

12 hrs.

## MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

SUSPENSION OF SENTENCE ON COM-  
MANDER NANAVATI

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received notice of an adjournment motion relating to the "suspension of the sentence on Commander Nanavati, who has been held guilty of heinous crime". This has been done by the Governor of Bombay. All the same, is the hon. Prime Minister willing to say anything?

**Some Hon. Members rose—**

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not going to allow a discussion on this. It is a purely State matter, the action of the Governor.... (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** This cannot be a State matter. This is an attack on the Constitution. According to law, all persons are equal, but a few persons seem to be more equal than others.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** It is not a matter pertaining to the States; it is a matter of constitutional propriety.

**Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal):** On a point of order.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur):** This is a most unusual happening. Such things do not happen every day.

**Shri Tyagi:** It is a constitutional matter, not a matter of State alone.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let me, first of all, hear the point of order.

**Shri Mahanty:** My point of order is that it is most unusual that the actions of the Governor should be discussed on the floor of the House. The suspension of the order is under the clemency powers of the Governor, which is a prerogative exclusively conferred on the Governor.

**Shri Tyagi:** No question of clemency.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Let us hear him.

**Shri Mahanty:** What I beg to submit as a point of order is that whatever the Governor has done, he has done under the exclusive privilege or prerogative guaranteed under the Constitution. I beg to submit that the actions of the Governor cannot be discussed on the floor of the House in this way. So, I beg of you not to allow the matter to be proceeded with.

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** As I have given notice of the adjournment motion, may I point out.....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Let us hear the Prime Minister.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** It is for you to determine the propriety of any such motion, but, *prima facie*, of course, this matter does not concern this House. Nevertheless, I quite understand that members should be exercised about what they might think to be an unusual occurrence. I should like to state the facts insofar as we are concerned about this matter.

As the House knows, Commander Nanavati was tried at length and by a very considerable majority of the jury he was held not guilty. Thereafter, the Judge referred this matter to the High Court, and the High Court have come to the decision that he was guilty of the charge made against him. Even though they have paid, I believe, a compliment to the Commander as an officer who has ability, they have said, quite rightly, that the law must have its course. Now, obviously, the law must have its course and nothing that the Bombay Government or the Central Government might say or do should come in the way of the law having its course. It is not an arguable matter. We stand by it and nothing, if I may say so, was ever under the contemplation of any Government which might indicate any disrespect to the Bombay High Court or its Judges.

Now the facts are that on the night or late evening of the 10th of March, I came to know, I was informed, of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru ]

the judgment that had been delivered almost completely—there was a small left-over—in this case by the hon. Judges of the Bombay High Court, that some representatives of Commander Nanavati had approached the Bombay Government—some representative of the Government—and suggested or told him that they propose to prefer an appeal to the Supreme Court, naturally going up to the Bombay High Court for permission to do so. They appealed to him, to the Government to suspend the sentence till the application for appeal was being considered. It was a matter really of some days, not a long period, and there was a gap period in between. Well, the Bombay Government representative told them this was an unusual procedure and that they (Bombay Government) would like to have the opinion of the Central Government. He told those representatives of Commander Nanavati to approach the Central Government.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** May I know the name of the representatives on behalf of Commander Nanavati who approached the Government?

**Mr. Speaker:** Let us first hear him patiently.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There were written applications on his behalf. Then they came to me, as I said, late in the evening of the 10th March. This was a legal matter which was not wholly within my ken. So, I asked them to see our Law Minister and I myself got in touch with the Law Minister and requested him to go into this matter and advise me. The Law Minister was good enough to go into it and next morning, that is, 11th March morning, or rather afternoon, we had a talk, the Law Minister and I. The Law Minister said that this is going to be an appeal to the Supreme Court, the matter will go before the Bombay High Court for permission and that it will be for the Bombay High Court or the Supreme Court to consider this matter from the point of view of giving an extension to

Naval custody, because there was the original order of the Bombay High Court for Naval custody, and that they will consider it. But there was slight gap period between this decision of the Bombay High Court and the decision on the application for leave to appeal. We are concerned with that period.

Now, I was informed that in case Commander Nanavati was sent to prison for this period now, under the rules of the Navy his future would be affected.

**An Hon. Member:** How?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Of course, whatever finally the decision is, we have to fulfil that. If the High Court or the Supreme Court decide that he must act in a particular way, we have to do it; there is no question about that, but there was no opportunity during this gap period, possibly some days, of that matter being considered in that light. The Law Minister, therefore, advised me that it would be completely in order if this provision of the Constitution were to be used in order to suspend the execution of the sentence for the period till the disposal of the application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court. I agreed with him. Thereafter, I got in touch with the Chief Minister of the Bombay Government on telephone and told him that this was our view in this matter and we were going to consider it. I also got in touch with the Governor and told him this and asked him to confer with and consult the Chief Minister. This has been, so far as we know, what we did.

Naturally I assume full responsibility for all this. The Chief Minister was good enough to accept our advice and to tell the Governor accordingly. The Governor thereafter issued that order, whatever it is. So the responsibility for this certainly lies with the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister. But in effect it was our advice to them for them to accept or not. I do submit that far

from going against the Constitution, it is respectfully within the Constitution. There is no doubt about it.

A question may arise though it was within the Constitution whether it was quite proper. It is legal and constitutional. That is not arguable. But whether there was any impropriety in this that question may well arise not really in this House but otherwise. Therefore I ventured to give these facts. As I said, we advised that the suspension should be till the disposal of the application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court which meant more or less. I cannot exactly say, a number of days—a relatively brief period. After that, the matter will be considered by the High Court and the Supreme Court if the appeal is admitted. At that moment the High Court or the Supreme Court can consider independently of this order the extension of the period for Naval custody, that is, the original order. I cannot say of course what they would be pleased to decide. But it is that short period that was intended to be covered. I have not actually seen the order issued by the Governor. So I cannot precisely say what the terms of it are. But this was the intention and it is proposed to carry out that intention whatever the precise terms of the order might be. I submit that it is not only constitutional but there is no impropriety in the circumstances and there is absolutely no question of any disrespect to constituted judicial authority.

**Shri Hem Barua:** I want a clarification...

**Mr. Speaker:** Let me first of all dispose of the point of order. Then I will come to the rest of it.

May I know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what the jurisdiction of the Central Government is to advise the Governor?... (*Interruptions.*)  
Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The Central Government is in constant touch with

the Chief Ministers. The matter was referred to us indirectly by the Chief Minister. We naturally gave him our advice on the subject.

**Mr. Speaker:** If it is a matter on which under the Constitution the Central Government can advise, then I have on y to consider, whether I should allow any discussion.... (*Interruption.*)

**Some Hon. Members:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

I can allow discussion on all matters for which the Central Government is responsible to this House. With respect to other matters in regard to which the Central Government is not responsible here, however important the matter might be, it would not be proper for me to allow a discussion by stretching jurisdiction which we do not have. If, under the Constitution, the Central Government is competent to give advice, then I will certainly go into the further material and the subject matter.

Now, a point of order has been raised by Shri Mahanty. He drew my attention to article 161 of the Constitution. Article 161 says:

"The Governor of a State shall have the power to grant pardons, reprieves, respites or remissions of punishment or to suspend, remit or commute the sentence of any person convicted of any offence against any law relating to a matter to which the executive power of the State extends."

The Governor can grant pardons. Independently, possibly the President also can do so under the Constitution. This was on advice indirectly sought and given to the Chief Minister. Now, under the Constitution it is the Governor who has intervened and suspended this sentence which he is competent to do under article 161. It is exactly because the hon. Prime Minister has given advice that evidently this adjournment motion is brought here. I will treat that advice as only

[Mr. Speaker]

departmental advice and not given under the Constitution.... (*Interruption*). Under those circumstances.... (*Interruption*). No, no; I am not concerned with it.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): Is a State Government a department under the Government?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not so. Here I am concerned with the constitutional aspect of it. Ordinarily the Central Government need not have given any advice to the Governor. He ought to have done so himself as the Governor is the head of that particular State. If they have sought advice, that advice has been given. I would even ask the hon. Law Minister to give me advice as to under what article of the Constitution the Central Government is entitled to give advice. I will ignore that advice and act upon this that under article 161 of the Constitution the Governor is competent to suspend the sentence. I would like to have clarification from the hon. Law Minister.

**The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the administrative relations between the Centre and the States are set out in article 256 of the Constitution and the jurisdiction of the constitutional powers of the Centre in relation to the States come into play. It is in Part XI, Chapter II, article 256 onwards. These are the powers which are exercisable by the Centre in relation to the States and if they are exercised they must be obeyed by the States. But the present advice is not within the purview of that Chapter at all. It is an advice which in the course of the functioning of the two Governments is always given in the course of the day-to-day administration of the Centre and the States. Take for instance.... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Is it within the ambit of the Constitution?

**Shri A. K. Sen:** Unless there is any prohibition under the Constitution, I presume there is no constitutional impropriety in either the hon. Prime

Minister or the hon. Home Minister or the Central Government giving this advice on any matter which may even fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the State. It is then a question for the State either to accept or not to accept such advice. If it were an advice which was to be given under the Constitution, under Chapter II of Part XI, then it would not have been a discretionary matter for the State either to accept or not to accept. But in these matters.... (*Interruption*). I hope the hon. Members will give me a little time to make these points. In regard to many States subjects which are exclusively within the States' jurisdiction, like agriculture, education and various other matters, though the executive power in relation to these subjects belongs exclusively to the States, yet the Centre gives advice in regard to these matters extensively and regularly. This advice may either be accepted or not accepted by the States. This is a matter falling purely within the routine administration of the State in the course of which the State wanted to have the views of the Centre. The hon. Prime Minister gave his views knowing fully well that it was a matter in which it was completely open to the State Government either to accept or not to accept those views. They have accepted them in this case. In the other case they might have disagreed or might not have accepted the advice of the Prime Minister. I do not see any question of the hon. Prime Minister not being able to give advice in regard to a matter which falls exclusively within the State's jurisdiction. I suppose the day will never come when the Central Government will refuse to give advice to the States in regard to matters falling even within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States.

**Mr. Speaker:** Am I to understand the hon. Law Minister to say that it is not a direction which is given under article 256?

**Shri A. K. Sen:** No, Sir. Certainly not.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not a direction given under article 256 and therefore it is not in discharge of any statutory obligation because it is open to the Central Government to give advice or to withhold the advice and it is equally open to that Government to accept that advice or not to accept that advice, whereas under article 256 if advice is given it amounts to a direction and under a later article of the Constitution if the State Government does not carry out that direction an inference can be drawn from that fact that there is a breakdown of the Constitution and the emergency powers can be invoked. It is clear from the hon. Law Minister's statement that this advice that has been given is not in exercise of the powers under article 256. Therefore, it is a purely voluntary advice that was given. (*Interruption*). I am here to decide whether, in the discharge of the responsibilities of the Centre, there has been anything done which this House can take notice of. So far as that advice is concerned, it is open to the Governor to accept or not to accept that advice. It is equally open to them to have sought the advice, or not to have sought the advice.

Under the circumstances, the only point is whether the act of the Governor can be called to question in this House. The Governor is the head of a State. There is a Ministry there. There is also a legislature there. I do not know how far that legislature can go into that question, it is not for me to decide whether even that legislature can go into the matter or not, when the Governor is authorised to do so. He may do so in consultation or not the matter does not arise.

So far as this matter is concerned, I am more than ever convinced that this is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the head of the State who exercises discretion in the matter, and therefore, this House has no competence to go into this matter. If such advice is given, it is an informal advice.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** How can it be?

**Shri Goray (Poona):** May I draw your attention to one point, that the Prime Minister did not give advice only to the Chief Minister of the State, but he said he also had a talk with the Governor.

**Mr. Speaker:** I leave it to the Central Government to give such advice as they feel competent, and I am not going to allow adjournment motions relating to matters where strictly under the Constitution the Central Government is not responsible for any act.

**Shri Hem Barua:** The Prime Minister said he takes the responsibility.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members will kindly hear me. I am disposing of the point of order. In view of the fact that this leads to complications, I would like the Central Government to exercise this power of giving informal advice in as few cases as possible.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** What is this?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I submit that informal advice has to be given in as many cases as possible, not as few. (*Interruptions*). If the hon. Member will permit me, what you have been pleased to say is perfectly correct; in such cases, the question does not arise, it is a very rare case; but in the broad acceptance of the term, this informal communication, as my colleague the Law Minister said, is a daily occurrence between the Ministries, the Prime Minister, the Home Minister, the Law Minister and every Minister and the respective Governments. That does not mean direction, but it means an attempt to help each other. We ask their advice, they ask our advice; it is a two-way traffic very often; so that, to say that we should not give informal advice and issue only directions would be exceedingly embarrassing.

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall explain myself.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The Prime Minister says he is taking the responsibility. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** All that I meant was that very often matters come up here as to the advice given. There are consultations between the State Government and the Central Government, but it is not necessary for the Central Government to tell us what advice they gave. Very often they say it is all confidential, and they are not going to give it. If the Prime Minister had only said that what passed between him and the others was confidential, I would not have worried myself. Therefore, whatever might be the situation, in the discharge of their duties they may consult the hon. Prime Minister and the other Ministers, and they may give advice, but so far as we are concerned, I will not take note of that advice.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Even if he takes the responsibility? (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** I agree with the point of order. All that I can say is that I cannot contravene the Constitution and the powers vested here, and allow a discussion over a matter which is entirely within the discretion of the Governor, whether he has exercised it rightly or wrongly.

**Shri Goray:** It has a far-reaching effect.

**Mr. Speaker:** The exercise of the discretion may be wrong or right, it is not for this House to decide; it is for that House to decide, or other parties.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** No, no.

**Mr. Speaker:** I agree with the point of order, and disallow this motion.

**Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi):** Is this question so narrow that it can be decided only on technical grounds? Does it not involve a question of some class of persons being treated in a discriminatory manner,.....

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Superior to everybody.

**Acharya Kripalani:**....as superior citizens? The Prime Minister has certainly the right to advice, but I know

that though the word "advice" may be used, it is pertinent to ask from whom the advice comes. If the advice comes from a person who holds a position which is very much superior to that of the person to whom he gives the advice, it is almost a command.

After all, what was at stake? What was at stake was the convenience of an officer, and that too for a short time. It is not right to say that if the judgment is reversed, the gentleman concerned cannot again be put into office. The Prime Minister spoke as though if he once goes to prison, his career would be ruined. There is no such thing. That the Governor exercised his authority is technically correct. But it is done in very, very exceptional cases.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It has not been done before.

**Acharya Kripalani:** It is not done for the convenience of an individual because he belongs to a particular class of people.

It may be even suspected by the people that this class of people is being put over the other classes because it is the military class. In the past too the military had, under the foreign Government, certain privileges which were not granted to the common citizen.

Therefore, I would request you not to consider this question merely on technical grounds. The case is *sub-judice*. If it had been decided, I could have understood the use of the Governor's powers of mercy, but it is *sub-judice*, it is a question of a few days only as the Prime Minister himself says. I think this interference does not make for the dignity of the judiciary. ...

After all, we have got four things that make our democracy to function that make our democracy to function properly. First is the legislature. In the legislature, unfortunately for us, on account of the overwhelming majority of one party, we have very

limited scope. Then comes an independent judiciary; then financial control by an independent audit; and the fourth is the Public Service Commission. If any of these institutions is tampered with, and on an occasion which does not require it, I think our democracy stands in danger. I am not talking here as a party man, belonging to the Opposition, but I think the whole country is shocked by this kind of conduct.

**Shri Tyagi:** May I seek your ruling on a matter?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have already given my ruling.

**Shri Tyagi:** I want a clarification of the ruling.

You have been pleased to rule that advice which is outside the purview of the Constitution, advice given without the Constitution, shall not be a matter of which Parliament can take notice. I beg to submit that advice given by the Prime Minister and advice given to a Governor who is our representative in the State and advice on an official matter, is the only one question which is most pertinent and relevant for this House to consider,—I am speaking not with any party bias, but purely on a constitutional ruling of yours—because, if this becomes a convention for the future, a precedent, then we shall have no control over the advice tendered by Ministers. They could always say, it was a private advice or something I think in such matters which affect the procedure of the judiciary or anything like that, any advice tendered by our Ministers is our responsibility and, therefore, I suggest we might reconsider this matter. In a matter like this, where the rules of the Navy came in the way, I should have advised the Prime Minister—if I were in a position to do so—to suspend the rules of Navy rather than interfere in the matter because that was his business. We could do it; Government could suspend the rules of Navy. Rules of the Navy were not so sacrosanct as the judiciary was and I would,

therefore, suggest that these matters are regular matters which the House could consider.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):** I beg to say a few words....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Shri Mukerjee.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central):** I beg of you to consider this matter a little more carefully because it affects our interpretation of the Constitution in letter and in spirit.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member has got a right to criticise the Government but never does he fail to criticise me also. I have considered it carefully. He need not use that expression.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** My submission is that it is necessary for us to consider this matter more carefully than we appear to have done so far because.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid that has become part of his nature.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I shall put my case without any preface. The Members of the Council of Ministers including the Prime Minister are responsible, according to the Constitution to this House. In regard to a certain thing which has happened, the point whether the Council of Ministers is responsible to this House or not has come into question. I know for a fact that what the Governor of Bombay State has done on the advice presumably of his Chief Minister is within the ambit of his jurisdiction. There is no doubt about it. But it has come out in this House—accidentally or otherwise, I do not know, I have heard it said by the Prime Minister—that it was the Prime Minister from Delhi who gave a certain advice to the Chief Minister of Bombay State as well as personally over the telephone to the Governor of Bombay State. It has also come out, as far as I can understand, that this "advice", so-called, of the Prime Minister, which my friend Acharya Kripalani has very correctly

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

characterised as a direction, preceded in point of time any decision made in regard to this particular case by the Governor of Bombay on the advice—if he got it at all—from his Chief Minister. That being so, the responsibility of the Prime Minister in regard to what happened over this case is absolutely clear.

We are not going into the merits of the matter as to whether a high officer of the Army or the Navy is concerned. That is a matter which, if necessary, we shall discuss in this House. But surely there is discrimination involved in this extra-ordinary intervention of the Prime Minister in a matter where the law might very well have been permitted to take its course, where the Governor might in his wisdom or on the advice of the Chief Minister have suspended the sentence concerned, in a matter where the Prime Minister had no business to interfere. It so happened that—for heaven knows what reasons—he felt impelled to send telephone message to the Chief Minister of Bombay State and to the Governor of Bombay. It may be for very good considerations, humanitarian considerations, which I personally might sympathise with, but as far as the constitutional aspect of the question is concerned, surely the Prime Minister appears to have done something for which he is answerable to this House. I am not telling you that he is definitely to be hauled over the coals, but the House has a right to demand a discussion over this matter where the responsibility of the Prime Minister and his Government can be fixed rightly and properly and that is why I say it is not for you to rule as you appear to have ruled earlier. I am sure you will, Sir, reconsider the matter and give us an opportunity of discussing it. (*Interruptions*).

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** It is a moral question. I want to say a few words. I believe that the Governor has done right in suspending the order because this was a very serious question where a wife of the naval officer was tempted by wealth. If someone does not

mind one's wife being tempted, that is another question. But this is a very serious question when a naval officer's wife was tempted. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** I have already heard him.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Wife is not anybody's property. We have allowed divorce to women; we have given equality to them. We cannot deny them freedom to love.

**Mr. Speaker:** After all, Acharyaji has given a humorous turn to a very serious matter.

So far as this matter is concerned, I agree that it has exercised the minds of many hon. Members. According to him, it is not a case where the Centre or the hon. the Prime Minister could have given advice and there is an apprehension that in such cases wherever the Prime Minister, whether in his official capacity under the Constitution he exercises powers or not, wherever he gives an advice, naturally no Governor or any Chief Minister in any State would easily discount the advice that is given (*Interruptions*). Acharya Kripalani said that it is not a matter where a death sentence has been passed and before any advice is given or an order of suspension is given, the man would be hanged and the injury caused cannot be undone.

These are all points in favour of the argument that this matter ought to be discussed, whether it is right or wrong. Possibly I might have allowed a discussion if I felt satisfied that under the Constitution the Central Government is bound to give advice and the State Government is bound to take advice. Neither the one nor the other happens to be the case here. Now, as the Prime Minister has said, there are a number of cases where it is possible for the Centre to give advice from time to time on various matters. All that I would say is that



all those pieces of advice that are given not under the Constitution but in the interest of the administration, for the exchange of experience, and so on, are not brought before the House and the House told that such and such advice has been given. It was open to the Prime Minister to have said, "No, no. What happens between me and others is confidential." The only misfortune is that we have got the information here that he has given an advice. If I throw open this discussion, then almost every second day for whichever fault a Minister commits there in the State and if some whisper comes in that it was done on the advice of the Central Government, I will have endless series of adjournment motions, not on account of any act done here but on account of an act done by a Minister in the State on the advice of so and so. Therefore, I would appeal to the hon. Members to consider if merely because of one particular matter which may be of much substance—maybe a serious one—I should throw open flood-gates and allow the bringing forward of a similar happening here and clothe the Central Government with responsibility. They would kindly consider this matter. I am aware of the seriousness of this matter. Under those circumstances, let us not create a precedent which will be used for purposes not in our contemplation and then spend away much time of the House and exercise jurisdiction over the matters over which we really have no jurisdiction under the Constitution.

Enough has been done. I have allowed opportunities to hon. Members also to say what they felt in this matter. My original order stands that I am not going to interfere and I agree with the point of order.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Do you mean to say that the Prime Minister should be allowed to hand over the destiny of the country to the Navy or the Army? In that case parliamentary democracy would be crushed to pieces.

#### ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. There is another adjournment motion which I have got from Shri Rajendra Singh. I would like to hear the hon. the Education Minister. There was a half-an-hour discussion relating to the affairs in the Aligarh University. The hon. the Education Minister said that a Committee had been appointed by the Vice-Chancellor to go into this matter. From the reports, it appears that the Vice-Chancellor of the University and every other member has resigned.

The other matter was not considered here because the Vice-Chancellor himself was going into it and appointing a Committee. Now, the Committee has been dissolved and all the members have resigned what is the situation?

**The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall):** The Demands for Grants of my Ministry are going to be considered today in the afternoon and also tomorrow. If you will kindly permit me, I will explain the whole position tomorrow afternoon.

**Mr. Speaker:** Very well.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** The half-an-hour discussion was held in this House and certain charges were brought by my hon. friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. So far as my information goes, the hon. Minister was given a note by the Vice-Chancellor in which he explained certain facts. The hon. Minister withhold that fact from the House. Again, as far as I know, the members of the enquiry committee were the nominees of Education Minister and technically they were appointed under the auspices of the Vice-Chancellor. These are the two points which are really serious, because the hon. Minister seems to run away from his responsibility, and if that is allowed to happen in this House, it would be difficult for the officers and the Vice-chancellor to work.