative action and why the University authorities could not do these things? If the University authorities could not do anything, why the State Government did not interfere in the matter? Is it right and proper that whenever a question is being put forth before the Central Government, the Central Government says that education is a State subject and, therefore, the Central Government cannot interfere in the matter?

**Dr. M. S. Aney** (Nagpur): The Banaras Hindu University is the Central University. The State Government cannot do anything.

**Dr. Sarojini Mahishi:** I am speaking with reference to some other Universities also. The Central Government says that education is a State subject and that the Central Government cannot interfere in the matter. When the State Government is confronted with this question, the State Government says that the Universities are autonomous bodies and that they cannot interfere in the matter unless there is a law and order situation calling for their help. If this is the condition, is it not provoking that the students should go to the extent of creating law and order situation or creating the chaotic situation and then only the Government is tempted to take some action in the matter? We have seen the student unrest in many of the Universities. We have seen it in Orissa and in Mysore. Ultimately, it went to this extent that the students took the law into their own hands and it was such a chaotic situation that called the Government to interfere in the matter. Therefore the Banaras Hindu University being a Central University, I would suggest that matters ought not to have gone to this extent. Administrative delays should be eliminated as early as possible. One stitch in time may save nine.

The second thing I would like to say is this. If there would have been a common Act for all the four Central Universities that would have been much better. Apart from the local conditions and other things prevailing there, a common or a uniform law for all the four Central Universities would have been much better. Now, the Minister has said that this particular Bill or this Act will be submitted to the State Governments and the Universities also so that the State Governments may have their own Acts also on the model of this Bill. But before the expert committee submitted the report, I wonder why there was this hurry to introduce this particular Bill. I would request the hon. Minister to look into this fact that an Act on this model is being introduced in the State Legislatures also.

I would like to stress here another point also. Sub-clause (v) of Clause 34 says:

"The Executive Council may, after consulting the Academic Council, withdraw all, or any of, the privileges granted to a college or institution...."

Now, with the elected element in the Executive Council all the influence is being whittled down. I would say, there should be a better safeguard that the Executive Council subject to the approval of the Supreme authority of the University, that is, the Court, may take such action so that there will be proper check upon the action taken by the Executive Council. There is the Court also which is the supreme authority as far as the University is concerned and it is entitled to review the programmes and the policies and suggest development measures and also to review any action undertaken by any of the bodies of the Universities. Under these circumstances, I hope the hon. Minister will look into this thing also that

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

the Executive Council may take action subject to the approval of the Court.

Then, I come to Clause 37. The Degrees of Doctor of Letters, the Degrees of Doctor of Science etc. are being conferred on persons, and it is inevitable that there should be a clause to this effect that these Degrees may be conferred on people only on the basis of merit. The less is said about these things the better it is. Not only this University but also many other Universities are conferring these Degrees as if it is a sort of obligation on their part to confer these Degrees on some of the persons in consideration of something else also. As a professor working in a University and knowing a little about the working of the other Universities, for example, the Gauhati University and the other Universities, I know all this. In fact, there was an editorial in one of the papers on the 31st August, 1962 stating that it was a shocking thing and the matters could not be corrected or remedied for a number of years and to the extent of Rs. 40 lakhs the grant was given by the University Grants Commission to the University and no account was being maintained and the Degrees were being conferred or rather sold also. I would like to know what was the University Grants Commission doing? What was the State Government doing? There is the head of the University, the Governor, the Chancellor of the University and all that. What were these authorities doing? The matters went to this extent. So, I say, an early action is quite essential. If proper authorities do not come forward to take an early action, the ultimate responsibility will be on the Government.

Many a time the hon. Minister for Education has expressed that education would be put in the Concurrent List. But before it enters the Concurrent List, I hope he does not mean that there should be chaotic conditions in the country as far as the

Universities are concerned. Gandhiji used the students' strength and capacity for the non-cooperation movement towards the attainment of freedom. The students' strength is such a strength that can be used as an instrument by all persons subsequent to Independence also. There are many of the political parties and groups and others who are using the students' strength as an instrument and I do not wish to put the blame on the shoulders of the students. It is an action and inter-action of so many vested interests and groups and parties within the University. The Commission went to the extent of saying that a University Professor in the Banaras Hindu University used the railway pass of a student for attending a marriage party and subsequently found that he was the recipient of in the Railway Inquiry Commission Report also—and this professor was given a warning. It was subsequently found that he was the recipient of the President's Award. I do not wish to go into all these details on this matter. Under these circumstances, it is better that proper recruitment of the teachers is made and the discipline among the student community is properly maintained.

Then, in one particular appendix I find that an arrangement is being made for the study of Hindu, Buddhist and Jain religion. I do not understand how this grouping is being made now. This is what Panini has said:

काचं मणिं कांचनमेकसूत्रे मृदा  
निबन्धन्ति विमत्र चित्रम् ।  
विचारवान् पाणिनिरैक सूत्रे  
श्वानं युवानं मघवानमह ॥

Even the great grammarian Panini has brought together *Sua*, *Yuva* and *Maghavan* in one *sutra*. Here, the grouping has been done—Vedic, Hindu, Buddhist and Jain studies. Hindus honour the *vedas* and the

Buddhists and Jains may not honour the *vedas* and they consider it as slander. That is different. Vedic and vedic or non-vedic studies could have been a better classification. During these days when we attach not much importance to these things but attach importance to the academic study, it is better these things are classified in a better way.

I would also subscribe to this opinion that the earlier the word "Hindu" in the name Banaras Hindu University and the earlier the word "Muslim" in the name Aligarh Muslim University is removed the better, because no longer the significance that was attaching at that time is existing at this time, and it should not call for certain prejudices and other misunderstandings also under the existing circumstances in the country. Therefore, I would like the hon. Minister to look into these things.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, unfortunately this is a Bill which I wish to oppose, not only because it has been moved in a condition where such a Bill is not necessary but because of certain clauses of the Bill. After going through these clauses, I feel that a democratic right of a particular university is being taken away.

What happened in 1958 after the enquiry? Much has been said in the House about the functioning of the Banaras Hindu University, about the professors and other persons who were associated with it. We had an exhaustive discussion in this House, and hon. Members expressed themselves very vehemently about it. But is it not true that whatever happened in the Banaras Hindu University is happening everywhere, in every university, especially in the Lucknow University or in the Muslim University in Aligarh? What was the cause for bringing this legislation so soon? The services of certain professors were terminated by the Vice-Chancellor, by the all powerful and all mighty

Vice-Chancellor. What happened? Each of those professors went to the court of law, and either by the High Court or by the Supreme Court the entire thing was quashed and they were reinstated. And the greatest tragedy is that professors like Dr. Hazariprasad Dwivedy, who was considered to be "most inefficient, undisciplined" and so on according to the Vice-Chancellor and whose services were terminated, the same Dr. Hazariprasad Dwivedy....

**An hon. Member:** Of the Punjab University.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** He was first one of the heads of departments in the Punjab University. And today Shrimati Indira Gandhi has included the same Dr. Hazariprasad Dwivedy, because of his calibre, as one of the members of the Evaluation Committee.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad** (Bhagalpur): And the Vice-Chancellor also had to apologize.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** And the Vice-Chancellor had to apologize.

All the powers are given to the Vice-Chancellor. It is said in this Bill that the court will be supreme. The Court shall be the supreme authority of the University. What will be the supremacy of this? It further says:

"Notwithstanding anything in sub-section (1), the Court shall not interfere with the Executive Council in the day-to-day administration of the University."

The Court will meet once a year, and they will decide certain matters of policy or procedure. But day to day, whatever may go on, all the power will be with the Vice-Chancellor and he will be the sole monarch of whatever he surveys. So I am opposed to this.

And sweeping powers have been given to the Vice-Chancellor that even the contracts of professors can be terminated by him.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

I shall not say anything about the various clauses since the Bill is going to the Joint Committee. But this Bill has been brought without considering the historic background of the Banaras Hindu University, without in the least considering the political aspect of it, without considering the amount of sacrifice the students and some of the professors of the Banaras Hindu University made at the time of Independence or in the 1942 movement. I fully agree with what Dr. Lohia said yesterday, that perhaps that particular background or the sacrifice made by the students and professors of the Banaras Hindu University to bring independence to this country, where some of them sacrificed their lives, is not known to the hon. Minister who was then Chief Justice of a High Court. So I do not blame him at all. I appreciate his calibre. But I am not for this Bill. It is too premature. It should not have been brought at all.

The Bill says:

"A special meeting of the Court may be convened by the Executive Council or the Vice-Chancellor, or if there is no Vice-Chancellor, by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, or if there is no Pro-Vice-Chancellor, by the Registrar."

I do not know, did the drafters of the Bill ever visit the University; did they ever consult any Professor of that University or even the Vice-Chancellor of the University? It is a most thoughtless Bill that I have seen, and we are asked to send it to the Joint Committee for further consideration. I am sorry that the motion for circulation was rejected. Because the hon. Member who moved it was a Member of the Joint Committee, he did not press it. But this was really a fit Bill which should have been sent for circulation.

Another question was raised. Much has been said about groupism. There is groupism throughout the country. That has come in

our blood and in our veins. There is groupism in the cabinet, whether it is the Central Government or the State Government. There is groupism in everything. Are we not responsible, as politicians or as Members of this House or as members of the Cabinet, for fomenting groupism further in the country? How is it that groupism in the Banaras Hindu University has been highlighted so much, and groupism in Lucknow or Bihar University or Muzaffarpur has not been highlighted? I have got a book, "Colonisation of a University", and I can read even the remarks of the Chancellor, Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, who was our respected Speaker. He has said that he was not consulted even. He was amazed to see the Union Public Service Commission being utilised for the purpose. Only one name was suggested for appointment as principal, knowing fully well that he was the only candidate and he should be taken in.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** Why do you accuse that University? Now, by this Act we are taking away the autonomy and doing the same thing with respect to the Banaras Hindu University.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I want that autonomy should be kept there. But what happened in other Universities? This should be rectified. I have no doubt about it.

What is the history of the Banaras Hindu University? They were the pivot of the national struggle. Today everything is confined into this Bill, and all their democratic rights are being curtailed. I therefore oppose this Bill, and I hope the Joint Committee will kindly take a note of it and, if possible, the Bill should be dropped.

There can be improvements in a university, provided every matter is looked upon with a sympathetic eye and with an eye to improve things. Otherwise, not only this particular

Bill, it will not solve the problems of the University.

Much has been said about indiscipline among students. Why is there this indiscipline? I have read the books written by Prof. Humayun Kabir as to why there is indiscipline among the students, the report of the Radhakrishnan Commission, and various other reports. Insecurity in the country is the main cause of the indiscipline among the students, insecurity about their lives. They do not know; if they fail in their B.A. examination they know that their parents cannot afford to send them to the college once again and that they will be on the streets and perhaps die in a shelterless condition, without any government shelter. The students will have to be taken into confidence. The national character has to be grown. We have made an assessment that our national productivity has gone up, that our national income has gone up. We have never cared to assess to what extent our national character has gone down. An assessment has to be made. The students should not be blamed. They are one of the two wheels—the students and the teacher are two wheels of a particular train; both of them have to reach a place which will increase the prestige of this country.

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा रुड़की यूनिवर्सिटी से कुछ ताल्लुक है इस लिये मैं इस विषय पर कुछ सुझाव देना चाहूंगा। रुड़की यूनिवर्सिटी का डिसिप्लिन संसार में सर्वश्रेष्ठ है। सारी दुनिया में इस तरह की डिसिप्लिन नहीं है। अगर वहाँ चौराहे पर आप सोना डाल दें तो चौबिस घण्टे बाद वह आप को वहीं मिलेगा। आप के द्वारा शिक्षा मंत्रों जो से मेरी दरुबस्त यह है कि वहाँ के वाइस चांसलर श्री घनानन्द पांडे हैं जिन्होंने एक देव पुरुष की तरह से, एक फरिश्ता सिकत इन्सान की तरह से वहाँ पर डिसिप्लिन कायम किया है। उन को शिक्षा मंत्री कांफिडेंस में लें। बनारस के मामले में मेरी अपील है कि

अगर वहाँ की डिमिप्लिन खराब हो गया तो महामना मालवीय जी की आत्मा को धक्का लगेगा। हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब को भगवान ने ऐसी ऊंची काबिलियत दी है कि यू० एन० ओ० आज भी याद करता है। ईश्वर ने श्री चागला को शेर जैसी पर्सनैलिटी दी है, उन को शेर जैसी आवाज दी है, वह यू० एन० ओ० में शेर की तरह गर्जे हैं। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे एक बार श्री घनानन्द पांडे को बुला कर बात चीत कर लें तो मसला हल हो जायेगा।

दूसरी बात यह है कि मालवीय जी ने जिम उद्देश्य से इस युनिवर्सिटी को कायम किया था वह अभी अधूरा है। मैं ने वहाँ जा कर खुद देखा है कि वहाँ पर आज संस्कृत अंग्रेजी के माध्यम से पढ़ाई जाती है। जो भी संस्कृत में एम० ए० की परीक्षा देने वाला विद्यार्थी है उस की पढ़ाई का माध्यम अंग्रेजी है। संस्कृत और अंग्रेजी मीडियम दोनों साथ साथ कैसे चल सकते हैं। संस्कृत देव भाषा है अंग्रेजी में कोई किताब भी नाजिल नहीं हुई, कोई धार्मिक पुस्तक इस जवान में नहीं है। यह सिर्फ एक बिजिनेस लैंग्वेज है। संस्कृत पढ़ाने का काम एक बिजिनेस लैंग्वेज को देना ठीक नहीं है। यह महामना मालवीय जी के आदर्शों के खिलाफ है। अंग्रेजी में कोई धार्मिक ग्रन्थ नहीं आया। किसी भी वर्ल्ड टीचर ने अपनी लाफटी टीचिंग्स इंग्लिश में नहीं दी। और बिस्मार्क इस बात को कहा करते थे :  
“When an Englishman says Christ, he means cotton.”

अंग्रेजी, यह तो एक लेने देने की जवान है और इस का संस्कृति और पवित्रता से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। आज हमारे स्कूल कालिजों और विश्वविद्यालयों में जो अनुशासनहीनता बढ़ रही है उस का मुख्य कारण यह है कि वहाँ पर धार्मिक शिक्षा नहीं है। जब तक विद्यार्थियों को दीनियत की तालीम नहीं होगी, जब तक मौरैल ट्रेनिंग नहीं होगी यह अनुशासनहीनता बढ़ती रहेगी। हमारे धर्म में यह सिखलाया जाता है :—

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

“अभिवादन शीलस्य नित्यं वृद्धे षट्पिनः  
चत्वारि तस्य वर्षन्त आर्युद्विद्य. यशोदलम् ।”

बड़ों के सामने जो अनुशासनहीनता करता है उसकी चार चीजें कम हो जाती हैं। उम्र कम हो जाती है, इत्तम कम हो जाता है, उस की कीर्ति कम हो जाती है, इज्जत कम हो जाती है और उसका बल कम हो जाता है। अंग्रेजी में यह तालीम नहीं दी गई है। अंग्रेजी में मां को भी माई डियर कहते हैं और वाइफ को भी माई डियर कहते हैं। इसलिए जाहिर है कि अंग्रेजी के जरिए यह अनुशासन कायम नहीं रह सकता है। अनुशासन कायम तब होगा जब अपने विद्यार्थियों को धर्म की तालीम दी जायगी और दीनियात की तालीम दी जायगी। दरअसल दीनियात ने सब से पहिले सिखलाया है :—

“अखखलको अयज्जुल्लाह व अह्वुल्ल खलके  
इल्लल्लाह मह्युसुनु इला अयालहि”

(हंदीस शरीफ)

सब से पहिले दीनियात ने धर्म ने यह मौरल ट्रेनिंग और यह रैलीजस ट्रेनिंग दी कि इस संसार के अन्दर मनुष्य की ताजीम करना, इंसानियत की इज्जत करना सब से बड़ा धर्म है। जब तक वहां दीनियात की तालीम नहीं दी जायगी यह इन्डिसिप्लिन वहां की दूर नहीं हो सकती। प्रोफेसरों और स्टूडेंट्स के अन्दर आज जो यह अनुशासन-हीनता चल रही है वह मिर्फ इस वजह से चल रही है। मैंने युनिवर्सिटीज के चप्पे चप्पे को जाकर देखा है और इस खयाल से मैंने युनिवर्सिटीज का सब किया था कि आखिर इस अनुशासनहीनता का कारण क्या है? इसका सबसे बड़ा कारण तो यह है कि लड़के बेरोजगार होते जा रहे हैं। स्वयं मुदालियर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में यह बात लिखी है कि जब बच्चों को विश्वास नहीं रहता कि विश्वविद्यालय से पास करके—वह बाहर निकलेंगे तो उन्हें सबिस मिल जायेगी तब

उनमें बेशक यह अनुशासनहीनता पैदा हो जाती है। इसके विपरीत मैं आपको पतलाऊं कि हमारी रूढ़ी युनिवर्सिटी से लड़के पास होकर निकलते हैं उन्हें साथ साथ नौकरी मिल जाती है क्योंकि वह युनिवर्सिटी केवल भारत देश की ही नहीं अपितु सारे एशिया भर की सबसे बड़ी एक इंजीनियरिंग युनिवर्सिटी है। बड़े से बड़े आदमियों ने उसे देखा है और जो एक दो महापुरुष रह गये हैं वे भी उसको बहुत जल्द देख लेंगे। उस युनिवर्सिटी से, विद्यार्थियों में कैसा अनुशासन होना चाहिए, यह सीखना चाहिए। श्री घनानन्द पाण्डे ने अपनी पत्नी प्रतिभा से वहां राम-राज्य का आदर्श स्थापित किया है।

बनारस हिन्दू युनिवर्सिटी के अन्दर जो आज एक डुएल सिस्टम और गवर्नमेंट चल रहा है, एक पार्टी के लोग हैं जो बीच में जाकर दखल देते हैं। प्रोफेसर का काम है कि वह एकाग्र चित्त होकर वहां पढ़ रहे बच्चों को शिक्षा प्रदान करे और वच्चे उसे एकाग्र मन से ग्रहण करें, उनका कैम्पटर बिल्डिंग और बोडी बिल्डिंग के बारे में सिखलाये, वैसा असली काम न होकर यह बीच में जो यूनियंस आदि खड़ी हो जाती हैं और जिनके द्वारा पार्टियों का प्रचार होता है, यह चीज हमारे अनुशासन को खराब करती है। मैंने आज तक किसी भी यूनियन के प्रसीडेंट को ऐसा नहीं देखा, मैंने सारे देश की युनिवर्सिटीज को देखा, किसी भी यूनियन के जनरल सेक्रेटरी को, चाहे वह किसी भी पार्टी के बेस पर खड़ा हो, मैंने यह नहीं देखा कि उसका स्वास्थ्य सुन्दर हो या आदर्श व चरित्र सुन्दर हो। खोखला सा उसका व्यक्तित्व होता है। किसी तरह रो शीक कर वह बी० ए० या एम० ए० पेट पालने के लिए पास कर लेता है लेकिन इस तरह से देश के निर्माण के लिए जिस तालीम की जरूरत होती है वह तालीम हासिल नहीं हो सकती है। वह तालीम तो तभी हासिल

होगी जब उसे वह धार्मिक विद्या आयेगी ।  
वेद भगवान में कहा गया है :—

“यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मन्येवानु  
पश्यति

सर्वं भूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजिगम्यते ।”

इस अनुशासनहीनता को समाप्त करने  
के लिए हम उन लोगों से मशविरा करें जो कि  
अपनी युनिवर्सिटियों में अनुशासन को  
कायम किये हुए हैं और दूसरे यह कि वहां  
पर हम धार्मिक तालीम देना शुरू करें ।

इसके अलावा कम से कम मेरी यह  
दरवास्त जरूर मानी जाय कि संस्कृत  
एम० ए० में अंग्रजी मीडियम में न रक्खी  
जाय बल्कि एम० ए० में वह संस्कृत की पढ़ाई  
संस्कृत मीडियम में रक्खी जाय ।

श्री ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिषी (सागर) :  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका अत्यन्त आभारी  
हूँ जो आपने मुझे थोड़ा समय अपने कुछ  
विचार प्रकट करने के लिए दिया ।

जहां तक आम तौर पर इस बनारस हिन्दू  
विश्वविद्यालय (संशोधन) बिल का सम्बन्ध  
है मैं उसका स्वागत व समर्थन करता हूँ ।

एक बात तो बार बार सदन में दोहराई  
गई है कि उसके नाम में से यह “हिन्दू” शब्द  
निकाल दिया जाय, इस बात ने मुझे प्रेरित  
किया कि मैं उस सम्बन्ध में अपने भी कुछ  
विचार सदन के सामने रखूँ । यहां इस बात  
पर बहुत जोर दिया गया है कि यह हिन्दू  
और मुस्लिम धर्मवाचक के जो शब्द हैं  
यह युनिवर्सिटी के आगे से अलग कर दिये  
जायें ।

मेरा इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहना है कि क्या  
वस्तु के नाम से ही उस वस्तु के गुणों में फर्क  
आ जाता है ? अब मेरा नाम ज्वाला प्रसाद है

तो क्या मुझे छूने से या मूँझसे बात करने से  
कोई जल जाता है । मैंने तो देखा है कि  
आज इस देश में ऐसी संस्थायें जिनका नाम  
सैकुलरिज्म की सीमा के अन्तर्गत है  
लेकिन उन संस्थाओं के अन्तर्गत जो काम  
हो रहे हैं वे सैकुलरिज्म की परिभाषा से  
बहुत दूर हैं । उन संस्थाओं द्वारा ऐसे काम  
किये जाते हैं ।

13.26 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

जो कि तोड़फोड़ के काम हैं, जो एक व्यक्ति को  
दूसरे व्यक्ति से और समाज के एक अवयव को  
दूसरे अवयव से अलग कर रहे हैं । हकीकत  
यह है कि केवल एक दिखाऊ नाम रख लेने से  
कोई काम नहीं होता है । बुनियादी चीज जो है  
वह काम की बात है । इसलिए मुझे तो लगता  
है कि कोई नुकसान नहीं है इस में कि वह  
बनारस विश्वविद्यालय अगर बनारस हिन्दू  
विश्वविद्यालय बना रहे । मुझे तो यहां तक  
लगता है, कोई बुरी बात न हो अगर वहां पर  
हिन्दू थियोलॉजी का विशेष अध्ययन किया  
जाये । मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अगर वहां हिन्दू  
संस्कृति, हिन्दूधर्म के प्रशिक्षण को विशेष  
व्यवस्था की जाय तो इस देश के लिए हितकर  
बात होगी । मुस्लिम संस्कृति की शिक्षा से  
तास्सुब इस देश में नहीं बढ़ सका है । हिन्दू  
संस्कृति की शिक्षा से और हिन्दू धर्म की  
शिक्षा से भी इस देश में तास्सुब नहीं बढ़  
सकता है । यह हिन्दू धर्म के न जानने के कारण,  
मुस्लिम धर्म के न जानने के कारण, धर्म के  
मूल तत्व को ग्रहण न करने के कारण ही  
नाइतिफ़ाकियां पैदा होती हैं । अगर धर्म के  
तत्वों को ठीक तरीके से समझा जाय, चाहे वह  
हिन्दू धर्म का तत्व हो चाहे मुस्लिम धर्म का  
तत्व हो, तो यह समाज जो इतना टूटा फूटा  
सा दिखाई देता है वह समाज इतना टूटे फूटे,  
नहीं । यह जो मकानों में आग लग जाती है  
और यह जो आदमियों को परेशान किया जाता  
है, एक धर्म वाला दूसरे धर्म वाले को सताता है  
तो क्या यह लोग धार्मिक शिक्षा प्राप्त किये

[श्री ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिषी]

हुए व्यक्ति हैं, क्या यह धर्म को समझने वाले आदमी हैं जोकि इस तरह की बेवकफियां करते हैं ? मेरा यह दावा है कि यह गुंडों की कार्यवाहियां हैं। यह मजहब को न जानने वाले आदमियों की कार्यवाहियां हैं।

संकुलरिज्म को इस देश में बहुत गलत अर्थों में समझ गये हैं। संकुलरिज्म के माने के बारे में मेरी यह निश्चित मान्यता है कि संकुलरिज्म का यह अर्थ नहीं है कि हम धर्म का अध्ययन न करें, धर्म का आचरण न करें। संकुलरिज्म के माने यही हैं कि इस देश का जो शासन है वह इस या उस, किसी एक धर्म के साथ अपना रिश्ता न जोड़ बैठे और इस तरह से एक धर्म के ऊपर किसी दूसरे धर्म को हावी न होने दे। संकुलरिज्म एक धर्म को किसी दूसरे धर्म पर हावी होने की गुंजाइश नहीं देता है। संकुलरिज्म के माने बहुत व्यापक व विराट हैं और उस में हर एक व्यक्ति को अपनी उपासना पद्धति के अनुसार अपने घर में य अपने उपासनागृह में जाकर करने की पूरी सुविधा देना है। एक धर्म का अनुयायी दूसरे धर्म के आदमी के साथ कोई अनाचार न करे।

यह जो इस विश्वविद्यालय के नाम के आग से हिन्दू शब्द को निकाल देने के लिए, यह उसका नाम परिवर्तन की बात मेरे बहुत से नजदीक के दोस्तों ने कही, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस से कोई वास्तविक परिवर्तन नहीं हो सकेगा। अगर तास्सुब की भावना, और संकुचितता का वातावरण नाम में से हिन्दू शब्द निकाल देने के बाद भी वहां पर बनी रहती है तो ऐसी हालत में देश में एकता स्थापित नहीं हो सकती है। बुनियादी चीज जो है वह यह है कि संकुलरिज्म की जो रिपोर्ट है जो एक धर्म के वास्तविक स्वरूप को ग्रहण करने की बात है वह देश की इन शिक्षा संस्थाओं में प्रचारित की जाय। हम अपनी

इन संस्थाओं में यह बतलाये कि हिन्दू धर्म ने तो यह कहा है कि :—

सर्वं खील्वदं ब्रह्म ।

वसुधैवकुटुम्बकम् ।

और वहां जो यह सिखलाया गया है : वहां भेद भाव की बात कहां ?

यह धर्म का मूल तत्व है जो अगर उन संस्थाओं से प्रसारित किया गया होता तो यह तास्सुब की बात पैदा ही न हुई होती। इस देश में फूट की बात पैदा ही न हुई होती।

तो मैं पहली बात जो कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि जो यह नामों को बड़ा महत्व दिया गया है वह केवल एक बाहरी चीज है। इस तरह के परिवर्तन से कोई बड़ा काम नहीं होने वाला है। ज्यादा जरूरी बात तो यह है कि हम वास्तविक धर्म का वातावरण उन संस्थाओं में बनाये। हम शिक्षा पद्धति को ऐसी बनायें जिससे कि वास्तव में धर्म के सत्य पथ पर चलने वाले व्यक्ति इन संस्थाओं के द्वारा तैयार हों।

इस के कांस्टीट्यूशन के मुतालिक यह बात कही गई है कि इस में कोर्ट को बहुत कम अधिकार दिया गया है। यह भी कहा गया है कि नामजद आदमियों की ज्यादा संख्या है। यह भी आरोप लगाया गया कि एक बड़ी पलटन है वाइस चांसलर और फिर प्रोवाइस चांसलर आदि की रहेगी जोकि संस्था पर हावी रहेगी। लेकिन जहां तक मैं समझता हूँ थोड़ा बहुत इधर, उधर युनिवर्सिटीज के कांस्टीट्यूशन में ने भी देखे हैं, करीब करीब ऐसे ही कांस्टीट्यूशन सारी संस्थाओं के हैं। मेरे यहां भी एक युनिवर्सिटी है। थोड़ा सा उस में मुझे भी होने का सुयोग मिला। वहां पर भी करीब करीब ऐसा ही

कांस्टीट्यूशन है। कांस्टीट्यूशन तो एक सहारा मात्र है। असली चीज वह वातावरण है जोकि हम उन संस्थाओं में बनाते हैं और वह वातावरण ही मुख्य वस्तु है। वाइस चांसलर अच्छे हों यह बहुत आवश्यक है। वहाँ पर वे एक स्वच्छ वातावरण का निर्माण करें। उस स्वच्छ वातावरण के अन्दर हम अपने विद्यार्थियों को शिक्षा की तरफ लगायें, ज्ञान की साधना के लिए लगावें जिसके लिए वह वहाँ पर इकट्ठा हुए हैं। इस तरह से हम उन्हें ज्ञान की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रेरित करें और अनप्राणित करें तभी वह अनुशासनहीनता का वातावरण इन संस्थाओं से दूर हो सकता है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रवर समिति इन सब चीजों पर विचार कर के इस बिल को एक ऐसा बिल बनायेगी जो कि एक आदर्श बिल होगा और जोकि इस देश को दूसरे यूनिवर्सिटियों के लिए गैड का काम करेगा। धन्यवाद।

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to all those who have participated in this debate for the various suggestions they have made, and I assure them that all the suggestions will be borne in mind when the Bill goes to the Joint Committee.

I want to assure this House that when we drafted this Bill, we did not intend in any way to interfere with the autonomy of the University, nor did we, in any way, wish to depart from the great ideals which Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya placed before the University when he founded it. On the other hand, our intention was that we should give to this University a constitution which would make it a true temple of learning and scholarship, that all the troubles we have had in the past should disappear and, that the professors and students should dedicate themselves to the cause of learning and scholarship.

Now, one has got to bear in mind the distinction between academic in-

dependence and administration of a university. I agree that in this Bill we have tried to tighten up the administration. After what had happened before 1958, we had to do it; we had to set up a machinery which would make such events impossible. It was a disgrace that the name of a great university like Banaras University should have been dragged into the mud and, therefore, my hon. friends will appreciate the reason why we have tried to tighten the administration of this University. But we have taken care to see that as far as academic independence is concerned, the University will function in an autonomous manner. I am one of those who believe that scholarship cannot flourish unless there is complete academic freedom, and I would be the last person in the world ever to interfere with the autonomy of a university, whether it be a Central University or a State university.

My hon. friend, Shri Banerjee, said that we have not introduced democratic institutions in this Bill. I do not understand what exactly he means. After all, we have got to have certain university institutions or authorities. They are to be elected in a particular way. We have got to have representation for professors and deans of faculties and also certain outside agencies. We cannot have those organs elected by adult suffrage or by democratic processes. It is very difficult to apply the political concept of democracy to the administration of a university.

My hon. friend, Prof. D. C. Sharma, and others have pressed upon me the view that I should delete the word 'Hindu' from the title of the Bill, from the name of the University. I wish to assure this House—and I do not think this House needs any assurance from me—that I am opposed to anything which smacks of communalism or which gives a communal aspect to any institution in our country. I seriously thought about this matter; I have felt that it would lead to unnecessary con-

{Shri M. C. Chagla}

roversy. What matters is not the name of an institution but what goes on inside it.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** That is it.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I assure this House that Banaras University or Aligarh University or any Central University will function as all-India institutions. They are not sectarian institutions. They will not be permitted to be sectarian institutions. But I give another assurance to this House, that if in the Joint Committee a majority takes the view that this word 'Hindu' should be deleted, I will support the amendment. When the matter comes to this House, I will try and see that whips are not issued and a free vote is taken. If the House decides by a majority that the word 'Hindu' should be deleted from the name of the University, I will immediately introduce a Bill to delete the expression 'Muslim' from Aligarh Muslim University. But it depends upon that the majority of this House and the other House feels, because, as I said, if deletion of names will lead to unnecessary controversy, we should not do so. What matters is the spirit which an institution is run; what matters is what is the outlook of an institution, what actually happens in an institution. A name means nothing. This House will remember what the late Prime Minister used to say when his attention used to be drawn to the portraits of Viceroys that are still there in Rashtrapati Bhavan. He said these merely record the march of history; it does not mean that we believe in them or that we subscribe to their policy or that we accept the philosophy for which they were responsible.

Therefore, as I said, names do not have much significance, unless a name creates an atmosphere which is bad for this country.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj):** If I may be permitted to interrupt, it

is the name and form, the two together, which constitute the personality. We cannot exclude either the form or the name. The two together constitute the personality.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** As I said, I agree with my hon. friend, in the sense that I would personally, left to myself, delete both the word 'Hindu' from this University and the word 'Muslim' from the Aligarh Muslim University. But as I said, even now, if the Joint Committee decides on that, I shall support the amendment.

**Shri Krishnapal Singh (Jalesar):** There is some misunderstanding. I think the name denotes that it is a kind of culture on which emphasis is placed in that particular university, not that there is anything communal about it.

**Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool):** It is for the House to decide.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** It is also known that this University is a Central University. It is also known that India believes in a secular philosophy. Undoubtedly in a sense, certain emphasis is placed in Banaras University on Hindu, rather Sanskrit, culture, just as certain emphasis is placed in Aligarh University on Arabic, Persian and Islamic culture. You should have a fusion of the two. I am very anxious that non-Muslim should go to Aligarh, and non-Hindus should go to Banaras University.

**Shri Yashpal Singh:** At present, they go.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Yes. Therefore, if this University emphasises an important aspect of our culture, which is Hindu culture or Sanskrit culture, it is as it should be. Somebody said it is the principle of Hindu Dharma, not so much the religion or ritual. It is an important aspect of our life. Similarly, if Aligarh has emphasised certain religious or ritual aspect of Islam, its philosophy, Arabic and Persian culture, it is not a bad thing.

But if the expressions emphasise the communal aspect of the universities, then it is a bad thing. But even to-day, the way the two institutions are being run, I do not think they are communal.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** They are not.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** They are not. Their selection is on an all-India basis. Students from all over India go there, and we see to it that the all-India aspect of the universities is maintained.

**Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma (Khammam):** Then why does he support the idea of deletion of the word?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** That is if the House desires it. Personally, I think there is no occasion for raising this controversy. But if the House feels strongly about it, I will support it.

**श्री योगेन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) :** क्या यह सच है कि किसी खास विश्वविद्यालय का यह विधान है कि किसी खास सम्प्रदाय का आदमी ही उस का वाइस-चांसलर होगा ? क्या माननीय मंत्री इस को कम्प्यूनिटीज्म मानते हैं या नहीं ?

**श्री मु० क० चागला :** मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। मेरा खयाल यह है कि सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज्में अच्छे से अच्छे वाइस-चांसलरज्में नियुक्त होते हैं।

**श्री योगेन्द्र झा :** अच्छे वाइस चांसलरज्में क्या किसी खास कम्प्यूनिटी के ही हो सकते हैं ?

**श्री मु० क० चागला :** सभी कम्प्यूनिटीज्में हैं, सारे इंडुस्तान में हैं।

**श्री योगेन्द्र झा :** किसी खास विश्व-विद्यालय का क्या यह विधान है कि उस

विश्वविद्यालय का वाइस-चांसलर किसी खास कम्प्यूनिटी के ही हो सकता है।

**श्री मु० क० चागला :** कुछ ऐसा नहीं है और ऐसा होना भी नहीं चाहिए। जिस किसी कौम में अच्छा वाइस चांसलर हो, उसको ले लेना चाहिये।

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** His point is whether there is any rule in the university that only a person belonging to a particular community should be appointed its Vice-Chancellor.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** No. I am not aware of any such rule, certainly not in the Central universities.

**Shri Yogendra Jha:** I am told that in the Aligarh University there is a rule that only a Muslim can be a Vice-Chancellor.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** It is not under the Act, as far as I know.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Is there a convention?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** So far it might have happened that only Muslims have been appointed Vice-Chancellors, but there is no law, and there is no reason why, if you can find a non-Muslim who can do very well in that university, he should not be appointed in that university.

**श्री योगेन्द्र झा :** सरकार का कानून नहीं है विश्वविद्यालय का अपना नियम है।

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I do not know about the past, I can only talk about the present and the future, and I assure my hon. friend that as far as I am concerned, I do not—I hope, I do not—try to be influenced by any communal considerations in making any appointments, whether it is the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras University or the Aligarh University.

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

My hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma has also referred to Clause 5 of the Bill, and he says that in that there is no mention about national integration. Some other criticisms have also been offered on this Clause which reads:

“(2) to promote Oriental studies including Vedic, Hindu, Buddhist and Jain studies, to give instruction in Hindu theology and religion and in moral and spiritual values and to impart physical training;”

Perhaps in the Select Committee we might consider redrafting this Clause.

Various Members have asked me why this Bill has been introduced in such a hurry, why I did not wait till the report of the University Model Bill Committee was out. Let us remember that the Banaras University, one of our great universities, is today being administered by a law which was passed to meet with a temporary phase in view of certain events that took place. It was never intended that that should be a permanent Act. That was in 1958. Six years have passed. When I became a Minister, that is about a year ago, I thought that this was an intolerable state of affairs, and I wanted to bring in a permanent measure. I tried to get the report of the University Model Bill Committee. I tried to impress upon them the necessity of letting me have the report as soon as possible, so that I could go to Parliament with this Bill. But the delay was so great that I felt that I could not wait any longer. But I assure you that in introducing this Bill I have been in constant contact with Dr. Kothari, who is the Chairman of that Committee, and I know the thinking of that committee. As far as I know, the Bill which I am placing before you, if it differs at all from the ultimate report, will differ in a very slight measure. I give another assurance to this House. I have already written to Dr. Kothari to let

me have that report as soon as possible, so that I can put it before the Select Committee, so that the Select Committee can amend the Bill in such a way as it likes to bring it in conformity with the report of the University Model Bill Committee. It will also be placed on the Table of the House.

My hon. friend Shri Chaturvedi stated that all the powers were vested in the Vice-Chancellor and the Visitor and that therefore the constitution was not democratic. The Vice-Chancellor is perhaps the most important officer of a university. My friend said: Look at the Vice-Chancellors we are appointing today! I have no control over the universities other than these four universities. I have a voice in the appointment of the Vice-Chancellors of these four universities, and any criticism about my appointments to these four universities is legitimate. I know—I do not want to mention names—that Vice-Chancellors have been appointed to other universities who should never have been appointed, but let us not forget that there are 61 universities in this country which are autonomous, over which I have no control. University is a State subject. Even the Visitor, the President, has no voice in the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor. What is the Union Education Minister to do except bemoan his fate that he cannot control the appointments?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It was a general observation. It does not particularly apply to this.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Unless higher education becomes a concurrent subject, the control that the Centre exercises over universities is very slight. It is only through the University Grants Commission. It is because we pay money to the universities that we have some control. Otherwise, firstly, the university is autonomous; secondly, the State has control over it. It is only when they come to us for grants that we can exercise some kind of control over them.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** Has the hon. Minister thought of deciding the question of making it a concurrent subject before the report of the other committee which he has appointed is received? Does he expect that this proposal regarding making university education a concurrent subject will be decided soon?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** No. I wish it was so. As my hon. friend knows, under the Constitution we have got to get a majority of the States to agree before we can change the Constitution. So far, not even one State has agreed to making higher education concurrent. You know what human feelings are. If you have power, you do not want to give it up. I think, if I might say so, we made a great mistake when, in drafting the Constitution, we made education a State subject. We followed the wrong, bad policy of the British Government. They attached no importance to education. The first subject that they decentralised under diarchy and handed over to the States, provinces as they were then called, was education. What interest had they in education? They wanted clerks and administrators; at the most lawyers and doctors. But today, we look upon education as the finest instrument for integration, for raising a modern nation, for spreading the knowledge of science and technology. Today we realise the handicaps because education is not a Central subject. But there it is. It has been done, and the amendment of the Constitution is not possible, as I said, unless we carry the majority of the States with us. I have no doubt that both this House and the other House would carry an amendment of the Constitution to make higher education a concurrent subject by an overwhelming majority, but that is no good; it has to be ratified by a majority of the States.

Shri Chaturvedi criticised the constitution of the Executive Council and the constitution of the Court. Clause 10 reads:

“(1) The Executive Council shall, subject to the control of the Court, be the executive body of the University and shall have charge of the management and administration of the revenue and property of the University and the conduct of all administrative affairs of the University not otherwise provided for.”

And the constitution of the Executive Committee is at page 26. I think we have tried to make—I will not use the word democratic—as representative as possible. In the Executive council you have the vice-chancellor, the pro-vice-chancellor, three deans by rotation; you have the faculty of arts, faculty of oriental learning and theology and faculty of education in group I, three other faculties in group II and three other faculties in group III, then the dean of students, the chief proctor, the principal of the women's college, two persons neither of whom shall be an employee of any university elected by the Court from amongst its members of whom one shall be a person from outside the State of Uttar Pradesh, four persons nominated by the visitor, one person nominated by the rector and one person nominated by the chancellor. The total comes to 16. If any suggestions are made in the Joint Committee to improve the Constitution, I will have no objection to considering them.

Shri Chaturvedi also spoke about the court; it has been constituted as the supreme authority, as I said in my opening remarks. It is the court that gave trouble on the last occasions. While we have accepted the court as the supreme authority, we have clearly laid down its powers.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It is a deliberate body; it has no functions.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I would not say that. It has got the power to lay down broad policy and to review the acts of the executive council. I do not think it is going to be a purely decorative body. If you look at the constitution,

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

there again we have tried to have as many representatives as possible. I think my hon. friend Mr. Dwivedy said that the principle of election was bad and we should have the principle of rotation.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** I did not say so.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** That was my suggestion: I quoted from the Radhakrishnan Commission.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** As far as possible we have accepted the principle of rotation. It is only where that is not possible we have resorted to the principle of election. Look at the constitution of the court. The representatives of departments and colleges, all deans of faculties should be there; heads of teaching departments who are not deans by rotation according to seniority as indicated in the Bill, they will be there; representatives of professors and principals, professors who are not heads of departments by rotation according to seniority, principal of the women's college again by rotation and so on. I agree that election creates parties and groups and canvassing. I have had some experience of the Bombay University; I was the Vice-Chancellor for some time and I think it is a bad principle that university professors and teachers should do electioneering work; rotation is a salutary principle. So, if you look at the constitution, you will find that wherever it is possible we have accepted the principle of rotation. But in certain cases it is not possible. For instance, representation for the graduates is there; we cannot have rotation. There has got to be a graduates' representative; after all the graduates of the university must have a voice in the administration of that university.

**Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Ferozabad):** I myself said so, that election has been eliminated and I welcomed it. It is because of the election that the tribe of teacher-politician is growing.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** So, it is only when it is impossible to have rotation, we have resorted to the principle of election.

It was said that doctorate should not be made cheap. My friend Dr. Mahishi said so; she did not mention the name. I hope she will give me the name in secret a little later so that I can look into this matter. There was also mention of degrees being sold. I entirely agree that the distinction of the honorary doctorate is one which a university should rarely confer and confer after careful consideration. The person who gets it should be a worthy recipient of that honour. To suggest that the universities should not have the power to confer degrees would be a revolutionary step. There is no university in the world that I know of, in UK or USA, which does not confer hon. degrees. But what we want is that these degrees, as I said, should not be given away cheaply, or, according to Dr. Mahishi, sold; or according to my hon. friend there, there should be no blackmarket in these degrees. But how do you bring that about by legislation? You can only bring it about by the university realising its responsibility, the executive council, the vice-chancellor and others should entertain no one unless he has rendered distinguished service to the country, to art in some phase of public activity. The language that we have used in the Act is, I think, unexceptionable. If that purpose has to be carried out, it depends upon the institution which administers the Act. I am sure the hon. Members do not want me to take away from the Banaras University the power to confer hony. degrees.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** There is no harm even if you take it away; you see the way it has been used.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** This will be the first such university, in that case. But why? After all there are distinguished men in India and why should not this

university confer doctorates upon those people? Why should they be deprived of that power?

Two hon. Members, I think, referred to the colleges at Gorakhpur. I have every sympathy for these colleges. But as I said in my opening remarks, this is not an affiliating university; it is a residential university. Two colleges had already been permitted to be affiliated and we do not want to disaffiliate. If we allow these colleges to be disaffiliated from Gorakhpur university and affiliated to the Banaras University, we would have thrown open the door for affiliation of other colleges. We do not want to do so. Banaras University is carrying on a particular experiment in education which is given in certain surroundings, in a residential university where professors and teachers are all in the same campus, where there is constant contact between teachers and students. The whole complexion of the university will change if once we admit that they can affiliate colleges outside the campus.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** Are there any other colleges affiliated?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** There are now two colleges which are already affiliated; it will be too difficult to disaffiliate them.

I think my hon. friend Mr. Dwivedy enquired: why should there be a pro-vice-chancellor? He will find the answer in the Bill itself, on page 18. The pro-vice-chancellor shall assist the vice-chancellor in all matters; when the vice-chancellor by reason of illness or absence for any other cause is unable to exercise the powers and perform the duties of his office, the pro-vice-chancellor shall exercise all the powers and perform all the functions of the vice-chancellor. In the absence of the chancellor, the pro-chancellor and the vice-chancellor, the pro-vice-chancellor shall preside at meetings of the court; he shall be entitled to be present at and to address any meeting

of any authority or body or committee of the university but shall not be entitled to vote thereat unless he is a member of such authority or body or committee. These are the duties and powers of the pro-vice-chancellor. Therefore, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor assists the Vice-Chancellor administratively, and acts in his place when there is a casual vacancy so that he is not merely a dignitary like the Chancellor or the Pro-Chancellor or the Rector.

14 hrs.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Why don't you define the powers of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor in the Act itself, so that he would discharge only those powers which have been conferred upon him? If there is some bifurcation of powers, it might be better. After all, he is a high-salaried person.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** The idea is not to have bifurcation because the scheme is, his office is coterminous with that of the Vice-Chancellor and we do not want any conflict between the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor must be a person in whom the Vice-Chancellor has confidence, and who would help him. I think the administrative work of the Vice-Chancellor is immense. The Banaras Hindu University, with its growing number of students, requires a lot of administration, and really the Pro-Vice-Chancellor is there to assist the Vice-Chancellor and advise him and to act for him when he is not there, and therefore, if you define the duties of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and demarcate the authority of the two officers, far from a harmonious working in the university, it would lead to friction and conflict.

I think one hon. Member said that there were too many officers as defined in clause 7. Let us look at it.

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

First, the Governor of the State of Uttar Pradesh shall be the Rector of the University.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** Let us begin with the Visitor and then count the numbers of dignitaries that has been provided.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** The Visitor is inevitable. He is the President of India. He has been given certain powers. So, he is not merely a dignitary. I think the Visitor interferes rarely but when he does he does to good effect. As is clear from what happened in 1958, if we had no Visitor, no committee would have been appointed and we would not have had the report which resulted in the passing of the ordinance. So, I would not call the Visitor an unnecessary officer. Then, there is the Rector. This is just a courtesy to the State in which the Banaras Hindu University is situated. He has no powers. Then there is the Chancellor. He has no powers except to preside over the court. The Pro-Chancellor acts for the Chancellor so that the real officers are the Vice-Chancellor whom you must have, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, you must have, the Treasurer you must have, the Registrar, you must have; the Deans of Faculties and then the Dean of Students, the Librarian and the Chief Proctor. So, I do not think that we have introduced any bureaucracy or officialdom in this Bill.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Why have you excluded the principals of colleges?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I must confess I am not in a position to give an answer straightaway. There was some reason why they were not looked upon as officers of the university. I will look into it and if there is any lacuna I shall set it right.

**Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella):** Is it because the Mudaliar Committee has inveighed against the concentration

of power in the Principals and pointed out to the misuse and abuse of their position in the university?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** My hon. friend is right. I am very grateful to him; that may be the reason; but I shall look into this.

Then clause 16D deals with protection of officers who act in good faith. May I explain this point especially to the hon. Member who raised this question. Almost every Act gives an indemnity to officers who act in good faith. Otherwise it would be impossible to act in good faith. If an officer was to face litigation because he makes a mistake in acting in good faith, the life of an officer would become impossible. If you look at the clause, it makes it perfectly clear. The attempt is not to save the officers who are guilty of malpractices. The attempt is to give indemnity to officers who act in good faith and while acting in good faith might act erroneously. The clause reads as follows:

"No suit, prosecution or other legal proceeding shall lie against any officer, teacher or other employee of the University for anything in good faith done or intended to be done by him under this Act or the Statutes or the Ordinances or the Regulations."

The key-word is good faith. Then, my hon. friend talked of misappropriation. If one misappropriates, clearly there is no good faith. But suppose he spends the money which is beyond the budget and nothing has gone into his pocket. That is an error. He has detected it because he is acting in good faith and he is carrying out his duties. But any act which is *mala fide* would not be protected by this provision.

Then Shri Sharma asked why we do not have a reviewing committee to review all the Central universities. The answer is that we have the University Grants Commission which constantly appoints reviewing committees

to review various departments and faculties of the universities, not only the Central universities but also of the other universities. Therefore, there is a constant check and control over these universities. If a university wants sanction for opening a new department, the University Grants Commission sends a reviewing committee and finds out whether the university is suited for that purpose or not. Personally I do not think any occasion has arisen for the appointment of a reviewing committee to review all the four Central universities.

**Shri Yashpal Singh:** Any reply in respect of the English medium for Sanskrit M.As.?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I shall look into that matter. I shall enquire of the Vice-Chancellor as to why it is that even Sanskrit is taught through the English medium. I was not aware of it. I will certainly look into it.

Then, Shri Gupta enquired as to who are the members of the committee to select the Vice-Chancellor, and he said he could not understand the provisions in the Bill. I should have thought with great respect to him that the provisions are very simple and very clear. Let me turn to page 5 of the Bill. Clause 7D says as follows:

“The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Visitor from a panel of not less than three persons who shall be recommended by a committee consisting of three members:

So, a committee is provided.

“Provided that, if the Visitor does not approve of any of the persons so recommended, he may call for fresh recommendations.”

Then, sub-clause (2) says:

“Two members of the committee shall be persons not connected with the University or college nominated by the Executive Council

and one member shall be a person nominated by the Visitor who shall also appoint one of the three members to be the Chairmen of the committee.”

So, the scheme is simple. You have a committee of three, two appointed by the executive council, and one appointed by the Visitor. These persons or this committee submits a panel of three names to the Visitor and the Visitor appoints a person from this panel. I wish I could find a better method of appointing Vice-Chancellors without sacrificing the autonomy of the universities. It is easy for me to say that I shall nominate without consulting the universities but that would be undemocratic. That would be interfering with the autonomy of the university. Consistently with the autonomy of the university, and consistently with efficiency and consistently with an attempt to get the best men possible, I think this is the only scheme we have found suitable. This is introduced in the Delhi University and I think on the whole it has worked well. We have very good Vice-Chancellors at the Delhi University, as you know, and I am sure that it is possible to get the best men available through this method of appointing Vice-Chancellors.

My hon. friend Shri Sharma also enquired—and it struck me at the moment as rather surprising—as to why power was given to the Banaras Hindu University to borrow money on the security of its assets. He asked, has the Central Government become bankrupt that a Central University should have to borrow money? May I point out this? Both the Visva-Bharati University Act and this University Act contain such a provision. An occasion did arise when this power had to be exercised. I shall give you an instance. The World University Service offered a loan of Rs. 45,000 to the University of Delhi for the construction of a community centre. The loan was interest-free and repayable

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

over a period of 23 years. With the approval of the Central Government, which consulted the UGC in the matter, the Delhi University availed itself of this offer. If there had been no provision in the Act, the Delhi University could not have got this money from the World University Service. This is only an enabling section and I sincerely hope and trust that no occasion will arise when the University will have to go out begging for loans at a high rate of interest. So long as we are there, we will look after the University.

Coming to my friend, Dr. Lohia, to the extent that he indulged in personal abuse, I will say nothing. If the abuse gives him pleasure, I will not deprive him of that pleasure. To the extent that he advanced arguments, it is my duty to meet them. He made a rather surprising statement that the Banaras University had produced no research and was very backward in mathematics. I think he was not fair to the University. He has forgotten that Mr. Narlikar, who has brought such glory to the name of India and whose recent research in physics, mathematics and astronomy has created a great sensation, was a student of Banaras University. He learned mathematics in Banaras.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** His father also was a great mathematician.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Yes; his father also was a professor. Therefore, it is not right to say that our universities are not producing scientists and academicians of eminence. I have invited Mr. Narlikar to come to India and give a series of lectures at Banaras. I hope Dr. Lohia will be there to listen to one of the lectures and admit that the Banaras University can produce great and distinguished scholars.

My friend, Shri Vidyalankar, said that the Banaras University should teach all religions and not merely Hinduism. I agree. I think compara-

tive religion and philosophy is a very important subject in this university and also in the Aligarh University. I think in page 47 there is already a provision for that. If not, we will make the necessary changes. Page 47 deals with the Faculties. It says: "Faculty of Arts—(12) Department of Indian Philosophy and Religion". I take it that that means comparative religion. He also said that there should be a provision for the teaching of all Indian languages. Item 14 is Department of Indian Languages. I think Banaras University is teaching today many Indian languages, just as Delhi University is doing. So, we have got it there.

Many speakers spoke about indiscipline. I am painfully conscious of the growing indiscipline among students. I agree with some of the speakers—I have said it very often publicly—that to my mind indiscipline is a symptom and not the disease. We should diagnose the disease and cure it. I also agree that indiscipline comes from a sense of frustration, from a sense of not belonging, from a sense that there is nothing you can do to improve the lot of society. We must do something to take our students out of this frame of mind. In the first place, you must have authorities in the universities from the Vice-Chancellor downwards, whom the students respect. That is the first cause of indiscipline. If you have a towering personality or even a fine personality, leave alone towering, the students will respect him. If you have professors and teachers who have high academic distinctions and fine character, students will respect them. Apart from that, if you want better academic surroundings and better academic atmosphere for the students, you must make it possible for the students and teachers to have contacts with each other. With the tremendous number of students we have, I am sure many students have no contact with the professors and teachers. That we cannot do by this Bill. You

cannot infuse spirit into an institution by legislation. These are matters that lie outside the Bill. As I said during the discussion on the UGC Reports, the UGC is doing many things in order to change the academic atmosphere.

Finally, to my mind, one of the main reasons for student indiscipline is the fact that students have too much leisure time on their hands—long vacations, hours after the lectures are over when they do not know what to do. I made a suggestion in the Chief Ministers' conference: Give the students something creative to do; let them feel that they created something. Then they would not have this sense of frustration. That again cannot be done by this Bill. I cannot improve discipline by this Bill.

**Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bagaha):** Did you give some concrete suggestion?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** The Chief Minister of Mysore told me, he is very keen on improving the forests and he is going to ask the students to go and sow trees, because there is a great deal of deforestation. He is going to pay the students something per day. I said, it is an excellent idea. You can employ the students. They will feel that they are earning something in their leisure. My friend asks whether I have made any concrete suggestion. India is calling for people to do voluntary work. There is so much of social work to be done; so much work to be done in the villages—sanitation, road-building, etc. If only you can harness the students for these purposes by appealing to their idealism and patriotism, I have no doubt that the students will respond. I do not blame the students. What they need is leadership.

**Shri S. N. Chaturvedi:** We are having youth festivals instead of harnessing their energies for such constructive work.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** If he is referring to the youth festival, that was a great

success. It brought students from different universities together. It made them feel that they belong to one country and are children of one motherland. They mixed with each other. They have debates and dialogues. It is not merely fun all the time; they do serious work also. I myself saw it, apart from the reports I got from the officers and I can give the assurance that it was a very great success. It emphasised the unity and oneness of India, which is a very good thing.

Shri Jadhav said that professors should be appointed on merit and it should be ensured that he has not got a bad past. I assure him, no professor, lecturer or reader is appointed in any university without a properly constituted selection committee. The committee has the record of the person concerned—his academic qualifications, etc.—and then he is appointed. What more can we do? How else can you appoint professors and lecturers except through the instrumentality of an independent, impartial selection committee? If the committee goes wrong and indulges in nepotism, it is just bad luck. It is not a committee of one member, but there are at least three members.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** Dissolve that committee then.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** In the Banaras University, you will find, I have proposed that in every selection committee there will be a representative of the Visitor. So far that provision was not there. It was left entirely to the University. I found in some cases—my hon. friend is right—that the selection was not as it should be. But now we will have some control. If we find that things are not as they should be we can take action, because the Visitor has the right to set aside an appointment if he thinks it has not been properly done.

As far as I know, Sir, I have answered most of the points. In conclu-

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

sion, may I again say, you cannot change the academic atmosphere of a university, you cannot infuse into it or instil into it great ideas by legislation. Legislation can only set up a machinery. You want human beings, you want a sense of purpose among the Vice-Chancellors; professors and the teachers to raise a university to a high pedestal. That cannot be done by this Bill or any Bill in the world. Therefore, our hope should be that in this administrative framework which I have tried to put in this Bill we will have the great ideals of this University maintained, the great traditions maintained and that the Banaras University will be one of our best universities as, I think, it already is.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th November, 1964 and communicated to this House on the 27th November, 1964 and resolves that the following 30 members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely:—

Dr. M. S. Aney; Shrimati Renuka Devi Barkataki; Shri A. E. T. Barrow; Shri Bhakt Darshan; Shri Yudhvir Singh Chaudhary; Dr. Panjabrao S. Deshmukh; Shri Madhavrao Laxmanrao Jadhav; Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar; Shri Harekrushna Mahatab; Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra; Shrimati Savitri Nigam; Shri Tika Ram Paliwal; Shri Sarjoo Pandey; Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel; Shri S. B. Patil; Shri P. S. Nattaraja Pillai; Shri S. K. Pottekkatt; Shri D. D. Puri; Shri Raghunath Singh;

Shrimati Renuka Ray; Shri Bal Krishna Singh; Shri Krishnapal Singh; Shri Rajdeo Singh; Shri Ramshekhar Prasad Singh; Shri Sinhasan Singh; Shri N. M. R. Subbaraman; Shri Kamal Nath Tiwari; Lt.-Col. Maharajkumar Dr. Vijaya Ananda of Vizianagram; Shri Ram Harkh Yadav; and Shri Ram Sewak Yadav."

*The motion was adopted.*

14.22 hrs.

DEMAND FOR SUPPLEMENTARY  
GRANT (RAILWAYS), 1964-65

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Railways (Shri Sham Nath):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I beg to move the Supplementary Demand for Grant in respect of the Budget (Railways) for 1964-65, under Demand No. 2 (Surveys). I should like to explain at the outset.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Normally speeches are not made when Supplementary Demands are discussed. He can reply at the end. Now, Motion moved:

DEMAND No. 2—MISCELLANEOUS  
RAILWAY EXPENDITURE

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 10,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1965, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Railway Expenditure'."

**Shri Himatsinhji (Kutch):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have said in

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.