

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services for the purpose of Railways during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1955, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is

"That clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted

Clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed"

The motion was adopted.

12-07hrs.

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY
(AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE
AND BANARAS HINDU UNIVER-
SITY (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume discussion on Shri Braj Raj Singh's resolution regarding disapproval of the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1958 (Ordinance No. 4 of 1958), and the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill, 1958.

Out of six hours allotted for both, 1 hour and 6 minutes now remain. Shri

Harish Chandra Mathur will continue his speech. After the discussion is over, the resolution will be put to the vote of the House first, and, if negatived, the motion for reference to the Select Committee will be put to the House.

I would request Shri Harish Chandra Mathur to be brief.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pal): The new point that I am going to make will be absolutely a fresh point.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): May I point out that in the Business Advisory Committee, the Speaker was pleased to say that one additional hour may be allotted to this subject if the House so desires. So, we may extend the time allotted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should have no complaint

Several Hon. Members rose—

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Several Members here have not spoken at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there is such a desire, I shall see that the time is extended.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug): I just wanted to point that yesterday, the Speaker was pleased to direct that those who are not in the Select Committee will be given preference. I think that has been sufficiently done. Now, I think the others may be given preference. They are also anxious to speak. This was the hope held out by the Speaker yesterday.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I entirely agree with the hon. Member. We shall see to it, provided there is time.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as I carefully listened to the spirited speeches made on this resolution and the Bill the day

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

before yesterday, I had a feeling that the hon. Members spoke with certain injured feelings. It is obvious that certain observations in the report have touched off their sentiments, and it was out of those sentiments that certain angry and spirited remarks emerged. It will be really unfortunate if in this important measure we are carried away by some anger and irritation, because, the measure before us, is of vital importance and great significance.

Firstly, the Bill concerns a national institution of great importance with which most of us had certain deep and intimate relation and respect. Secondly, it concerns a very great principle—the autonomy of university life and administration. When we are called upon to discuss upon matters of such vital importance, a great responsibility devolves upon us. As I said, we all feel deeply interested in this great national institution, but I might inform the House that we who come from what used to be the old princely States in Rajasthan have a special feeling for this University, because we had only this University to look upon as our own. Even my friends from Uttar Pradesh and Bihar had some other universities in their States which they could call their own, but we who were in those Indian States could consider only the Banaras Hindu University as our own, and our deep feeling of ownership of this University was always given a cordial response by the great founder of this University.

I might inform the House that most of our students from those princely States had always found their place in this University for all types of education. My own younger brother went to this University for the engineering degree in 1929. My two sons took their engineering degree from this University. I mention this only to give the House an indication of the background and the context in which I am speaking. If anybody would look at the list of donations, he will find that Jodhpur, from where I

come, is at the top of the donors' list. We have in that University a Jodhpur Chair and even when the greatest political pressure was brought upon those Indian States we never hesitated to stick to our position. Here I may mention with pardonable pride that in 1946 it was my proud privilege to send a cheque for Rs. 2 lakhs to this University when it was in financial difficulties. I have mentioned this, not just to boast but to show how deeply interested we are in this University, and it is in this context that I will speak.

The first question which naturally arises in our mind, which must be answered to the satisfaction of everyone, is: was it necessary to appoint this Committee? Was there any real justification for it? Or was it an onslaught on the autonomy of this University, this great institution for which we have such strong feelings? My friend, Pandit Malaviya, who spoke the other day, spoke with injured innocence and with great eloquence. I do not claim half that eloquence. Still, I do claim that I have facts in my possession which are much more powerful than his eloquence. It was an evil day for this great University when the noble efforts of the great Vice-Chancellor of this University, Dr. Radhakrishnan, to persuade Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee to come as Pro-Vice-Chancellor, so that when Dr. Radhakrishnan retires he may step into his shoes as Vice-Chancellor was foiled and sabotaged by certain intrigues in that University and if my information is correct, my hon. friend, who spoke with all that vehemence had a lot to do in this matter. Those pressure methods which were employed to make the climate of this University suffocating for a person like Dr. Radhakrishnan, those pressure methods which were responsible for keeping away a personality like Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, those very methods and those very means recoiled on my hon. friend, who spoke with that eloquence, and he himself screamed under those very circum-

stances and reported to the Education Ministry that an enquiry was warranted. It was made impossible, because of the intrigues that were played on that University, for any personality of any eminence to go there and remain as Vice-Chancellor. All efforts were made to have a person of the standing of Dr. Radhakrishnan as Vice-Chancellor. And all the Vice-Chancellors, as the Minister of Education has read out copiously from the reports and letters of these eminent Vice-Chancellors of this great University, have stated one after the other that such an enquiry was warranted.

Now, in the light of these circumstances, may I know what course was left open to this Government except to order an inquiry? If any charge could be laid against this Government, the charge is that they delayed the matter too much and that they permitted this state of affairs to grow to such an extent that it became essential to take immediate action. But, possibly respecting the autonomy of this institution, possibly guided by the great name of the founder, with which it was associated, they waited till the last moment. It was only at this stage when it became absolutely impossible that they appointed this Committee.

Now, having justified the appointment of this Committee, the second question which arises is whether the Committee was properly constituted. I might submit that the very personnel of the Committee suggests that no better committee could have been appointed which would command the highest respect from all quarters. We have two eminent members of this House in it. I will not say a word about them. Then we have the personality of the ex-Chief Justice Mahajan on that Committee. Chief Justice Mahajan, whom I know personally, is not very much liked by the Government. He was an eminent Judge, Supreme Court Judge and then the Chief Justice of that Court and he always gave decisions which were very uncomfortable to the Government. Can anybody in any

earnestness suggest that the Government appointed a Committee with Justice Mahajan in it wanting a report to their liking? It would be just asking for the impossible or talking something absurd or nonsense. So, it is really a matter of great regret to me that the personnel of this Committee was so lightly criticised. Certain members went even to the extent of suggesting that a committee should be appointed to go into the conduct of this Committee. Whenever this House has asked for a certain committee to enquire into such matters, they have always suggested that we should put in some High Court Judges. Now, here is a Supreme Court Judge; he was even the Chief Justice. He was a Judge who, as Chief Justice, had earned the reputation of his own for his independence. So, in spite of all that, the members of the House are not satisfied, I do not know what else will satisfy them.

Then, this Committee was not appointed out of any arbitrary powers but under the regular rules framed under the Banaras Hindu University Act itself. If anybody had taken care to read the Report, he would have found it stated in the report "Under rule . . . the Visitor had appointed". Here I would not like to say a word which will have anything to do with the President, who happens to be the Visitor in this case. Could, we, for one moment, think that the Visitor would permit himself to be carried away by certain Government notes, and particularly in respect of this University for which he himself had certain personal attachment? He would not have permitted the Government to take any action which would not be in the best interests of the University. I cannot conceive of such a thing.

Now, having said that, having justified the necessity for the Committee, having justified that the personnel of the Committee could not have been better, let us see what further action should have been taken by the Government. I would like to remind

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

this House and every member of this House that whenever reports of such committees have been submitted, it has been the usual practice for the Government to accept them instead of treating them lightly. When a Committee consisting of such eminent persons from all walks of life submits a report, here we sit down and suggest that Government should have thrown out that report summarily and without giving any value to it. I do not say that Government are duty bound to accept all that have been stated in this Report. I do not also think that everything that has been stated in this Report is correct. But there is the least doubt, I do maintain, that the Committee was probably constituted, the committee was warranted, there could not have been any better persons in the Committee and whatever the Committee has reported deserves the respectful consideration of everyone concerned.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Even when there are factual errors in the report?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: While discussing this matter certain hon. Members stated that this Report was one-sided, that it never took into consideration what was to be stated by a certain group, that the Committee was carried away by the Vice-Chancellor and that the Report is an absolutely superficial one. I would only request those hon. Members to take the trouble of reading the report. The Committee had invited each and every member who was interested in this University to tender evidence, to submit memoranda etc. When a Committee openly invites everyone interested in the affairs of the University to submit memoranda, how can it be called one-sided? They have gone through as many as 70 memoranda and quite a large number of persons were examined by them, and those persons who have been

examined are persons of great eminence. Not only that. The matter does not end there. When some of the members represented that the time allotted, the time given for submitting the memoranda was short, the Committee never hesitated to extend the time, and give a much longer time so that anybody who was interested could submit a representation. Could the Committee be called a partial committee?

After having given the extended time, after having taken all the evidence which was available and after having considered all the memoranda which were presented to the Committee, it comes to certain conclusions. Not only this, the Committee has in its report mentioned at more than one place—if I had the time I would go through this report and read to you from page to page and show to the House as to how carefully the Committee has considered each and every aspect . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am glad the hon. Member knows that he has very little time now.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That is why I am discussing only the important principles and the important points. But this view which I am representing has not been represented in this House and if you do not allow enough time to put forward this view, there will be a very wrong impression staying in this House. But still.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Normally when we are discussing a Resolution 15 minutes are allowed and the hon. Member has had 15 minutes.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: We are discussing the two, both together.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can have five minutes more.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Otherwise I would have confined myself to 15 minutes, but because we are discussing both....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can speak for another five minutes.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I will try to wind up in five minutes.

These very facts which have been mentioned by certain hon. friends stating that they had not been considered, the Committee had made a specific reference to them. They have gone through those facts and even in the epilogue—their epilogue is very interesting—they have visualised all this criticism and have made a mention of it in their epilogue. So, it would not be fair to say that. But having said all this, I do wish to invite the attention of the hon. Members to the two apprehensions which have been given expression to here or elsewhere.

What is felt is that there is not only one group—it may be a dominant group—but there are three groups. Two or three of the groups are in the University. The apprehension is that the action taken will result only in crushing this one group and the other groups will come up. The apprehension is that the action is designed to strengthen a group which is today not dominant but which is weak. It has also been alleged that the present Vice-Chancellor has a group of his own, that his father—a head of a department in the university had appointed certain persons, that he himself is responsible for certain appointments and that there is a group of his own in which he is interested. I wish the hon. Minister to make it clear and not only to give us an assurance but to tell us whether this is a fact, whether there is any truth in this apprehension and allegation and what further steps he proposes to take to see that not only this particular group is liquidated but

all groups are liquidated and proper atmosphere is generated in the University. This apprehension should be laid at rest.

Another word which I wish to add is that apart from these groups another feeling, and a very correct feeling, is that most of the deeds are attributed to this University. This great national institute has been isolated and has unnecessarily been given a bad name. Many of the things which are happening in this University are happening elsewhere also. I do not know how far this is correct. May be, it is true. As a matter of fact when I spoke in the University Grants Commission debate, I strongly recommended to the hon. Minister that we should bring together the heads of all the Universities, we should try to find out what are the difficulties of those Universities and we should try to frame in consultation with the Universities a constitution which will eliminate most of their troubles. It appears that some of the difficulties are due to the constitution, certain election methods and certain procedures. Of course, they are due to the undesirable character of the teachers. But I think such a course is very necessary because we know it for certain that many unfortunate things are happening elsewhere also. There is nothing to isolate this University and if Government and any of us are taking any interest it is because we are deeply interested in this University. This University occupies a singular position in the nation. If we are not to permit this shrine of light, life and learning to be shrouded by dirty intrigue and if we are not to permit this national institute to degenerate into a selfish family affair, I think these actions which have been taken by the Government were definitely warranted. But they must now be conducted in a dignified manner.

I do not like the step taken by my hon. friend in asking the Vice-Chancellor to stay away from the Screening Committee. Either he should

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

not be a Vice-Chancellor there, and if he is worthy of being a Vice-Chancellor then he must be on the Screening Committee. A Vice-Chancellor who has not got the confidence, who does not enjoy this much confidence to stay in the Screening Committee, he is not worthy of being there. I think the hon. Minister himself complained during the course of his speech that the Vice-Chancellor has been made more ineffective. I say such a step of the Government—the Government yielding to any loud cries and asking the Vice-Chancellor to stay out of the Screening Committee—is one of those steps which will very much weaken the authority of the Vice-Chancellor. If they find that the Vice-Chancellor is not worthy of it, I think it is better that he resigns from the Vice-Chancellorship and we have an absolutely clean slate to proceed on and give this University an absolutely new atmosphere.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my colleague the hon. Minister of Education has placed this measure before the House on behalf of the Government and there was hardly any necessity for me to intervene except that I felt perhaps it might be helpful to the House if I pointed out one or two major implications of what we have suggested to the House and what those who oppose this action might lead to.

It is obvious that everyone in this House is greatly interested, concerned and anxious about the present and future of this great institution. It happens to be in Banaras, rightly so, if I may say so, because whatever the virtues and failings of Banaras might be, it is the most ancient centre of India's culture and rightly it was considered an All-India centre and an All-India University. Therefore we are all anxious and if a measure of sentiment comes in in our consideration of this problem it is not

surprising. It is right that we should feel a little sentimental about certain matters though sentiment should not override reason and a logical and objective approach to such a problem.

It is a well known fact that things have not been satisfactory in this University for a considerable time. Some of the ablest of our citizens in this country have had intimate dealings with this University as Vice-Chancellors and the like. We have the record of their opinions. Many of us also, though not possessing an intimate knowledge, have possessed some knowledge of what was happening and we were unhappy. There have been repeated demands for an enquiry. Among those who made the demands was our colleague in this House, Shri Govind Malaviya, when he was associated in a closer capacity with the University.

Why were those demands made? Because things were not considered to be functioning properly and correctly and because it was stated repeatedly that there were pressure groups pushing the University this way and that way, coming in the way of the Vice-Chancellors and coming in the way of the internal organisation of the University. I am not, nor is the Government as a whole, competent to go into these detailed matters. The Government can only function according to the rules by appointing a competent committee. There is no other way to do it and I submit that the Committee that was appointed was as good a committee as could have been appointed for this purpose.

Among the other good things there is one good thing, that the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, apart from being an eminent educationist and having other qualities, is a person who, to my personal knowledge, is a very staunch believer in the autonomy of Universities. In fact I have the misfortune

to be told by him in another connection once or twice—he objected to what Government had proposed—and he said “this is interfering with the autonomy of Universities”. He made that perfectly clear to us, to the Government. And we agreed with him, and in fact we changed our thinking to some extent because of his criticism I am mentioning this fact because more than any one in this House I think he believes in the autonomy of the Universities. Now, if a man like that makes a suggestion which happens to be an infringement, for the time being, of the autonomy of the Universities, it has a much greater importance and value than if perhaps somebody else had made it. Speaking for myself, when I saw that Dr Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar said so, it had a tremendous effect upon me. And so also the others in the Committee. The Committee was very very far from, what might be called, a governmental committee. It was a completely independent committee. They could decide as they liked.

That Committee having been appointed and the Committee going into this matter as thoroughly as they could and consulting not only those they have mentioned but, I think, others that they don't mention so much—very important persons who were not only high up in the educational field but were intimately connected with the Banaras Hindu University—, they came to certain unanimous conclusions.

May I here just say one word? Stress was laid by hon. Member that they did not go to the University. Well, as a matter of fact, I am told they did not live in the University. They lived in Banaras for the days of the enquiry. They conducted the enquiry outside the University, but as individuals they did visit the University campus. I am not sure, I made a venture to express an opinion because I heard something to this effect that deliberately they set up their office outside the campus of the

University to avoid demonstrations and the like and to work quietly and in peace. But they, as individuals, did go there.

Now, this completely independent and impartial and highly competent committee appointed by the Government comes to a certain conclusion; and the Government consider it. I would like this House to consider what would have happened if this Government had the temerity not to accept their recommendations. Where would we have been, this Government? And how would we be justified in saying on the ground stated here that “Oh, we don't wish the autonomy to be interfered with” or that “You did not stay long enough in the University campus to be able to express an opinion”? Is it a reason we could have given, on behalf of Government, not to accept the report? I submit it would have impossible for us to adopt that attitude and not to accept that report. We may have, in our acceptance, slightly varied it. In fact, we have slightly varied it. They have gone much further than this Ordinance or this Bill.

Therefore, I submit that having gone that far, first of all in view of everything that had happened, it had become inevitable for the President as Visitor to appoint a Committee of Enquiry. The Committee of Enquiry having been appointed at a high level, and a distinguished committee being appointed and that Committee making some recommendations, it was exceedingly difficult for the Government even if it thought otherwise, which it didn't, to reject those recommendations. And I submit it is exceedingly difficult for this House, with all the wisdom contained in this House, for it to reject the recommendations, broadly speaking, of that Committee. This House may reject even something put forward by the Government. The House is wiser than the Government. The Government does not pretend to be specialists. But where we have

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

this distinguished committee considering this problem, not from a party point of view, not from a governmental point of view, but from the point of view purely of education, purely of the Banaras Hindu University, then it becomes exceedingly difficult and a very unwise thing for that recommendation to be thrown overboard

Because, one thing is certain. Even, let us suppose that the recommendation in its entirety was not perfect. Nothing is perfect. And may I say in-between that when I am speaking on this matter I am not, speaking for myself, accepting every word they have said in the report? I admit that certain inaccuracies have crept in, in minor matters. Great stress has been laid on certain drafting inaccuracy or some list containing some names which it should not contain. It is so. Whose fault it is, I do not know; perhaps some Secretary's or some clerk's or, if I may say so, some carelessness of the Members of the Committee. But they are very slight and immaterial things. The major facts are not covered up by this fact that a list contains an odd name which it should not contain. I am not here to support every word and every phrase of the report. But I am here to support the main outlook, the main recommendations of the report, as embodied in our Ordinance and now in this Bill with minor variations.

So I say if we had not done that, where would we have been, the Government, facing this House and the country? And where would the Banaras Hindu University have been after all this? After this report that has come out, that has been published, if we did nothing and said "Carry on", I really cannot conceive how the Banaras Hindu University could have carried on and how any decent person would have gone to the Banaras Hindu University as Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor or in any other capacity.

Sometimes you cannot go back, you cannot unscramble an anomaly. It is done. You cannot go back upon it. Even though you might think that a slightly wrong step has been taken, you cannot go back. Because, the thing means ruin to the University—after all this publicity and all this report and all that has happened. And even this was done because of previous, continuous complaints by a succession of Vice-Chancellors of the highest standing. Here is our Vice-President.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What a clear admission on the part of the hon. the Prime Minister!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is all right. Let the Prime Minister proceed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite grasped it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him not worry about it. He may go on.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There was the distinguished Chairman of the University Grants Commission. All these people who know something about their job and who were not interested in this individual or that individual, this group or that group—there are many others like that—they all come to a certain conclusion, and a firm and strong conclusion, much firmer and stronger than mine or my friend the Education Minister's. Again I put it to this House what exactly would have happened if Government had rejected this report, on whatever ground it may be, and how they could have justified it to Parliament or the country. I submit we could not have done so. And the result would have been confusion in the educational world, not only in the Banaras Hindu University but in every University in India.

Having gone that far, having all these facts which had come out, it became inevitable for us to go further ahead and to accept it in some form, maybe in some slightly modified form, and to put things right or to endeavour to put things right. It had to be done. And we have tried to do it in this Bill, in the Ordinance first and then in this Bill, which is a somewhat milder way of approach than the Committee had suggested. The Committee went further. They wanted the scrapping of the whole thing. We have done it mildly.

And what has been done, it should be remembered, is a temporary expedient to pass over a provisional period, so that this House may consider the matter fully and amend the old Act in such manner as it wishes, and then it may go on. So this is a temporary expedient to cover this h.atu. I do not know how long it will last. It may last a year, it may last six months, it may last eight months, that is, till the framing of the new Bill or the new Amending Bill. For the moment, certain steps have been taken for the University to carry on during this intervening period. It could not carry on, I submit to this House, in the old way without being affected by the Report of the Committee regardless of the Ordinance, regardless of this Bill. If we just left it there, after this report, it could not have carried on. I submit, the whole atmosphere is vitiated, charged, counter-charged. I am not saying who is to blame and who is not to blame. That is a matter into which one can go in detail. I accept for my part the verdict of the Committee which consists of eminent men. All I know about the University is that things have not been satisfactory. I cannot say this man is guilty or that. I have not gone into that. But I think I am entitled to accept the recommendations and the report of a body of eminent men who know their work in these matters. I submit, if at this stage, first of all, the

Government had not accepted it, this University could not have gone on. It may have dragged on. But, after all that has happened, it could not really function adequately—nobody, teachers, professors or Vice-Chancellor. I do not know how easy it would have been to get Vice-Chancellors. There has been a succession of them coming and going, some of them most eminent persons in India. Those who have survived—because two of them Acharya Narendra Deva and Shri Amarnath Jha have not survived, both having strong opinions about the working of the University at that time, to my knowledge—those who have survived, eminent men, have given their opinion here and how to the Committee and to us about the working of this University. Where else are we to go for our advice?

So that, we had no alternative, I say regardless of our opinions. I do not say that our opinions differed. I say we had no alternative but to proceed in this way. I put it to this House, if by any odd chance, this House did not approve of this and rejected the proposal made before it, where will we be about this University? One cannot un-scramble events. Things have happened in the course of years. Things have happened in the course of the past month or two, in the period when the Committee was sitting. Things have happened now. All this has happened. One cannot un-write all this. The only way is to take hold of this matter, get a firm grip and ask the best of our people to deal with it and put it right. That is the only way to do.

The temporary arrangement that has been made, has been made, as the House will no doubt appreciate, from the point of view of putting the best people we can get in the Executive Council—they are not on party lines; there is no party about it—educationists of repute in it so that they may carry on during this period and give

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

a good beginning, again a fresh beginning to the University. Meanwhile the matter will come up before this House to consider an amendment of the Bill, the final Bill, and we hope that this great and fine University,— I do not know if it is the biggest, but certainly one of the biggest in India—it is not by bigness that Universities go, but by the quality of work—will be able to function well

So far as the Central Government is concerned, it is a Central University. It is a University which costs a lot of money to the Central Government Rs 55 lakhs a year, apart from special grants. It is a large sum of money. We give it. We do not wish to interfere with it. In fact, we do not give it. It is the University Grants Commission, another relatively independent body that deals with these matters. In this matter, again, as I mentioned indirectly, the University Grants Commission also holds strong views about the giving of this money to the University as it is. It has almost indicated that if no change is made, let somebody else look after this University, they can't. Look at this position. Are we to leave matters in mud air or hanging, with no roots, no soil. It cannot be done. We have to go ahead about it and go ahead more or less on the lines suggested by this Committee of enquiry.

One word more. The hon Member who spoke last said something about the Vice-Chancellor being in this so-called Screening Committee. He seemed to think that the Vice-Chancellor's name has not been put there in the Screening Committee because of pressures being brought to bear upon us, because of some other odd reason or because we did not trust him. I really do not understand this. There has been no question of pressure or, at any rate, pressure that affected us. There is no question of our not having the fullest faith in the

quality of the work that the present Vice-Chancellor is doing there. He has had to face a very difficult situation. I do not know, I do not say that he or anybody else is a perfect individual or he may not have made mistakes here or there. But, he has faced a difficult situation with courage and integrity and we wish him well. But, we did feel, and I think correctly, that in this complicated situation, to put him also in that committee was not fair to him. And, I think that it was he himself that agreed with this view and did not want to be there. Therefore, we agreed to what he said and removed his name from the list in the Amending Bill that is being placed before the House because he has, as it is, a hard enough task to face. There is no question of doing anything derogatory to him. We wish him all success in this hard task.

I submit, therefore, that the Bill as it has been introduced, is certainly the right course, the only course; there is no other way out. There is no other course that we can possibly adopt in this matter.

श्री गणपति राम (जोनपुर रहित अनु-
सूचित जातिया) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस
युनिवर्सिटी के विषय में पिछड़े वर्गों और हरि-
जनों की क्या भावना है। इस को जानने के
लिये उन्हें भी अक्सर मिलना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय . अभी मैंने श्री ईश्वर
अय्यर को बुलाया है, आप बैठ जायें।

Shri Easwara Iyer (Trivandrum):
Mr Deputy-Speaker, it seems to me
that an unfortunate tempo has been
raised in respect of this Banaras Hindu
University Bill. So far as this matter
is concerned, some of us who are
beyond the ambit or sphere of activity

Bill

of this University, have been supplied with certain materials and from them we have to judge as to what is happening in respect of this University. I am not denying for a moment the integrity or sincerity or status or position of the Members who constituted the Committee. But, I would certainly think that we cannot accept the report in its entirety just because it has been put forward by a body of eminent persons. The report has to be analysed. We are not as helpless as the hon. Prime Minister would say. We must scan the report and understand it and try to analyse the report and find out whether there is any question of partiality or impartiality in respect of this report.

A reading of the report makes me rather unhappy. It seems to be a judgment delivered without concrete facts, on purely imaginary surmises. Opinion in this House is sharply divided and it is for us to find out as to whether this report has to be accepted or not. I am not going into the merits or demerits of the report, but I would only refer to certain salient features. What prevented the Government from making a reference regarding the financial position of the University? The Prime Minister said that a good amount is being spent on this University, given by the University Grants Commission. A reading of the terms of reference would show that the question of the finances of the University has not been referred. Why? There have been rumours that the funds of the University have not been fairly and squarely dealt with. In fact, there have been a number of reports appearing in the newspapers. I cannot vouchsafe for the truth or otherwise of these reports, but certainly when a very substantial sum has been expended on the University, the matter of the finances of the University should also have been made a matter of investigation.

There is a report that there has been purchase of about Rs. 14 lakhs
 121 L.S.D.—6.

worth of zamindari bonds; when the market rate was somewhere about Rs. 37, the bonds were purchased at Rs. 42. Is this report correct? These matters should have been investigated

They say there is some dirt which has accumulated regarding this University. There may be dirt because a reading of the report and all that is happening will leave us with the feeling that all is not well with this University, and there is no smoke without a fire. They say they are thinking of a clean-up. If a clean-up is necessary, why retain the Treasurer? The Treasurer and the Vice-Chancellor are continued now. Let us have a good clean-up. Let all persons of responsibility in respect of this University be cleaned up.

Then, why was this Ordinance promulgated in such a hasty manner? Parliament was in session till the 9th of May. If something was radically wrong with the University, the matter could have been brought to the notice of Parliament then. An Ordinance is brought pleading that some interim arrangement is necessary because the University has to reopen in July, when Parliament is not in session. Why is this hurry about it? Having waited till May 9th, why not wait till Parliament reconvenes?

On a reading of the report we find that the entire responsibility is not on the shoulders of the teachers or the students or the teacher-politicians group as the Committee would say. I would certainly say without any hesitation that the slowness of the Ministry in acting, and the not too impartial attitude of the Ministry are responsible for the chaotic conditions in this University.

The Banaras Hindu University has a glorious tradition. Certainly we must agree that it has got a tradition, but there is no use in revelling over

[Shri Easwara Iyer]

the traditions if we are not ready to preserve those traditions.

The Committee's report is rather very unsubstantial. Some conclusions are arrived at on the basis of facts or based on certain surmises, as for example, paragraph 30 of the report. I would invite the attention of the hon. Members of this House to the grave allegation that has been made by the Members of the Committee in that paragraph:

"One aspect of life in the University which has been revealed by the Divisional Commissioner is far more surprising than any of the acts of indiscipline. He has referred in his memorandum to students visiting houses and lodges of disrepute and to certain students being associated with these. He has also mentioned about certain teachers committing offences involving moral turpitude. It was painful reading for the Committee to go through these unvarnished facts and the members do not see any reason to discount the statement made, for, in the evidence tendered by more than one person, charges and imputations of immorality in the University have been made and a case of unnatural offence involving a Professor is stated to be before a court of law."

It seems to be a very frightful disclosure, but perhaps this has been made, I would say, with a jaundiced eye. When the question whether a person is guilty or not is before a court of law, is *sub judice*, why make mention of it, except perhaps to present a lurid picture of what is happening there? Paragraph 30 of the report is wholly unnecessary, unless, of course, there is good evidence, tangible, substantial evidence, to come to a *prima facie* conclusion regarding that. A mere mention of that like

this report is not going to help matters. It is only throwing mud at the professors and the students. I am not saying the students or the teachers are getting on very well there, but I certainly disagree, I certainly resent such remarks being made without any substantial evidence.

It is certainly within our competence—and we are not as helpless as the Prime Minister would say—to comment upon this report, and say that the members of the Committee have only recorded their first impressions. I am not questioning their status or integrity, I would only say I am commenting upon their incapacity to arrive at the correct decision. It is certainly within our competence to say that the Committee's report is wholly unacceptable and that we should have an impartial probe if there is necessary, let the Members of the University machinery in which the Central Government has got a responsibility. If that impartial probe is necessary, let the Members of the Select Committee go there, have an impartial probe into the affairs of the University and suggest the ways and means of redressing it.

After the Ordinance has been passed, it has now come in the form of a Bill before Parliament and is being referred to a Select Committee. It is usual for us, when there is a Select Committee, to have a Joint Committee inclusive of Members of the Rajya Sabha also. I am not saying this is the universal rule, but why not have a Joint Committee with Members of the Rajya Sabha also?

An Hon. Member: No time.

Shri Easwara Iyer: You may say there is no time, but we have waited so long. We must have a good understanding of what is happening in this University before we go into a sort

of piecemeal legislation. Now the time has come to have a sort of legislation and try to smoothen the affairs of the University, but according to the Minister a three-clause Bill is sufficient to stop all this rot that is happening in that University. He might be very sanguine about the results, but the Banaras Hindu University Act which was passed in 1915 needs a reorganisation and reorientation, if I may say so, in accordance with the changing circumstances. Why have this three-clause Bill? We should have a thorough analysis of the entire Act. We should have a study of the Act and suggest ways and means regarding the necessary changes that are required for the proper functioning of the University.

This three-clause Bill is put before us, and the Select Committee cannot be beyond the ambit of the amendments that the Bill has proposed, and once it emerges in the form of an amending Act it is not going to smoothen the affairs. In fact, it is only pouring oil into fire.

Lastly, I would say that the time-limit that has been prescribed for the Select Committee is too short. In view of the fact that a lot of heat has been generated on the subject and opinions have been sharply divided here, let us have a close study of this Bill. Let us do it in a calm atmosphere and let us do it slowly but surely to avoid all this trouble in future. The Select Committee should be given at least six months and the Committee should consist of Members of the Rajya Sabha also. Hon. Members on the other side may not agree with my suggestion. But this is what we feel, coming from a place where we do not have close knowledge of the affairs of the Banaras University, as was exhibited the other day by my hon. friend Pandit Govind Malaviya.

13 hrs.

Sir, a university must function as a university. A curious thing has

been happening nowadays. We are not oblivious to that. That is the case of management taking part in politics, of teachers taking part in politics and the bond which has been existing between the teacher and the student—the *guru sishya bandha*—has not been getting on fairly well. We find a group of teachers in order to ventilate their grievances setting up the students and rightly or wrongly some politicians or political groups get behind the students. I am not for one moment contending that students should not take part in politics. Students have every right to read and discuss politics, but it is not the right of the management and the teachers who are expected to teach the students in the temple of learning to interfere in politics, to take sides with politicians as has been happening in our State, Kerala State, where the management is interfering with the students. The management is setting up the students and the students are asked to go on strike. This has been an unfortunate state of affairs, and this might be happening in the Banaras Hindu University also. If that is so, these things should be stopped.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now the hon. Member is getting on to another climax!

Shri Easwara Iyer: It is not going to another climax. As a person who has something to do with education, as a person who has been employed as a lecturer in a university, I know what are the functions of a teacher and a professor. To take part and discuss politics with students is one thing; to instigate them to action is another thing.

Shri Kottukapally (Moovattupuzha): Is he speaking on the Banaras Hindu University or Travancore University?

Shri Easwara Iyer: It is better my hon. friend revised his ideas about the Travancore University, because much water has flown. We have now got a

[Shri Easwara Iyer]

Kerala University Probably the Rip Van Winkle may wake up I would say

Mr. Deputy-Speaker In conclusion I hope!

Shri Easwara Iyer In conclusion, Sir, here is a Bill in which the affairs of a university are being dealt with Let us have no party politics let us not take sides, let us discuss it in a free and dispassionate manner and let us see whether we cannot settle this matter without taking sides

Lastly,—I will not take more than one minute—in this case even after the passing of the ordinance I find that the Vice-Chancellor has issued a circular I am reading from an official document which has come into my hands

An Hon Member. How?

Shri Easwara Iyer. How is not the question It has come to my hands I am not in the dock

It says

‘Great caution should be exercised in admitting students to various courses Students with political affiliations, taking part in subversive activities be not admitted Only such students who are serious and attentive in their studies should be given preference in the matter of admissions’

Very nicely worded document! But it gives uncontrolled discretion to authorities in the matter of admission and certainly there is room for partiality and trouble in enforcing this rule What exactly is “subversive activity”? Is it capable of definition? Any student can be rejected admission on the ground that he is taking part in subversive activities These generally worded circulars are of no use and would only create

chaos and trouble, and if I may say so with all respect, if even after the ordinance such rules are framed, it is not going to improve the conditions of the Banaras Hindu University

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I had as a matter of fact no desire to participate in this debate, because I was associated with the report which is being examined and criticised here It would have been better if I had not spoken But I found that a rumour has been set afloat that Mrs Kripalani does not stand by the report, hence she is shirking coming into the House My friends who know me during the last twenty years of my public life would know pretty well that nobody can make me sign a report if I do not agree with it I stand by the entire report and I also stand by the action taken by Government in this matter

It has pained me considerably to see the manner in which criticisms have been levelled against this report as well as the action of the Government Government had no other way, as has been explained by the Prime Minister, but to take a very bold and immediate step to control the affairs of the University which are in a very sorry state

Sir, when I was asked to serve on the Committee, I was very reluctant I knew it was a very unpleasant job, a task in which we would expose ourselves to all kinds of unfair attacks Just now the hon Member who spoke before me had the temerity to suggest that it was a partisan report What had we against the university? Why should we bother to give a report in favour of one party or another party, we are not concerned with any party It was very wrong on his part to have made any such insinuation

Sir, I have very great sentiments for the Banaras Hindu University I am not a student of the Banaras Hindu

University. But I have served this University for eight years. I served in those days when Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviyaji was the Vice-Chancellor. Under his inspiration and guidance many people came, many eminent people came and served for a pittance. This university stood for nationalism, patriotism and idealism. This university had a great place in the life of the country. I served in those days. We had departments which were famous all over India. The students of our Engineering College were accepted wherever they went. We offered courses of study which were not offered in those days in any other universities.

It was a residential institution. Why? Because Malaviyaji wanted to build the entire life of the students, to give them other things besides education. He wanted to give them a broad outlook; he wanted our boys to go into India and show that they stood for a particular way of life. This university was very good in sports and other extra-curricular activities. I remember the UTC companies of the university used to bring shields. We had great ambitions for this university and we still have great ambitions. We want to make it an all-India university, where academic standards are high, and from which students come out with inspiration and idealism.

Sir, I do not wish to go over the entire issue of the debate because the hon. Minister has already covered many points. I will, therefore, focus my remarks on a few points of criticism. One point of criticism was—and I am most surprised that this criticism was voiced by Shri Hiren Mukerjee, Professor Hiren Mukerjee, who is closely associated with education—that similar conditions prevail in other universities. God forbid! I do hope that in other universities similar conditions do not prevail; and if similar conditions do prevail in other universities it is time that we have

some heart searching. If this is the atmosphere in which we want to bring up our young generation, it is a matter of shame for us and we should see what we can do to remedy it.

The tasks set before us, that is, this particular inquiry committee, was not a roving inquiry into the affairs of all the universities. We were not asked to give a comparative study of the conditions prevailing in the other universities. We were given a specific task. We were asked to go into the affairs of the Banaras Hindu University. Also, under particular heads, we had to make inquiries, and we did make inquiries. So, this argument that because similar conditions prevail in other universities there was no ground for making an inquiry into this university does not stand. Besides, I would like to know in what other university, vice-chancellors, of this eminence, like Dr. Radhakrishnan, Dr. Amarnath Jha, and Acharya Narendra Dev, were there? They were not mere educationists, but they very eminent men in this country who had held this post, and all of them found it difficult to continue and, therefore, had to lean the part. Our eminent friend Pandit Govind Malaviya was also a vice-chancellor. From the letter as disclosed by the Minister.

An Hon. Member: What about the present vice-chancellor?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Please do not disturb. I do not want to get disturbed.

The letter reveals that Pandit Govind Malaviya was exceedingly unhappy; he had to come away in disgust and in unhappiness. And this gentleman...

Pandit Govind Malaviya (Sultanpur): That is not correct.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Excuse me. Facts reveal otherwise. He

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

actually said that this report was light-hearted. . . .

Pandit Govind Malaviya: 'Had to come away' is not correct.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: We would very much like to be corrected on that matter, for, we have gone into the whole affair. He said that this report has been written 'light-heartedly'. I would say that this report has been written with the heaviest possible heart. It was no pleasure to us, senior people who are working in the field of national work for so many years, to reveal these things about a university, and a university of national character, a university which is considered an all-India university. We did it with a very heavy heart. So, if anybody makes such remarks, I think those very remarks are lighthearted; those remarks are made without a proper sense of responsibility.

Then, many things have been said as to the manner in which the inquiry was conducted. All our findings are based on memoranda, on evidence, and on witnesses. Somebody said that we did not go to Banaras. We spent five days in Banaras and we preferred to stay outside the university, because we wanted to carry on the work with peace of mind and without disturbance. We were told that we did not visit the university. As far as I am concerned, I know many people in the university; I know many affairs of the university; I am intimately in contact with the university affairs. And all of us, during those four or five days, found time to go and see things for ourselves.

As far as the examination of witnesses was concerned, here is the list given of the number of people who appeared before us as witnesses, and from the names you can see what kind of people they were. They were pro-

fessors belonging to both the groups, students belonging to both the groups, people who were associated with the administration of the university, other eminent men and all the vice-chancellors. We went and took evidence of all the ex-vice-chancellors who are living, except of Pandit Govind Malaviya who did not choose to appear before us; nor did he send us any memoranda. If he was ill he could at least have assisted us by sending memoranda

Then, all kinds of funny charges have been made. I can tell you that our chairman was rather lenient. Whoever wanted to come at the last taje,—and whose names were not within the list, was called. After all, we are busy people, and we have other work to do, but within the time possible we gave them as much time as we could. Whoever wanted to come and say anything was allowed to come and say it. People came privately to me; as I had belonged to the university before, many people knew me. They came and said all kinds of things. Whatever they had to say, we heard them, and whatever we heard shocked us more and more and made us more and more unhappy. That is all that I can say.

So, voluminous material was placed before us. The Collector of Banaras came before us and placed before us various facts.

Shri Yadav (Barabanki): SP also?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: If the SP did not come, the Collector was sufficient to place the material before us.

Then, I shall say something very unique. I have worked on other inquiry committees. I was chairman of the Industrial Finance Corporation Inquiry Committee. But we have never gone through this kind of experience that we are now going

through. We are twitted in the lobby; we are twitted outside. We are asked: 'On what have you based your findings?'. We have based our findings on facts, on papers which I am ready to lay before the House. I would ask Government to lay the papers, to lay the memoranda that we received before the House; and I challenge that it would not redound to the credit either of the students or of the professors to see the facts revealed in the memoranda:

Then, I am shocked that the gentlemen who spoke before us had chosen of all paragraphs paragraph 30. I would have said that they should not have referred to it. I do not want to say many things. But we had a very anxious time; we were wondering and we were thinking whether we should put this wretched material here or not. Such facts were brought before us that we had to hang our heads in shame. We could not have thought that students were exposed to this kind of life. There is shortage of hostels, and students go and stay in all kinds of undesirable quarters. Students and professors together visit undesirable places. The Proctor is called in the middle of the night to go and handle such situations, and then people have the temerity to say that we have written this without sufficient facts. Do you want facts? Do you want documentary evidence of people going to brothels? Is it ever done? I was shocked, and I may tell you that I am a woman who has worked in public life for many years, but when the students came and recounted certain matters, in the committee, I had to ask the chairman to allow me to leave the room, because if I stay there they could not have probed into the matters. Do you think that this redounds to the glory of the Banaras Hindu University management, this redounds to the glory of our students' life, this redounds to the glory of a national institution? You are the best person to judge it.

I am surprised at the "light-hearted" manner in which we have been attacked. About moral turpitude I say we are charged, and we have been told that we have given wrong facts. I would like you to go and study the papers of the cases that are before the courts and see whether there are charges of moral turpitude or not in these cases. I challenge you to go and see them.

Shri Yadav: How many cases are there?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Wait a minute. I do not want to be cowed down.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Yadav should not be impatient if he wants to get a chance to speak.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I do not want to be, and I am not, cowed down by people.

Then, I would also place some of the responsibility for this state of affairs on our Government. The first thing is what Shri Harish Chandra Mathur has said, that Government should have taken this step much earlier. Secondly, during the course of our inquiry, we came to know of a case where one great professor, who may be an eminent scholar, who used forged students' concession passes for taking his son's marriage party. This matter came out in the Railway Corruption Inquiry Committee also; and this matter came before us. Now, the moral fibre of the university is low. For that, everybody is responsible including the Government. This great gentleman. . .

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): And he has charged the other party for the fare.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: That is an additional matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member should realise that this could have been briefed earlier. (Laughter)

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I shall accept the additional comments. It is really not a laughing matter. It is a serious matter. This gentleman, this eminent scholar and elderly gentleman was given Padma Bhushan or some such title—that honour was bestowed on him by the Government. After all, before honouring such people, I would request Government to make a little inquiry. If you honour such people what standard do you uphold before the students—the standard that forgery and fraud are so good that they can be honoured?

I do not want to go into the details but I shall tell you of some of the cases which came before us, which show the entire fibre of that institution has gone rotten. A case came before us—

Shri Achar (Mangalore) Probably, at that time, Government did not know about it.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Must be Anyway.

Shri Ashoka Mehta: They do not read the reports.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no interruptions. I would request hon. Members not to interrupt, because otherwise the whole tenor is spoilt.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Another matter came to us regarding the conduct of one of the heads of departments. I did not wish to mention these details but the inquiry committee has been charged with having arrived at conclusions without bases, hence I have to mention a few cases. The son of this professor, the head of this department, submitted a thesis for doctorate. The thesis was so very good that he got hundred out of hundred. So, some people became slightly suspicious.

Fandit Govind Malaviya: In which year?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: The hon. Member knows it very well.

Fandit Govind Malaviya: The House should also know it.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Then, it was discovered that this thesis was the joint product of all the staff of that particular department. (Interruptions) Please do not go on disturbing me.

Such were the facts that were revealed to us. Another very eminent gentleman, who is still a professor—the other gentleman has gone, the other professor whose son's thesis was questioned admitted before us that he had not allowed some students to appear for examination on the plea that their percentage of attendance fell short of the required quota.

Now, this eminent Professor admitted before us that for three months he never maintained an attendance register. If you do not maintain an attendance register for three months, how would you know whether a student's attendance is full or not? But whether a student is to be sent up or not is decided by his personal feelings towards the student rather than on anything else. It is decided from the fact whether the student was willing to do all that the Professor asked him to do.

I would like to point out to my eminent critics that one of the members of the Committee was no less a person than Shri M. C. Mahajan, ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India. If he was good enough to play the small role of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, I am sure he was good enough to be a member of our Committee, to be able to examine and sift facts placed before us. In the

Committee, the questioning was mainly done by Shri Mahajan. Because he did the questioning so beautifully, we had no need to intervene. Many of the witnesses got entangled in the lies that they were trying to place before us. Shri Mahajan beautifully brought out these lies and contradictions.

Coming to this particular case of the Professor, first he tried to bluff us. Then he admitted that he did not keep the register for three months. Then the batch of students supporting him came and said, 'No, the Professor had maintained the register' without knowing what the Professor had already admitted before us that he had not. When they were questioned further and shown the statement of the Professor, they did not know what to say!

We had a very difficult and thankless task and we did it because we considered it a painful duty. We considered it our duty to try to uphold the honour of this University which is dear to all of us Indians. We did not want that the good and fair name of this University should be besmirched. What are our findings? What is the impression left on us about the conditions prevailing in the University?

Every year there is trouble during the time of admissions—strikes, hunger-strikes, hooliganism, breaking of panes and other furniture of the Vice-Chancellor's house. All these things happen during the time of admissions. Why does this happen? Because some of the Professors, big Professors, heads of Departments of the University, think, and they have advocated before us, that students in the arts department should be admitted *ad lib*. There should be no limit put to admission of students to the arts department! They said, 'Yes, we admitted that for science and other technical departments, there should be a limit; but for arts you can go on admitting without any limit'.

We were told that in the arts classes, all the students could not be accommodated in the class rooms. They were sitting in the verandas, if I may use a vulgar phrase, *danda bajaraha* the and not doing any work. They could roam all over the place. The Principal of a College, one of the heads of Department, advocated this astounding theory. When we asked him how he as an educationist could say that students could be admitted *ad lib*, did he not realise that at least some physical space was necessary, in the class rooms, did he not realise that some students-professor ratio should be maintained, did he not realise that certain other amenities were necessary if we really wanted them to study, he had no reply to give—because he we felt was anxious that the students should come and create confusion!

Then the students came and they also advocated the same theory, that there should be no limit to the number to be admitted in the arts section. Why? Because

मालवीय जी ने कहा था कि विद्या मंदिर का दरवाजा मब क नियो खुला रहना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं तो कहती हूँ कि विद्या के मंदिर का दरवाजा अगर द्रप त रह से खुला रखा गया तो वह मंदिर नहीं रह जायेगा बल्कि वह एक अस्पताल हो जायेगा और आज वह एक अस्पताल सा बनने लगा है।

So many students are taken. They have no place in the hostels. They have no place in the class-room. They cannot be looked after. The wardens who were appointed in the time of Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Iyer got all the benefits of becoming Wardens, financial and otherwise, but did not care about the students. They did not bother about the students. The students live in all kinds of lanes and bye-lanes and undesirable parts of the city.

As far as sports and games are concerned, in Banaras when we were

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

there, the UTC had an honourable place. Our company every year brought shields. It was a smart company. But this year we were told that the NCC quota allowed by Government was not fulfilled. The boys did not want to join. The same conditions prevail in the matter of games, sports and other extra-curricular activities.

If you want this kind of thing to go on in the University, you are welcome to have it. But if you want to give real education to the students, the institution must be run with certain limited number of students. Every year there is this trouble and tussle about admissions, the question is raised whether students should be admitted *ad lib* or not. Professors themselves have broken the rules made by them fixing a certain quota for admission. They themselves admit students beyond the limit. The argument is

दरवाजा खुला रहा चाहिए ।

The problem is wider. It is not merely one pertaining to the Banaras University. Students are coming up in large numbers for admissions. A large number is now coming from Eastern UP. They want to have College education. In Eastern UP, there are very few colleges, therefore they rush to Banaras. The question is whether Banaras should retain its all-India character as a good University, as a better-type University catering for talents drawn from all the States, both in the ranks of students and those of Professors, or should it merely go on admitting indifferent students from the near-about districts.

Shri T. N. Singh (Chandauli):
Eastern UP.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: What-ever it is. I am not afraid. I would certainly say that the problem of finding colleges for the students is a problem for the UP Government. The

UP Government should start more colleges in that area so that these students who wish to go to college could get an opportunity. Banaras University alone cannot meet that demand. It is too big a problem to be dealt with in that way. If you try to do that, the standard of Banaras University would be lowered and the conditions that are prevailing in Banaras now will continue. If you want to give real education, you have to start more colleges. Let the UP Government get funds from the Central Government. But it is squarely the responsibility of the UP Government to start more colleges for that State.

Another much bigger problem came before us, was whether students should go on joining the arts course and become art graduates and add to the ranks of the unemployed all over the country. The Government should start other courses of technical and other education where students can find an opening. Otherwise, they undergo an academic course which leads them nowhere, which results in this kind of chaos and confusion in the Universities.

We were attacked for having emphasised the all-India character of the University. We cannot help it. Malaviyaji himself had conceived of this University as an all-India University. I would refer you to page 37 of the Report where certain figures of financial assistance that the University has received are given. In 1942, this University got Rs. 3 lakhs from the Central Government and Rs 1 lakh odd from the UP Government. In 1956-57, the University got Rs. 5½ lakhs from the Central Government and Rs 2 lakhs from the UP Government.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: So may be the case with other Universities.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Whatever it is, I am not concerned with other Universities. I am on the limited field of this University. As regards non-recurring expenditure, the UP Government gave Rs. 1.72 lakhs and the Centre gave Rs. 13 lakhs. If the Centre is spending so much money—there are only a few Central Universities—certainly let us retain the all-India character of the University. Let us try and see that the best talent from all over India comes there. Let us give them specialised courses of study. That is the work of this University. At least, that is how we think of it. We should make it into a 'national' University.

I am very sorry that my Eastern UP friends have been hurt by the remark that the Eastern UP group dominates in the University groups. We meant no disparagement. I myself am so closely associated with UP that I consider myself a 'UP walla'—whether my friends recognise it or not. If I have a permanent home, it is in UP. I have spent the best part of my life in UP, in Banaras and Allahabad and other places. This remark was not meant as a disparagement. If anybody has taken it like that, we are very sorry, and on behalf of all the members of the Committee, I would like to say that we are sorry and it was never meant that way. We are extremely sorry for that. But this group is called by the name 'the Eastern UP group' by the people and unfortunately, we used that epithet. It was not intended to be of disparagement to the Eastern UP people. In fact, the Eastern UP people are good and better than others; if you want me to say so, I will say that. We never intended this remark as a disparagement. Why should we do it?

There is also another point. I personally would have been happier if the Vice-Chancellor had not been associated with us in this inquiry, not because the Vice-Chancellor behaved in any incorrect manner during the

proceedings but because it has given a handle to the critics of the Report. The Vice-Chancellor was associated with us while we were sifting and making inquiries, but he had nothing to do with it when we wrote the Report.

Then I come to the very big point regarding the autonomy of the Universities. I yield to none in my desire to uphold the autonomy of the University and I tell you none of the members were against autonomy. We would be the first to support and fight for autonomy. But when such conditions prevail, drastic remedies become necessary. Jawaharlalji has made it amply clear that it is only a temporary measure till we can stabilise the condition in the university and the standard of work is brought to a level and the University starts functioning properly. It is only a temporary measure; just as a surgeon has to use his knife on a diseased person, in the same way, this is an emergent and temporary measure which had to be taken. Otherwise, it would be impossible to maintain a high standard in the University.

I am very surprised that Members of Parliament in this House are unhappy that an enquiry has been held into a scandal. I thought Members of Parliament are always very keen to have enquiries made into scandals. This time the whole attitude is different; I do not know the reason why. I think it is our duty.....

Pandit Govind Malaviya: What scandal please?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: You know more about this scandal than I do.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: What are you speaking about?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Here is the report and here are all your

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

written words. It is open to any Member of the House to read the words and to put a different interpretation than those I have put. I have nothing to say. I take your own words.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: But after that there was a new Act. The Government through Parliament passed a new Act after that in order to set things right.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: If everything had been set right we would not have had this thankless task to do. I think every hon. Member should think seriously about it. It is not a party matter or a group matter. We want to do our best. We want to set an example to other Universities and I hope that you would all support the report

There may be a few factual errors. I am sorry if any errors have crept in. The Chairman tried to correct some of them. Our intention was to see that this University is put on its feet and run properly. That is our intention and Government, I am sure, have brought the bill with the same intention

Pandit Govind Malaviya: May I request the hon. Member to enlighten us on one or two points; only about facts?

1. She has referred to a case where some Professor had written the thesis of a student. We should like to know which year this was and whether after that any action was taken against the Professor and if so what action. Whether he was not sent away from the University and whether that was not about 15 or 20 years ago?

2. The second point about which I should like to have information from the hon. Member is as to whether the residential part of the University to which she has referred has been on

the increase or on the decrease; and if on the decrease since when.

3. The next thing I would like to know is whether this agitation at the time of admissions to which she has referred, occurred only since two years ago; and if so whether it began when there was not a question of any further increase in the number of admissions but actually when it was ordered that the number of students who were being admitted to the University year after year was to be drastically reduced, reduced so much that in some case, it was brought down to a little more than half of what they used to be before; and that there was agitation and protest in the University due to such reduction?

I should like to get factual information on all these.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister has to make the reply and he will try to collect this information if he can and give in his reply

श्री सरजू पांडे (गमडा) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल से मैंने कई बार अपना नाम आपके पास भेजा मगर मुझे बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला। मैं इस नागजगी को वजह जानना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय भ्रमर नाराजगी को कोई वजह होगी वह माननीय मंत्री साहब को बता दी जायेगी।

श्र. गणपति राम (जीनपुर—रमित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मुझे बड़े अकतोस से कहना पड़ता है कि भ्रमर माननीय सदस्य इस तरह से मुझे इन्टरफियर करते रहे तो मैं उनको बत नहीं दे सकूंगा।

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav will please finish his speech within ten minutes as I have to call the hon. Minister.

श्री वाचक उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बिल कितना विवादग्रस्त है यह तो इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों के रक्त से ही पता चल जाता है। विश्वविद्यालय के अन्दर हस्तक्षेप करने की श्री चिन्तामणि को तो चिन्ता करनी ही पड़ी साथ ही हमारे श्रीमाली जी को भी चिन्ता करनी पड़ी। उसी का अग्रसर हुआ है यूनीवर्सिटी पर, सारे देश में और इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों पर भी, और अन्ततोगत्वा प्रधान मंत्री को भी बीच में पड़ना पड़ा और प्रधान मंत्री जो ने कहा है जैसा कि अभी माननीया श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी जी ने फरमाया है, कि हम में से कोई भी यूनीवर्सिटी की प्राटानामी के विरुद्ध नहीं है, प्रधान मंत्री भी इस के विरुद्ध नहीं है, और यह कानून तो मिरफ़ थोड़े समय के लिये बनाया जा रहा है बाद में शायद कोई इस से बढ़िया कानून आयेगा।

13 37 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

श्रीमन मैं आपके द्वारा माननीय मंत्री महोदय से और इस माननीय सदन से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। हमारे माननीय कांग्रेसी नेताओं और सरकार के दो जबाने हैं। एक जबान से तो राधा जी की मृत्यु अहिंसा, जनतंत्र की पुकार लगायी जाती है और दूसरी जबान से अंधेरे अंधेरे अपने कार्यों से और कायदे और कानून से जनतंत्र और प्राविशियल प्राटानामी को मिटाने की कोशिश की जाती है।

आज यह बिल हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत है। इस पर जितने भी माननीय बोले हैं उन में से कोई भी विश्वविद्यालय की प्राटानामी के विरुद्ध नहीं है, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भी उसकी प्राटानामी के विरुद्ध नहीं हैं। लेकिन आज बड़ी तेजी के साथ बनारस विश्वविद्यालय के अन्दर हस्तक्षेप किया जा रहा है। इस विश्वविद्यालय में अब तक पूरी स्वतंत्रता रही है शिक्षा दीक्षा के मामले में, जिसको अंग्रेजी सरकार भी खत्म नहीं कर सकी। लेकिन आज यह कार्य मौजूदा सरकार के हाथों हो रहा है जो अपने को जन प्रिय सरकार कहती है और यह कार्य बड़े ढंग और बड़े कायदे के साथ सम्पन्न हो रहा है।

श्रीमन् हम इस विधेयक को देखें और जो अध्यादेश जारी किया गया है उस पर नज़र करें, तो क्या देखते हैं? राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने एक कमेटी का निर्माण किया। मैं इस में कोई शका नहीं करना चाहता और न मैं माननीय राष्ट्रपति के इस अधिकार को गलत बताना चाहता हूँ कि उन्हें यह अधिकार नहीं था। उनको यह अधिकार था। लेकिन, श्रीमन्, जो बनारस विश्व विद्यालय का कानून था उसके अन्तर्गत धारा ५ उपधारा ४ के मुताबिक चाहिए था कि यूनीवर्सिटी को भी इस बात की नोटिस दी गयी होती। परन्तु न जाने वे कौन से कारण थे कि जिनकी वजह से वाइस-चांसलर महोदय न यूनीवर्सिटी को इस तरह की कोई इत्तला देने की कोई कोशिश नहीं की। कमेटी की रिपोर्ट भी तैयार हुई। उसकी भी यूनीवर्सिटी को इत्तला नहीं हुई। माननीय सदस्यों ने जिन्होंने इस के पक्ष में भाषण दिये हैं उन्होंने कहा है कि इस कमेटी के सदस्य बहुत योग्य, विद्वान और बड़े लोग थे। सदन में बोलने वाले किसी भी सदस्य ने यह नहीं कहा कि वे योग्य व्यक्ति नहीं थे या इस काम को ठीक नहीं कर

[श्री वादव]

सकते थे। किसी ने भी उनकी योग्यता में शंका नहीं की है। परन्तु एक बात जरूरी थी कि जहां इस कमेटी में ये सुयोग्य लोग रहने जरूरी थे वहां यह भी आवश्यक था क्योंकि, ईस्टर्न यू० पी० और बिहार के ऊपर लाइन लगाये गये हैं, कि वहां प्रासपास का कोई अच्छी योग्यता वाला व्यक्ति जिसको यूनीवर्सिटी के बारे में ज्यादा से ज्यादा जानकारी हो, वह इस कमेटी में रखा जाता। और ऐसे व्यक्ति इसी माननीय सदन के सदस्य माननीय श्री गोविन्द मालवीय थे। उनको प्रासानी से उस कमेटी में रखा जा सकता था। परन्तु हुआ यह कि उनको तो कमेटी में नहीं रखा गया। कमेटी ने उनको लिखा है कि अगर तुम चाहो तो आकर कमेटी से इंटर्व्यू ले सकते हो। वे बेचारे बीमार थे और इस कारण नहीं जा सके। उसके बाद भी कमेटी ने कोई प्रयत्न नहीं किया कि जाकर उन से जानकारी हासिल करती। इस से क्या पता चलता है। इस से पता चलता है कि इस के पीछे कुछ हेतु रहा होगा। कोई भी व्यक्ति चाहे उसको यूनीवर्सिटी के अन्दरूनी मामलों की जरा भी जानकारी न हो, इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़कर अनुभव करेगा कि यह किसी विशेष उद्देश्य को लेकर लिखी गयी है। जहां देखिये सारी रिपोर्ट के अन्दर पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार का जिक्र है। इस के अतिरिक्त उस में कुछ मालूम नहीं होता। इधर उधर कुछ स्टूडेंट्स के इन्डिसिग्लिन के बारे में जिक्र है और कहा गया है कि विश्वविद्यालय में सब गड़बड़ सब बड़ हो रहा है। और उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी भाग और बिहार के लोगों के कारण यह गड़बड़ है। बस इस के अतिरिक्त इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कुछ नहीं है। व सो विश्वविद्यालय की आर्थिक स्थिति का जिक्र है कि उसके फाइनेन्सेज का

सदुपयोग होता था या दुरुपयोग होता था, विद्याधियों के ऊपर कितना खर्चा किया जा रहा है आदि या कि जनरल एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के नाम पर कुछ चीजों का दुरुपयोग किया जा रहा है या यह कि उस के अन्दर किस तरह से गड़बड़ चल रही है। इस के अन्दर इन चीजों का कोई जिक्र नहीं है। इस कमेटी के बारे में कुछ भलती है इनक जो टर्म आफ रेफरेंस इसको दिये गये थे कि इन बातों की जानकारी प्राप्त की जाये वे गलत हैं लेकिन कमेटी ने एक कदम और आगे बढ़ाया है और अपने काम को केवल पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार तक ही सीमित रखा है और दूसरी बातों की तरफ उस कमेटी ने ध्यान नहीं दिया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस और माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान जाये।

कमेटी ने यह जिक्र किया कि जितने भी वाइस चांसलर आज तक यहां हुए हैं उन में से किसी को ठीक से काम करने का मौका नहीं मिला। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि माननीय मंत्री महोदय और स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के कानों में तो यह चीज आयी, लेकिन सर्व साधारण के कानों में, सारे हिंदुस्तान के लोगों के कानों में और शिक्षा जगत में लोगों के कानों में यह चीज नहीं पड़ी कि यहां पर वाइस चांसलरों को ठीक से काम नहीं करने दिया गया है और एक से एक सुयोग्य वाइस चांसलर को मजबूर होकर वहां से काम छोड़ कर जाना पड़ा। महामना पंडित मदन मोहन मालवीय के बाद हमारे डा० राधाकृष्णन वहां के वाइस-चांसलर नियुक्त हुए, उन्होंने कई वर्ष तक वहां काम किया। और जब वह आक्सफोर्ड यूनीवर्सिटी के चिर्चिटिंग प्रोफेसर बना दिये गये तो वह छोड़ कर चले।

इस के बाद श्री भ्रमरनाथ झा को वहाँ का वाइस चांसलर नियुक्त किया गया। वह उत्तर प्रदेश के पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के चेयरमैन थे और उनको उस समय के उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री और प्राज के केन्द्र के गृह-मंत्री, श्री गोविन्द बल्लभ पन्त जी ने कहा कि एक साल के लिये चले जाओ। वह एक साल के लिये गये और उस समय के बाद वह वापस चले गये। न तो किसी को काम करने के अयोग्य ठहराया गया और न किसी को गड़बड़ के कारण मजबूर होकर हटना पडा। उसके बाद आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव जी वाइस चांसलर हुए। खेद है कि वे प्राज हमारे बीच नहीं है। दुःख तो यह है कि प्राज नरेन्द्र देव जी और न श्री भ्रमरनाथ झा हमारे बीच मौजूद है। सरकार चाहे जिस तरह से उन के बारे में किसी बात को कह कर अपने हक में इस्तेमाल कर ले। आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव जी की तान्द्रुस्ती खराब रहती थी और वे कोई बड़ा काम करने के लिये तैयार नहीं थे। लेकिन यूनियनरसिटी को एक सुयोग्य आदमी की आवश्यकता थी इसलिये वह वाइस चांसलर बनने के लिये राजी हो गये। तान्द्रुस्ती तो उनकी खराब थी ही। साथ ही उस वक्त कुछ राजनीतिक परिस्थिति ऐसी हुई कि वे प्रजासमाजवादी पार्टी के चेयरमैन बना दिये गये। जब यह परिस्थिति पैदा हुई तो वे मजबूर हो गये और उन्होंने अपनी तान्द्रुस्ती के कारण अपने पद से इस्तीफा दे दिया। वे इस कारण नहीं गये कि उनको अपना काम करने में कठिनाई पैदा हो रही थी। माननीय सदस्यों को मासूम है कि उसके ६ महीने बाद ही खराब तान्द्रुस्ती के कारण आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव जी हमारे बीच में नहीं रहे। लेकिन प्राज इस कमेटी में इन चीजों को नहीं रक्खा जा रहा है बल्कि उसकी भ्रसमी क्षमता को बतलाने के बजाये विश्वविद्यालय

को काले रंग से रंगने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है, उस विश्वविद्यालय को जिसने हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई में काफी हिस्सा लिया था और जिसका प्राज उसे गर्व है।

मैं यह मान सकता हूँ कि वहाँ पर कुछ गड़बड़ी हो सकती है, लेकिन उसके लिये यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि एक प्राइनेन्स जारी कर दिया जाय, एक शाही फरमान जारी कर दिया जाये, और उसके द्वारा वहाँ के वाइस चांसलर को एक जनरल बना दिया जाये उस विश्वविद्यालय का। मुझे तो यह देख कर अफसोस होता है और भ्रमर यही हालत रही तो" मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद यह भी नीबत आ जाये कि बनारस विश्वविद्यालय के वाइस चांसलर को फस्ट क्लाम मजिस्ट्रेट के अधिकार देने पडें कि वह चाहे जिस विद्यार्थी या प्रोफेसर को सजा देकर साल दो साल के लिये जेल में डाल सके। यह कार्य शिक्षा संस्थाओं में वह सरकार कर रही है जो सत्य और अहिंसा की पुकार लगाते नहीं सकती और प्राज बनारस विश्वविद्यालय के मामलों में इस तरह इंटरफियर करके उनकी आदानी को नष्ट करना चाहती है।

प्राइनेन्स में क्या है? प्राइनेन्स में तीन चीजें हैं। एक तो एग्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल में तबदीली और दूसरे ज. मौजूदा कोर्ट है उसकी संख्या को घटाना और संख्या घटाने के साथ साथ उसको एक एडवाइजरी बाडी का रूप देना और जो एकेडमिक काउंसिल है उसको तबदील करना। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी कौन सी बजह पैदा हो गयी है जिसकी बजह से प्राज यह तबदीली करने की जरूरत हुई है। खास कर जब कि प्राज एग्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल में ज्यादातर लोग वाइस चांसलर के मत के हैं और वे नासिस्टेड

[श्री यादव]

हैं। फिर भी क्या जरूरत पड़ गयी इतनी जल्दी कि इस तरह का कार्य किया जाये।

इस सिलसिले में मैं वह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कुछ गलत तथ्य रचे हैं। एक स्थान पर उसने कहा है कि वहाँ के २३ लोग पर मुकदमे चल रहे हैं। मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि १५ लोग ऐसे हैं, जिन पर कोई मुकदमा नहीं चल रहा है। केवल आठ ऐसे लोग हैं, जिन पर कई मुकदम बगैरह चल रहे हैं। लेकिन इस के बावजूद इस माननीय सदन के सामने—इम जिम्मेदार हाउस के सामने इस तरह की रिपोर्ट पेश की जाती है।

जहाँ तक यूनिवर्सिटी के अध्यापकों का सम्बन्ध है, सारी यूनिवर्सिटी में कुल ५७५ अध्यापक हैं, जिन में से ३६४ अध्यापक उत्तर प्रदेश के बाहर के हैं, १२२ अध्यापक पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश के हैं और केवल ८९ अध्यापक पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के हैं। इस आर्डिनेंस के लागू होने से पहले एग्जिक्यूटिव कांसिल के २२ सदस्यों में से केवल ३ ईस्ट्रन यू०पी० के थे और बाकी बाहर के थे। जहाँ तक प्रिंसिपल का सम्बन्ध है, १४ प्रिंसिपल में से केवल दो पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के हैं। इन तथ्यों के बावजूद इस प्रकार की गलत बातें प्रस्तुत कर के यह कहा जा रहा है कि यूनिवर्सिटी के अन्दर पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के लोगों का अधिपत्य है और वे लोग चाहते हैं कि उन का अधिपत्य बना रहे और वे लोग काम नहीं करने देना चाहते हैं। मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि अगर वहाँ पर कोई गठबड़ करना चाहता है, तो वह गठ बड़ यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन की तरफ से, शिक्षा मंत्रालय की ओर से और भारत सरकार की ओर से हो रही है।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात और निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, श्रीमन्। वाइस-चांसलरशिप के लिए यूनिवर्सिटी की तरफ से तीन व्यक्तियों के नाम भेजे गए। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि शिक्षा मंत्रालय को क्या पडी थी कि वह कोई नाम सजेस्ट करता। श्रीमन्, जरा आप सर सी० पी० रामास्वामी की स्पीच को देखें।

I may quote

'Very soon after I sent my letter to the Visitor, I had contact with the President of India, who is the Visitor of this University and with the Ministry of Education and I feel that I ought to take this House in confidence when I mention that the persons connected with the Ministry suggested the name of Dr V S Jha as the person who may be selected as the Vice Chancellor. It so happens that I have never met the gentleman before and I have never known him. So, I have absolutely no knowledge of what is the background of the nomination of Dr V S Jha, but I may mention that the persons in the Ministry of Education seem to be very highly impressed by him and consider that he is very suitable.'

उन तीन व्यक्तियों में से एक को ११ वोट मिले, दूसरे को १० वोट मिले और तीसरे को ७ वोट मिले और डा साहब को केवल ६ वोट मिले। शिक्षा मंत्रालय तो पहले से ही उन में इंट्रेस्टिड था। इसलिए उस ने उन को यूनिवर्सिटी के ऊपर थोप दिया। मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यूनिवर्सिटी के सम्बन्ध में जो भी परेशानी पैदा हुई है, वह थी वी० एस० झा के कारण पैदा हुई है। इतना ही नहीं, आर्डिनेंस जारी करने के बाद शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने उन को स्पीकिंग

कमेटी का मेम्बर भी बना दिया। शिक्षा मंत्रालय का उन पर पहले से ही बरदहस्त था। अब उनको स्क्रीनिंग कमेटी का मेम्बर बना कर उनके हाथ में ए. ए. और हथियार दे दिया गया। हमारे यहाँ एक कहावत है—एक तो बाध, दूसरे बन्दूक बांधे। उन को शिक्षा मंत्रालय का समर्थन पहले से ही प्राप्त था, उनको स्क्रीनिंग कमेटी की मेम्बरशिप और दे दी गयी। आ साहब को सब में कम वोट मिले थे। कुछ लोगो ने उन की मुसालफत की। उन लोगो को दबाने के लिए उन को अधकार दिये गये। एक दो मामले तो शायद पहले भी थे। बाद में आ साहब के द्वारा आठ लैबचरार्ज के खिलाफ जाच कमेटी बिठाई गई। अगर मैं उन के नाम दू, तो अच्छा ही होगा।

"List of Enquiries instituted by Dr V S Jha, Vice-Chancellor against Teachers of Eastern U P and Allied Areas

- 1 Dr Gopal Tripathi, Principal, College of Technology, President of Teachers' Association
- 2 Dr Daya Swarup, Principal, College of Mining and Metallurgy
- 3 Dr Ram Deva Mishra, Head of the Department of Botany
- 4 Dr. Virendra Kumar, Lecturer, Ayurveda College
- 5 Dr V S Dubey, Hon University Professor of Geology.
- 6 Prof Radhey Shyam Sharma, College of Technoloy.
- 7 Shri Gauri Shankar Tiwari, College of Technology.
8. Dr Jagadish Sharma, Librarian, B.H.U."

श्रीमाननीय सदस्या श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी कह रही थीं कि यूनिवर्सिटी में बड़ी गड़बड़ है, लेकिन स. ी. उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हर जगह इनडिसिप्लिन है। पहले दिन श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने भी कहा था कि इस तरह की इनडिसिप्लिन तो सब जगह है। अगर भारत सरकार सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लिये एक जाच करवाने के लिये एक कमेटी बिठानी कि आखिर इस गड़बड़ और इनडिसिप्लिन का कारण क्या है, आज छात्रों और युवकों में अनुशासनहीनता क्यों बढ़ रही है, तो यह बात समझ में आ सकती थी। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज जितनी गड़बड़ हो रही है उस का कारण पढ़े-लिखे लोगों की बेकारी है। आज वे लोग बेकार हैं। आज स्थिति यह है कि जब कोई छात्र बी० ए० पास करता है तो उस को कोई काम नहीं मिलता है। इसलिए वह एम० ए० में प्रवेश प्राप्त कर लेता है, चाहे वह थर्ड डिविजनर ही क्यों न हो। इसी प्रकार एम० ए० के बाद लग पी० एच० डी० करने लग जाते हैं। व किमी न विमो प्रकार ग्रुप ग्रॉप को व्यस्त रखना चाहते हैं। श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी न बहना कि थर्ड डिविजनर भी आ कर वहाँ घूमना चाहते हैं और दाखला करवाना चाहते हैं। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस तक व विषय में क्या कहा जाये। उन का तर्क ठीक ही है। अब वह इस तरह तो बैठती नहीं है, इसलिए उन के तर्क का बुरा तो कहा नहीं जा सकता है। तो फिर उन के विषय में क्या किया जाय? श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी ने कहा कि उन लोगों को कैसे लिया जाय। मैं बहना हूँ कि उन के लिए कालिजिज कोले जाये और कालिजिज नहीं खाले जा सकते हैं, तो फिर सरकार उन के लिए काम की व्यवस्था क्यों नहीं करती? आज वे लोग बेकार घूम रहे हैं, जो कि हमारे सामने बड़ी विकट समस्या है।

[श्री वादर]

श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी ने बड़े बड़े लोगों के नाम लिए। उन्होंने कहा कि वहाँ के कमिश्नर से बताया कि वहाँ पर बड़ी इन्डि-सिप्लिन है। ये वही कमिश्नर श्रीग कलेक्टर हैं, जिन के रवैये में आज कोई भी तब्दीली नहीं हुई है—जैसे वे लोग अग्रज के जमाने में थे, वैसे ही आज भी है—श्रीग जिन्हें कुछ दिन पूर्व हमारे विरोध में बैठने वाले लोग बहुत हिकारत की नज़र से देखते थे। लेकिन आज उन्हीं लोगों की शहादत पेश की जाती है। हमें तो ऐसा लगता है कि अब इस प्रकार की कमटी में भविष्य में कप्तान दरोगा और वास्टबल वगैरह की गवाहिया ली जायगी कि बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी में गडबड है या नहीं और फिर यूनिवर्सिटी में एक साम्राज्यवाद स्थापित कर दिया जायेगा और वाइस-चान्सेलर बादशाह बना दिया जायगा उस पूरा अधिकार दिया जायगा कि उस के मुख से जा निकले वही कानून हो और उसे वहाँ नाफिज कर दिया जाय।

जहाँ तक इस विषयक का सवाल है, यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। सरकार की भी इस में गलती है। कमटी की रिपोर्ट अप्रैल में तैयार हुई थी। उस समय यह सदन बैठ रहा था और तब यह विषयक पाम किया जा सकता था। लेकिन सरकार का कोई फिज़ नहीं थी। वह तो अन्टीग्रियर मोटिव से कुछ और ही करना चाहती थी। सरकार मोचनी है कि वह पैसा देती है इसलिए वह जिन तरह यूनियनिटी को चलाना चाहे चलाए। मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि यह पैसा किसी व्यक्ति का नहीं है। यह पैसा न तो शिक्षा मंत्री का है और न श्री सी० डी० देशमुख का है। वह पैसा सारे देश का है—वह जनता का पैसा है। वह खजाना श्री भीरारजी देसाई या प्रधान मंत्री का नहीं है और न ही वह चिन्तामणि दशमुख का है, जिन को आज-कल बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी की बड़ी चिन्ता है। अगर उस से कोई बड़ी

मुहब्बत है, तो फिर वाइस-चान्सेलर को क्यों नहीं हटाया जाता है, जिन के खिलाफ लोगों की बड़ी उग्र धारणा है? मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। यह विधेयक बहुत इम्पोर्टेंट है और सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लिए महत्व का है। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस सारे मामले को इतना लाइटली नहीं लेना चाहिए कि पहले तो आईनेंस जारी कर दिया और अब एक सिलक्ट कमेटी बिठा दी है, जिस को कहा जाता है कि वह २२ तारीख तक रिपोर्ट दे दे और फिर यह विधेयक यहाँ पास हो जाय। अध्यक्ष महोदय ने कमटी की सदस्यता के सम्बन्ध में पहले एक व्यवस्था दी थी कि उस कमेटी में वही लोग हो सकते हैं, जो कि विधेयक की स्पिरिट और उस की मन्शा की कद्र करते हों। अगर उस बात को मान लिया जाय तो बड़ी खतरनाक हालत होगा। उस में पहले श्री गोविन्द मालवाय का नाम था और वह वहाँ रहना भी चाहते थे, लेकिन फिर शिक्षा मंत्री की ओर में उन के स्थान पर श्री वाजपेयी का नाम रख दिया गया। आखिर क्या मतलब है इस का २२ तारीख तक कुछ नहीं होगा। उस कमटी में तो सरकार के प्रपन मनचाहे लोग हाग और वहाँ से विधेयक सदन के सामन आ जायगा। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय में न केवल इस माननीय सदन के सदस्यो और राज्य सभा के सदस्यो बल्कि सार भारतवर्ष के योग्य और अनुभवी लोगों की राय ली जानी चाहिए और जनता का मत मातृम करना चाहिए। सार भारतवर्ष के लोग पढ़ लिख लाग जाकि एमिनेट स्कालर ता नहीं बन बल्कि जा थोड़ी बहुत दिलचस्पी इस बारे में रखते हैं तथा जा थोड़ी बहुत जानकारी इस बारे में रखते हैं उनका भी इस पर विचार करने का तथा अपनी राय जाहिर करने का मौका दिया जाए। इस हेतु मैंने एक मसौदा भी उपस्थित किया है कि इस विधेयक को जनता की राय जानने के लिए प्रसारित किया जाए और उसके बाद इसको

ज्वायंट सिलेक्ट कमेटी के सुपुर्ष किया जा सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस मामले में जल्दबाजी से काम न ले। सरकार कहती है कि वह टेम्पोरेरी मेयर है, अस्थायी मेयर है। जब ऐसी बात है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि अस्थायी व्यवस्था लाने के लिए कोई बुरा रास्ता न अज्ञत्यार किया जाए और जब यह रास्ता अज्ञत्यार किया जाता है तो यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। अगर वह अच्छा रास्ता होता, ठीक रास्ता होता तो हम अवश्य ही इसको सपोर्ट करते। लेकिन हम समझते हैं कि आप गलत रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं और अगर आप थोड़े दिन और ठहर लें तो कोई पहाड़ टूटने वाला नहीं है। लखनऊ में इस से भी कहीं ज्यादा गड़बड़ी है, विद्यार्थियों की वजह से नहीं बल्कि आपकी ही वजह से वह गड़बड़ी है। और भी मस्थायें हो सकती हैं जहाँ पर गड़बड़ी फैली हुई हो। पता नहीं आप बनारस विश्वविद्यालय में ही इतनी दिलचस्पी क्यों ले रहे हैं ?

अन्त में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस विधेयक को मारे देश की राय जानने के लिए प्रसारित करे। इसमें कोई हरज की बात नहीं है बल्कि इससे लाभ ही होगा।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, I want to reply to the debate.

Mr. Chairman: He may kindly wait; he will also be called upon to reply.

Shri T. N. Singh: Sir, before the hon. Minister starts his reply, I would like to suggest that in his reply he may cover this question of Eastern U.P. As one belonging to Eastern U.P., and as the report has mentioned about Eastern U.P., I would like him to clarify one point. Does he really think that the so-called corruption or misdeeds of the boys is due to the fact that there are so many poor persons attracted from those areas, or does he believe that it is the boys belonging to the richer classes, living in the hostels, who are responsible for it? Does he really think that those poor students who actually beg, work hard and earn money for their studies are responsible for these things, and in that connection, does the Government really believe that whatever the report has said is true?

श्री गणपति राम : सभापति महोदय, मैं भी एक प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ। कांस्टीट्यूशन ने गारंटी की है कि हरिजनो तथा देश के दूसरे बैकवर्ड क्लासिस के उत्थान के लिये खास तौर पर कदम उठाये जायें और उसके लिये स्पेशल प्राविजन भी रखा गया है। बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी ने देश के गरीब लोगों को एडमिशन देने के लिये भी स्पेशल प्राविजन बना रखा था। क्या हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय की यह मंशा है तथा सरकार की यह मंशा है कि देश के गरीब लोगों को तथा पिछड़े वर्गों को शिक्षा से वंचित रखा जाये या वह गरीब तबकों तथा पिछड़े वर्गों का भी उद्धार करना चाहती है ?

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): Sir, I would suggest that the hon. Minister may reply towards the end. There are just a few more speakers, I think, who would like to participate in this debate.

Mr. Chairman: Am I do understand that the hon. Member desires that the time be extended still further? It has already been extended.

Shri Dassappa: It can be extended till 2.30.

Mr. Chairman: After all, even the Chair has limited powers. That power has already been exercised by the Deputy-Speaker. I cannot extend the time now.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, my resolution was moved first; therefore, I should be allowed to reply first and then only the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: I know that. I know the rules also. According to the rules, it will be better for the hon. Member himself to get an opportunity, while he is replying, to reply to the points made by the hon. Minister also. If he does not want to reply to those points I will call him now if he so desires.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: No, Sir, I will reply afterwards.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: I would like to know—whether the opportunity was taken before or not—whether those who have moved amendments—my friend over there has moved a resolution—will have some opportunity, after all this debate, of replying and meeting the points raised.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has been a Member of this House for a sufficiently long time. He knows the rules very well

14 hrs.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: The rules are.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. When the Chair is speaking, the hon. Member should desist from speaking. When the time comes, the hon. Member who has sponsored the resolution will get his time for reply. But the other Members, who have tabled a motion for eliciting public opinion or for postponing the motion for reference to the Select Committee and the rest will not get opportunity to speak again. We follow the ordinary practice in all such cases.

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall): I would not like to take the time of the House for long. I think the Prime Minister has already explained the position as far as the Government is concerned. I would however, like to deal with a few points arising out of the debate. I have listened with great respect to the criticisms which have been made by the hon. Members but I must say that some of the criticisms made have filled me with a feeling of dismay. I was hoping that as far as this measure is concerned, which deals with one of our greatest national universities, it would be taken up in a dispassionate way and we would be trying to understand the difficulties and the crisis through which the university is passing.

Shri T. N. Singh has raised the question with regard to eastern Uttar Pradesh. I think that reference is unfortunate. It was quite unnecessary. The major thing that is in the report is that some groups have existed inside the university for a long time. I think it is quite immaterial to see from what regions they come, from what areas they come or to which areas they belong. This reference could have been avoided by the Committee. I was told by some of the Members that this is the current name in those areas and therefore they put in this name.

The important thing that we have to consider in this report is whether

there is any problem with regard to this university, whether the university is facing any difficulty with regard to administration. Shri H. N. Mukerjee who was sitting there said that the Government has taken a hasty action, a thoughtless action, and he said that if I give him the figures with regard to the number of strikes he would have probably to join hands with the Government and support the measure which the Government have taken.

An Hon. Member: Never.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am quoting Shri H. N. Mukerjee. I am sorry he is not here. He would be willing to do something if I gave figures regarding the number of strikes and showed that there was the problem of student indiscipline. Let us look at the university from this angle. In 1957 there were three strikes: strike in the College of Technology in March, 1957; strike in the college of Ayurveda in March-April, 1957, and strike in July, 1957 on the question of admission in the university. I would not like to take the time of the House by going into the details regarding the reasons why these strikes took place.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: Why not?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I would briefly mention them if the House is interested. Regarding the first strike, strike in the College of Technology, the executive committee of the university examined this question and has appointed Shri G. K. Shinde, a retired Chief Justice of the Madhya Pradesh High Court. The matter is still under enquiry. The report makes a mention of this strike and gives us some idea of the circumstances under which the strike took place. If what is contained in the report ultimately proves to be true—the matter is under enquiry and I do not like to say anything now—I think it is something about which we should all feel concerned, and if such things happen inside the universities, they bring discredit to the educational institutions.

Now, the strike with regard to the Ayurveda College took place because the students wanted a particular person as the principal of this college. This is an incredible demand on the part of the students. Are they to decide who should be the principal of the College and who should be their vice-chancellor? That person is said to be a topmost cardiac and chest surgeon and his release from service under the Himachal Pradesh administration has been, it is understood, a matter of prolonged negotiation. I am told that the students of the Ayurveda College are on strike at the present moment also. The reason, I understand, is that they are demanding that the principal of the college should go.

I have with me a pamphlet. I do not know who has signed it. It was circulated in the university. I quote from it:

“Saddest is the story of the college. . . .”

It is said at the end, “Students of the College of Ayurveda, Banaras Hindu University”. “A wooden doll, knowing nothing and being horrible, has shown total failure in administration”. That is how they describe their teachers. “Every day quarrels in the staff; fights between office workers and servants. Frustration among the students has led us to the conclusion; Kick away the devil.” This is the centre of learning where we are expecting that culture will flourish. “A donkey with lion’s skin on cannot succeed. Bribery in the office.”

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Is it signed?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: This is not signed. It is written, “Students of the College of Ayurveda”. It is immaterial whether this is signed or not. That such a pamphlet should be circulated inside the university is a disgrace to the university.

An Hon. Member: Printed by whom?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: "A donkey with lion's skin on cannot succeed. Bribery in the office. Leakage of examination papers, and partiality in every field inspire us to take the law into our own hands". If the hon. Members want to encourage such a pamphlet, I shall tell them it will destroy all our education and the future of the universities.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: Nobody does. But will the hon. Minister also say that if the university cannot have ...

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: He has had opportunity to speak and I did not interrupt him. Now, I am continually being interrupted. This is not fair.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: We want only facts.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am giving the full facts.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: If there has been any....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I have got more facts than my hon. friend can have.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Now, when even one word escapes from the mouth of the hon. Minister there is interruption. It is not proper. Let the Minister proceed in his own way. If there is any question, any objection, etc., it can be raised after he has finished. But this sort of running commentary does no credit to the Member who makes it or to the whole House. I would, therefore, respectfully ask all hon. Members to keep decorum in this House and allow the hon. Minister to proceed.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Now, with regard to the strike which took place in July, 1957, what was the reason?

The University Grants Commission, after a great deal of thought and deliberation, decided that the university should not admit their students indiscriminately, that there should be some kind of selection made. Since the university wanted to regulate the number of admissions in the colleges, there was a strike. There was a hunger-strike in 1956 over a trivial matter, namely, the declaration of a holiday after the inauguration of the University Students' Union. I am told—I am hoping that this is not true—that when some of the principals of the colleges were consulted whether a holiday should be given, in the meeting, they said no holiday was necessary. They went home and incited the students to go on strike. I hope this is not true, but if this is true, I say it is something which is a matter of serious concern for this House and for the Government. There was a strike in July, 1956 and in July, 1957, and the Government were apprehensive that there might be a further strike in July, 1958. I think there was full justification for issuing the Ordinance. We do not want to destroy our universities. My hon. friend, Professor Mukerjee—unfortunately he is not here—said that if there was any acute educational crisis, he would be willing to come and say "Come along, let us do something about the University". Are these not symptoms of acute educational crisis? I put it to the House. Strikes engineered by the teachers, hunger strikes because they are not admitted to the University, students demanding that the Principal should be appointed by them or the name should be suggested by them, is that the way in which the University should function? Well, these are very serious matters and let us not take them light-heartedly.

I am sorry to find that Professor Mukerjee thought it fit to criticise the Chairman of the University Grants Commission. He said that the Chairman of the University Grants Commission paid a cursory visit to the

University. It was not a cursory visit. We all know how thorough and efficient Mr. Deshmukh is in his work. He has devoted himself whole-heartedly for the improvement of the Universities and I think we should be proud that he is the Chairman of the University Grants Commission. When Mr. Deshmukh went there, he was disgusted with the way in which the Banaras Hindu University was functioning. When I showed him the Report, he said that he fully endorsed the recommendations which were made by the Mudaliar Committee.

From whom are we to take our guidance? Is it not from the Vice-Chancellors who have been there, who have told us that the University was not functioning effectively, that they could not function effectively because of the intrigues and factions inside the Universities? The Chairman of the University Grants Commission tells us that there is something seriously wrong with the University and things must be rectified. We appoint a high-power committee. They tell us that there is a crisis in that University and immediate steps should be taken. Here are certain pamphlets which are distributed by these persons who are themselves under examination, whose conduct is being investigated. Are we to trust those people and these pamphlets which are sent to us and distributed here?

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): May I point out to the hon. Minister that persons who are responsible for distribution of these papers do not belong to the University?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am told that some of the professors have come here to distribute the pamphlets.

Shri Nagi Reddy: The Vice-Chancellor has sent somebody else.

Mr. Chairman: Are we deciding this dispute? The hon. Minister is making a statement.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am surprised that Professor Mukerjee should have thought it prudent to say that people in Delhi had a contempt towards that University. We have great respect for that great centre of learning. It is our desire that, as soon as possible, it should become one of our greatest national universities, the ideal University in the country.

I am sorry to say that Shri Govind Malaviya, who is an ex-Vice-Chancellor of this University, thought it prudent to say that this measure will set the whole institution into blazes and no power of any Government would be able to apply a corrective. Is this the language which an ex-Vice-Chancellor of a University should use?

Pandit Govind Malaviya: Because I know the institution.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I do not like to be interrupted. I do not know whether the Ordinance will have any effect or not, but his statement will certainly excite the people and create indiscipline.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: On a point of order. May I know if there is anything wrong in any Member interjecting a Member, or asking a question, when another Member is speaking? Is that parliamentary or not? We want to be guided by the Chair. I thought we were exercising a right of Members of this House, which have come down from the very beginning, when we seek elucidation, when we seek more light by interjecting a remark. That is part of the debate in this House. If I am mistaken, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. Chairman: There are interjections and interjections. Some interjections are made with a view to elicit some information. Some are made only to spotlight the remarks made by the speaker and to insinuate that he is not making right remarks. Some are meant only for the purpose of obstructing the speaker.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: That should not be.

Mr. Chairman: At the same time, the rule that we have observed in this House is that we do not gag the Members and allow them to make interjections, provided they are not meant for the mere purpose of heckling him and they do not interfere and allow the speaker to go on with his speech. But if the purpose of making such remarks is only to show that whatever the speaker is saying is wrong, or to obstruct him that is ordinarily not allowable. Then the thread of the argument is broken and spirit of the debate cannot be kept up. When an hon. Member is going on with his speech, if some other persons interject, and interject in such a way that it would appear that whatever he was saying was all wrong, he will not be able to go on with his speech as he would like to. Now, the interest of the debate requires that when a Member is speaking, he should be allowed to make his speech. I would, therefore, request all the members to kindly observe this rule. Otherwise, they will have to pay for it themselves when they are making their speeches and others are allowed to make such interjections as will interrupt their speeches.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I was saying that this statement, which was made by an ex-Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University in this House does not do much credit to the University or to the Vice-Chancellor. He says:

"The measure will set the whole institution a blaze and no power of any Government will be able to apply the corrective."

Is that the language which the ex-Vice-Chancellor of a University should use? Does he know what effect it is going to have in the University which is passing through a crisis at the present moment? I am sorry to say that he quoted Mahatma Gandhi about the importance of the

office of the Vice-Chancellor. We are in the habit of quoting Mahatma Gandhi in and out of places without accepting his advice. I should like to quote here a letter from Mahatma Gandhi, which he wrote from Srirampur to Dr. Radhakrishnan on 17-12-46. This letter appears in Tendulkar's book on Mahatma Gandhi Volume VII, page 344

"Om Prakash"

This refers to the matter relating to Pandit Govind Malaviya's entry into University politics and holding offices inside the University.

"Om Prakash gave me your letter yesterday. My congratulations on your decision. I had expected nothing else of you. You will be in charge as long as you are needed there."

He further says:

"I never dreamt of any of the brothers being Pro-Vice-Chancellors or holding any of the high offices in the University or even any office whatsoever except it be in its interest. They should all be mute servants. Perhaps you may have seen my article on the subject in the 'Harijan'.

Dr. Shyama Prasad is an ideal man for the post. Only I wish he was as sober a Hindu Sabha man as he is an able and learned administrator. You may show this to him. You are calling him to no easy job."

Then the last paragraph says:

"As to your last paragraph, the less said the better. I am on the anvil. M. K. Gandhi"

This is the advice which Gandhiji had given. I wish that advice had been followed. Many of the difficulties

of the University and many of the things which have happened since then would not have happened if this advice had been accepted. Pandit Govind Malaviya is a friend of mine. He is like a brother to me. I had the privilege of sitting at the feet of Malaviya and learning at his feet. Therefore, it is painful to me to bring all these facts to the knowledge of this House. But I think I have a duty to perform in this regard.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: Will I have an opportunity to say something about this later on, because it is a personal matter which has been referred to? Since my name has been mentioned, will I have an opportunity to clear up the position and ask for further information, if necessary?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. There is nothing personal in any of these letters. It is only when a person is referred to and he has to offer some remarks about himself that an occasion is afforded to him for making certain personal observations. Now, from what has been stated by the hon. Minister I do not find it necessary to give the Hon. Member any opportunity to say anything.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Hon. Members, one after another, had agreed that the affairs of the Banaras Hindu University were far from satisfactory. Many hon. Members have said, "We know that this is happening in the University". But they did not suggest any practical solution though they criticised the action which the Government have taken. In this very House several times the Government have been criticised that we are doing nothing with regard to the improvement of standards—intellectual and moral standards—inside the Universities and when the Government takes action—a right and correct action—the hon. Members come here and criticise the Government.

I would not like to take more time of the House. Banaras Hindu University is a great national university.

Universities can become powerful instruments for building up our country and for social reconstruction. If there is anything wrong inside the University it is the duty of the Government to intervene and set the University right. I greatly respect the autonomy of the University, but autonomy has a certain purpose. Freedom should not degenerate into licence and that is what was happening in the Banaras Hindu University. Freedom was being misused. It is my desire that as soon as possible normal conditions should be restored inside the University and the professors, teachers and the students should be engaged in their normal duties of pursuing truth and knowledge. That is what we want the University to do and I shall be very happy and it will be my earnest endeavour to see that normal conditions are restored and as soon as possible I will bring forward a new revised Bill before this House. This was an emergency and the Government had to meet this emergent situation.

श्री ब्रज राम सिंह : मेरे प्रस्ताव पर जो बहस हुई है उसके लिये मैं सदन का बहुत आभारी हूँ। लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि सरकार की तरफ से उन बातों का कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया गया है जो मैंने इस आर्डिनेंस के प्रस्तावित किये जाने के सम्बन्ध में उठाई थीं।

14-23 hours.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

इसके साथ ही साथ बहुत सी ऐसी बातें भी कही गई हैं जिनका कहा जाना ठीक भी मालूम नहीं पड़ता था।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कह दिया है कि इस यूनिवर्सिटी को करीब ५५ लाख रुपया सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की धर से मिलता है जब कि सन् १९४२-४३ में तीन लाख के करीब ही मिला था। लेकिन वह यह बतलाना भूल गये कि इस ५५ लाख या ५१ लाख में से कितना रुपया टेक्नीकल शिक्षा के लिये तथा उसके नाम पर दिया जा रहा है और

[श्री ब्रज राज सिंह]

कितना दूसरी टाइप की एजुकेशन के काम पर बिया जा रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान भर में दूसरी भी कई इंस्टीट्यूट्स हैं जिन्हें सेंटर की तरफ से टेक्नीकल तथा दूसरी शिक्षा के लिये काफी रूपया बिया जा रहा है। इसलिये बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय को जो रूपया टेक्नीकल शिक्षा के विकास के लिये दिया जाता है उसके आधार पर यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार वह रूपया केवल इसी विश्वविद्यालय को दे रही है तथा दूसरे विश्वविद्यालयों को नहीं दे रही है तथा कितना रूपया दे रही है उसके बस पर उम्मे कोई विशेष अधिकार प्राप्त हो जाते हैं।

इसके साथ ही साथ एक और बात मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस इन्क्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में जो रेक्मण्ड दिया गया है उसमें बतलाया गया है कि १९४२-४३ में जहा पर खर्चा २६ लाख के करीब था वहा १९५६-५७ में वह दो करोड में भी ऊपर चला गया है। आप १९४२-४३ में केवल तीन लाख ही दे रहे थे और अब करीब ५१ लाख दिया जा रहा है जिसका मतलब यह हुआ कि आप १७ गुना ज्यादा दे रहे हैं। लेकिन अगर आप खर्चों को देखें तो वह भी करीब ८ गुना बड़ा है। अब देवना यह है कि जो खर्चा बड़ा है यह किस तरह बड़ा है और इतना रूपया आया कहा में है। यह रूपया दूसरे मोसिस में विश्वविद्यालय को मिला है। आप टेक्नीकल शिक्षा का नाम पर जो रूपया देते हैं उसमें आपको यह अधिकार नहीं मिल जाता है कि आप यूनिवर्सिटी की स्वतंत्रता के मामले में कोई दखल दे, उसकी स्वतंत्रता का अपहरण करे। अगर आप ऐसा करते हैं तो यह आपके लिये उचित बात नहीं है।

यहा पर यह भी कहा गया है कि सरकार के जो लोग हैं वे यूनिवर्सिटियों की आटोनोमी के बड़े भारी समर्थक हैं। लेकिन आटोनोमी के समर्थक होते हुये भी आप

वह कदम इसलिये उठा रहे हैं कि इस तरह की स्थिति पैदा हो गई थी कि जिसमें अब तौर के उसका प्रबन्ध ठीक ढंग से नहीं चल सकता था। मैं आपसे सवाल पूछता हूँ : आपने, हमारे एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि केवल तीन स्ट्राइक्स हुई थी जिन में से एक हगर स्ट्राइक थी और इस हगर स्ट्राइक की बात कह कर उन्होंने कह दिया कि इस यूनिवर्सिटी की आटोनोमी का, इसकी स्वतंत्रता का अपहरण करने की आवश्यकता थी। क्या मंत्री महोदय बतलायेंगे कि कितनी बार दूसरी जगहों पर हगर स्ट्राइक हुई है, कितनी और स्ट्राइक्स हुई हैं और कितनी बार लाठी चार्ज किया गया है और कितनी बार गोनिया चलाई गई है ?

किन्तु हजारों लोग गोनी में मारे गये क्या इसलिये इस सरकार का जो चुनाव हुआ कैरेक्टर है, यह मन्त्रिमंडल है, यह सदन है, इसका परित्याग कर देना चाहिये ? इसलिये मैं कहूँगा कि उन दलीलों का जो मैंने दी थी, सरकार की तरफ से कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया।

मैं आखिर में एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ। आप इस आर्डिनेंस में तीन बाने करते हैं। एक तो आप स्क्रॉनिंग कमेटी बनाते हैं। स्क्रॉनिंग कमेटी के बारे में डा० श्रीमाली और प्रधान मंत्री दोनों ने कहा है कि उसमें वाइस चांसलर नहीं रहेंगे। वाइस चांसलर ने भी असमर्थता प्रकट की है। पता नहीं उन्होंने असमर्थता कैसे प्रकट की जब कि पहले उन्होंने मजूर कर लिया था। इस आर्डिनेंस के बनते ही असमर्थता प्रकट कर दी। स्क्रॉनिंग कमेटी में कुल तीन मेम्बर रहेंगे। अब उसमें इस तरह से केवल दो मेम्बर रहेंगे जो कि काम नहीं कर सकेंगे। इस तरह से आर्डिनेंस ने जो तीन काम किये हैं, उनमें से एक या तो यो खत्म हो जाता है क्योंकि स्क्रॉनिंग कमेटी वाली चीज तो बँकार हो गई वाइस चांसलर के न रहने से।

दूसरी चीज ध्राप कोर्ट को सलाहकार परिवर्ष बनाते हैं। कोर्ट साल में एक बार बैठता है, दो बार नहीं बैठता। छः महीने बाद तक जो क.टं बना है उसकी भी बैठक का सवाल नहीं है। इसलिये दूसरा काम भी जो ध्राप इस प्रॉडिनेंस के जरिये से करना चाहते हैं वह इतनी आवश्यक नहीं कि उसे प्रॉडिनेंस के जरिये किया जाये।

तीसरा काम जो प्रॉडिनेंस के जरिये किया गया है वह यह है कि २१ के बजाय ६ प्रादमी एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल बनायेगे। २१ मेम्बरों की जो एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल थी उस में नामिनेटेड मेम्बर १५ हुआ करते थे। नई एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल में सिर्फ ६ नामिनेटेड मेम्बर होंगे। नये नामिनेटेड मेम्बरों की लिस्ट देखने से पता चलेगा कि पहले १५ नामिनेटेड प्रादमियों में से कई ऐसे हैं जो कि अब जो नई एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल होगी उसमें भी नामिनेटेड होंगे।

इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हू कि सिर्फ इन तीन कामों के लिये प्रॉडिनेंस बनाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं हो सकती है। एक स्त्रीनिग कमेटी की, दूसरे एडवाइजरी बाडी की क्योंकि यह साल में मिलेगी ही नहीं, तीसरे एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल के मेम्बर भी करीब करीब वही हैं जो पहले नामिनेटेड किये जाते थे। ऐसी अवस्था में ध्राप यह प्रॉडिनेंस क्यों लाना चाहते हैं ?

प्रधान मंत्री और डा० श्रीमाली दोनों ने यह आश्वासन दिया है कि यह बिल जो आज सरकार रख रही है प्रॉडिनेंस के बजाय यह सिर्फ अस्थायी तरीके का है, स्थायी तरीके का नहीं है और छ महीने, आठ महीने या साल भर के अन्दर सरकार ऐसा बिल लायेगी जो अच्छा होगा और जिसमें हर तरह के परिवर्तन किये जा सकेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हू कि इस कानून के अनुसार जब स्त्रीनिग कमेटी काम नहीं कर सकेगी, जब कोर्ट का कोई काम होगा नहीं, जब

एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल में ध्रापके वही पुराने नामिनेटेड मेम्बर होंगे और उन से ध्राप को कोई परेशानी नहीं पैदा होती है तो इसके लिये ध्राप प्रॉडिनेंस क्यों रखना चाहते हैं और अपने ऊपर दोषारोपण कराना चाहते हैं कि ध्राप ने यूनिवर्सिटी की आटोनामी का अपहरण किया है उस की स्वतंत्रता का अपहरण किया है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हम प्रतिम स्टेज पर भी सरकार को अपनी प्रतिष्ठा का सवाल नहीं माने देना चाहिये। जिन तरह से स्त्रीनिग कमेटी की अपनी गलती को मंजूर किया है उसी तरह ६६ को भी मंजूर करे कि प्रॉडिनेंस प्रस्थापित करने की बात गत थी। महात्मा गांधी का सिद्ध होने के नाते ध्रापको यह गलती मंजूर करनी चाहिये और कहना चाहिये कि हम इस गलती को मान लेते हैं और प्रॉडिनेंस को वापस लेते हैं और जल्दी में जल्दी हम इस बात की कोशिश करेंगे कि एक अच्छा बिल बनाया जाय और यह टैम्पोरेरी बिल जो है इसमें भी १५ दिन या महीने में मशौघन करके ठीक किया जाय ताकि उससे कार्रवाई चल सके। मेरा कहना है कि प्रॉडिनेंस के जरिये से जो घामन प्रबन्ध चलाने ध्राप जा रहे हैं उससे ध्रापके नाम पर धब्बा आता है, इसमें ध्रापकी प्रतिष्ठा नहीं बढ़ती है। इससे मुल्क के अन्दर यह भावना फैलती है कि ध्राप कानून का आदर करना भूल गये हैं। ध्राप इस प्रॉडिनेंस को वापस लीजिये। साथ ही यह भी कहना चाहता हू कि पहले तो ध्रापने जब सदन की मेज पर रिपोर्टों का रिपोर्ट ध्रापने की तारीख अप्रैल में बताई। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि अप्रैल में रिपोर्ट मिली है, अब कहते हैं कि मई में मिली। लेकिन चूकि यह कहा गया था कि १५ अप्रैल को मिली थी इसलिये डा० श्रीमाली ने कहा कि वह इसका चेक ध्राप करके बतायें कि कब मिली। लेकिन वह बात अभी बताई नहीं गई है

Dr. K. L. Shrivastava: I will make it clear afterwards.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: If you make it clear just now, it will be proper Can you?

Dr K L Shrimali. I have now checked up and find that the work "April" occurring in the last line of the opening paragraph of the statement laid on the Table of the House explaining the circumstances which led to the promulgation of the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1958, as also in the last line of the opening paragraph of the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill, 1958, is not correct and should be replaced by the word "May

I sincerely apologise to the House for the inaccuracy and the inconvenience caused thereby My Office is issuing the necessary corrigendum

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : किस तारीख को वह मिली मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वही तारीख रही, बस अप्रैल की जगह मई पढ़ा जाय ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह इन सूरतों में जो कि मैंने सदन के सामने रक्खा इस आर्डिनेंस को रखने की न जरूरत थी न रक्खा जाना चाहिये था इसलिये मैं कहूंगा कि आर्डिनेंस को वापस लिया जाय । इसमें सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा का सवाल न लाया जाय । हा, यूनिवर्सिटी का कार्य जिस तरह चल रहा है, अगर उसमें सुधार करने की आवश्यकता हो तो उसमें सुधार किया जाय । इस सदन में कुछ इस तरह की बातें कही गई हैं कि वहा गुटबन्दी है इसलिये ऐसा किया जा रहा है । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें किसी गुट के सम्बन्धित होने का सवाल नहीं है । शिक्षा सस्थाओं में जो लोग गुटों के सम्बन्धित हों, उनको जिन तरीकों से भी सरकार ठीक समझे ठीक करे और उनमें

गुटबन्दी को खत्म किया जाना चाहिये । लेकिन एक गुट का खत्म करने के लिये दूसरे को बढ़ावा दिया जाय यह शिक्षा के लिये अच्छा नहीं होगा ।

अन्त में मेरा मदन से यही निवेदन होगा कि वह मेरे इस प्रस्ताव को पास करे और आर्डिनेंस को नामजूर करे ।

Mr Deputy-Speaker: I hope the House would like me to put these motions to vote though it is time now for the Private Members' business to be taken up We might take another five minutes over this and give full time to the nos official business

Several Hon Members Oh yes

Mr. Deputy-Speaker First I have to put Pandit Govind Malaviya's amendment to the resolution moved by Shri Braj Raj Singh

Pandit Govind Malaviya Sir, I do not want to press it

*The amendment was, by leave,
withdrawn*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So I shall now put the original resolution moved by Shri Braj Raj Singh

The question is

"This House disapproves of the Banars Hindu University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1958 (Ordinance, No 4 of 1958) promulgated by the President on the 14th June, 1958"

I think the 'Noes' have it

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The 'Ayes' have it

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the lobbies be cleared

Shri Khadlikar (Ahmednagar): Who has asked for division?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member (Shri Braj Raj Singh) asked for it. Does the hon. Member want division?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then what was the objection taken? I have not been able to understand.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Chingleput): They say it should be taken at three o'clock.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: After 2-30 P.M. we can take it.

The result of the division is ...

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Sir, my machine does not work.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will add one more to the 'ayes'.

Shri Siddananajappa (Hassan): Sir, my machine also is not working.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then I will add one to the 'noes' list.

The result of the division,* with those additions, is:

Ayes : 28

Noes : 113.

The resolution was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then we come to the motion for reference of the Bill to Select Committee and the amendment to it moved by Pandit Govind Malaviya. Does he press his amendment?

Pandit Govind Malaviya: No, Sir.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is another amendment to it, moved by Shri Yadav. I shall put it to vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 13th October, 1958."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendment moved by Shri Vajpayee is ruled out of order; he has lost his chance because he has accepted to be on the Select Committee.

So I will now put the motion for reference to Select Committee to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the Banaras Hindu University (*Amendment*) Bill, 1958, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Sardar Hukam Singh Shri Banarsi Prasad Jhunjhunwala, Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha, Shrimati Jayaben Vajubhai Shah, Shri Radha Charan Sharma, Shri C. R. Narasimhan, Shri R. Govindarajulu Naidu, Shri T. R. Neswi, Shri Hiralal Shastri, Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh, Shri Sinhasan Singh, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Pandit Munishwar Dutt Upadhyay, Shri Birbal Singh, Pandit Krishna Chandra Sharma, Shri Nardeo Snatak, Shri Mahavir Tyagi, Shri N. G. Ranga, Shri N. R. Ghosh, Shri Nibarhan Chandra Laskar, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, Shri Prabhat Kar, Shri T. Nagi Reddy, Shri Braj Raj Singh, Shri J. M. Mohamed Imam, Shri Jaipal Singh, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Surendra Mahanty, Shri, R. K. Khadilkar, Shri H. C. Dasappa, Shri Khushwaqt Rai and Shri Asoke K. Sen with instructions to report by the 22nd August, 1958."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now we shall take up non-official business.

*Names of members who recorded votes have not been included under the direction of the Speaker as the photo copy of Division result did not clearly show the names of all members.