

निर्माण आवास तथा संभरण उपमंत्री
(श्री अनिल कु० चन्दा): (क) ३१ जन-
वरी, १९६१।

(ख) ६,१०,००० रुपये।

(ग) सरकार ने निश्चय किया था कि नई बसाई गई बस्तियों के बाजारों को सम्बन्धित स्थानीय निकायों को सौंप दिया जाये। नई दिल्ली नगरपालिका समिति ने तो अपने श्री कार-क्षेत्र में स्थित बाजारों को अपने हाथ में ले लिया परन्तु दिल्ली नगर निगम ने हाल ही में इस मंत्रालय को सूचित किया है कि वह अपने क्षेत्र में स्थित बाजारों को नहीं लेगा। मोतीबाग-२ का बाजार इन्हीं में से एक है। इस बाजार की दूकानों का नियतन (अलाटमेंट) राजसम्पत्ति निदेशालय द्वारा जल्दी ही कर दिया जायगा।

Shri Sushil Kumar Pateriya was a Member of the First Lok Sabha during the years 1952 to 1957. He passed away at Bombay on the 3rd October, 1961, at the age of 38.

Shri B. S. Hiray was a Member of the former Central Legislative Assembly during the years 1945 to 1947 and of the Provisional Parliament during the years 1950 to 1952. He passed away at Dhulia on the 6th November, 1961, at the age of 56.

We deeply mourn the loss of these friends and I am sure the House will kindly join me in conveying our condolences to the bereaved families.

May I request the House to stand in silence for a short while to express its sorrow?

*The Members then stood in silence
for a minute*

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO UN-
STARRED QUESTION NO. 1516,
DATED 13TH MARCH, 1961

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): For the figure of 330 appearing in line 7 of part (b) of Unstarred Question referred to above, the figure of 315 may please be substituted.

12.04 hrs.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

AFFAIRS OF ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVER-
SITY AND COMMUNAL DISTUR-
BANCES IN U.P.

12.02 hrs.

OBITUARY REFERENCE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House of the sad demise of four of our friends, namely, Shri Balasaheb Salunke, Sardar Sant Singh, Shri Sushil Kumar Pateriya and Shri B. S. Hiray.

Shri Balasaheb Salunke was a sitting Member of this House from Khed constituency of Maharashtra. He passed away at Poona on the 10th September, 1961, at the age of 41.

Sardar Sant Singh was a Member of the former Central Legislative Assembly during the years 1930 to 1945. He passed away on the 13th September, 1961, at New Delhi at the age of 79.

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of several adjournment motions. I have disallowed a few. I will take up adjournment motions Nos. 1, 4, and 18. Shri Vajpayee has tabled adjournment motion No. 1, which says:

"The failure of Government to take necessary steps to rid the Aligarh University of the virus of communal fanaticism and sectarian bigotry, a frightful manifestation whereof has been the recent chain of unfortunate incidents which spread outside the precincts of the University not only to undermine our efforts at national integration but also to endanger the law and order situation in Aligarh and other adjoining districts of Western U.P."

A similar one—adjournment motion No. 4—has been tabled by Shri Balraj Madhok, which says:

“The failure of the Government to appoint a Visitors’ Committee to enquire into the affairs of Aligarh University and rid it of anti-national elements.”

Adjournment motion No. 18, tabled by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, reads:

“The communal riots in the Aligarh Muslim University due to carelessness of the Vice-Chancellor and the situation arising due to their reaction be discussed.”

What is the situation?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): May I know, Sir, why our adjournment motion on the same subject has been disallowed?

Mr. Speaker: All right, that may also be treated as having been read by me. That is adjournment motion No. 17 tabled by Shri S. M. Banerjee and Shri K. T. K. Tangamani, which says:

“Failure of the Government to appoint a judicial enquiry into the recent communal disturbances in certain places in U.P.”

What is the situation?

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali): Sir, as far as this question is concerned, it deals with two aspects. One relates to the unfortunate incident which took place in the Aligarh University, and the other deals with the riots which to some extent were related to the incidents which took place in the University but for which the University cannot be held responsible.

Now, we have to view this question in proper perspective. As far as the Government of India are concerned, I cannot take any responsibility or answer questions relating to the disturbances which took place. They are questions of law and order, and it is the Government of Uttar Pradesh 1355(Ai) LSD—6.

which took necessary action. And, I also note that questions were raised in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly and the Uttar Pradesh Government answered those questions.

As far as the University is concerned, it is a very limited question. Sir, at the time of election there was some scuffle between the students. The Vice Chancellor has appointed a committee to enquire into the whole affair. The Enquiry Committee has submitted its report and the Vice Chancellor has called an emergent meeting of the Executive Council which will consider that report.

As you are aware, Sir, the University is an autonomous body and as an autonomous body it ought to be competent to take necessary action. Necessary action is being taken. As for other aspects, you would agree, Sir, that it is not for me to answer those questions. I would also submit for your consideration whether it is in the interest of the University, which is an entirely autonomous organisation, that its affairs should be discussed repeatedly on the floor of the House. It does not help in any way. The Government are making efforts to bring about reforms. As you are aware, Sir, an Enquiry Committee was appointed to consider the whole question. The report of that Committee was discussed thoroughly on the floor of the House and Government have under consideration necessary measure. I would like to submit, Sir, that repeated discussion of this question will not help in any way, will not help the Government or the University.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Sir, May I make a submission? The question is, why the Government of India did not appoint a committee to enquire into the affairs of the Muslim University which resulted in a communal clash within the precincts of the University and outside it? Why is it that no action has been taken against the university authorities who did not

[Shri Vajpayee]

suspend the elections which were conducted on communal lines? It has been reported in the Press that the Vice-Chancellor asked for the resignation of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, but because of the fact that a clique which is supporting the Pro-Vice-Chancellor gave notice of a no-confidence-motion against the Vice-Chancellor himself, the whole matter has been hushed up. We entirely agree that the University is an autonomous body, but no institution in the country can be allowed to jeopardise the very foundations of national integration and principles of secularism simply because it is an autonomous body and Government is helpless to interfere in the matter.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: It is not true that Government are helpless. The Government are not helpless in the matter. The Government are fully aware of their responsibility in the matter and it would not allow any institution to jeopardise national security....

Shri Vajpayee: National integration.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali:...or national integration whatever the hon. Member might say. I would only like to say that we must understand the nature of an autonomous institution. Here is a University about which an Act has been framed by this Parliament giving necessary freedom and autonomy to it. Does the hon. Member expect the Government to interfere in such a simple matter as.....

Shri Vajpayee: It is not a simple matter.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I am afraid the hon. Member is linking up what took place outside the University with what took place inside the University.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): As my colleague has stated,

this question of the Aligarh University has been discussed here repeatedly and fully and an inquiry committee was appointed consisting, among others, of Members of Parliament. Various charges which were made against the University by hon. Members in this House were proved to be false in that committee. So it is easy to go on making charges here, whether they are proved or not, saying all this has been done. One cannot appoint committee after committee to enquire broadly into the same thing. One thing that is mentioned here is why something was not done and why the Vice-Chancellor has not postponed the elections. I think he was completely right in not postponing the elections. If I had been there, I would not have postponed the elections. I cannot understand this business. In the middle of night, at 2 A.M. or midnight—I forget the time now—to postpone the elections. It is really a most extraordinary request to make, because some development had taken place.

Shri Vajpayee: There is no question of postponing the elections at the dead of night. The elections were conducted on communal lines for fifteen days.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Member might permit me, the whole incident at the Aligarh University (*Interruptions*), deplorable as it were, was a minor incident; let us remember that. The major thing has happened after that in Aligarh town and other places in which the instigators were completely different persons, other people. That is the bad thing about it. If nothing else had happened after the Aligarh elections, it was a bad rag for which steps might be taken by the Vice-Chancellor. It is not a matter which has received any publicity. It was what happened brief note. It was what happened afterwards, in which these students had nothing to do but some other

students may have something to do by exciting people in Meerut or other places, that was given wide publicity.

Shri Vajpayee: It is not a fact.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a matter which may or may not have been enquired into. It is difficult for the Central Government to look into the law and order situation of Meerut and Aligarh towns. As I said, the Central Government should have to enquire into the Aligarh University affair. About that a committee has been appointed already and it has, I understand, presented its report. But I do submit that everything that has happened in the university was trivial which was not important enough for the House to go into.

Shri Vajpayee: Question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I realise that the hon. Member has made charges about the university which were shown to be false in the inquiry committee. I remind him of this. I am talking of the background.

Shri Vajpayee: The committee was not asked to enquire into this charge. Its terms of reference were quite different.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He is quite aware of it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He is making charges against the Vice-Chancellor, against other individuals. Personally, I think it is highly improper for persons who are not in this House, eminent citizens of this country, to be charged of corruption etc. in this way by hon. Members of this House without the slightest proof or evidence. I myself was deeply concerned and deeply grieved that hon. Members should take advantage of their position to make charges against people outside who cannot defend themselves.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (New Delhi): The main charge was of regarding the communal character of the University. Does the Government deny this fact.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Deny what?

Mr. Speaker: Let us separate one from the other. It is unfortunate that this event should have occurred. But this has got a limited scope. Some students were interested in the election to the Student's Union and one party succeeded against the other party. Some students are reported to have gone and molested some other students. There the matter would have stopped but something else happened in the town and elsewhere. We are not concerned with that in the adjournment motion here, nor is this House responsible for what has occurred, nor is it responsible for the law and order situation with respect to other matters that have occurred. The small question is whether the election should have been controlled and, if it has to be controlled and it was not controlled and the students have gone to another camp, whether the authorities, more so this House or the Government for the time being in charge should be taken to have failed in their duty of preventing the boys at the dead of night going into some other camp. I do not think even the Vice-Chancellor could have prevented all that occurred there, much more so . . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Dr. Zakir Hussain did it.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going into this matter. In any case, the Central Minister of Education is not responsible for the boys going there.

Shri Vajpayee: When the Education Minister went to the university, he was shouted down and he was asked to go back.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Whatever might have been the unfortunate consequences of this, others might have taken advantage of that and many things might have occurred both in Aligarh and other towns in Uttar Pradesh. The small point is

[Mr. Speaker]

whether what occurred in the university, is a matter for adjournment motion here. If some boys go and insult some other boys in a camp at the dead of night because they were defeated in the elections, what could the Minister do? So, nothing could be done, so far as this Minister is concerned.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The various incidents can be divided into three parts. One is what happened in the university in connection with the elections. The second question is what happened outside in other cities and the third one is the whole background of the Aligarh University, which is a vital and important matter. Now, my colleague, the Education Minister has stated that the background has been largely enquired into by a committee and, in fact, it is his intention to bring forward some legislation, keeping in view the report of the last committee and other matters. It is a big question, the whole background being changed, whether it is the Aligarh University or any other university. We cannot take it up this way. So, what remains is the question of incidents in the university and the law and order situation in other areas.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): There is one other question. The Education Minister should throw light on the question whether the elections to the students' union were run on communal lines. Why was it allowed to be so run? If it is proved that this report is true, why did the authorities sit tight over this question? Because, the whole mischief flowed from that.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): I have got to say only one thing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Now the hon. Minister.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: With regard to the question that has now been raised, in the beginning the elections were

not being run on communal lines, because the notes which were shown to me indicate that several Muslim students had proposed the names of Hindu students and vice versa. So, it was not the intention of the boys to have elections on communal lines. But certain developments took place at a later stage. Of course, from the results it is very clear that all the Hindu boys were kept out and only Muslim boys were returned. So, the elections were run on a communal basis at a later stage. But, again, this is a matter which is being looked into by the university. As I said, the Vice-Chancellor has appointed a committee, the report has been submitted to the Vice-Chancellor and he has called an emergent meeting of the Executive Committee which will consider this question.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I seek a clarification?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (गुडगांव) :
वह तो एक ड्रामा है। उस से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा।

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing more to be said. I have heard enough. Evidently, the hon. Members are under the impression that this could have been prevented, instead of allowing it to run on communal lines, as the Vice-Chancellor was on the spot and he must have been aware of it, and therefore what is the object of asking the Vice-Chancellor himself to appoint a committee. Therefore, they say "we want a judicial committee". I leave it to the Government (*Interruptions*). In some form or other this matter has been coming up in the House. This is not intimately connected with the other one that has been disposed of at an earlier stage. This is an independent one. Anyhow, inasmuch as this started in a university, it is necessary that the university must be cleared of all communal

passions and wranglings of this kind. It is good if an independent committee could go into this matter, but I leave it to the Government to decide. So far as the adjournment motion is concerned, I do not think any useful purpose will be served by discussing the matter at any length in this House. So, it is rejected.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I seek a clarification?

Mr. Speaker: No, I am sorry.

DECISION OF THE ELECTION COMMISSION
ON RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. Speaker: I now come to the next adjournment motion by Shri Vajpayee which reads:

"The decision of the Election Commission to annul recognition granted to political parties on a national basis and instead to recognise parties only on State level, a decision which is not only arbitrary and contrary to the statement made by the Law Minister in the Lok Sabha during the last session but also detracts from our efforts to strengthen factors which contribute to national integration. Furthermore, coming as it does a few months before the general elections, the decision has created serious unforeseen difficulties in respect of election plans and strategy of all major parties except the Congress."

What is the situation? How has it arisen?

Shri Vajpayee: The Election Commission has thought fit to change the basis for the recognition of all-India parties. It has been done just on the eve of the elections. The Election Commission could have waited for the results of the election. It should have laid down the criteria now and should have implemented them after the results of the elections had been announced. Now the recognition of certain parties, most of whom are

Opposition parties, who secured all-India recognition by virtue of securing a certain percentage of votes during the last general elections has been withdrawn. As a matter of fact, now no all-India party exists in the country except the Congress . . . (Interruption.) On a previous occasion when the question was raised in the House Shri Nagi Reddy asked—I would like to read the question—

"May I know whether it is a fact that the Election Commission is thinking in terms of changing the position of the all-India parties which has been accepted previously on the basis of a new criterion that they are trying to adopt before the elections are held?"

The reply of the hon. Law Minister was:—

"No, Sir. The only change that will be made, if possible, will be the liberalising of grants of symbols to parties."

As a matter of fact, no restriction has been put on certain political parties.

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): Sir, I wish this matter was brought up earlier. The Chief Election Commissioner announced his decision on the 25th August after meeting all the representatives of the parties on the 24th August in which meeting the provisional draft order was circulated. Objections were heard and various matters were gone into. The hon. Member allowed the last Session to go without raising this question and has raised it now. But in any event relevant information should be placed before the House in order to show that this decision was arrived at after mature and full consideration of all the facts.

May I state, Sir, how this matter cropped up? You will yourself remember that this matter was raised off and on by various parties which had not the advantage of having an