

which the Parliament and the Government have undertaken, namely, improving the lot, economic, social and political lot, of multitudes of people who in the past were the neglected community.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Only one question, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. No questions will be allowed. If I allow Shri Banerjee, half a dozen more questions will come.

श्री मौर्य : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सिर्फ एक जानकारी चाहता हूँ। वह बहुत जरूरी है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is an age-long question. It cannot be solved in one day. There will be other occasions. I will now put Shri Sivamurthi Swamy's amendment to the vote. The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

"and is of opinion that the State and Central Governments have utterly failed—

(a) to provide free housing plots or to erect free mud huts as shelter for all those Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes who are homeless,

(b) distribute waste lands and tenancy lands physically with full ownership or right of cultivation without any middle agency,

(c) to form Co-operative Farming Societies among Harijans and Scheduled Tribes within the framework of planning objectives,

(d) to establish cottage and small scale industries to provide means of livelihood for these people,

(e) to educate them generally on State expenditure especially

in higher and technical education,

(f) to provide employment in Government and non-Governmental agencies, and

(g) to improve their general economic and social conditions."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the Twelfth Report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for the year 1962-63, laid on the Table of the House on the 24th November, 1964".

The motion was adopted.

13.43 hrs.

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): I beg to move:

"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. S. T. Barrow; Shri Bhakt Darshan; Shri Yudhvair Singh Chaudhary; Dr. Panjabrao S. Deshmukh; Shri Madhavrao Laxmanrao Jadhav; Shri Gauri Shanker Kakkar; Shri Harekrushna Mahatab; Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra; Shrimati Savitri

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

Nigam; Shri Tika Ram Paliwal; Shri Sarjoo Pandey; Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel; Shri S. B. Patil; Shri P. S. Nataraja Pillai; Shri S. K. Pattekkatt; Shri D. D. Puri; Shri Raghunath Singh; Shrimati Renuka Ray; Shri Bal Krishna Singh; Shri Krishnapal Singh; Shri Rajdeo Singh, Shri Ramshekhhar 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."

I propose to be very brief in moving this Motion for consideration. As the Bill is going to the Joint Committee, all the details will be thrashed out there, and I will just point out the salient features of the Bill which I am piloting.

May I just give a little bit of the background? The House will remember that for many years the conditions in the Banaras University were very disturbed and the university was not at all functioning properly. Things reached such a pass that the President as the Visitor of the university was compelled to appoint an enquiry committee. He appointed an enquiry committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Mudaliar, the Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University. This committee submitted its report in April, 1958. This report revealed a very sorry state of affairs in the university. The committee expressed the view that the university had lost its all-India character and could not be regarded as a residential university by any stretch of imagination. The committee had also listed some of the most important causes of the deterioration of the academic life of the university. In order to remedy the state of affairs of the university, the committee had recommended far-reaching changes both in the composition of the university authorities as well as in the methods of recruitment of officers and teachers

at various levels. In view of this, the Government felt that before the new term started on the 9th July, 1958, an ordinance should be promulgated. An ordinance was promulgated to remove from the executive council the pressure groups and to prevent the interference of the court in the administration of the university. The trouble in the university was really caused by the ineffective functioning of the executive council and also the way the court functioned and interfered with the administration of the university. This ordinance was promulgated on the 14th June, 1958. Then the ordinance was enacted by this Parliament on the 20th September, 1958. Under this ordinance and the Bill, the court was deprived of its supreme governing status and was made only an advisory body. Similarly, the executive council was reconstituted, making it a small body consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and seven other persons nominated by the Visitor.

Then, an amending Bill was introduced in May, 1961. It was introduced in this House, but the Bill did not proceed and was allowed to lapse. The present amending Bill is largely based on the Bill that was introduced in 1961. But we have incorporated many changes. I might point out, in order to anticipate a criticism, as to why we have not waited for the report of the Model Acts Committee, which has been set up in the Ministry, of which Dr. Kothari is the Chairman. We have set up a committee in order to advise us as to what is the best legislation that we can have for the different universities. The intention is that this model Bill will be circulated to all the States in the hope that they will bring their own university legislation into line with this model Bill. You might well ask me, if this is my intention, why I have not waited for the report to come in before introducing this Bill. The answer is that in the preparation of the Bill we have had constant collaboration with the University Grants Commission and we

know what the thinking of the committee is on this subject. To a large extent we have incorporated the various suggestions that have come from the University Grants Commission and also from the Banaras University itself.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): When was that model Acts Committee set up?

Shri M. C. Chagla: It was set up some time ago. There have been constant questions in this House as to when the report was expected. I am very sorry for the delay. I really do not understand why committees should take all this time to make reports. But the members of the committee live in different parts of India and dates do not suit them. Meetings are called and adjourned. I was assured by Mr. Kothari yesterday that he is expecting the report of the committee by the end of this month.

This committee was appointed in December, 1961, to be exact. It is a very long delay and I apologise for that. It was long before my time and ever since I became Minister, I have been trying to remind the University Grants Commission.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): You are abolishing committees.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I cannot abolish this committee; it is a very useful committee and I want its report. What is more, I want to implement it. But I assure the House that by the end of this month or at the most by the beginning of next month, we shall get the report and the House will see it.

The main features of the Bill are as follows. The House will bear in mind that when Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya started this university, his main purpose was to make it a residential university. We have tried as far as possible to maintain this important feature of this university. We

have provided that the university should not in future affiliate any college or institution. But we have not de-affiliated colleges which are already affiliated to the university. We have in India affiliating universities. My own university—Bombay University—is an affiliating university. Calcutta and Madras Universities are also affiliating universities. These universities were founded a hundred years ago. At that time, the pattern was that the university should embrace within its ambit as many colleges as possible. But later on, the importance of a residential university where the students live in the campus began to be realised and the Banaras University and the Aligarh University were started with that point of view. Therefore, we have provided in this Bill that there shall be no more affiliation. I do not think all the students in this university reside in the university campus, but large majority of them do and we hope more hostels will be established, so that the Banaras University will become completely residential.

The second important provision is, the Court is proposed to be made the Supreme authority of the University, but its powers are clearly laid down, namely:

- (i) to review from time to time the broad policies and programmes of the University;
- (ii) to suggest general measures for the improvement and development of the University; and
- (iii) to review the acts of other authorities of the University such as the Executive Council and Academic Council except where such authorities have acted in accordance with the powers conferred by or under the Act.

The Court will also consider the annual report, annual accounts and the budget of the University and can approve the budget with or without

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

modifications. Care has, however, been taken to see that the Court will not interfere with the Executive Council in day-to-day administration of the University. If we look at the report of the committee of enquiry—the Mudaliar Committee report—the main trouble in this university was that the Court took upon itself to interfere with the day-to-day administration of the university. No university can function if a large body, with all sorts of interests represented there, interferes with the daily administration of an institution. Therefore, while we have given the status to the Court, we have made it largely advisory. As I said, it will review from time to time the broad policies and programmes of the university. It may lay down policy and the broad programmes, but the day-to-day administration will be left to the Executive Council.

The Court itself is going to be reconstituted. Under the old dispensation, the Court was much too large. Now it will be a compact body consisting of 83 members, 41 of whom will be from the University and the remaining 42 from outside the University, with a view to ensuring the balance between the two elements. It is practically fifty-fifty.

The Reviewing Committee set up under the amending ordinance of 1958 will stand abolished, the work of the committee having been completed. The Reviewing Committee was set up to deal with that particular emergency under that ordinance. Now that we have reached stable conditions, I hope there is no further need of keeping this committee.

The Standing Committee of the Academic Council is also abolished and its functions are being restored to the Academic Council. That committee also was set up for that particular purpose, which no longer exists.

The term of office of the Vice-Chancellor is at present six years and

he is not eligible for reappointment. It is now proposed to reduce the term to 5 years, but he will be eligible for reappointment for a second term. We have carefully considered the question of the term of the Vice-Chancellor. We feel it should not be too short; otherwise, he cannot leave his mark upon the university. Nor should it be too long. So, we have fixed five years but if he functions well, if he does well by the university, there is no reason why he should not be eligible for reappointment. So, we have made this change in the present Bill.

One important provision we have included is that the Vice-Chancellor will be empowered to expel any student from the university, if such a course, according to his opinion, is necessary for the maintenance of discipline in the university, after observing the principles of natural justice. I have every sympathy for the students; I appreciate their idealism, patriotism, spirit of sacrifice, etc. But as you know, Sir, indiscipline is unfortunately increasing and we must vest the Vice-Chancellor with this important power. But he shall observe the rules of natural justice, which means, he will present the charge to the student, give him an opportunity to show cause and if he is satisfied that the student has been guilty of indiscipline or insubordination, he will be expelled.

The offices of the Provost and Chief Rector have been abolished but there will be a Rector and this office will be held by the Governor of Uttar Pradesh. The Rector is really a sort of symbolic office, an office of status. The Rector has no power, just as the Chancellor has no power, when he is the Governor.

The Treasurer of the University will hereafter be whole-time salaried officer. A great deal of trouble arose, because we had not defined the qualifications of the Treasurer, which we have done in this Bill.

Provision has been made for the University to borrow money with the approval of the Central Government. Opportunity has also been taken to strengthen the provisions relating to arbitration of disputes arising out of contracts between the University and any of its officers and teachers. Instead of officers and teachers rushing to courts of law and having unending litigation, we have made a special provision with regard to arbitration.

14 hrs.

Finally, there is also a provision to ensure the presence of a nominee of the Visitor in every selection Committee charged with the duty of selecting officers of the university. One of the gross abuses which came to light when the enquiry committee made its report was the way selections have been made to professorships, lecturerships etc. In order to ensure that proper people are recruited, that no nepotism is shown, we have provided that the Visitor as the President will have a right to have his representative in every selection committee.

Sir, there is a substitute motion tabled by an hon. Member.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhakt Darshan): Sir, he has given in writing that he is not moving it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshan-gabad): It is out of order. He is a member of the Joint Committee and therefore he cannot move it under the rules.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Even apart from that, I did not think this was a case where the Bill should be circulated for public opinion. After all, this is a very specialised type of legislation. All the academic authorities have been consulted. We have a Joint Committee of Members many of whom are distinguished educationists. Therefore, they will look into all the provisions.

With these words, Sir, I commend the motion to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House concurs in the recommendations 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 Madhav Laxmanrao Jadhav; Shri Gauri Shanker Kakkar; Shri Harekrushna Mahatab; Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra; Shrimati Savitri Nigam; Shri Tika Ram Paliwal; Shri Sarjoo Pandey; Shri Prushottamdas R. Patel; Shri S. B. Patil; Shri P. S. Nataraja 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."

There is a substitute motion.

Shri Bhakt Darshan: He is not moving it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He has to withdraw it. If he moves, he must resign from the Committee.

Shri Narendra Singh Madhida (Anand): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the Rashtrapathi for visiting the Banaras University as a Visitor in those days; pursuing the matter and taking the necessary steps for improvement. Because of that we had the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Ordinance, the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Act, 1958, and now this Bill in 1964.

I have various suggestions to offer to the hon. Minister and to the Joint Committee. We have the names as Banaras Hindu University and also the Aligarh Muslim University. I think, in our secular state of affairs we should drop the name "Hindu" from this university and "Muslim" from the Aligarh University.

I welcome this Bill for various reasons, because it has introduced some very welcome clauses such as 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 also to impart physical training. It is all very laudable. If all this works out well it will do a lot of good to our country.

I also welcome the appointment of a Vice-Chancellor as a whole-time salaried officer in the University. I have a suggestion to make. When this University functions in a new way, when degrees are conferred on the graduates at convocation they should wear dresses which are suitable to our Indian conditions. We have this European dress of very decorative black robes with green or such stripes and a cap. I think it is good for the European countries, but in India we must change it to suit Indian traditions. In the Vallabh Vidyapeeth at Anand we have Indianised this custom. I suggest that the Joint Committee may take a note of this and prescribe a dress suitable to our Indian way of life.

I know of cases in universities where some lecturers or professors have produced fictitious or false certificates, in regard to their qualifications.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I rise to a point of order. I have no doubt you will agree with me that this interesting debate on an important Bill should not be conducted without a quorum in the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Bell is being rung. The hon. Member may resume his seat.

There is quorum now. The hon. Member may continue his speech.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: Sir, I was drawing your attention to the point, about false certificates produced by some of the professors and lecturers. I know of an instance in a particular university wherein a professor had brought in false certificates and some officials now have been taken to task. It was very awkward to pinpoint that responsibility in that particular university. It seems the blame was thrown upon the appointing Dean. In some matters, I would request the Joint Committee to look into the question of fixing the responsibility, for looking into the certificates of professors or lecturers who are appointed in the university and satisfy whether they are valid or not. If they are proved false, there should be a procedure for responsibility. It should not be thrown to be just tossed about between a Dean and a Registrar.

I want to make a special mention about student indiscipline. The main reason for this measure is student indiscipline in this particular university. We have been seeing student indiscipline all over the country. It is no use blaming the students for it all the time. They are our own children. Of course, they are also partly responsible for it in certain ways, but we have to show them the method whereby they may improve their discipline and

behave in a proper way. For that purpose I desire that this Joint Committee should pay more attention to moral training. Moral training is very necessary in our country. We are fast forgetting the good morals that were introduced by Mahatma Gandhi and also, subsequently, by other leaders. Moral training, which is very important in life, should be brought into this University. And, for making the students follow up a proper way of discipline they should have plenty of recreation and facilities in the sports field. I see that many universities do not take sufficient interest.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Training in moral and spiritual values, not moral training.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I request the Joint Committee to go into the question of training in moral and spiritual values, as suggested by Dr. Aney and also the way of life in the University in which the students are kept engaged in various hobbies, sports and other items of life.

I have also a suggestion to make that politics should be completely debarred from discussions in the universities. Politicians should not be permitted to go to the university and make political speeches. We have such a golden rule in Vallabhvidyanagar, the constituency which I represent. I have not made one single speech in that university; nor do we allow any politician to hold any meeting of a political nature in the university campus so that the professors and students may not take part in it. If such a healthy convention is established in the Banaras Hindu University also, I am quite sure it will have a telling effect on the professors and students of that university.

We must bear in mind that this is a residential university. In a residential university a lot of stress has to be laid on facilities offered to the students. Because, on matters like

supply of poor food, increased messing charges on account of the rise in cost of living, difficulty in obtaining books, the student world gets agitated and they ventilate their feelings in different ways. We must channelise their feelings by having committees consisting of students to look into their grievances. Then they will be in a position to ventilate their grievances in a proper and correct way.

These are my humble suggestions and I am sure the Joint Committee will consider them. I wish the Joint Committee every success. I hope it will come up with a very fine report.

Shri Sumat Prasad (Muzaffarnagar): Sir, this Bill is a welcome measure. The founder of the Banaras Hindu University wanted it to be a model university. Its main features are its all-India and residential character, and the provision of the teaching of a high standard so that it will attract talents from every part of the country. It is a matter of regret that it was dominated by certain groups in the university and even the selection of professors and lecturers was made on the basis of pulls and pressures. Such groups used to exploit the students and thereby indiscipline increased both amongst the teachers as well as the students. Certain students considered it their privilege to secure admission in the university, irrespective of whether they possessed the necessary aptitude to be benefited by the high standard of university education or not. It is a matter of great satisfaction that the President took steps to put an end to this state of affairs. An Ordinance was promulgated, which was subsequently embodied in an Act to stop the deterioration in the situation and to set things right. It is but proper that this Bill has been brought before the House so that a permanent legislation may be passed to ensure health-development of the university.

I do not understand why the Education Minister did not wait for the report of the Model University Committee. He has just now stated that

[Shri Sumat Prasad]

the report of that Committee will be available by the end of December. So, there is still time. I hope the Joint Committee will take advantage of the suggestions to be made in that Report.

The present trouble in various educational institutions and universities is of students' indiscipline. Every day we hear instances of student indiscipline with the result they do not benefit properly from the education received in universities and colleges, and they do not come out as useful citizens. So, more attention should be paid to the development of character. During the time when the country was under the domination of the Britishers, certain *gurukul* type institutions were established where more attention was paid to the development of character and the personality of the student. The provisions of the Bill will go a long way in improving the tone of the university. The development of character will depend mostly upon the atmosphere prevailing in the university and so the improvement of the atmosphere in the university is essential.

An hon. Member has made the suggestion that in our universities, at least in the Banaras Hindu University, there should be common dress which will bear the impress of our mode of living. The students of the university should represent the culture of this great country. I hope it will be looked into. There are provisions for the teaching of theology and moral and spiritual education. I hope it will go a great way in improving the character of the students.

However, much will depend upon the atmosphere which is brought about there. With the provisions in the Bill there will be no chance for any group to dominate in the university. It is a very healthy provision that the Visitor will keep himself in touch with the developments there. The Vice-Chancellor will not be at the mercy of any group; he has been given power even to expel students from the university.

I am told that there are two other colleges there which are affiliated to the Gorakhpur University. The system of education here is certainly much better than the one prevailing in the State university. The Joint Committee may consider if it will be advisable to allow those institutions also to affiliate to this university, if they so desire.

The provisions regarding the constitution of the Court of Director and Executive Committee have got to be considered in greater detail by the Joint Committee.

I think it will give ample opportunity to persons concerned with the university, or those who have experience of its working, to express their views so that the system of administration may be further improved and this university may be able to realise the dreams of its founder. Very prominent persons have been associated with this university. Our worthy President was also its Vice-Chancellor, other eminent persons have been its Vice-Chancellors; but on account of the unhealthy atmosphere there it was not possible for them to continue for long and to improve its tone. It is very gratifying that the Government took measures in time to restore the lost prestige of the University and the Education Minister has come forward with this Bill which aims to ensure its smooth working on a sound basis.

श्री शं० ना० चतुर्वेदी (फ़िरोज़ाबाद) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह दुःख की बात है कि बनारस विश्वविद्यालय में ऐसी स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई कि जिस से सरकार को इस प्रकार का बिल इस सदन के सामने उपस्थित करना पड़ा। इस बिल के द्वारा यूनिवर्सिटी की स्वायत्तता की प्रायः समाप्ति हो गई है और उस में शासन का हस्तक्षेप अधिक हो गया है। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि वहाँ जो स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई, उस की वजह से ऐसा करना लाज़िमी हो गया है।

अगर हमारे शिक्षा के मन्दिर भी राजनीति से दूषित हो जायें और उन में पार्टीबाजी घुस जाये, तो फिर हमारी शिक्षा की क्या स्थिति होगी ? इसी वजह से वहां पर सारी गड़बड़ी हुई, शिक्षा का स्तर गिरा और विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता बढ़ी । यदि शिक्षक विद्यार्थियों में अपने प्रति श्रद्धा का भाव जा त नहीं कर पाता, तो चाहे कैसा भी कानन बन जाये, कितनी भी सक्ती की जाये, यह सम्भव नहीं है कि किसी शिक्षा-संस्था में अनुशासन रह सके । इसीलिए ये सब प्रतिबन्ध लगाने पड़े ।

यह तो हम जानते ही हैं कि हमारी शिक्षा का स्तर गिर रहा है और लोगों में पद की लालसा इतनी बढ़ गई है कि वे अपने कर्तव्य से भी च्युत होने के लिए तैयार हो जाते हैं । दुःख की बात यह है कि पढ़े-लिखे हमारे गुरुजन भी इसी प्रवाह में बह गये हैं । इस प्रवृत्ति का प्रभाव केवल विश्वविद्यालयों तक ही सीमित नहीं है, बल्कि इस का एक परिणाम और भी दृष्टिगोचर होता है । यदि पढ़े-लिखे आदमी एक शिक्षा-संस्था को जनतांत्रिक ढंग से नहीं चला सकते, तो पता नहीं इस देश में जनतंत्र का भविष्य क्या है । इस बिल में हम को करीब-करीब चुनाव को अलाहिदा ही करना पड़ा है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत अच्छा आ है । जितना ज्यादा इस में चुनाव रहता, उतनी ही ज्यादा गड़बड़ी फैलती । इन चुनावों ने ही उस जाति को जन्म दिया है, जिस को हम नीचर पालिटीशन के नाम से पुकारते हैं ।

हम में एक बड़ा भारी दोष यह है कि हम स्पष्ट बात नहीं कहते । जब विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता आती है या शिक्षकों में पार्टीबन्दी का दौर-दौरा होता है, तो हम कहते हैं कि बाहर के लोग इस में आ कर हस्तक्षेप कर रहे हैं । दो रोज पहले जब निर्वसिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमीशन पर बहस हो रही थी, तो एक माननीय सदस्य ने इस

बात पर बहुत जोर दिया कि बाहर के लोग, पालिटीशन्ज, राजनीतिक लोग, शिक्षा-संस्थाओं में हस्तक्षेप न करें । परन्तु उन्होंने एक शब्द भी इस विषय में नहीं कहा कि टीचर्स जो पालिटिक्स में घुस गये हैं और उन्होंने शिक्षा-संस्थाओं का सर्वनाश कर दिया है, उस का क्या इलाज है । यह बीमारी खाली बनारस विश्वविद्यालय में ही नहीं, यह तो अन्य स्थानों में भी फैली हुई है । एक यूनिवर्सिटी के बारे में एक कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में यह लिखा था :

“This is a beehive of intrigue without a trace of scholarship anywhere.”

इस स्थिति में हम कैसे यह आशा कर सकते हैं कि हमारे विश्वविद्यालय देश को भावी सुन्दर नागरिक, देश का नेतृत्व करने वाले दे सकेंगे ? यह तो एक मजबूरी है कि इस तरह का बिल आया और जिन स्थितियों में यह आया, उन को दृष्टि में रखते हुए हमें इस का समर्थन करना पड़ रहा है । लेकिन हमें वास्तव में इस बात का दुःख है कि हम अपनी शिक्षा-संस्थाओं का भी प्रबन्ध सुचारु रूप से, अपने ही द्वारा और जनतांत्रिक ढंग से करने में असफल रहे हैं ।

इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में मुझे दो-चार बातें ही कहनी हैं । गो इस में ऊपर का ढांचा जनतांत्रिक है, लेकिन इस में सर्वोपरि अधिकार विजिटर को दिया गया है और बाकी रोज-मर्रा के काम का अधिकार वाइस-चांसलर के हाथ में दिया गया है । चांसलर, प्रो-चांसलर और रैक्टर तो शोभा के पद हैं । चांसलर को तो शायद एक दफा जा कर कोर्ट की मीटिंग में प्रेसाइड करना है । कमेटीज में नामीनेशन्ज विजिटर के द्वारा होंगे, लेकिन चांसलर को इतना भी अधिकार नहीं दिया गया है कि सिलेक्शन कमेटी आदि एक-आध कमेटी में उस के द्वारा नामीनेशन किया जाता । वाइस-चांसलर के सिलेक्शन के लिए जो कमेटी बनती है, उस में भी उस का कोई अधिकार नहीं है ।

[श्री श० ना० चतुर्वेदी]

रैक्टर की स्थिति भी बिल्कुल वैसी ही है। उस को सिर्फ़ कोर्ट में एक आदमी के नामीनेशन का अधिकार है और इस के अलावा उस के पास और कोई काम नहीं है। पता नहीं इस यूनिवर्सिटी में रैक्टर की पोजीशन क्या होगी ?

वाइस-चांसलर के चयन के लिए इस बिल में यह व्यवस्था की गई है :

"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;

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

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 persons nominated by the Visitor who shall also appoint one of the three members to be the Chairman of the Committee."

इस में दो व्यक्ति एक्सीक्यूटिव कौंसिल के द्वारा नामीनेट किये जायेंगे। बेरा सुझाव यह है कि या तो एक व्यक्ति चांसलर के द्वारा नियुक्त हो, अथवा यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमीशन के चेयरमैन उस कमेटी में रहें। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ज्यादा उपयुक्त होगा।

क्लाज 4 में कहा गया है :

"In section 4 of the principal Act in the proviso, for the words "to those who have consented to receive it", the words "to those who or, in the case of minors, whose parents or guardians have given their consent thereto in writing" shall be substituted."

इस का अर्थ मेरी समझ में नहीं आया है। धार्मिक कक्षा में छात्र स्वेच्छा से जाते हैं। इसलिए इस सम्बन्ध में यह प्रतिबन्ध लगाने की क्या आवश्यकता पड़ गई है कि छात्र या उन के अभिभावक लिख कर दें कि हमारे बच्चे धार्मिक शिक्षा को ग्रहण करेंगे या नहीं? जिन को यह शिकायत हो कि हम को जबर्दस्ती किसी धर्म की शिक्षा दी जाती है, उन की बात सुननी चाहिए। लेकिन पता नहीं कि इतना बड़ा प्रतिबन्ध किस कारण से लगाया गया है कि वे अपनी अनुमति लिख कर दें।

इस में जहाँ यह है कि :

"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".

इसमें कल्चर शब्द और जोड़ दिया जाये। जहाँ हम रिलिजन और थियोलोजी का अध्ययन कर वहाँ कल्चर का शब्द भी इस में आ जाये तो ज्यादा उपयुक्त होगा।

एमरजसी पावर्ज वाइस चांसलर को दी हुई है। उस में लिखा हुआ है :

"If, in the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor, any emergency has arisen which requires immediate action to be taken, the Vice-Chancellor shall take such action as he deems necessary and shall report the same for approval at the next meeting to the authority which, in the ordinary course, would have dealt with the matter:

Provided that, if the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor is not approved by the authority concerned, he may refer the matter to the Visitor, whose decision thereon shall be final".

इस में यह कहीं नहीं आया है कि अगर विज़िटर ने भी उसके ऐक्शन को डिसएप्रूव कर दिया, उस ने भी उसकी स्वीकृति नहीं दी तो क्या स्थिति पैदा होगी। जो उसने ऐक्शन लिया है, उसकी क्या स्थिति हो जायेगी, वह खत्म कर दिया जायेगा या किसी को कम्पेंसेशन दिया जायेगा, क्या उसका किया जायेगा ? यह स्थिति माफ नहीं है। यह भी माफ होनी चाहिये।

जिन लोगों का कन्विकेशन हो जाये मारेल टरपिट्यूड के लिए उन को पांच बरस बाद फिर यूनिवर्सिटी में स्थान दिया जा सकता है, यह इस में लिखा हुआ है। यह शायद जैसे हमारे इलैकशन के कानून में है, उसके अनुसार बनाया गया है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह इस बात पर विचार करें कि क्या जिन लोगों को मारेल टरपिट्यूड के लिए सजा हो चुकी हो, उनको शिक्षा संस्थाओं में फिर से स्थान देना बहुत उपयुक्त है ? क्या प्रभाव उसका विद्यार्थियों पर पड़ेगा यह सोचने की बात है। पार्लिमेंट और असेम्बलियों की जो सदस्यता है वह उससे भिन्न है। विद्यालयों में विद्यार्थियों के ऊपर, नवयुवकों के ऊपर इसका कैसा असर पड़ेगा, यह विचारणीय विषय है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस पर ज्वायंट सिलैक्ट कमेटी अवश्य विचार करेगी।

सिलैकशन कमेटी में जहां वाइस चांसलर है वहां प्रो-वाइस चांसलर को भी स्थान दिया गया है जो कि उसी का नामिनी होता है। ऐसा क्यों किया गया है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया है। मैं समझता हूँ इसके बजाय अगर इस में यह होता कि चांसलर का नामिनी होगा तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता।

डाक्टरेट के सम्बन्ध में मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। हमारे देश में डाक्टरेट बड़ी सस्ती हो गई है। डाक्टरेट का जो वास्तविक आशय था वह यह था कि जिन लोगों ने देश की या राष्ट्र की सेवा में नाम

कमाया हो, विशेष कार्य किया हो या उन में कोई योग्यता विशेष रूप की रही हो, वे ही डाक्टरेट लेने के हकदार समझे जाते थे। इस तरह से कोई लोग अगर डिग्री न ले पाये हों तो उनको डाक्टरेट दे कर सम्मानित किया जाता था। आज यह हो गया कि पद की प्रतिष्ठा होने लगी है और गुण और सेवा को सब लोग भूल गये हैं। यूनिवर्सिटियों द्वारा इस तरीके से डाक्टरेट्स दिये जाने का बड़ा बुरा असर पड़ता है साधारण जनता के मानस के ऊपर और विद्यार्थियों के ऊपर भी। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम शिक्षा संस्थाओं द्वारा कहीं न कहीं तो गुण और सेवा का सम्मान होना चाहिये बजाय इसके कि जो पद पर पहुंच गये हैं, उनका सम्मान किया जाये। गुण और सेवा को प्रोत्साहित करने की आज देश को बड़ी भारी जरूरत है। पद के पीछे पीछे अगर हम घूमते हैं तो उसका हमारे जन जीवन के ऊपर जो दुःप्रभाव पड़ता है, उसका हम अंदाजा नहीं लगा सकते हैं। इसी वजह से हमारे सार्वजनिक जीवन का स्तर भी गिरता जा रहा है। मैं इस पर विशेष जोर दूंगा कि इसका ध्यान रखा जाये कि जो वाकई योग्य हो या जिस ने राष्ट्र और देश की सेवा की हो उसी को यूनिवर्सिटियों द्वारा सम्मानित किया जाये।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस विधेयक के आने से और पास हो जाने से उस विश्व-विद्यालय की जिस की पूज्य मालवीय जी ने स्थापना की थी और जिस का हमारे देश के निर्माण में बड़ा भारी हाथ रहा है, अवस्था में सुधार होगा और यह देश की महती सेवा कर सकेगा।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, I heard the Education Minister carefully when he moved for consideration of this Bill, but I am not convinced as to what was the particular haste to bring this Bill for discussion now, when he himself says that the report of the Model University Committee will be

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedi]

available by the end of this month. I would have appreciated if this particular Bill concerning the Banaras Hindu University was such a model one that probably the report of the Model University Committee would become infructuous after this Bill is adopted and this would be accepted as a model for all universities in this country. That is not so.

As the Education Minister has said, he has taken particular care to get the opinion of the Chairman of the University Grants Commission or the Chairman of that committee. But I do not think that that is enough; because, if a committee is going into this matter it would have been better to wait for the report of the committee, to the collective wisdom which they must have applied to this very question.

They have delayed this matter for six long years, as he himself has admitted. In 1958 it was promised; an assurance was given by the late Prime Minister Nehru that this was a temporary measure and a more comprehensive Bill would be brought forward soon. Six long years have passed since then. In 1961 they introduced a Bill. Even that lapsed. They did not pursue it further. They could have as well waited for a month or till the next session.

I do not therefore see how this particular Bill is going to improve the conditions of the Banaras Hindu University. That is a point for discussion.

As the Education Minister has said, the entire Bill is based on the report of the Mudaliar Committee. Now, I do not know whether he accepts that the Mudaliar Committee report is a full and comprehensive one which deals with all aspects of administration of the Banaras Hindu University, not only administration but also whether it touches upon all other aspects of the problem of education in the University. If one looks to the report

from that point of view, one unhesitatingly comes to the conclusion that this report is not a full report which can be completely relied upon for changing the conditions of the University. The Committee was appointed when the conditions of the University were very bad, disgraceful I would say. But is the Education Minister in a position to tell us that the provisions of the Bill are such as would not give any scope for the recurrence of the very problems that created this trouble in the Banaras Hindu University—group politics, favouritism, nepotism, all that led to this disgraceful atmosphere? I do not think this Bill is a reply to that; there is hardly any such indication in it.

What he has tried to do is that he has completely ignored the lessons of the past. I am sorry to say this. I did not expect Mr. Chagla to agree to become the sponsor of this Bill; because, as I find, instead of creating or helping to create a congenial atmosphere, academic atmosphere, in the University, what he has tried to introduce is a more bureaucratic apparatus to run the administration of the Banaras Hindu University. There is nothing more, nothing less, so far as this Bill is concerned. I do not think that this is a very welcome move, that you would suppress democratic functioning of a University because somebody in some sphere, at some stage, has misbehaved and so you try to introduce a Bill of this sort. If you really believe that the stage has reached in this country because of indiscipline not only amongst students but also in the higher-ups who are always busy with group politics, this politics and that politics, that only a strong administrative officer, an I.A.S. officer, is necessary, then there is no need for any University. Let it then be a department of the Government and it can run like that. But if you really want to maintain the autonomous character of any University and if you really want to foster an academic atmosphere,

then nothing should be done either in the shape of a Bill or by any order or by any other measure to create an atmosphere as if the teachers in this country are nothing and that only the administrators count. Mr. Chagla will be defeating the very purpose for which he boasts to be working in this country to bring honour to the teaching staff, the academic staff, and giving that privileged position in the present society. Having gone through this Bill, I feel compelled to come to this conclusion.

We have the Central Universities, the Delhi University, the Aligarh University, etc. These Universities are being governed, I think under the University Act of 1915. We have two or three amendments here in the Banaras Hindu University Act. The University Grants Commission is there. It is looking after different problems of education in the higher sphere. Now, if the University Grants Commission is there which is vigilant enough, why is it that we are changing the entire character of this University? If you want to put the Central University in a special category, I could understand that. But it is not so. You discriminate between the Delhi University, the Aligarh University and the Banaras Hindu University. I could have welcomed if this discrimination was done away with, as my hon. friend suggested. I fully agree with that. If he had amended the Bill by deleting the word 'Hindu', I would have certainly welcomed this move. The names like the Banaras Hindu University or the Aligarh Muslim University have no place either in the academic atmosphere or in the secular country like ours.

We have seen that for 35 years it has worked well barring a few incidents and these incidents do not happen very often. Sometimes they occur and they are dealt with in a usual manner. It is not that you are always afraid that because this has occurred, this will occur again and so it is

necessary to introduce this measure or that. That is not the way how it should be tackled. In my opinion, the Universities should be self-contained and they should function without any interference of an outside authority. That is the 1st thing which has to be remembered if we really want to achieve something. You must distinguish between administrative and academic atmosphere.

Having said this much—I do not want to make any further general remark—I would now come to the different provisions of this Bill. In my opinion, as I said before, no proper thought has been given to this Bill which is merely based on the recommendations of the Mudaliar Committee. I would like to draw your attention to some of the provisions of the Bill. There is a provision 7(c) in the Bill which provides for a Pro-Chancellor. I do not know what is the function of the Pro-Chancellor. According to me, it is redundant and not necessary at all. Who will appoint this Pro-Chancellor? If the Vice-Chancellor himself is going to appoint him, he is to assist him like a glorified clerk

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): He is all in all.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am told that the University is spending Rs. 3000 per month on this Pro-Chancellor. What are his functions? He has no functions. Whenever the Vice-Chancellor himself is absent and he delegates some powers to him, then only he can do something. Is it necessary that we should have this Pro-Chancellor at all? At the same time, if you look at the powers of the Vice-Chancellor himself, the Vice-Chancellor has been made an autocrat. Wide powers have been given to the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor, being the head of the administration there, should have more powers to deal with the different problems arising in the University. But should these powers be so sweeping as is

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedi]

proposed in this Bill? The Vice-Chancellor has been given powers to discipline the students. That is all right. Then, he is given the powers to dismiss the teachers. I would specially like to draw the attention of the hon. Education Minister and that of the Joint Committee to sub-clauses (3), (4) and (8) of Clause 7E. Sub-clause (3) says that he can delegate his powers in regard to discipline to anybody that he likes, that is, if the Vice-Chancellor wants to create a group of people in the administration, he can delegate this power to anybody and do any mischief he likes. I do not know whether it will encourage the group feeling or it will discourage it.

Then, about students, the Education Minister has repeatedly talked about social justice and that if he takes action, he must give a hearing to the students. So, there is nothing wrong in giving these powers. But about the teachers, he can dismiss the teachers and do anything that he likes and there will be no appeal. Further, if you read another provision 16D with that, it makes really a very strange reading. I do not know whether it has escaped the notice of the Education Minister. The proposed section 16D runs thus:

"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."

So, it would apply not only to the Vice-chancellor but to every employee of the university. Who is going to decide whether a thing was done in good faith or not? What would happen if there is any embezzlement or any irregularity committed by responsible officers in the university? They cannot be questioned according to the provision made in this section.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Embezzlement is not in good faith.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Who will decide that?

Shri M. C. Chagla: The court will decide it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: When you say that anything done in good faith cannot be challenged, *prima facie* somebody has to decide whether it has been done in good faith or not.....

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): Embezzlement is not an act done in good faith.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: So, why should you at all put these restrictions?

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I just clarify one point? If a suit is filed and if the court comes to the conclusion that something was done in good faith, then no suit will lie; if the court comes to the conclusion that it was done in good faith, then there will be no cause for action. Embezzlement cannot be an act done in good faith.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Is it necessary at all to have this provision? If there are any irregularities or if there is anything wrong, would not the ordinary course of law be applicable?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: How much time have I taken so far?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has taken 15 minutes already.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Shall I get only 15 minutes? I thought I would get some more time.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is the sole spokesman of our big group here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: 4 hours have been allotted, and I have got sixteen names in the list before me, and I have to give time to the other Members also.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There must be some method in which you should function so that we may know how much time we shall get. In fifteen minutes, I do not think I have covered a number of points. I have still some points left. If you want I can conclude now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to give some time for the other Members also.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I shall try to be brief.

I think that this sort of provision would give room for arbitrary and high-handed action.

Then, I find that while the term 'officers of the university' has been defined, the librarian and deans of faculties have been held to be officers of the university, but the principals of the colleges and the chief wardens have been scrupulously avoided. Why should that be so? Is it intended that the teachers would have nothing to say in the administration of the university, and if so, why?

Dr. M. S. Aney: No.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I hope that my hon. friend who is on the Joint Committee would look into this matter.

I would also like to draw the attention of the House to another matter about which the Education Minister had made a reference, and that is about the term of office of the vice-chancellor. He has said that the present law provides for six years. Instead of that, the period is now going to be made five years, but at the same time, the person concerned is made eligible for being re-elected. I feel that if at all one is re-elected, ten

years would be a very long period. The previous provision of 6 years was all right. But if Government wanted to make it two terms, instead of making it five years they could have better made it three years, and if the person is really wanted, he might be re-elected for a second term of three years.

I would now like to say a word about the appointment of vice-chancellors. What are the criteria fixed for this purpose? At present, somebody makes a recommendation, and the Visitor makes the selection or some other person does it. But what are the actual criteria adopted for the purpose? I might read out to you the recommendation of the Radhakrishnan Commission, and—I would like to know from the Education Minister whether in appointing vice-chancellors, the criteria laid down by the Radhakrishnan Commission are being followed. Those criteria read as follows:

"The vice-chancellor must command confidence of the teaching staff by both adequate academic reputation and by strength of personality. He must know his university well enough, be able to foster its points of strength and foresee possible points of weakness before they become acute. He must be the keeper of the university's conscience by setting the highest standard of example. All these he must do, and could be done as a constitutional ruler; he is not and should not have autocratic power . . ."

So far as the pro-vice-chancellor is concerned, I could even accept the provision in regard to that office, if it is intended that the vice-chancellor will be an administrator, and the pro-vice-chancellor will be necessarily an academician. If some such division of work is there I could understand it. Otherwise, if the vice-chancellor can be chosen from anybody and everybody, I would submit that the person chosen must conform to the standard

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedi]

laid down by the Radhakrishnan Commission.

Then, there was some reference made by an hon. Member to the question of conferment of degrees, and I would like to associate myself with what he has stated. My hon. friend the Education Minister has stated in this House that he is out to eradicate or eliminate blackmarketing in education. I believe that if he had deleted the provision relating to this matter in this Bill, then he would have added to his credit, because then he would have at least removed blackmarketing in the conferment of doctorate degrees.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It will add another feather to his cap.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It has really become a scandal.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): It is a scandal.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It has added to confusion in this country. So far as I know, in other countries, when one gets a degree like this from any university, he cannot use before the name as "Doctor". I recall that once a friend of mine went to a new place, he became sick and he wanted the assistance of some doctor; he found nearby a board at the entrance to somebody's house saying 'Dr. so-and-so', and immediately he rushed into that house but found to his surprise that the person inside had no medical degree or anything of that sort.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Was it Dr. Govind Das?

Shri Ranga: He is a famous writer. But there are people who are only ordinary graduates and who are able to get these doctorates.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Nobody will quarrel if somebody gets a doctorate degree by writing some thesis or something of that sort. But what

is being done now is that the doctorate degree is conferred on anybody and everybody; I would say that by doing this kind of thing, the universities are only worshipping power. As soon as a person comes to power, he gets a doctorate degree. If you confer a doctorate degree on a statesman, one could understand it. But today, you could hardly distinguish between statesmen and politicians. Today, what happens is that doctorate degrees are conferred on those persons who are in power and who can in some way satisfy a university, without taking into consideration their other qualifications.

Shri Ranga: And many of them are not even graduates.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I hope that the Joint Committee would look into these things. I would also appeal to the Education Minister to apply his mind to the questions that I have raised.

15 hrs.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am glad that the academic quarantine in which the Banaras University had been put is coming to an end. I am also glad that the ordinance, the amending Act, the reviewing committee and the standing committee, which would have been dark blots on the name of any academic institution in any part of the world and which, unfortunately, marred, sullied and blackened the good name of this University, associated with the names of great men like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Dr. Radhakrishnan, my brother Dr. Amarnath Jha and Principal A. K. Dhruva, are going to be things of the past.

But the question is: does this Bill make an improvement on the existing situation? Does this Bill restore Banaras University to that prestige, to that high pedestal on which it had stood at one time? Does the

Bill preserve the unique features of this University? Does it make it really not only a national university—we have so many national universities now; we have so many institutions of national importance . . .

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West): Not so many national universities. How many are there? He says 'so many'.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Does the Bill make this University a University in the real sense of the word 'university', which it was at one time—of international importance and international prestige. People went to Banaras not only to see the temples of Banaras, not only to visit the ghats of Banaras but also to pay their pilgrimage to this University at one time. There is no doubt about it. Does this Bill do anything of the kind? I am afraid the answer to these questions is not very very satisfactory.

Recently, the Chief Ministers of our country met in Delhi, which is the home of all lost causes, and said that they must put an end to communalism. On the very next day, our Education Minister, who I think stands for national integration more than anybody else—I pay my homage to him—the very next day our Education Minister brings forward a Bill which puts the seal of approval on communalism in this country. Communalism in politics can be a pernicious thing; but communalism in academic matters is a poisonous thing. By saying 'Banaras Hindu University' or 'Aligarh Muslim University', or something like that, you are sanctifying communalism; you are putting your seal of approval on communalism.

I know when I was a college teacher in Lahore. I used to read the statements of our great Education Minister, Shri Chagla, and I used to feel happy. Even now I feel happy; he has not changed; he remains a nationalist, pure and simple, a thoroughbred nationalist. But I would have

expected him to bring forward a Bill entitled Banaras University Bill.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): If the House agrees, he would, I think, have no objection to it.

Shri D. C. Sharma: It is a pity he has not done anything of the kind.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): The hon. Prof. Sharma can table an amendment; we will all join hands and support him.

Shri D. C. Sharma: He will support me, but owing to that support, it will be lost in the House.

Shri Nambiar: Then I shall oppose!

Shri D. C. Sharma: He and I are good friends. But what can we do?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He is a leftist in the Congress.

Shri D. C. Sharma: My second point is this. We have our national laboratories. You appoint a reviewing committee for national laboratories. The report of that committee is circulated to the laboratories and the laboratories go on improving under the impact of that report. Some persons from abroad come to review the work done by them; some persons from our own country join hands with them, and that is how it is done. Why is not a reviewing committee set up to review the working of these Central Universities which are consuming the lion's share of the funds for university education in the country? Why don't you have a comprehensive, all-round, all embracing reviewing committee to review their working? Delhi University goes its own way, Banaras University goes its own way, Aligarh University has its own path, Visva-Bharati has chalked out its own course. Of course, I want them to do so. But why should there not be a reviewing committee to show to us why these Central universities are receiving the most-favoured-nation treatment at the

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

hands of the Government of India? This is what ought to have been done.

I know the hon. Minister of Education will see to it that periodically the work of these universities is brought under some scrutiny or review so that you need not have an ordinance when any emergency occurs, you need not pass any amending Bill when any crisis occurs. That is a thing which should be done, that is a thing which is needed.

Now, I want to say one or two things about the Bill itself, its provisions.

Shri S. M. Bauerjee: What about the title?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I come to cl. 5:

"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"—

I do not know how these two things, physical training and training in theology can go together.

Shri Nambiar: Moral and physical training.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Anyhow, the Education Ministry is very wise. I can bring together sometimes incompatible things—there is no doubt about it. But I should have thought that some concession should have been made here to what we call national integration, emotional integration. Something should have been done here to show that it is not going to be a Hindu island in a nationalist India or a Muslim pocket in a nationalist India, but that it is in a way integrated with the rest of India. Unfortunately, that has not been done. I feel very unhappy about it.

Then I come to the new clause 13(b) under clause 5, which reads:

"with the approval of the Central Government, to borrow on the security of the property of the University, money for the purpose of the University;"

Has our Indian Government gone bankrupt, has our Indian Government gone insolvent, that it cannot give enough money to a university like the Banaras University, and that it has to borrow money in order to manage itself on the security of its property? I think this university is not a limited bank, is not a business house, is not a commercial undertaking, is not like the State Corporation in Foodgrains, that it should be able to pledge its property for the sake of managing itself. I think this shows in what commercial spirit this Bill is drafted, in what unacademic spirit this Bill has been brought forth. I think a thing like this should not be there. I do not think this is to be found in any Bill of any university with which I am acquainted, and I think it should not be there here also.

I know of some universities which besides their own departments, have one hundred or two hundred colleges affiliated to them, and even there I do not find so many officers as this residential university is going to have. It is going to have a whole battalion of officers, a whole army of officers, Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, so many officers. What are they meant for? Why can't they take a lesson from a university like the Punjab University or other universities. Do they have so many officers? No. This university is going to be made a paradise for retired people, for people who want to have some kind of service there, and I take strong objection to this large unjustified, inexplicable

multiplication of officers in this university.

I do not know by what law of calculation they have given three years to the Chancellor and five years to the Vice-Chancellor. I think the term should have been the same for all.

Then, the court is saddled with so many duties, but how can the court do all these tasks if it has only one meeting in a year. That is something which I cannot understand, and which, I think, very few academic persons or politicians will be able to understand.

Half the number of members of the court will be from the university, and the other half will come from outside. I know that Banaras is a centre of pilgrimage, but if you want to enable people to have a pilgrimage to Banaras, you can devise other means, instead of making the university a kind of avenue, so that other persons like me or Shri Dwivedy, . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am not interested.

Shri D. C. Sharma: . . . may have a pilgrimage to Banaras as members of the court. I think it is unheard of. The university stands for teachers and I think at least 80 per cent of the teachers should have been on the court.

Then, in the Executive Council there are six nominations. Every officer has been given the right to nominate. I wish the Speaker of the Lok Sabha had also been given the right to nominate.

Shri Nambiar: The Deputy-Speaker also.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think this is unfortunate, that this should not have been done.

Then, I come to the faculties. What are these faculties? I find that these faculties are what you may call old-world faculties. In some ways they

are good, but why should not there be a faculty of yoga. Yoga is a respectable thing in the USSR, in America, in other parts of the world, and in the Banaras University there is no faculty of yoga, and I say this is something which is very objectionable.

Every faculty has branches and departments, but I find that the faculty of fine arts has only one department, namely music.

The Banaras University should be raised not merely in terms of our national prestige, but also in terms of international prestige. Something should be done to restore it, and I wish the University specialises not only in the departments which are already there, but in new branches of departments like physics, chemistry and other things, so that it may become a university in the real sense of the word.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Kedaria. Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): It is a good thing that the Bill has been brought forward after all. From 1958 it has been hanging fire. It is also a good thing that the Bill has been brought by the present Minister of Education.

In the very beginning I should refer to what has already been commented upon by some friends, namely that it would have been better if the Bill had been brought under the nomenclature of Banaras Central University. I think that not only this University but all the Central Universities should have the word "Central" in their name, so that people knew from the name itself that these are universities under the Government of India. They should be called Delhi Central University, Aligarh Central University, etc. Everywhere that should be done.

This University had built up a reputation of an all-India character through what it achieved and through what the

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya]

founder of the university himself did for the intellectual regeneration of India. As I think of him, I feel that his whole spirit and the way he lived his life were such that he was a picture of saintliness, completely fitting in with the atmosphere of the University. If there is trouble in the university today, it is because the university has lost the ideal of its founder, it has lost what the founder himself wanted it to be, the way that he lived his life and the way that he wanted his students to live and the staff to live. That is the ideal that the university has lost. The question is whether by legislation we can restore the university to the ideal which its founder wanted it to be. It is not only a question of legislation, but also of personalities. There is trouble with the students today because they do not find before them an ideal to follow in their academic life; that is why they go astray. That is the problem in the university life itself; persons whom they see before themselves are not representatives of ideals and examples in correct conduct and that is the root cause of student indiscipline. If that could be tackled, the student indiscipline would be solved very easily. I wish that the hon. Minister, when he sees this Bill through, will try to inculcate on the university that it has to live up to the ideals with which it was founded.

Banaras enjoys the reputation of being an all-India centre from time immemorial. Nowhere in India the intellectual supremacy or spiritual achievements of a person were accepted unless they were tested and proved in Banaras. People from the south or north or east or west, who claimed intellectual or spiritual supremacy or spiritual achievements had to come to Banaras to stand the test and to be accepted as all-India authority. That was so with Shri Sankaracharya; that was so with Shri Chaitanya; that was so with everybody. Let the university build up that reputation, fitting in with this tradition that Banaras has been holding in Indian history and Indian

culture. That is what I dream of this University and I hope our present Education Minister will be able to do this so that it can claim to be the living centre of intellectual and spiritual achievements in India. If that is done, the university will succeed.

Having said this, I shall say something about the Bill. Mr. Sharma was speaking before me about the number of officers beginning from the Visitor, Rector, Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor, Vice-chancellor, etc. The university is too much burdened with officers like this and I believe its work will not be facilitated by bringing in all these officers and administrative figures. We are now-a-days appointing whole-time Vice-chancellors. I had the opportunity or the good fortune to see the founder working as a Vice-chancellor and how he did his work in the university. On one occasion I was there in the university when Pandit Malaviyaji was taking rest after meals. There was commotion among the students and they rushed to the residence of the Vice-Chancellor. In a moment, the old man jumped up and got out of the room and faced the students: "what is the matter?" In a moment, the whole thing was solved and the students went away, quietly and peacefully. That was due to the contact that he had with the students, though he was not a whole-time vice-chancellor of the type that we are getting now. I find that the old-time vice-chancellors working part-time did for greater and much better work than what the present full-time vice-chancellors are doing, because their attention is divided and diverted to so many things. When a person is appointed a vice-chancellor, he must devote all his attention to the university and get relieved of his other preoccupations. There has been a recommendation by the Sapru Committee, I believe, that persons who are to be appointed in the University Grants Commission should not be working vice-chancellors they may be retired vice-chancellors, and

not working vice-chancellors as it is done now. That should be the principle, whether he is given one term or a number of terms. When I think of the terms of the vice-chancellors, the example of the vice-chancellor of the Madras University comes to my mind. Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar is now enjoying his 6th term, after the completion of 15 years of vice-chancellorship and over and above his work as vice-chancellor, he is leader of the opposition in the Madras Legislative Council I do not know how it works. I want to impress upon the hon. Education Minister that when a person is appointed as vice-chancellor he should be requested to devote all his time to the students and the university and not allow his time and attention to be diverted in that way.

There is one more thing. The element of elections might be removed from the university as far as possible. That is not my suggestion; that is the recommendation of the Radhakrishnan Commission that elections should be replaced by rotation as far as possible. I do not know whether it is possible in this Bill. Because of the elections the entire time of the holders of offices goes to whip up their party so that they can get another term. If the element of election is reduced, the atmosphere of the university could be cleared much more than it is now. The root cause of much of the troubles that have been reported in the newspapers about universities in U.P., at least about two or three of them, is due to the fact that the holders of offices tried to keep a party so that they may get themselves elected. I may refer in this connection to an old report by Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola who presided over a committee of enquiry on the Aligarh University, that committee came to the conclusion that persons who should have been in the position of servants found themselves masters of the situation: that was so because they could manipulate and manoeuvre to keep the higher officers in their control or threaten them with removal unless they agreed to what

they dictated. That position should be avoided in the university. Persons who are put in position should be assured that they have not to depend upon the accidental support of this group or that group in order to discharge their functions.

The hon. Minister referred to making the court the supreme body or supreme authority. I do not understand what this supreme authority means. I will request him to explain it further, how far it would enjoy supremacy in the matter of conducting the university and how far its supremacy would be limited by other bodies and how far it could determine whether they are functioning properly or not.

There is one more thing which the hon. Minister might examine. I believe that excepting Pandit Malaviyaji and one more, other Vice-Chancellors could not complete their term in the Banaras Hindu University. That is due to some troubles. I am not sure whether my friend, the late Shri Govind Malaviya, did complete his term. At least our President who was the Vice-Chancellor had to come away before he finished his term. Why was it that Vice-Chancellors could not complete their term? That particular feature of the administration and running of the university will have to be tackled and remedied. I suggest that when the Minister has now brought this Bill, he should tackle this particular feature so that in future the university may be conducted in peace.

That is all for the present. I hope the Minister will take into consideration the points made by me.

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस बनारस हिन्दू विश्व-विद्यालय की स्थापना महामना मालवीय जी द्वारा की गई हो उस की ऐसी दुर्दशा हो तो यह एक खेद की ही बात है। उसकी गहराई में जाने के लिए एक कमेटी सरकार ने नियुक्त की और उस की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर यह

[श्री काशी राम गुप्त]

संशोधन विधेयक इस सदन में उपस्थित किया गया है। साधारणतया यह बहुत ही क्षोभ की बात है कि ऐसी पुण्य आत्मा के द्वारा जिस विश्वविद्यालय की स्थापना हुई हो उसमें आगे चल कर इतनी गिरावट आ गई हो। उसके क्या कारण हैं उस और माननीय सदस्य श्री द्विवेदी और श्री डी० सी० शर्मा ने एक इशारा किया कि अगर उसमें से यह "हिन्दू" शब्द हटा दिया जाय तो अच्छा होगा। लेकिन उनको यह नहीं भूल जाना चाहिए कि इस "हिन्दू" शब्द के आधार पर ही इस विश्वविद्यालय की स्थापना हुई थी। जब अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी बनी उसके पश्चात् एक विचार यह हुआ और उस विचार के आधार पर ही यह बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय बना है।

आजकल यह एक प्रकार का फ्रैशन हो गया है कि सैकुलरज्मि के नाम पर "हिन्दू" शब्द को भी साम्प्रदायिकता का नाम दे दिया जाय जो कि मैं समझता हूँ कि उनकी सरासर भूल है। कम से कम, जो सज्जन यह कहना चाहते हैं वह कम से कम अपने नामों के साथमें तो इस बीमारी को दूर करें। कोई शर्मा हैं, कोई दिवेदी हैं तो कोई चतुर्वेदी हैं, जब तक वे लोग अपने अपने नामों में से यह शर्मा, दिवेदी और चतुर्वेदी आदि नहीं हटाते हैं तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि उनको यह बात कहने का अधिकार नहीं है। मैं स्पष्ट कर दूँ कि यह हिन्दू शब्द विश्वविद्यालय के नाम के साथ रखना यह कोई बुराई की बात नहीं है और न ही यह कोई साम्प्रदायिकता है। वास्तव में एक साम्प्रदायिकता के लाने का कारण तो यह अंग्रेजी का शब्द "रिलीजन" है जो कि वहाँ पर लिखा हुआ है। मैं मानता हूँ और मैं क्या स्वयं बापू जी भी यह मानते थे कि हिन्दू के साथ रिलीजन शब्द नहीं होना चाहिए बल्कि रिलीजन की जगह धर्म शब्द वहाँ पर होना चाहिए। कारण धर्म की व्यापकता रिलीजन शब्द से बहुत अधिक है और भिन्न भी है। इसलिए जहाँ जहाँ भी

यह "रिलीजन" शब्द आया है उसकी जगह "धर्म" शब्द आना चाहिए। हो सकता है कि इससे कुछ लोग जो कि धर्म के माने रिलीजन ही समझते होंगे वे इस पर बौखला उठें लेकिन

15.33 hrs.

[SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI in the Chair.]

मैं उन अपने सज्जनों को बतलाना चाहूँगा कि हमारे शास्त्रों में धर्म की जो मर्यादा रक्खी गई है और जो उसकी परिभाषा की गई है उसमें साम्प्रदायिकता लेशमात्र भी नहीं आती है। हिन्दू धर्म का जो मूल आधार है, पुनर्जन्म और मोक्ष, वह ही अन्य मतों में और उनमें भिन्नता ला सकता है। बाकी सारे मजहबों के एक ही हैं और सभी मजहब एक प्रकार के साधन बतलाते हैं। अतः मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जत्र इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर यह बिल बने तो यह देखना चाहिए कि मूल तत्व क्या है जिसकी कि वजह से यह खराबी और गिरावट आई है। मेरे विचार में इस का मूल कारण यह है कि जो हमारे गुरु होते हैं, जो हमारे आचार्य होते हैं, जो अध्यापक होते हैं, उनके लिए जो एक विशेष गुण की आवश्यकता है वह उनमें विद्यमान नहीं रहा है। हमारे अध्यापक देवी-सम्पदा युक्त और सात्विकता से श्रोत प्रोत होने चाहिए। अब यदि दोनों बातें उन में नहीं हैं, चाहे कितने ही विश्वविद्यालय क्यों न बनायें, कितने ही विधान क्यों न बनायें, गिरावट समाप्त नहीं होने वाली है बल्कि ऐसे लोग-जितनी ही विद्या ग्रहण करेंगे उतने ही उनके राक्षस बनने की सम्भावना है। लेकिन यदि उनमें यह गुण है तो वह विद्या उनके लिए आभूषण होगी। दुर्भाग्य यह है कि हमारे देश ने इस कला को खो दिया। जिस समय हम अपने गुरुजनों का चुनाव करते हैं, चयन करते हैं, उस समय इसके बारे में हमारे पास कोई विधि नहीं रह गई है। चुनने की विधि तो है लेकिन उसको उपयोग में लाना चाहिए। लेकिन विश्वास नहीं रह गया है। यदि वह विश्वास होता तो इससे पहले जो कुछ

गुरुकुल बने या डी० ए० वी० कालिज बने, उनमें एक खास बात थी कि ऊंचे से ऊंचा विद्वान् कम से कम वेतन लेने की कोशिश करता था लेकिन आज उसको नालायक माना जाता है यदि वह ऐसा करे। इसलिए जब तक यह परिपाटी बनी रहेगी कि आई० ए० एस० अफसरान की तरह से इन लोगों को, जितना विद्वान् ऊंचा होगा, उतनी ही ज्यादा तनख्वाह देनी आवश्यक है, यह उनके लिए एक आभूषण है, गौरव की बात है तब तक यह गिरावट बराबर चलती रहेगी। आखिर इन विश्व-विद्यालयों में हुआ क्या है? यही हुआ है कि लोगों ने अपने स्वार्थ की पूर्ति के लिए, जब उनको यह विश्वास नहीं रहा कि वे इस योग्य हैं अथवा नहीं तो उन्होंने वहां गुट्ट बनाये और यह गुट्ट बना कर उन विद्यार्थियों का दुरुपयोग किया और उनकी भावनाओं का दुरुपयोग किया, और इस प्रकार से किया कि वे वहां पर जमे रहें। इसलिए हमें यह देखना होगा कि जो कुछ भी परिवर्तन लाया जा रहा है, क्या वह हम को सही दिशा में ले जा रहा है? मैं समझता हूँ कि जब उसके बारे में हम देखेंगे तो पता चलेगा कि यह बहुत नाकाफी है।

पहली बात तो यह है कि पृष्ठ 2 के ऊपर धारा 5 के अन्तर्गत यह लिखा हुआ है :—

“वैदिक, हिन्दू, बुद्धिस्ट एण्ड जैन स्टडीज” मैं नहीं समझता कि यह वैदिक और हिन्दू में यह भेद क्यों किया गया है? मुझे तो कोई ऐसा हिन्दू नजर नहीं आता जो कि वेद को न मानता हो। अलबत्ता बुद्धिस्ट और जैन स्टडीज का भेद इसलिए किया गया है कि उन्होंने वेदों को मानना छोड़ दिया अन्यथा मूल सिद्धान्त के अनुसार वैदिक स्टडी हिन्दू के अन्तर्गत आती है क्योंकि पुनर्जन्म और मोक्ष में उनका विश्वास है। इसलिए इस प्रकार की परिभाषा करना कि वैदिक स्टडी अलग है और हिन्दू स्टडी अलग है यह एक मलत बात है।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं प्रवर समिति के सदस्यों से यह भी निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस बिल की शब्दावली के ऊपर विशेष रूप से ध्यान दें। इस प्रकार से शब्दों को केवल धर, उधर जोड़ देने से कोई काम नहीं चलता है। है। वैदिक और हिन्दू का एक ही मतलब होता है और यह वैदिक और हिन्दू अलहदा वस्तु नहीं है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि यह अलहदा अलहदा वैदिक शब्द और हिन्दू का शब्द रखना एक बहुत ही गलत बात होगी।

इसी प्रकार से आगे चल कर उन्होंने जो लिखा है “हिन्दू थ्योलाजी एण्ड रिलीजन” वह भी ठीक नहीं है। मैंने कहा कि रिलीजन शब्द की जगह पर धर्म शब्द होना चाहिए।

इसी तरह बिल में अनुशासन बनाये रखने के बारे में जो प्रतिबन्ध लगाया है मैं उससे सहमत हूँ किन्तु उन प्रतिबन्धों के लगाने के साथ साथ कुछ नियम बनाने पड़ेंगे जिन नियमों के आधार पर यह परीक्षण लाभप्रद होगा। देखना यह होगा कि वह लोग अनुशासन के अन्तर्गत किस प्रकार से रहेंगे? उसमें विशेष बातें यह होनी चाहिए कि उनका सादा जीवन हो, सात्विक जीवन हो। उनकी एक आचार संहिता हो जिसका कि असर उनके वहां के विद्यार्थियों पर पड़े और विद्यार्थियों के लिए भी वही एक कठोर और तपस्या का जीवन बिताने के लिए उनके ऊपर एक अच्छा असर डाल सके। अगर यह सब कुछ नहीं हुआ और जो शब्दावली इसमें रखी है बही बनी रही तो वह आपका अनुशासन भी उसी प्रकार का हो जायगी जैसे कि डंडे के जोर से अंग्रेज हुकूमत चलाते थे, उसी तरीके की एक आतंक लोगों के दिमाग में बैठ जायगा। अनुशासन के नाम पर जबकि हम बाइस चांसलर को इतनी बड़ी शक्ति दे रहे हैं तो फिर वह बाइस चांसलर यदि जरा भी गड़बड़ हो तो उससे उसके दुरुपयोग होने की सम्भावना है। इसलिए कुछ निबन्ध विशेष तौर पर बनाने होंगे जिनके कि आधार पर नाप तौल कर यह परीक्षण क होगा।

[श्री काशी राम गुप्त]

इसके साथ ही पृष्ठ 5 के ऊपर वाइस चांसलर के चयन के सम्बन्ध में लिखा हुआ है कि वहां पर तीन आदमियों की एक कमेटी बनेगी। लेकिन उस तीन आदमियों की कमेटी में कौन तीन आदमी होंगे इसके बारे में कुछ भी चर्चा वहां पर नहीं है। मैंने बिल को बहुत ध्यान से पढ़ने की कोशिश की और टटोलने की कोशिश की लेकिन वह वहां पर नहीं मिला। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि मन्त्री महोदय यह बातलायें कि वे तीन आदमी कौन होंगे जिनको कि वह विजिटर महोदय तैनात करेंगे? उसके बारे में जानकारी होनी जरूरी है।

यह जो पांच वर्ष की अवधि दोबाग बढ़ाने की बात है मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत ही गलत बात है। मन्त्री महोदय का कहना तो यह है कि अगर आदमी अच्छा होगा तो उस की सेवा करने का एक अच्छा मौका मिलेगा। लेकिन यह ज्यादा अवधि तक सेवा करने की जो बात कही गयी है किसी विग्रेप परिस्थिति में हो तो बात दूसरी है। उस पांच वर्ष की अवधि बढ़ाने को बिल में रखने के बजाय यदि विजिटर महोदय को यह अधिकार हो कि वह तो वर्ष की अवधि बढ़ा सके तो वह दूसरी बात है। एक वर्ष उसमें लिखा हुआ है, दो वर्ष की अवधि को और बढ़ाने का विजिटर को अधिकार दे दिया जाय लेकिन और आगे बढ़ाने के लिए उसको अधिकार न दिया जाय क्योंकि हमारे देश में जो स्थिति चल रही है उसमें जहां तक एक आदमी जमता है तो उस को अपने निहित स्वार्थ को बनाने की एक अभिलाषा होती है। इसके अलावा जब एक आदमी वृद्धावस्था में हो जाता है तो वह कुछ यह भी सोचता है कि यह पद बहुत ही इज्जत की जगह है इसलिए इस पर मैं ज्यादा से ज्यादा देर तक क्यों न बना रहूँ, भले ही उसकी उसके लिए शक्ति हो अथवा न हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रवर समिति इस बारे में पुनः विचार करेगी।

क्लाज़ 13 में कहा गया है कि "बाई एनी इंडियन प्रिंस आर चीफ" के स्थान पर "बाई एनी रूलर आफ एन इंडियन स्टेट" रख दिया जाये। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अब तो कोई इंडियन स्टेट नहीं रही हैं। उचित शब्द तो "फार्मर इंडियन स्टेट" हो सकते हैं। मन्त्री महोदय को इन शब्दों की ओर ध्यान देना चाहिए। "इंडियन स्टेट" से पहले "फार्मर" शब्द जोड़े बिना काम नहीं चलेगा।

जहां तक कोर्ट का सम्बन्ध है, उसके 83 सदस्यों का चयन किस प्रकार से होगा, इसकी व्यवस्था पृष्ठ 23 पर की गई है। उस में आर्ट्स को बहुत बड़ा स्थान दिया गया है, लेकिन ग्रोरियंटल लर्निंग तथा थियोलोजी के लिए केवल एक स्थान रखा गया है। जिस बनारस विश्वविद्यालय की आधारशिला धर्म और संस्कृति हो, उसमें उनकी फ़ैकल्टी को केवल एक स्थान देना उस विश्वविद्यालय का मज़ाक उड़ाना है। प्रवर समिति को यह सोचना होगा कि महामना मालवीय जी ने जिस विश्वविद्यालय की नींव डाली है, उसकी मूलभूत बातों की रक्षा करने के लिए उनको अधिक स्थान देने चाहिए।

मन्त्री महोदय ने बताया है कि इस मास के अन्त में या अगले मास के पहले सप्ताह में माडल एक्ट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आने वाली है। प्रवर समिति को इस बात का समय और अवसर मिलेगा कि वह इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का उपयोग कर सके। अगर इस बिल और उस कमेटी के माडल एक्ट्स में बहुत फ़र्क होगा, तो हमारा तात्पर्य सिद्ध नहीं होगा। माननीय मंत्री ने यह बिल ला कर ठीक ही किया है। अगर प्रवर समिति माडल एक्ट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का उपयोग कर सकेगी, तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

अन्त में मैं वह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमें इस बारे में भी सोचना होगा

कि इस प्रवर समिति में किस प्रकार की गवाहियां ली जायेंगी और उस में किस प्रकार के लोग बुलाए जायेंगे। इस सम्बन्ध में केवल जाबतेबाज़ी से काम नहीं चलेगा। इस विश्वविद्यालय के मूलभूत आधाराओं की रक्षा करने के लिए हमें इस प्रकार के लोगों को भी बुलाना होगा, जिन का नियमों के अनुसार इस से सम्बन्ध न हो, लेकिन जिन की हैसियत अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय है, क्योंकि केन्द्र इस विश्वविद्यालय को चलायेगा और इस में पुरातनपन की एक छाप होनी चाहिए, इस में एक विशेषता होनी चाहिए। मुझे याद है कि जब जर्मनी में प्रोफ़ेसर मैक्स-मूलर ने वेदों के अनुवाद की बात की, तो दुनिया में एक हलचल मची। यूरोपीयन होते हुए भी उन्होंने उस काम को उठाया। आज जो लोग सैकुलरिज्म के नाम पर धर्म की बात मुन कर नाक भौं सिकोड़ते हैं, उन को सोचना चाहिए कि सैकुलरिज्म तभी सफल हो सकता है, जब हम सही रूप में उस की रक्षा करें, हमारे देश की मूलभूत संस्कृतियों को—चाहे वह संस्कृति हिन्दू हो, बौद्ध हो या इस्लाम की हो—इन विश्व-विद्यालयों के जरिये उचित संरक्षण मिले, उन को फलने-फूलने का मौका मिले। सैकुलरिज्म का मतलब यह नहीं हो सकता है कि हम किसी धर्म के बारे में चर्चा न करें, किसी मजहब के बारे में चर्चा न करें।

साम्प्रदायिकता तो बिल्कुल दूसरी बात है, जिस का उपयोग आजकल कुछ निहित स्वार्थ करते हैं। यदि हिन्दू, मुस्लिम, सिख या बौद्ध के नाम पर साम्प्रदायिकता चलाई जाती है, तो निश्चित रूप से वह हेय और त्याज्य है। किन्तु “हिन्दू” आदि शब्दों से घबराना कि इन शब्दों को उपयोग करने से साम्प्रदायिकता की बीमारी आ जायेगी, यह हमारी बहुत भारी कमजोरी है। हमारी इतनी बड़ी और पुरानी संस्कृति है, जिस

की तमाम दुनिया तारीफ़ करती है। इस के बावजूद हमारी दशा यह है कि हम बाहर कोई असर नहीं डाल सकते। यदि स्वामी विवेकानन्द और स्वामी राममोक्ष बाहर न गए होते, तो आज इस दुनिया में वेदान्त और हिन्दुत्व का कोई नामो-निशान न होता। यदि वे देश से बाहर जा कर हिन्दुत्व और वेदान्त की बात का प्रभाव डाल सकते हैं, तो हमें उन को हटाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, बल्कि उस उन को सही रूप में रखने की आवश्यकता है।

बनारस विश्वविद्यालय के साथ जो “हिन्दू” शब्द लगा हुआ है, वह सार्थक है और वह तब तक सार्थक रहेगा, जब तक हम इस नीति पर चलेंगे, जब तक हम उन विश्वविद्यालयों को सुरक्षित रखेंगे, जिनमें ने यहां के धर्मों को पनपाने और संरक्षण देने का प्रयत्न किया है। हां, यदि केन्द्र सोच-विचार कर के और सब लोगों को बुला कर इस प्रकार के शब्दों को हटाने का निश्चय करे, तो उस पर विचार किया जा सकता है। वह एक गम्भीर प्रश्न है, लेकिन वह इस बिल का विषय नहीं है। इस बिल के आधार पर “हिन्दू” शब्द को हटाना बिल्कुल गलत बात होगी और मैं उस का घोर विरोध करता हूं।

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella):
Sir, I rise to support the motion to refer the Bill to a Joint Committee. The Banaras University, as hon. Members who spoke before me have said, was founded to fulfil a great mission. My hon. friend, Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya, referred to the personality of the Founder of this university, and reminded us that this university was founded by a person who not only reflected the renaissance of Indians, but also played a great role in moulding that renaissance. The university itself has been a symbol of national resurgence, a source of pride and inspiration to the nation. When such a national institution suffers a fall from

(Shri Ravindra Varma)

its pristine glory, suffers a deterioration in its atmosphere, it is something that should cause concern to the whole country.

It is true that this Bill has not come before the House a day too soon. In fact, at the time that the earlier Constitution and statutes of the university were superseded in 1958 as a result of the crisis that developed in the university, this House and the country were told by Government that Government would very soon come before Parliament with a Bill to provide for a permanent reorganisation of the statutes of the university. It can very well be argued that in view of the fact that a committee has been set up to draft a Model University Bill, and an Education Commission has now been appointed, it is quite likely that new ideas would be thrown up, new structures would be envisaged and it might, therefore, be necessary for the Government to come before Parliament again with further suggestions for the modification of the Banaras Hindu University Act. But it is clear that the state of affairs that has been existing in the University since 1958 cannot be prolonged. The present Bill, it has been stated, has been largely modelled on the basis of the recommendations of the Mudaliar Committee. It is well-known that this committee was appointed by the Visitor because of the crisis that developed in the University in 1958. It has been said that "the report of the Committee has been written in anger", and that the Committee has painted an inexact picture of the conditions in the university. It has been said, in fact, that much had been made of what happened in the University in 1958. Sir, when you spoke from the floor of the House, you said that perhaps it might not be wise to think that the kind of conditions that existed in 1958 existed before 1958 or might recur after 1958. Nevertheless it cannot be gain said that the developments of 1958 were not abrupt developments. There had been a steady

deterioration in the conditions in the University even before 1958. And, the crisis that erupted in 1958 was in fact the culmination of many factors which led to the conditions that existed in 1958.

Sir, the Committee which was appointed by the Visitor to go into the conditions in the University presented a report which was in fact, to say the least, a document that should make every lover of the University shudder. It was pointed out in the document that the position of the University had been steadily deteriorating in all aspects of university life and administration; that the pressure and stampede of students from the neighbouring areas had resulted in poor standards of admission in the University; that the concentration of power in the hands of certain members of the staff, especially in Principals, had helped them to acquire and exploit a hold on students and staff; that irregular and injurious practices in the constitution of selection committees and the appointment of teachers had vitiated the atmosphere of the University; that lowering standards in the evaluation of the examinees, nepotism in examinations and lobbying for the appointment of examiners had resulted in a shameful deterioration in the standards in the University; that groups and power politics were rampant among the teachers of the University and that, in the opinion of the Committee politics among teachers was much worse than indiscipline and group politics among students since students formed only a floating population. In fact, it is good to remind the House that the Committee concluded its recommendations by saying: "We regret to have to state that from all the material placed at our disposal, we cannot help feeling it has become a hot-bed of intrigue, nepotism, corruption and even crimes of various description".

It may be said that this was a transitory phase. It may be said that this

report was written in anger. It may be said that this report was written in anguish rather than in anger. But the fact remains that conditions were shameful and unsatisfactory, that this state of affairs was not an abrupt development, that conditions worsened steadily till they led up to the crisis of 1958.

One may differ from the analysis that the Committee made, and hold that group politics and the abuses to which the provisions for elections were put were not really the causes of the malady. One may hold, even if one agrees that the provisions for elections were abused, that the remedy or answer to the abuses to which elections lend themselves is not the abolition of elections; that in an attempt to bathe and clean the baby, one should not throw out the baby with the bath-water. The House and the Joint Committee should certainly consider whether the deterioration in the atmosphere and the standards of the University was a consequence of the provisions for the elected element in the organs of the University; whether the extent of abridgement of the elective element proposed in the Bill is necessary, whether it is desirable; how far the abridgement of the elective element will adversely affect the academic and administrative autonomy of the University; whether, as you yourself said, the statutes that have been proposed for the University will be fool-proof—and it is not enough if they are fool-proof as it has been proved they must also be knave-proof—whether these statutes will effectively preclude the possibility of group politics and guard against the deterioration of the academic atmosphere that led to the grave situation of 1958.

Sir, the Bill, as has been pointed out, is largely based on the recommendations of the Committee. The main objectives are certainly laudable objectives, namely: to preserve the all-India or universal character of the University, to preserve its residential character and to ensure that

the atmosphere necessary and conducive for academic development is maintained in the University. Now, to preserve the all-India character of the University it is very clear that the conditions of admission to the University, the recruitment and promotion of teaching staff, the constitution of the organs of the University and the maintenance of the universality of the appeal and ethos of the University should all be taken into consideration. Sir, a University which cannot guarantee and ensure academic freedom cannot qualify itself to being called a University. But there is a difference between administrative freedom or administrative autonomy, and academic freedom or academic autonomy. A certain degree of administrative freedom is absolutely essential to ensure academic freedom and academic autonomy. I am not sure whether the two words mean the same thing, whether one can come to the conclusion that there can be no academic freedom and no academic autonomy where there is no plenitude of administrative autonomy.

Certainly, there is ground for an apprehension that the plea that the central character of the University, the central appeal of the University should be maintained may lead to a degree of confusion between central control and bureaucratic control. It is one thing to say that the University should be so controlled that its central appeal may remain, and it is another thing to say that bureaucratic control from the Centre is essential to preserve the central appeal of the University.

The Bill proposes to change the composition and powers of many of the organs of the University. There are changes proposed in the manner of appointment of the Vice Chancellor. There are changes proposed to enhance the authority of the Vice Chancellor over the staff and students of the University. There are changes which will give the Vice Chancellor the power to expel students and

(Shri Ravindra Varma)

take disciplinary action on the teachers and other staff in the University. There are proposals to reconstitute the Court and to add to its powers. Originally the Court was an advisory body. It is now proposed to make this body the supreme authority of the University. Even the residuary powers of the University, according to this Bill, will be vested in the Court. The Court will adopt the budget, amend statutes, review the work of the Executive Council and the Academic Council and formulate policy. But, we have been told, it will not have the power to deal with the day to day administration of the University.

In view of the increase in the authority of the Court, the constitution of the Court becomes a very important matter to which the House and the Joint Committee must give attention. What is the change suggested in the composition of the Court? The Court will consist of 83 persons, 41 of whom will be from inside the University. If you have a look at the officers who will total up this number of 41 you will see that they can more or less be described as *ex officio* members of the Court. 41 out of 83 will therefore, be *ex officio* members. The remaining 43 will be from outside; of these 10 will be elected by registered graduates, 3 will be elected by Parliament, 29 will be to represent various interests and will be nominated. I would, therefore, say that the Joint Committee should consider whether the composition of the Court cannot be improved to increase the elected element.

Again, when we come to the clauses that govern the representation of the registered graduates in the Court we find that there is a lot of change that is sought to be introduced. Some of these changes are certainly welcome changes; such as the one that proposes that in view of the fact that the alumni of the University are spread all over India there should be

constituencies and zones to ensure that registered graduates from every part of the country will get representation in the Court. While this is laudable, one is not quite sure whether some other clauses which govern the qualifications for being elected as representatives of the registered graduates are equally desirable. For example, there is a provision which says that no such representative shall be "a member or an employee of any University." "Any" is the word used. It is not confined to the Banaras Hindu University. By this clause you are actually shutting off anyone who has anything to do with any university in India. Anybody who is devoted to the cause of education, normally speaking, will have some kind of association with some university. By the inclusion of this clause the Bill proposes to exclude all such people who are devoted to the cause of education, who are interested in the cause of education, who are engaged in the work of higher education, from becoming members of the Court. The advisability and wisdom of this proposal is something which the Joint Committee should study.

16 hrs.

Then again, when we come to the clauses that relate to the executive council, we find that the powers of the executive council have been increased. In view of the fact that the Standing Committee of the Academic Council is also sought to be abolished by this Bill, the Executive Council will have added weight and authority. Now, what will be the composition of this executive council? Out of 16 members, as my hon. friend, the Member for Gurdaspur, has pointed out, 6 will be nominated and only 2, I suppose will be elected. The elected element in the executive council is being whittled down; the representation of the teachers in the executive council is being whittled down. When there is a standing committee of the Academic Council, the teachers and the staff have some

means of getting their difficulties brought to the notice of the university, as far as the day-to-day administration and the academic work of the University are concerned. Now that becomes problematical.

Sir, there is a provision for the enhancement of the Vice-Chancellors' powers of discipline over the students as well as the staff. I am one of those who believe that the sanctity of the atmosphere of the university should not be sullied by indiscipline, whether it be from the students or from the teachers. But will the Vice-Chancellor exercise these enhanced powers of discipline acting on his own, at his own discretion, or will he do so in consultation with the executive council? Will there be any appeal from any action that he takes for the enforcement of discipline, either to the executive council or to the Visitor? Clause 7-7(c), which refers to the power of the Vice-Chancellor to take action in an emergency, says that there will be a right of appeal, which can be exercised within thirty days by any member of the staff against whom any such action is taken. I wonder why the hon. Minister thought that it was not necessary, or it was undesirable to provide for a right of appeal of a similar kind in the case of action taken by the Vice-Chancellor to enforce discipline during normal times.

While concluding, I also want to make a passing reference, if I may do so, to the fact that the position of the pro Vice-Chancellor is not amply clear in this Bill. It is necessary to clothe him with the unambiguous dignity and authority that he will require if he is to function effectively. There is also an obvious omission, a very glaring omission, about the role that the principals who are the administrative heads of the colleges, have to play as officers of the university. I am sure that these important questions, which cause concern to many Members of the House, will receive due attention from the Joint

Committee. With these words, Sir, I support the motion.

Shri A. N. Vidyalankar (Hoshiarpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, first of all, I find it very difficult to reconcile myself with the denominational character of the university to be created by this Bill. In spite of the pleadings of my hon. friends, Shri Gupta and the previous speaker, I still feel that when we are talking of national integration, in this year 1964-65 it is absolutely unthinkable that our education should be carried on on denominational lines.

This university was founded in 1915, fifty years ago. We are still maintaining the same name and the same traditions. I quite agree with the suggestion made by my hon. friend, Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya, that the name of the university should be changed as Central University of Banaras or something similar to that.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: What about the Aligarh University?

Shri A. N. Vidyalankar: It is strange that my hon. friend, Shri Gupta does not understand my argument. When I say that I am against the introduction of denominational elements in education, can he not understand that I am against not only Hindu denominationalism but I am equally against Muslim denominationalism?

Then, this Bill takes away the democratic character of the institution. As the effective or efficient functioning of an institution depends upon its constitution this Bill has to be examined most carefully from that point of view. The main object of the Bill is to take away the autonomy of the university; the provisions of the Bill are of such a kind that the university is to be given a new type of character.

The hon. Minister has stated that this Bill has been drafted on the lines suggested by the Committee

[Shri A. N. Vidyalankar]

that was set up to draft a Model University Bill. He also stated that it was drafted in consultation with the Chairman of the University Grants Commission. If we are to accept that statement, it means that this Bill gives us an idea of the recommendations that are going to be given by that committee. If the recommendations of that Committee are going to be on the lines of the Bill which has been drafted, I feel that we ought to be spared of those recommendations, because after so many years they would be presenting a delayed report after a month which would be of no use to us in any respect whatsoever.

16.06 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI *in the Chair*]

We are a democratic government. In our country we are building up democratic socialism. How can we build up a democracy without educating our children on how democracy functions? Our children are at such an age when the spirit of democracy should be instilled in their minds. They should be permitted to practise democracy. Democracy cannot be imposed; it cannot be created by an order; it has to be grown; it has to be allowed to grow; it will grow in course of time if we put no obstacles in its way.

What is wrong with our whole system of education? Whether it be in the schools, colleges or universities, if we try to impose a kind of one-man rule or a few-men-rule democracy fails. If we say "all right, concentrate all administrative power in one person or in a small group", we do away with democracy. That is not the remedy to our problem. The remedy is to allow the democratic institutions to allow. We have to introduce more of democracy in our educational institutions. Democracy means creating a sense of responsi-

bility. If your problem is indiscipline among students, why do you not place responsibility on students themselves? Why do you not make them responsible by giving their organisations some functions and making them answerable for their actions? Similarly, give some powers and responsibility to the management, to the colleges and schools. Because, to do away with democratic institutions is not the remedy for failure of democracy anywhere. Therefore, I feel that in introducing in this Bill the system of nomination and to do away with democracy, to take away the powers and make a few persons nominated by the Executive powerful and almost absolute arbiters, the approach is absolutely wrong. I think, this approach specially in the educational sphere should not be tolerated.

Similarly, power has been given to the Vice-Chancellor for the expulsion of students. I do not object to that. After all, discipline is to be maintained and there can be occasions when students are to be punished. But the whole thing is this. You are not dealing here with school children who cannot understand the value of democracy or the value of discipline. You are dealing with students who are in colleges, who are at the university stage. If at the university stage you require such powers to be given and exercised, it means that you have failed in your purpose of education and you have not been able to create that democratic spirit among children. That is the problem and that is because from the very beginning you have not created any system whereby students should take responsibility on their own shoulders. They should manage the things; they should manage the schools and the colleges. More and more responsibility should be thrown on the students collectively. That is the way to create democracy; otherwise, these students who come from the univer-

sities, when they enter life they will fail and our democratic institution will not succeed.

Coming to the purpose of university education at present it is only academic teaching. The building up of the mind, the creation of true ideas and concepts and outlook, the creation of behaviour patterns and an imprint of that university or educational institution on the personality and character of the student are not there. No effort is being made for that. In the whole system that has been set up under this Bill, there is no hint or indication that these purposes are in our mind. In fact we have lost the sense of purpose.

What is the purpose of education? Academic education or learning, bookishness is not our purpose of education. The main purpose is to build up the citizen. How will the citizen be built up? How will a citizen with the sense of democracy and with the sense of purpose, with the enthusiasm for socialistic living, be created? That purpose is lost. It is not there. We just go on finding quack remedies which are applied. I feel, in this Bill also the same thing is there.

No spirit is created among our teachers. Mostly in the universities and in this University also, just as everywhere, among the teachers the same thing is going on. Everyone wants to earn money; everyone wants to collect and amass money, whatever be the means. In the universities also the teachers and professors also do the same thing. They go on writing textbooks. They try to get those textbooks approved. Some people form into groups and textbooks are approved.

These are all teachers who just want to sell their knowledge. That

also can be tolerated; but they just write textbooks and all that.

This University was founded with great ideals and with great aspirations. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya wanted something to be created here. That purpose is lost. Now we are just doing a patch of work. No inspiration is received from the Centre. I think, the Education Minister should have thought of the whole problem of education, the whole concept of education. Keeping that in view he should have come to this House saying, "This is the University which was created or founded with great ideals; these are the ideals; this is the purpose of education and, therefore, we are giving this a new shape and a new form". This ought to have been the thing.

In the earlier Act there was the mention of the moral training. In this Bill, somewhere in the earlier provisions, the 'moral training' is proposed to be omitted. I do not know why moral training cannot form part of the education. I do not take morality in the narrow sense. There is the social morality and social morality is the thing which is very much needed and that training is necessary. The character training the moral training, is part of the education and that must be there.

Then, I also find Hindu religion is mentioned. If only Hindu religion had been mentioned, I would have thought that Hindu religion included many other religions, Jainism, Buddhism, etc. But here Jainism and Buddhism are also separately included. If these are mentioned, why not Sikh religion also be included? That is also part of our religion. As I said earlier, if the University is to teach religion and theology, I feel it should include all kinds of religions, say, Islam, Christianity etc. A narrow interpretation should not be given.

Similarly, I find so many faculties have been formed. There is the Arts

[Shri A. N. Vidyalkar]

Faculty and many other Faculties. In that list I see the Department of English is there, the Department of Hindi, Sanskrit and Pali is there. The Department of Arabic, Urdu and Persian is also there. We have other languages also in India. Why not have Tamil, Marathi, Gujarati and so on? These languages are also Indian languages. This is a Central University, a kind of national University. Why not include departments of other languages also? All the Indian languages should be taught and the proficiency in those languages should be imparted.

I hope these things will be taken into account by the Joint Committee. I would suggest to the hon. Education Minister that, in fact, he should either radically redraft the whole Bill or he should wait for some time and let him get the report of the Education Commission that he has appointed. Indian education should be given a new purpose, the national purposes and then only we can properly draft a good Bill. In this University, no research is being done. No useful research is being done here. The subject of Indology should be included. I do not know whether good teachers are being produced now. I feel, after the Joint Committee has gone into this Bill, all these improvements will be made.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : सभापति महोदया, मैं कुछ दुविधा में पड़ गया हूँ कि मैं श्री रवीन्द्र वर्मा से अथवा श्री चागला से आरम्भ करूँ। श्री रवीन्द्र वर्मा ने एक मुन्दर शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया, पठन, पाठन का स्वातन्त्र्य। एक तरफ इस का अर्थ है कि अध्यापक स्वतंत्र होने चाहिए अपनी विद्या की खोज करने के लिए। स्वतंत्रता सही मायने में वहीं होती है जहाँ प्रतिभा और योग्यता होती है। दूसरी तरफ इस का अर्थ यह भी है कि विद्यार्थी स्वतंत्र होने चाहिये, पठन, पाठन में।

मैं एक देश की कथा आप को सुनाता हूँ जो इस आधुनिक विश्व में पढ़ाई, लिखाई में अक्सर दुनिया में नम्बर एक रहा है कि वहाँ विद्यार्थी स्वतंत्र है अपने अध्यापक को चुनने के लिए, स्वतंत्र है अपने दर्जे को चुनने के लिए और किस विषय में किस आदमी की सुनेगा; स्वतंत्र है कि विश्व-विद्यालय में पूरे साल भर में केवल दो दिन जाय या ज्यादा जाय। अध्यापक वगैरह कोई भी वहाँ जो होता है एक नई खोज करता रहता है इसलिए विद्यार्थी को लालच हो जाती है। विद्यार्थी पर कोई जबरदस्ती नहीं है लेकिन उसे लालच हो जाती है कि वह अपने अध्यापक की बातों को जा कर सुने। मेरे जैसा आदमी अठारह, उन्नीस, बीस बरस की उम्र में विश्वविद्यालय में शायद साल भर में दो दिन ही जाता था, लेकिन वहाँ के अध्यापक इतने अच्छे थे कि मुझे जबरदस्ती जाना पड़ता था। इसे कहते हैं पठन-पाठन की स्वतंत्रता।

यह मैं इस लिए खास तौर पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज विश्वविद्यालयों और शिक्षा के बारे में जितनी भी बहस होती है, उसमें फ्रिजूल प्रबन्ध, अनुशासन, खर्चा, ऐसी-वैसी वाद्दियात चीजों पर हमारा ध्यान खत्म हो जाता है और इस बुनियादी चीज पर हम नहीं सोचा करते हैं कि विश्वविद्यालय का तात्पर्य क्या है। और इसीलिए मुझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि आज मैं इस विधेयक का सम्पूर्ण विरोध कर रहा हूँ, क्योंकि लोगों की

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : माननीय सदस्य उस देश का नाम बता दें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस देश का नाम जर्मनी रहा है। असल में "ड्यूश्लैंड" है, लेकिन मैं "जर्मनी" इस लिए कह रहा हूँ, क्योंकि अंग्रेजों की मार्फत वह नाम आ गया है।

लोगों और मा वीथ जी के विश्वविद्यालय को इस विधेयक का तात्पर्य और नतीजा एक ही मालूम पड़ता है कि उसको अफसरों और श्री चागला का विश्वविद्यालय बना दिया जाये। असल में यह दो परम्पराओं का टकराव है। एक तरफ है चापलूसी, खैरख्वाही और व्यवस्था के केवल अमन के अंग की परम्परा, जिसके प्रतीक हैं श्री चागला साहब। और दूसरी तरफ है आजादी की परम्परा, कुछ नये निर्माण की परम्परा, जिसका प्रतीक है 1942 का बनारस विश्वविद्यालय, जिस ने बलिया के जिले को स्वतन्त्र कर दिया था। और बलिया के कलेक्टर को गिरफ्तार किया था। उस परम्परा को चागला साहब बिल्कुल ही नहीं समझ सकते—कोरे हैं। इसीलिए ऐसा विधेयक यहाँ पर आ पाता है। वरना अगर यह लोक सभा इन दो परम्पराओं के टकराव को समझे बैठे, तो फिर व्यवस्था के उस दूसरे अंग—चैन, प्रतिभा और नव-निर्माण पर भी इसका ध्यान जाये, आजादी और विद्या पर भी।

सबसे पहले तो मैं इस विधेयक के उस बड़े खराब काम की तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ, जिसमें नामजदगी और चुनाव को इतना ज्यादा घोल दिया गया है कि यह चुनाव के नाम पर नामजदगी का विश्वविद्यालय हो जायेगा। अभी श्री रवीन्द्र वर्मा ने कहा कि कार्यकारिणी में सोलह में से छः की नामजदगी होगी। वास्तव में अगर ध्यान से देखा जाये, तो कार्यकारिणी में चौदह ऐसे होंगे, जो किसी न किसी रूप में सरकार के आदमी होंगे—नामजद हों, अथवा अध्यापक होने के नाते सरकार के कब्जे में हों, अथवा और किसी तरह से अधीनता में हों। ऐसी सरकारी अधीनता हो जायेगी कि दरबार तक कार्यकारिणी के अलावा सरकार के कब्जे में आ जायेगा।

उपकुलपति कौन होगा ? कहा है कि उपकुलपति का चुनाव होगा, एक कमेटी होगी तीन आदमियों की। कौन होंगे वे तीन आदमी ? एक आदमी होगा, जो कि

कार्यकारिणी की तरफ से रखा जायेगा। कार्यकारिणी के चौदह आदमी सरकार के अधीन रहेंगे। एक आदमी होगा, जो सीधे विज़िटर यानी सरकार का नामजद किया हुआ होगा। ऐसी अवस्था में कहाँ है चुनाव ? यह तो सम्पूर्ण रूप से नामजदगी का सिद्धान्त है, लेकिन चुनाव की चादर उड़ा कर नामजदगी को छिपाया गया है। इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि बनारस विश्व-विद्यालय सरकार का अधीन हो जायेगा—और सरकार का भी केन्द्र रूप है, उत्तर प्रदेश का नहीं या किसी और अंग का नहीं, केन्द्रीय सरकार का अधीन हो जायेगा। और इस लिए विश्वविद्यालयों की स्वायत्तता—जिस सिद्धान्त को अपनाया गया है—बिल्कुल नहीं रह जायेगी। मैं हिन्दुस्तान के सभी विश्वविद्यालयों को सावधान कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह पहला कदम है, जिसको सरकार आजमा रही है और अगर यह सफल हो जाता है, तो सभी विश्वविद्यालयों की स्वायत्तता खत्म कर दी जायेगी, यह बिल्कुल निश्चित बात है।

और आखिर विश्वविद्यालयों की स्वायत्तता क्या है ? विश्वविद्यालय क्या है ? एक राष्ट्र के अन्दर विश्व है। उसको अपना इन्तजाम खुद करना चाहिये। उसमें इतनी स्वतन्त्रता होनी चाहिए कि वह नई विद्या की खोज करे, नया ज्ञान हासिल करे और जो पुरानी विद्या है, उसको अच्छी तरह से उपलब्ध करे। इस तरह की विश्वविद्यालय की स्वायत्तता के होते हुए जो चीज आज हम लोगों के सामने है, वह क्या है ? किस चीज को विश्वविद्यालय में अच्छा समझा जाता है ? इसी बनारस विश्वविद्यालय पर जो कमेटी बिठाई गई थी, मुदलियार रपट जिसने दी, उसमें मैंने कुछ कसौटियां डूढ़ने की कोशिश की। तो सब से बड़ी कसौटी यह बताई गई कि कौन विश्वविद्यालय कितने ज्यादा प्रशासन की सेवा के आदामियों को पास करवाने में सफल होता है। जब मुदलियार रपट में

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

यह कसौटी रख दी गई कि कौन विश्वविद्यालय कितने कलक्टर और कितने डिप्टी कलक्टर बनवाता है, तो मैं आपसे सिर्फ यह कह सकता हूँ कि उस रपट को तो बिल्कुल दिया सिलाई लगा कर जला देना चाहिए। विश्वविद्यालय के मतलब ये नहीं होते कि कितने पैसे खर्च करते हो, अथवा कितने किरानी पैदा करते हो, अथवा उस को चापलूसी का केन्द्र कितना बनाते हो। माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री को तो चापलूसी का केन्द्र बड़ा पसन्द आयेगा, क्योंकि उसके जरिये जो कुछ सफलता उन्होंने अपने जीवन में प्राप्त की है, वह यही है। क्या वह इसको अविद्या या अज्ञानहीनता का केन्द्र बनायेंगे ?

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के विश्वविद्यालय सिर्फ अज्ञानहीनता, अविद्या, चापलूसी और साथ साथ केवल किरानी पैदा करने के केन्द्र बन गए हैं। कहां है वह खोज ? कहां है विज्ञान ? कहां है उपलब्ध विद्या का हासिल करना ? आखिर क्यों कोई विश्वविद्यालय में जाता है ? अगर स्वार्थ के हिसाब से देखा जाये, तो वह जीवन में तरक्की करना चाहता है। अगर देश के हिसाब से देखा जाये, तो हिन्दुस्तान जैसा पुराना देश कुछ आधुनिक हो, उस में कुछ हुनर हो, पेशे का हुनर, इंजीनियरिंग का हुनर अथवा वकालत का हुनर, कोई न कोई हुनर होना चाहिए। और इस हुनर के मतलब हैं कि अब तक दुनिया में जो विद्या है, उसको अच्छी तरह से पढ़ कर हासिल करना। लेकिन उसके बाद झट से दूसरा कदम आ जाता है। अब तक की विद्या के साथ साथ नई विद्या की खोज करना, उसके पीछे लगना। मैं आपको केवल एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। आज के संसार के लिए सफलता की दृष्टि से भी और शक्ति की दृष्टि से भी गणित सबसे बड़ा विषय है। मैं समझता हूँ कि गणित में हिन्दुस्तान बिल्कुल सिकर है, हर एक विश्वविद्यालय सिकर है। कहीं कुछ है ही नहीं।

अगर कोई पुराने ग्रन्थ का ज्ञान है, तो वह भी किसी हद तक पंचांग देखने तक रह जाता है और कहां रूस और अमरीका वाले तो चन्द्रमा तक अपना वायुयान भेज रहे हैं।

अगर सच पूछा जाये, तो यहां के विश्वविद्यालय एक तरह की अजीब अविद्या के केन्द्र बन गये हैं। हुनर के साथ साथ ज्ञान भी हो। मैं एक और गुण को यहां पर नहीं लाना चाहता हूँ। कुछ लोग उस को अद्वैत कहेंगे, कुछ लोग उसको शील कहेंगे, कुछ लोग कहेंगे कि सम्पूर्ण मनुष्य बन जाना। अगर कोई मुझ से पूछे, तो मैं कहूंगा कि आज की दुनिया में वह समता और शील है। अगर हम समझ जाते हैं कि विश्वविद्यालय का असली मतलब है देश को बनाने के लिए, खुद को बनाने के लिए, कोई न कोई पेशे का हुनर और उसके साथ साथ चरित्र के संगठन के लिए अथवा अपने दिमाग को शान्ति देने के लिए कोई और शील का, समता का सिद्धान्त, तब हम अनुशासनहीनता को समझ सकते हैं।

यहां पर अनुशासनहीनता का बड़ा जिक्र होता है। किसको अनुशासनहीनता ? जिस देश का शिक्षा मंत्री अशिक्षित हो और दिन-रात अपनी शपथ को तोड़ता हो, जिस देश का प्रधान मंत्री पाखंड का निचोड़ हो, उस देश में विद्यार्थियों की अनुशासनहीनता का हमेशा जिक्र करते रहना, आखिर इसके मतलब क्या होते हैं ? आखिर अनुशासनहीनता . . .

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (बलरामपुर) : आन ए प्वायंट आफ आर्डर। यह कहना अनपार्लियामेंटरी है कि "प्रधान मंत्री पाखंड का प्रतीक हो" और इसलिए इसको विहड़ कर लिया जाये।

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: This is absolutely wrong.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मुझे कोई उत्तर देने की जरूरत नहीं है न ? मैं आगे बढ़ता हूँ।

Mr. Chairman: I request the hon. Member not to use such words.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप प्रार्थना करें, मैं भी आप से प्रार्थना करूंगा। लेकिन लोक-सभा को हमें लड़कियों को तहजीब सिखाने का केन्द्र नहीं बनाना चाहिये। यहां पर हम बहस कर रहे हैं बुनियादी चीजों पर।

अब मैं आगे बढ़ता हूँ . . .

Mr. Chairman: I am extremely sorry. Nobody has sought this advice. The only thing I request him not to use such expressions.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदया, अगर आपकी यह इच्छा है कि मैं इस शब्द का इस्तेमाल नहीं कर सकता हूँ और इसके लिए मैं बैठ जाऊँ तब तो बात अलग है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि पाखण्डता का निचोड़ बिल्कुल उचित शब्द है।

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma (Khammam): On a point of order. Apart from the words used being parliamentary or not, there are certain conventions that are followed in this Parliament to prevent the repetition of words used by one side, as happened the other day. So, I request the Chair to control such sort of happenings. Things should not happen at least now.

Mr. Chairman: I have requested not only Dr. Lohia, but Members on both sides not to use such words.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मालूम होता है आज इस लोक सभा . . .

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: If one Member from that side uses certain words, we cannot prevent Members from this side from repeating them.

Mr. Chairman: I have requested him.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी बाई (विकाराबाद) : मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि आनरेबल लड़कियाँ

यहां कौन हैं और सिखाने वाले इनको कौन हैं ? इस तरह के शब्दों का माननीय सदस्य को इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने अभी हिन्दुस्तान का तो कोई जिक्र ही नहीं किया है। केवल इतना ही मैं कह पाया हूँ कि जिस देश के शिक्षा मंत्री अशिक्षित हों . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : बिल्कुल गलत बात है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जिस देश के शिक्षा मंत्री अपनी शपथ को दिन रात भंग करते हों वहां विद्यार्थियों से अनुशासन की उम्मीद करना बिल्कुल मूर्खता है, इतना ही मैं कह पाया था। मुझे आगे बढ़ने ही नहीं दिया गया। मैं हिन्दुस्तान के शिक्षा मंत्री तथा प्रधान मंत्री के लिए कह रहा हूँ। मुझे इस बात का बड़ा अफसोस है कि आज जितनी भी महिलायें हैं सब एक साथ मुझ पर गुस्सा हो गईं। एक एक करके अगर होतीं तो मैं सम्भाल सकता था। एक साथ तो बड़ा मुश्किल हो जाया करता है।

सभापति महोदय : आप हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में तो नहीं कह रहे हैं ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं कैसे नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं आप को याद दिला दूँ कि मेरा वाक्य क्या था

सभापति महोदय : किस देश के बारे में आप बोल रहे हैं ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ऐसे मौकों के ऊपर मैं फिर से आप से अनुरोध करूंगा कि आप लोक सभा के सदस्यों को थोड़ा नियंत्रण में रखें। जरा वे सभ्य समझ कर टोका करें।

Mr. Chairman: I wish to interrupt at this point to say that he should not

(Mr. Chairman)

advise the Chair in that way, because it is the duty of the Chair to look to all these things.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं सलाह नहीं दे रहा हूँ, अनुरोध कर रहा हूँ। अनुरोध का कुछ और मतलब होता है।

Mr. Chairman: Therefore, even though the words may not be unparliamentary, I request all the Members not to use such words. They should use decent words. I request him to conclude his speech now.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : दो बातें आपने कहीं। मैं उन पर जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। अभी क्या मैं बोल सकता हूँ ?

सभापति महोदय : समय तो खत्म हो गया है लेकिन आप खत्म करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कुछ समय आप दे रही हैं, जिसके लिए बहुत धन्यवाद।

इस तरह का . . . विधेयक क्यों आपाता है, इस पर भी थोड़ा विचार करना चाहिये। मैंने मुदालियर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के ज्यादातर अंशों को पढ़ा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की बहुत भक्ति है अंग्रेजी भाषा से और बहुत द्वेष है हिन्दी भाषा से, इसीलिये इस तरह का विधेयक आपाता है। इसीलिए बनारस विश्वविद्यालय को तोड़ने का प्रयत्न किया गया है।

उसके अलावा जिस तरह से मुदालियर रिपोर्ट ने उस विश्वविद्यालय को अपने वातावरण से निकाल देना चाहा था वह विश्वविद्यालय कहां है, इसको आप देखें। देहात के बीच में वह है, गरीबी के बीच में वह है, ऐसे इलाके में वह है जहां हजारों में केवल उड़ विद्यार्थी विश्वविद्यालय और कालेज की शिक्षा लेने जाते हैं। किनारे के बड़े बड़े शहरों में और दिल्ली शहर में जो अनुपात है उसको आप देखें तो आप को पता चलेगा

कि हजारों में चार, तीन और सात पर वह जा पड़ता है। यह गरीबी का इलाका है, यह देहात का इलाका है। उसमें जो विश्वविद्यालय बना हुआ था जाहिर है कि वह कुछ क्रान्तिकारी विश्वविद्यालय होता और वह क्रान्तिकारी विश्वविद्यालय होता जा रहा था। लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार जो हमेशा व्यवस्था का केवल, अमन का केवल अर्थ समझा करती है और चैन का अर्थ नहीं समझती है उसी को नागवार गुजरा, नापसन्द आया और उसने इस विश्वविद्यालय को तोड़ना चाहा है। मैं इतना ही कह दूँ कि जहां पर इनकी गरीबी है वहां लोगों की इच्छा होगी कि वे बड़ी तादाद में भरती हों और परीक्षा अच्छी तादाद में पास करें फीस कम हो। ऐसी अवस्था में अगर ऊपर से अंकुश लगा दिया जाता है तो फिर यह विश्वविद्यालय अपना काम-काज नहीं कर पायेगा।

इसके अलावा जो अनुशासनहीनता का दिन-रात जिक्र किया जाता है, उसमें स्वाधी अनुशासनहीनता और परमार्थी अनुशासनहीनता का फर्क जरूर करना पड़ेगा। मैं . . .

सभापति महोदय : अब आप अपना भाषण समाप्त करें।

Dr. M. S. Aney: Madam, I am thankful to you for giving me some time for intervening in this debate. As I am a member of the Joint Committee I will not deal with the points which will be discussed there. I would like to make a few remarks on the general aspects.

This Bill reminds me of those first days when this Banaras Hindu University was started. It was in the year 1905 when the Congress session was held in Banaras when late Gopala Krishna Gokhale was President. It was in that year when Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the founder of this University, first brought out a pamphlet explaining to the whole of India his idea of having a new university

in Banaras at that time. In a big meeting arranged for that purpose he explained those objectives. When his speech was over, the late Surendranath Banerjea got up and spoke and said: I would very much like to be the professor in English in the university that is to come into existence. The late Lokmanya Tilak said: I would very much like to teach the boys of this university mathematics. The idea of that university as placed before the people of India at that time was not only to teach the routine things that are taught in all the universities but to turn out young men who have got faith in India, its culture and traditions of the past, as also faith in the future, to put them on the path of the most advanced countries. That was the idea of those great patriots who had devoted their whole life to build a modern India, and it was because of their efforts that ultimately we succeeded in getting things moved. That was the idea before them. Now, ten years were spent in discussing this question privately and in public and ultimately it was in the year 1915 that this Bill was put before the old Imperial Legislative Council and the University then came into existence.

I find that some of my friends here feel that it was a denominational university founded in the year 1915 and in this year of grace 1964, they feel that this 'Hindu' should go altogether. One can think so if one is guided only by the words. But can you really call it a denominational university at all? I would like to draw the attention of the House to one point.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to section 3(3) of the old Act wherein it is said:

"The University shall be deemed to have been incorporated for the purposes, among others, of making provision for imparting education, literary, artistic and scientific, as well as agricultural, technical, commercial and professional, of furthering the prosecution of ori-

ginal research, and of giving instruction in Hindu theology and religion, and of promoting the study of literature, art, philosophy, history, medicine and science, and of imparting physical and moral training."

Therefore, except one subject, namely, Hindu theology which has been included in the subjects for training, it does not show that the university was a denominational one. An institute or a university becomes denominational when it is intended only for a particular set of persons and a particular part of the population and for a particular religion or a particular sect and so on. But here, you will find from section 4 of the old Act, the following:

"The University shall be open to persons of either sex and of whatever race, creed, caste or class, and it shall not be lawful for the University to adopt or impose in any person any test whatsoever of religious belief or profession in order to entitle him to be admitted therein, as a teacher or student, or to hold any office therein, or to graduate thereat, or to enjoy or exercise any privilege thereof, except in respect of any particular benefaction accepted by the University, where such test is made a condition thereof by any testamentary or other instrument creating such benefaction.

Therefore, my point is this: the university from the very beginning was open to all persons both for learning and training. This broad view or broad-based view was there when the university was started. It may be said that there is provision for teaching Hindu theology. But what is Hindu theology? You will find that all the religions are given there in the relevant section of the old Act also and the word 'Hindu' includes in this context not only Hindus but Buddhists, Jains and Sikhs. Everyone of these faiths is included in the term

[Shri M. S. Aney]

'Hindu'. So, it means that the theology of all these faiths is also included in the course of training.

16.43 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

My point is that Pandit Malaviya was anxious to see to this aspect of the education, and that is, people were getting all sorts of education in those days, in the university, but had practically no grounding whatsoever in the religions in which they were brought up. Therefore, those students were becoming not only non-Hindus but they were becoming more or less persons who had no faith in any religion at all. In order to remove that, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya wanted to make some provision for the boys to have what may be called theology, not in the ordinary sense of ceremonies or rituals but a theology based on eternal religion which is more or less of a common nature with other religious texts also. That was the idea. Without a grounding in religion, the students would have no moorings; though the boys would be learning in different universities, they would be wanting in character, and religion is the one thing that shapes the character. One thing that gives character is to have faith in certain eternal principles which alone would build the students and make them fit citizens. That was the faith that Pandit Malaviya wanted to instil among the students of the university.

The hon. Minister may have his own religion, but I am sure he and most people will agree with me when I say that unless there is faith in certain eternal principles, it is useless to expect that the boys and girls coming out of the universities will turn out as people of character. That is why the proviso to section 4 of the original Act includes the following provision:

"Provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent religious instruction being given

in the manner prescribed by the Ordinances to those who have consented to receive it."

The study of theology was not compulsory upon anybody. It was left open to the boys to have it or not. Now, the amendment that is being made by clause 4 is that in the case of minors, the consent of the parents or guardians is necessary for religious instruction to be given to the students. So, nobody is compelled to have religious education. Just because the word 'Hindu' is there, one should not think that the university is a denominational one. This is the main idea I want to put before the House and this main idea is kept there, though the wording may be changed here and there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Normally, a Member of the Joint Committee is not allowed to speak. You are a Member of the Joint Committee and you can urge all these points in the Joint Committee.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: Sir, while appreciating the revolutionary spirit of even a senior Member like Shri D. C. Sharma, I cannot agree with him in his suggestion to remove the word 'Hindu' from the Banaras Hindu University. Hinduism is not a particular religion. It is a faith that is followed by the people of Hind. Our friend has also been confusing cateism and communalism with that of religion. A friend from that side said that the word 'religion' is very narrow in its meaning in English. Even there, I think he is wrong, because the word religion is derived from the Latin word Re-li-gion which means going back to the origin; that is from whence all this creatin has come by intrasppection.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: I said that in comparison with *dharma*.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: Even 'religion' is not so narrow as my hon. friend considers it to be. We must be very careful that our secularism should not make us forget the spiritual

value. I do not remember Gandhiji saying anywhere that we should forget religion. Throughout his life his teaching has been one of understanding between different religions, not forgetting any religion, because the essence of our culture itself is religion. But for the religious values that are there, our culture would not have been so great, whether it is Islam, Hinduism, Christianity or Buddhism.

The other day, while speaking on the UGC Report, the Minister said that there are certain faculties in certain universities which have to be developed. If it is the Aligarh Muslim University, they can improve the Arabic, Persian and Islamic culture. In the Banaras Hindu University, one of the main objectives has been to train the youth and build up the character of the youth by the study of religion and ethics. I am very glad that a Sanskrit college is coming up at Tirupati. Just like that, in these particular universities, these faculties should be developed to a great extent. I am sure many Members will agree with me that religion can solve many problems which we are unable to solve here in Parliament or outside and many of the material concepts.

Sir, ever yone of us knows how we fought and won our independence. Gandhiji lived in religion and understood the real concept of religion through love and understanding of the oneness of all the religions. That is why we are respected throughout the world. To a certain extent we can solve our problems here, but there are other things which our soul urges and they can be solved only by religion or the great scriptures that have been given to us by the sages. There need not be any clash. Fundamentally, religion teaches the oneness of life. Sir, there is no time for me to go into a discussion on religion now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: She may leave religion alone and come to the Bill.

Shrimati LakshmiKanthamma: Of course, it may look nice talking of

secularism and other things, and concede that it is very reactionary to call it "Hindu" or "Muslim" and all that. But I would request the Minister to give greater thought to this before taking a decision on this issue. I am sure he will not take a decision to change this.

Well, the popular opinion is in favour of this Bill.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Not at all.

Shrimati LakshmiKanthamma: A number of editors, after the promulgation of the Ordinance in 1958, have given opinion in favour of this Bill.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I was here in this House.

Shrimati LakshmiKanthamma: The *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, in its leader, said:

"Every educated Indian will hang down his head in shame when he reads the report of the Committee of Enquiry on the Banaras Hindu University which has been released along with the Ordinance issued by the President to take over the administration of the university. The findings of the Committee are almost unbelievable; those are undoubtedly unprecedented in the century-old history of Indian Universities. Yet no one can set them aside as exaggerated or unwarranted by evidence . . ."

The *Hindustan Times* said:

"A university which depends almost entirely on the Central Government for the financial support should be restored to its original character as an institution open to students from all parts of the country."

The *Statesman* also said:

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, at least she must have a quorum. She is quoting many things.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may resume her seat. The Bell is being rung....Now, there is

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

quorum. The hon. Member may continue her speech.

Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma: The *Statesman* in its issue dated June 17, 1958, says:

"What has been revealed at Banaras has been happening, in big or small measure, at some other universities not governed by Central Acts. With few exceptions standards have tended to fall while activities of teacher-politicians have increased to the general detriment of academic standards and morale and discipline including that of the students. Student indiscipline largely arises from conditions created for them in the universities; toning up of the one without that of the other hand in fact proved to be impossible."

There are several such comments. I am sure that no parent would like his or her children to be victims of politics in universities. Several hon. Members have referred to the great role played by the founder of this university in the cause of education.

Reference has also been made to the Mudaliar Committee Report. On the 20th July, 1957 the President appointed a Committee with no less a person than Dr. A. L. Mudaliar as Chairman and Shri M. C. Mahajan, ex-Chief Justice of India, Dr. P. Subbarayan, MP, Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani, MP and Shri Navroji J. Wadia as members. The Committee submitted its report in April, 1958. This report, which is of 44 pages, has held that there has been a steady deterioration in all aspects of university life and administration. In the opinion of the Committee, the university has become a hot-bed of intrigue, nepotism, corruption and even crimes of various description. The fundamentals in the constitution of the university were its all-India character and its residential nature. According to the Committee, the university has ceased to fulfil either of the two qualifications. It

further says that the lower standards prescribed for admission were not justified and the admission of such a large number of students without caring to look at their standards at the time of admission have resulted in the fall in standards in the university.

Similarly, in the matter of affiliation, the university had been affiliating a number of colleges outside the residential area of the university. It was also admitting a greater number of students than could be accommodated within the campus. Then, the indiscipline among teachers was mainly responsible for indiscipline among students. There was great misuse of powers and greater concentration of powers in the hands of a few individuals such as principals. The selection of teachers was not made on merit. That is the reason why several clauses have been introduced here whereby the Reviewing Committee could go into the details of it and deal with the problem in a fitting manner.

Then, certain groups had a dominant voice in the admission by being represented in the selection committee, which resulted in the deterioration of standards in the university. The conferment of doctorate and the results of other examinations were mostly influenced by group politics.

An Ordinance was promulgated to set matters right. This Bill is being brought forward to make it an Act. This Bill gives the university comprehensive powers to raise the standards to a proper level.

I am sure the Minister will keep in view the suggestions contained in the reports of the Committee and those made here by hon. Members to make it an ideal university. With these words, I support the Bill.

17:00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, December 16, 1964/Agrahayana 25, 1886 (Saka).