

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** I voting for ayes.

**Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak):** I am voting for noes; I do not know how it has reflected. Neutral... (*Inter-ruptions.*)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If he does not know how it is reflected there, he should not worry. Now, I shall put clause 13 as amended to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That clause 13, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 13, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is another amendment held over—No. 19. I shall put that to the vote of the House. The question is:

Page 7,—

"omit lines 11 to 19."

*The motion was negatived.*

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

"That Clause 21, as amended, stand part of the Bill"

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 21, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

**Shri B. Gopala Reddi:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

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

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

14-38 hrs.

### BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now take up the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill, 1958 as reported by the Select Committee. Four hours have been allotted for all the stages of the Bill.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):** Five hours.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** One hour at the discretion of the Chair. Now, I would like to take the sense of the House as to how these four hours should be distributed among the various stages.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Four hours for general discussion.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** And nothing for the clauses? For the present, we have to divide the four hours we have got.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** 3½ hours and half an hour.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There ought to be some time for the clauses also. I think three hours may be allotted for the general discussion and one hour for clause-by-clause consideration and the third reading also.

**The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimani):** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Sir, in making this motion, I would not like to take the time of the House and go over all the arguments which I advanced in introducing this measure. The Select Committee has fully considered this Bill and has made two major changes in the Bill. One relates to statute 29 of the draft Bill with regard to the constitution of the Selection Committee. In the draft Bill it was stipulated that the Selection Committee should consist of such

persons as the Executive Council might appoint, and the procedure to be followed by the Selection Committee in making recommendations was to be determined by the Executive Committee, and if the Executive Committee was unable to accept any recommendations made by the Selection Committee, it should record its reasons and submit the case for the Visitor's final orders.

There was a great deal of discussion in the Select Committee, and ultimately it was decided that the composition of the Selection Committee should be specified, and the provision which has now been made is more or less on the same lines as those laid down prior to the promulgation of the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Ordinance 1958, except that there is no Visitor's nominee on the Selection Committee, and the Treasurer will not sit in the Selection Committee for the appointment of the Registrar.

The second important change which has been made by the Select Committee is with regard to the Screening Committee. There has been a great deal of controversy in the House and there was a controversy in the Select Committee also with regard to this provision, and ultimately the Select Committee decided that the Screening Committee was not a good name for a university body, and therefore it has been renamed as Reviewing Committee, and I have accepted this provision.

The re-draft of this clause brings in the Solicitor-General to the Government of India into the picture, and the clause as it stands now provides two opportunities of being heard—first by the Reviewing Committee and then by the Executive Committee. The Solicitor-General will satisfy himself that a *prima facie* case exists before the machinery of the Reviewing Committee is set in motion.

To my mind this provision provides a very valuable safeguard. I am most

anxious that there should be no harassment of any kind and that the ends of justice should be fully met. The members of the Executive Council who were holding teaching, administrative and other posts in the university on 14th June 1958 have also been brought within the scope of this clause, and it has been further provided that they cannot take part in the meetings of the Executive Council in which recommendations of the Reviewing Committee relating to them are considered. I would like to submit that as far as the Reviewing Committee is concerned, this provision is essential and indispensable if we want to meet the situation which has arisen in the university.

The reports of the ex-Vice-Chancellors are before us. The report of the Mudaliar Committee is before us, and for the last several years factionalism in the university has not allowed any Vice-Chancellor to function effectively. This situation has to be met if the university is to survive. If we are interested in the future of the university, I think we have to get rid of those undesirable elements in the university which are responsible for undermining the morale and the discipline in the university today.

When the Bill was referred to the Select Committee I had hoped that after the changes made in the original Bill there would be unanimity of opinion. I think it would be a good thing if this Parliament could set up a convention that as far as the universities are concerned, we should take a non-partisan view.

**Shri Bhaj Raj Singh:** The convention that you should not interfere.

**Dr. K. L. Shrivast:** I am coming to that. He will have plenty of opportunity to reply.

A university does not serve any one particular group or one particular party. It serves the whole society,

[Dr. K. L. Shrivalli]

and, therefore, when we are discussing matters which relate to a university, it will be better if we can take a dispassionate and detached view and not treat them in a political spirit.

I am sorry to say that some of the hon. Members, while giving their Minutes of Dissent have subordinated the larger interests of the university to the narrow interests of the party. I will try to explain why I am saying this.

The Select Committee has added a new provision that when allegations of the nature referred to relate to a member of the Executive Council who was holding any teaching, administrative or other post in the University on the 14th June 1956, the Executive Council shall, without considering the allegation, refer the case of such person, together with the copy of the allegation, to the Solicitor-General to the Government of India. This provision brings the Vice-Chancellor, Pro Vice-Chancellor and the Treasurer within the ambit of the provision. Nobody is left out. Even after this provision, the hon. Members, in their Minutes of Dissent, have demanded that the present Vice-Chancellor should be removed.

What is the fault of the present Vice-Chancellor? You have appointed a Reviewing Committee. The Reviewing Committee is going into the case of all persons—not only teachers, but the present Vice-Chancellor, Pro Vice-Chancellor and the Treasurer. The Vice-Chancellor will not sit in the Executive Council when his case is being discussed. I am sorry to say that malicious propaganda has been carried on by interested persons, and some hon. Members are not even willing to give a fair trial to the Vice-Chancellor. They consider that the appointment of the Reviewing Committee is too severe a measure for the members of the staff who may have been possibly guilty of professional misconduct, and they would like the Vice-Chancellor to be relieved of his

responsibilities even when his case is being examined by the Solicitor-General or the Reviewing Committee. I ask the House: is this the way in which justice should be done? This raises a serious doubt in my mind as to whether they are really interested in the welfare of the university.

The only fault of the present Vice-Chancellor is that, in accordance with the decision of the former Executive Council where the representatives of the so-called group were also present, he was heard by the Mudaliar Committee. There was no lack of confidence in the present Vice-Chancellor till the publication of the Mudaliar Committee Report. Some of the misguided students and interested teachers have now made him the scapegoat and have turned against him all the fury which was actually intended against the Mudaliar Committee. What has he done to incur the wrath of the people? As far as I know, no charge has been levelled against him.

There has been a great deal of controversy about his appointment, and my Ministry has been accused of interfering with the administration of the university. Hon. Members have referred to the statement made by Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar at a court meeting. When this statement came to the notice of my Ministry, one of our Deputy Secretaries, Dr. Lakhani, wrote to Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar asking whether the statement was correctly reported. Sir, I am reading the letter which Dr. Aiyar wrote to the Ministry on 4th May, 1956, in reply to Dr. Lakhani's letter—long before Mudaliar Committee was appointed:

"I have just received your secret letter of 28th April and own to a feeling of surprise and indignation. The so-called report is inaccurate and mischievous and designed to denigrate the Ministry of Education.

There was a meeting of the Executive Council at which I

had to mention the fact that I had communicated to the President of India and to the Education Minister my resignation of the Vice-Chancellorship of the Banaras Hindu University. It is also true that Shri Humayun Kabir and Dr. Saiyidain had both spoken highly of Dr. V. S. Jha in response to my request for suggestion. It was understood and taken for granted that the Executive Council in whom lay the right of choosing a panel should be given some sort of guidance and advice by the Vice-Chancellor as on previous occasions. I relied on the opinions of my good friends Humayun Kabir and Saiyidain and told the Council in strict confidence that persons in whom I had full confidence had suggested Dr. Jha's name and that I was willing to sponsor his choice though I was not personally acquainted with him."

He further says—and that is the root of the whole trouble:—

"I know that there is active canvassing going in favour of Dr. R. S. Tripathi, the Principal of the Arts College, and against all other candidates including Dr. Jha. I have also made it plain that speaking personally and in view of the situation (political, party and personal) in the University, a Professor or Principal from the ranks of the University staff is in my opinion unsuitable whatever his academic attainments may be."

It is not a very happy statement about a University, but it is there. Then he says

"Evidently the news has leaked out from one of the members of the Executive Council and has been deliberately distributed and circulated with an ulterior purpose."

Sir, I ought to tell the House that this statement mentions many other things and the statement was signed. As far as the Ministry is concerned, when this matter was brought to the notice of the Ministry we wrote to Dr. Aiyar, and after he contradicted this statement we did not want to pursue this matter further. I would like to read another paragraph from this very statement which might interest the House. This paragraph has been omitted from the statement which was circulated to the Members—I mean the pamphlet which was circulated and which has been quoted here.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur):** Sir, it would be better if the whole speech of Dr. Aiyar in which he made that statement is placed before the House, instead of reading a letter dated 4th May. This letter was not given to the House when the Bill was originally before the House. Now that this matter has been brought up here, it would be in the interest of the House, I submit, if the very speech of Dr. Aiyar is placed before the House so that hon. Members will have a true picture of the position.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** When the Ministry was in possession of this letter, why did it not place it before the Select Committee which went into the matter very thoroughly?

**Dr. K. L. Shrivastav:** I will explain that also. This letter was marked 'secret', and I wanted to consult Dr. Aiyar before it could be placed before the House. I thought it would not be fair to Dr. Aiyar if we placed it before the House without consulting him. We, therefore, wrote to Dr. Aiyar. He wrote back and said that we should not only place it before Parliament, but we should give wide publicity as far as possible. It was only after the Select Committee had practically finished its work, it was only on the day of its last meeting or so that we had received the reply of Dr. Aiyar. I did not want to hide it from the Parliament, but from the

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

point of view of propriety it was not proper that I should place it before the House earlier.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** The speech of Dr. Aiyar was referred to in the House earlier. Quotations were made from the pamphlet that was published. All relevant papers in the possession of the hon. Minister should have been placed before the Select Committee and also before the House. This letter was not even read out by the hon. Minister when he replied to the earlier debate, nor was this letter given to the Select Committee. This letter has come at the last stage. This letter is dated 4th May, 1956, much before the Mudaliar Committee came in or anything happened. It should have been placed before the Select Committee. What I submit is, the whole speech of Dr. Aiyar should be placed before the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister has given his explanation. Whether it is acceptable to the hon. Member or not, he has given whatever explanation he has got.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimali:** My hon. friend Shri Humayun Kabir is here. I asked him what happened when Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar came. He told me that Dr. Aiyar came to seek advice. I think it was his right to seek advice from any person he liked.

**The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir):** I was not a member of the Ministry at that time.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimali:** Yes, he was not a member of the Ministry at that time—Shri Saiyidain was there. It was open to Dr. Aiyar to seek the advice of any person whether in the Government or outside, and it was also open to these officers or people outside the Ministry to give such advice as they liked. In fact, Shri Kabir told me that he had suggested along with the name of Dr. Jha one or two other names. Personally I

think there is nothing wrong in giving this kind of advice, and it is wrong to call it interference in the administration of the University.

I would, therefore, request the House to examine the full facts in proper perspective and not be carried away by false propaganda which is being carried on at the present moment by interested persons. If the hands of the Vice-Chancellor are not clean, the Solicitor-General and the Reviewing Committee will take cognizance of this fact and will report to the Executive Committee. Let us not be prejudiced against him on the basis of baseless rumours and vile propaganda.

I shall now come to some of the Notes of Dissent. The hon. Member Shri Vajpayee had suggested that some senior member of the Executive Council should become the Chairman of the Executive Council and Chairmanship of the Council should not *ipso facto* devolve on the Vice-Chancellor. I would like to submit that this is the most extraordinary suggestion which has been made by the hon. Member. In our country we have done enough to undermine the University authorities and if we accept this proposal the Vice-Chancellor will be reduced to a non-entity in the University. The office of the Vice-Chancellor should be considered as one of the highest offices in our country. As the chief executive head and the academic officer of the University, the Vice-Chancellor is the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Executive Council, the Standing Committee of the Academic Council and the Finance Committee. In the absence of the Chancellor and the Pro-Chancellor he also presides over the meetings of the Court. This practice is prevalent not only in our Universities but also in the Western Universities. The Vice-Chancellor has a highly strategic and even a very difficult position. He is to represent the University on numerous occasions, preside at all sorts of functions, make

speeches before all sort of assemblies, represent the University on various committees and commissions and generally maintain the public relation; of the institution. He has budgetary problems to face and sometimes also expected to raise funds for the University. If you lower the position of the Vice-Chancellor as suggested by the hon. Member, would any person with self-respect take up this position of responsibility?

The hon. Member Shri Mahanty and some other Members have objected to the appointment of the Screening Committee—now called Reviewing Committee—and have suggested that this Committee will cast “a criminal court” like shadow over the University. The report of the Mudalhar Committee as well as the reports of ex-Vice-Chancellors have revealed how the intransigence of a small group has paralysed the academic life of the University and undermined the University authorities. Is it not our duty to set up a machinery which would examine the conduct of all those persons who by their professional misconduct have been responsible for the present state of affairs? Recently, there has been a court of enquiry to look into the conduct of some civil servants in the high positions. If this can be done in the case of officers of the Government of India, I do not see any reason why it should not be done in the case of those persons who have been entrusted with the most important task of guiding the young generation and who have failed to discharge their responsibilities and have thus betrayed the trust which was laid in them by the society.

15 hrs.

The members of the teaching staff will have full opportunity to present their case before this Reviewing Committee as well as the executive council and in this way the ends of social justice will be fully met. There should be no fear in the minds of these people who have been carrying

on their duties conscientiously and who are maintaining a high sense of professional integrity. The Reviewing Committee is concerned only with those persons whose continuance in office is likely to be detrimental to the interest of the university.

The hon. Member Shri Khadilkar and some other hon. Members have suggested that the court should have been kept in abeyance till a comprehensive legislation of a permanent nature is enacted. If the Government had taken this action, hon. Members would have criticised us for not taking a drastic action. The Government have not suspended any university bodies but have only changed their powers and functions. The court has been a centre of intrigue during the last several years and therefore it was considered desirable that it should no more continue as a supreme governing body but should perform other duties and exercise such powers as may be assigned to it by the Visitor under this Act. It still retains the power to elect the Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor and the Treasurer. Even for a temporary period, I should not like the university to become completely disassociated with the representatives of the departments, colleges, teachers and old students. The members of the court have been nominated and there is no risk of any factionism during this period.

The question has also been raised with regard to the provision of increasing the representation of the Members of Parliament. The situation is that at present there are four Members of Parliament in the executive council of the university, and these Members are *inter alia ex-officio* members of the court. In addition, there are three Members of Parliament among the Visitor's nominees on the court. In the draft Bill, there is provision for three representatives of Parliament. Thus, altogether, there are ten Members of Parliament on the court consisting of 53 persons including the Pro-Chancellor. In my opinion, this provides full representation to this august House and the

[Dr. K. L. Shrivastava]

other House. When this revised Bill comes before the House, the House can decide how many members of Parliament should be there on the court.

As regards regional representation, I have already given an assurance, and I would like to repeat it on the floor of the House that efforts will be made for the nomination of persons belonging to those regions which have not been represented so far, as soon as suitable opportunity arises.

I would like to take the time of the House in giving briefly a picture of the university as it exists at the present moment. The university is expected to be a self-governing community, but at present there is no law and order. A small number of students who, I have reason to believe, are inspired by political parties and interested teachers inside the university have taken law in their own hands.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Can we have the political parties' names?

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** Socialist Party, P S P.

**Dr. K. L. Shrivastava:** The hon Member knows better than myself. The effigies have been burnt. Threats of burning the Vice-Chancellor alive if he does not leave the university have been given. The residence of the Vice-Chancellor was surrounded for days together and now the house of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor who is an old man—I am told he is about 76, and I do not know the exact date of birth—is being surrounded by the students. Some students went to the Vice-Chancellor's residence, removed the name-plate and have declared that the Vice-Chancellor who had come to Delhi would not be permitted to go back to the university. Leaders of political parties have taken full advantage of the situation and are exploiting them for political ends without realising that these very methods would be used against them when they come into power.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** May I know the names of the leaders?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Not necessarily here.

**Dr. K. L. Shrivastava:** They have addressed the meetings of the students and have asked them to carry on the agitation more vigorously and forcefully so that the Ordinance may be withdrawn and the Act may be thrown out.

On 14th August, the student leaders threatened the Vice-Chancellor that they would physically prevent him from hoisting the flag on the Independence Day. Hunger-strikes, torch-light processions, speeches full of threats, violence and intimidation, loudspeakers and demonstrations of nerve-rattling nature have become the normal feature of the university life. Do these incidents not indicate that the university has lost its academic character and has become an arena of political strife? If such happenings continue to recur in our university, is there not a danger that there will be a retreat of our civilisation and we shall return to a state of barbarism?

The students of Ayurvedic College are demanding the appointment of a person who is at present employed with the Himachal Pradesh administration. I made a personal request to the Health Minister to depute him but I have been informed that he is unwilling to accept the principalship of this college. What am I to do? How are we to meet such unreasonable demands of the students?

I would like to ask the House whether by encouraging such tendencies among students we are building up proper university traditions. For the maintenance of proper university traditions, two things are essential: the spirit of liberalism and respect for ordinary processes of law. They are the root and branch of university life. If we allow the students to develop false ideas of freedom and encourage them to defy the university authorities we cut at the roots of university

tradition. The Mudaliar Committee has made some references to some undesirable activities of some of the students. The Committee had no intention to bring slur on the whole student community of the university. Some painful incidents were brought to their notice by some responsible persons, and they have brought them to our notice not with a view to condemn the student community, but with a view to give them better guidance. The members of the committee are interested in the future of the young generation as much as we are, and they are anxious that the university students may set up high moral standards so that they may be worthy of our noble heritage and culture.

The report also contains some quotations from the memorandum submitted to the committee which contains the unfortunate references to eastern Uttar Pradesh. There is no intention on the part of the committee to condemn the whole of eastern Uttar Pradesh which is a part of our country—a vital and organic part. They only referred to a small group of people inside the university who have not maintained high professional conduct and have brought discredit to the university.

I would, therefore, request the House to consider this report and this Bill in their proper perspective. The university is suffering from a chronic disease, and let us not do anything by word or deed to aggravate its malady.

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

"That the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration".

I have to point out that I have received about a dozen names of hon. Members. There might be others also.....

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Yes; we are also here.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** ....who had not sent their names but who may wish to speak. Altogether, we have got three hours, and there must be, on the whole, I think two dozen Members. Even with the additional hour promised by the Speaker added, we will have four hours at the most. Half an hour has already been taken up. Therefore, I request the hon. Members to be very brief so that a large number of Members may be accommodated. Could we put a limit of about 15 minutes for each Member, in the normal course?

**Several Hon. Members:** Yes, yes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That may be all right, because, at this stage, perhaps all the controversy that we had during the first stage may not be opened again. Now, we can confine ourselves to the alterations made or those that ought to have been made and have not been made.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** The hon. Minister has read a story, and we have got to refer to it.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Which he should not have normally done.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not necessary that whatever he has said should be again referred to. While dealing with the provisions of this Bill, hon. Members might make a passing reference to it, but that does not become an issue to be decided here by the Parliament. We have now the provision of the Bill and we have to look into them and see whether we can improve upon them.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** We agree that we have to concentrate on the provisions of the Bill, but the hon. Minister has not chosen to do it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I hope the Members will not follow the same path.

**Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal):** In view of the observations made by the hon. Mini ter in regard to our minutes of dissent, I request that such of us who have been named may be kindly provided an opportunity to reply.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Those who have an opportunity can speak on that also.

**Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the situation that has developed in the Banaras Hindu University and the problem that we are trying to resolve just now are of a nature where not only no partisan consideration can be shown, but no political attitude can be taken. We are concerned with the welfare and the development of a major institution of learning and I am sorry to find that not only there in the university, not only in the great State in which the university is situated, but even in this august House, tempers are rising and people are allowing themselves to get divided. I believe for a variety of reasons, above all because whatever steps were necessary and corrective; need to be taken have been long delayed and this delay has resulted in the ossification of the differences and difficulties in that great institution of learning. It is not very easy to bring about a change.

If a change is to be brought about, the students as well as the teaching community there must realise that **this House is not going to permit this kind of thing to continue.** We are anxious that no injustice should be done. Injustice to an individual here and there to me is not as important as injustice to a great institution of learning and to tens of thousands of students whose very life we seem to be playing with today.

I would like to invite attention to a statement which was recently issued by a number of citizens of Banaras, which includes someone who is very dear to me; and, I am sure a large number of Members of this House

have the same deep respect and affection for him. I refer to my esteemed friend, Mr. Achyut Patwardhan, who was a student as well as a teacher of this university. He had a very distinguished career as a public man. He has withdrawn from public life and he is living a kind of dedicated life completely away from tensions and turmoils. He is not interested in politics, elections or anything of the kind. This is what he says:

"The situation in the Banaras Hindu University today and the manner in which the student demonstrators were conducting themselves at present will ultimately affect seriously their own larger interests. Any impartial observer of the university and a friend of the students cannot help feeling that the affairs of this institution have been far from satisfactory for the last several years that nothing less than a drastic change is called for. In so far as the Mudaliar Commission had also supported this finding, the signatories find themselves in substantial agreement with it, although they do not subscribe to every statement contained in the report. They are convinced that the Banaras Hindu University should be completely free from all influences of political parties; or, otherwise, the situation which is bad is likely to become worse. The signatories appeal, in conclusion, to those connected with the present situation in the university to stop all demonstrations and to free the university from the unhealthy atmosphere which it has been surcharged with in the last three or four weeks."

I did not speak on the previous occasion. I thought it my duty on this occasion to raise my humble voice in support of the appeal that Achyut Patwardhan has made. I would like to appeal to every section of this House to carry on this discussion in a manner whereby the situation will not only not get aggravated, but the

student community and the teaching fraternity there will realise that as far as this House is concerned, this matter is not going to be viewed in any partisan manner, in any regional manner, but this matter is going to be viewed in a manner whereby this great institution of learning can once again function in the manner in which everyone of us here wants it to function.

Having said that, I do not agree with the hon. Minister of Education. He seems to feel that there is a small group which is functioning in an intransigent manner. I do not know much about the university, but if it was merely a question of a small group functioning in an intransigent manner, your screening committee or the reviewing committee probably would pluck out those undesirable element out of the body politic of the university. But I have read very carefully the various papers that were laid before the Select Committee which the Select Committee, in their wisdom, have made them available to us. May I invite your attention to the letter which Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar wrote to the Visitor? I am reading from page 56, para 4:

"The background and personnel of the University, due to unchecked and untoward developments during several years are such that I have to devote eight or ten hours a day to routine, petty and often contentious work of a taxing character. Unfortunately, there is no one else who could adequately deal with the almost daily quarrels and intrigues amongst professors and their subordinate lecturers and tutorial and administrative staff. Furthermore, the University is divided into two (in fact three) irreconcilable parties or groups, partly political and partly personal in character, that seek, not only by open and unrestrained disputes among themselves, but also through engineering anonymous and other communications and by other

means, to acquire influence in the various academic bodies of the University, e.g. the Executive Council, the Standing Committee and the Academic Council. All but a few of the highest grade of Professors and Readers are engaged in this unceasing and ignoble conflict to the obvious detriment of their legitimate duties toward; their students or in the direction of Research. Hardly any department in the University but has two groups which are constantly laying their respective complaints against each other . . ."

Mark the word, "all but a few".

I think whatever the disease, the disease is deep-seated and police action is not going to end it. I am afraid that, just as when the administration in a State breaks down, the Centre takes over the administration and you send a high-powered commissioner to be in charge of the State, that kind of approach is not going to work here. This university, if it is to be set right, will have to be tended very carefully. Under the Bill that has been brought before us, virtually the responsibility has been taken up by the Visitor. If he fails, I am afraid we shall never be able to cleanse any stables in any other university.

I would like to remind the hon. Minister and to my fellow Members of this House about the heavy responsibility that lies on our shoulders. It is not that the Banaras Hindu University is the only erring university. It is a great university and things have gone wrong there. Now, things may be wrong in many other universities also. We do not want to touch the other universities if we can help that. By setting things right in one university, we hope and trust that in other universities, people will realise that this august body is not going to keep quiet if anyone is going to play with the destinies of the future generations of our people. Therefore, things in this university will have to be

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

handled in a manner whereby so far as the other universities are concerned, no police action and no Mudaliar Committees will be needed. If that is to be done, may I beg of the Education Minister not to show as if he would like to pick here for the Vice-Chancellor. I do not know the Vice-Chancellor. I have met him twice and that too very very casually. Perhaps he is a very fine person. I have nothing against him. But if we want to set things right, let it not be as if the Education Minister stands four square behind the Vice-Chancellor and the rest of the forces are going to wreck this action of the Education Ministry and sabotage the support that he is bound to gather. I think that is not a happy way of tackling the situation. I would appeal to the Vice-Chancellor—his hands may be very clean, his conscience may be very clear—but I would appeal to him to make it clear that he has no desire to remain. Let us make it possible for someone who would not be able to arouse this kind of antipathies and antagonisms to come in; a healing touch has to be applied; a Screening Committee has to be appointed; some people have to be removed. I do not know very much about it. But I want a different kind of approach, and an approach which is interested not so much in saying: this man is wrong, that man is undesirable, that man has to go; because it is not that that we want. That treatment would have been just and proper if there were only a few erring here and there and a vast majority of the teaching staff was behaving properly. But that does not seem to be the case, as Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar has stated. If that is so, a different approach is necessary. I am not concerned with amendments.

I am concerned with approach, because no matter what law you pass here, unless the right approach is provided, the laws are not going to bring about the changes that we desire there.

Secondly, I feel the students should be told that this House, and this House ultimately means the people of India, will not tolerate any kind of demonstrations and excesses in which they are indulging. I would appeal to the Education Minister, and better still to the Leader of the House, that he should invite a few Members of this House who command the confidence of this House and command, I hope, at least evoke a certain amount of allegiance of the student community there. Let that small group visit the University and convey to the Students our willingness to help them in every possible way. If more money is needed, we will give them; if more hostels have to be given, we shall be the first to look into that. But we shall not permit the kind of things that a small section of the students are indulging in. I would appeal to the other political parties that we should not trouble the waters in order to fish in them. There are enough troubles. In UP itself there are enough. There is so much of mal-administration, there is so much of opportunity for anyone, any opposition group that wants to build up a massive case against the administration. I say there is any amount of it there. Let us try to keep away from this problem. Let us try to contain it, contain it in a manner whereby we will not allow any political predilections to come into it. All that can be done provided the Minister himself approaches the problem in a manner whereby he will reduce, and not aggravate, the opposition that is there to some of the measures that he is supporting.

I do not know if I have been able to communicate my feelings to you. I have only one more point, and that is a very small point. Three Members of Parliament are to be there. It is suggested that the Speaker and the Chairman should nominate them. I do not agree. Seven of our distinguished colleagues have already been nominated by the Visitor or by the Education Ministry. Three of our colleagues, therefore, should be permitted to be

appointed by us. I have the greatest of respect for the power of discrimination and power of judgment of the Speaker. But knowing the importance of this, let us see with what wisdom, with what anxiety, with what sense of carefulness this House will elect persons on that body. Let not that right and that responsibility be taken away from our shoulders and put on the shoulders of the Speaker. I have the greatest respect for the Speaker. But here we are on trial, and I would like that we should be permitted, before the bar of history where we are on trial, to see whether we come out of it successfully.

**Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am sorry to find the way in which the hon. Education Minister has placed the facts before the House. I quite realise the responsibility of the House and of the Members speaking on this Bill. The effect of it will be great repercussions in our national institutions. Knowing full well the situation, I am sure no single Member will try to speak in a way which will act as a matchstick to the gun powder. But, of all persons, the Education Minister, I am sorry to find, unnecessarily created a hitch in this discussion on this Bill. He wanted the House to discuss this dispassionately and without any hitch. But I think his sling at the political parties was rather out of place. I am quite confident that all hon. Members, whether sitting on this side or that side of the House, are anxious that irrespective of whatever has happened in the past in the University, we should all pull our weight together to see that it functions well, at least from right now. That is why we wanted to discuss this matter dispassionately. But I am sorry that the Government spokesmen, instead of using words which are necessary for this particular moment, used words which will cause great harm.

During the course of his speech he made some reference to the political parties. Some hon. Members immediately stood up to say that they are

of the PSP, SP and communist party. I would only like to draw the attention of the House to the threat which was given by one of the members of the Congress party. I want the House to remember that. So, it is not a question of political parties. It is a question of individuals, how they look at things. Here we are not to discuss this matter from any party angle. No one would like it. At least I can say for our party that we will not do it.

Here we will confine our discussion only to the provisions of this Act, to the changes that have been brought out by the Select Committee, whether they are going to improve the matter at this particular moment, instead of indulging in acrimonious debate between party factions or trying to strengthen the hands of the persons who want to create trouble in the Banaras Hindu University. That is not our approach. I for one can say that I at least will not approach this discussion from that angle.

Even considering that the situation in the Banaras Hindu University is not what it should be, I have not been able to get from the Ministry really what was the necessity of promulgating the Ordinance, because from the 10th of May to 11th August he has not been able to give anything that has happened in the Banaras Hindu University which necessitated the promulgation of the Ordinance. He has referred to Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar's letter; he has referred to Pandit Govind Malaviya's letter; he has referred to other things. But all these things refer to the incidents of the years 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954. What was the necessity of promulgating an Ordinance? What happened between May 9th and August 11th which necessitated the Government promulgating the Ordinance? Up till now those facts have not been placed before the House. I want to say that by promulgating the Ordinance Government has already created a bad situation which could have been avoided. It was not necessary to

[Shri Prabhat Kar]

promulgate the Ordinance. As was stated by Shri Asoka Mehta, it is not by police action that you can change the whole administration; it requires a change of heart; it requires a different approach. That approach has not been made by the Government. After promulgating the Ordinance, the court has already been nominated. I have nothing to say against the persons who have been nominated there. But what was the necessity of immediately nominating on the court, persons who have been elected from the representatives of the teachers. It has been admitted that there are factions. More than one—two or three groups—are there. Anyone of these persons might belong to one or the other group and naturally it will create a situation by which somebody will create the plea to again create an atmosphere which is not congenial. There was no necessity of immediately nominating the members of the Court, because the Court for all this time did not meet. The Court has now been reduced to an advisory body. According to the new Act, the Court is to advise the Visitor in respect of any matter which may be referred to it for advice and to advise any authority of the University in respect of any matter which may be referred to the Court by such authority. There is no function of the Court at present. There was no necessity of nominating the Court and nominating on the Court representatives from amongst teachers who have been charged of having formed into groups and who have been charged of having been for all these years source of all these troubles. There was no necessity, but yet the Government did it. The Government nominated certain persons. Quite naturally, it may be the feeling of others that the Government wanted to give strength to some of the groups and that one of the groups had the backing of the Government. Naturally, if the other groups today come forward to create agitation they have got at least a genuine plea—I would say, if not

a ground, a plea—to agitate over this matter. I would say that the Government should not have nominated the Court. There was no necessity of nominating the Court immediately because there is no function of the Court existing today.

It has been said that so far as the Vice-Chancellor is concerned, he is a very efficient man. We have got nothing to say against him. So far as he is concerned personally and his educational qualifications, we have got nothing to say. But today centring round him all these troubles are being created. So, it is necessary that in order to see that there is peace in the University, he may be requested to stand by in the interest of the University. I would wish that he may be requested to stand by even if an unreasonable demand is made. It is necessary that one person should stand by. The hon. Minister knows the feeling of the hon. Members of the Select Committee in this particular matter. I do not want to say any word about the Vice-Chancellor, but I want the Government to take note of the feeling of the people and it will be better and in the interest of the institution that the Government should make such a request to the Vice-Chancellor.

Then I feel that in the Act, even as it stands, there is a possibility of a misunderstanding amongst the persons connected with the Banaras Hindu University. As I said, there was no necessity of nominating persons. About the formation of the Court also, in the Fourteenth Statute of clause 7 we find that the Court shall consist of the following members, namely:—

- (a) the Chancellor, *ex-officio*,
- (b) the Pro-Chancellor, *ex-officio*,
- (c) the members of the Executive Council, *ex-officio*,
- (d) two persons from the Departments and Colleges of the

University, nominated by the Visitor,

- (e) two persons from among the teachers of this University other than Professors, nominated by the Visitor,
- (f) five persons from among the old students of the University, nominated by the Visitor, etc. etc.

Now, if we go through the letter of Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar or the letter of Pandit Govind Malaviya, we will find that on the question of the activities of these groups who belonged to the teaching staff how they have been trying to discredit one or the other Vice-Chancellor. Now, to take some one of them in the Court and allow them to continue the intrigue, I do not find any rhyme or reason. It has been said that they are nominated and therefore there is no chance of any factionalism. Even if they are nominated they belonged previously to one or the other group. They will be representatives of one or the other group. If they have been a party to all these things before, simply because they are nominated by Government they will not have the same partisan attitude, I at least for one cannot believe. Rather, they will feel now that they have got the support of the Government and therefore if any one of them is so nominated, they will carry on the same intrigue as they were carrying on before.

Then comes the question of the Selection Committee. Most of the troubles had arisen out of the activities of the Selection Committee in appointing the teaching staff. There we wanted that in the Selection Committee there will be no member of the Executive Council, because the Executive Council will have an opportunity to sit over the decisions of the Selection Committee. After that if the Executive Council is unable to accept the recommendations made by the Committee, it shall record its reasons

153 LSD—7.

and submit the case to the Visitor for final orders. If the Selection Committee includes a member of the Selection Committee, he will, while selecting, discuss certain things and will again sit over the decisions of the Selection Committee in the Executive Council. Therefore we suggested that in the Selection Committee there should be no member of the Executive Council because the Executive Council will have an opportunity to sit over the suggestions made by the Selection Committee and if there is any difference, in that case this matter will be referred to the Visitor whose decision shall be the final thing.

Then the next thing I would say is that in the formation of the Court, we find that there will be three Members of Parliament, two to be nominated by the Speaker of the House of the People from among the members thereof and one to be nominated by the Chairman of the Council of States from among the members thereof. As has already been stated, I would suggest that Members should be elected and here also particularly in view of the fact that the state of emergency exists today which has necessitated the promulgation of the Ordinance, it is necessary that more representatives from the Parliament should be in the Court to guide the working of the institution. In that case I would suggest that because you agree to the existence of an emergency and because the House has agreed with the steps taken by the Government with the promulgation of the Ordinance there should be more representatives from the House and we would suggest that at least there should be 12 representatives—eight from the Lok Sabha and four from the Rajya Sabha—to be elected on the Court so that the House may have a proper control over the function of this University. I would also suggest that instead of having 29 members nominated by the Visitor, we should have 20 members and there should be at least one representative from the State Legislatures in this Court because this is an all-India body and

[Shri Prabhat Kar]

there are charges—if not of provincialism, but some sort of charges—against some part of a State. At least because of the feeling and the sentiments of the people I would like that one representative from the State Legislatures should also be in the Court so that the all-India character of the University can be established in the Court itself.

Then I would say that when the Government came before the House they had completed everything. Every course which was necessary they took and wanted the House to give sanction to whatever they had done. This is not the way. There is a difference of opinion. It is not difference of opinion between the Opposition and the ruling Party. There is difference of opinion among the Members that belong to the ruling Party. It is a matter which needs considerable thought. The Government should not have come before the House having completed every step. The Government should have taken the House into confidence before acting on the provisions of this Bill. There I do not agree with the Government that it was necessary to nominate all the persons and to complete all the formalities that were required under the Ordinance.

Lastly, I am very glad that the Screening Committee has now been changed to Reviewing Committee and the procedure that has been adopted is also very good. The only thing we would say is that the Government should at least tone down so that there may not be fear in the minds of anybody and although there may be a Reviewing Committee it is not the intention of the Government that because there was something—some report by some Vice-Chancellor on the teaching staff—their cases will be considered and an attempt will be made to victimise them because they held one or the other view which may not be the one which the Government would like. That type of statement should come. I hope, while replying

to the debate, the hon. Education Minister will tone down his feelings, because, I am afraid, the way he spoke just now is not going to create a situation which will be helpful to the University and to the country. Rather it will aggravate it, which, at least this House does not want. Every one really is sorry, I would say, for the state of affairs that is going on in the Banaras Hindu University.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Aurangabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I was not present when the discussion on the Committee's report took place in this House. I have gone through the Mudaliar Committee report and it has made me very sad because the academic atmosphere in this great University has been polluted and it has lost its glory and goodness. The disease seems to be too deep-rooted and therefore, the approach to solve this problem has to be also a well-considered one.

I entirely agree with my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta, and I do not also think that it is merely a clique or a small group that has vitiated the atmosphere in the University. Something more deep-rooted, something more objectionable, something more sinister has taken hold of the University. It is a mental disease: may be a disease coming out of a certain feeling of frustration or the instigation or the encouragement given by certain sections, I do not know. But the manner in which this malady is going to be removed has to be somewhat different.

I am connected with educational institutions for over 25 years, very intimately connected with the conduct of such institutions. Factions do arise. It is in the manner in which you deal with the staff and the students that the good or bad atmosphere in an educational institution can be maintained. If you allow freedom and at the same time create a sense of responsibility, the academic atmosphere

is maintained and the institution flourishes. If you suppress that freedom and handle the affairs, in an unrealistic manner, you spoil the whole thing.

I would just like to plead with the Education Minister and give him a very simple suggestion. I have no objection to the Screening committee or Reviewing committee or whatever he feels necessary. Let him have it. But, you will not be able to change the mind of the students by having recourse to these committees. I am quite clear about it. You will have to adopt a psychological approach. I have been looking to the atmosphere that is prevalent there. We are receiving representations even now. I do not know what has happened to this University: to the professors, to the students, to those who are instigating the entire personnel there. Why should these people carry on propaganda amongst Members of Parliament when this august body is giving its considered view to this problem? The remedy has to be drastic. At the same time, it must be a softening one. Therefore, I would more depend upon not an enactment of this type—it is necessary, let it go—but a loving approach made to the students so that they may realise their responsibility and create that kind of atmosphere which would ensure academic progress.

Something has been said about the Vice-Chancellor. I have tried to understand the proposition. Nothing can be said against any person. This House shall be the last to have to say anything about any person as such. But, I also feel that in the atmosphere as it prevails at the present moment, if the Vice-Chancellor can himself vacate the place, so much the better. Because, he will be helping to smoothen the affairs and he will not be in the picture to influence the various processes of action and punishment which will be taken by the Screening committee. Let there be not an iota of doubt that there will

be a suspicion about his own bona fides in the mind of anybody who is going to be punished or tried or whose case is going to be scrutinised by the Reviewing committee. That seems to be necessary. Of course, it is for him, and for the Education Minister to consider this suggestion.

It is good that this House has considered the problem in a non-partisan way. That is welcome. I think the student world of India has to be told very clearly and all the political parties, including the one to which I have the honour to belong, must make a solemn declaration that no student community in India will be exploited for political ends. Otherwise, no University will be able to retain its academic atmosphere. In my own institution, we have made it, not a written law, but a convention that no member of the staff will be even a primary member of any political party. He may hold any views. He is free to do that. He can give his own ideas to the students. Let the students be free. The House will be interested to know that though I belong to and I hold the Gandhian philosophy dear and I am trying to understand it and follow it as best as I can, there is no bar in my institution for the students and the staff to understand, learn and also assimilate other philosophies, marxism etc. In the part of the country in which I have the opportunity to serve the people, most of the leaders of all political parties have been given by my institution: Marxists, Communists, Royists, Gandhites. There is that free atmosphere. There is no suppression of any ideology. Having done that, we find that the students are disciplined, well-behaved and also well-meaning.

Sir, this is an interim measure, but the interim measure should be very short-lived and a well-thought out and a well-considered measure should follow. I hope this interim measure will serve the purpose for which it is being enacted and before the

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

permanent measure comes, the academic atmosphere in the university shall have been reimbursed.

Lastly, I support wholeheartedly and fully the suggestion made by Shri Asoka Mehta that some Members of this august House should be persuaded to visit the university, and stay there as long as it is necessary and try to create a psychological change among the students and also amongst the staff. And then, if there are certain elements who are not amenable to reason, who are not amenable to patriotism and better sense, a punitive measure can be adopted.

I have nothing more to say. It is with great sadness that I am participating in this discussion. I have the honour to stay for some time in the year at Banaras in my institution there, and it would be indeed a happy moment for me and a joy for me to see that the Banaras Hindu University reverts to its original position.

**Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi):** The Banaras Hindu University has been a symbol of something great, and something beautiful, and we have all looked at it from our early childhood with reverence and with love. Therefore, it is natural that everyone of us here should feel deeply perturbed and unhappy at the way in which things and events have been moving in that university for a pretty long time.

It has been stated here that the vice-chancellor should vacate or that the Minister should make it clear that he does not stand by the vice-chancellor. I very humbly disagree with either of these statements, for the simple reason that it is not the vice-chancellor A, B or C that one has to contend against, but this idea which has got round in the Banaras Hindu University that it is possible to bully out one vice-chancellor after another; if one remembers that in that university a man of the eminence of Acharya Narendra Dev could be made to shed

tears, one can very well imagine what the state of affairs there must be. It is very necessary, therefore, that it be made clear in unmistakable terms to all concerned that they will not be able to push out any vice-chancellor by following the methods and the tactics that they have been adopting.

I have nothing to say for or against the present vice-chancellor. I have met him a few times, and I think he is a very able man, and I do not think anybody here has expressed any opinion or made any statement contrary to this point of view. It has been stated that he is the centre of trouble. It is not this vice-chancellor that has been the centre of trouble, but many before him have been the centres of trouble. The reason is that for too long, things have been allowed to drift. It was with the hope that by talking to people, by trying to be nice to people, good sense will ultimately prevail, it was with this thought at the back of their minds that I presume one after the other, the authorities that were in charge did not take any drastic action and things were allowed to move from bad to worse. Ultimately, Government did wake up, and I am sorry that they took so long to wake up, but they did wake up, and they appointed a committee, and when the report of that committee was received, it revealed a state of things so terrible that immediately action was considered necessary.

It has been asked why the ordinance was promulgated. I ask why the ordinance was not promulgated years ago. The question is that if things had been bad for such a long time, why a proper enactment was not brought before Parliament earlier. The Minister has indicated in his remarks that the Government were really not aware that things were so bad, till this report came before them. Reports had been reaching them, and reports had been reaching the ears of all of us that the situation was

unhappy and things were bad, but that things had come to such a pass was realised only when the Mudaliar Committee's report came. And it was good that immediate action was taken, and this report was not allowed to thrust on the shelves of the Government offices as many other reports have had the fortune or the misfortune of doing.

Therefore, I am very glad that action has been taken at last, and as was stated earlier, a drastic remedy was necessary for this deep-seated malady, and this action of Government has provided that drastic remedy. There might be certain minor points in this Bill that might need change here and there. The Select Committee has done an excellent job, and at the end of prolonged sittings and strenuous labour, they have produced a report that is before us. I feel strongly that we should accept that report and we should impress upon the Education Minister that as early as possible a permanent measure be brought before this House. In that permanent measure, any other changes that may be necessary can be introduced.

It has been stated here that the students are misbehaving. I do not for one moment blame the students. Wherever any where students go wrong, or there is indiscipline, I think the blame for it has to be laid at the door of the teachers, and not at the door of the students. It was also said that the hon. Minister while replying to the debate might have toned down his feelings in this matter. I do not see how any one can. He spoke with deep feelings and deep pain in his heart that the custodians of our children, the custodians of the future generations of India, should have so forgotten their duty, should have been so carried away by considerations of a very transient nature, that they have jeopardised the welfare and the future of these youngsters and led them into ways which are neither good for them, nor good for the University, nor good for the country as a whole.

16 hrs.

Sir, the University is a place of learning. Nobody should do anything to distract the attention of the boys and girls from the course of learning, so that they may prepare themselves for the responsibilities that are to fall upon their shoulders. What would any one say to those people, be they politicians, be they teachers, be they anybody, who would descend to the level of instigating the students into leading agitations, as is being done at Banaras, as has been done at Jaipur? And unless this evil is nipped in the bud, it is likely to go further. I most heartily welcome the suggestion that was made here a short while ago by an hon. Member that all political parties should take a solemn pledge that they will not use students for any political purposes, whether it be at the time of elections or whether it be at any other time like the occasion that arose at Jaipur or the occasion that is there at present at the Banaras Hindu University.

A healing touch is no doubt necessary. But how is that healing touch to be provided? A few Members of Parliament or few other well-wishers of the students can go and talk to the students for a short while. But the people who are to be constantly in touch with those students, the people who are to wield a permanent influence over them are the teachers under whom they spend a few years, and the most formative years of their lives. Therefore, it is very very necessary that those teachers be made to realise the folly of their ways; and those of them who are prepared to mend their ways, should certainly not be victimised, or humiliated in any way. But with regard to those who are not prepared to do that and who will continue in their undesirable ways, well, I am afraid it is necessary that action be taken against them and the atmosphere set right. I am glad, therefore, that the Reviewing Committee is provided, and this Reviewing Committee will do the needful.

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

Now, the question is, should the Vice-Chancellor be there when the reviewing committee does its work? I think it is absolutely necessary that at the moment there should be no changes made as a result of this agitational approach. Ultimately, when the whole atmosphere is cleared, it may be time to make any necessary changes; and the Vice-Chancellor himself might be so tired and fagged out by the end of that time and so happy that things are at last restored to normal that a change, may be brought about, and probably that will be done. But, Sir, any change at this moment which gives any one the impression that it is possible for them to adopt an agitational approach and push out the Vice-Chancellor after another or make his life miserable will be a most unfortunate step, and nothing should be done to encourage such a feeling.

As for the Members of this House who are to serve on the Court, whether they should be nominated or elected is not a terribly important point from my point of view. In a way, I would welcome that we do not bring election in this question at all, for the simple reason that we want to keep this whole business of the University completely above election canvassing and anything of that kind.

Shri Asoka Mehta said we are on trial. By all means, we are on trial. But I do not think this is the appropriate time to test our soundness of thinking or otherwise. I think there are plenty of opportunities when we can put ourselves on trial, and we will be put on trial. But at this moment—the one prime concern is not to test the soundness or otherwise of any particular person or groups of persons or even this august House, but to find out some method by which the affairs at the Banaras Hindu University can be set right. And I feel, Sir, that can only be done if political considerations of all kinds, including elections of all kinds, at the moment

are kept aside and people who in the opinion of the Speaker and of the Chairman of Rajya Sabha—and in accordance with whatever other provisions have been made—will serve the purpose which they are intended to serve, should be put on that Court. However, if other people feel strongly that this is a matter for elections. I do not have any particular objection—although my preference is that the nomination that has been suggested should be stuck to.

With these words I whole heartedly support the measure that the hon. Minister has placed before this House

Shri Khadiikar (Ahmednagar). Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with your permission I would like to make a brief reference to the Enquiry Committee's Report. But before making any observation I would like to make one thing clear. And that is that whatever I say about the Report or the Bill is not intended in any way to encourage the students who unfortunately are now showing, I feel, a slightly mentally-deranged type of behaviour there, seeing from Press reports—I do not know exactly, what is going on there now.

But, as I said, I must briefly make a mention of the Report for one reason; because, the report is a sort of diagnosis, and a remedy is suggested for curing a chronic disease (*An Hon Member. Cancer*) of a malignant nature—I would put it that way.

Now, unfortunately, if we go through the document, one fails to understand how these people have approached the problem itself: because, the defect is in the whole approach. At the present moment, there are two types of approaches, as we see there. One is an ivory-tower academic approach, and the other is a bureaucratic approach. Unfortunately, this measure, to a large extent, from the Government side reflects a

bureaucratic approach. The members of the Committee, naturally, were overburdened with a great sense of responsibility. And before making any further observations, I must say that I know there were elderly statesmen like Dr. Subbaroyan or another lady Member whose zeal for social work is well known. With all this, the whole approach is wrong. Because, why was this chronic disease allowed to develop, and whose responsibility is it? There is factionalism, I know. The whole atmosphere is faction-ridden, and the academic life has been disturbed. In my opinion, it is not only a question of Banaras. It is a national waste. Because, there are people in this country who can hardly send their children to primary schools, leave aside colleges we are trying to invest, as we say, in human beings, or that it is human capital that we are developing. And we say that we have not enough resources to develop this potential energy of our country, that is there in the coming generation. On the other hand, I find we are handing over Rs. 50 lakhs to this University and for the last five or six years matters have been going from bad to worse. While making a diagnosis, the Committee ought to have very frankly apportioned the blame. Why I say this is because I find some evidence in the Radhakrishnan Committee's Report. I would not read from that Report and tax the House. But on page 462 of the Report, there is a very significant observation. Even then the number had gone up. There was no hostel accommodation. Things were disturbing. The Committee has observed that all this is due mainly to the responsibility which the UP Government has failed to discharge or own. Therefore, the atmosphere is being poisoned due to overcrowding. That is one aspect.

Another aspect is this. After all when the Members of the Committee pass such a severe judgment on young students there, are they not their sons or grand-sons? Have they ever considered this aspect when they

passed judgment of a criminal character on these people? Was it not fair, was it not their duty, to have waited ten times before apportioning blame. These are the boys and they are behaving in a way not to our liking. There may be some instances of gross mis-behaviour. But I feel that the Education Ministry and the Secretary to that Ministry who has come out recently with a very fine book where he has considered the socio-psychological approach to education, have failed to take stock of the whole position and reform it before publishing the report in such a way 'that here is a disease; no doubt students are to blame'. But there are elders also who are equally responsible for the present state of affairs. Can you ever imagine that a University like Banaras is an isolated thing? It must be judged in a particular social milieu. It cannot be isolated. There is factionalism everywhere. I do not defend students there or teachers. I do not defend their conduct. I do not defend the growth of factionalism or certain teachers taking a partisan attitude. At the same time, if Government, who are supposed to tell them what are their responsibilities, fail to take note of the surrounding conditions, I am afraid the diagnosis is essentially vitiated. Therefore, as soon as the Report was published, they were bound to resent. Let us understand them. Let us take a little understanding approach. It is no use tarring the whole community in Banaras with the same brush; it is wrong.

With this Report in hand, Government ought to have thought, 'Here is a case. A Committee of experts have investigated, given us the full diagnosis, where they have failed to take note of the socio-pathological background of the whole situation and suggested certain remedies'. Government in their wisdom thought that Ordinance was the remedy and as soon as Parliament was in session they would come with a new measure.

[Shri Khadilkar]

I do not, for a moment, want to be goody-goody; I do not want to encourage the students in this. But let us face the situation in a realistic way. And when I say 'in a realistic way', let us try to understand and feel, as the Select Committee at one time felt, that something is wrong and the approach is not correct. So it was suggested—if I mistake not—by our Chairman that some sort of a goodwill mission should go there and if it went there, it would definitely bring about a desired change in the atmosphere. An eminent Doctor was heading the Committee. When you approach a patient, unless you know the background, unless you know his living conditions, unless you know whether proper nursing is there, whether there is somebody to give a little attention to the patient and take care of the patient, you will not be able to give the proper treatment. If you forget these things and say: 'All right. Here is a remedy suggested. All right. Prescription. Have injunction' Ordinance and other things follow. This type of symptomatic treatment is not going to bring about the desired results.

Let me warn the Education Minister. Today we are in a fix. We cannot possibly say that would be against any sense of responsibility—that the behaviour of the students is such that we should defend it. It is indefensible. At the same time, what is the behaviour of the Education Ministry? They have got these two or three Universities under their direct control. What is their record? Let them for a moment think: when we are wasting Rs. 50 lakhs on one University, and if this is the atmosphere, in any other country, the first and foremost thing that would be done would be that the department the Ministry—not the individual—would have been put on prosecution—not the students.

I am sometimes puzzled what has happened to this country. There are men of public standing, eminent men with qualifications. They have not the moral courage, unfortunately, to

face facts and go to the students and tell them: 'My young friends, here you are going wrong way. You have got the best opportunity in your lives. Let us meet together'.

Is there a provision that the Vice-Chancellor occasionally summons the students and tries to understand them, their difficulties and other things? If that sort of understanding approach had been there, things would not have come to such a pass. While the farewell is there, there is fulsome praise for the students; at the same time, there is a secret report to the Government. This does not speak well of our public life; this does not speak well of men who are supposed to guide the destinies of the younger generation.

This is a sorry state of affairs. Therefore, I would humbly submit that while you have come with an emergency measure, do not go with the impression that now you have a weapon in hand to punish them. That sense of punitive punishment will not bring the desired results; only a sense that they must be approached in a tender manner, in a sensitive way so as to understand their mind, would bring about the desired results.

I submit that if Government are going to administer this measure in the spirit in which they have been acting so long and in a bureaucratic manner which reflects the whole psychology of the Government, they would fail to bring about the desired results. I would like to warn them here and now. I do not know the Vice-Chancellor. My hon friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, said just now that the whole atmosphere has to be changed. All right. There is a psychological reaction against the Vice-Chancellor. I am not concerned with this party or that. Why not remove him? This is a matter of treatment in a particular situation. It is not any way derogatory to the Vice-Chancellor because he has done something and he is not only responsible for all these things. I do not for a moment maintain that. But I would like to

tell Government the sooner the Vice-Chancellor is relieved of his duties, the better it would be in the interests of the University, the students as also the reputation of the Central Ministry of Education.

The second point is this. As I have said in my minute of dissent, in the present circumstances, in an emergency, keep it as an emergency measure. You cannot keep two things together, a sort of formal democratic body like the court round about and emergency measures. No, it is wrong. Therefore, it would have been proper to suspend the Court for the time being, keep it in abeyance. Even if a function-less appendage was found necessary, it is entirely wrong to give representation to students, teachers or departments because in the eyes of some sections they are naturally suspect.

And, thirdly—I will not take more than a couple of minutes, Sir...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Only one minute.

Shri Khadilkar: Thirdly, as I have said already, nominations have taken place and so we cannot possibly suggest alterations. But I do feel that this is not a salutary democratic principle that elected representatives are supposed to be nominated either by the Visitor or the Speaker. I have full faith in the fairness of our Speaker and of the Visitor. But you must lay down a certain tradition of democratic convention in our Parliamentary institutions. Therefore, I have suggested that it should be by election and the number should be increased.

With one word I will conclude. I have gone through the list of nominations. Excuse me for saying this of the academicians that are there. They have a certain amount of rigidity, a sort of aloofness, a certain amount of academic arrogance as I would characterise, it with this attitude therefore, they would fail to meet the

situation, with an understanding approach I may humbly submit again that if you are going to maintain the Court, have some people from here. Because when we are discussing such matters and when we are vesting powers, we must have the fullest support of the House.

Recently, at Naini Tal. to avoid labour strikes, certain conventions were established. I would go like that to have them for the universities. So far as the younger generation is concerned, so far as the student generation is concerned, we of all parties and sections of the House must reach an understanding and establish conventions so that in this human investment on the coming generations not a nP will be wasted and we shall avoid all conflict, all strife and all factionalism. Let us try to build up educational institutions that would live to the highest ideals we have had so far before us.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, one thing which seems to be harmless today is to criticise the Government because that will not upset the situation in Banaras. Possibly, it may please a few sections also which are so much agitated in Banaras and all around and also those who are interested in some of those friends. But, even then, I am not able to discover whether the Government is blame-worthy.

Time and again, in this House, so many of us have been complaining that the Government only appoints committees and then appoints some other committees to examine those reports and later on appoints a high-power committee of the Cabinet to examine that second report and thereafter, it delays taking any kind of action. And, it has been complained today also that for a large number of years Government has been sleeping. At long last, when Government awakens itself, and appoints a committee, possibly on the recommendation or on the suggestion of the present Vice-Chancellor, and

[Shri Ranga]

as soon as the report was received by Government it took courage in both hands and gives publicity to the report and effect to it in the form of this Ordinance, then, also we begin to criticise the Government. I do not find any kind of consistency. On the other hand, I do really feel that this Government and the present Minister deserve congratulations from this House and the other House also for the expeditious action they have taken.

An Hon Member The whole country (*Interruption*)

Shri Ranga: One hon friend says after 7 years The greatest tragedy that befell the Banaras Hindu University was the death of the revered national leader, Malaviyaji. But, how long could that grand old man go on living for the sake of the University? He lived to a ripe old age and he died nobly with all laurels. It is the duty of the rest of us to try and see that this University is properly looked after.

It has been said that for a number of years the University has been suffering from this malaise and so little has been done. That is exactly the reason why this Government has taken this drastic action and we should congratulate the Government.

My only difficulty is how to reconcile myself to this means of Ordinance. That is my real difficulty. I made enquiries and I was told that the report was not ready. The consideration of the report was not finished before the last session was over and soon after that they had to take action as the next session was so far away. In between, the opening dates for the University and the colleges were coming on. Therefore, some action had to be taken and the action was taken.

It does not matter if sometimes we have to make some sort of exception.

It is for the very same reason we have made provision in the Constitution giving power to Government to pass an Ordinance and then place it before the Houses. Then it is before the bar of this House. If we do not like that or their judgment in making the Ordinance, it is open to us to dismiss them. Therefore, I am not inclined to find fault with Government for the action it has taken.

Secondly, there is this question of the Vice-Chancellor and the staff. I cannot be a party to blaming the students alone, nor can I be a party to blaming anybody for the matter of that specifically, either the students or the staff or the Vice-Chancellor. The whole lot of them, unfortunately for themselves, have got into this terrible muddle. If this had been a temporary wrong one can understand, saying so and so is blameworthy. There is nothing special in this kind of malaise in the Banaras Hindu University. Every other University has been suffering from this kind of malaise either to a lesser or a greater degree. At some stage or other, in some manner or other, action has had to be taken and it has fallen to the lot of the Banaras Hindu University that it had to be taken in this way.

In one sense I am glad it could be taken in the case of this University because it would not be possible for anybody either in this country or outside to accuse our Government either of partiality, on religious, political or various other grounds. It is specially fitted for such treatment. It is a national University *par excellence*. My own nephew studied there; my niece studied there; in every one of the families of the South you will find one or other young man or woman who had had the privilege of studying in the Banaras Hindu University. For the last 35 years or more we have been claiming it as our real national University. Therefore, if any University can possibly stand this kind of operation, it is the Banaras

Hindu University alone that could have stood it and it is standing it. Therefore, I am glad that it has fallen to the lot of the Banaras Hindu University and not to a smaller or a weaker University to bear this kind of operation.

Next I am not anxious that any of the members of the staff should come to be punished. It would be a blot on the community, on the record of educational institutions in our country, that we would have to go and ask any one of the members of the staff of the Banaras Hindu University to leave that University in bad odour. Nor would I like that kind of suggestion that is being made by a good number of our hon Members that the Vice-Chancellor should be sent away. It would not speak well of us. Therefore, I was not so very happy about this Revising Committee either. If any action were to be taken I would really like Government to accept the suggestion that these people be given a chance and let them behave themselves well to the satisfaction of the whole nation. If within the next one or two years their behaviour is quite satisfactory, we will retain them. Otherwise we would content ourselves with sending some of them. We will not send them but in the interest of the cause of education in this country, we will tell them, 'please offer your resignations'. If any assistance is to be given to them by Government in order to provide for them, we shall seek for them honourable places in other Universities, and Government would be willing to use their good offices with the other Universities to accommodate these people. That would have been the best possible solution but that could not be done. Therefore, the present solution that is offered here is really good. It gives every possible protection, double protection or even treble protection for these people. In spite of it, I would like the hon. Minister to appeal to the Prime Minister as well as to the President of our Republic not merely as a Minister but as the head of the university

administration from the side of the Government, as Minister of Education, to use their good offices with the staff as well as the Vice-Chancellor and suggest to them with all respect due to an educationist that they should think about it by themselves, about the resignations. How they do it, in what diplomatic manner they do it is another matter. Instead of that, having to ask these eminent deans of faculties, heads of departments and great professors and experienced lecturers to go before a reviewing committee and to let their fate be governed by the decisions of that committee would not be becoming of either our Ministry or of our Government or of anybody, even of the University. You will be setting up a bad precedent. Unfortunately, because we must have some kind of statutory provision, this is the best that could be thought of but over and above this, I would like the Visitor—I hope I may say something although it is the convention that we are not expected to say anything against him—in whose person we have an Indian who is respected and known for his saintliness, apart from all the other great qualities of his to send for these people and meet them directly and put it up to them. Let the Government strengthen the hands of the Visitor by offering to provide equally honourable place in other universities for such of the professors, readers, lecturers and others who would be good enough to offer their resignations from this university so that the word will go to all the educationists all over India that no educationist need have the fear of such things as dismissal from a great and eminent educational institution like this.

Having said this, I would have very much liked my hon. friend, the Minister of Education, to have agreed to incorporate a provision here, not immediately here and now but when the next appropriate stage comes, for the appointment of these various people in different categories on the court. Instead of nominating seven eminent Members of Parliament on

[Shri Ranga]

the responsibility of the Government alone, he should be willing to let Parliament itself elect those seven people also, in addition to the three who are proposed. I wish to congratulate him also on the readiness with which he has accepted the suggestion made by my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta that even in regard to these three Members, if he so desires, he would be willing to let them be elected by the House. It would be in the fitness of things for our Speaker as well as the Chairman to let this thing be done by Parliament itself. When these people go to the Banaras Hindu University, all those who are interested in it would know that these ten gentlemen are coming there as the elected representatives of the sovereign Parliament in this country.

I wish to say a word in regard to the tragedy that has befallen us through the death of our great national leader and revered friend, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. If only he had been alive today and if he had an opportunity of standing by my hon. friend, his hands would have been strengthened and our hands would have been strengthened and we would have had the confidence that the great institution that was founded by the other national leader, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, is now being put again on an even keel by the equally eminent national leader, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. But that harsh task has befallen on the young shoulders of my hon. friend and I wish to congratulate him for having had the courage to have done what he has done and also for having had the generosity in accepting the suggestions that were made in the Select Committee in regard to the reviewing committee and various other things.

In conclusion, I would like to make only a small suggestion. Let him not take this in such a personal manner and look at the Vice-Chancellor as a personal question. We all ought to be interested as much in the Vice-Chancellor as he is and we would all

like to maintain the prestige of the Vice-Chancellorship and also the present incumbent. Let not that Vice-Chancellor and let not this Minister have a feeling that anyone of us have any kind of a hard feeling about him. On the other hand, I do really think that the Vice-Chancellor deserves a word of support and praise that during his tenure somehow or the other he has been able to persuade the Government to exercise its power in order to take this power in such a way that this situation has come to pause. I wish to appeal to the students, professors, staff and the general public of Banaras by saying only this that Banaras is being looked upon by all of us as a holy place not only for the Hindus but for the educationists all over India. As an educationist, I wish to appeal to them to rise to the occasion and agree with us and sympathise with us in this very hard task that we have had to shoulder on this particular occasion and support and sustain us in our sincere and genuine effort by seeing that the Banaras Hindu University really comes back again into its own as it used to be in the days of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, the Mudaliar Committee has made three points in the report. The first is that a university cannot be run in the manner it should be merely by Acts, Statutes, Ordinances and regulations. The real success of the university depends upon the personnel and professors and the teachers who have got to do every day their work in the university. That is one of the main points.

This idea of a university has been exemplified years ago in India. The creation of the Nalanda University and the world-wide reputation that it enjoyed were due to the fact that it had among its professors men of very high moral stature and culture. No education is worth the name unless it had a moral background and there were such people that carried on the

work of the Nalanda University which had attracted thousands of people from all over the East and probably from the West, making provision for more than 1,500 students in a cool and clear atmosphere, untarnished by political struggles and communal struggles and unaffected by professional jealousies. On the other hand, it was based on a moral background and conducted in a very cool and calm atmosphere. I personally think that it was due to the influence and thought that was prevailing at that period owing to the teachings of Lord Buddha. So far as that ideal is concerned, I wish we were able to realise and recapture those ideals for India once again so that we can get back the name that we earned in the old days.

But unfortunately, this University starts with the word 'Hindu.' The Banaras Hindu University seems to lay emphasis on the word 'Hindu' and it is a peculiar feature of U.P. which seems to supply the core of the Union Government that it has also got another communal university—the Aligarh Muslim University. One seems to be a reaction to the other. The moment people thought that it was a Hindu University, then all the affairs of the university had been made duly a matter for the Hindus, and more particularly a matter of the top class Hindus, who happen to be what we call the Brahmins, in this area. They claim all the monopoly of intelligence, all the monopoly of character and all the monopoly of knowledge. It is such people that have been in control of the affairs of the university, and what is its fate today? Its affairs are being bandied about in the streets of Banaras if not in the streets of Delhi.

**Pandit Govind Malaviya** (Sultanpur): May I say that if the hon. Member will look into the facts, he will find that that has never been so?

**Shri Siva Raj:** I do not belong fortunately to U.P. I come far down from the South. Otherwise, I would be caught in this mesh of passion. I am trying to speak and appeal to

members in a dispassionate manner and my hon. friend is drawing me into a controversy.

Secondly, the committee has come to the conclusion that it is an emergency, an emergency of a critical nature, that the canker has set in and is of a cancerous nature. What else would anybody who wants to rectify the disease do except adopt a surgical remedy which I believe the hon. Education Minister has done in this case? But my surprise is that it has not been done earlier. Somebody asked: "all these six years or seven years the Government was in the know of things, why did they not move"? I personally think there was a reason. Unfortunately this University is called the Banaras Hindu University, and the Education Ministry, unfortunately, was in the hands of a Muslim gentleman. If today there is so much agitation and pressure against a Hindu Minister, Dr. Shrimali, I am afraid the whole of U.P. would have risen in arms against the late Maulana Azad if he had taken strong action. That is my explanation. That is an unfortunate fact which one has to face in this country.

I did not have an opportunity to speak on the day when the motion was brought for referring the Bill to a Select Committee, but I think there was no cause for referring this Bill to the Select Committee at all, because this Bill is based on the Ordinance which is again based in its turn upon the report of the Mudaliar Committee. I do not know what pressure or pressure group operated upon the Education Minister to agree to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, and I hope the Select Committee, in introducing the two or three major changes, have not whittled down the force and the value of the original provisions of the Bill. I shall be satisfied if the Education Minister could tell me that these changes, the major changes as he called them, made by the Select Committee will not take away the effect and the real nature

[Shri Siva Raj]

of the original Bill, that is to take immediate action

I have listened very carefully to the very appealing speech of Shri Asoka Mehta and other hon Members. All that they do is to make an approach without action. There are occasions when one can make a friendly approach, there are occasions when one can make arrogant approach as somebody suggested, and there are other occasions when people make what I call an appeasement approach. Some of the speeches that were made here today seem to be of the last-mentioned character, and it is a policy of appeasement which some of our friends want to follow. I think it is very dangerous in matters educational, particularly in handling the younger generation. I personally think that the whole thing calls for action, and immediate action, and that is what was exactly done by the Education Minister and it is the first time I suppose that I join with my hon friend Shri Ranga—we are generally on opposite sides—in congratulating the Education Minister on taking very strong action.

One thing more I would request the Education Minister to bring forward this consolidated Bill as early as he can. That will be the real place where we can set right all the ills and the defects that have crept into the Banaras Hindu University.

**श्रीमती उमा नेहरू (मीतापुर)**

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी मेरे वास्ते कोई नई चीज नहीं है। हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी को भ्रम से मैं जानती हूँ और हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी की तरफ कुछ हमारा झुकाव भी है। आज हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी की जो हालत हमने देखी और एक भ्रम में हम सुनते हैं और देखते भी हैं और जो बातें हम सुनते हैं वे बहुत तकलीफदेह बातें हैं। लेकिन आज हमारी नीमत यह आई और बात इतनी बड़ी कि हमारे सामने और सरकार क

सामने सिवाय आर्डिनंस लगाने के और कोई मन्त्र इलाज नहीं था। मेरी खुश की राय तो यह है कि कितनी भा मुवीजन शर्मा न पड़े, इसका जो उसका सामना करना चाहिये लेकिन आर्डिनंस नहीं लगाना चाहिये। आर्डिनंस लगाना एक तकलीफदेह और कमजोरी की बात मालूम होती है। इसलिये आर्डिनंस के तो मैं बहुत खिलाफ हूँ लेकिन हाँ यूनिवर्सिटी की जो हालत है मैं भी बराबर सुनती आती हूँ, वह वाकई में बहुत भ्रममोसनाक है। वाइस चांसलर की मैं पुरानी बातें नहीं कहूँगी क्योंकि वे सब बातें हाउस में कही जा चुकी हैं कि किस तरह से एक एक वाइस चांसलर वहाँ आये और निकले। उन सब में वाफिक हूँ और सामग्री में अमरनाथ झा के बारे में तो मैं बखूबी वाफिक हूँ। उन्होंने खुद मुझ में इस यूनिवर्सिटी के बारे में चर्चा की थी और इस यूनिवर्सिटी की हालत मुझे बताई थी और मैं समझती हूँ कि सब इमका जानत हैं, इसका और जिज्ञा करना बेकार है। लेकिन यह सब सामने आते हुए भी, इस यूनिवर्सिटी को देख कर और हमारा भारत में जितनी यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं उनकी हालत देख कर विद्यार्थियों की दशा देख कर, टीचर्स और प्राफेसर्स की एग्जिस्टेंस देख कर इमान मोचने लगता है कि आखिर किया क्या जाय। एक दफा तो हम उसकी शुद्धि और दुरूस्ती करे ही। केवल हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी का जिक्र इस समय नहीं है। हमारे सामने मारी यूनिवर्सिटीज का सबाल है। लखनऊ यूनिवर्सिटी में मैं खुद देखा है कि आये दिन जरा जरा भी बात पर लडक हडताल कर देते हैं। एक दफा तो लखनऊ यूनिवर्सिटी के लडको न बमो को जलाना और सडको पर लगे बल्बो को नोडना शुरू कर दिया। मैं खुद उनके पास गई और उन से कहा कि देखो भाई अगर तुम्हें गवर्नमेंट में नाराजगी है और तुम्हें यह सरकार पसन्द नहीं है तो तुम लोग जा कर गवर्नमेंट में बातचीत करो लेकिन

यह जो तुम बनें और बल्ब जला और तोड़ रहे हो तो यह तो तुम अपना नुकसान कर रहे हो क्योंकि आखिर यह बनें और बल्ब तो तुम्हारे ही हैं। आज उनको इतना भी जान नहीं है कि इस तरह वे अपना ही नुकसान कर रहे हैं और वे ऐसा समझते हैं कि अगर उन्होंने एक बस जला दी तो गोया उन्होंने उत्तर प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब की कोई खाम बस जला दी। उनको यह इल्म नहीं है और समझ नहीं है कि हर चीज जो यहाँ की है उसमें उतना ही उनका हक है जितना कि मिनिस्ट्री का है। उनका इस चीज का ज्ञान बराना और भिखाना हमारा फज है।

यहाँ इस अवसर पर जितन व्याख्यान हुए हैं उनमें सब में पहला जा श्री अशोक मेहता का व्याख्यान हुआ और जो बात उन्होंने कही वह बिल्कुल दुरस्त कही और मैं उन में बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ। हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री महादय का यह मोचना है कि इस प्रश्न का क्या हल किया जाय। हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के बारे में जो जितन में बराबर सुनती आयी है उसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि मुदायलियर कमिटी की रिपोर्ट का पढ़ने में इमान के रागट खड्ड जा जाते हैं। मैं समझ ही नहीं सकती थी कि इतनी नीचाई तक हमारी हालत हो गई है और जिन बातों और वाक्यान्त का उसमें जिक्र किया गया है अगर वे सब सही हैं तो इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि उसकी पूर्ण तरह में शक्ति करनी है और ऐसा करने में कोई हज्र भी नहीं है क्योंकि इमान के बदन में अगर कोई फोडा फुसी अथवा नासूर हो जाता है तो उसका इलाज करने के लिये सबल आपरेशन करना होता है। आपरेशन के अलावा और कोई दूसरा इलाज हो भी नहीं सकता है। मेरी गय में मिनिस्टर महादय को बड़ गौर में उस पर विचार करना चाहिये।

सब में बड़ी बात जो मैं समझती हूँ वह यह है कि जितने भी पार्लिमेंटियस हैं जितने

भी कांग्रेस वाले हैं, जनसभा हैं, पी० एम० पी० के हैं, मोरनिस्टम हैं, किमी भी पार्टी के हो, उनको मेरी राय में यूनिवर्सिटीज और विद्यार्थियों से दूर रहना चाहिये और हमारे विद्यार्थियों को हमारे बच्चों, और लड़कों की जिसका कि हमने वहाँ पर शिक्षा प्राप्त करने के लिये भेजा है, सियामी पार्टी को उन बच्चों को उनको तालीम हासिल करने की राह में इधर उधर भटकाना और हटाना नहीं चाहिये और आज मुझ दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस के कारण हमारे बच्चों की जिन्दगी बिल्कुल तबाह हो रही है। इस सम्बन्ध में यहाँ पर जितनी स्पीचेंज हुईं और जिनका मैंने सुना मैंने देखा कि श्री अशोक मेहता की एक स्पीच थी जिसमें उन्होंने इस मवाल का हल मुझाया और माधन बताया कि इस तरीके में अगर हम चले तो मारी यूनिवर्सिटीज का हम कवर कर सकते हैं उनके अलावा बाकी जा भी हमारे भाई बोल मैंने देखा कि किन्नरा की स्पीच में गुम्मा था और कितना की स्पीच में शान्ति भी थी लेकिन जितनी भी स्पीचेंज थी उनका बैकग्राउन्ड पार्लिमेंटल था और जो कि बच्चों और स्टूडेंट्स के लिये एक नुकसानदायक चीज हानी है। इसलिये मैं उनमें यह कहूँगी कि वे यूनिवर्सिटी स्टूडेंट्स में दर रहता ज्यादा अच्छा हो।

बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस चांसलर का जिक्र मैं यहाँ बराबर सुनती हूँ। मैं तो हैरान हूँ क्योंकि मैं समझती हूँ कि कोई भी वाइस चांसलर क्यों नहीं है। हमारा चाहिये कि वाइस चांसलर की जा पोजीशन है इज्जत है उसको हम कायम रखें। आज अगर हम वाइस चांसलर काट धमियाग बनाकर उसका जिक्र करेगा तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि आप कायदे निजाम और डिमिप्शन को किस तरह में यूनिवर्सिटी में कायम रख सकेंगे।

इतना कह कर मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को मुबारकबाद कहती हूँ कि उन्होंने हिम्मत

[श्रीमती उमा नेहरू]

के साथ इस सवाल का सामना किया और हमारे सामने यह बिल रक्खा लेकिन मैं साथ ही जैसा श्री अशोक मेहता ने कहा उन से कहूंगी कि हमारा इलाज केवल नष्टार चलाने का ही नहीं होना चाहिये। हमारा फर्ज है कि हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के एफेयर्स को ठीक करने के साथ साथ तमाम यूनिवर्सिटीज के हालात को ठीक करे। मैं यूनिवर्सिटीज स्टूडेंट्स में बराबर मिलती रहती हूँ और मैं उन के हालात से बखूबी वाकिफ हूँ। हम को अपने स्टूडेंट्स को ठीक तौर पर रखना है और उन को सही रास्ते से भटकने नहीं देना है। यूनिवर्सिटीज के तालिबान्स्मो की तो हालत खराब ही है लेकिन हमारे स्कूलों में जो दस दस और बारह बारह वर्ष के बच्चे पढ़ रहे हैं वे पढाई की ओर ध्यान न दे कर बाहर मड़को पर गालिया देते हुए निकलते हैं और अगर यही एजुकेशन होनी है तो इस से तो ज्यादा अच्छा है कि कोई एजुकेशन न हो। आजकल जो एजुकेशन में गड़बड़ी चल रही है और जो खराब हालत है वह बहुत अफमासनाक है और वह हमारे तालिबान्स्मो के लिये और राष्ट्र के लिये घातक और नुकसानदेह है। कम और अधिक न कह कर मैं मंत्री महोदय से जो बिल रक्खा है उसको मपोर्ट करनी हूँ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह . उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा इस बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी में बहुत गहरा सम्बन्ध रहा है। मैं उसका शुरू से स्टूडेंट रहा हूँ। इसी यूनिवर्सिटी में मैंने ज्ञान किया और यही से एम० ए० किया। इस यूनिवर्सिटी के बड़े बड़े महानुभावों को देख चुका हूँ। बड़े बड़े वाइस चांसलर्स यहाँ आये। उनको भी मैं देख चुका हूँ। जब मैं उसका एक विद्यार्थी था तो उस वक़्त हम लोग एक गाना गाया करते थे—“सर्व विद्या की राजधानी” और आज जो गाना यहाँ पर हो रहा है उसके माने हैं “भवं पार्टीज की राजधानी”। बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी

सर्व विद्याओं की राजधानी थी। आज वह हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी पार्टीज की राजधानी हो गई है। पार्टीबदी के दलदल में हम को हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी को उबारना है। अगर हम हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी को नहीं उबारेंगे तो इस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी का नाश हो जायेगा। सरकार ने जो ऐक्शन लिया है उसके बास्ते हम उसको धन्यवाद देते हैं। श्री अशोक मेहता ने जो सुझाव रखे हैं वे सुझाव उत्तम हैं। उन सुझावों का इस हाउस के द्वारा समर्थन होना चाहिये।

बहुत से लोगों ने आटोनमी के बारे में बहुत बातें कही हैं। इसमें आटोनमी का नाश नहीं होता। बल्कि आटोनमी इस सभा के हाथ में आती है। इस यूनिवर्सिटी का जितना खर्चा है उसमें सिर्फ २ लाख रुपये प्रान्तीय सरकार देनी है, बाकी साग रुपये मेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के द्वारा दिया जाता है।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह यह गलत है। २ करोड़ का खर्च है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : रिकॉर्डिंग नं. ५७-५८ में ५५ लाख रुपया है। उसमें से २ लाख रुपया ५० पी० गवर्नमेंट देती है और ५३ लाख रुपया मेंटर देता है। नान रिकॉर्डिंग में ५० पी० का सिर्फ १ लाख रुपया है। अगर जरा स्टेटमेंट को देखें तो आपको सब बात मालूम हो जायेगी। उसमें यह सब कुछ छपा है। इस मुदालियर कमिटी रिपोर्ट के मिलसिले में ईस्टर्न ५० पी० का भी नाम लिया गया है। ईस्टर्न ५० पी० में हम लोग भी हैं। अगर ईस्टर्न ५० पी० का नाम न लिया जाता तो अच्छा होता।

हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी सारे हिन्दुस्तान की मस्था है। देश में जितने सूबे हैं और जितने लोग हैं सब का इस में कट्टीव्यूशन है। इस यूनिवर्सिटी की स्थापना उन लोगों द्वारा हुई थी जिन्होंने कि कांग्रेस की स्थापना की थी जैसे स्वर्गीय श्रीमती बेसेट और के० टी० तैलंग ( Telang ) इत्यादि जिन महानु-

भाषों ने इस देश में राजनीतिक आन्दोलन की शुरुआत की, उन्होंने हिन्दू कालिज की स्थापना की। वह आज हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी के रूप में है।

जब हिन्दुस्तान में राजनीतिक आन्दोलन की बात चली तो हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी सब यूनीवर्सिटियों से आगे रही। वहाँ के सबसे ज्यादा विद्यार्थी जेल गये। हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी ने अच्छे-अच्छे स्कालर उत्पन्न किये। उन्होंने देश का नाम उज्वल किया। लेकिन आज आन्दोलन का समय नहीं है। आज विकास का समय है। उस वक़्त हमको हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी लेनी थी, लिहाजा विद्यार्थियों के सहयोग की जरूरत थी। हिन्दुस्तान आगे बढ़ सके अगर हिन्दुस्तान हमारा था तो उन विद्यार्थियों का भी था। वे आन्दोलन में आये। उन्होंने गोली खायी। सब कुछ किया। लेकिन आज आन्दोलन की जरूरत नहीं है। आज जरूरत यह है कि आजादी के बाद हिन्दुस्तान का विकास हो। आज भी अगर विद्यार्थी यही समझते हैं कि आन्दोलन ही हमारा एक मात्र साधन है तो यह चीज अनुचित है। आज तो हमें ऐसे विद्यार्थियों की आवश्यकता है जो रिसर्च में, ज्ञान में और विज्ञान में दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटियों के विद्यार्थियों से आगे हों। लेकिन हमें दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जहाँ तक ज्ञान विज्ञान का सम्बन्ध है उसका स्तर हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में पिछले दस पन्द्रह वर्षों से बहुत कम है। इस बीच शायद ही हमने हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय से ऐसा स्कालर पैदा किया हो जिसने नाम पैदा किया हो। जिससे हिन्दुस्तान की और हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ी हो। किसी यूनीवर्सिटी की प्रतिष्ठा उसके ईंट पत्थर और इमारतों में नहीं है। यूनीवर्सिटी की प्रतिष्ठा तो इस में है कि उससे अच्छे-अच्छे विद्यार्थी निकले। लेकिन जब इस दृष्टि से देखते हैं तो दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस दिशा में हम असफल ही रहे हैं।

हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के लिये एक बिल प्राया है। इस प्रकार का बिल लाने के सिवा और कोई चारा नहीं रह गया था। यह फोड़ा तो मालवीय जी के समय से आरम्भ हुआ। बढ़ता गया। पकता गया—पकता गया। अगर इस समय इसका आपरेशन न किया जाता तो यह बढ़ कर नासूर हो जाता। वह सारी यूनीवर्सिटी को खा जाता। लिहाजा इस फोड़े का जो इतनी जल्दी आपरेशन हुआ यह अच्छा हुआ। अगर आपरेशन होने के बाद भी इसकी ठीक से दवा न की गयी तो सेप्टिक हो सकता है। इसलिए हमें इस फोड़े की रक्षा करनी है ताकि सेप्टिक न हो और हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी की उन्नति हो।

एक माननीय सदस्य : मालवीय जी ने उसकी कुछ दवा भी बतलायी थी ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : जब मालवीय जी की घालोचना होने लगी और उन पर आरोप होने लगे तो उन्होंने वाइस चांसलरी को नमस्कार किया। यह काम राधाकृष्णन् जी के हाथ में दे दिया कि तुम चलाओ। अगर माननीय सदस्य यूनीवर्सिटी के बारे में सब कुछ जानना चाहते हैं तो हम सुना सकते हैं लेकिन अपनी कालिख को अपने ही मुँह पर पोतन से क्या फायदा। आज जो मुदालियर कमेटी की यह हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी के लिए रिपोर्ट आयी है वह हम सब लोगों के लिए कलक की बात है। इससे हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का जो गौरव था, उसका जो सम्मान था उसको धक्का लगा। उसमें कालिमा लग गयी। आज तो यह हाल है कि आप रेल में जाइय, बस में जाइय आप लोगों को यह कहते सुनेंगे कि यह बनारस हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी कैसी यूनीवर्सिटी है। लोग अपने बच्चों को इस यूनीवर्सिटी में पढ़ने भेजने के पहले सोचते हैं कि भेजें या न भेजें। पहले यह हाल था कि सारे देश के लोग यह माचते थे कि हमारे विद्यार्थी

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

अगर हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में जायेंगे तो अच्छी शिक्षा पायेंगे। विश्वविद्यालय का उच्च आदर्श था। उसका उच्च उद्देश्य था। वहां से शिक्षा पाकर विद्यार्थी एक अच्छे नागरिक के रूप में देश के सामने आते थे। जिस समय मालवीय तथा श्री राधाकृष्णन् जी जैसे वाइस चांसलर थे उस समय इस विश्वविद्यालय से ऐसे विद्यार्थी उत्पन्न हुए जिन्होंने देश के वास्ते जान दी, गोली खायी। ऐसे स्टूडेंट हिन्दुस्तान में सबसे ज्यादा हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में ही थे।

उस विश्वविद्यालय के उपचार की बात हो रही है। इस सिलसिले में अशोक मेहता जी ने कहा है कि इसमें पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य नामिनेट होते हैं। उनका इलैक्शन होना चाहिए। मैं भी पार्लियामेंट से एक नामिनेटेड सदस्य हूँ। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर नामिनेशन की जगह पर इलैक्शन हो तो अच्छा है। किसी के लिए पार्लियामेंट का सदस्य होने के बाद नामिनेट होकर जाना ठीक नहीं है। अगर इलैक्शन हो तो सभी लोगो को अवसर प्राप्त होता है। तीन चार सदस्य यहां से जाते हैं उनका नामिनेशन नहीं होना चाहिए। पार्लियामेंट के द्वारा उनका इलैक्शन होना चाहिए।

इसके बाद अब आप यूनीवर्सिटी की तालिका को देखें . . . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या माननीय सदस्य एक मिनट में खत्म कर देंगे ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : जी नहीं, अभी मुझे समय लगेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : तो कल जारी रहें।

17-01 hrs.

### IMPORT LICENCES FOR NEWS-PRINT AND PRICES OF PAPER\*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the half-an-hour discussion.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): I wish to raise only three points in today's discussion, viz., misuse of licences by importers of newsprint, lack of control over price of indigenous paper and lastly the need strictly to control imported newsprint and paper.

In answer to two of my questions on the 11th of this month, the hon. Minister did not reveal the exact state of affairs and I thought the answers were either incomplete or evasive. In one case, I was convinced that the answer was wrong. I asked a specific question about the profits of the industry and in fact, gave him the index of profit, as I know. But then he said in reply that it is not as if the entire industry has made the highest profit. I would like to take up this point first, because I have some figures

The hon. Minister seemed to be under the impression that paper was not an industry which had made the highest profit, while the figures collected from the Ministry of Finance and published in the *Eastern Economist* reveal an entirely different picture. The figures do not include the figures for 1956-57, but figures for 15 years from 1941 and I find that in the listed industries, namely, jute, cotton, iron and steel, tea, sugar, paper, gold and cement and all other industries, paper touched the highest index; it is about 747.8 with 1939 as 100. The general index for all industries is only 334.3. In the case of jute, it came only to 277.5, in iron and steel 307.9, in tea 183.1 and in gold 200.4. So, these