

[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]

word "treason" should be taken out of it. My hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, thought that I was speaking against him and his associates. It is not so at all. Suppose my hon. friend, Shri Gupta, fearing that he would be arrested and punished under the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act passed by Parliament recently, slips out of the country and takes refuge, say, in Pakistan or in South Africa.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would rather try Dr. Kunzru's house, but not there.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: I should like him to be allowed to live there in peace. The Government should not trouble him by demanding his extradition from the State to which he may escape. His offence will be of a political nature.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do I understand that Dr. Kunzru wants to part company with me so easily having been with me for nine years?

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: I care more for his safety than for anything else and I should not like the Government of India to demand his extradition.

Now, Sir, I said that we have to look also to the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue on the next day.

The House stands adjourned till 2 30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at two minutes past one of the clock.

The house reassembled at half-past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

REPORT OF THE ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY ENQUIRY COMMITTEE

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh):
Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Report of the Aligarh Muslim University Enquiry Committee, 1961, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am very grateful to the Chairman for having admitted my motion and for having given me this opportunity to discuss this very important issue in this august House Sir, this Enquiry Committee, as you are all aware, had been born in a very great controversy around the Aligarh University. I think, Sir, the hon. Minister deserves a little thanks from me and from the House in that he did not allow the controversy to pull him so much as to concede the demand for a Visitor's Committee, but accepted the suggestion of the University to have a Committee appointed by the University Executive Council itself. This is very important because the University's autonomy, the regard that the different sections of our people have for the University and the emotional attachment that the alumni of the University have for their own University have been weighing with him and these have been preserved. Therefore, the decision that the University itself appoint a Committee of its own with a personnel which was agreeable to the Minister himself was the first good step taken in this particular case. Now, Sir, this step, the House would be aware, is radically different from the one which we took in Banaras, and my hon. friend, the Education Minister, would pardon me because it is precisely this point that I raised on that occasion, that we pay respect to the attachment that people have for their own Universities. The great obstetrician that Dr. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar is, had tried to apply forceps in a case of normal delivery. Here, the forceps were avoided and we see, Sir, that the delivery is absolutely normal. The child may not be

acceptable to everybody because, after all, the child is the child of its parents and it may not be acceptable to everybody. Obviously, I love my child but you may not like that child because that child is probably not to your liking or not to your standard. However, Sir, here is a case of normal delivery. Even though there were certain misunderstandings in the beginning about this Committee, they have themselves said that ultimately this Committee was conceived in good faith and it has brought out certain results. I must congratulate the personnel of this Committee for having adhered to certain basic principles faithfully. Now, Sir, what are those principles? Reading through the entire Report and also through the appendices, we see that three things run through the entire Report. The first is, they have been impartial, no prejudice and no likes and dislikes. Nothing has been allowed to colour the vision of the Committee. Secondly, they are very firm in regard to the irregularities. The Committee have not concealed what has been found to be absolutely irregular. Thirdly, Sir, we find in the Report a sort of sympathy for the autonomy of the University. Nothing has been said or done that would harm or hurt the autonomy of the University or the feelings of those who love the University. At the same time, they have tackled everything that was referred to them firmly. This is exactly the reason why this Report makes a very great impression on the reader. Now, Sir, precisely because the Committee had been impartial, precisely because the committee had been firm against certain irregularities that were found and precisely because the Committee respected the autonomy of the University and the feelings of those who are attached to the University, attempts are being made directly or indirectly to cast aspersions on the impartiality of the Report itself. Sir, I have before me the Debate of the other House, I am not going to quote from it; I have before me the controversy in certain papers; I have also before me the

various things that are being said about the Report. Now, Sir, the first point that is raised, and raised in a very subtle manner, is that had the Vice-Chancellor not attended some of these meetings probably the Report could have been more impartial. Now, what does it mean? It means that because the Vice-Chancellor attended some of these meetings the Report is coloured. It means that. This, precisely, is the thing that should be avoided, because we know that under no law could the Vice-Chancellor be avoided. Not only that, Sir, but under no condition could it even be hinted that the presence of the Vice-Chancellor in some of the meetings of this Committee has vitiated the findings of the Committee and the recommendations. Why I say so, Sir, is because the Committee themselves say in their Report that the Committee were not guided merely by the oral evidence that was brought forth. They were also in possession of a heap of documents submitted by various organisations and individuals. The Committee even received anonymous letters and representations and well documented at that. The Committee took into consideration all of them seriously. I suppose, Sir, that the documents that the Committee received, the representations that the Committee received, were not before the Vice-Chancellor and were not even shown to the Vice-Chancellor. How then do we say that the Committee, when they based their conclusions on these documents, had a coloured view? The Committee were not merely guided by the oral evidence recorded. Moreover, Sir if the Chairman of the Committee felt that any witness would not like the Vice-Chancellor to be present there or that the presence of the Vice-Chancellor would have embarrassed the witnesses, he would not have been present at such meetings. Moreover, the Vice-Chancellor was not present when the Committee was deliberating on its findings and on the evidence they had recorded. In these circumstances it would be wrong to say that just be-

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

cause the Vice-Chancellor attended a few meetings of the Committee—he could not avoid it, because there was no representative of the Vice-Chancellor to attend the meetings . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): How many meetings did he not attend? Do not mislead the House.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am not misleading the House. My hon. friend can say whatever he wants to say when he speaks and I will try to answer his points at the end of it.

The point now is that when certain evidence was tendered orally, the Vice-Chancellor was not present. At a few meetings of the Committee he was present. But when the deliberations took place, he was not present. The Report itself says that. I don't know how many meetings he attended, but at the meetings where the Committee deliberated on the records placed before it, he was not present. Even the written records, evidence and representations were not open to the Vice-Chancellor. My only point is, let there be no reflection on the impartiality and integrity with which this Committee approached the whole problem of this enquiry. That much about the character of this enquiry. I am not going to deal with this aspect further at this stage.

Of course, the University fully co-operated with this Committee. There is no doubt about that. The Committee itself says that whatever they wanted was produced and whatever was not available was searched for. The Committee itself says that in so many words. Therefore, there is no question of the University not cooperating.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Why should my hon. friend be doubting? The members of the Committee are all of very high standard and the whole country respects them.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Well, that is all right. I am not saying it. I am saying that from the debates that I have read, from the debate that is going around this Enquiry Committee, I find that such charges are made in an indirect manner, trying to say that this Report is neither adequate, nor sufficient, nor impartial. That is why I had to say all this.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Sir, if I am not mistaken, nobody in the Lok Sabha had ever doubted the impartiality of the Committee. There was objection to the Vice-Chancellor attending the Committee; but the hon. Member is mixing up the two. Nobody ever doubted the impartiality and integrity of the Committee.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The hon. Member, when he refers to this matter, probably says that by implication they say that because the Vice-Chancellor was there, the judgment of the Committee was influenced, and that is casting aspersion on the members of the Committee.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, my two minutes spent now may please be noted.

Now I come to the enquiry aspect. Again, as I was saying, the Committee was born in an atmosphere of wild allegations. I had occasion to speak about them and my hon. friend, the Education Minister, was very much embarrassed in those days. We had some talks also on that point. At the same time, most of those wild allegations about purchases and all that have been proved to be wrong. For example, there was the case of the Secretary of the Education Ministry and his house about which there was some trouble. There was trouble about so many purchases. In our House also these things came up and in their Report the Committee says that those allegations are wrong. The Enquiry Committee was not guided by itself in this matter. An officer

of the Housing Ministry, a technical expert, Mr. Selvam, was lent to the Committee by the Government and he enquired into the matter. So we see that those wild allegations have also been proved to be incorrect.

True, on the question of finance, the Committee is firm. The Committee is very firm on these financial irregularities and these have been completely brought out by the Committee. It has shown no quarters in this respect. Here, Sir, I want to say a few words on this particular aspect. Sir, the Committee had enquired into all those financial things for the last ten years or so, from 1952 onwards. During the last ten years, not only the Aligarh University but every university has been drawing heavily from the University Grants Commission. The Vice-Chancellor has spoken to the public on more than one occasion that the U.G.C. has been very very charitable, that it has been very generous to the University, often granting huge amounts. The Committee has brought out very clearly that the machinery of accounts and finance in the Aligarh University was so weak that it could not cope up with the expanding responsibilities of the University and the inflowing amounts from the U.G.C. Sir, this has to be very seriously considered by the University and considered by everybody.

There are two aspects flowing out of these irregularities. One is that these irregularities had been committed. But most of these irregularities are in the earlier period of these ten years. That means the University on its own—there may be sluggishness—was slowly trying to do something about its accounting staff, but at the same time it was not enough. Now we find that even the objections raised by the Audit Officer of Uttar Pradesh in 1952 have been satisfactorily answered. I understand that the whole machinery was in such

a bad state of affairs that they could not find vouchers, or say where records were, and it was only after this enquiry was started and when officers were sent and they sat on the people that things were unearthed. Obviously, this is a very bad thing for any university, much more so for a Central University, a public university like the Aligarh University with which vast sections of the people have real emotional attachment. This aspect of the Report is very serious and I hope that very serious consideration will be given by the University and any tendency to, what I may call, slacken vigilance on this score, the country will obviously not tolerate. After all, from the hard-earned money of the entire people, we pay a lot of money to the various universities.

I need not at this stage go into all the details of these various transactions, because they are there brought out in a very detailed manner.

Next I come to the matter of appointments and promotions. Here again, out of about 1,200 appointments for all the ten years, the Committee went into the cases of many appointments in respect of which specific allegations were made, the appointment of readers, professors and so on. They also went into the cases of other staff on the basis of a 25 per cent random sample. And they found about 11 serious irregularities in appointments. I am not for a moment suggesting that 11 out of 1,200 cases is a very small number. I must say that in a seat of learning even 1 in 1,200 is bad; and therefore, the University must address itself very seriously to this matter. The appointment of a selection committee which the Enquiry Committee has suggested is very important. Here, the appointment of a selection committee from a panel kept by the University Grants Commission is a recommendation of the Committee which should apply to all the universities in the country.

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

After all, the question of appointments is a serious question everywhere. Sometimes, due to psychological reasons, sometimes due to feeling, sometimes due to frustration, somebody, if he is not selected, will say that he is victimised. Therefore, this must be applied to every University in the country. After all the U.G.C. is not going to have a panel only for the Aligarh University or even for the three Universities only. There must be a panel of experts available with the U.G.C. from where external experts may be selected for the various Selection Committees of the Universities. The Executive Council of the University by not accepting that recommendation has not followed the spirit of that recommendation. I am sorry that I have to say that but at the same time I should say that it must be made applicable to every University.

Another very serious question is about the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. Unfortunately the Enquiry Committee had before it a heap of information that in this unfortunate University of Aligarh the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor always clashed. The famous Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Zakir Husain, had also clashed with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor became two centres of administration and clashed and they became two different sources of inspiration and clashed. Should we have a Pro-Vice-Chancellor at all? Even in the old days, in the pre-freedom days, the Vice-Chancellors were dignitaries like Education Ministers or some such people.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I must have half an hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are 16 names. Not half an hour. You will have a right to reply also. Please try to finish as early as possible.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Exactly at three I will sit down. You must give me that indulgence.

When they clashed, obviously you must find a way out. When Vice-Chancellors could not spare time, as we had in the Banaras Hindu University—Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was very much busy—we had a whole-time Pro-Vice-Chancellor. Why should we have two whole-time administrative posts when the occupants of the two posts have been clashing? Therefore the Committee has suggested the dropping of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor but with all sympathy and understanding, they have said that the Vice-Chancellor must have an assistant, but the ultimate responsibility and answerability must rest on the Vice-Chancellor and he should be answerable. Therefore that recommendation also is a very healthy one and should be made applicable to the Banaras University also, because the Delhi University does not have a Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): It is necessary in Banaras.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Dr. Kunzru seems to be the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras University all the time. I do not think that sort of thing should be there. If this is the position taken, then the Muslim University Executive Committee will take this position, because I understand that the Education Ministry of the Government of India had advised the Muslim University, sending them a copy of the Banaras Hindu University Bill, and told them: "Now you are considering the Enquiry Committee Report, please also consider this Bill and see that your rules are in line with the Banaras Hindu University Bill". If that is the case, why should you fight against the Muslim University not accepting the procedure of appointment of the Selection Committee or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor? Let there be no quarrel because they have only done what you have provided for the Banaras University. The question is whether you want two full-time functionaries. In that case you

change the position and say that the Vice-Chancellor should be honorary and I have no objection to that. These are Central Universities. You want the biggest dignitaries of the country to preside over their destinies. Make them honorary Vice-Chancellors. I have no objection but then the Executive Committee should be told accordingly.

Lastly, I will come to the character of the University. I know that a lot of debate is going to take place on this. Here I entirely agree with the Committee. The character of the University has to be minority in form and secular in content. Let there be no confusion about the words I am using. We will have to accept the minority form of the University but we shall have to accept also the secular content of its education. It is in this University that Sir Syed and Shibli clashed. Sir Syed wanted liberal modern education but stood for conservative politics. Shibli stood for radical politics but for conservative education. I say, let us take the best of the past and also reject the worst of the past in the Aligarh University. The best of it is modern education and modern political outlook. The worst of it is obscurantist social ideas and conservative politics. Where Sir Syed clashed with Shibli, take Sir Syed's tradition and reject that of Shibli's. Where Shibli clashed with Sir Syed, take Shibli's contention and reject Sir Syed's. Unless you take that step, you cannot save the Muslim University of Aligarh. Its character of minority University will have to be accepted because after the two World Wars, every country is addressing itself to the question: "What is the rational approach towards minorities? Should the minority be allowed to frustrate and thereby breed revivalism or not?" We have to approach the minorities from a different angle. We have to integrate them in the democratic set-up of the country. That integration will have to take place first and foremost in our seats of learning. Once, Prof. Kabir, addressing a meeting in

Hyderabad, was saying that unfortunately in India—and he was right too—particularly in medieval India and in the subsequent periods, there had not been an intellectual integration of the Hindu and Muslim scholars. Both were running in their own grooves. Both were thinking in their own ways. The intellectual integration had not taken place. I think Prof. Kabir is very much worried about this intellectual integration because without that there will be everyday Hindu-Muslim riots in his home. I think that approach has to be very seriously made. When I say that we want the secular content of the education, I am saying this that unfortunately today positions are taken by important personnel of University as well as by some friends of the University who want to run the University on obscurantist lines. Here is a pamphlet:—"S.O.S. for Aligarh University"—signed by whom?—signed by many people including Dr. Syed Abdul Lateef of Hyderabad, Dr. Meer Wali-ud-din, ex-Professor of Osmania University, etc. There are so many eminent people, eminent in their own fields but absolutely obscurantist in their social outlook. Now the Head of the Jamiat Islam-e-Hind is a signatory to it. So many others are there. I think the hon. Minister will please take note that many M.L.As. and ex-Members of Parliament of his own Party, the Congress Party, are there. What do they want? They have said:

"There are Muslim teachers in the University who would not hesitate masquerading as atheists and rationalists, swearing by a Karl Marx or a Vinoba Bhave and even openly denouncing and deriding their own saints and divines in their anxiety to pass off as genuine patriots and loyal citizens of Bharat and avoid the remotest possibility of their religious convictions being confused with communalism by their pay masters."

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras):
Minority . . .

(Interruptions)

DR. R. B. GOUR: Obscurantists, why minority? In the majority community also you find obscurantism, revivalism, all sorts of casteism and everything is coming up. In your own State of Madras, you will find revivalism. You do not say that revivalism is something which is the monopoly of the minority communities. Not at all. National integration is being threatened in our country. It is being threatened by the revivalists, obscurantists and social reactionaries, whether they are of the Hindu variety or the Muslim variety. Do not bother 3 P.M. about the variety or colour or hue. Go at their throats, fight them, clean your intellectual atmosphere and then you will find that a real intellectual national integration of all our universities and the teaching staff will be possible. Then only you will find that a real national integration on the intellectual plane in the universities has taken place. I am sorry that even the Chief Ministers did not discuss what sort of teaching they have to provide. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, accepting the minority character in form we shall also have to accept with equal vehemence the secular content of learning. Aligarh is not going to be a Deoband; Aligarh shall not be allowed to become a Deoband. It is not going to be a university of mullahs and maulvis. It is going to be a university of learning where modern education will be imparted from which scientists, engineers, medical men and others will come out to serve India and to carry the country forward.

The question was proposed.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala): Sir, I move:

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

'and having considered the same this House is of the opinion

that steps should be taken by the Aligarh Muslim University to implement the recommendations contained in the Report.'"

The question was proposed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got 16 names before me including the Minister. The Minister will be called to reply at 5.15. Members of the Congress Party will not take more than 15 minutes. The House may sit till 6 O'clock, if it so desires.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपसभापति महोदय, मुस्लिम विश्वविद्यालय इन्क्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आज सदन के सम्मुख प्रस्तुत है। इस रिपोर्ट में जितने मामलात के बारे में जिक्र किया गया है उसके ऊपर विस्तार से प्रकाश डालना मेरे लिये इस समय गैर मुमकिन है। मुझे जो थोड़ा सा समय दिया गया है, उसमें मैं जो कुछ कहा जा सकता है, विशेष मुद्दों के संबंध में कहने की कोशिश करूंगा। किन्तु हालात में यह कमेटी स्थापित की गई है, इसका जिक्र इन्क्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कर दिया गया है। जब युनिवर्सिटी के फाइनैस के हालात खराब देखे गये और आडीटरों ने बराबर यह रिपोर्ट की कि युनिवर्सिटी की फाइनैस की हालत खराब है और बड़े बड़े नुक्स पाये गये तब इस शिकायत पर युनिवर्सिटी ने एक कमेटी नियुक्त की, लेकिन उसके मेम्बर नहीं मिल पाये। इसके बाद फिर आडीटर ने वहां के फाइनैस के बारे में शिकायत की और तरह तरह के एतराजात हुए। इसके बाद श्री पी० सी० अग्रवाल के सभापतित्व में एक कमेटी मुकर्रर की गई जिससे यह कहा गया कि वह आडीटर के आब्जेक्शन्स देखे और उनका जवाब दे। इस कमेटी ने युनिवर्सिटी से कागजात मांगे लेकिन उसको कोई रैलैवेंट रिकार्ड्स नहीं दिये गये। इसका हथ्र वही हुआ जो पहली कमेटी का हुआ था। जब इस तरह की इर्रेगुलैरिटीज वहां पर हुई तो पब्लिक में इस

के खिलाफ आवाज़ उठने लगी। जब इस तरीके से वहां का इंतज़ाम चलने लगा तो जनता को हक हो गया कि वहां के इंतज़ाम के बारे में मालूम करे। जब इस तरह की संस्थाओं में जो जनता के चन्दे से चलते हैं या सरकार की मदद से चलते हैं, वहां का इंतज़ाम गलत होता है, पैसों का सही मायने में इस्तेमाल नहीं होता है, तो सही इंतज़ाम करने के लिये कोई न कोई कार्यवाही करनी ही पड़ती है। हमारे मित्र श्री गौड़ ने युनीवर्सिटी आटानौमी की बात कही लेकिन युनीवर्सिटी आटानौमी के यह मायने कभी नहीं होते कि जब किसी संस्था में खराबी आ जाय और बराबर कहने पर, ध्यान दिलाने पर भी, अपने को न सुधारे और जो ऊपर आथारिटी है वह भी कुछ न करे, ऐसी दशा में जनता को यह हक होता है कि उसका इंतज़ाम ठीक करने के लिये अपनी आवाज़ उठाये। इन सब बातों को देखते हुए विज़िटर ने अपनी ओर से युनीवर्सिटी की फाइनेंस की जांच करने के लिये अपने नुमाइंदे से जो कि विज़िटर की ओर से फाइनेंस कमेटी में था वहां की हालत को बतलाने के लिये कहा। जब इस मेम्बर ने भी विज़िटर को यह रिपोर्ट दी कि युनीवर्सिटी की हालत बहुत खराब है और उसकी जांच करने के लिये एक कमेटी नियुक्त की जानी चाहिये तो इस पर युनीवर्सिटी वाले बहुत घबड़ाये और उन्होंने सरकार से कहा कि इस तरह की कमेटी मुकर्रर होने से हमारी बदनामी हो जायेगी। अगर कमेटी नियुक्त करनी ही है तो हम नियुक्त करेंगे और जिन मेम्बरों को आप चाहेंगे और जिस तरह के टर्म्स आफ रेफ़रंस इस कमेटी के लिये चाहेंगे वह हम करने के लिये तैयार हैं। तो वह बात तो ऐसी ही हुई कि अंग्रेजों के ज़माने में जब बाहर से कुछ लोग शेर का शिकार करने के लिये आते थे तो यहां पर जो शिकारी या राजा साहब होते थे वे उन्हें जंगल में मचान पर ले जाते थे। मचान पर बहुत से लोग जिनमें यहां का शिकारी भी होता था उनको बैठा दिया जाता

था। जब शेर सामने आता था तो शिकारी स्वयं निशाना लेने के साथ साथ उन साहबान से भी कहता था कि वह भी अपनी बंदूक चलायें ताकि शेर मारने में उनका नाम हो जाये कि शेर उन्होंने ही मारा है। अब दुनिया पढ़ी लिखी हो गई है और इस तरह की बातों को अच्छी तरह से जानती है कि विज़िटर के बार बार कहने पर भी युनीवर्सिटी वालों ने वहां की हालत को नहीं सुधारा। जब कमेटी मुकर्रर करने का सवाल आया तो युनीवर्सिटी वाले कहने लगे कि यह तो हमारी इज्जत का सवाल है और इससे हमारी बदनामी हो जायेगी। यह कमेटी तो हमारी तरफ से होनी चाहिये। क्या आज दुनिया यह बात नहीं जानती कि अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम युनीवर्सिटी में क्या क्या चीज़ें हो रही हैं? हमारे गौड़ साहब कहते हैं कि सब चीज़ें नैचुरल ढंग से हो रही हैं। लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि वहां पर जो कुछ भी हो रहा है वह सब अन-नैचुरल हो रहा है। आज दुनिया को वहां की बात सब जाहिर है और कोई चीज़ छुप नहीं सकती है। इससे ज्यादा हिपोक्रेसी और क्या हो सकती है।

जहां तक कमेटी के परसौनल का सवाल है, मुझे उन पर बड़ा एतमाद है और मैं उनकी बड़ी इज्जत करता हूं। उनके ऊपर किसी का असर नहीं हो सकता है, यह बात भी मैं जानता हूं। लेकिन यह बात दूसरी है कि उनका किसी विशेष बात की तरफ रुझान हो। हर एक का होता है, मेरा भी हो सकता है, लेकिन उनकी ईमानदारी पर, उनकी इम्पाशियलिटी पर कोई शुबहा नहीं कर सकता है। लेकिन मेरे सामने एक उसूली सवाल है और वह यह है कि जब विज़िटर कोई कमेटी वहां की हालत की जांच करने के लिये नियुक्त करता है और युनीवर्सिटी की तरफ से यह कहा जाय कि हमारी ओर से यह कमेटी नियुक्त की जाय, इस चीज़ में हमारा नाम हो, यह बात कहा तक उचित है? युनीवर्सिटी के खिलाफ इल्ज़ाम है और

[श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान]

यूनीवर्सिटी वाले कहें कि हम ही इन्वैस्टीगेट करेगे, यह बात कहाँ तक ठीक है ? मेरे खिलाफ कोई इल्जाम हो और मैं यह कहूँ कि मैं ही इसको इन्वैस्टीगेट करूँगा, यह बात ठीक नहीं मालूम देती है। अगर मैं ने कोई कत्ल किया और फिर यह कहूँ कि मैं ही इस चीज को इन्वैस्टीगेट करूँगा...

श्री अकबर अली खान : आप कत्ल क्यों करेगे ?

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान : मैं तो एक उसूल की बात कह रहा था कि यह बात कहाँ तक ठीक है कि जिसके खिलाफ कोई अभियोग हो वही यह कहे कि मैं ही इन्वैस्टीगेट करूँगा।

श्री एम० आर० शेरवानी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अभी आपने ही कहा कि मेम्बर इम्पाशियल है और मुझे उन पर कोई शुबहा नहीं है।

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान : आप मेरी बात अच्छी तरह से सुन लीजिये। मैं आपको इम्पाशियल की बात नहीं बतला रहा हूँ बल्कि मैं एक उसूल की बात कह रहा था। आप मेरी बात को अच्छी तरह से सुन नहीं रहे हैं। मैं तो एक उसूल की बात कह रहा था। जहाँ तक कमेटी के मुकर्रर करने का सवाल है वह कानून की दृष्टि से ठीक है और उसमें कोई नुक्स नहीं है। लेकिन अगर नैतिकता की दृष्टि से देखा जाय तो यह बात उचित मालूम नहीं पड़ती है।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं इस बात के ऊपर सिद्धान्त रूप से एतराज करता हूँ कि हमारे दो माननीय सदस्यों को बाद में क्यों बढ़ाया गया। मैं इन मेम्बरों को अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ और इनकी ईमानदारी पर किसी को कोई शक नहीं हो सकता है। अगर ऊपर

से भी जोर पड़ता तो भी ये मेम्बर दबने वाले नहीं थे, यह बात सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। लेकिन शक की बात यह है कि जब दो मीटिंग्स हो गई थीं तब इन दो मेम्बरों को अपाइन्ट किया गया। यह एक ऐसी बात है जो दूसरों को यह सोचने से रोक सकती है कि इस मामले में कहीं न कहीं कुछ गड़बड़ है और इस तरह से लोगों के दिलों में शक पैदा हो जाता है। जनता में इस बात का शक करना कि पहले इन मेम्बरों को अपाइन्ट क्यों नहीं किया गया ठीक मालूम देता है। इस मामले में चाहे मिनिस्टर साहब की गलती हो या किसी और की हो लेकिन जरूर इस चीज में गलती की गई और ठीक तरह से कार्यवाही नहीं हुई। जिस समय इस कमेटी के मेम्बरों का ऐलान किया गया था उसी समय इन मेम्बरों को भी नियुक्त कर देना चाहिये था। इसलिए यह जो कार्यवाही बाद में दो मेम्बरों के बढ़ाने की हुई, गलत हुई। मैंने इन दो मेम्बरों के बाद में बढ़ाये जाने की वजह सुनी कि उस कमेटी में कोई मुसलमान मेम्बर नहीं था। अगर यह बात ठीक है तो पहले ही उसमें मुसलमान मेम्बर को रख देना चाहिये था। अगर उस कमेटी में सब मेम्बर मुसलमान ही होते तब भी हम लोगों को किसी किस्म का शुबाह नहीं होता। लेकिन बाद में इस तरह बढ़ाया जाना लोगों के दिलों में शक पैदा कर देता है। हमारे यहाँ बहुत से ऐसे मुसलमान मेम्बर हैं जिनकी निष्पक्षता पर किसी को कोई शुबाह नहीं है। अगर मुसलमान मेम्बर को रखना ही था तो पहले ही यह काम कर देना चाहिये था जिससे किसी तरह की शक की गुजायश ही न रहती।

इस चीज के साथ ही साथ मुझे एक चीज की ओर ध्यान दिलाना है और वह यह है कि इस कमेटी को चाहे किसी ने मुकर्रर किया हो, लेकिन टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस को देखते हुए इस कमेटी का मुकर्रर किया जाना जरूरी नहीं था। जहाँ तक हिसाब किताब का

मामला था, आडीटर ने अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी थी और एक टैकनीकल कमेटी मुक़र्रर करके इस बात को ठीक कर लिया जाता ।

जहां तक मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी का संवाल है इसके साथ कुछ दूसरे संवाल भी हैं जो लोगों के दिमाग में हर वक्त तहलका मचाये हुए रहते हैं । जैसा कि कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि जब हम इन चीजों के ऊपर जिसका जिक्र कमेटी ने किया है, विचार करते हैं, तो हम युनीवर्सिटी की हिस्ट्री और ट्रेडिशन को इग्नोर नहीं कर सकते हैं । जिस तरह की इस युनीवर्सिटी की हिस्ट्री रही है और जिस तरीके से यहां कम्युनलिज्म को बढ़ावा दिया गया उसको कोई नहीं भूल सकता है । हिन्दुस्तान के बहुत से लोगों के दिमाग में यह बात अब भी ताजा है । आजादी के इतने वर्षों के बाद भी मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी ने अपना कैरेक्टर नहीं बदला । जिस ट्रेडिशन और कैरेक्टर के बारे में हमारे माननीय मेम्बरो ने रिपोर्ट में जिक्र किया है उससे ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि ये चीजें युनीवर्सिटी में शुरू से ही चली आ रही हैं । जिस तरह की अन्य चीजों का जिक्र कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में किया है उससे भी लोगों के दिल में इस युनीवर्सिटी के बारे में शक पैदा हो जाता है । आज वह जमाना आ रहा है जबकि चारों तरफ देश की भलाई के लिये यह नारा लगाया जा रहा है कि इमोशनल इंट्रिप्रेशन होना चाहिये । इस बात के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि कमेटी इस बात के ऊपर जाती कि कम्युनल कैरेक्टर इस युनिवर्सिटी का बदला या नहीं । जैसा कि कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से जाहिर है इस कमेटी के टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस में इस चीज के बारे में कोई जिक्र नहीं किया गया था, लेकिन कमेटी ने इस चीज को कुछ छुआ अवश्य है । इस रिपोर्ट से ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि पार्टिशन से पहले वहां अन्धकार ही अन्धकार था । लेकिन पार्टिशन के बाद जो १३ साल गुजरे उनमें प्रकाश ही प्रकाश रहा है । अगर कोई इलजामात लगाता है तो यह कहना ठीक

ही है कि लोगों को समझ बूझ कर इलजामात लगाने चाहिये, और वकील साहबान यह कह सकते हैं कि इसका कोई सबूत होना चाहिये जिस तरीके से अदालत में सबूत होता है । ठीक है, सबूत भी इन चीजों का हुआ करता है । लेकिन जब ऐसे नाजुक मामले होते हैं तो उसी ढंग से उनकी इन्क्वारी होती है । इसमें कोई बदनामी की बात नहीं है । जब से इन्क्वारी कमेटी बैठी, मैं जानता हूं कि उसने बड़ी निर्भीकता के साथ काम किया है । बहुत सी गलत बातें हुईं । हर तरीके से रखना अंदाजियां की गईं, रोड़े अटकाये गये । इसको इस कमेटी ने नहीं माना लेकिन इससे अधिकारियों की जिहिनियत का पता लग जाता है । जब कमेटी मुक़र्रर होती है तो एक ऐसा स्टेटमेंट वाइसचांसलर साहब देते हैं जिसका जांच पर असर पड़ता था । यहां हम एक अजीब नज्जारा देखते हैं, कोई साहब कहते हैं कि वहां दो पार्टियां हैं । कोई कहता है कि तीन पार्टियां हैं, कुछ कम्युनेलिस्ट हैं, कुछ कम्युनिस्ट हैं और कुछ नेशनेलिस्ट हैं । मैं यह देखता था कि कमेटी जब मुक़र्रर हुई तो कोई नहीं था, सब एक थे । उन्हें चाहिये था कि कहते कि जो देखना हो, उसे देख लो, और यह भी देख लो कि इसका कम्युनल कैरेक्टर बदला है या नहीं बदला है । किन्तु ऐसा न कर खास तौर से वाइस-चांसलर और दूसरे लोगों ने मिल करके एक वावैला हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर मचाया कि देखिये, एक इदारा है मुसलमानों का और उसके ऊपर हमला किया जा रहा है । क्या हमला है ? बुराइयों का निकालना कोई हमला नहीं है । हिन्दुओं का इदारा हो या मुसलमानों का इदारा हो, जब तक उससे खराबियां तेजी के साथ और सख्ती के साथ नहीं निकाली जायेंगी तब तक उसका सुधार नहीं हो सकता है । मैं समझता हूं कि जिन लोगों ने इस तरीके से सोचा, अगर वे दिल पर हाथ रख कर देखें तो उन्हें महसूस होगा कि उन्होंने इस इंस्टिट्यूशन की कोई भलाई की बात नहीं

[श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान]

सोची। पुराने जमाने से जो एक प्रिजुडिस चली आ रही थी उसका जारी रहना कुछ ठीक नहीं मालूम पड़ता। उसको दूर करना जरूरी था। अगर कोई कमियां हैं तो उनको निकालने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

श्री एम० आर० शेरवानी : मैं आन-रेबिल मेम्बर को याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि मिस्टर रफी अहमद क़िदवई, डा० जाकिर हुसैन और दूसरे बड़े बड़े नेशनलिस्ट लीडर्स वहां से निकले और मैं यह कहूंगा कि अब तक पुराने रवायात चले आते हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.
order.

श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान : मेरे मित्र शेरवानी साहब जो रवायात की बात कह रहे हैं, वह ठीक है। इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक दोहा याद आ रहा है जो इस प्रकार है :

भले बुरन के होत हैं, बुरे भलेन के होत ।
दीपक से काजल परत, कमल कीच मे होत ॥

भले आदमियों में से बुरे आदमी निकल आते हैं और बुरे आदमियों में से अच्छे आदमी निकल आते हैं। कमल कीचड़ में पैदा होता है और दीपक जो रोशनी देता है उससे काजल परता है। इस तरह जो हस्तियां बनीं, वे उससे निकल कर बनीं, उसके अन्दर नहीं बनीं । (Time bell rings.)

मैं तो अभी भूमिका भी नहीं बांध पाया। समय नहीं है, नहीं तो मैं बतलाता कि किस तरह से इसको शुरू से बनाया, इसकी हिस्ट्री क्या है और सर सैयद अहमद खां जो बहुत बड़े नेशनलिस्ट थे उनके ऊपर किस तरह से अंग्रेजों ने जाल डाला। इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी बतलाता कि तीन अंग्रेज प्रिन्सिपल्स मिस्टर वेक, मिस्टर वियोडर मोरिसन और मिस्टर आर्चबोल्ड ने वहां तीन चार संगठनों को बना करके किस तरीके से हमारे फीडम मूवमेंट की मुखालिफत की। जब यहां से

मांग की गई कि सिविल सर्विस का इम्तहान यहां होना चाहिये तो उनकी तरफ से कहलाया गया कि अगर यहां सिविल सर्विस का इम्तहान हो जायेगा तो एक दर्जी भी कुर्सी पर जा करके बैठेगा। इसी तरह जब यह मांग की गई कि नमक का कर कम होना चाहिये तो उसकी मुखालिफत की गई और जब यह मांग की गई कि हिन्दुस्तान में लोगों को हथियार मिलने चाहिये तो उसकी भी मुखालिफत की गई। इसी के फलस्वरूप उनको सर का खिताब मिला। उसके बाद की हिस्ट्री आप सब लोगों को मालूम है। वहां तीन चार एसोसियेशन्स बने और आखिर में जो चौथा एसोसियेशन्स बना वह मुस्लिम लीग था और तब से मुस्लिम लीग का जमाना आया उस वक्त मुस्लिम लीग के लीडर मिस्टर जिना और लियाकत अली खा अक्सर ये कहा करते थे

"Muslim University is the arsenal of Muslim League."

ऐसे हालात को देखते हुये यह जरूरी था कि कमेटी इन बातों को गहराई से जानने की कोशिश करती कि यहां कुछ विशेष परिवर्तन हुआ है कि नहीं। इसमें लोगों के दिमाग से वह चीज निकलती और देश का बहुत फायदा होता। साथ ही साथ जो इमोशनल इटिग्रेशन की बातें होती हैं उसमें भी हर तरीके से मदद होती। समय नहीं है, इस-लिये और ज्यादा नहीं कह सकता।

SURI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the outset, I have to record my protest at the manner in which we are hustled into this debate. One day it was announced that the discussion on this was going to take place on the 29th. I made my plans to leave Delhi on Friday. On the day of my leaving I heard that it was going to come today. So, I had to rush back all the way from Saurashtra.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody announced that it was on the 29th.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: This was not discussed by the Business Advisory Committee. In a democratic House there is something like a Business Advisory Committee and the Business Advisory Committee surely may have met within the first week. Members should have been given a time table or the programme of the House, so that they could have arranged their programmes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We meet only when we are short of time.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Are we full of time today?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes sufficient time has been given.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Then, why do you put restrictions on time? You are contradicting yourself, with due respect, and my protest is not against you. My protest is against the Government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Within the time allotted, it has to be restricted. Please go on.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: All that you have said does not take away what I have said. It has inconvenienced Members, it has inconvenienced me considerably. To announce one day that the debate is going to take place on the 29th . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are making a wrong statement.

DR. R. B. GOUR: When was it announced? Never was it announced.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If you have seen the press reports . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should not be guided by press reports. You get agenda papers.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I think this House deserves a little more courtesy.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Business of the House can not be at the convenience of the hon. Member.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I would like you to take note that he is disturbing. The only way to deal with these friends is always to give them a dose of their own medicine.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You give room for such things.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, it is a very sad matter that one of the biggest institutions of this country, an educational institution, has had to be discussed in Parliament threadbare in this manner, that it has to be the subject-matter of questions in both Houses. And I am very sorry to say that the Government has not come out better or in any way in a creditable manner throughout the whole episode. I must characterise the Ministry of Education as weak, ineffective and incapable of even exercising supervision over what is happening under its very nose, even when repeated questions were asked in this House. I ask the Minister of Education to remember the various assurances that he has given in this House and in the other House and to tell us whether he has kept them during the course of this enquiry. On one occasion the Minister assured Parliament that the Vice-Chancellor, who sat on this Committee being in the position of an accused, would not take part in the proceedings. This was twisted by the Vice-Chancellor to mean that he could sit on the Committee right through. Dr. Gour tried to mislead the House. He is not correct. There are hon. Members in this House who were present at the Committee's business. They will tell you that the Vice-Chancellor on the Committee except on very rare occasions, was present right through. In normal circumstances I would not have objected to the presence of the Vice-Chancellor. But there are ab-

[Shri Dhyabhai V. Patel.]

normal circumstances with regard to the Aligarh University and particularly this Vice-Chancellor and this enquiry. If the Vice-Chancellor were a person like Dr. Zakir Hussain, an educationist primarily, I would not have minded. Unfortunately for this University, this Vice-Chancellor is a businessman, and a thorough-going businessman, if you like.

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI: He was a school teacher.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He has forgotten the ideals of a school teacher. He has been a thorough-going businessman. He spends his time in Delhi, Bombay, Bhopal and other places attending Board meetings. Who looks after the University? And thorough-going businessman that he is, he does not brook opposition. Is it not a fact that one Professor Saha who dared to come and give evidence before the Committee was evillaboured before the Vice-Chancellor's house by an inmate of his house? How do you expect this Committee . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are concerned with the Aligarh University Enquiry Report now.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am talking of the enquiry, and the report is part of the enquiry. I wish, Sir, you would not disturb me by taking my time and breaking my trend of thought. You are not here, Sir, to defend the Government or the Committee. You are here to help us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will confine ourselves to the report.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The fact is not denied, and under such circumstances how do we expect professors, school teachers and academic people to come forward and give true evidence before a Committee of this type? That is the important aspect of this enquiry which should not be forgotten. Under normal circumstances if an enquiry was to be conducted by

people who have only academic interests, who are men of learning, whose pursuit in life is purely academic, such things would not happen. But here is a businessman—and you know what businessmen are—and if he is sitting at the head of this University, what else can happen?

DR. R. B. GOUR: You should be happy that a businessman is there.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I do not know what my friend means or what the friends opposite mean who laugh at what he says.

I have referred to the various questions that have been asked in this House again and again. Unfortunately the Ministry has never been able to come out better in the questions. It seems they are trying to hide some things or something about which they cannot very well give an explanation. Why this attitude?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: What are the things which were hidden?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I will presently come to that. The Vice-Chancellor, as I have said, is a businessman and more an absentee Vice-Chancellor. Instead of being present there all the time he is always moving about.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Is that the issue before the Committee? May I know from the Minister?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: My friend is there in the Western Court as I am, and we know how often the Vice-Chancellor is there instead of being at Aligarh where he is to look after the University.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: If he has to come there on work, is there anything wrong in it?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: But he is maintaining a permanent suite, a permanent driver, a perma-

ment chauffeur in Delhi. Is he working at Aligarh or at Delhi? However, I am glad to see that he has got so many advocates in this House.

DR. R. B. GOUR: And also opponents like you.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The type of education, the type of emotional integration that would take place under such a Vice-Chancellor is not surprising. It was reported—I do not know, I speak subject to correction—that when the Indian Hockey Team was defeated for the first time in 25 years, when it lost the trophy that it enjoyed for 25 years, there were celebrations in Aligarh. The whole country, the whole sporting world of India, was aggrieved at the defeat

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am sorry for such allegations. Is there anything on record?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You can correct me if I am wrong.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Are we entering into a fresh run of allegations or are we discussing the report?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I am being interrupted on all sides. You have to give me time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please confine your remarks to the report. You are going outside the report.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: One of the items dealt with by the Committee is irregularities in the purchase of property, payment of prices which were not justified. I do not know how the Committee has come to this conclusion. The Vice-Chancellor has always managed to steer the Committee into a position which he liked. He was not satisfied with the original Committee. He got two more people appointed, and it has to be remembered that he has got relations high up in the Education

Ministry also—the hon. Minister may deny if I am not making a statement of fact instead of other Members interrupting me again and again. Sir, as regards purchase of lands, about which reference to irregularities has been made, I am afraid I cannot accept the report in the manner in which it is presented before this House. We are told that it was referred to an expert. I do not know what type of expert we get in the matter of land, because land has several aspects. There is vacant land, there is building, there are so many things, and in such matters particularly when there is possibility of a little difference of opinion, the better course which is usually followed is not to leave it to one person but to have a committee of two or three experts so that we get a proper report. In this case it has been left to only one person. Then the difference in the price paid compared to the price of adjacent plots sold is so high. Rupees three is the price that the University has paid for some of the plots, whereas the adjacent plots on one side were sold for eighteen naye paise and on the other side for ten naye paise.

DR. R. B. GOUR: For how much did you purchase?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Shall I answer him, Sir, or shall I ignore him? I will abide by your advice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please go on.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Another important charge against the University is nepotism, the number of relations of the Vice-Chancellor appointed all over the University in different positions. The University is full of relations, it seems, staffed by one or two families. Then the worst thing is that in the matter of examinations and results influence has come to bear. Normally, Sir, grace marks are given or condonation of certain things is made to persons who score a few marks less than

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

those required for passing. Have you ever heard of somebody being condoned and given a degree when he secured only 5 per cent marks in one subject? Compartmental examinations are certainly held, but when one goes through a compartmental examination, it means that he gets at least a tolerable number of marks, not 5 per cent. as has happened in some cases here. This has lowered the academic standard of the University apart from the other aspects that I have mentioned. The Minister of Education has been an academician and he would understand the implications of what I say. I hope he has gone into this. If he had gone into it thoroughly, he would understand exactly what I mean and what I say.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: He has yet to tell me what facts were hidden by the Government.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: If he will be good enough to give us the reference in the report and say things, that would conveniently give us a chance to answer them.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I was one of those who had asked a large number of questions about the affairs here. Then I received a letter from the Deputy Secretary of the Education Ministry saying that the Committee would be glad to meet the Members of Parliament who had taken part or had asked questions on this matter or who were interested in it, and a certain date was specified. I replied that I had very little knowledge of the affairs of the University but that I had taken interest and I had asked questions on this matter; that I would like to come before the Committee and ask certain questions so that I could enlighten myself on this point (*Interruption.*) I do not yield you; I refuse to yield to you.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): We are not discussing these things. It is all imagination.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Sapru, you will have your time.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am surprised that an hon. Member of this House who sat on the Committee talks like this.

Sir, I wrote to the Secretary of the Committee that I would be glad to meet the Committee on a certain date, and I was leaving Delhi the next day. Promptly I got a letter to say that the Committee was not available on that day and that I should not come but that if I could stay over for the next day, I could come before it. All the affairs of this Enquiry Committee have been managed in this way. Very cleverly the enquiry has been steered off the important points. Things had been made inconvenient for people who wanted to come forward and give facts, and that is what I mean by saying that an effort has been made to conceal facts.

Sir, the whole episode is a very sorry episode in the history of the progress of education in this country. Sir, to my mind it is of no consideration that this is called a Muslim University. I would have made the same remarks if it had applied to any other university. If the affairs of a certain university are not being conducted properly—and they are not being conducted properly—it has to be admitted, and the Report is halting, half-hearted. I am very sorry to say that. There are certain aspects into which I would have expected the Committee to go deeper and give information—to go right deep into it. I am sorry that I am disappointed that the Committee has failed to go very deep into this. The Vice-Chancellor was to be exonerated if things had been all right at the University. I would have been only too glad to hear it. But what is the use of saying that audit slips are missing, that vouchers are missing? I cannot accept Dr. Gour's statement that the audit slips and vouchers were missing. But experts

had found them out, dug into the matter and replaced them. That is not, how accounts are kept. Surely, that is not the way. If the accounts are not all right, if the vouchers are missing, you cannot dig into anything, find them out and set them right. What is wrong is wrong. If the accounts are not regular, it has to be admitted that the accounts are not regular.

Sir, during questions in both Houses of Parliament allegations were made that the purchase of property by the University was used to enable certain people to escape the provisions of the Evacuee Property Law. The Committee discreetly or cleverly is silent on this matter. I do not know why. I fail to understand it. I hope that the hon. Member who has got so much excited over it will, while he speaks, enlighten this House whether they at all went into this question and what their findings were; which case they investigated or did they shut their eyes to it? Here is a point on which my friend who is unnecessarily getting excited can enlighten us. He is an able lawyer, he understands things.

Sir, what I wish to say is that the Report as it is presented does not make a very happy reading. The Committee was supposed to say the last word on this matter. Just now, because I was absent from Delhi, a pamphlet has come into my hands—"Remarks of the University on the Report of its Committee of Enquiry." So, Sir, the person who was the accused was not only allowed to sit on the panel of judges but also to issue something himself on the judgment that was against him. This is unique; this can only happen in such an Education Ministry and in this country.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is indeed regrettable and unfortunate that in the course of two years we have had the occasion to discuss the Enquiry Committee Reports

on the working of two of the Central Universities. Sir, two documents have been placed in our hands; one is the Aligarh Muslim University Enquiry Committee's Report and another is "Remarks of the University on the Report of its Committee of Enquiry". It is not my purpose to go into these Reports in detail because that is not a matter that is necessary for me to do—Members go through these. But it is for me to go into certain general aspects, and about two matters I would like to make a particular reference.

One of the facts that have been made evident in the Report is about the missing or the non-accounting of Rs. 1 lakh. It is up to the Committee itself to face the reply that has been given by the University; that is, they have quoted a letter from the Accountant General, U.P. that this money has been accounted for properly. Sir, I read from page 1 of "Remarks of the University on the Report of its Committee of Enquiry". It says:

"The entry in respect of a G.P. Fund Note for Rs. one lakh erroneously shown in the balance sheet as an investment from the Medical College Fund has come in for notice in the report of the Committee. The whole position in respect of this entry was explained by the Hony. Treasurer in his note submitted to the Accountant General, and the Accountant General, after examining the note, has observed in his letter No. OAD-11/AMU-60-61/4070 of November 19, 1960 'the detailed note on the G.P. Fund Notes valuing Rupees one lakh enclosed therewith has been examined by us. The facts stated therein have been verified to be correct'."

Sir, this is a discrepancy

AN. HON. MEMBER: How do the numbers of the G. P. Fund compare?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: between the Report of the Committee and the reply

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] which calls for a reply from the Government because it is indeed a very important matter. It is not a matter of opinion, it is a matter of fact.

Secondly, Mr. Deputy Chairman, there was the wholesale allegation that was made against an educationist of repute, Prof. Saiyidain—there was a lot of mud-slinging at him—and I am very happy that this Committee in all fairness has said that not only has Prof. Saiyidain sold his house for a proper price but that it is a very good deal for the University for having purchased it at that price. Having said these two things, I must go into the other allegations that have been made to the Committee.

Sir, the allegations that have been made to the Committee are very serious indeed. I am not prepared to accept that when we appoint a Committee, that Committee can be influenced. I am sure that we have people in this country and in this House who can face facts and the Committee that has been appointed for this occasion also had to and did, face facts and they have given a fair Report. There is no end to discussions if we begin to suspect the Reports of the Committees and I take it—and I say it with a sense of responsibility—that the only way in which this House can do business is to appoint responsible Committees and then take their Reports to be true, take them to be valid and take it that they have gone into the matter sufficiently well.

Sir, very serious allegations have been made. In the remarks of the University, they have not denied those allegations. Even taking into account what has been accepted in the remarks mentioned in this note by the University itself, accounts have not been maintained properly—they accept it; overpayments have been made—they accept it; files are missing—they accept it; recoveries have not been made which should have been made, which has been pointed out in the Report—they accept it. It says that a better accounting proce-

dure should be introduced, that they do not have proper people to look after the accounts. They accept it. All these are accepted. Not only that; something more. It seems that people who had been dismissed from Government service were appointed to offices of the University. Nobody can approve a thing like this. It has been pointed out to and accepted by the university that they were also appointing unqualified persons to the staff of the university. That is also accepted. Thus, Sir, without going into further particulars about which there may be a dispute, I say these are very serious allegations indeed, and in an academic body.

Sir, I do not want to look upon this discussion as anything emotional, as anything having to do with Hindu-Muslim feelings, but look upon it on a basis of fairness and strict impartiality. What I say, I say on the statements that have been made. I do not refer to certain statements which have been denied by the university. I do not refer to matters which have been referred to by Dr. Gour in the matter of appointments, about certain recommendations of the Committee that a Pro-Vice-Chancellor should not be appointed, and about the appointments of certain expert committees. Sir, the University has pointed out that in the Bill that has been introduced in the House for amending the Banaras Hindu University Act these very things have been allowed for the Banaras University and so what is good for the Banaras University is good enough for the Aligarh Muslim University. That is their statement. Sir, I do not go into those questions which are questions on which there can be a difference of opinion and which this House may have an opportunity to decide when that Bill comes before this House. But going into the matters that have been accepted by the remarks of the university, I say, Sir, even as it is,—I do not like to use very strong language—I say that the affairs of the university have not been properly attended to, have not been properly conducted, have not been properly shaped.

Sir, I am averse to looking at, and to thinking always about the past. As that great Churchill said in times of war, "thinking too much of the past may make us lose the future". So, Sir, I do want to consider here as to what we should do hereafter.

Much has been said about emotional integration. Sir, this is one of those things about which so much is said, which itself disturbs emotional integration. You know, Sir, when a man is healthy, he does not feel his limbs. I feel my nose most when I get cold. And all this talk about emotional integration, and very vehemently, that itself is a sign that we do not have it. What shall we do about it? We have had its past; it is true that the Aligarh University stood for certain things in the past. Let us accept it—no fighting it—because the past is past; that has happened; you cannot deny your past; it is true. Mr. Chauhan's speech—I do not understand the Hindi speeches; but I could understand a little—sometimes I misunderstand, maybe . . .

SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN:
It is better that you could not understand it.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: He said there was the Muslim League mentality, or something like that, in the Aligarh University. Maybe it is true. I shall take it that it is true. But what is the use of saying it now? Those things which led to the partition of India have happened. Today it is our duty to say what we shall do hereafter so that that mentality does not continue, and in considering these things I have a few suggestions to make.

Sir, we have found in the report that communal scholarships have been accepted. They must have been accepted. In the Madras University today, we do not accept private endowments which give communal scholarships. These little things, which make people think in terms of their castes

and their communities, we shall not go on encouraging them. I would even suggest, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that in both the names, the Banaras Hindu University, and the Aligarh Muslim University, this "Hindu" and "Muslim" may go. That is easily done, but that, by itself, may not be the solution. We must go into the underlying currents of things which have made us feel "Hindu" and "Muslim" according as we belong to this community or that community, treating the two communities as poles apart. Of course all differences cannot be obliterated in this world. Differences will remain, but in spite of these superficial differences, we must develop a unity and a higher unity, and if we are to produce this emotional integration even in a place like Aligarh, which has a past history which has not been very good from our point of view or from any point of view, all I say, Sir, is that we must develop certain loyalties which are higher than this loyalty which we see there. And what is it that we can do?

Sir, much has been said about Islamic studies. Islamic studies may be provided not only in Aligarh but elsewhere too. They are provided in Madras today—that has not produced any bad tendencies. I know, Sir, in those days, when Hyderabad was not integrated, when I had the honour of being the Minister for Education in Madras, wild allegations were made that in the Osmania College in Kurnool guns and ammunition were stored to be used on behalf of Hyderabad. When this news came to me, I did send people to find it out. Nothing of the kind was there. When we are frightened, when there is want of trust, many rumours are spread, very many things are broadcast and we, Sir, in our wisdom, shall not believe many of these things, but we shall also not shut our eyes to certain separatist tendencies that do exist in our country—in the name of religion in the name of caste, and community—and those must go. Also, Sir, just as we, in Madras, have provided for

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] Islamic studies, for the study of Arabic, I wish that in the Muslim University at Aligarh we provided for Sanskrit studies, a Chair for Sanskrit. We must provide for Vedantic studies. Why not? In my opinion these are also important among the many other activities which will bring people together, so that we shall say that our centres of higher learning are not centres of quarrelling but are centres in which we can transcend our differences and stand for something higher and nobler and stand for this country as a whole.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Chauhan says that there is provision for Sanskrit studies at the Aligarh Muslim University.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Now, Sir, I have a few words to say about the present status and character of the University. On page 112 this has been discussed by the Committee, and the Committee has referred, as it ought to, to the amending Act of 1951. According to that Act, Sir, which incorporated an article of the Constitution of India, no grants can be given to any institution which serves only one community, and that is very correct. And today, if the Aligarh University continues to be of one character, it is up to us to see that we introduce all the elements that are necessary, so that people of all kinds and all cultures will be able to find a place in that University.

Sir, there is one other matter, which frightened me—I was not prepared for that information. My hon. friend opposite said that one Professor Saha, who gave evidence against the university, was belaboured opposite to the Vice-Chancellor's house . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: By an inmate of his house.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I would like to know whether this is true—No. 1—and No. 2, if this is true, whether it was

enquired into to find out as to who was responsible for it, and if the allegation and the implications of that allegation are true, it is very bad indeed.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Prof. Saha was belaboured. As far as I know, it had nothing to do with this enquiry.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Was he not belaboured soon after he gave evidence by an inmate of the Vice-Chancellor's house?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Well, he was belaboured; it is true he was manhandled and the matter was reported to the police, and it is also true that during that period of enquiry, this gentleman was manhandled, but as far as we know, it had nothing to do with the enquiry by this Committee.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But has this been enquired into . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order; your time is up.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I am happy to learn that. Anyway this may be enquired into . . . (Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: What more information . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I strongly object to the manner in which this hon. Member goes on making allegations without substantiating them. He said they were hiding facts. I asked him. But he does not give the facts. When I say he was manhandled but this has nothing to do with the Enquiry he continues to persist in his charges. Well, it is a most extraordinary way in which this hon. Member is making allegation after allegation against the Government and the University. It is most unfair.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: In the few minutes that are left with me . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. No minutes are left.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: . . . I would only like to say this. This report does not give an edifying reading. It does not do good to the University, it does not do good to us, it does not do good to the students or the staff, not only in Aligarh but any other university in this country.

Sir, coming to the selection of Vice-Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor is a key person in the University. I do not know what standards are observed in his selection. It appears politics is playing a part in the selection of candidates. The University Education Commission which was presided over by the Vice-President, Sir, made a very important recommendation, namely that men of character, ability and, in addition, academic standing, without any regard for any other consideration should be selected for the posts of Vice-Chancellors. If the two Central Universities had a lot of trouble, to me, Sir, the Government cannot say that they are autonomous bodies and they have no responsibility by them. In the selection of Vice-Chancellor the Government does have a great responsibility and I wish, I hope and I pray that hereafter in the choice of these high posts proper selections will be made.

One other matter

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Let me finish. You cannot be so discourteous to me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. You are cutting into others' time. There are sixteen more Members. Mr. Ansari.

شری فرید الحق انصاری (اتر

پردیہ) : مسٹر چٹیار جی -

اس رپورٹ کے اوپر جس طرح سے بحث

ہو رہی ہے میرا خیال ہے کہ ہمیں اس سے اونچا اٹھنا پڑے گا۔ میں یہ عرض کروں گا کہ میں جہاں اس معاملہ کے اوپر اپنے خیالات کا اظہار کرنا چاہتا ہوں وہاں میں یہ بھی بتا دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ میرے تعلقات اس انسٹی ٹیوشن سے بہت پرانے رہے ہیں۔ میں اس انسٹی ٹیوشن کا پرانا اسٹوڈنٹ ہونے کی حیثیت سے جو کچھ کہوں گا وہ ایک خاص نظریہ سے کہوں گا اور ظاہر ہے کہ میرا نظریہ اور میری خواہش یہی ہوگی کہ اس انسٹی ٹیوشن کی ترقی ہو، اس کو اچھی طرح سے چلایا جائے۔ ہر اس شخص کا جو آزاد ہندوستان کی ترقی چاہتا ہے اور جو یہ چاہتا ہے کہ آزاد ہندوستان کے نوجوانوں کی تعلیم و تربیت اونچے معیار کی ہو، اس کا نظریہ یہی ہوگا کہ اس ادارہ کی فلاح و بہبود ہو۔

ایک عجیب بات ہے کہ علیگڑھ مسلم یونیورسٹی کے جن معاملات کے متعلق یہ انکوائری کمیٹی بیٹھائی گئی تھی ان معاملات کا زیادہ تر تعلق پرانے وائس چانسلر سے ہے۔ موجودہ وائس چانسلر، بیچپارہ، کی بد قسمتی ہے کہ وہ اس کا شکار ہو گئے۔ ہاں اس کی یہ ضرور کمی ہے اور غلطی ہے کہ اس نے ان معاملات کو ختم کرنے کے لئے، ان کو سدھارنے کی کوئی کوشش نہیں کی۔

[شری فرید الحق انصاری]

اب ہم کو اس رپورٹ کو اس نظریہ سے دیکھنا ہے کہ اس کمیٹی نے جو رپورٹ پیش کی ہے وہ ایماندارانہ، دیانتدارانہ واقعات پر مبنی ہے۔ یا کسی جذبات پر مبنی ہے۔ جیسا کہ ڈاکٹر گوز نے کہا مجھے بھی یہ کہنے میں عذر نہیں ہے کہ یہ (رپورٹ) دیانتداری اور انصاف پر مبنی ہے۔ اور جو واقعات انکوائری کمیٹی کے ممبران کے سامنے آئے ان کی جانچ پڑتال کر کے انہوں نے یہ رپورٹ دیا۔ دو ایک باتیں البتہ آنریبل ایجوکیشن منسٹر سے جاننا چاہونگا۔ ڈاکٹر گوز نے اس کو بیان کرنے کی کوشش کی لیکن اس سے میری تسلی نہیں ہوئی کہ جب ایجوکیشن منسٹر نے وزیرس کی انکوائری کمیٹی بیٹھانے کا ارادہ کیا اور فیصلہ کیا تو کیا ایسی وجہ آگئی کہ وائس چانسلر کے کہنے سے دوسری کمیٹی مقرر کر دی گئی۔ دوسرے یہ کہ جن حضرات کے نام وائس چانسلر کے کہنے پر انکوائری کمیٹی میں رکھے گئے وہ نہایت قابل، عالم، فاضل لوگ تھے جن کو ماہر تعلیم کہا جا سکتا تھا۔ پھر کیا ضرورت پڑ گئی کہ بعد میں دو نام اور اس میں بڑھا دیئے گئے۔ یہ میں سمجھ نہیں پایا ہوں۔

بہر حال انکوائری کمیٹی بننے کے بعد ایک خاصی چھیخ و پکار ہوئی۔ اخباروں میں بہت کافی پروپیگنڈا

ہوا اور مجھے افسوس ہے کہ اس سلسلہ میں جو پروپیگنڈا ہوا وہ نہایت ہی نازیبا پروپیگنڈا ہوا۔ بعض اخباروں میں ایجوکیشن منسٹر پر حملہ کیا گیا کہ چونکہ وہ ہندو ہیں اس لئے انہوں نے انکوائری کمیٹی بیٹھائی ہے۔ حالانکہ یہ بالکل غلط ہے اور میں یہ دعویٰ کے ساتھ کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ ایجوکیشن منسٹر کا رویہ اور گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کا رویہ جہاں تک کہ مسلم یونیورسٹی کا معاملہ ہے بالکل غیر جانبدارانہ رہا ہے۔ انہوں نے ہمیشہ آگے بڑھ کر ہر طریقہ پر مسلم یونیورسٹی کی مدد کرنی چاہی ہے اور وہاں کے معاملات کو سدھارنا چاہا ہے۔ اگر کہیں کوئی غلطی رہی ہے تو گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا اور ایجوکیشن منسٹر نے اس بات کی کوشش کی ہے کہ اس کو چھپایا جائے۔

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No responsible person has questioned that. No institution has questioned it.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Papers.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: Papers of Aligarh.

اس پروپیگنڈا کے سلسلہ میں میں نے اس ہاوس میں یہ سوال کیا تھا کہ کیا یہ صحیح ہے یا صحیح نہیں ہے کہ ایجوکیشن منسٹری کے کچھ لوگ اس پروپیگنڈا میں شریک ہیں۔

تو میں یہ کہہ رہا تھا کہ جہاں تک گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کے رویہ کا سوال

ہے گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کا رویہ ہمیشہ یہ رہا ہے کہ اس یونیورسٹی کے ساتھ اچھا سلوک کیا جائے، اس کو زیادہ سے زیادہ پیسہ دیا جائے اور جہاں تک ہوسکے اس کو ترقی کی جائے۔ میں نے یہ بھی ابھی عرض کیا کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا نے اور ایجوکیشن منسٹری نے ہمیشہ جو کوئی بھی کمزوریاں آئیں ان کو چھپانے کی کوشش کی۔ اس سلسلہ میں میں نے اس سیشن میں ۲۱ اگست سنہ ۱۹۶۱ کے لئے ایک سوال پوچھا تھا جس میں میں نے یہ دریافت کیا تھا کہ طلبہ کالج علیگندہ کے پرنسپل جو ہیں ان کی نوکری میں کیا توسیع کر دی گئی ہے۔ تو اس کا جواب مجھے یہ ملا۔

“Your question mentioned above has been disallowed on the ground that it relates to a matter under the control of a body not primarily responsible to the Government of India.”

بہر حال اب سوال اس بات کا ہے کہ جو خبریں شائع ہوئیں اور جو الزامات اس یونیورسٹی پر لگائے گئے وہ کس حد تک صحیح ہیں اور کس حد تک غلط ہیں۔ بہت سے الزامات بے بنیاد بھی لگائے گئے جیسے کہ ہم نے دیکھا کہ پچھلی مرتبہ جب لوگ سبھا میں قیادت ہوا تو پتہ چلا کہ بہت سے الزامات بالکل بے بنیاد تھے۔ اس رپورٹ کو اس نظریہ سے ضرور دیکھنا ہے کہ جو خرابیاں اس یونیورسٹی میں ہیں یا رپورٹ میں جو خرابیاں

بتائی گئی ہیں ان کا سدھار کیسے ہو سکتا ہے۔ کسی سیاسی عقیدہ سے یا کسی کے مذہبی عقیدہ سے میرا بالکل مطلب نہیں ہے۔ چاہے کوئی جماعت اسلامی کا ممبر ہو، چاہے کوئی کمیونسٹ پارٹی کا ممبر ہو، مجھے اس سے کوئی مطلب نہیں ہے۔

4 P.M.

میں یہ ضرور چاہوں گا کہ جہاں تک ان کا یونیورسٹی کا کام ہے یعنی تعلیم دینے کا، تربیت دینے کا، وہ تھکانے سے ہو۔ تعلیم اور تربیت کے سلسلہ میں نہ تو سیاست بیچ میں آوے اور نہ مذہب بیچ میں آوے۔ میں یہ نہیں چاہوں گا کہ سیاست کے ذریعہ سے وہاں گت بندی کی جائے۔ میں یہ نہیں چاہوں گا کہ مذہب کی بنا پر وہاں کسی جماعت کی ترقی کی جائے۔ نہ تو میں وہاں مادی گت بندی چاہتا ہوں اور نہ میں وہاں دوسری گت بندی چاہتا ہوں۔

ڈاکٹر راج بہادر گور : ایسا ہو گا تو لڑکے تھکانے لگ جائیں گے۔

شری فرید الحق انصاری : لگ ہی

رہے ہیں۔ یہی تو شکایت پیدا ہو گئی ہے اور اسی وجہ سے گورنر ہے۔ میں تو چاہوں گا کہ وہاں کے جو چیئرمین ہیں ان کی تقرری اس نظریہ سے ہو جو کہ یونیورسٹی گرانٹس کمیشن نے بنایا ہے اور جو وہاں کا اسٹیٹوٹ ہے اس کے مطابق ہو۔ کسی طرفداری کی بنیاد پر نہ ہو۔

[شری فرید الحق انصاری :-]

میں نے آپ سے عرض کیا کہ چند شکایتیں ضرور ایسی ہیں جن کی کہ بنیاد ہے - آپ کو یاد ہوگا کہ اسی ہاؤس میں میں نے وائس چانسلر کے مکان کے متعلق سوال کیا تھا کہ کیا وجہ ہے کہ اس کا پہلا اسٹیمپت تیس ہزار روپیہ کا ہوا اس کے بعد پھر ۸۱۸۰۰ روپیہ کا ہوا اور اس کے بعد ایک لاکھ چوبیس ہزار دو سو آٹھ روپیہ کا ہوا - پھر یہاں جو جواب دیا گیا وہ دیا گیا - میں نے باہر بھی اچھے پارلیمنٹ کے ممبروں سے اس کا ذکر کیا اور دوسرے لوگوں سے بھی ذکر کیا تو انہوں نے کہا کہ مسلم یونیورسٹی میں چونکہ باہر کے دنیا کے بڑے بڑے لوگ آتے ہیں اس لئے اتنا بڑا عالی شان عمارت اور آرام دہ مکان بنانے کی ضرورت ہے - مجھے تعجب ہوتا ہے صرف مسلم یونیورسٹی علیگڑھ ہی ایک ایسی یونیورسٹی ہندوستان میں ہے جہاں کہ بڑے بڑے لوگ دنیا کے آتے ہیں - لکھنؤ یونیورسٹی بھی ، بنارس یونیورسٹی بھی ہے ، الہ آباد یونیورسٹی بھی ہے جہاں کہ بڑے بڑے لوگ آتے ہیں - لکھنؤ اور بنارس یونیورسٹی کا مہرا تجربہ ہے - یہاں کا وائس چانسلر جو تھا وہ ایک کدوہ میں رہتا تھا اور اس میں صرف اس کی چارپائی اور ایک میز دھتی تھی اور اس پر ہی دیو دیوی فائلیں پڑی دھتی تھیں - ایک کرسی رکھی ہوتی تھی - ایک دری بھی وہاں نہیں دھتی تھی -

ڈاکٹر راج بہادر گور :- یہاں اسٹینڈرڈ

ہوٹل ہیں جہاں کہ لوگ ٹھہر سکتے ہیں -

شری فرید الحق انصاری :- جی ہاں

بنارس میں ضرور ایئر کنڈیشنڈ ہوٹل ہیں -

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सक्सेना : बनारस के वाइस-चांसलर का बंगला बहुत अच्छा है ।

شری فرید الحق انصاری :- تو کیا

باہر کے لوگ آویں تو اتنا بڑا مکان بنایا جائے - اور اس کے سلسلہ میں اتنا پیسے کا خرچ کیا جائے ؟

اب آپ دیکھئے کہ وائس چانسلر کے مکان کے سلسلہ میں اس رپورٹ میں پیج ۶۶ پر پیرا ۲۴ میں چیف ٹیکنیکل یگز امینڈ کی رپورٹ میں اسکے متعلق یہ کہا گیا ہے —

“Similarly, the Chief Technical Examiner has drawn pointed attention to several irregularities in the maintenance of such vital and basic records as measurement books. In the case of the Vice-Chancellor's house, entries made in the measurement books have been rendered unreliable in consequence of accepted procedures not having been followed. This, in our opinion, is a very serious matter and one which should receive urgent attention of the authorities concerned in the University . . .”.

دوسری بلڈنگیں جن کے متعلق اس میں ذکر ہے ان میں سے ایک انجینئرنگ کالج کی بلڈنگ ہے اس کے متعلق بھی اس رپورٹ ۷ پیج ۶۵ پر پیرا ۲۳ میں لکھا ہے —

“In the case of the Engineering College Building, in particular, the Chief Technical Examiner had to

make an evaluation of the work done by actually recording.... detailed measurement.... The University authorities had expressed their total inability to produce such basic record as detailed drawings and designs and estimates adopted for execution of work on the plea that their Engineers had failed to maintain such records."

پھر اس سلسلہ میں اس رپورٹ کی فائنلنگس جو ہیں وہ پیج ۶۷ پر پیرا ۲۷ اور ۲۸ میں ہیں۔ اس سے پتہ چلتا ہے کہ جہان تک بلڈنگوں کا سوال ہے اس میں بہت سی اریگولیریٹیز ہوئی ہیں اور اس کی ضرورت ہے کہ یا تو یونیورسٹی اس کی جانچ پڑتال کر کے اس کو سدھارے اور اگر یونیورسٹی اس کو نہیں سدھار سکتی ہے تو گورنمنٹ اس بات کی کوشش کرے کہ وہ اس کو سدھارے۔

دوسرا معاملہ جو کہ رپورٹ میں تعجب خیز ہے وہ ریکورڈنگس اور ایوانیٹیمینٹس اور پروموشنس کا ہے۔ اس کے متعلق جو طریقہ استعمال کیا گیا وہ کچھ ایسا نہیں ہے جو کہ کسی کی تسکین اور تشفی کر سکے۔ اس رپورٹ کو پڑھنے کے بعد اگر کوئی شخص اس نتیجہ پر پہنچتا ہے کہ یونیورسٹی میں جتنی تقرریاں ہوئی ہیں وہ غیر جانبدارانہ بنیاد پر ہوئی ہیں تو مجھے کچھ نہیں کہنا ہے۔ مگر اس رپورٹ کے پیج ۸۰ پر پیرا ۱۳-۱۴ اور ۱۵ کو پڑھنے سے پتہ چلتا ہے کہ ایسا نہیں ہوا ہے۔ میرے ایک دوست نے یہاں ذکر کیا کہ جہاں تک

ایوانیٹیمینٹس اور سلیکشن کا سوال ہے وہاں اس سلسلہ میں وائس چانسلر اور پروفیسر وائس چانسلر میں آپس میں ہمیشہ اختلاف رہا ہے۔ اگر یہ اختلاف ایمانداری اور دیانتداری کی بنیاد پر رہا ہے تو ہم کو اس کی کوئی شکایت نہیں کرنی چاہئیے اور کوئی اعتراض نہیں کرنا چاہئیے۔ ہاں اگر دونوں نے طرفداری کی بنیاد پر اختلاف کیا ہے تو ضرور ہمیں شکایت ہونی چاہئیے اور یہ بری بات ہے۔ لیکن اگر ان میں سے ایک بھی ان تقرریوں کے وقت جو میٹھا تقرری کا ہونا چاہئیے اس پر اڑا رہا تو اس کی تعریف کی بات ہے اور جو دوسرا اڑا نہیں رہا ہے اس کی غلطی ہے۔ اس سلسلہ میں جو ڈپٹی رجسٹرار اور اکاؤنٹ کلرک کی تقرری کی بات ہے اس کا میں ذکر کرونگا۔ ابھی ایک رپورٹ ہمیں ملی ہے اس میں اس کے متعلق ہے۔ وہ رپورٹ یہ ہے۔

"Remarks of the University on the Report of its Committee of Enquiry".

اس میں اس کے متعلق جو وجوہات دی ہیں اس سے مجھے کوئی تشفی نہیں ہوئی ہے۔ رپورٹ کے پیج ۸۴ کو دیکھئے۔ رپورٹ کے پیج ۸۴ پر پیرا ۲۹ میں لکھا ہے۔

"The incumbent of this post was formerly employed in the office of the District Judge, Badaun, and was dismissed from service for the theft of some original depositions from the file of a sessions trial"

[شری فرید الحق انصاری -]

آخر میں جو مجھے کہنا ہے وہ
طبیہ کالج کے متعلق کہنا ہے - طبیہ
کالج کے متعلق بہت سی شکایتیں
آئی ہیں - طبیہ کالج کے متعلق
اس رپورٹ میں بھی ذکر ہے اور جو
کچھ شکایات طبیہ کالج کے متعلق آئی
ہیں ان سے وائس چانسلر نے انکار
نہیں کیا ہے - اس میں لکھا ہوا
ہے -

"No denial of the charges made
by them has come to us from any
official source. We are, therefore,
constrained to believe that there is
substantial truth in these charges."

اس سلسلہ میں طبیہ کالج کے جو
پرنسپل ہیں ان کی بابت میرے
پاس وہاں کے جو پرانے اسٹوڈنٹ تھے
انہوں نے درخواست دی جس میں
انہوں نے لکھا کہ پچھلے سال جب ان
کی سروس ختم ہوئی تب انہوں نے
ایک افہرقتیوت یہ دیا کہ ہمارا جو
پرانہ افہرقتیوت عمر کے بارہ میں تھا
جب ہم نوکر ہوئے وہ غلط ہے اس کی
بدا پر ان کی ایک سال تک اور تقرری
ہوئی - اس کے بعد پھر ان کی
سروسز کے ایکسٹینشن کا سوال آیا
تو وہاں طبیہ کالج میں جو خرابیاں
تھیں ، جو فیورٹیزم تھا ، جس طرح
سے دواخانہ کی کم درائیں زیادہ
قیمت پر بیچی جاتی تھیں ، ان
سب کی بنیاد پر وہاں کے اسٹوڈنٹس
نے ایچی ٹیشن کیا - کے سلسلہ
میں بھوک ہڑتال کی اور بھوک
ہڑتال میں وہاں کے بڑے بڑے لوگ
ایگزیکٹو کونسل کے ممبر بڑے

اور کہا کہ تم اس کو ختم کرو تو اس
معاملہ کو طے کر دیں گے - جب وہ
بھوک ہڑتال ختم ہو گئی تو پھر ان
کا تین مہینے کے لئے سروس میں
ایکسٹینشن ہو گیا -

اس لئے میں یہ عرض کروں گا کہ کم
سے کم وہ چیز جو لوگوں نے انکوائری
کمیٹی کے سامنے رکھی ہے ضرور اس کو
پڑھئے - اس میں اتنے مکروہ الزامات
لگائے گئے ہیں پرنسپل کے متعلق
جس کا کوئی گھکانہ نہیں ہے - اس
آدمی کے اوپر جو الزامات لگائے گئے
ہیں وہ بالکل بجا ہیں اور ایسے ہیں
جو میں ہاوس کے سامنے کہہ نہیں
سکتا ہوں - اس لئے میں درخواست
کروں گا کہ اس روشنی میں اس رپورٹ
کا دیکھا جائے - گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا
اس یونیورسٹی کے ساتھ کوئی خاص
ڈسکریملینیشن کا برتاؤ نہ کرے بلکہ
بنارس یونیورسٹی اور علیگندہ
یونیورسٹی دونوں کو ایک نظر سے
دیکھے و جو سدھار بنارس یونیورسٹی
میں کرتی ہے وہی سدھار علیگندہ
یونیورسٹی میں کرے تو کوئی وجہ
نہیں ہے کہ اس کی حالت سدھار نہ
جائے - اور میں یہی چاہوں گا کہ یہ
یونیورسٹی جسکو سر سید مرحوم نے
جس بنا پر بنایا تھا اس کے لئے
جو تقاضا آج آزاد ہندوستان کا ہے اس
کے مطابق یہ کام کرے - تب ہی یہ
پہلے پہلے کی نہیں تو نہیں

श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मिस्टर डिप्टी चैयरमैन, इस रिपोर्ट के ऊपर जिस तरह से बहस हो रही है मेरा ख्याल है कि हमें इससे ऊंचा उठना पड़ेगा। मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि मैं जहां इस मामले के ऊपर अपने ख्यालात का इजहार करना चाहता हूं वहां मैं यह भी बता देना चाहता हूं कि मेरे ताल्लुक़ात इस इंस्टीट्यूशन से बहुत पुराने रहे हैं। मैं इस इंस्टीट्यूशन का पुराना स्टूडेंट होने की हैसियत से जो कुछ कहूंगा वह एक खास नज़रिये से कहूंगा और ज़ाहिर है कि मेरा नज़रिया और स्वादिष्ट यही होगी कि इस इंस्टीट्यूशन की तरक्की हो, इसको अच्छी तरह से चलाया जाय। हर उस बख्स को जो आज़ाद हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की चाहता है और जो यह चाहता है कि आज़ाद हिन्दुस्तान के नौजवानों की तालीम व तरबियत ऊंचे मैयार की हो उसका नज़रिया यही होगा कि इस इदारा की फल्लाह व बहवूदी हो।

एक अजीब बात है कि अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी के जिन मामलात के मुताल्लिक यह एंक्वारी कमेटी बैठाई गई थी उन मामलात का ज्यादातर ताल्लुक पुराने वाइस चांसलर से है। मौजूदा वाइस चांसलर बेचारे की बदकिस्मती है कि वह इसका शिकार हो गया। हां, उसकी यह ज़रूर कमी और गलती है कि उसने इन मामलात को खत्म करने के लिये, उनको सुधारने की कोशिश नहीं की।

अब हमको इस रिपोर्ट को इस नज़रिये से देखना है कि इस कमेटी ने जो रिपोर्ट पेश की है वह इमानदाराना, दयानतदाराना वाकयात पर मबनी है या किसी जज्वात पर मबनी है। जैसा कि डाक्टर गौड़ ने कहा मुझे भी यह कहने में उज़र नहीं है कि यह रिपोर्ट दयानतदारी और ईसाफ पर मबनी है। और जो वाकयात एंक्वारी कमेटी के

मेम्बरान के सामने आये उनकी जांच पड़ताल करके उन्होंने यह रिपोर्ट दिया। दो एक बातें अलबत्ता आनरेबल एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर से जानना चाहूंगा। डाक्टर गौड़ ने इसको बयान करने की कोशिश की लेकिन उससे मेरी तसल्ली नहीं हुई कि जब एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर ने विजिटर्स की एंक्वारी कमेटी बिठाने का इरादा किया और फैसला किया तो क्या ऐसी वजह आ गई कि वाइस/चांसलर के कहने से दूसरी कमेटी मुक़र्रर कर दी गयी। दूसरे यह कि जिन हज़रात के नाम वाइस चांसलर के कहने पर एंक्वायरी कमेटी में रखे गये वह निहायत काबिल आलिम फ़ाज़िल लोग थे जिनको माहिर तालीम कहा जा सकता था। फिर क्या ज़रूरत पड़ गई कि बाद में दो नाम और इसमें बढ़ा दिये गये। यह मैं समझ नहीं पाया हूं।

बहरहाल एंक्वायरी कमेटी बनने के बाद एक खास चीखोपुकार हुई। अखबारों में बहुत काफ़ी प्रोपेगंडा हुआ, और मुझे अफ़सोस है कि इस सिलसिला में जो प्रोपेगंडा हुआ वह निहायत ही नाज़ेबा प्रोपेगंडा हुआ। बाज़ अखबारों में एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर पर हमला किया गया कि चूंकि वह हिन्दू है इसलिये उन्होंने एंक्वायरी कमेटी बिठाई है हालांकि यह बिल्कुल ग़लत है और मैं यह दावे के साथ कह सकता हूं कि एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर का रवैया और गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया का रवैया जहां तक कि मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी का मामला है बिल्कुल ग़ैर-जानिबदाराना रहा है। उन्होंने हमेशा आगे बढ़ कर हर तरीके पर मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी की मदद करनी चाही है और वहां के मामलात को सुधारना चाहा है। अगर कहीं कोई ग़लती रही है तो गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया और एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर ने इस बात की कोशिश की है कि उसको पाया जाये।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No responsible person has questioned that. No institution has questioned it.

Dr. K. L. SHRIMALI: Papers.

श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी : Papers of Aligarh. इस प्रोपेगंडा के सिलसिले में मैंने इस हाउस में यह सवाल किया था कि क्या यह सही है कि नहीं सही है कि एजुकेशन मिनिस्टरी के कुछ लोग इस प्रोपेगंडा में शरीक हैं ।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि जहां तक गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया का रवैया का सवाल है गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया का रवैया हमेशा यह रहा है कि इस यूनिवर्सिटी के साथ अच्छा सलूक किया जाये । इसको ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैसा दिया जाये और जहां तक हो सके इसकी तरक्की की जाये । मैंने यह भी अभी अर्ज किया कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने और एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री ने जो कोई भी कमजोरियां आईं उनको छिपाने की कोशिश की । इस मिलमिला में मैंने इस सेशन में २१ अगस्त, सन १९६१ के लिये एक सवाल पूछा था जिसमें मैंने यह दरियाफ्त किया था कि तिब्बिया कालेज, अलीगढ़ के प्रिंसिपल जो हैं उनकी नौकरी में क्या तौसीह कर दी गई है । तो उसका जबाब मुझे यह मिला :

“Your question mentioned above has been disallowed on the ground that it relates to a matter under the control of a body not primarily responsible to the Government of India.”

बहरहाल अब सवाल इस बात का है कि जो खबरे शायी हुईं और जो इल्जामात इस यूनिवर्सिटी पर लगाये गये वह किस हद तक सही हैं और किस हद तक गलत हैं । बहुत से इल्जामात बेबुनियाद भी लगाये गये जैसा कि हमने देखा कि फिद्दीनी मर्तबा जब लोक सभा में डिबेट हुआ तो पता चला कि बहुत से इल्जामात बिल्कुल बेबुनियाद थे । इस रिपोर्ट को इस नज़रिया से जरूर

देखना है कि जो खराबियां इस यूनिवर्सिटी में हैं या इस रिपोर्ट में हैं जो खराबियां दनाई गई हैं उनका सुधार कैसे हो सकता है । किसी मियासी अकीदा से या किसी के मजहबी अकीदा से मेरा बिल्कुल मतलब नहीं है । चाहे कोई जमात-ए-इस्लामी का मेम्बर हो चाहे कोई कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का मेम्बर हो मुझे इससे कोई मतलब नहीं है ।

मैं यह जरूर चाहूंगा कि जहां तक इनका यूनिवर्सिटी का काम है यानी तालीम देने का, तरबियत देने का वह ठिकाने से हो । तालीम और तरबियत के सिलसिले में न तो सियासत बीच में आवे और न मजहब बीच में आवे । मैं यह नहीं चाहूंगा कि सियासत के जरिये से वहां गुटबन्दी की जाय । मैं यह नहीं चाहूंगा कि मजहब के बिना पर वहां किसी जमाअत की तरक्की की जाये । न तो मैं वहां मादी गुटबन्दी चाहता हूं और न मैं वहां दूसरी गुटबन्दी चाहता हूं ।

डाक्टर राज बहादुर गौड़ : ऐसा होगा तो लड़के ठिकाने लग जायेंगे ।

श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी : लग ही रहे हैं । यही तो जिकायत पैदा हो गई है और इसी वजह से गड़बड़ है । मैं तो चाहूंगा कि वहां के जो टीचर्स हैं उनकी तकररी इस नज़रिया से हो जो कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने बनाया है और जो वहां का स्टैट्यूट है । उसके मुताबिक हो । किसी तरफ़दारी की बुनियाद पर न हो ।

मैंने आपसे अर्ज किया कि चन्द शिकायतें जरूर ऐसी हैं जिनकी कि बुनियाद है । आपको याद होगा कि इसी हाउस में मैंने वाइस चांसलर के मकान के मुतल्लिक सवाल किया था कि क्या वजह है कि इसका पहला एंटीमेंट तीस हजार रुपये का हुआ उसके बाद फिर ८१ हजार ८०० रुपये का हुआ । और उसके बाद १ लाख २४ हजार २०८ रुपये का हुआ । खैर यहां जो

जराब दिया गया वह दिया गया । मैंने बाहर भी अपने पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों से इसका जिक्र किया और दूसरे लोगों से भी जिक्र किया तो उन्होंने कहा कि मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी में चूक बाहर के दुनिया के बड़े बड़े लोग आते हैं इसलिये इतना बड़ा आलीशान, उम्दा और आरामदेह मकान बनाने की जरूरत है । मुझे ताजुब होता है सिर्फ मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी, अलीगढ़ ही एक ऐसी युनिवर्सिटी हिन्दुस्तान में है जहां कि बड़े बड़े लोग दुनिया के आते हैं ? लखनऊ युनिवर्सिटी भी, बनारस युनिवर्सिटी भी है, इलाहाबाद युनिवर्सिटी भी है जहां कि बड़े बड़े लोग आते हैं । लखनऊ और बनारस युनिवर्सिटी का मेरा तजर्बा है । यहां का वाइस चांसलर जो है वह एक कमरे में रहता था और उसने सिर्फ उसकी चारपाई और एक मेज रहती थी और उस पर ही दबी हुई फाइलें पड़ी रहती थी । एक कुर्सी रखी होती थी । एक दूरी भी वहां नहीं रहती थी ।

डाक्टर राज बहादुर गौड़ : वहां स्टैंडर्ड होटल है जहां कि लोग ठहर सकते हैं ।

श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी : जी हां, बनारस में जरूर एअर कन्डीशन होटल है ।

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू : बनारस के वाइस चांसलर का बंगला बहुत अच्छा है ।

श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी : तो क्या बाहर के लोग आये तो इतना बड़ा मकान बनाया जाये और उसके सिलसिले में इतना पैसा खर्च किया जाये ।

अब आप देखिये कि वाइस चांसलर के मकान के सिलसिले में इस रिपोर्ट में पेज ६६ पर पैरा २४ में चीफ टेक्नीकल एक्जामिनर की रिपोर्ट में इस के मुताल्लिक यह कहा गया है :

“Similarly, the Chief Technical Examiner has drawn pointed attention to several irregularities in the maintenance of such vital and basic records as measurement books. In the case of the Vice-Chancellor's house, entries made in the measurement books have been rendered unreliable in consequence of accepted procedures not having been followed. This, in our opinion, is a very serious matter and one which should receive urgent attention of the authorities concerned in the University . . .”

दूसरी बिल्डिंगें जिनके मुताल्लिक इसमें जिक्र है उनमें से एक इंजीनियरिंग कालेज की बिल्डिंग है उसके मुताल्लिक भी इस रिपोर्ट के पेज ६५ पर पैरा २३ में लिखा है :

‘In the case of the Engineering College Building, in particular, the Chief Technical Examiner had to make an evaluation of the work done by actually recording . . . detailed measurement . . . The University authorities had expressed their total inability to produce such basic record as detailed drawings and designs and estimates adopted for execution of work on the plea that their Engineers had failed to maintain such records.’

फिर इस सिलसिले में इस रिपोर्ट की फाइलिंग्स जो हैं वह पेज ६७ और पैरा २७ और २८ में हैं । इससे पता चलता है कि जहां तक बिल्डिंगों का मवाल है उनमें बहुत सी डरेग्यूलैरिटीज हुई हैं और उसकी जरूरत है कि या तो युनिवर्सिटी उसकी जांच पड़ताल करके उसको सुधारे और अगर युनिवर्सिटी उसको नहीं सुधार सकती है तो गवर्नमेंट इस बात की कोशिश करे कि वह उसको सुधारे ।

दूसरा मामला जो कि रिपोर्ट में ताजुब-खेज है वह रेक्यूमेंट, एपाइन्टमेंट्स और प्रमोशन्स का है । उसके मुताल्लिक जो तरीका इस्तेमाल किया गया वह कुछ ऐसा

[श्री फरदुल हक अनसारी]

नहीं है जो कि किसी की तस्क्रीन और तशफ्फी कर सके। इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ने के बाद अगर कोई ग़रुस इस नतीजे पर पहुँचता है कि युनिवर्सिटी में जितनी तकररियाँ हुई हैं वह ग़ैर जानिवदाराणा बुनियाद पर हुई हैं तो मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है। मगर इस रिपोर्ट के पेज ८० पर पैरा १३, १४ और १५ को पढ़ने से पता चलता है कि ऐसा नहीं हुआ है। मेरे एक दोस्त ने यहां जिक्र किया कि जहां तक एपाइन्टमेंट्स और सेलैक्शन का सवाल है वहां इस सिलसिले में वाइस चांसलर और प्रोवाइस चांसलर में आपस में हमेशा इख्तिलाफ़ रहा है। अगर यह इख्तिलाफ़ ईमानदारी और दयानतदारी की बुनियाद पर रहा है तो हमको उसकी कोई शिकायत नहीं करनी चाहिये और कोई एतराज नहीं करनी चाहिये। हां, अगर दोनों ने तरफ़दारी की बुनियाद पर इख्तिलाफ़ किया है तो जरूर हमें शिकायत होनी चाहिये और यह बुरी बात है। लेकिन अगर उनमें से एक भी उन तकररियों के वक्त जो मेयार तकररी का होना चाहिये उस पर अड़ा रहा तो उसकी तारीफ़ की बात है और जो दूसरा अड़ा नहीं रहा है उसकी ग़लती है : इस सिलसिले में जो डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार और अकाउन्ट्स क्लर्क की तकररी की बात है उसका मैं जिक्र करूंगा। अभी एक रिपोर्ट हमें मिली है इसमें उसके मुतल्लिक है। वह रिपोर्ट यह है :

“Remarks of the University on the Report of its Committee of Enquiry.”

जहां इसमें उसके मुतल्लिक जो वजूहात दी हैं उससे मुझे कोई तशफ्फी नहीं हुई है। रिपोर्ट के पेज ८४ को देखिये। रिपोर्ट के पेज ८४ पर पैरा २६ में लिखा है

“The incumbent of this post was formerly employed in the office of the District Judge, Badaun, and was dismissed from service for the theft of some original depositions from the file of a sessions trial...”

आखिर में जो मुझे कहना है वह तिब्बिया कालेज के मुतल्लिक कहना है। तिब्बिया कालेज के मुतल्लिक बहुत सी शिकायतें आई हैं। तिब्बिया कालेज के मुतल्लिक इस रिपोर्ट में भी जिक्र है और जो कुछ शिकायत तिब्बिया कालेज के मुतल्लिक आई हैं उनसे वाइस चांसलर ने इनकार नहीं किया है। उसमें लिखा हुआ है :

“No denial of the charges made by them has come to us from any official source. We are, therefore, constrained to believe that there is substantial truth in these charges.”

इस सिलसिले में तिब्बिया कालेज के जो प्रिंसिपल हैं उनकी बाबत मेरे पास वहां के जो पुराने स्टूडेंट थे उन्होंने दरखास्त दी जिसमें उन्होंने लिखा कि पिछले माल जब उनकी सर्विस खत्म हुई तब उन्होंने एक एफीडेविट यह दिया कि हमारा जो पुराना एफीडेविट अफ़ के बारे में था जब हम नौकर हुये थे वह ग़लत है। इसकी बिना पर उनकी एक साल तक और तकररी हुई। इसके बाद फिर उनकी सर्विसेज के एक्सटेंशन का मजाल आया तो वहां तिब्बिया कालेज में जो खराबियाँ थीं जो फ़ेवरिटिज्म था जिस तरह से दवाखाना की कम दवाएं ज्यादा कीमत पर बेची जाती थीं उन सबकी बुनियाद पर वहां के स्टूडेंट्स ने एजीटेशन किया। इसके सिलसिले में भूख हड़ताल की और भूख हड़ताल में वहां के बड़े बड़े लोग एक्जैक्यूटिव कौंसिल के मेम्बर पड़े और कहा कि तुम इसकी खत्म करो तो इस मामला को तय कर देंगे जब वह भूख हड़ताल खत्म हो गई तो फिर उनका तीन महीने के लिये सर्विस में एक्सटेंशन हो गया।

इसलिये मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि कम से कम वह चीज जो लडकों ने ऐक्वायरी कमेटी के सामने रखी है जरूर उसको पढ़िये। उसमें इतने इल्जामात लगाये गये हैं प्रिंसिपल के मुतल्लिक जिसका कि कोई ठिकाना नहीं

है। उस आदमी के ऊपर जो इल्जामात लगाये गये हैं वह बिल्कुल बजा हैं और ऐसे हैं जो मैं हाउस के सामने कह नहीं सकता हूँ। इसलिये मैं दरखास्त करूंगा कि इस रोशनी में इस रिपोर्ट को देखा जाये। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया इस युनिवर्सिटी के साथ कोई खास डिमिक्विमेशन का बर्ताव न करे बल्कि बनारस युनिवर्सिटी और अलीगढ़ युनिवर्सिटी दोनों को एक नजर से देखे और जो सुधार बनारस युनिवर्सिटी में करती है वही सुधार अलीगढ़ युनिवर्सिटी में करे तो कोई बजह नहीं है कि उसकी हालत सुधर न जाये और मैं यही चाहूंगा कि यह युनिवर्सिटी जिसको सर सैयद मर्हूम ने जिस बुनियाद पर बनाया था उसके लिये जो तकाजा आज आजाद हिन्दुस्तान का है उसके मुताबिक यह काम करे। तब ही यह फले फूलेगी नहीं तो नहीं।]

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a little embarrassing for me to speak on this Resolution. I joined the Committee rather late and I did so with the greatest possible reluctance. I did so on the assurance that the Minister of Education wanted me to be there. Personally, I have a sort of feeling that the best thing perhaps in the circumstances would have been to have a Visitor's Committee from the very beginning. But this does not mean that this Committee has not done good work and credit is due in a large measure for the good work that it has done, to our distinguished Chairman, Mr. G. C. Chatterji, and our very efficient Joint Secretary, Mr. B. N. Malhan.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, reference has been made to the fact that the Vice-Chancellor participated in the meetings, of the Committee. Under the University's Act, it was not within our power to prevent the Vice-Chancellor from functioning in the Committee. He did not participate at the deliberative stage. He was there to question, with the permission of

the Chairman, the witnesses who were coming before us. It was not within our power to prevent the Vice-Chancellor from functioning in that capacity. Apart from that, there is the principle of natural justice which I venture to suggest, all enquiry committees must observe. Professor Wheare, in a monumental book that he has written—"Government by Committees"—has referred to this principle. And it is this, that you cannot deny to a person in the position of the accused, a person in the position of the defendant, an opportunity to defend himself and to put forward his case. Now, it would have been impossible for us to test the veracity of any witness if we did not know all about him and what we did was to look into every memorandum which was placed before us and which was supported by documents. Mr. Malhan and Mr. Naik went through these memoranda very carefully and I can assure the House that every possible step was taken to verify facts supplied to us anonymously, but supported by memoranda.

Next I would like to say one or two words about the financial mess in which the University found itself. That financial mess dates from the year 1950. There was certainly negligence on the part of the University. Certainly gross irregularities were committed by the University. Culpable negligence was shown by the University and audit reports were not considered or not replied to with that seriousness which the audit authorities had a right to expect, which the public had a right to expect from the University. Certainly, there were other irregularities. Some embezzlements also had taken place. But you have to view the whole thing in a proper perspective. These things happened just after the partition, more or less, or say a few years after the partition, and for some of them the present Vice-Chancellor is not responsible. Whatever be his fault he may be a businessman, just as my hon. friend, Mr. Patel, is a

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

businessman, and the present Vice-Chancellor is a Cambridge graduate, I don't know whether Mr. Patel is a Cambridge graduate—the present Vice-Chancellor, whatever his fault, is not responsible for them. The responsibility for that has to be fixed, if responsibility must be fixed, upon someone who occupies an **exalted** position. Of course, he is a man of great eminence in the world of education; but men of eminence in the world of education do not always make good administrators. I venture to differ in this matter from my respected friend, Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar.

Next I come to the question of the building operations. Of course, I could quote from the passages here with regard to financial irregularities. I do not wish to minimise the importance of those financial irregularities and I also say this, that the University never seriously applied its mind to the question of supplying the Audit Officers with answers. It was only after we started functioning that the University began to apply its mind seriously to the question of audit objections.

Now I come to the question of the buildings. Serious objections and serious allegations were made with regard to the buildings which were purchased by the University. The Government of India placed at our disposal an officer—a Chief Engineer of exceptional ability—Mr. Selvam. He went through the matter very carefully. He submitted to us a report which will be found in the appendices to the Report. The general conclusion to which he came was that the prices paid were not unreasonable. He made a number of comments with regard to various matters of a detailed character. I am glad that attention was invited to some of those comments by Mr. Ansari. But the general conclusion to which he

came was that the prices paid were not unreasonable.

There was the question of the purchase of the land of Begum A. M. Khwaja. The view of the technical examiner was that the price paid was not unreasonable, and he is an authority on the matter. We referred the matter to the Land Acquisition Officer and Mr. Malhan himself went to find out from the Land Acquisition Officer whether the price paid was, in his opinion, not proper, because we had been told that some lands neighbouring that area had been sold for a lower rate. But the consistent view taken by these authorities was that the price paid was not unreasonable. On that evidence, I venture to assert that no body of honest men would have come to any conclusion different from what we have come to. May I also say this? We have not spared Mr. Khwaja. We have commented on the fact that it was improper for him to be present at the meeting at which the affairs relating to the land owned by his wife were being discussed. I am surprised, I am astonished at the stupidity of the University Executive Council. The University Executive Council has not cared to understand the ethical implications of the principle which we have laid down. They have dismissed our report with scant courtesy. I do not know whether Dr. Wadia had any letter of thanks but I have had no letter of thanks for the work that I did as a Member of the Committee. I think the Executive Council has tried in the memorandum that it has submitted, to enter into arguments with us. It has tried to refute almost everything that we said. Take for example the question of the recruitment of staff. Certainly some of the members of the staff were not recruited in the proper manner. We have pointed out that there is some interceding in the university but we have also said that we cannot say on the material before us whether there was some influence brought by relatives or not. There was a particular case to which we have made

reference. That relates to an appointment in the History Department and the stand taken by the Executive Council differed at different times. At one time the matter was not put before the Executive Council because the Academic Council had discovered that it had never authorised the Vice-Chancellor to appoint a particular person as a member of the Selection Committee. At another time, fortified by the opinion of an eminent Member of Parliament, Mr. Pathak, and an eminent Judge of the Madras High Court, it took the line that the constitution of the Selection Committee itself was illegal because powers could not be delegated by the Selection Committee to the Vice-Chancellor. The legal position taken by them was absolutely a sound one but the manner in which the whole thing was done was absolutely dishonest and I use the word deliberately because in some other cases before and after this case, that principle of delegated authority was ignored. We have considered the question of the emergency powers of the Vice-Chancellor. Certainly there has been excessive use of those powers. I have not associated myself with the views of the majority in this matter because I have not been able to work out the percentages but I am prepared to say that the use of those emergency powers was in many cases unnecessary and my view is that we should have some objective tests whether the law . . . (*Interruptions.*) The law in regard to this matter requires a change.

I would say a word about the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. I am sorry to differ in this matter from my respected friend, Dr. Kunzru. I do not know what his experience of the Banaras University is but I am putting it purely on theoretical grounds. I have no prejudices for or against the present Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the Aligarh Muslim University. I have read some of his books. They are scholarly productions. But I think it is unwise from an administrative point of view to have two heads.

Dyarchy does not work. It did not work in this country and it does not work in the Aligarh University and it will not work anywhere. Therefore, while conscious of the fact that the Vice-Chancellor needs assistance, we have said that the position of the man who assists him should definitely be subordinate to him, namely, he should have the rank of a Rector or Dean of Administration. I would like this principle to be accepted for all Universities. I was perhaps the most vehement critic of this Pro-Vice-Chancellorship and I do not regret having taken the line that the institution of Pro-Vice-Chancellorship is not desirable in the interests of University administration. Of course, the University is very angry with us for making this suggestion. We have suggested that there should be a Dean of Students' Welfare. They have turned down this suggestion. I think the University's duty is towards its students and I should have thought that the Aligarh Muslim University, which claims to be the premier Muslim University in the world, would have welcomed a suggestion which would enable teachers to be in touch with their students. Therefore, I attach very great importance to this post of Dean of Students' Welfare. We have suggested some changes in the composition of the Selection Committee. We have suggested that the U.G.C. should be brought in, that the panel for selections should be supplied by the U.G.C. I do not know what the reasons for refusing to consider this proposal on its merits are. But the University Executive Council has turned down that proposal.

An important question which we had to consider was that many appointments were of a bad character. Compulsorily retired Government servants . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: And even dismissed ones . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: . . . were employed and we were told that in the case of one post they had taken the

[Shri P. N. SAPRU.]

opinion of one who had been a Judge of the Supreme Court. I do not know what facts were supplied to him but I think it is wrong for any University to provide asylum for men who have been convicted of criminal offences or who have been dismissed for offences involving deep moral turpitude.

I will say one or two more words. The ground to be covered is very large. Before I close, I shall say something on emotional integration. I am not unaware of or unalive to the dangers which communal Universities create for us in this country. Education must be a liberalising force. I have in the note which I have appended to this Report quoted on this point a striking passage from Lord Haldane's dedicated life.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: (Nominated): Are there any other communal universities?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: There is the Banaras University which perhaps is also a communal university but I think we should not exaggerate these dangers. I do not like the Jamait Ulema's but I think in the University you will find many men who can take a balanced view, many men who have in the past rendered eminent services to the nation. Some of them may be revivalists. My sympathies are with the progressives and I would like therefore the question of the establishment of a Chair in Islamic Law to be seriously taken up by the University authorities so that Islamic Law might become as progressive as it is in modern Islamic countries today. I do not want this University to be a place for theologians. I have respect for theology and comparative religion but all these things need to be looked at from a broad angle. May I say one word finally in regard to the question of admission which is important? We have nowhere suggested in our Report that there

should be any quotas. We have pointed out that the present ratio is 65 to 35. We have also pointed out that the question of post-graduate teaching and admission to professional colleges deserves to be considered separately. We have placed the case for academic freedom and we have quoted from a Judgment of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in which he says that the right to choose who shall be taught is one of the essentials of academic freedom. Sir, I stand by that principle of academic freedom. I have no regrets for having been a party to a Report which suggests—it may be the indirect result of it—that there should be some consideration shown for Muslim students in this country. I would not like Aligarh to be looked upon as the Mecca of their dreams by our Muslim students but I would like it to be a great place of Islamic culture and civilisation and of that composite culture which is the glory of this country.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have before us the Report of a Committee whose integrity has not been questioned and cannot be questioned by anybody. It is evident from every page of the Report that the Committee has taken great pains to ascertain the facts and to arrive at conclusions without any pre-conceived notions. The sober language in which the Committee has expressed its views is a tribute to its impartiality and its desire to say nothing which would not be strictly in accordance with facts. The Committee has brought to light many defects in the administration of the University. These defects have been detailed by the previous speaker. It is not necessary therefore for me to go into them. It is clear from what the Committee has said that the financial administration of the University was not as good as it should be, that during the last ten years many financial irregularities had been committed and some appointments in the teaching staff and some appointments

in the non-teaching staff had been made in a questionable manner. Now, it may be said, Sir, that the proportion of the appointments made irregularly to the total number of appointments made by the University is very small but that happens in every University. If there is favouritism, it is shown only in a few cases. There is no University in this country where every appointment has been made on the basis of favouritism but as Shri Raj Bahadur Gour said, even if a few instances come to our notice which show that appointments have been made on grounds other than those of fitness and merit, it is a matter that requires the serious consideration of the University. The Committee has made some observations with regard to the character of the Aligarh University. What I should have liked the Committee to do is to state whether the University's standards in the matter of admission were reasonably high and whether they were uniformly applied in all cases. The terms of reference referred to the admission of students also and I thought therefore that something would be said on this point. I do not know how admissions are made but I take it that the same-standard is followed in the admission of all students no matter to what community they belong.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: That is implicit in our recommendation.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: I wish it had been made a little more explicit. What I would like ensured is that the Aligarh University should be a place for the development of knowledge and boys who are admitted there, whether they are Muslims or non-Muslims, should be made to realise that they would gain admission there entirely on the basis of their qualifications and not because of their belonging to any community. If the University finds boys of equal merit and sometimes gives preference to Muslim boys because of the character of the University, it will not be open

to serious criticism but if the fact that the University has been started by a minority community means that students belonging to it should have preference in the University irrespective of their qualifications, then it is a proposition with which I am unable to agree.

Lastly, I would like to say a word about the Committee's recommendations. Generally speaking, its recommendations appear to me to be sound and the replies of the University on some of the points seem to me to be so weak as to be deserving of no consideration. The University's contention that there is no bar to the appointment of men dismissed from Government service will not raise its prestige in the eyes of anybody and cannot be accepted as valid for a moment.

Though the recommendations may be accepted in general, I should like to say a word about the reference made by Shri Raj Bahadur Gour to the desirability of abolishing the post of Pro-Vice-Chancellor in the Hindu University. The Aligarh University Enquiry Committee has given reasons for holding the view that there should be no Pro-Vice-Chancellor in that University and on the facts before it its view may be perfectly correct. I am not going to argue the case for the retention of the post of Pro-Vice-Chancellor in the Banaras Hindu University at this stage. I shall only say that my support to the Committee's recommendations in the case of the Aligarh University should not mean that I am automatically committed to the acceptance of recommendations of this character in the case of the Banaras Hindu University also. I should not like these Universities to be dealt with in accordance with different standards. The standards must be the same. But the existence of the Post of Pro-Vice-Chancellor in the Aligarh University has been considered objectionable by the Enquiry Committee on certain definite grounds and what the House will have to see

[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]

when it considers the Hindu University (Amendment) Bill is whether those grounds apply to the Hindu University also. If they do, then the post of Pro-Vice-Chancellor must without hesitation be done away with there. But if they do not, if the Enquiry Committee objects to the post of Pro-Vice-Chancellor in the Aligarh University, because of certain special circumstances that exist there, then, we shall have to consider the case for the continued appointment of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor in the Banaras Hindu University entirely on its merits.

This is all that I have to say, but I should like to say before I sit down that I give my general support to the Committee's recommendations. It will be for the Education Minister to consider the grounds on which the Executive Council has refused to accept any of these recommendations. Some of them may be valid. In that case, it may be allowed to depart from the Committee's recommendations. But if the reasons appear to the Education Minister to be unsound, he should have no hesitation in enforcing the recommendations of the Committee, which have been made in order to ensure a high degree of efficiency in the administration and absolute impartiality in the matter of appointment of persons belonging to the teaching staff and the non-teaching staff.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the very outset I must congratulate the Chairman and members of the Committee for the excellent Report they have submitted. I have read the Report and my feeling is that a dispassionate and objective approach has been brought to bear on all the questions referred to them. I find from the Report that they have criticised the University where criticism was due. At the same time, they have also appreciated some good points which they found in the University. I feel that it is a matter

of pride to our House that two members of the Committee—Prof. Wadia and Shri Sapru—are Members of this House.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: In whom we have full confidence.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN: They are eminent Members of our House and we have full confidence in them. The terms of reference of the Committee were confined to, firstly, the financial transactions from 1951 up to date, with special reference to the objections of the auditors, secondly, appointments and promotions during this period and also the question of admissions and, lastly, to make such recommendations as may help in the better administration of the University.

Now, Sir, as far as the first item, namely, financial transactions are concerned, the Committee has considered, firstly, the question of the purchase of land and houses, secondly, the question of construction of some new buildings by the University and, thirdly, other financial transactions, particularly those which have been objected to by the auditors. It is clear from the Report that as far as the purchase of land and houses is concerned, the University has paid a price which is clearly less than what the buildings and the land are worth. Then, in the matter of construction of buildings, it has pointed out very grave irregularities. In the matter of other financial transactions also, which have been objected to by audit and the utter carelessness to meet those audit objections, the Committee has taken the University authorities to task. Although such a state of affairs is to be found not only in the other universities and colleges but also in most of our public institutions, I do not think that it should be taken in any way to exonerate the Muslim University from the responsibility it owes to the Government and people of this country in respect of properly regulating and properly maintaining the accounts and also of

taking full care to see that public money is properly spent. It is time that we should impress on all those who are charged with the duty of spending public money that it is a very serious matter and that their responsibility can in no way be minimised. They must pay special attention to the financial rules, which provide checks and counter-checks and if those financial rules are ignored, definitely the administration cannot successfully continue. The Committee has made concrete suggestions to remedy the defects and I hope the University will implement them, and the Government will see that they are implemented by the University.

As regards appointments and promotions, I may say that as far as this University or any other university is concerned, there are very few cases of promotion. In the case of teaching posts in particular, even if a person has been working as a lecturer, his appointment to the post of Reader—he may be appointed temporarily—is made by direct recruitment, in which persons who are lecturers of that particular institution and those who belong to other institutions are entitled to compete. Therefore, there are very few cases of promotion in a university. I find that eleven appointments have been objected to by the Committee. The period covered is sufficiently long, but it does not in any way exonerate the University, although in a period of eight or nine years, in which about 1100 or 1200 appointments were made, the Committee could lay its fingers only on about eleven cases. If there is irregularity in appointments, if there is partiality or nepotism, that must be stopped. Even one case is quite sufficient to say that there has been irregularity in appointments. I find that in the explanation which they have given about these appointments—they have printed a book which has been supplied to us: "Remarks of the University on the Report of its Committee of Enquiry"—I think in one or two cases it may even be considered plausible, but I am

astonished that as far as the employment of dismissed Government servants is concerned, the only comment I find is that there is no rule to bar these appointments....(Interruption)whether it is theft or anything else. In Government service or even in private service if a person's character is doubtful, he is not employed. In a university which is to build up the character of our young men, if persons of doubtful character are going to be employed, there will be an end of the objects for which the university stands. Even if there are no rules, the appointment of such persons is highly improper and it adversely affects the name of the university. The only saving feature of course is—although there is no justification for it, I must admit it—that most of these irregular appointments are in respect of non-teaching posts.

As far as admissions are concerned, I am glad to find from the Report that they have approved the present system which has been in operation for a number of years. The Committee has approved the present system of admissions by the University which is that they prefer the First Divisioners and high Second Divisioners, that is, those who have obtained 55 per cent marks of their own institutions.

The Committee has also made certain recommendations for better administration and I hope most of them will be implemented. There are certain questions of course on which there may be two opinions. For instance, a change in Constitution of the Executive Council has been suggested. Then for the selection of Vice-Chancellor a slightly different method is suggested from what is at present in existence. Then the appointment of the Dean of Students Welfare, the abolition of the post of Pro-Vice-Chancellor, I think these are matters which may be further considered both by the University and by the Government, and whatever is in the interest of the University should be done. On these points there may be two opinions.

[Shri Nafisul Hasan.]

I am very glad to find that as far as students' discipline is concerned, the Committee is fully satisfied. I find that at present in the universities at least in my State there has been trouble as far as student discipline is concerned. Aligarh University is also situated in my State, and therefore I am very happy to read their observations about student discipline. I will just read from this Report two or three sentences:

"We are glad to record, from a mass of evidence placed before us by all those associated with the Muslim University, Aligarh, that the disciplinary tone in the student community is fairly high and in this respect the University compares very favourably with many others. The Students' Union, the various sports clubs, Hall Councils etc., seem to be working harmoniously and there has been no tendency on the part of student bodies to formulate demands or try and influence decisions in matters which lie outside their domain. We are specially struck with the fact that student organisations did not send up any memoranda to our Committee or demand to be heard in any representative capacity."

Then it goes on:

"We had several opportunities of meeting the students in informal gatherings and found that though they were conscious of many directions in which the amenities provided for them could be improved, they were willing to let these matters rest in the hands of the University authorities and senior teachers with whom the Committee was discussing them."

In the end, Sir, I may tell the House that I also was a student in this very University and therefore I am also vitally interested in its welfare, and I wish that both the present University authorities and the Government will do their best to see that it prog-

resses and serves the best interests of the country.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I was first approached by the Minister to be a member of this Committee, I was given to understand that it would be a Visitor's Committee. Subsequently the Minister yielded to the pressure of the Vice-Chancellor and agreed that the Committee should be appointed by the Aligarh University. If the hon. Minister will excuse my saying so, I think it was a little weakness on his part, a weakness which might have been engendered by the fact that he is too much of a gentleman. I personally feel that the University authorities have not responded as they should have to the gesture on his part. I do remember that the Minister threw out a very broad hint that in our meetings the Vice-Chancellor, whatever may be his theoretical rights, should not be present. This hint was not taken by him and he was present practically at all our meetings. I am perfectly certain that many of the timid members of the staff were prevented from giving evidence because the Vice-Chancellor was present. But I can assure this House that his presence did not make the slightest impression so far as the members of the Committee were concerned. We did not lose our independence simply because the Vice-Chancellor was there, though it would have been better and more graceful . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): May I ask Professor Wadia, when he felt that way, whether he did not make a suggestion that the Vice-Chancellor should be formally requested not to be present at the meetings?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: It would not have been very graceful on the part of any member of the Committee to have made such a suggestion, because the Vice-Chancellor was present there under the authority given to him by a statute of the University, and it

would have been open to him to say: "Who are you to challenge me? We have appointed you. I am here by statute." Anyway, that question did not arise.

5 P.M.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It was said that the Chairman did not want him to be present.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I do not think that the Chairman ever did not want him to be present. I do not think that it would be very graceful on the part of any of us to have told the Vice-Chancellor not to be present.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did you discuss it?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I may assure the Members that there were many occasions on which we met informally when the Vice-Chancellor was not present, and we discussed many things. But I wish to assure the Members in this House that the presence of the Vice-Chancellor did not make the slightest difference to our attitude and to our opinions. I am perfectly sure about that.

Well, Sir, I feel that the University authorities have not been playing cricket. After having appointed the Committee, we had a right to expect that since we had spent nearly a year of our precious time on the deliberations, they would have accepted our recommendations. Instead of that, they appointed a Committee to sit in judgment on our recommendations and although they have accepted many of our recommendations, they have also not accepted several of our important recommendations, which they would not have done if the Committee had been the Visitor's Committee. That I personally feel as a grievance as a member of this Committee. The Vice-Chancellor and the University authorities—I repeat again—were not playing cricket.

Well, Sir, I am thankful to Dr. Gour for all the things which he has said about the Committee, especially when he is usually critical. But I was very much surprised that my good friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, should have been so unreasonably critical of the Committee. I think that he has not been fair to us.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Now you agree that I am good to good men.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: You are, in spite of your criticisms.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sometimes.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I should have expected my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, to have appreciated the fact that on every term of the reference made to us, we have brought an impartial, objective attitude to bear on the problems placed before us. We have not minced words in saying that the financial organisation has been extremely bad, that a mistake should have been committed, maybe, with all good faith or without any bad faith, that it should have taken nine years to correct it—it certainly does not speak much either for the auditors or the financial section of the University—or that large amounts should have been written off under the emergency powers of the Vice-Chancellor which certainly does not speak well of the financial responsibility of the University—or that numerous amounts should have been lost or overpaid because some officers had gone away to Pakistan and so on. All this certainly does not speak well of the University, and we have not hesitated to point out these defects. Nor have we been slow in pointing out the defects on the administrative side, in the Registrar's organisation. It is most unfortunate that a Central University should be so badly organised even in the year 1960. I think the House should be grateful to us for making very strong recommendations—because we had a financial expert on

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

our Committee—to make the University function much more satisfactorily in the future.

Well, so far as the admission of the students is concerned, my friend, Pandit Kunzru, has raised a warning but I do not think it was really necessary to extend that warning to us. I think—I personally feel—that since the University was founded in the interests of the Muslim community, it is but fair that the Muslim character of the University should be preserved. I do not for a moment suggest that inferior Muslim students should be dumped on the University simply because they are Muslims. It is not in the interest of the University, and nobody has recommended it. We have laid emphasis on the Aligarh students and the Aligarh students mean Muslims as well as non-Muslims. And we have made it a point that once they have been admitted, no discrimination should be made against anyone of them simply because he is a non-Muslim, so that on that point I think we are on perfectly safe grounds.

Now Sir, I feel that several important recommendations of the Committee have not been accepted by the University. There is the question—and a very important question—of the Pro-Vice-Chancellorship on which my friend, Pandit Kunzru, has very definite views. So have I. But I speak from experience as Pandit Kunzru cannot, because I have been a Pro-Vice-Chancellor myself, and I know where exactly and under what circumstances the Pro-Vice-Chancellor's appointment is justified and I know where exactly it is not justified. And I am perfectly clear in my mind that, where you have a full-time paid Vice-Chancellor as in Aligarh or in Banaras, the appointment of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor is at best superfluous; at worst harmful, and, therefore, it is very necessary that the post should be abolished. Now, such an important re-

commendation has not been accepted by the University.

We have recommended that if a member in the Selection Committee differs from the opinions of the majority, he should be asked to mention his reasons for it. Now, even that it does not want to accept. Why should not a dissenting member have the right to say why he does not accept certain recommendations? It will be some guidance to the Executive Council. They did not accept the recommendations for the constitution of the Selection Committee for non-academic posts. We have recommended the appointment of a Dean of Student Welfare. I think it is one of the best recommendations that we have made and one which has been very successfully carried out in the Banaras Hindu University and yet, the University has turned it down. So it goes on. We know that there have been many occasions on which the administrative and the academic members of the staff have not been able to see eye to eye. There have been open disputes on that point and, therefore, we suggested that specific instructions should be issued to all the heads of departments by the administration, and the University has turned it down. There is no reason given for it. We have delved in detail into many unsatisfactory appointments made, about the Deputy Registrar, the Assistant Registrar on the academic side and others. Well, Sir, it has been pointed out that in the course of about ten years nearly twelve hundred appointments were made and we have pointed out only eleven which have been bad; it comes to hardly one percent. of the staff. But that is not the way of looking at appointments. A University should be like Caesar's wife, should be above suspicion. Every appointment made should be perfectly fair and should not be exposed to the charge of nepotism as has been the case. In the case of the Aligarh University, it has been openly said that the appointments have been practically monopolised by about six families in Aligarh.

It does not speak well of a university and that requires looking into.

Teaching and research should not be demarcated. They should go both hand in hand and yet, even while we were sitting on the Committee, the Executive Committee takes a decision and makes a separate department of the Institute of Islamic Studies. Even though the Vice-Chancellor was requested by our Chairman that they should wait till our Report was out, this courtesy was not extended to us. After all, the waiting for a few months would not have made any difference to the University.

Well, Sir, I should just like to make a reference to one point which is a very delicate point. I am conscious that there is one problem in the University which has been acutely agitating the minds especially of the teaching staff in the University and even outside the University and of which we have not taken very firm notice.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN) in the Chair.]

And that refers to the Communist infiltration in the affairs of the University. Well, Sir, I may frankly admit that the members of the Committee themselves were somewhat divided in their attitude to this general question, and that is why their report appears to be very innocuous. We tried to cover up our differences by using words which do not mean much, but I may frankly tell you on the floor of this House, as a Member of the Rajya Sabha, that there is something not so simple as my friend, Mr. Sapru, imagines. I do agree with him that there should be academic freedom. After all, the Communist Party has been recognised as a political party by our country, and that is why we have our Communist friends here, and I welcome their presence. Their criticism is very often useful.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: Sometimes.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: But I am acutely conscious of the one fact that the freedom which they demand from others, they are not prepared to extend to others, and especially when some key appointments like the Deputy Registrar or the Assistant Registrar, which have been occupied and filled up by Communist, fall vacant, it often happens that a non-Communist, however good he may be, will never get a fair chance of appointment. But I, as an individual member, feel very strongly about this. What the University should do or what the Government should do, I do not know; I leave it to them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I say, Sir . . .

PROF. A. R. WADIA: You can speak later.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it proper for a Member of the Committee, having done something there, to bring in here, in the usual American style, 'Communist infiltration', and to say things? It was open to him to raise it there and have it thrashed out. I have read through his report. There is no such reference. He could have given a note of dissent there that he did not like such things. Therefore I say to Dr. Shrimali that McCarthyism would do no good. Therefore people who believe in McCarthy style should not be put on such committees, however great they may be in their own fields.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): I think the hon. Member realises his responsibility of both the capacities.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not as a member of the Committee but as a believer in McCarthyism.

(Interruptions).

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Well, I may have been put on the Committee, but I am a Member of the Rajya Sabha as well, and the freedom that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has often claimed for

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

himself can be claimed by me as well as a Member of the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not go to committees.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Anyway, Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is free to have his own opinions. I have frankly expressed the distress that many members of the Aligarh University do feel about the situation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the evidence?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Now, Sir, I may frankly say what the result of that reaction has been. One definite result of that reaction has been the rise of naked orthodoxy, naked bigotry, in the University. Now I know that one member of the Communist Party has been openly critical even of the Qoran. I have been told that by members of the Aligarh University themselves. Now you can easily imagine that in a Muslim University criticism of the Qoran will easily evoke even a revolt. My surprise is that the students have not rebelled. Anyway I am not surprised that in the interests of Muslim orthodoxy they are building up now an outer opposition to the communistic influence in the University (*Interruptions*) and that seems to me to be equally dangerous to the well-being and the good name of the University. Well, Sir, it is not for me, as an individual Member of the Rajya Sabha, to say what could be done. It is for the Government to take action. I am perfectly certain that they are fully conscious of all the facts, and I repeat again that I appreciate—apart from my friend Mr. Dahyabhai Patel's remarks—the appreciation that has come from practically all the Members who have taken part in this debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to have a word.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Not just now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Any time you may call me.

(*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, before I proceed to make my observations on the Committee's Report, I would like to thank Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour for giving this House an opportunity to discuss such an important matter. I would also like to express my appreciation of the services that the members of this Committee have rendered not only to the University but also to the country. Sir, their task was none too easy. They took upon themselves an onerous responsibility. We know, Sir, when in this country we find minorities a bit sensitive, that to probe into the affairs of a minority institution is really a delicate matter, and it is liable to be misinterpreted. The task of the Committee Members therefore was very delicate and very difficult, and particularly so, Sir, after the Vice-Chancellor of the University issued a press statement to say that the allegations made against the University were false and a travesty of truth and something of the sort.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: And the Committee ultimately held that it was substantially true.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Anyone who goes into the Committee's Report will find whether it was so or not. Well, I am not going into that. I have also to appreciate, Sir, the firmness with which the Minister of Education has dealt with this matter. I am aware of Prof. Wadia's observation here regarding his gentlemanly weakness, but I am sure that but for the firmness of the Education Minister this Committee would not have come into being. knowing, as we do, what the committee previously appointed by the University did. Sir, the picture that is revealed after this Committee raised the curtain of this University is a dismal one but after hearing Prof. Wadia I must say that it is a startling picture too.

Sir, let me come to the financial irregularities. There will be some irregularities in any institution. Even in Government the Public Accounts Committee finds several irregularities of a very grave nature. So, if some irregularities occur in spite of the University authorities taking care and precaution and exercising prudence, well, no one would blame the authorities but here, Sir, I cannot entirely absolve the authorities of the University of their responsibility for these irregularities. Sir, the financial position of the University was not very happy. If Table VI is seen, there is a tremendous difference in the expenditure incurred in 1950-51 and that in the years after 1950-51. I can understand the difference being Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 20,000 but the differences are in lakhs of rupees, and the Committee observe that whereas the enrolment with the University had increased $2\frac{1}{2}$ times, the recurring expenditure of the University had increased 4 times. Well, this is a state of affairs which should certainly have attracted the attention of the management. But management has not given any attention to it. The system of audit which the University seems to have adopted or observed or tolerated so long is a system which no other institution in the country worth the name has ever accepted. Sir, it is a voucher system, and according to the voucher system anybody here can be an auditor. It simply means this. You take an item of expenditure and see if there is a corresponding voucher or not, and if there is a corresponding voucher, you mark it off. Well, if that is what audit means, anyone of us can be an auditor. But here was a firm of chartered accountants appointed to go into this purpose in this manner, and this firm of chartered accountants was the one particular firm, as the Committee say, which was favoured by the University authorities. I do not want to go into the motive of it. Now, Sir, it is the business of a firm of chartered accountants, it is the ethical code of chartered accountants, to go about their duty in a very honest manner, and here I see that this firm has not

gone about it in an honest manner, because they did not care to verify an item of expenditure to see whether it was properly authorised or not, whether it conformed to the statutes of the University or not. Maybe, the University authorities were ignorant of that, but I can never excuse the University authorities for tolerating such a procedure. A man comes, sits as an Auditor and says, "You incur the expenditure. I will O.K. it." This is the system, the Committee very wisely pointed out, that has been responsible for so many of the irregularities.

There is further default on the part of the University authorities. When the Accountant General, Uttar Pradesh, brought to the notice of the University authorities certain defects and irregularities, as a result of which the Education Ministry at the Centre sent queries, what was the attitude of the University? If the University authorities, whosoever they were, were very honest, they should have certainly awakened and gone into the thing. But here, to our great regret and to the misfortune of the University, they did not care until the Ministry of Education issued reminders after reminders, repeatedly. And what is the reply that they get? It is something on the following lines:

"There is no use appointing a committee to go into this question. We shall ourselves give replies to audit objections."

This is how the University authorities reply when very grave irregularities are pointed out. The Committee on page 31 says:—

"... how this voucher audit conducted before 1951 was at times perfunctory and one cannot help forming the impression that it might have concealed as much as it revealed."

The various irregularities committed are of a very grave nature. I have also been a member of the Public Accounts Committee and I have also come across irregularities but not

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

irregularities of this magnitude. Here is a sum of Rs. 1,29,473/- credited to the Medical College account and to this day the Treasurer does not say where the amount has gone. He has not satisfied the Committee. The Committee says that no definite reply has been received in this regard.

Mention has already been made of the G.P. Notes worth one lakh of rupees. Of course, later on it was found but a wrong entry was made and the amount really was placed in fixed deposit, and later when it was discovered, this fixed deposit was withdrawn and the amount was credited to the Medical College account. It is all right to say that there was no loss on that account, but would the University authorities tolerate a mistake on the part of the accountant of their University of this sort? A man very easily forgets what was in the fixed deposit, and then he credits it to the Medical College Fund and debits it to the Muslim University Fund.

Sir, the University's responsibility is again to be questioned with regard to the appointment of an Honorary Treasurer. This Honorary Treasurer was obviously a favoured man, was got intentionally, because he was made to supervise everybody connected with the audit even the Internal Auditor who should have an independent status. The position of the audit was made to subserve this Honorary Treasurer and the Committee says that many of these irregularities were due to this Honorary Assistant Treasurer's attitude.

Sir, I should like to say a few words about the building. Hon. Members have made observations regarding this building. I do not find anything wrong in what is reported about the purchases made. God alone knows what must have happened but when an impartial officer of the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry, Mr. L. G. Salyam is appointed he goes into the accounts in a technical manner and reports to us that the prices paid

were not high, rather in some cases they were advantageous, I do not think it is fair on our part to question his statement. But there are some observations made by the Committee with regard to this affair when they say that no particular system was observed. Contracts were not openly published. Tenders were not openly invited and then some favoured contractors were accepted and a contractor was given advance payments, and that contractor finally failed to do the work and the work had to be entrusted to other contractors. One of them migrated to Pakistan. In reply to a query by the Auditors it was stated that they had migrated to Pakistan. But later on it was revealed that they were in India, and they were in Kanpur. It is a very sad state of affairs. The acceptance by the University authorities of the contention of a person disappearing and migrating to Pakistan, I can never commend. I can never commend the authorities for giving rise to such a myth.

Then, with regard to appointments and promotions, this is a very disturbing feature. Two hon. Members of the Committee have spoken here. After that it is not necessary for me to go into the question of these appointments. I have gone through the detailed appointments of persons, for instance, the History Professor, Office Superintendent of the College, Foreman, selection of dismissed people and so on and so forth. In all these cases not only propriety was not observed but, as hon. Members have observed, there has been favouritism shown and no decent institution worth the name would have done it. In one case very unfortunately a series of promotions has been given. The person is taken today, appointed temporarily, draws temporary pay and three or four months later is shifted to another appointment and his temporary pay is safeguarded and he gets another pay there. Again he is shifted, sent abroad for studies and when he comes back, he is shifted from that work. All this, as the hon. Mr. Sapru

was saying in another connection, was a dishonest method, and nobody can excuse appointments made of people who were guilty of moral turpitude.

(Time bell rings.)

I will take two or three minutes more.

Sir, an hon. Member made serious charges regarding nepotism. I am very reluctant to make such a charge. But if we go through the list of several appointments which the Committee has mentioned, it reveals that there are only five families and all the appointees are related to these five families. It seems as if it was a family gathering. Such a state of affairs should not prevail in a university.

Then, there are the Tibbia College affairs. The Committee have said that these Tibbia College affairs were very disgraceful. The products of this college were not regularly trained. The words they have used are: "They were a menace to the public". Without undergoing proper training they were even allowed to practise allopathy and they have said "They were a menace". In the face of such a state of affairs in the Tibbia College I refer to a letter written by the Chairman in response to the request of the Vice-Chancellor. After challenging the propriety of this Tibbia College the Committee has recommended the dissociation of the University with the Tibbia College.

(Time bell rings.)

My time is up but before I sit down I want to suggest to the Minister that I do not agree with Dr. Gour's suggestion that this institution or any institution in India, particularly an educational institution, should be a denominational institution. The denominational character of this institution should go. What is wrong if you abolish the word "Muslim"? Take it off. Take off the word "Hindu" from Benaras Hindu University. Keep this one as only Aligarh University. If even that is not needed, you can say "A" University and "B" University. That

is the only way to national integration. Sir, I would suggest to the hon. Minister very humbly, that he should amend the Central Act itself for this purpose. Let him take courage in his hands, just as he has taken courage and appointed this Committee of Enquiry. Let him amend the Act to secularise the University. I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not want the Islamic character of the university to be lost. I want its Islamic character to be retained. Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar was saying here that in the Madras University Islamic culture is being taught. There is nothing wrong in it. So also, let the Aligarh University continue as in the past, to be a centre of Muslim culture. But let it be a secular university and not be like the forbiddin city of China, and be only for one community. I could have excused it even if it had been for one community, but here it was only for one family or some families. So I submit the hon. Minister should take strong action in this matter.

Thank you, Sir, for showing me this indulgence. I generally agree with the recommendations of this Committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFIGUL HASAN): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Please take only five minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it was not my intention to speak on this particular subject, although I am one of the sponsors of this notice. But after hearing the speech of one of the hon. Members of this House who also happens to be a member of this particular Committee which enquired into this matter, I am somewhat provoked, somewhat tempted and somewhat angered to speak. He seems to have laid down a dangerous principle. I do not know who the communists are in the Aligarh University in high positions. I did not know. I should have known, but he seems to know. Anyway, assuming his principle, if communists are in such positions, that is to say, people with communist thought and so on,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

then of course, according to him, the heavens will come down. The University will go to rack and ruin. Education will disappear and there will be nothing but dark despair. Such is his view. May I ask, if such principles were to be accepted, would I, and others on this side of the House, not be better entitled to ask why gentlemen connected with big business house of Tatas, should be made members of the University Grants Commission and be nominated and so on, and sent on university enquiry commissions? This question I may also ask. Therefore, do not introduce such a thing.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: No member of the house of Tatas is on the University Grants Commission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that; but the Tata people get in there. And I say, people who go a step further to the right, compared to the Swatantra Party, find their way into such commissions and into such bodies, including the University Grants Commission. Well, nothing happens. Then why should I take this kind of sermonising on such things from such a gentleman just because he happens to be an educationist in a particular way? You understand, Sir. Therefore, let us not go into these things. If that is the game, then we can also play it. I will play it and expose certain members of the University Grants Commission and bring up their entire connections, economic and otherwise, with certain big businesses and ask the student community and the teaching community, how they feel about such positions being filled in the universities, by such persons. So it will not be good. Therefore, those who are in glass houses should not throw too many stones on others. That is all the advice that I give.

Here I would like to invite your attention to what Mr. Sapru has said in his note of dissent.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, there is no note of dissent to this Report. I should like to correct the hon. Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, it is a separate note then. There he has said that though some of the teachers may have Marxist thought, there is no evidence whatsoever to show that they are communists. Here is a former judge of the Calcutta High Court . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he was of the Allahabad High Court.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sorry, of the Allahabad High Court, a former judge of the Allahabad High Court and a well-known jurist of this country and I think he would understand these things better, this point of evidence and so on, than a certain gentleman who may be very well connected with big business but who does not understand or study law; that is the position, even if he be a member of a commission of this kind. Mr. Sapru—I mean Dr. Sapru—contradicts it here.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: "Mr. Sapru" is correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is so learned that I feel like calling him "Doctor". This is not a contradiction of any majority or minority report. In this there is no majority or minority. So is it decent, is it proper for an hon. Member to say that, after having functioned in the Commission? He did not raise any objection to the Vice-Chancellor being present because it was improper, according to him. How could he ask the Vice-Chancellor, even informally for courtesy's sake, not to be there, for reasons of propriety? But having functioned there and after having got all the opportunity to write whatever thing he wanted to write, he is taking advantage of this debate to bring in in the usual McCarthy style, this question of penetration of Communists. People would laugh at such things

when they come from a learned man. That is not the question. What I say is, as far as the University is concerned, people will have all kinds of thoughts, Congress thought, Communist thought, Marxist thought, and even Mr. Wadia's out-dated, conservative thought. I don't mind having his thoughts there, although I want all those thoughts to be overcome properly in the intellectual and ideological fields. But I have objection to bringing it in here when there is not the slightest need.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Mr. Gupta will keep his promise and finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir. But this is the crux of the matter. Here you have communalism and reaction, both. It was Hindu communalism and Muslim communalism, and now I find that big business also has smuggled in here and they have combined to attack the Aligarh University and from that position a kind of war is waged against progressive things, a war of conservatism against liberal ideas, a war of dark obscurantism against something that is enlightenment and all that. Such is the position.

Sir, I finally request you and through you the Education Minister, that if people have strong political prejudices against a particular party, whether it be the Congress Party or the Communist Party or the P.S.P., the Government should never appoint such people to commissions of this kind or to the University Grants Commission. Otherwise people would make it a point to agitate in the country, to demonstrate and to hold black flag demonstrations when such a gentleman comes to any place.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I am very grateful to some of the hon. Members who have said some kind words about me. I think it is more their large-heartedness than anything that I may have done, that is responsible for the remarks that they have made.

In the first place I should like to pay my tribute to the members of this Committee. This has been done by several Members who spoke and I should like to wholeheartedly join hands with them in this. The members of the Committee had a very difficult task. In fact, I had to approach each of these members individually. Members appointed to work on this Committee were most reluctant. It was not a very pleasant job and I am deeply grateful to them for having served on this Committee. Prof. Wadia complained that after having requested him to serve on the Visitor's Committee, I later on asked him to serve on the University Committee. Sir, this is true. The Government had decided to appoint the Visitor's Committee. Several Members have questioned my conduct in this regard. But I would like to assure the House that I did this in the best interest of the University. A deputation came and saw me and it included a distinguished Member of this House and he would bear out that I told the Members of the deputation of the Executive Council that Government had decided to appoint a Visitor's Committee. I did not want to do anything which would in any way give an impression to the people that we wanted to do any kind of harm to the University. It may have been an error of judgment but I would like to assure the House that I did this with the best of motives. Now after the Committee started this work, unfortunately there were some differences between the Vice-Chancellor and the Committee. It was very unfortunate that these differences arose and the Committee resigned. At the time this Committee was being appointed, a suggestion was made that an hon. Member of this House, a distinguished Member, Shri P. N. Saprú, might also be included in this Committee. In fact a question was asked here in the Rajya Sabha as to why I was not including Mr. Saprú. My approach in the beginning was that all these three members should belong to the minority communities. It was proposed to have a Financial

[Dr. K. L. SHRIMALI.]

Adviser, Mr. Kartar Singh Malhotra, coming from Punjab, then Prof. Wadia and Prof. G. C. Chatterji. We thought that it would be better to keep neither a Hindu nor a Muslim. These three gentlemen were distinguished in their fields. . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: There was a fourth Member also.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Who was it?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The Secretary.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: If the hon. Member thinks that the Member-Secretary should not have been there, he is very wrong. He had a right to be there. I strongly object to his suggesting by any means that there was a Hindu Member. That is what he is hinting at. I am afraid he is doing more harm to the University by raising this question.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: When the hon. Minister classified it, then I said that it was better to give the correct picture. I do not cast any aspersion against the Member-Secretary. Let it be made clear but I said that there were 4 members.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Secretary to the Government had to be there. In fact our past experience at the Banaras Hindu University shows that there were errors and mistakes and therefore an officer of the Ministry had to be there. He was there as an officer of the Education Ministry and not as a Hindu or a Muslim. Let me make it very clear to the hon. Member. Raising this kind of thing is doing more harm to Muslim University. I have great respect for my hon. friend but raising this kind of questions is injuring the cause

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am not raising. You raised this question saying that these were the three people. I simply pointed out that there was another gentleman who was the Member-Secretary, without any aspersion

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: By suggesting and insinuating that he was a Hindu Member

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I refuse to yield to the hon. Member. I strongly object. A Government officer is a Government officer. He is neither a Hindu nor a Muslim

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member need not say

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I refuse to yield. It is very objectionable

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): Nobody mentioned the community.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I was saying all the time that here were three gentlemen. Let me say, one was a Parsee, one was a Sikh and one was a Christian, all selected because they did not belong to any....(Interruptions). Hon. Member should stop making comments on what I say now. These people were highly distinguished in their own fields and had made great contributions in the field of education and finance and, therefore, we made this selection. Then the question arose that some more members should be added. In fact this deputiation which came to me, they themselves, suggested that Mr. Sapru's name might be included. I must say that I have the highest respect for Mr. Sapru. He knows it. He is an old friend and I hold him in high esteem.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The most sensible man you took.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: If I did not put him on this Committee at the first instance, it was not because I had in any way thought that it might injure the cause of the University or he might be partial. Far from it. My whole intention was to make the people realise that this was an impartial Committee which the Government had appointed, a Committee whose integrity and impartiality could never

be questioned, but later on the question arose and it is true that pressure was brought on me and the Vice-Chancellor himself came and said that this Committee had some friction and he said that it would be better to have some person with judicial experience. Mr. Sapru's name was suggested. Then I thought it would be better to put another judge from the minority community and so we had these people. This is my explanation. I have acted in the best interests of the University. I have always respected the University.

I shall come to the report a little later but before that I should like to make a reference to the Aligarh Muslim University Enquiry Committee appointed under the Chairmanship of Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola in October 1927. I should like to just read a few extracts to show how the University stands today with regard to administration as compared to that period when this Committee was appointed. It consisted of three persons—The Hon. Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola, Sir Philip Hartog and Sir George Anderson. The terms of reference were more or less the same and what did that Committee say?

"We made it our first business to ask for a detailed statement of the names, qualifications and pay of the staff, but we were only able to obtain it after long delay, as it appears that the University keeps no full record of the qualifications and services of the various teachers."

With regard to appointments they said:

"But in Aligarh a number of appointments have been made by promotion at a meeting of the Executive Council without previous consideration as to whether the higher post was required or not, without definition of the conditions of the post, without advertisement and without a Committee of Appointment to consider the qualifications of the persons promoted. Readers have been promoted to professorships and lecturers to readerships in this way without the slightest

consideration of the question whether more qualified candidates could not be obtained for the higher posts. Some of the promotions may have been deserved; others were certainly not; and we recommend that this practice should be discontinued."

Then with regard to building and maintenance of accounts also this Committee had to make some comments. The Committee goes on:

"We are of opinion that the expenditure needs more checking in detail than is exercised at the present moment and that the Finance Committee has been far too lightly worked . . .

We are not satisfied with the financial working of the Book Depot, the Press or the Buildings Department. We have had grave complaints made with regard to all these departments, especially the Building Department. It has been stated that buildings have been erected without the previous approval of either plans or estimates, that there have been grave faults in the buildings erected in this way, and that there have been overcharges."

When one reads this Report of 1927 and again reads the report of 1961, one does not find any substantial improvement. In fact the same things have been repeated. It seems that the same pattern has been maintained in the Aligarh University during all these decades. This is a matter which is of grave concern not only to the Muslim community but to the whole country. We are anxious that our universities should be places where in administration, in efficiency, in integrity, in impartiality, there should be no question. They must be above suspicion in these matters. How are they to produce men with character and vision and provide leadership for the country? It is a great misfortune of mine that I had to deal with the Banaras Hindu University first and the Aligarh University now. It is a very unpleasant job but I shall not shirk my responsibility in this matter. And unfortunately, as Dr. Raj

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

Bahadur Gour pointed out, the Aligarh University lost sight of that vision and ideals of its founder and it got mixed up in politics and he is right when he said that the University started giving modern education with conservative politics. Of course, I shall have to say something about the 'conservative politics' a little later in some other context. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru—I am quoting a statement which appeared in *The Leader*—said:

"The college.....

This was about the M.A.O. College.

"The college was not only a seat of Western education for Muslim youth but under the active inspiration and guidance of its first three Principals Beck, Morison and Archibald, was also a centre of great political activity. The purpose was to fight the Congress and prevent the introduction of democratic form of Government."

This has been the bane of the Aligarh University. I do not like to refer to the past because I think it is wrong to remind the University every time of this past but at the same I think we should make a proper analysis of the whole situation. The Aligarh University became a centre of Muslim League activity. A number of their students and professors went into the country and propagated this ideology which led to the partition of this country. After independence we sent one of our best men to that University, Dr. Zakir Husain. I am sorry our revered friend here made some reference to Dr. Zakir Husain; I am afraid I do not agree with him. As far as I am aware

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I have the highest regard for him. What I said was that these things occurred in his time and the fact that he is a great scholar does not necessarily make him also a great administrator.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, it is true that some of these things occurred in

his tenure but let me tell you that the Committee has not pinned down the responsibility on anybody. There have been certain financial irregularities but he has been let down by people whom he had trusted. That is what has happened in Aligarh University. Unfortunately, though our friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has been greatly excited about a very innocent remark which has been made by Prof. Wadia, it seems the cat is out of the bag and he does not like to face the truth. That is the whole trouble. After independence the Aligarh University has been selected by the Communist Party as the single University for the propagation of the Communist ideology among the students and teachers. Let him deny that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What are we to deny? Sir, he is making an allegation

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: He won't deny it. Aligarh University is the one University which has been selected by the Communist Party

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do propaganda here, everywhere. In Calcutta we do propaganda. I do not know if in Aligarh University

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: They are very careful people, very clever people.

Sir, after independence some of the people who advocated partition of India felt frustrated and communism flourishes in an atmosphere of frustration and despondency. It is very interesting to observe how the development has taken place. Sir, I ask you, what is the relationship between the Marxist ideology and the Muslim League ideology? Are not they poles apart? How is it that in the Aligarh University which was a centre of Muslim League activity suddenly overnight we found Professors becoming communist. There are today—let me tell my hon. friend, Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour..... (Interruptions).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, If the hon. Minister speaks like the Police Minister, then you must give us a chance to deny this.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Education Minister is speaking like Education Minister.....(Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): Order, order.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: . . . and I want to tell my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that they are doing great harm to the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where is all this in the Report? He can't make statements which

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I repudiate such things.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: What happened when agitation started in Kerala?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is Kerala to be discussed here now?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): No more disturbance. He is on his legs. (Interruptions).

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am not yielding.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He should speak about the Report, not about what happened in Kerala, what happened in Soviet Union.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: They are not prepared to face facts. It was the Professors of the Aligarh University who issued a signed statement in connection with the agitation which was started against the Kerala Education Act. Is it true or not?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let him ask others.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Have these Communist Professors of Aligarh University ever criticised Chinese aggression? Let me ask him. They were ready to condemn the agitation in Kerala but why did not they come forward when there was aggression by China? They must answer this question, if they are honest and loyal to this country?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Sir. You give your ruling.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I refuse to yield.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Does the shoe pinch them?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): Let me hear your point of order. What is it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point of order is this. Here the debate is on the Report of the Aligarh University. That is the subject-matter which is being discussed. All the discussions have taken place on the Report.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Except Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's remarks which I must contradict.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is giving the guidance. I need your guidance, Sir. But then I am misguided. Now, this is the position. I said certain things with regard to Prof. Wadia's charge. I repudiated it. He has to reply to the points that have been raised.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): What is the point of order?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): No arguments. Please state your point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He need not go to China, Soviet Union, Communism and all that.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am speaking of the Aligarh University and of no other place. It was the Aligarh University Professors who signed that statement and I would like to ask whether any statement has been issued on Chinese aggression on this country, whether any statement has been issued when aggression was committed in Kashmir. I would like to ask my hon. friends; they are not prepared to face facts. Why are not they prepared to face facts? He is speaking of McCarthyism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You ask them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): He is in possession of the House, no disturbance please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why should he ask me? He should ask the Aligarh University Professors.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Hon. Members are not prepared to face facts. That is the tragedy. Why don't they face facts? They were ready to sign a statement when the agitation was started in Kerala. Why are not they ready to sign a similar statement when China attacks India or when Pakistan commits aggression? I ask these gentlemen.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why ask me?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This is a simple elementary question which our friend understands but our friend is in the habit of bullying other people and it is highly objectionable on his part to say that there is McCarthyism in this country. No country has a more liberal Government than this country where the Communists are allowed to issue a statement when an agitation is started . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me say he is a McCarthy; I stand corrected.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: . . . and he stands here and speaks of McCarthyism in this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are a McCarthy.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: They issue a statement and they say that there is McCarthyism in this country. Sir, we want to allow full freedom in this country whatever the political ideology of the people may be. There are Communist Professors; don't we know this? But we have not objected to their being there. One thing about which we are worried is this to which Prof. Wadia referred. He said that their methods are dangerous.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What methods?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: They indoctrinate the students. They have their loyalties outside the University, outside the academic world. We expect the professors to pursue truth. I would like to ask our communist friends, who are so much agitated, to tell me whether they are pursuing truth or they are guided by the dictates of their party. They are always sacrificing truth in order to serve their party ends, and that is not the way in which education can be carried on in a democratic society. Let them face some more unpleasant facts. Certain developments have taken place in Aligarh after we sent Dr. Zakir Hussain there. As I said, he is one of our best country-men. He did his best. What did Dr. Zakir Hussain say when he left the Aligarh University? Let me quote him:—

"Eight years ago I came to Aligarh University with high hopes. Today I go deeply disappointed. I believed that you had attained a certain degree of maturity of judgment, but your activities during the past few days proved that this was far from the truth."

And further on he says:—

"Don't lose patience if others are critical of your past history. Your

future is dark if you persist in the manner you have acted. You may not like my words, but more as your friend and well-wisher I should tell you the truth."

Nobody could have given a better warning to the Aligarh University than the ex-Vice-Chancellor of the Aligarh University, who is one of our greatest men in the country today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good. Give me a copy.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: You will get a copy all right. Anyway, you can get a copy for yourself. What has happened in the Aligarh University? Dr. Zakir Hussain to some extent was not able to succeed. He became disillusioned. And who is responsible for this? The responsibility lies with the communist friends who made it difficult for him to function there . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where..
(Interruptions).

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Let me tell you that on the floor of the House.

(Interruption.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has quoted a document from which he has read out. He is blaming the communists for it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): He can draw his own conclusions. You may not agree with his conclusions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The entire document may be placed before the House. Under the rules I can claim it.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Under the rules I am saying this. The statement will be placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, on a point of order. The hon. Member is interrupting very frequently. He belongs to the Communist Party. A member of the Communist Party

has moved the motion. If he has anything to say on the remarks of the Minister, the mover has the right of reply. Why does the hon. Member interrupt the proceedings?

(Interruptions.)

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: These people are in the habit of interrupting anybody who does not agree with them. That is their habit and I seek your protection in this matter. Is it right for the hon. Member, when I am standing on my legs, to go on interrupting me?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will be interrupted.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I shall not be bullied, let me tell you. I am going to state the facts as I see them.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFI-SUL HASAN): Please sit down. There have been too many interruptions in the speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why is he saying 'bullying'? You are there to look after.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Our friend, Dr. Gour, spoke of obscurantism and revivalism in the Aligarh University. It is true. There are strong tendencies of revivalism in the Aligarh University.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Yes, there are.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: In fact, my information is that there are three professors who belong to Jamait-i-Islami. We all know their ideology. Why has this development taken place? This development has taken place because of the communists who are trying to destroy the University. This revivalism is a reaction against the type of activities in which these people are indulging and if there is revivalism . . . (Interruption) . . . the responsibility will be on the Communists. Let me tell them quite frankly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is how a Minister talks.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The responsibility will be on the Communist Party. It is they who have said that there is obscurantism. I have not said it. It is they who have said that there is a growing tendency of obscurantism and revivalism and if that is so, the responsibility must be taken by these gentlemen who are trying to indoctrinate and who are trying to preach against the basic doctrines of Islam.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never thought that he is so allergic to communism.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Please do not interrupt. Let the hon. Minister proceed. He is in possession of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, entertainment.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Please let him go on.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Now, we enter the stage of entertainment and I leave the Communist Party here. I now proceed to another subject I do not want to go into the Report. Enough has been said on the floor of the House about it. I do not also like to say anything about the comments of the University on the Report. Again, the Government will examine them. But there is one thing about which I feel very strongly and I think the Aligarh University has not realised its full responsibility in this matter. That is with regard to the employment of dismissed Government servants. Now, what do they say? This is the type of comment which the University has made:

"The main objection in this case is that he was re-employed by the University although he was dismissed by the U.P. Government.

As already pointed out, there is no ban on the re-employment by the University of dismissed Govt. servants. Also it is reasonable to assume that the Selection Committee which interviewed Mr. Mushtaq Ali had a fairly clear idea of his past career and had recommended him after taking the fact of his dismissal into consideration. It may further be pointed out that his work in the workshop has been satisfactory."

Now, Sir, I ask the House, what does this mean? Here are people who have been dismissed by the U.P. Government on account of moral turpitude, criminal offences? And this is the defence which the University gives. I would like to know which way the University is drifting to. Who is taking responsibility for the statement? When I ask the Vice-Chancellor, he says he is sorry. He is not even prepared to take responsibility for this. What are we to do about this matter? The University must realise that it is dependent on the Government completely. The University is not a separate State or a separate entity. It has to function within the framework of this Government. And they say, it almost amounts to saying, 'Not only we have employed them, but we are justified in employing them and we shall continue to do so.' This is the challenge which they have given to the U.P. Government. What has pained me is that among the members of the Executive Council was an I.C.S. officer. I hope that he was not present on the day this Report was discussed and comments were made. He is an I.C.S. officer in the Government of U.P. and the committee of which an I.C.S. officer is a member says that there is no objection to employing dismissed Government servants. Where are we going? Is that the loyalty which we expect from an I.C.S. officer? I hope he was not present. If he was present, I think it is a very serious matter which the Government will have to take into account.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I hope he was not a communist according to your description.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not get derailed, Dr. Shrimali.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It does not affect me, because I am stating a truth. When I am stating a truth, I am not worried about anything.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the attitude he has taken towards us.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I think the University has misunderstood the nature of autonomy. If they say that in the name of autonomy they can employ dismissed Government servants, they are quite mistaken. That will not be done and if they want directives, Government will give directives. If anybody gives shelter and asylum to criminals, to people who are dismissed by Government, Government will give a directive to the University. Let me be very clear about this. If the University forces the Government to do it, we shall do it and I shall not shirk my responsibility in this matter.

Sir, I have already exceeded my time-limit. It is not my intention to detain the House any longer. I do not want to go into the various matters which have been raised, but one thing in the end I should like to say. It would have been much better for the Vice-Chancellor and the authorities of the University to have devoted more time to the University instead of lobbying in the halls of Parliament, meeting Members of Parliament and giving them briefs.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Not only in Parliament but also in Western Court.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Unfortunately the nature of responsibilities which a Vice-Chancellor has to discharge has not been fully understood. I consider the Vice-Chancellor's office to be the

greatest office in this country, and we would like to send our best people as Vice-Chancellors of Universities. Sir, the Vice-Chancellor should move about with dignity, and not sit in the Hall of Parliament and canvass among Members of Parliament or give briefs to the Members opposite. This is not the kind of thing which is expected of persons who are holding that post of responsibility. I am here to defend the university, it is my duty to defend the university, and I will do so, but what is this kind of canvassing and issuing pamphlets and all other things being done? Their Public Relations Officer comes in the official gallery here and goes to the places where news are being issued. Is that the way in which the University should respect truth? These are very objectionable matters, and I would again appeal to the University with all the sincerity and earnestness I can command to put their house in order. It is no use trying to shield the evil things which exist in the University. The University is passing through a crisis at this time. As I said, there are two forces pitted against each other. There is the strong, organised Communist Party there and there is this revivalist group which are both quarrelling among themselves. Our friends there know all this, and they want to take full advantage of the situation. Therefore, I would like to warn the University that for some time it is in their interest to keep out of politics. Let them devote their time to study. Let them devote their time to giving more time to the students. They need their guidance, and help. And the University would be rendering the greatest service if they acted more as professors and less as politicians. I have great respect for our friend, Mr. Sapru, and I agree with every word he has said. He need not have quoted Harold Laski. He could have quoted our Prime Minister. I am proud of this fact that the Government have always respected the autonomy of the university. Here in India we have professors belonging to the Communist Party. Nobody objects to their being there; We have

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

also professors who belong to Jamait-i-Islami. If there is any organisation which is acting against the national interest, which is indulging in anti-national activities, Government will have to consider as to what should be done about it.

Sir, freedom must bring with it a sense of greater responsibility. If the universities want to enjoy freedom, let the professors show a greater sense of responsibility. That is the only way in which university autonomy can be preserved. University autonomy cannot be preserved through nepotism, through corruption, through maladministration. For preserving university autonomy we must have people who have the highest integrity and character in the university. That is the only way in which university autonomy can be preserved. I do not think it is Mr. Sapru's wish that in the name of university autonomy the university should do anything it likes. When there is an agitation in Kerala, they sign a statement; when there is an attack by China, they keep quiet.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On a point of personal explanation. I have made my position perfectly clear. I have referred to subversive activities and I have said that they are not covered by political activities.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He will not understand.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: One word I must again say. We have a liberal Government in this country. We have maintained democratic traditions in this country since independence. This country has allowed political opposition. But no country can take risk with its security. This point I wish to drive home as forcefully as I can to my friends there. It is the responsibility of the Education Ministry to inculcate nationalism among the students. It is the responsibility of the Education Ministry to make people aware that they have a duty towards the country. There they think of Soviet Russia and China and they get

their guidance from there. Let the Communist Party declare in unequivocal terms that China has been an aggressor and I shall stop criticising the Communist Party in this country. (Interruption) I have never criticised the Communist Party, but when they take sides, when in the case of Kerala they agitate and in the case of China they keep quiet, that is what is worrying us. Let them make an unequivocal declaration that there is aggression by China, we will stop criticising the Communist Party, we will embrace them with both arms.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, a copy should be made available to us to pursue the matter.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am sorry that I have to speak after the Education Minister's tirade against the Communist Party. I thought that the Education Minister was speaking on behalf of the House which had endorsed his decision to appoint such a Committee when such questions were asked in the House. I thought that the Education Minister was speaking on behalf of the Government to make the policy of the Government clear in relation to the University. I had never thought for a moment that he was speaking as Dr. Shrimali, a Member of Rajya Sabha from the Congress Party from the State of Rajasthan. I never thought that he was going to make such a speech. Sir, he had his opportunity as a Member of Rajya Sabha and he could have spoken on the debate on the International Situation and taken his stand on the question of the Communist Party's attitude towards the border question. I do not think it adds to the dignity of the position of Education Minister if the Education Minister speaks on a report like this, in a manner like this and on a point like this. I am sorry I never provoked anyone . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: You spoke of McCarthyism. That provoked me.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Is it not the responsibility of the Education Minister to place before the House all facts with regard to the University?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think I also know my responsibilities a little. I did not in my original speech suggest anything of the kind. My friend also did not suggest anything because Prof. Wadia not as a member of the Committee but as a Member of Rajya Sabha spoke something about the Communist Party, and the leader of the Communist Party spoke something. If Dr. Shrimali had to say anything, he could have asked some Congress Member to answer Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He should not have wasted his lungs on speaking like that. He may have his anti-Communist views. Let him have his anti-Communism, let him enjoy it. I am quite satisfied that he will never change his view towards the Communist Party even if the Communist Party says so many things. He said he would embrace it. I am sure he will never embrace. That is a mistake he will never commit of joining a Party of oppressed masses or for that matter any leftist party. I am sorry I do not expect that sort of thing from him, but I did expect him to give a proper statement of policy. However, if he did not fulfil his responsibility, it was not my mistake. But certain points have been raised. I can understand his anger that so much of anti-Communism was not displayed in the debate in this House as was done to his satisfaction in the Lok Sabha. He might have been disappointed in that, and therefore he thought that he should do that job. I have no grouse, no complaint. That is a different matter. But then let me just place very humbly before the Education Minister that it is not Communism that breeds obscurantism. It is not Communism that creates communalism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Prime Minister does not say so.

DR. R. B. GOUR: If that were to be so, the Communist Party would not

be invited to a National Integration Conference. Anyway I am not going into that. But one thing I would like to ask the hon. Minister who claims to be a great educationist also. Revivalism of the worst type existed in this country. Does he mean to say that that has been bred by the Communist Party? I would like to know if there are certain Hindu politicians on those Benches in his party who say, India was never free for one thousand years and the first time it got freedom was on 15th August, 1947 and this revivalism is preached with a brazen face. Then does it mean that the Communist Party is responsible for it and did it generate it? Let him not for a moment confuse obscurantism with Communism even in an indirect manner because that would be wrong. It would be against the tenets of intellectual honesty to say that Communism breeds it; it does not breed obscurantism, it fights it. And we know that there is going to be a bitter battle against obscurantism, revivalism and communalism of both the varieties, Hindu as well as Muslim. I am sure, Sir, that the forces of liberalism and the forces of educationists, of rationalists, of democrats and of Communists will have to unify in one common stream to fight against revivalism, communalism, casteism and chauvinism. That is what we mean by national integration. In this very University of Aligarh, in the past obscurantism ruled the roost; all the liberalising forces met together and fought against it. Unfortunately, it is the anti-Communism of that brand that was demonstrated in this House that has again revived such forces, not only in the University but all over the country. Therefore..

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Dr. Shrimali cannot deny it. Nehru is there. What is he?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Therefore, they are not bothered about it. So, I appeal to the House. I am not bothered about what the Education Minister says because the Prime Minister himself has said that Ministers in our own country also sometimes speak with