

tomorrow we go on as long as some kind of relevant discussion is taking place. Is that all right?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: That is all right.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): They do not want relevance, Sir.

# THE BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION  
(DR. K. L. SHRIMALI) Sir, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, it is my unpleasant duty to bring this measure before this House. Nothing is more painful to me than perhaps such a drastic measure for this great University which has also been my *alma mater*. The University has been suffering from a chronic disease for the last several years and it has lost its power of recuperation from within. It is only as a last resort that the Government has decided to intervene and however painful the task may be, I shall not shirk my responsibility and duty to this House as well as to the University. Sir, I would not like to embarrass you in any way by relating the circumstances under which you had to leave the Banaras Hindu University. I would, however, like to say that the University has fallen on evil days since your departure in 1948. Eminent scholars and statesmen have gone to this University as Vice-Chancellors but one after another they left the University in sheer disgust. Sir, you would remember that Dr. Amar Nath Jha had given an assurance that he would serve the University not only for three years but even for a longer period if he found a favourable atmosphere in the University. Dr. Amar Nath Jha left the University within a period of ten months and the conclusion which we have to draw is clear that he did not find the atmos-

phere of the University favourable. He was succeeded by Pandit Govind Malaviya. I have placed before the House a detailed report by Shri Govind Malaviya which would fully acquaint the House with the situation which was existing in the University and which led Shri Govind Malaviya to quit the University. Shri Govind Malaviya was succeeded by the eminent scholar and statesman, the late Acharya Narendra Deva. I quote here a Resolution given notice of by a Member of the Court which was considered at its meeting on Sunday, the 5th April 1954. The Resolution said:

"इस कोर्ट की दृष्टि में आचार्य नरेन्द्रदेव जैसे व्यक्तित्वनामा कुलपति के होते हुए भी गत कई वर्षों से हिन्दू विश्व-विद्यालय के कार्य में प्रगति नहीं हो सकी है। जो चक्र जहाँ था वही है तथा नियुक्तियों एवम् साधारण प्रबन्ध में कहीं कहीं उससे भी पीछे है। अतः यह कोर्ट भारत सरकार से अनुरोध करता है कि वह भविष्य में कुलपति के निर्वाचन में इस बात का ध्यान रखे—I would like the House to note the following words—कि कुलपति पूर्ण स्वस्थ, कुशल, न्यायप्रिय तथा ऐसा व्यक्ति हो जो विश्वविद्यालय की व्यवस्था में पूरा समय लगा सके।"

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: In English.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Well, Sir, the purport of this Resolution is clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They are asking for the English version.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Banaras Hindu University has not been able to make any progress in spite of the fact that it had availed of the services of eminent scholars and statesmen like Acharya Narendra Deva. The Resolution further goes to say that the Government of India should keep in mind when it is appointing Vice-Chancellors that the Vice-Chancellor

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

should be just, that the Vice-Chancellor should have administrative ability and the Vice-Chancellor should be healthy. Well this Resolution is a clear reflection . . .

SHRI T. PANDE: (Uttar Pradesh): Was it withdrawn?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, Sir. I was only giving the Resolution. It was withdrawn ultimately when good sense prevailed. But this Resolution was enough to break the heart of Acharya Narendra Deva.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: (Uttar Pradesh): Who moved that Resolution and how was it withdrawn?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This was moved by Shri Krishna Deva Prasad Gour. It is true that the Resolution was later on withdrawn when good sense prevailed. But when Acharya Narendra Deva resigned, he said he was resigning on account of ill-health. We should not forget the fact that immediately after one month of the notice of this Resolution, Acharya Narendra Deva resigned and people in whom he confided, would agree with me that his heart broke when notice of this Resolution was given.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): May. I ask what Shri Krishna Deva Prasad Gour is now? Is he a Congress M.L.C.?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am not going to discuss persons and personalities. I am only giving these facts. Whether he is a Congress M.L.A. or a Socialist or a Communist, I am not concerned. I am concerned only with the situation which has been arising in the University continuously.

Sir, he was succeeded by Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar and I have placed the letter which he sent to the Government, to the Visitor, and he clearly says that he found himself completely ineffective to carry out the policies in which he believed and he could not influence the large policies in the

University. And, therefore, he left the university in despair.

Sir, I would not like to take up the time of the House describing the treatment which has been given to the present Vice-Chancellor. He has become the subject of public controversy and I would not like to say here anything about the present Vice-Chancellor. I would only like to say that the Banaras Hindu University has made history when it tried to prevent the Vice-Chancellor from entering the campus of the University.

Sir, these incidents which took place one after another, were a matter of great concern to the Government. There were repeated strikes. Agitations were started on false issues. The Banaras Hindu University became an ideal place where no punishment could be given to anybody for dereliction of duty or defiance of law and order. All these years, the Government had hoped that these eminent Vice-Chancellors, persons of great integrity and character, would be able to put the University in proper order. But our hopes were in vain. Therefore, as the last resort, the President, in his capacity as Visitor of the University, ordered that an enquiry should be made into the affairs of the University in pursuance of section 5 (2) of the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915.

Sir, the Mudaliar Committee has again become a subject of great public controversy. But I would like to submit that as far as the Government is concerned, we could not have appointed a better committee than this. On this Committee, we had the eminent Vice-Chancellor of a university—Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar who has been an educationist of international reputation. On the Committee we had an ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India and an ex-Judge of the Bombay High Court and an ex-Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University. We had also two Members of Parliament on the Committee. Sir, I do not think it would have

been possible for us to have had a better team and a better committee to enquire into the affairs of this University.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): Does the report . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would request the hon. Member to have some patience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will have your opportunity to speak. I am going to allow everybody to have his say.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Provided he is relevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, provided he is relevant and he is not repetitive.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, the University was informed about this matter on the 20th July 1957 and was requested in pursuance of section 5(3) of the Act to appoint a representative who may be present and be heard by the Committee. The old Executive Council of the University appointed Dr. V. S. Jha, the Vice-Chancellor of the University as its representative at the enquiry instituted by the Visitor. The Committee submitted its report in May 1958 and when that report came to us I was greatly shocked. Personally I would have very much liked that this report had not been published. But at the same time I had to make this information available to the Members of Parliament. It could not be kept a secret document.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Due to the newspapers?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Therefore, the report was published.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Why should it be kept a secret and not published?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I was not very happy about some of the things which had been said about the University.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): They were not true?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): May I ask the hon. Minister a question? Does he imply that he could have or would have kept it a secret if he wanted to?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I could not have kept it a secret, as I have said. But my first reaction was that such a report was not made public. It is regretted that certain factual errors had crept into the body of the report. But I would like to submit that these errors do not affect in any way the main conclusions of the report which have been accepted by the Government. The Government have not accepted each and every statement contained in the report. We are concerned with the main conclusions which have been arrived at by the Mudaliar Committee, and I have no doubt in my mind that the central fact which has been underlined by the Committee is that there are pressure groups inside the University which are vitiating its academic atmosphere. This fact has been fully substantiated by the reports of the various ex-Vice-Chancellors. I would, therefore, request the hon. Members to recognise the central feature of the Banaras Hindu University when we are discussing this measure, and I would also request the hon. Members that this central fact should not be clouded by the various unimportant issues arising out of this report. Nobody who has the interest of the University at heart and who wants to judge this issue impartially can deny that there is a canker in the body politic of this University which is eating into its vitals, and unless it is completely eradicated, normal health will not be restored in the University's body.

Sir, I would not like to take the time of the House any longer. I would give briefly the main provisions of this Bill. There are four special features of the Bill. Firstly,

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

the Court which was the supreme governing body in the original Bill has been made an advisory body. The Court in the past has been a centre of intrigues, and much of the trouble that has arisen in the University has arisen because of the certain composition of the Court as it existed. Therefore, after we received the Mudaliar Committee report we changed the character of the Court. We nominated members to the Court and we took away the powers which it had in the past and made it an advisory body.

Another change which has been introduced in this measure is that the Executive Council has been given the sole authority to administer the University, and the members the Executive Council instead of being elected have all been nominated by the Visitor. Thirdly, certain changes have been made in the composition of the Selection Committee. I would like to say that after this Bill went to the Select Committee the provision with regard to the Selection Committee has been made more or less on the same lines as those laid down prior to the promulgation of the Ordinance, except that there is no Visitor's nominee on the Selection Committee and the Treasurer will not sit on the Selection Committee for the appointment of the post of Registrar.

Sir, another provision which has been made is with regard to the Reviewing Committee. This again has been a subject of great controversy. After we received the reports of the ex-Vice-Chancellors and the report of the Mudaliar Committee, the Government had to take some action to set matters right inside the University. Nobody will deny that there are these pressure groups inside the University which are vitiating the academic life of the University and which have completely paralysed the academic atmosphere in the University. The Government had to take some action. Now what is the way in which things could be remedied?

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Groups or only one group?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There may be one or two groups, that does not matter. The fact is that there are people inside the University who are corrupting the life of the University. That is a fact which must be recognised, and that is the central fact which I have been emphasizing throughout.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: That has not been recognised.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Therefore it was necessary. The Mudaliar Committee itself has suggested that a Screening Committee should be appointed to look into the conduct of those teachers who have been responsible for vitiating the atmosphere of the University. The Select Committee decided that its name should be changed into Reviewing Committee. I have accepted that amendment.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sugar-coated pill.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Another change which has been made is that the Solicitor-General to the Government of India has been brought into the picture. The Executive Committee will consider the cases of those persons whose continuance in the University is detrimental to its interest. They will give their own observations and will send the report to the Solicitor-General. If the Solicitor-General is satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case with regard to these people, he will send the papers to the Reviewing Committee. The teachers will have full opportunity to present their case before the Reviewing Committee, and before the Executive Committee which will finally decide about this matter.

Sir, I must say that I was not very happy when the Select Committee

made certain changes in this Bill. The changes that have been made now will bring within the ambit of the provision the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and the Treasurer also. Now, the Vice-Chancellor's office should be considered as one of the highest offices in our country, and no University can function effectively if the teachers know that they can bring in complaints against the Vice-Chancellor also to the Court. But since this controversy had arisen and since various kinds of false accusations had been made against the Vice-Chancellor, I have accepted this change in this provision. Now, after this provision, complaints could be made against the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Chancellor and the Treasurer who were members of the last Executive Committee when this Ordinance was promulgated, and the Executive Committee will send these papers to the Solicitor-General without making any comments. If the Solicitor-General is satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case with regard to these people, he would send the papers to the Reviewing Committee, and these people, if they are themselves concerned in this matter, will not sit in the Executive Committee when this matter is being discussed.

Sir, after these provisions have been made I think there should be no reason for complaint from any quarter. The ends of social justice are fully met. The teachers will have an opportunity to have their say in the Reviewing Committee as well as the Executive Committee. The Solicitor-General of India will fully examine this case, and still I find that there is a hue and cry as to why this Reviewing Committee has been set up. This arouses a suspicion in my mind that vested interests, people who have been responsible for this state of affairs in the University, who have been responsible for the ruin of the University, are afraid that this Reviewing Committee may possibly put an end to all the malpractices in which they have been indulging for the past several years.

Sir, these are the four main provisions of this Bill. I would like to submit that this is a temporary measure. I propose to bring a comprehensive measure before this House as early as possible. It will be my constant endeavour to see that normal conditions are restored in the University to see that all these bodies have been set up, remove the canker from the body of the University, eradicate all those elements which have been responsible for the ruin of this University and to bring this state of affairs to an end and after that has been done, I hope the normal life—academic life—in the University will be restored. The Banaras Hindu University is a great national institution. This University must be set in order so that it may play its due role in the task of national reconstruction. During the last few years, after you had departed from the University, Sir, it has gone astray. It is the responsibility of this House to give a constructive lead so that it may turn its back on its real path of seeking truth and knowledge.

Sir, I do not want to say anything more, but I would like to request the hon. Members that in discussing the affairs of the University, we should be able to rise above politics. The University does not serve any particular section of the society; it serves the whole society. It is a social institution and it is one of the greatest social institutions. Therefore, it is our duty to see that in discussing the affairs of the University we rise above narrow parochialism, and party politics. I would, therefore, request the hon. Members of this House, with the greatest humility that in discussing this measure we may consider the whole problem in its proper perspective and we may concentrate on the main issue which is involved in this measure. I would like also to submit that hon. Members of this House themselves have on several occasions made complaints about the standards of our universities. Here is a test case as far as one

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

universities are concerned. If the House can give a constructive lead in this measure, it will have an effect on all the universities of this country. The question is, are we prepared to discuss this question in a non-partisan spirit? Sir, the universities have a very important role to play in the reconstruction of our society. We have undertaken various plans and projects and the success of all these does not depend so much on material resources as on human talent and human resources and it is the function of the universities to provide this talent and this leadership. If the universities fail at this critical time in our history, the future of this country will be very bleak. It is in this spirit that I have brought this measure before the House and it is in this spirit that I would like this House to consider this measure.

Thank you.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, before the hon. Minister sits down, may I ask him a question? I think he owes an explanation to the House as to why the Select Committee of only one House was appointed even from the point of view of saving time. The Motion was made on the 13th and this House met only on the 18th. He might as well have told us about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Seeta Parmanand, this question was raised some time ago in this House and the Minister gave an explanation. There is no doubt about it. There was no idea of having a Select Committee at all in the first instance. Then it was an after-thought and it was put through and we met a week later. I have said once before—I repeat it again—that this House has a genuine grievance in that matter.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I have explained the position and I would like to apologise to this House that a Joint Select Committee was not appointed. I might also like to inform the House that I myself was not a

member of the Select Committee—myself being a member of this House, I was not a member of the Select Committee. But I thought that the agony in regard to the affairs of the University should not be prolonged and therefore, I took a great risk of not becoming myself a member of the Select Committee and I had no intention to flout the wishes of the House. And I would have been very happy if there had been a Joint Select Committee. But it is under these circumstances that this measure had to be adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

“That the Bill further to amend the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.”

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Chairman, I would begin where the hon. Minister has ended.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

With all the courage that I could muster, I should like to be constructive. But, unfortunately, I shall have to make certain remarks which, in the opinion of the hon. Minister, would not be constructive. But at the same time, as far as the University is concerned, as far as the whole problem is concerned, I hope they would be in a way constructive, because criticism of certain things that have gone wrong is always constructive even though it is criticism. Nevertheless, I would make the best of my efforts to suggest certain remedies which, in my opinion, have got to be suggested and which, in my opinion also, the Government shall have to adopt.

Sir, I may quite agree with the hon. Minister that the central point that has got to be considered is the existence of pressure groups in cliques in the Banaras Hindu University. Otherwise, Sir, I hope it would not be any Indian university because in every university they exist. I agree

on that point. Straightway, I would agree on that point and straight I will go into finding a solution of that point, of that canker, that disease that trouble, that has arisen in that University, which is a Central University. But, Sir, may I ask the hon. Minister, with all the humility at my command, is that the only central point that has been raised by the Mudaliar Committee? Or has the Mudaliar Committee found a very straight answer to this straight question? Or is it even there that it has indulged in certain half-truths? Sir, the hon. Minister was right when he said about pressure groups. But I think a perusal of the report—even a cursory perusal of the report—would lead us to the conclusion that there is only one pressure group in the University. And unfortunately that Committee has landed itself into a mess by quoting certain individuals, certain memoranda that have been submitted to it. I should like to submit that the first and foremost mistake committed was by the Government itself in giving incomplete reference to this Committee. Why is it so? What prevented the Government from also recommending to this Committee to go into the financial aspects of the University, the administrative aspects of the University, into the educational aspect, curriculum and everything? How is it that the educational standards are going down? One central point of the reference was indiscipline. If you could see, you will find that the Government itself has committed a mistake by making only indiscipline the central point of reference. Therefore, the Committee also has gone into only the question of indiscipline, from only a certain angle. So, the Committee has come to certain conclusions which are not wholly true, that Committee has come to conclusions which are not verified, that Committee has come to conclusions which are not justified. Therefore, when I make a criticism of this Committee, it is rather with pain that I do so because with this Committee are associated really very eminent

men of our country, men of learning, men of education, men of science, men who have been connected with the universities and university administration and life for long years. Therefore, I am sorry to say that it is all the more painful to me because I have got to say certain things—of course, I take pride in considering myself a student of Dr. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar, not directly, but by reading his books even when I was a medical student at Hyderabad—and such eminent men were expected to go into this question in a manner which will be really effective, which will be correct, so that the conclusions would be unchallengeable and straight. What is it that was needed? It was that they should go straight into the question and then create a sense of responsibility in the country and a sense of authenticity in the report and then take the country as a whole to tackle the acute problem of the Banaras Hindu University. But what has happened? What is the result? Is that the result of the Mudaliar Committee? Is that the result of the measure that has been adopted by the Government? No. Sir, I must confess that the Report started with an incomplete reference. In the Report you find unverified findings and therefore there are certain hasty conclusions. What is the result of all these hasty conclusions? There is no determination to fight the evil. Now that is an unfortunate position, Sir, Let us examine the real facts. Let us obtain the real facts. I quite agree with the hon. Minister that the central fact or the central point has not to be ignored. I would rather emphasise that the central point should not be ignored. But at the same time, I must not also forget or miss the defects in the entire approach, the defects in the very genesis. Sir, the matter could have been tackled in a straightforward manner and the findings could have been easily verified. Of course Sir, the Mudaliar Committee had before it thousands of memoranda. But if that evidence was to be tested and its authenticity was to be tested then counter-evidence ought to have

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

been called from those against whom this evidence was given. But that was not done. That ought to have been done. In fact, that should have been the ordinary procedure. In this unfortunate Report what do we find? We find a Divisional Commissioner submitting a report about students, and that has been quoted. I should have asked whether that Divisional Commissioner's evidence was tested at all and its authenticity proved by some counter-evidence. I should have asked whether the students were called to cross-examine the Divisional Commissioner when he said certain things about those very students. Well, without cross-examination or verification no report would be authentic, and also no conclusion would be sound. Therefore, it is bound to create confusion; it is bound to raise tempers. And therefore, Sir, this is a very serious matter.

Now, Sir, the hon. Minister has himself accepted that certain errors have crept in. Is it merely that certain errors have crept in? Are these errors not of any serious magnitude? Are they not creating really some problems? Is it not a fact that these errors are entirely responsible for clouding the entire issue of the Banaras Hindu University today? Well, Sir, when you are giving a whole table of cases that have been launched, many cases do not exist. I made it a point personally to see whether there were such cases; I made it a point even to enquire whether notices had been served and later on some compromise arrived at. But I have seen cases where no notice was served leave alone their remaining pending in the court. Then Sir, they have given a whole list with a view to creating the impression that a certain group is responsible to get all its relatives admitted to the staff of the University. But I am afraid many of those instances were also wrong, not authenticated, not verified and not correct. There are not many relatives. Of course, Sir, I am told that the problem of the son-in-law

of a person has been brought in who has no daughter at all.

(Interruption).

I also enquired from my informant whether he had his brother's daughter and therefore the son-in-law means son-in-law only in law and not actual son-in-law. Anyway, my reports were quite different. Dr. Kunzru is, of course, intimately, connected with it, and therefore, his reports may be different. But anyway these facts are quite wrong. And even if one fact is wrong, it is a reflection on that Committee, and such a high-powered committee as that. Therefore, Sir, these errors are not errors, but they are actually blunders that have crept into the report and that are clouding the whole issue. Let us not forget that. Therefore, let us muster courage and disown these errors so that we can create a proper and right atmosphere in the Banaras Hindu University, and let us take it in the right direction so that it can take the people into confidence, whom it wants to reform and whom it wants to serve. That is absolutely necessary to be done. I want a courageous step to be taken in this respect. Let us not forget that. I won't agree with the Prime Minister when he says that this is a high-powered committee and therefore we should not reject its report. Haven't you rejected many high-powered committees' reports? Haven't you rejected the Ashoka Mehta Committee's Report? Haven't you rejected many other high-powered committees' reports in this country? Then why not do that in this case? Again, Sir, I must remind the House that I am making a very constructive suggestion. Let the Government muster courage and reject the blunders and errors that have been committed in this report. Otherwise, you are not going to instil any confidence into the public, which is very necessary for you in order to make a beginning towards the reform that you have taken up in your hands. That is very necessary. Sir, I feel that the obstetrician has come to certain wrong conclusions. I humbly



submit that it could have been a normal delivery at the very outset but the obstetrician has suggested instrumental application for the case just because he has not been able to come to a sound conclusion.

Sir, I may remind the hon. Minister that I personally met Mr. Krishna Dev Prasad Gour who happened to be my relative also. I asked him: What is it that has made you bring forward this resolution against Acharya Narendra Deva? Well, he tried to play on me and he said that he was a P.S.P. gentleman and he was creating some kind of nepotism in favour of the P.S.P. I plainly asked him: Is it not a fact that certain political prejudices against Acharya Narendra Deva have made you bring forward this resolution? I asked him that question. The existence of cliques is there in every university. But may I ask one question here? Is it not fact that every Vice-Chancellor has left the University with a heavy heart? There is no doubt that the existence of cliques is there in every university, but it is very troublesome in the case of the Banaras Hindu University. That we agree. I put this question to those who refused to agree, and they could not say 'no' to it. They had to agree that every Vice-Chancellor had gone with a heavy heart. But I would beg of the hon. Minister not to implicate in this affair students and say that they are removing these Vice-Chancellors, because it would be against facts. The Committee has suggested that these groups have utilised these students in their bargains. But that is an unfortunate blunder again that has crept into the report. May I ask one question from the hon. Minister? Could anybody produce facts that the students were instrumental in staging any demonstration against Dr. Radhakrishnan, any demonstration against Dr. Amar Nath Jha, any demonstration against Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar or Shri Govind Malaviya? Students went to the railway station to prevent Dr. Radhakrishnan from going away from the University. Students approached Dr. Amarnath

Jha not to leave the University. Students did not want Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar to leave Banaras. In fact, Sir, any, authentic report would have said that these students defended these Vice-Chancellors. But unfortunately that is not the impression that you get from the report. The impression that the report creates is that the students have been used by these pressure groups against these eminent Vice-Chancellors also, which is not correct, and which is quite wrong. I should say that no facts have been produced to verify such a statement and therefore that statement is damaging. Therefore, Sir, you must with courage tell the students that you are not going to accept such a thing, which is quite wrong. Only then you will be able to instil confidence among the students. May I say that the moral allegation against the student is something very unfortunate. I don't know how it could have been slipped into the report. As I told you, a Divisional Commissioner's evidence is not a word of law or a word of God. To make it the whole basis of allegation against the students themselves in such a sweeping manner, in such loose manner, to implicate and cast aspersions on the entire community of students of the Banaras Hindu University, is something very astounding, very amazing and is something that I cannot stand. Therefore, I should ask, is it a fact that only in Banaras the tempers have been roused against this? The clique is there. You should have been able to isolate the clique and take the entire people with you in order to see that the clique is not there or see that the clique is rectified or something done to it, but what has happened? In fact, the temper is roused because these blunders are there in the report, they are given prominence in the report. They are in your actions also, unfortunately in your speeches also. You have not isolated these two things. May I ask, is it only one particular group that existed, whatever name you may give it? I would like to ask, how is it that the last two or three years of the

[Shri R. B. Gour]

Banaras University administration was not being subjected to any scrutiny of this Committee or the Governmental authorities? Does it mean that the cliques existed only before these two years? My information is and I am not in the habit of producing unverified information on the floor of this House—that a 'clique' has been created even round the present administration in the Banaras Hindu University and not a very happy clique that way. Sir, without implicating any persons, who cannot defend themselves here, may I tell you that there is in Banaras Hindu University what is nicknamed as 'bucket group' or 'balti group'. You know what a bucket or a balti is. It is a sort of a club of happy-go-lucky teachers and professors who so far have not indulged in the University politics, who have just a club of playing cards and enjoying life. Now, it is these people who have been implicated around the present administration in the University and they have come to play a dominant and a predominant role in the University affairs. Would you like to fight a clique with the help of or by creating another clique? Will that be a democratic way or a scientific way of tackling a problem which you want to tackle? All these are not prominent men.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have put up 2 speakers. Forty-five minutes is the time allotted for your side. You have taken 22 1/2 minutes.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We will adjust. Let me finish the points which my Party wants to raise. I would like you to start with a clean slate. This is not a very happy group and some of them are not very eminent men in this group so as to deserve toleration in spite of their vices. Why don't you smash it? You don't have that courage, you don't have that approach to begin with.

Then an impression is created by this report and my friend Mr. Chettiar's

amendment is a reflection of that wrong impression that has gained currency in this country. That impression is that northerners are dominating this Banaras Hindu University and the southerners are victims of that domination. I want to smash that impression which has been created unfortunately by the report and utterances of Government members themselves. Shall I give you the facts? Among the teachers—the total number is 575—those who come from outside U.P. are 364—a clear majority of 63 per cent. Let me remind you that wherever recruitment is made, the persons belonging to the State where the centre of recruitment exists, are always getting a priority and get a better chance anywhere in the country.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: This is an all-India University.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am coming to that point which is another misnomer. I should like to ask you, how many all-India institutions are there in the country where you deny this . . .

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): The Madras State admit students from any part of the country in their University . . .

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Do you mean to say . . .

(Interruptions.)

DR. R. B. GOUR: Shall I yield to all these interruptions? I am talking of teachers. Let us not go into other things. Take any all-India institution—a regional research laboratory, a food research institute or any institute. If the recruitment is in any State, obviously the people belonging to that State get a priority for the simple reason that the centre of recruitment is there. Nevertheless, the Banaras Hindu University has a majority of non-U.P. people in the teaching staff. (Interruptions.) I beg of hon. Members to please listen to me. I am not making any destructive suggestion. I am not speaking on the basis of facts which

cannot be proved. Take the appointments during the months of March to December 1957. The total was 191, people from outside U.P. were 125 and from U.P. the rest. Could there be any more positive proof that in the teaching staff, it is not people from U.P. who dominate? Why then this allegation? Among the students in the technical colleges—agriculture and engineering colleges—probably 59 per cent. are non-U.P. students. Then why should it be made such a big issue? I would beg the hon. Member who moves the amendment to make the Madras University a Central University and tell me next year if Madras students are not in a majority in that university? Why this hullabaloo about this matter that it is a Central University? It is a Central University because the Centre gives the maximum of grant but suddenly a Central University means an all-India University and an all-India University means all-India population and all-India population means that the local population must suffer. That seems to be the logic—that is exactly the logic that is very detrimental to the very approach towards this University. It is unfortunate that Banaras is situated in Banaras where it exists. You could take any Banaras from Banaras and say Banaras is no more inhabited by the people of U.P. Of course the U.P. students are there in the arts college. The arts college people don't go from one State to another. Even then you find a fairly good number in the arts colleges. Only for technical education people go beyond their State boundaries and there you have the Banaras University. What has happened in Banaras to say that the Banaras University has lost its all-Indian character and therefore the all-India Government must do something to reinstate that? That is something very obnoxious, the very approach militates against the so-called national approach that we want to build up in this country? I cannot understand. I am happy that Osmania University was not taken over by the Centre and made a Central

University. We have already enough trouble in the Osmania University without having to import more by making it an all-India . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): You would have got more grants.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We don't want such grants which means more problems. This is the problem. I want you to tackle it in that spirit. The students have been provoked because of these unfortunate remarks, the citizens of Banaras have been provoked because of these unfortunate remarks, people from U.P. have been provoked because of these unfortunate remarks, people from South India have been provoked because of these remarks. Let me ask the Government, with whose help are you going to tackle this problem? Is it the way? Therefore, it is very difficult not to take cognisance of these unfortunate features of this report. It is therefore very difficult to criticise the report. We shall have to do it in the very constructive approach which the Minister has suggested should be brought to bear uppermost on the discussions.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair.]

We started with a certain prejudiced approach—no discipline, existence of pressure groups, etc. So starting with prejudices, we have ended in purges.

That is another tactical line of approach of the Government  
1 P.M. in this respect, starting with prejudices and ending with purges.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Even after the report of the two ex-Vice-Chancellors Shri Govind Malaviya and Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, does the hon. Member think that there was prejudice in the mind of the Government?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Of course, I agree there is prejudice in your mind, Government, I do not know, because Government is no person, has no head and no brain.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: That means that the hon. Member does not discriminate between facts and prejudices.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I cannot because there is prejudice in your mind. It is evident. You start with prejudices and end with purges. That is what I am telling you, two types of prejudices, one against the teachers and another against the students.

SHRI T. PANDE: What is left?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Government and the Mudaliar Committee. Sir, the question is that you are prejudiced and the question is you have restored to purges. The rule of the *danda* is there. I tell you how. The report suggests that the students are being utilised by the pressure groups and then it goes on to speak about a person who has been a student for fifteen years. I think the time that he spent in the jail as a result of British oppression is also included in this period. Let me tell you Sir, this. That particular student was arrested at the time of the escape of Shri Subhash Chandra Bose under the charge of alleged conspiracy. He was a student in 1948 and he joined the University in 1951 after passing his examination. I do not know how then the figure of fifteen has been arrived at. That is one fact which is the result of a prejudice. It was not an impartial approach; there was partiality of judgment. That student, and therefore such students, must be purged. What is the *modus operandi* of the purge so far as the students are concerned? A circular by the Vice-Chancellor that the students should not be admitted . . .

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Are we sitting through the lunch Hour, Sir?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Of course.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): We are sitting through the lunch Hour.

DR. R. B. GOUR: A circular from the Vice-Chancellor says that the colleges should not admit students who are indulging in subversive activities. You are an eminent ex-Judge and so, Sir, kindly tell me what subversive activities the students can indulge in? If a student goes to the Communist party office then it becomes subversive activity according to the 'law' prevailing in our country, at least in the major part of our country. What does it mean? This circular is not so innocent as it is made out to be. In the admission form, a *danda* has been added in red ink that the Principal will be justified in rejecting the application of any student without assigning reasons. The limit of purging activity, victimisation. There is no right of appeal and the students cannot go anywhere. They cannot go to the Vice-Chancellor and they cannot come to the hon. Minister. Now, Sir, with this you want the people to support you and say that you are going to tackle the problem in the right way and that, therefore, you must be backed by the entire strength and the full strength.

Then Sir, let me tell you about the teachers. I am told that some sort of a screening committee was sought to be appointed for Allahabad University but that the teachers rejected it and Government had to withdraw it. You can verify this. You may change the nomenclature to sugar-coat the quinine that is inside, but, may I ask one humble question? It is the Executive Council through which the matters will go to the Solicitor-General and it is the Executive Council to which the matters will come back from the Reviewing Committee and therefore the final decision again resets with the Executive Council. You may say that it is a new Executive Council that you are nominating. How then do you justify and how then do you say that full justice will be done to the teachers whose cases will be referred? The Solicitor-General has been brought in, it appears to me, to give a respectable

appearance to the whole of this thing. I have nothing to say. I am told that Dr. Radha Binod Pal is going to be the Chairman of this Committee. He is a very eminent person and I cannot expect or even doubt that he is going to be partial or that he will ever do any such thing. He will be just, I agree, but nevertheless, why don't you guarantee that your new Executive Council is going to be entirely new, nothing to do with those who are associated with the past? Why don't you say so? It is a simple thing. Those gentlemen who have lost the confidence of the people cannot be the instrument of the new approach with which you want to go to the University. Those who have created the atmosphere—right or wrong, I am not going into that, into the merits of that question—and those who have landed themselves in an atmosphere, those that have no confidence absolutely at their command can never be the instrument of the reform that you propose for the Banaras Hindu University.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** How long does the hon. Member propose to take?

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** I am finishing. This is after all the first reading. I have given some amendments but I need not take much time at this stage. Of course, I will not discuss the other points.

Therefore, I would submit that the approach be new; let it not be bureaucratic but let it be one of gaining the confidence. In fact, the other gentlemen should no more be associated with the administration. After all, how do you think that the new Executive Council is going to start with a new approach, with a bold approach, with a democratic approach, to review the whole thing when you have these gentlemen to be the instruments of such an approach? Practically, they have lost the confidence. Therefore, it is necessary to see that these gentlemen are not associated with the Executive Council at least

for the interim period for which you want this Act to operate.

Much has been said in the report and in the speeches about the Ayurvedic College. I would like to take five minutes about this Ayurvedic College business. I am convinced it is one thing which could be isolated from the general problem and solved. There are two major problems for this Ayurvedic College, one is the question of the Principal and the other is the question of the recognition of their degree. Here again I must confess—I do not know whether the hon. Minister is going to accept it or not—that there is a classical example of bungling which the Government has done. For the last twenty years that degree is existing, A.B.M.S., Ayurvedacharya and Bachelor of Medicine and Surgery. The problem is similar to the one at the Lucknow Ayurvedic College. We have an Ayurvedic College in Hyderabad. We give them only the necessary lectures in anatomy and physiology to facilitate them in regard to getting the basic modern grounding for studying Ayurvedic but here they go beyond that. A higher course of modern medicine is taught including anatomy, physiology, bacteriology, pharmacology, medicine, surgery, etc. Now, they want to recognise Ayurveda only for purposes of U.P. and not the B.M.S., portion of the degree. Sir, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor was good enough to give a document which contain the decisions of the Standing Committee of the Executive Council of the Banaras University.

**SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh):** Did the hon. Member say—Standing Committee of the Executive Council?

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** I am sorry; it is the Standing Committee of the Academic Council. In it is given the demands of the students of the Ayurvedic College. I am not going into the whole of it, but point 2 says: A letter is being sent. And after how many years of agitation, Sir? I want to

[Shri R. B. Gour.]

know on this point. Lucknow is going to be a problem. Here the Health Ministry will have to come into the picture. The trouble with our Indian Medical Council is that they are nurtured in the traditions of the British Medical Council and they would outright reject any course where Ayurveda or Unani is mingled with modern medicine. Therefore, a new approach has to be made and the Indian Medical Council will have to appoint a sub-committee to visit this college, to go into the curriculum, to go into the education imparted there, and then suggest the improvements to enable them to recognise it, because they will have to recognise it for the modern medicine side of it not the Ayurvedic side of it. Well, it is for the Medical Council not to go into the Ayurvedic side of it and to enquire whether the B.M.S. side of it is satisfactory or not. Sir, I am unable to understand how a degree of Rome, which bears absolutely no comparison with our M.B.B.S. degree in India, is recognised by the Indian Medical Council. I do not know what are the standards. So the Indian Medical Council will have to approach the issue with full strength and determination.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): How is the old L.M.P. course? Is this course better than the old L.M.P. course?

DR. R. B. GOUR: It is better than L.M.P. There is no surgery in the L.M.P. course.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): L.M.P. course has surgery.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): That L.M.P. course is wide. I do not know whether you had been to Madras and seen the course. The course is a wide one.

DR. R. B. GOUR: There is another tendency not to encourage the L.M.P., L.M.S., etc. In any case, I am convinced that A.B.M.S. is any day better than the Rome degree which has been recognised. But I do not say that you

should recognise it straightaway. You send a Committee to study the curriculum, study the hospital facility, the teaching facility, the qualifications of the staff, etc. Everything you study, then suggest measures, suggest improvements and then recognise it if you are satisfied. For example, they did it in the Osmania University. Dr. B. C. Roy was sent to study the working of that medical college and to make suggestions, where necessary, so that it could be fit for recognition by the Indian Medical Council. Well, he suggested certain improvements in the anatomy course. They were done and the medical college was recognised. Therefore, why cannot the Indian Medical Council be asked to take that course? Let me tell you, Sir, I have submitted a similar thing to the Health Ministry for discussion in the Consultative Committee of the Health Ministry. I want the whole thing to be gone into. I don't agree with the present approach. And then about the principal. Well, it is an unfortunate position. There is quarrel between the modern medicine side of it and the Ayurvedic side of it. Therefore you need a principal who knows both, who will command the confidence of the teaching staff, the students and all the rest of it. Fortunately for us, there is one gentleman in the whole of the country who can do it, who is the right person to do it. Well, here is the copy of the letter from the Vice-Chancellor to Dr. Shukla, the letter which he had written to the Health Ministry, copy to the Education Minister—that Rajkumariji had publicly accepted in Banaras that, that particular gentleman would be given to them on deputation, on loan. Well, I told the students: Don't be carried away by what Rajkumariji had said, she probably might not have known that he was a temporary person. I told the students like that because I knew the position and, as you know, our Ministers do not know all the files; it is natural. Nevertheless I am told now that he is made a permanent incumbent. I would beg of the House to

prevail on the Government and I would beg of the Government to persuade him to accept the post temporarily at least, and we shall have to do this in the interests of the college and the university. My request to Dr. Udappa from this House is: Let him accept this post even temporarily. I know for some reasons he does not want to do so. For example, he thinks that the university students are unruly. He may also think that he may not get a chance to get into the Central Service. He is now in one State Service. All right. From the State Government Service if he can come to the Central Service even as a Principal of an Ayurvedic College he can come to the Central Services. Let us ask him to accept it, because it will be in the interests of the college and the university and of its recognition.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: These are problems of persons.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It is; it has boiled down to that; it is unfortunate. Otherwise you cannot get a similar person.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Change of personnel will not affect beneficially the University in its present set-up.

(Interruptions.)

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am not discussing personalities but here personalities have become policies; that is the trouble with the Banaras University and therefore I would beg of the Government to absolutely isolate and quarantine the Ayurvedic College and the question should be tackled separately, boldly and immediately. About its recognition the Indian Medical Council may appoint a board to examine the matter. The Indian Medical Council will have to basically change its policy, that "we" cannot recognise hotchpotch degrees; that sort of approach should not exist. Therefore, Sir, I think it is necessary that in order to start with a clean slate, to remove the confusion that has been created, to cool down the

heat that has been generated, to bring down the tempers that have been raised, a very courageous declaration on the part of the Government is required, that they do not for a moment agree, not to the small errors but to the blunders that have clouded the central issues. I again say, Sir: Let us not give the new approach the appearance that it is not clean, that it is clumsy, that it is an approach with a vengeance and that it means all that is attributed to it. At this stage I do not have more to say about the entire attitude of the Government and the new measures, and with only one point I will conclude, Sir.

So far as primary and secondary education is concerned, in Kerala you thought that the Bill should be referred to the Supreme Court. But here is a university problem, and you don't think that it should be referred even to the consultative Committee of the Education Ministry. Even the Members of Parliament and the legislators from Banaras should not be taken into confidence! And even the Parliament will be taken into confidence only when you have passed the Ordinance and done everything that you wanted to do. Well, that speaks very badly of the ways of the Ministry, and I think the hon. Minister owes an explanation on this point. The Prime Minister calls the Consultative Committee on Foreign Affairs. So he could have convened a meeting of the Consultative Committee for Education.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): This is again politics.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It is not politics, it is a question of democratic practice. Therefore, I think the whole approach was not a clean approach. Let him not own it up; let him disown it at least at this late hour, and only then will it be possible to instil confidence and move and proceed with the reforms that are so dear not only to him but to the entire Parliament.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I sincerely welcome this Bill. I have only a little regret about it. It should have come much earlier, and nobody had been able to tell us why it could not come much earlier than it has actually come. Sir, I cannot say the very same thing about the report on the Banaras Hindu University. I do not know whether I can say I sincerely welcome the report, but I do confess, Sir, that I have read the report with great interest, with gripping interest. I have rarely read such a report before, which was so frankly expressed, so outspoken as this report. I have also rarely read a report which was so courageous and so bold as this, which has exposed things, persons, parties, groups, with a courage which, I think, is a little on the wrong side, a little too courageous; I have never come across so courageous a report. It has also made recommendations, firm and clear recommendations, long-term as well as short-term. For the time being we are concerned with the short-term, not with the long-term. It will be easy now for the Ministry to prepare a more comprehensive Bill for the long-term reform of the University. Sir, while reading the report I came across certain paragraphs and certain expressions and I began to think whether I was reading a report about any University, about the Hindu University, about the Banaras Hindu University. Sir, I will give just a few lines from page 14 of the report:

"We regret to have to state that from all the material placed at our disposal, we cannot help feeling that it has become a hot-bed of intrigue, nepotism, corruption and even of crimes of various description"

Supposing, Sir, this sentence were placed before somebody and if he was blindfolded and asked what could be the institution about which this is said. I think nobody could dream that it was about a University, much less a University called the Hindu University, the Banaras Hindu Univer-

sity. It is astounding and yet it is true. Therefore, Sir, I must confess to a feeling of sadness when I read that Report. I have met a number of friends from U.P. and a number of other friends in the study group mostly from U.P. were so excited, so acrimonious, so bitter and I was watching all the time, listening all the time with great sadness and wondering in my mind what was the acrimony about, what were the bickerings about. It was to me an intense sense of shame that such a thing could happen in any University. It is no argument to hit back and say but others are also bad—perhaps they are worse—why do you expose us, why do you put your finger so firmly, so harshly upon us, why do you expose the Banaras Hindu University which Pandit Malaviya founded? That argument did not go into me; it produced a sense of repulsion and I said so to my friends. To my friend Mr. Govind Malaviya I said, 'you are very strong; you said things very clearly but I am quite convinced that the report is on the whole materially correct and the Bill as it is, is very necessary, very essential. Only you and I should be extremely sorry that such things have happened.' Even if everything is not true or accurate or not factual—even half the things said in that, I would say perhaps it may be exaggeration—even if a quarter of the things said in that were true, I would say the report is welcome. I would then say, put this University in order and I would go further and say, if this institution is put in order, the other institutions also must be put in order and as quickly as possible. Sir, when I read the . . .

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: If they had the courage . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: If at all we had the courage. The country expects we should have greater sense of courage, greater sense of justice and equity. If this House does not possess it, woe unto the country, not only to the University.



DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: This will have great moral effect on other universities also.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: If any university is to be put right, it must be put right as quickly as possible. Sir, when I read this report, it appeared to me, here was an area, a locality, a land, which is called in war no man's land, where anything could happen—any demonstration, any slogans, besieging a person, humiliating a person—and some of them are noble men held in great respect outside—and nothing could be done and nothing has been done. No police, nothing of the kind, no law and order. I for my life would not like to sit within the campus of . . .

SHRI T. PANDE: It is not a fact; it is not correct.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I am glad to know that.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: There is no know . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Please wait; do not get excited.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: There is no question of getting excited.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: It is a matter of shame; it is not a matter for anger at all.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Yes; it is a matter of shame. That is what I am saying.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Please, Sir.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: I only want to put a question.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): What Prof. Malkani is saying is that the report says that there is no law and order in the campus of the University. Well, that may or may not be a fact but he is entitled to assume that . . .

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: I am only putting a question, Sir.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I am not mentioning any person; I am keeping away from all controversial matter. I am only saying things that . . .

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: I only want to know since when this state of affairs had begun. Was it during the time of the other Vice-Chancellors also?

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: That is not my concern. That is not argument. Please, Sir, don't waste my time.

Therefore my mind began to work that if this University is tainted, perhaps others are also tainted and I have been—we all have been—witnessing such things—lawlessness and disorder—in other universities also and I must confess that now and then I felt that perhaps . . .

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Worse.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I am not hitting anybody; I am not hurting anybody. I am simply making a statement and I do not see why he feels hurt about it. Do not feel too guilty about it. I do not want you to be guilty. I only want to feel along with you a sense of shame. Why don't you share it with me?

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: I do.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: You are sharing guilt with me; I am not going to share guilt. I am feeling a sense of shame. It is the country and the country's universities which are suffering in the same manner in which the Banaras Hindu University is suffering. That is how I feel about it and I must say to my hon. friend, the hon. Minister right opposite to me, that somehow I felt that things are crumbling and only when they fall on our heads we will realise what is wrong. The thing has fallen on our head; let us now at least wake up and realise where we are going.

Sir, he has given us a Bill. I call it the mechanics of the University. You can have four sections and later

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

on a bigger comprehensive Bill with 50 sections or 500 sections and have so many statutes and laws in that. You might, say, have a maze of statutes and rules and you can have excellent rules. But what about the dynamics of the University? What about the dynamics of life? And I begin to think that this question of Eastern Group or Western Group is overdone and this question of politicians and students is overdone. You talk of student-politicians; you talk of professor-politicians; you talk of principal-politicians. Well, everybody is a politician nowadays. Why can't they be politicians? Then I begin to feel that to be a politician is in the air. It is like a disease; it is like an infection. When you get infected you get cholera or plague. When you and I are infected by politics why can't they be? When you and I are infected by politics, you and I become very cheap leaders, cheap politicians. To-day everyone in public life wants to become a cheap politician just as everybody in service wants to become an I.A.S. Technicians, electricians, mechanics, they all want to become I.A.S. It is in the air. Nobody thinks what he is capable of on merits. In the same way everybody wants to become a politician; then why can't a student? why can't a teacher? why can't a principal? It is no use abolishing the institution of principals. Tomorrow you may say, abolish the institution of students for the matter of that. The question is we must realise that something is the matter with the country, with the life outside, with us outside. What is with us is with them, perhaps in a worse form. Therefore, this is a matter which should worry you and worry me. What is wrong with them? It is a reflex action of what is wrong with me and with you outside, and if we put ourselves in the right, then they are automatically in the right. And if you do not put yourselves right, then they will see what you are doing, they will know what you are thinking and feeling and they will act, think and feel

exactly what you do, think and feel. I personally feel, Sir, that it is no use blaming this or blaming that. I am glad to tell you that reading through this Report I feel, though there may be student politicians and principal politicians and so on, they are more or less, victims of other persons and they are, to my mind, cleverer and sharper people if you go up and up. And even the principals to a certain extent are also the victims or parties or members of parties outside or members of the executive, probably, that is as far as I can see. So the infection spreads from outside and that infection has got to be stopped. Can it be stopped? That is the question. It is no use saying that the university atmosphere is not noble, when the whole life outside is not noble, is almost ignoble, ambitious, greedy, selfish. How can you expect noble things in the university? I find that even university, taken at its ordinary basis, an ordinary university, doing nothing noble, cultural or things of that kind, research or adding to knowledge and all that, biggish and pompous things, but ordinary universities I find very much below the ordinary colleges in any country, for the matter of that. Even transmission of ordinary knowledge, academic knowledge is not done properly there at all. Sir, I was a professor once, for thirteen years in an ordinary mofussil college in Bihar. And may I say that I was proud to belong to that college, though it was a government college? I had in that college, so many activities. I was in charge of sports and I used to play for two hours every day. I was in charge of the library and I could get the necessary books, all except Communist books which the Secretary used to score them out in red and blue pencils. "Young India" I could see only after I joined Gandhiji in 1920. Before that I did not know the look of it. I used to subscribe for "The Search Light" and I was black-listed because I subscribed for it. I used to run a society for poor boys and I

used to collect something to support those boys. Even now if I am given the choice, I would love to be a professor, but not of course, in the Banaras Hindu University. I love the reminiscences of those days, and also when I was in Gandhiji's university in Ahmedabad. These I love. There is a great ardour in my heart when I think of those good old days which I passed. And now we come to this present, where even ordinary examinations are a fraud and a farce, where there are no games or sports for the boys, no extra-curricular activities for them, not even ordinary amenities for the boys at all. Is it a desert, this campus? Is it Goldsmith's Deserted Village? Or is it a glorious thing, a glorious university in India? Sir, even as an ordinary university, giving ordinary education, it falls very much below ordinary standards, of what education should be. It should make you think, what is wrong? It is a very serious matter. And if I may say so, and if I may indulge in a little digression, no university will be right unless the pattern of education is changed and unless it has a pattern of education which is in tune with the needs of the country, with the needs of the people and with the needs of the time. You cannot put the universities in order, unless they are in tune with the very best, not the lowest, not the basest, but the noblest and the best aspirations of the people, of the nation and of the country. And you see none of this in the present pattern. It is the old, rotten mediaeval pattern. Nothing new happens there. It is all old, and naturally the boys, the professors and the principals take it tamely, take it very flatly with no interest in the work at all. There is nothing new. But in the good old days, I remember, every day was a new day. But to-day everything is old, rotten and of no use whatsoever. You cannot put life into dead things. You cannot put life into a dead university.

Sir, I have begun to doubt whether this university can continue as an

all-India institution, as a central institution, placed as it is, as my hon. friend just now said, in Uttar Pradesh and surrounded by an area which is not only poor, but thickly populated. It is very keen for it and there is bound to be tremendous pressure and tremendous rush into the university which will be irresistible. And yet, by making it central, we have let things completely go to dogs. The local government thinks that it is not its business. For us in Delhi, Banaras is far away and we do not care. We think that they will look after it and the result is, nobody looks after it. I rather think of the Aligarh University. There is the university known as the Aligarh Muslim University . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): May I remind the hon. Member that his time is up?

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Just five minutes more, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Three minutes is the limit for Congress Members.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Now, coming to the mechanics of it, I accept the Bill as it is. But I would suggest two changes. I do not know if they would accept them. I see no reason why the Court should be an advisory one. I have read the notes. I have thought about the matter and I have discussed it with a number of persons. But whose advice is it that you want? Do you stand in need of any advice just now? You have been wise for the last ten years, in time, out of time. You know what to do and what not to do. The report is an advice. It gives the advice of various people, distinguished people on various occasions. It only puts it in one place in a concise way and presents it properly marshalled. But there is nothing new. You knew what was coming in the report. It is an open secret, what they have said, more or

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

less. And I do not see what advice you seek from the Court which will contain as members dissatisfied, disgruntled and discontented persons who know they are only nominated just to satisfy them. You know a new Bill is coming up within a few months. What you want today is execution, implementation and decision and quick implementation. And the beauty of the whole Bill is that you have concentrated power in the Executive Committee. Now you want to again dilute it, to weaken it. Here is a strong Bill and you want to weaken the Bill. Here is a strong report. You want to weaken it. Please do not do that. I see no reason why the Court should be there at all. (Time bell rings.) One more minute, Sir.

About the Screening Committee, I want to make one suggestion for a change. This Screening Committee is symbolic of the whole thing, of how things have gone bad and how many people have gone bad in the University. Now you call it a Reviewing Committee. Now, you want to send it first of all to the Attorney General, or rather the Solicitor-General. But once it goes to the Solicitor-General and he says, "I have legal proof and the case is good. In law it is good" then do you think the Reviewing Committee will dare to review at all? Not at all. Law is law and there it is. The man is convicted by the Solicitor-General. I close my eyes, if I am a member of the Reviewing Committee, because I cannot change it, once he has said so. What he says must stand. So the Reviewing Committee will become lazy and lethargic. But if from the beginning, if you leave it to them, then they will be alert and see properly, because they will know that it will ultimately go to the Solicitor General and they will wake up and see the legal side, the moral side and the academic side. They will see all the three sides and then say this man is not wanted. Otherwise, to my mind, you will examine only the legal points, what is

visible, what can be proved by law and on paper and by documents; that will be taken up and examined and not others. So, if you can make these changes, I shall be very happy. Thank you.

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Banarās Hindu University Bill has come in for a lot of comments everywhere, in this House and outside. This Bill is the result of the Mudaliar Enquiry Committee Report. So far as the measures proposed in this Bill to improve the state of affairs of the Banarās Hindu University are concerned, with alterations here and there, I can hardly have any objection. I do believe, Sir, that the Banarās Hindu University like other universities of India needs to be improved. There is a lot of room for improvement, and for some time past the Banarās Hindu University like other universities has not been doing well. That is obvious. But, Sir, the report on which this Bill is based, and on which the Ordinance was based, makes painful reading. I have gone through that report very carefully and I have a feeling that had this report not been made the measures which this Bill proposes to adopt to remedy the state of affairs in the Banarās Hindu University would not have been very seriously opposed. Maybe, one or two things in the Bill might not be liked, but on the whole the measures might not have evoked so much of criticism, might not have met with so much of opposition, but it is this report, Sir, which has caused all this trouble. I do not know whether this report could be kept secret or not. I do not know. The Education Minister is in a better position to tell me that. But, Sir, apart from the fact whether this report could be kept secret or not, the fact that a report of this kind has been produced is itself a very painful thing. In fact, when I read the report it took my breath away. The report is based on unverified and uncorroborated evidence. Somebody said something, it appears, and on that basis the report has been prepared without verifying

or corroborating the information given to the members of the Committee. I cannot say that the members of the Mudaliar Committee who are very distinguished countrymen of ours were partial, that they were not objective, but surely they have not cared to get what they heard either in evidence or on the basis of the memoranda which they received corroborated by reliable witnesses. I therefore believe, Sir, that a great injustice has been done to the Banaras Hindu University, to this great temple of learning, by painting it in the manner in which it has been done.

Sir, I may be forgiven for saying that I am reminded of what Mahatma Gandhi said about Miss Mayo's "Mother India". While referring to that book, he said that it was a drain inspector's report. Not that the things contained in that report were all wrong, most of them were probably correct, but the good aspects of India were not mentioned there in that report. I therefore believe, Sir, that so far as this report is concerned, the good aspects of the Banaras Hindu University also should have found some mention, and then possibly the students and the teachers and all those who have been associated with the Banaras Hindu University would not have resented what the Government are proposing to do now.

Sir, I admit that there are shortcomings in the University, a large number of them, and the report could have certainly suggested how those shortcomings should be remedied. All that I suggest is that it should have been a balanced report, not the kind of report which has been produced. It is completely lacking in balance.

Sir, I am an old student of the Banaras Hindu University. I went to it in the year 1930 when the civil disobedience movement was going on in the country. I went to the Banaras Hindu University attracted by the atmosphere of nationalism in that

University. Everyone knows, Sir, that on account of the founder-Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University there was an atmosphere of nationalism in that University. That is why students from all over the country went to the Banaras Hindu University, were drawn towards it. They felt themselves stifled in other colleges and universities and so they went there. I mean no reflection on the other universities. I do not mean to say that the students of the other universities were not patriotic, they were patriotic, but somehow on account of the control which the British Government could exercise over those other universities, it was not possible for those students to express their nationalist urges as fully as the students in Banaras.

Sir, I would like to invite the attention of the House to paragraph 40 of the Mudaliar Committee report where it is said:—

"Moreover it is not only the Banaras University students but the alumni of all Indian Universities who naturally on account of their youthful enthusiasm and selfless conduct, contributed to the struggle."

I do not wish to say anything against the other universities, I have already made that clear. But it seems to me that even where credit was obviously due to the Banaras Hindu University, it has been withheld. This, Sir, has caused a lot of resentment. I am indeed surprised that the Committee tried to belittle even the past glory of the University. The University is in a bad way, there is no doubt about it, but not as painted by the report. Even with regard to matters which are obvious to everyone there seems to me to be a kind of approach which is bound to cause exasperation, and it has caused exasperation. It has exasperated me so much that I feel inclined to say that perhaps because most of the members of the Mudaliar Committee have never taken any part in our freedom struggle, they did not like to be told that the students

[Shri D. P. Singh.]  
of the Banaras Hindu University were in the forefront of our national struggle.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would like to remind the hon. Member that two members of the Committee were Congressmen and they took a great part in our national struggle.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: That is why I said most of them; out of five three had nothing to do with our national struggle. I am sorry to have to talk like this, but being hurt I have to say this, and I should be forgiven for expressing myself in this manner about the members of the Mudaliar Committee.

I would like to say, Sir, that the main reason why the Banaras Hindu University is not settling down to normality is obviously the Mudaliar Committee report. The teachers and the students alike at Banaras have been offended beyond measure. They feel that when the state of affairs in most of the other universities is no better, why has this University been singled out in this manner. I personally feel, Sir—I have some experience, not as a teacher but I have been associated with a large number of teachers of the Patna University—that the state of affairs in other universities also is not much better. That is my impression. I shall be very happy if I am wrong, but somehow that has been my feeling.

Therefore, they have been very much hurt that they should have been singled out for a complete smashing of their reputation in the country. They are filled with a sense of shame and humiliation and they feel that the Vice-Chancellor is the cause of it all. They are, therefore, angry. I do not, for a moment, justify the demonstrations or the hunger strikes which have become the order of the day in the University campus. We all feel sorry for these things. They must come to an end. But, Sir, I am only trying to understand the feelings and the

position of the teachers and the students in the background of the report, on the basis of which all these measures are being taken today. The report, I submit, is full of inaccuracies. I do not know why the hon. members of the Mudaliar Committee did not care to examine that facts that were placed before them in a more scrupulous manner. There are, as I said, obvious inaccuracies in the report. If we read the report and if we are satisfied that those inaccuracies exist there, then we have to reject the report out of hand and we cannot take it as a report which could be of any value. I say that for the following reasons:

In the report, it has been made out that the teachers and students of eastern U.P. districts are dominating the University, that they dominate the life of the University. As has been pointed out by my friend, Dr. Gour, there are about 600 teachers in the Banaras Hindu University. Only 90 come from eastern U.P. About 64 or 65 per cent. of the teachers come from outside U.P. I think then that the University has not lost its all-India character so far as the teachers are concerned and or that all of these 90 teachers are also not in the small pressure group that is supposed to be dominating the life of the University. They do not count for anything at all.

I would like to submit that even so far as the percentage of students coming from different parts of India is concerned, the all-India character of the University is maintained. On that score, it should not have been criticised. I feel, Sir, that I need not dilate upon this. Dr. Gour has already told us that in the technological colleges of the University about 58 per cent. of the students come from States other than U.P. and that in the non-technological colleges the number of students from outside U.P. is, of course, small—27 per cent.—and that is absolutely understandable. As our Prime Minister in another

context has said, the solid facts of geography cannot be wished out of existence. The Banaras Hindu University, being situated in Banaras, is bound to attract a large number of students particularly in the non-technological colleges, from U.P. There is nothing surprising about it.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** What the report says is that the Banaras Hindu University has ceased to be of all-India character. It has become the dumping ground of efficient and inefficient students from neighbouring areas.

**SHRI D. P. SINGH:** So, I say that so far as the neighbouring areas are concerned, the University is there. Students from Madras or Bombay do not go to the law college in the Banaras Hindu University, they do not go to the Central Hindu College or to the training college. They cannot possibly feel encouraged to go there. Why should they go there? There is nothing much for them there. So, naturally, even this allegation or this impression which is sought to be created by the report is wrong. The University has not lost its all-India character at all. Most of the students in the technological colleges come from outside U.P. and this should have received a word of praise at the hands of the members of the Committee.

Sir, I would like now to refer to Appendix 3 of the report and also to Appendix 4. Sir, it has been said that quite a large number of teachers in the University are inter-related. Here is Appendix 3 on page 39 which gives the list of teachers. The names of 20 teachers have been given. Sir, about a University which employs 600 teachers, is it proper to make an allegation or some kind of an insinuation like this, that the teachers who are there get their own relations appointed when only 20 teachers out of a total number of 600 are relations?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** That has been questioned

**SHRI D. P. SINGH:** That has been questioned. It has been said, Sir, I understand . . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** The teachers should not get their students' these written by the Department and pass them off as those of students in whom they are interested.

**SHRI D. P. SINGH:** I will come to it later, Sir.

It has been brought to my notice that about seven or eight teachers whose names have been given are not the teachers of the Banaras Hindu University at all. Nos. 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 16 and 18 in the list do not belong to the teaching staff of any one of the colleges in the Banaras Hindu University.

**SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay):** Where do they belong to?

**SHRI D. P. SINGH:** I do not know; at any rate, they are not teachers.

Then again, I would like to show to the House that Nos. 7 and 15 are not related to anybody among the teachers of the University. So, we find that out of a small list of 20 teachers, may be some of them are related. Is it anything surprising? Anywhere, not only in the University, but in any establishment, there are some people who try to get their relations employed and some relations do get in there. I hope they get in there on the basis of merit.

So far as Appendix 4 is concerned, I would like to draw the attention of the House to this. This Appendix contains the gist of disputes pending or disposed of in Courts of Justice with the University as a party. This list contains 23 names or institutions which are involved in litigation against the University. Out of these 23, I am told that 16 persons never filed any case against the University, never went to court against the University. I am really surprised how on the basis of a list like this which could

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

be easily verified in my opinion, so many conclusions have been drawn.

Sir, much has been made of the influence of the pressure group in the deliberations of the Executive Council. I understand that the pressure group has never succeeded in influencing the decisions of the Executive Council. Whatever the Vice-Chancellor wanted, has always been accepted by the Executive Council. I do not know why so much has been made of this. There is one thing to which attention has already been drawn by a previous speaker and that is the report of the Divisional Commissioner on the basis of which there is a paragraph here—paragraph 30. I would read out just a few lines.

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

Here also it is not stated how many persons.

“ . . . charges and imputations of immorality in the University have been made and a case of unnatural offence involving a Professor is stated to be before a court of law.”

When I went through this report, I really felt extremely vexed, extremely angry. Why should a report of this kind give a paragraph of this nature? A report produced by eminent men gives a paragraph of this nature on the basis of mostly uncorroborated evidence. After all,

we have not been given any material to find out whether what has been stated in this paragraph has been corroborated or not.

2 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The material was the evidence that was tendered before them.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: I believe that the allegations made by the Divisional Commissioner are of such a serious nature that they should not have been incorporated in the report, unless sufficiently corroborated by the evidence of other reliable witnesses. More than anything else, it is this that has incensed the teachers and the students of the Banaras Hindu University. And then who can say that other universities are free from these shortcomings? I do not at all suggest, Sir, that these shortcomings should not be removed. But to think that these exist on a big enough scale to find mention in the report is, I submit, not justified. I am not prepared to believe that the Banaras Hindu University is worse than most other universities in the country in this respect. At any rate, the report does not convince me at all. It seems to me, Sir, that it may be useful to find out what kind of a man the Divisional Commissioner is who submitted a memorandum of that kind.

I would now like to say a few words about the injustice that has been done to some of the Vice-Chancellors in this report, the report has done injustice to a Vice-Chancellor of the calibre and integrity of Acharya Narendra Deva of revered memory. It is utterly wrong to say that the pressure group became more dominant during Acharyaji's time. It is, again, utterly wrong to say that he could not give sufficient time to his work as Vice-Chancellor on account of his illness and other activities. Everyone at Banaras knows that Acharyaji did more work with greater ability for the University than anyone else, save the founder of the University and our



revered Dr. Radhakrishnan. He devoted all his time and energy in a most selfless manner to the work of the University. Out of the money that he used to get as his salary, he used to contribute about Rs. 800 per month for a Students' Welfare Fund, which he founded. He, more than others, put the pressure group in its place. It was during the time of his successor that the pressure group augmented its strength. So far as the appointment of the chief wardens and all that is concerned, Acharyaji had made certain changes for the better. It was only when he left the Banaras Hindu University and his successor came that some of the shortcomings crept in. The stranglehold of the principals, if it was a stranglehold, was increased during the time of Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, not when Acharyaji was the Vice-Chancellor of the University. I am surprised that the report while referring to other Vice-Chancellors in terms of absolute praise, has made slight distinction while referring to Acharya Narendra Deva. This has pained me and I somehow cannot understand why this discrimination was made.

So far as the law and order position in the University campus is concerned, we all admit that the position of law and order is not very satisfactory. I will say that it is not at all satisfactory. But is it worse than the law and order position in some other universities of India? Allahabad, Lucknow and many other universities have been scenes of great disorder in recent years. I do not believe that the Banaras Hindu University is in this respect worse than these universities. I should think that comparatively speaking, except for what is happening now, there has been some peace in the Banaras Hindu University campus, better peace as compared with the situation that obtains in other universities. I do not say for a moment that all is well with the Banaras Hindu University. Our standards have recently gone down in the educational institutions or other institutions. Everywhere our

standards seem to have gone down considerably and something must be done to raise our standards. If steps are taken to correct the state of affairs at Banaras, we should all welcome it. At least a beginning is being made. But I wish to make it clear that the measures of reform are indicated not on the basis so much of the Mudaliar Committee report as on the basis of the well-known fact of the lowering of standards in almost all our educational institutions. The report as it is, in my opinion, is a worthless document. It is based on absolutely flimsy and unverified evidence. It has done great harm. It lacks grace and should not have been produced at all. It is indeed unworthy of the eminent persons who constituted the Committee. I know, Sir, the members of the Committee had no grudge against the University. But surely they have not done a good job. I have not met a single person who has approved of the report, howsoever much he may be in favour of reforms in the University.

A number of other points are there in the report about which I would like to say just a few words. Much has been said that teachers do all kinds of things, things which are not proper and they go scot-free. That is the impression which has been created by reading this report. But that is also not true, at any rate it is not more than in the case of other universities. It has been pointed out that a particular teacher availed of concessional railway tickets for taking a *barat* party, that a thing like that has happened in the Banaras Hindu University. This is deplorable. But did the Committee care to find out as to whether that teacher was punished or not? I understand that he was debarred by the University from the right to hold any administrative post in the University.

Another case has been quoted, namely that the head of a department—Sir, you were referring to this perhaps—in some science college at the Banaras Hindu University helped his son to do experiments . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I must tell the hon. Member that he has exceeded his time limit by five minutes.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: What was my time limit?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Twenty-five minutes. You have spoken for thirty minutes.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: Five minutes more, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): We have got a very large number of speakers.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: I was naturally concerned about this report.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): So, I would like him to co-operate with me in this matter.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: I would like to say just a few words. I believe that when the Committee started its work, it should have also looked into the finances of the University. I do not know why an enquiry into the finances of the University was not included in the terms of reference of the Committee. We are told that the finances of the University are in a very bad way. Recently, during the term of the present Vice-Chancellor—I do not know whether the Vice-Chancellor was responsible for it—zamindari bonds worth about Rs. 14 lakhs were purchased by the University. People say that these bonds were purchased at higher rates than the prevailing market rates.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The prevailing rate was Rs. 37 but they were purchased at Rs. 42.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: This should have been looked into by the Committee. Though this was not in the terms of reference of the Committee. I would like to say a few words . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Now you are going on to a new topic. That might be a proper place to stop.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: I will just conclude. I would make a few suggestions so far as the Bill is concerned. It is true that the Bill has not followed the recommendations made by the Mudaliar Committee report in toto. Some recommendations have been followed. The Mudaliar Committee report wanted to make the Vice-Chancellor almost a dictator. That has not been done, fortunately. The Bill gives power to the Executive Council which is very good indeed but I would suggest that this Executive Council should have included one or two outstanding distinguished old students and teachers like Shri Achyut Patwardhan about whom there cannot be any difference of opinion. I would also like to suggest that so far as the court is concerned, either you don't have a court at all because now we are going to have another comprehensive Bill or if you have it, then give it the power which it enjoyed. After all it is a nominated committee and it sits only once or twice in a year. Where is the sense in having it and not giving it the powers which it should enjoy? I have a suspicion—I hope it is not justified—that a long time may elapse before a comprehensive Bill comes. It should be made absolutely clear that within 6 months, the comprehensive Bill will be introduced and the University will be given the autonomy so that the fear that the University may not get back its autonomy at all may be laid at rest.

Though I wanted to say a few more things, since you have told me many times to stop, I am stopping.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I wish to speak on this Bill because I feel I owe it to the institution where I had my earlier education, I mean the Central Hindu College which has blossomed forth into the present Banaras Hindu University.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I also was a student there.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: I also feel it my duty to speak because I belong to an area which has unfortunately received the attention of the Enquiry Committee. I do so because I feel that before greater mischief is done, the errors—the grievous errors—into which the enquiry Committee, perhaps unwittingly, has fallen, should be corrected. I feel very sad that a Committee of eminent men who went with very high ideals and high purpose, who have written a very good report, should have gone into matters which were absolutely irrelevant and which has created a lot of opposition. They could have easily avoided them. It was not at all necessary for them to go into those things and the fact that such an eminent Committee should write about those things without careful sifting, without finding out the correct facts about them, is a matter of great sorrow. I feel very sad that this should have happened and that instead of a good and congenial atmosphere, an atmosphere of antagonism has been created. People do realise that there has been trouble in the University, they do realise that there are difficulties in the University. Nobody denies that but to have gone into facts which have no bearing, which are not correct, which are absolutely false is a thing which has created all these difficulties.

DR. R. B. GOUR: This year in the eastern districts there were three calamities—floods, famine and Mudaliar Committee report.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: I feel I owe not only to myself and the group criticised, but also to this House to say that if there is one State in India which is absolutely free from any provincial bias, it is the State of U.P. If I may be pardoned for saying so, to talk of a smaller group in U.P. based on regionalism is the result of hasty, if not confused, understanding of the situation. I am sorry to have to say this but it is necessary. The House

and the country should know what the Parliament and the Members of Parliament feel about the report. They should know that though we agree with the general conclusions arrived at, we do strongly condemn the methods that have been adopted. In this connection, I would also like to say that I yield to none in my regard for the individual distinguished members of the Enquiry Committee, yet I feel that they have not bestowed that attention to the problem concerning this matter which it deserves; otherwise how could one explain the errors, that have crept into their report and which have been admitted by the Minister?

There is another point which is very clear and that is that the members of the Committee did not realise that the time was short and they should hurry up their report. The Committee was appointed in July 1957 and they submitted the report in April 1958 and the Ordinance was promulgated because the report came in April. The report could have come much earlier because they took evidence at Banaras for 5 days only and that was probably in January.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: January 28th . . .

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Therefore this Ordinance could have been avoided and we would have been happy about it because we could have considered a Bill in the ordinary course but because they did not carefully consider this aspect, things have come to this pass and we have had an Ordinance but I am glad that now we are having this Bill. There is a well-known legal maxim that justice must not only be done but must seem to be done. In the disturbed state of affairs in the University, the best thing for the Committee would have been to steer clear of all unnecessary controversial matters.

There is another matter which has really pained me and that is that the Committee did know that there were

[Shri Mahesh Saran.]

two groups, one group led by the Vice-Chancellor and the other, of other people. Then why was it that the Vice-Chancellor was associated with the enquiry? He was present all the time. I think this created a bad atmosphere. This should not have been so. I am only pointing out these things to show how these matters are really affecting the ordinary men regarding this report. Having said all this, I do realise that the affairs of the Hindu University are in a mess and that serious attention has to be devoted to set them right. Everybody will accept this proposition but the whole question that has to be seen is how to set it right? What are the methods? My submission is that if in the new Executive Council which is to come, the present Vice-Chancellor is one of the members, it would be a sad day for the University because you would eliminate one group and keep the other group. All the groups must be eliminated. It is very sad that I have to say this. It may be that the present Vice-Chancellor may be a very nice man—I do not know anything about him. But I have the feeling that when there are doubts in the minds of people, when there are two groups and it is publicly declared that he is the leader of one of the groups, it is not proper that we should have him in the Executive Committee . . .

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: He will be the Chairman of it.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: That will complicate matters, that will not smoothen matters. That will not create an atmosphere of harmony and of goodwill.

Therefore, I am obliged to make this suggestion.

Now, Sir, I do not know whether it is necessary for me to talk of preserving the autonomy of the University but we cannot and should not ride principles to death and in the circumstances that exist, it is our clear duty to support the Government in trying to solve this problem. I should

have, in other circumstances, said that nominations are not good but, in the present circumstances, of course, the whole body is nominated and I do not mind it because we are going to have very soon a comprehensive Bill which will see to these things.

Now, Sir, coming to the Bill, it is good that the Prime Minister has made it clear that this Bill is a temporary measure and that it will be replaced by a comprehensive Bill of a permanent nature. When that Bill comes, it will be time for us to see that the University is placed on sound and democratic foundations. As for the Bill itself, I am glad that the Screening Committee has been transformed into a Reviewing Committee and I am glad that before action is taken, the Solicitor-General's advice will be sought. As things stand at the present moment, people are fearing all sorts of things and people are afraid of this Screening Committee. I am glad that this change has been made and, with the suggestion that I have made, that the Vice-Chancellor should not be on the Executive Council, I think things would improve, things would be much better and the people would take the new legislation with a little bit of grace.

One word more and I have done. The Executive Council contemplated under this Bill will be a small body of nominated persons. It is desirable that it should seek the advice of the court more frequently than an elected Executive Council would normally do and, therefore, my submission is that this court should meet more often than it used to do before. I do not propose to go into the question whether it is desirable to have the court function only as an advisory body because that matter will come up later when the whole matter is gone through. That question need not be dealt with here now.

Sir, I have said whatever I felt about it. I was, in the beginning, very doubtful whether I should speak but I felt that a great injustice had been

done. A feeling of resentment is gaining ground in the minds of people by unwarranted remarks and it was necessary for Members to point out that these errors which have crept in have created disappointment and discouragement to the people. Therefore, I spoke a few words. I hope this will be taken note of by the Minister. Otherwise, I give my full support to the Bill.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Bill not with any sense of pride or any sense of joy but genuinely with a heavy heart for the reason that as an educationist I believe in the autonomy of a university but I believe that there is one thing more precious in a university and that is the health and life of the university. Unfortunately, we have been aware that for the last ten years, this autonomy has been abused, very grossly abused, so as to necessitate the resignation of a series of most eminent Vice-Chancellors. Therefore, I congratulate the Education Minister on the courage he has displayed in tackling this problem and in bringing forward this Bill. I do agree with several critics both in this House and outside the House that the Government of India has slept too long over the affairs of the University but one can appreciate the difficulties of the Government. Anyway, I am glad that it has fallen to the lot of an old student of the Banaras Hindu University to have the courage to set things right. Sir, the Banaras Hindu University is not the result of mere legislation; it is the result of a vision, of a dream of a great patriotic Indian who described himself as a great beggar and succeeded in collecting lakhs and crores of rupees for the realisation of that dream. I am very sorry that Dr. Gour has tried to bring down the Banaras Hindu University to the level of other Universities. I think there is a special sense in which the Banaras University occupies a very special position among the Universities in India. It was founded in order to encourage and resuscitate the old Hindu culture. It was definitely

founded as an all-India institution. It was definitely founded as the first residential University in India and, more than all else, it has been Centrally administered and fifty-five lakhs of rupees go to the support of that University from the coffers of the Central Government and so, I think, it is our responsibility to see that this money is made good use of, that no party or group is allowed to exploit the situation. The money, after all, comes out of the pockets of the tax payers and especially the elected representatives of the tax payers should be very cautious, should be very alert, in seeing that the money is well-spent.

Well, Sir, I share with the Education Minister his misgivings about some of the recommendations of the Select Committee.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I see the expediency of introducing these changes. I see the expediency of introducing the Solicitor-General but I think he has been brought in in the wrong place. First of all, it is the Executive Council that has to be convinced that there is a *prima facie* case against a particular officer and then it has to send up the case to the Solicitor-General. The Solicitor-General has to certify that there is a *prima facie* case against that man. In that case, it will be sent to the Reviewing Committee. The Reviewing Committee will collect evidence, will give a chance to the accused person, if I may use the expression, and then send it back to the Executive Council for action. Now, it seems to me that it would have been infinitely better, infinitely more legal and infinitely more constitutional if the Executive Council was authorised to send up the case directly to the Reviewing Committee and the Reviewing Committee went through the case, made out a case and then had it sent up to the Solicitor-General. If the Solicitor-General gave the opinion, "Yes, there is a foolproof case against this gentleman", then it

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

would not have been left to the Executive Council to say "Yes" or "No". They would have been bound by the opinion of such a high legal officer but, unfortunately, there is no time to move any amendment as that would only delay the Bill.

Now, Sir, personally I think that there cannot be or at least should not be two opinions about the necessity of appointing a Committee of enquiry. I think the Education Minister has made out that case very strongly. As for myself, even after reading the report, if I had felt that the Committee need not have been appointed, I would have had to change my opinion after what I have experienced as to what is happening in Banaras during the last three weeks. I can only say, 'circumspice' look around. What has been happening during the last three weeks? The Vice-Chancellor is kept out of the campus: the Pro-Vice-Chancellor's house is picketted. He is an old man of 75 years. The Registrar's house is picketted. There have been threats that the telephone lines will be disconnected and this has gone on for three weeks. I can excuse a body of students in a moment of excitement doing something which will not stand the test of reason. I can understand that students do get excited. We know the crowd psychology but these cool, calculated, deliberate acts day after day make one suspect some better brains are behind all these tactics than the poor students can command.

Well, Sir, Dr. Gour has been very eloquent; I admired his speech. He should have been a lawyer, he would have made a great name as a lawyer, and the duty of a lawyer is to take advantage of small little points so that even criminals can be let off being given the benefit of doubt. That is the unfortunate weakness of the British criminal law. And he has played his part beautifully. But from the other standpoint I would have appreciated Dr. Gour's reaction to what he saw in Banaras—because he went a day before I went—I would have

appreciated his reaction, either of condemnation or of praise, about the tactics of the students, who were standing at the gate of the house of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and not permitting even a man like myself or my friend Mr. Basu to enter the house.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Or Dr. Kunzru.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: In fact there is a comic side to it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour who was so eloquent did not say anything about it.

DR. R. B. GOUR: So let us together condemn the Vice-Chancellor and the students.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I shall speak tomorrow.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: These Ayurvedic students came to see me and I said: I want to see the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. He said: "Yes, Sir, but you can see him as a Member of Parliament, not as a member of the Executive Council." I asked him: How am I to distinguish myself as a Member of Parliament on the one hand and a member of the Executive Council on the other? I said it affected my self-respect and I refused to go in those circumstances. Then he said he would consult his colleagues. And in the afternoon I received a letter that, "you and Mr. Basu would be welcome to visit the P.V.C." We went there. As we were coming out one of the picketers thrust a bit of paper into my hand and said: "You please sign that you were permitted to go". Naturally I refused to sign. Then in the evening when the Ayurvedic College students saw me again they made it a grievance against me that I did not sign in the afternoon. I said: Why should I sign? I do not want your permission to go and see the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. He said: Then, Sir, don't blame us if we

do not permit you to go tomorrow. Well, I complained about this to some other members of the action committee, and they were a little more reasonable and sensible and they prevailed upon the student leader of the Ayurvedic College students to withdraw from his position. Fortunately or unfortunately, next day we had no time and we did not go. Now, I should have liked to hear something of the reaction of Dr. Gour to this sort of tactics. Suppose Dr. Gour has a personal enemy and that personal enemy collects a few people and stations them at his gate and prevents his clients from getting in, prevents his relations from getting in, prevents his friends from getting in, prevents him from getting out, even to attend the session of the Rajya Sabha, what would his reaction be? I say it would have come with great force from him if he had said one word in condemnation of this sort of tactics. Unfortunately, he has not done it. He has played beautifully, he has played very well, the part of the opposition leader, but not as a Member of Parliament with that sense of responsibility that we expect of one. I am sorry to say that, Sir, but it is my firm conviction.

Well, Sir, it seems to me that at the present moment the strike is being conducted on the principle of that well-known Hindustani proverb,

मेरे को कोई न मारे ताँ मैं सारे गाँव को मारू  
Nobody opposes them. For certain reasons we do not wish to oppose them and therefore they are taking full advantage of it. How long this sort of thing is going to continue, I do not know: it is in the laps of Gods.

Now, Sir, coming to the Mudaliar Committee report it is a very forthright report, a very frank report, but I do agree with the Education Minister and many others who have said that it could have been better drafted. It has a few errors, but these errors do not affect the major portion of the report, or the main contentions of the report. Now let us not forget,

Sir, that whatever may be the defective draftsmanship of the report, in the other House the other day a member of the Committee, Mrs. Kripalani, spoke on the floor of the House expressing her regret that this expression "Eastern Uttar Pradesh Group" had got in. She expressed her regret not merely on behalf of herself but on behalf of all the members of the Committee. Now, is not that a very courageous act at the same time? I see no particular credit in it because I am perfectly certain that when they referred to the Eastern Uttar Pradesh Group they, by no means, intended a denunciation of all the inhabitants of Uttar Pradesh or of all the teachers from U.P. or of all the students from U.P., because no sensible person would make such a denunciation.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH (Madhya Pradesh): Who has done it?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Well, Sir, it is a matter of interpretation. You take the word very literally. There are so many loose expressions which are used, for example, we say: Jews are money-grabbers. Certainly not all Jews are money-grabbers. We very often use such loose expressions . . .

SHRI D. P. SINGH: But this expression has not been generally understood in the sense in which you say it has been.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I did not care to interfere when the hon. Member was on his legs and I do not wish to be interfered with by others when I am on my legs, and I am not going to interfere when other people speak.

Well, this is the plain position. A regret has been expressed by Mrs. Kripalani on behalf of the members of the committee and by the Education Minister on behalf of the Government that this was unfortunately a wrong expression. I am aware that paragraph 30 with reference to the students has caused bitter resentment among all the students. Students

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]  
may be mischievous, and students who are perfectly gentlemanly, perfectly law-abiding, even they resent it and very rightly resent it. I wish that the report had been more carefully drafted.

Now, Sir, coming to the strike at the present day, I am glad there is at least one point on which I can whole-heartedly agree with Dr. Gour and that is his reference to the students of the Ayurvedic College. We have spent nearly nine hours with them and I don't mind admitting on the floor of the House that their grievances are absolutely genuine. They do need a good principal; they do need better teachers; they do need better hostel facilities. Sir, I was taken round the Ruia hostel where the Ayurvedic College students are housed and I was ashamed, literally ashamed to go to that hostel; it is so bad, and I told the Vice-Chancellor about it, and the Vice-Chancellor showed me the minutes of a previous meeting when they had asked for more money from the University Grants Commission, to do away with all these defects. There is no water in the pipe; flush is not working; there are so many defects in that Ruia hostel. It is dirty with no amenities whatever. If I were a student of the Ayurvedic College I would certainly resent it.

Now, Sir, the interesting point is this. They want better hospital facilities, and I find that the Executive Council, the old Executive Council, not the new one, has already recommended the establishment of a hospital with 300 beds. The students demand a hospital with 1,000 beds. Now, I am afraid that is a very tall order, and I told them so and I am glad that they appreciated the reasonableness of my argument that 1,000 beds would be too costly a proposition. Even a big city like Bombay or Calcutta may not have a hospital with 1,000 beds. Then they modified their position by saying: We don't want it immediately; it could be in ten years. I said: Ten years is not a long enough period; you may

get it in twenty years. Anyway, I appreciated the reasonableness of the students on that point.

Now, Sir, unfortunately this agitation of the Ayurvedic College students has been tagged on with a very, very virulent attack on the present Vice-Chancellor. Sir, last January this little thing was produced, this memorandum of the students of the College of Ayurveda of the Banaras Hindu University. In that they express their thanks to Narendra Devaji and to Rajkumariji for promising to send a particular individual as their principal, because they wanted him. Now it is very interesting and I should like to draw your attention to this sentence which occurs: "We are grateful to the present Vice-Chancellor, Dr. V. S. Jha, who has very recently taken this matter seriously in his hand. We believe that he is doing his best." Now, Sir, the interesting point is that I knew nothing about the existence of this document in January itself, but when I went to Banaras it was placed in my hands, and when it was placed in my hands this particular sentence had been scratched out in ink.

Now, unfortunately facts cannot be rubbed away by blue pencil marks or red pencil marks. The fact remains that Dr. Jha in January 1958 took up a strong attitude and supported the demand of the students for a particular principal. Now, if between January and September Dr. Jha had changed his attitude, if he had said, 'well, in January I wanted this man but now I do not want that man' I can understand the anger of the Ayurveda College students and their rubbing out this sentence. The actual fact is that Dr. Jha right up to this moment continues pestering the Education Minister and the Education Minister continues pestering the Health Minister to get this gentleman in the interests of the Ayurveda College of the Banaras Hindu University. Under these circumstances is it fair, is it honourable to say all sorts of things against the Vice-Chancellor, to keep him confined to his house and



once he has left the house not to permit him to return to the campus even? I leave it to the Members of this House to make up their mind about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Sir, I have got many points to say. I am in your hands. If you allow I may go on. Because there are certain things which I am in a position to say but which others will not be in a position to say.

Sir, it seems to me that the demand for the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor at the present moment is certainly unjustifiable. One cannot deny the existence of a group. That fact has not been denied even by the Opposition; it has not been denied even by the strongest protagonists of the Eastern Uttar Pradesh group. That group exists. It was that group that was responsible for the resignation of successive Vice-Chancellors. Now, if at the present moment the present Vice-Chancellor, conscious of the existence of this group, wants to purify the University and wants to take certain action against these people, it is very unfair to call him the leader of another group. After all, the Vice-Chancellor has to carry with him the sympathy of the people at large; he cannot do things by himself. He has to carry with him the sympathies of the Executive Council and of the Members of the Court. There may be some people against him but he has the right to see that there are some people on his side and I think it would be grossly unfair to say that he is building up another party, another group. You might as well say that the Judge who tries a batch of criminals is the leader of a group against the criminals. It seems to me most unfair.

There has been another charge against the Vice-Chancellor that he has not denounced the Mudaliar report. Now, how is he concerned with it? How can he and why should he? He was not a member of the Committee.

DR. R. B. GOUR: But he assisted the Committee all right.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: What do you mean by saying he assisted the Committee. Of course he was present. If you suggest even for a moment that the mere presence or an occasional answer by the present Vice-Chancellor would affect the judgment of a man like Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, of a man like Mr. Justice Mahajan, of a man like Shri Navroji J. Wadia, of a public leader like Mrs. Kripalani or of an independent man—not politically independent because he belongs to the Congress Party—who has been the Chief Minister of an important State, if you think that these five people would allow themselves to be dominated by the present Vice-Chancellor, either you are over-rating the abilities of the present Vice-Chancellor or miserably under-rating the intelligence of these five great people. I venture to submit that there can be no reason for suspecting the present Vice-Chancellor in this.

Now, there is another important point. There again I am more or less in agreement with Dr. Gour—not completely. Anyhow he was trying to exonerate the students and I am really tempted to ask a question—is the present strike really a students' strike? My own experience goes to show that the vast majority of the students has nothing to do with it. I addressed as many as seven meetings; I was heard in pin-drop silence in six meetings. I was warned that I might expect some trouble in the Science and Arts College, but even in the Science College I was listened to with perfect courtesy in pin-drop silence—much greater silence than I experience in this House. It is only in the Arts College that I was heckled, not during my speech—they listened to me with perfect courtesy even there—but at the end of the speech when three students who, I understand, have the honour to belong to the Communist Party wanted to ask questions.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: What is the meaning of 'free' students?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I said three. Now, the Chairman was very courteous and he asked me whether I was prepared to answer questions and I said, certainly, for if I had refused, they would say I was funky and I did not want to leave that impression. But unfortunately instead of asking questions they began haranguing and they made all sorts of statements against the Mudaliar report, against this person and that person. Of course there were people distributed in the hall who shouted in their support.

Anyway, I have had in my long life as a teacher many opportunities of dealing with very awkward situations with students and I am proud to say that I emerged successful. On this occasion I felt a little depressed that I had failed, that I could not convince these Ayurveda College students to change their tactics and to adopt a more human and humane attitude to an elderly gentleman of 75 years. I felt depressed but that sense of depression completely disappeared the next morning when I was visited by another set of students represented by the President of the Banaras Hindu University Union and he assured me that the vast majority of the students were tired of this sort of strikes, were tired of this sort of thing. Now, Sir, the question arises, why is it that a handful of people are trying now to paralyse the University? The answer is very simple. I remember as a student, there was an address given by Gopal Krishna Gokhale and in that address he said, we, Indians, lack righteous indignation and I am afraid that unfortunate characteristic clings to us even in these days of our independence and freedom. We lack righteous indignation. When we see a wrong we do not have courage enough to oppose it tooth and nail; we still want to act in the line of least resistance.

DR. R. B. GOUR: And that is why you are not condemning this report.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I have condemned what needs condemnation. I can't condemn the whole report because there are a few errors or because it is bad draftsmanship.

Well, Sir, that is the real reason. Further we had very long talks with some members, some very prominent citizens of Banaras and one of them had the courage to say that it is not a students' strike at all. It is engineered by the people who are afraid of this Reviewing Committee 'fighting with their backs to the wall.' They have hired these people. That is the allegation made. Right or wrong, I don't know. I merely say it for what it is worth. And I am inclined to accept that, for this reason, because I know the psychology of the Indian student. You can always argue with them. They are a fine set of warm-hearted young men, with a certain amount of idealism. If you are reasonable and if you are one reasonable enough to accept their grievances, when they are real grievances, they will be on your side. If you feel that some of their grievances are unreasonable, you can still argue with them for half an hour, for one hour, for two hours and ultimately, you can bring them round.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Pradesh): Why not try now also?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: For this reason, that they are not students, they are the agents of certain other people.

There is another little thing which I would like to refer to and that is the very biased attitude of the press as represented by the P. T. I. Whatever may be the personal grievances of the correspondent against the authorities, one thing we expect of a news correspondent is that he will be exact and fair in the despatches that he sends to his head office. When an important communique was published over the signatures of men like Iqbal Narayan Gurtu, Achut Patwardhan, Rohit Mehta and so many others . . .

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: And Rajaram Shastri.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Yes, Rajaram Shastri and so many others, it was the duty of the correspondent to have sent it out straight, as a whole document. But what did he do? He struck out the one paragraph which has something to say in favour of the present Vice-Chancellor. Is it fair? Is it not hitting below the belt? How can we have faith in these newspaper reporters if they do not do their duty, and if they manipulate things in their own interests? The Government is giving, I understand, a very big grant to the P. T. I. and very rightly, but I trust the Government will see that they at least get an explanation why this distorted version was sent away.

Sir, before I sit down . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: By the way, when did this happen?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Very recently, I do not have the document now, but it happened very recently, during the last three weeks.

Before I sit down, I should like to refer to one experience of mine. It was in the year 1947-48. We had gained independence. We had gained freedom. By that time I had the complete confidence of my students. I called them together and told them very frankly, "You have played a very important part in helping the Congress party to achieve our freedom. The country is grateful to you for that."

DR. R. B. GOUR: The Congress party?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Yes, the Congress party. Then you, at that time belonged to it. Everybody belonged to it. There was no other party at that time.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It was the Indian National Congress.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: All right, the Indian National Congress which we, in short, call the Congress Party. Even today it is the Indian National Congress, rightly or wrongly.

62 R.S.D.—6.

Sir, I appealed to them and told them. "This is the time when you should dissolve the Students Congress. Go back to your studies. Prepare yourselves for the great tasks that are awaiting you. You are going to be the future leaders of India." They agreed. I felt it was a great triumph for me. Fortunately or unfortunately they had to go to their political masters and the Ministers of that day would not permit them to dissolve the Congress. That was my defeat. And I venture to think, with all the events of the last ten years, that it was a defeat for the country. The Congress Ministers, flushed with success, would not see beyond the tip of their nose. They could not see what consequences they were sowing and what they were building up by encouraging students in this sort of life.

Well, Sir, I have still faith in Indian students. I have served in South India. I have served in West India and I have served in Central India. And everywhere my experience has been the same. And in spite of my apparent failure, I still have faith in the Banaras Hindu University students. And I still believe that if they will only be left alone by these people who are afraid of facing this Reviewing Committee, the Banaras Hindu University has a great future. Sir, we all know that this is only a temporary measure and a great and comprehensive measure is going to come.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: In how many years?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Well, Sir, in my own interest, I want it to be within six months, because I find it very inconvenient to go all the way from Bombay to Banaras. But I leave it to the Government, because they may be having their own difficulties. I don't know. But I do hope it will not be more than one year.

Well, Sir, this University is bound to get its autonomy. What I mean by autonomy is non-interference by

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

Government, and I accept that principle even if the Government pays money. But I do not mean by autonomy this blessed principle of election which creates parties, which creates groups. The Banaras Hindu University is not the only university that has suffered from this disease. We, in Bombay University suffered from the same disease ten years ago and the Government of Bombay appointed a committee of which I happened to be a member. And we came to the conclusion that the principle of election should be reduced as much as possible in the university. That is the only way to restore health. That is the only way to permit the teachers and the professors to devote themselves, their whole time and their best energies to the task of teaching and improving their knowledge and carrying on research, instead of frittering away their time in building up parties, caucuses, in canvassing and getting the support of students to canvass for them which is a very unhealthy thing. And when this comprehensive legislation comes into existence, I do hope something of this type will be borne in mind.

Well, Sir, all of us are interested in the Banaras Hindu University. Whether we belong to Uttar Pradesh or not, does not matter a bit. Banaras has got great traditions. It is a great centre of Hindu culture and even today, it is the centre of a great university and this great University stands for the whole of India. Let us not look at it and its problems from the standpoint of this province or that province. Let us look at it as Indians first and Indians last.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, before any other hon. Member begins his speech, may I make one thing clear? I think Prof. Wadia seems to have the complaint that I have not said anything condemning the students.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: It is true.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Purposely I have said it and I have said it to Prof.

Wadia and also in the House in so many words that it is only the Ayurvedic College which is involved in this matter. So let us separate this business and let us tackle the two problems connected with it. That solves the matter. That is all.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: They are doing it.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That is exactly the point.

श्री टी० पाण्डे : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुदालियर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों का जिक्र किया गया है। मैं भी उसी क्षेत्र का रहने वाला हूँ और बलिया जिले का रहने वाला हूँ, जिसकी कई बार चर्चा की गई है।

श्री श्या० सु० तन्खा : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह भी कहिये कि मैं पांडे भी हूँ।

श्री टी० पाण्डे : मैं पांडे भी हूँ, जिसके बारे में इसमें विशेष रूप से चर्चा है। किन्तु यह मेरा दुर्भाग्य है कि मेरा उनमें से किसी के साथ संबंध नहीं है।

3 P.M.

अभी मैंने एक शिक्षाशास्त्री का भाषण सुना। मुझको वह भाषण एक शासक का भाषण प्रतीत हुआ, एक शिक्षा शास्त्री का काम प्रतीत हुआ। और इसके लिए मैं क्षमा चाहता हूँ। शिक्षा मंत्री ने जो विधेयक उपस्थित किया है उसी के बारे में हमको कुछ ऐसी बातें सुनने को मिलीं, जिन से उस एक आक्षेप का प्रतिकार होगा जो कि कमेटी के विवरण में हमारे ऊपर किया गया है। हमें उनके भाषण से बड़ी निराशा हुई। इसलिए मैं आपसे कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। मैं कमेटी के विवरण को ज्यों ज्यों पढ़ता हूँ उससे मुझ बड़ी निराशा होती है। उसमें महान व्यावृत्त है, उनके अनुभव भी बड़े हैं और कई क्षेत्रों में उनके काम भी हैं। लेकिन नदेसर के राज महल में बैठ करके जैसा विवरण उन्होंने उपस्थित किया उसमें भी कुछ लोगों ने काम

किया, कुछ लोगों ने काम नहीं किया और जो विवरण उन्होंने उपस्थित किया वह मुझको एकतरफा मालूम होता है। मुझ को ऐसा मालूम होता है कि ऐसे महापुरुषों के ऊपर आक्षेप करना मुतासिब नहीं है। लेकिन हमको और वहां के निवासियों को उन्होंने अभियुक्त घोषित कर दिया है और हम इस सदन के समक्ष एक अभियुक्त की दृष्टि से सफाई देने के लिए खड़े हैं। यह स्थिति उन्होंने उपस्थित कर दी है जो न उचित थी और न जिस आवश्यकता थी।

हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय काशी में स्थित है और देश के महान पुरुष महामना पंडित मदन मोहन मालवीय ने उसकी स्थापना की थी। काशी नगरी विद्या का केन्द्र सर्वदा से रही है और यह उचित था कि विद्या का यह मंदिर, सरस्वती का यह भवन उसी स्थल पर स्थापित हुआ। मालवीय जी ने शुरू से ही इस बात की कल्पना की थी कि इसका भारतीय रूप रहे और आज भी वह वद्यमान है।

अब मैं कमेटी के विवरण के सम्बन्ध में आप से जिक्र करना चाहता हूं। इसके पहले मैं चाहता हूं कि इस विश्वविद्यालय की सेवाओं को आप देख लें और उसकी क्या विशेषताएँ हैं उसे भी आप देख लें। पहली बात मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि मालवीय जी का यह स्वप्न था कि हिन्दू आदर्शों के आधार पर, भारतीय संस्कृति के आधार पर, एक विश्वविद्यालय की स्थापना की जाय। यह विश्वविद्यालय उसी का मूर्तस्वरूप है। जिन दिनों हमारे देश में अंग्रेजों का शासन था, इस विश्वविद्यालय की महान सेवाएं रही हैं। मैं यह जानता हूं कि जिस क्षेत्र में यह विश्वविद्यालय आज है वहां १५, २० जिलों की जनता का जो नेतृत्व उन्होंने किया है वह हमारे इतिहास में सर्वदा अमर रहेगा। वहां के विद्यार्थी, वहां के अध्यापक और वहां का सम्बन्धित वातावरण सर्वदा अगुआ का काम करते रहे हैं। सन् १९२० के उस महानयुद्ध को मैं देखता हूं, सन् ३० के युद्ध को देखता हूं,

सन् ३२ के युद्ध को देखता हूं और सन् ४२ का जो अंतिम संग्राम हुआ उसमें यहां के विद्यार्थियों ने और यहां के अध्यापकों ने हमारा नेतृत्व किया है और आदर से हमारा मस्तक उनके सामने झुकता है।

अब मैं विश्वविद्यालय की अवस्था के बारे में आपसे जिक्र करना चाहता हूं। आपने देखा होगा कि सन् १९४२, ४३ में जहां १९५२ लड़के थे, आज सन् १९५७, ५८ में ८५८६ लड़के हैं। अनेक विभाग खुले हैं और बहुत से भवन बने हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भी विशेष अनुदान दिये हैं और विश्वविद्यालय उन्नति के पथ पर निश्चित रूप से है।

अनुशासन के सम्बन्ध में मुझे आप से यह निवेदन करना है कि १९२०, १९३०, १९३२ और १९४२ इन सनों को छोड़ करके जब कि भारतीय स्वतंत्रता का संग्राम अत्यंत तीव्र गति पर था, यह विश्वविद्यालय कभी भी एक अच्छे-खासे समय के लिए बन्द नहीं रहा है। अनुशासन की इस कमेटी में बड़ी चर्चा की गई है। एक सज्जन ने कहा भी है कि यह एक ऐसा क्षेत्र है कि कमिशनर ने विवरण लिख दिया है कि इस क्षेत्र में तो किसी तरह का अनुशासन नहीं है। पुलिस नहीं जा सकती, उसका कहीं प्रवेश नहीं है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि प्रिंस आफ वेल्स जब काशी में पधारे थे तब भी यह प्रश्न उपस्थित था। उस वक्त मालवीय जी थे और उन्होंने पुलिस की सहायता लिए बगैर शांति और अमन कायम किया। समूचा विश्वविद्यालय बन्द था, विद्यार्थियों ने हड़ताल कर रखी थी जबकि प्रिंस आफ वेल्स यूनिवर्सिटी के प्रांगण में पधारे थे।

श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
इमीलिए नाराजगी हूँ यूनिवर्सिटी से।

श्री टी० पाण्डे : मुझे बड़ा खेद है और मैं इस बात से बहुत दुःखी हूँ कि वर्तमान समय में

[श्री टी० पाण्डे]

पुलिस की सहायता एक दो बार लो गई है। यह कोई अच्छी चीज नहीं है हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के लिए। हड़ताल की बड़ी चर्चा की गई है कि हड़ताल है बड़ी गड़बड़ी है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मेरा भी दो तीन विश्वविद्यालयों से सेवा करने के दृष्टिकोण से सम्बन्ध है, अध्यापक होने के नाते नहीं। मैं इलाहाबाद विश्वविद्यालय को देखता हूँ, लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालय को देखता हूँ। तो मुझ को यह देख कर आश्चर्य होता है कि यदि अनुशासन की दृष्टि से हम इन तीनों विश्वविद्यालयों का तुलना करें तो हम यह पाते हैं कि हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में अनुशासन अधिक है, डिग्लिन अधिक है। यह तो इस विश्वविद्यालय की हालत है और ऐसी दशा में इस विश्वविद्यालय की उन्नति होनी चाहिये। इसको आगे बढ़ाना चाहिये। फिर क्या कारण है कि इस कमेटी की स्थापना हुई। इसके कोई कारण जहर रहे होंगे। कारण दिये गये हैं। इसमें कहा गया है कि अध्यापक राजनीति में हिस्सा लेते हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिले और बिहार के पश्चिमी जिले के लोग दरिद्र होते हैं, उनको खाना नहीं मिलता है और वे पढ़ना चाहते हैं। वे विद्या के अनुरागी हैं, वे सरस्वती के मंदिर की उपासना करना चाहते हैं, वे काशी चले आते हैं; पढ़ते हैं और फीस नहीं देना चाहते हैं, इसलिए हड़ताल होती है। अगर महापुरुषों की, कमेटी के सर्वमान्य परमपुरुषों की यही फार्डिंडिंग है तो वे दया के पात्र हैं। मैं यही आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ।

दूसरी एक बात वहाँ के एक कमिश्नर साहब के सम्बन्ध में कही जाती है। मैं उनके सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं उनको अधिक जानता हूँ। उनकी इस कमेटी के सदस्य जितना जानते हैं, उससे अधिक जानता हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह कहता हूँ कि उन्होंने यह लिखा है कि मझ यह भूचला मिली है कि यहाँ के विद्यार्थी और कुछ अध्यापक भी अनैतिक आचरण करते हैं। मेरा सिर लज्जा

से झुक जाता है कि ऐसे पुरुषों ने स्वयं को नहीं देखा, किन्तु दूसरों को देखते हैं। मुझ एक घटना याद आ गई है। उन दिनों मैं काशी में था। जब कोई स्कूल, कालेज बन्द होता है तो बहुत से विद्यार्थी एकत्रारण निकलते हैं। एक घुड़सवार मिपाही चला जा रहा था। उसके पैर में जो जूता था वह किसी विद्यार्थी के सिर पर लग गया। विद्यार्थी ने एतराज किया और उस पर उसने कहा कि तू अपना सिर उठा कर क्यों नहीं चलते हो। आप विद्यार्थियों को जानते हो, हम भी जानते हैं, युग भी जानता है, सदन भी जानता है और सदन के बाहर भी लोग जानते हैं। चीप एजिटेटर्स इसके लिये रिसर्पासिविन हैं और स्कोनिंग कमेटी के डर से लोग इस्टिगेट कर रहे हैं, यह कहना आसान है। लेकिन स्थिति को सम्भालना बड़ा कठिन होता है। वह कुछ ही लोग कर सकते हैं। अब देखिये उसका नतीजा क्या होता है। वह सिपाही हंटर उठा करके मारने को तैयार हो जाता है। फिर ५० विद्यार्थी जमा हो गये और उस सिपाही को घोंडे पर से उतार कर के कहा कि अगर इस रास्ते पर से फिर कभी जाओगे तो ठोक कर दिये जाओगे। इन पर वह सिपाही महाशय भाग खड़े हुये। एक सब इस्पेक्टर ने आकर के क्षमा मांगी और मामला रफा दफा हो गया। यह मामला गया अधिकारियों के पास और अधिकारियों के पास सारी बातों की चर्चा क्लब में होती है। उन्होंने कहा कि इन विद्यार्थियों का क्या ठिकाना है, के सब से सब जाते हैं वर्याओं के यहां, इनकी यही हालत है, और कुछ अध्यापक भी जाते हैं। उन्होंने एक रिपोर्ट लिख दी और आप वहाँ गये तो उस रिपोर्ट को देख लिया। फिर आपने उसे प्रकाशित कर दिया और सब को चरित्रहीन घोषित कर दिया। यह महापुरुषों की लीला है और मैं यही कहूंगा कि वे दया के पात्र हैं। दूसरी बात यह कही गई है कि उप कुलपतियों के इस्तीफों का एक तांता लगा हुआ है। यह उत्तर प्रदेश का पूर्वी हिस्सा है जिसमें ५, ६

जिले ह और जिसमें प्रायः सभी एक दूसरे से जुटे हुए हैं। और ये हावी है और साहब दूसरों को निकाल दिया जाता है। मैं आपको बतलाता हूं, जरा आप फिगर्म भी देख लें।

**डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिगे :** जरा रेफरेंस भी देख लीजिये।

**श्री टी० पांडे :** दलबन्दी की चर्चा है। तो हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में १७५ अध्यापक हैं जिनमें ८६ उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के हैं। १५०५ प्रतिशत अध्यापक यहां के पढ़ाते हैं। ये १५ फीमदी जो लोग हैं ये सभी के ऊपर हावी हो जाते हैं? यह तर्क मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। काशी में यह विश्वविद्यालय निश्चित रूप से स्थित है। किताब में लिखा है कि काशी नगरी त्रिशूल पर बसी हुई है लेकिन देखने में नहीं आता है। हम सब उसके चारों तरफ बसे हुए हैं। तो हमने यहां के १५ प्रतिशत अध्यापक रखे हैं। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं, एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर साहब यहां नहीं हैं, लेकिन उनसे भी मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि अन्नगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी है, शान्ति निकेतन है, हैदराबाद यूनिवर्सिटी है, खडगपुर और शिवपुर में इंजीनियरिंग कालेजें हैं और न मालूम कितनी प्रयोगशालाएं देश में खुली हुई हैं, तो ये जिन स्थानों पर अवस्थित हैं वहां के इनमें कितने अध्यापक हैं, कितने विद्यार्थी हैं और कितने कर्मचारी हैं कभी इस पर भी गौर किया है? उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों में काशी स्थित है, तो काशी को कहीं अन्यत्र उठा ले जाइये। हम तो भूखे हैं, गरीब हैं और आपकी राय में हमारा आचरण भी शुद्ध नहीं है और आपकी राय में हम दलबन्दी भी करते हैं तो फिर हम कहां जायें। ऐसे लोगों के बीच में, ऐसे अनाचारियों के बीच में काशी नगरी का रहना बहुत वाछनीय नहीं मालूम होता है। रिपोर्ट में यह भी विवरण किया गया है कि काशी में यह विश्वविद्यालय न होता। काशी में विश्वविद्यालय न होता तो मैं कहता हूं कि और अच्छा होता। मैं आपसे कहता हूं कि काशी नगरी में अगर भागीरथ गंगा न

बहती तो और अच्छा होता। लेकिन जो आप चाहते हैं वह होता नहीं है, भगवान् को कुछ दूसरा ही मंजूर है। काशी में लाखों करोड़ों इंसान जायेंगे और सर्वदा जाते रहेंगे और भगवान् विश्वनाथ की पूजा भी करेंगे और उसमें भागीरथी भी रहेगी। यह आश्चर्य की बात है कि किस बात की आप कल्पना करते हैं? मैं नहीं समझ पाता हूं। आप महापुरुष हैं, आप तजुर्बेकार हैं और बड़े अनुभवी हैं। इस कमेटी के जो सदस्य हैं उनकी बड़ी प्रशंसा की गई है। लेकिन जो विवरण है वह कुछ एकतरफा मालूम होता है, पक्षपातपूर्ण मालूम होता है। और कभी कभी ऐसा मालूम होता है कि इस विवरण को शायद आपने देखा नहीं है। क्योंकि विवरण में जो तथ्य उपस्थित किये गये हैं उनमें सैकड़ों गलतियां हैं। पता नहीं कि उनको आपने बेरिफाई किया है या नहीं किया है।

अब, प्रबन्ध समिति जिसको एग्जीक्यूटिव कमेटी कहते हैं उसकी हालत देख लीजिये। इस प्रबन्ध समिति में २२ सदस्य होते हैं जिनमें से उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के ५ सदस्य हैं और ये ही सारी खुराफात की जड़ है। ये ही सब लोगों का बहुमत अपने पास रखते हैं। उन ५ सदस्यों में भी जो वस्तुस्थिति है उसको भी देख लीजिये। उनमें से एक साहब उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के विरोधी हैं।

आगे चलिये, एकेडेमिक कौंसिल की स्टैंडिंग कमेटी है, उसमें कुल २० सदस्य होते हैं और उनमें से ३ सदस्य उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के हैं।

नियुक्तियों के बारे में भी मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि उसको भी आप देख लें। जब से यह वाइस-चांसलर साहब तशरीफ ले गये हैं तब से जो नियुक्तियां हुई हैं वह मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं। १८७ नियुक्तियां हुई हैं और उनमें ३२ लोग उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के हैं। मुझे बड़े आश्चर्य की बात मालूम देती है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के

[श्री टी० पाण्डे]

लोगों को नियुक्त ही क्यों किया गया ? उनसे कहा जाता है कि आप गरीब भी हैं, आपका आचरण भी ठीक नहीं है और आप दलबन्दी बहुत करते हैं इसलिये आप पढ़ाइये नहीं । संसद् एक कानून पास कर दे कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के लोगों में तीन गुण हैं, नम्बर १, गरीब हैं, नम्बर २, दलबन्दी करते हैं और तीसरे यह कि दुराचारी हैं और यह कानून डाक्टर राजेन्द्र प्रसाद के ऊपर सबसे पहले लाया जाय जो कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति हैं । उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों से उनका बहुत सम्बन्ध है और वह बिहार के पश्चिमी जिले के निवासी हैं । सर्व प्रथम उन्हीं के ऊपर यह कानून लागू कर दें । यही आपकी प्रशंसा है । यह आपकी कमेटी है । कमेटी के संगठन के बारे में भी मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं ।

(Time bell rings)

मैं चाहता हूं कि आप मुझे थोड़ा समय और दे दें ।

श्री उपसभापति : १५ मिनट हो गये हैं ।

श्री टी० पांडे : ठीक है, लेकिन मैं आपसे थोड़ा समय चाहता हूं । मेरी स्थिति एक अभियुक्त की है और मैं सफाई दे रहा हूं ।

श्री उपसभापति : पांच मिनट और ले लें ।

श्री टी० पांडे : कमेटी के संगठन के बारे में मैं निवेदन करना चाहता था । मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि समूचे भारतवर्ष में आपको एक भी सुयोग्य हिन्दी भाषी इन्सान नहीं मिला जिसको कि आप इसका सदस्य बना सकें । यह आपका सर्व भारतीय चरित्र है और हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में सर्व भारतीय चरित्र चाहते हैं । लेकिन कमेटी में सर्व भारतीय चरित्र न हो । जो हिन्दी भाषा भाषी है उसको कभी न रखा जाय । क्योंकि हिन्दी भाषी अगर उसमें बुलाया जायगा तो वह शायद उत्तर प्रदेश की भाषा में बातचीत कर लेगा—मेरी राय में । जैसा कि नियम है आप सब जानते हैं—कमेटी बनाने के पहले गवर्नमेंट के लिये जरूरी था कि विश्व-

विद्यालय से पूछताछ करे । मगर पूछताछ नहीं की गई । अगर यह अखिल भारतीय विश्वविद्यालय है तो फिर अखिल भारतीय कमेटी बननी चाहिये थी । इस कमेटी में अखिल भारतीय स्वरूप का अभाव है क्योंकि इसमें हिन्दी भाषा भाषी एक भी व्यक्ति नहीं है । तो भी मैं उसमें विश्वास करता हूं ।

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिगे : श्री महाजन तो हिन्दी समझते हैं ।

श्री टी० पाण्डे : समझने के लिये तो आप भी समझते हैं लेकिन हिन्दी-भाषी नहीं हैं । भावना का प्रश्न है, विचारों का प्रश्न है । बहुत से स्मृति पत्र दिये गये हैं, बहुत सी गवाहियां दी गई हैं, रामनगर रियासत के नसेदर राजमहल में बहुत सी गवाहियां हुई हैं लेकिन यह कमेटी हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में नहीं पधारी । विश्वनाथ जी के मन्दिर का दर्शन नहीं किया और मालवीय जी की कल्पना का जो स्वरूप खिंचा हुआ है उसका दर्शन करने नहीं गई ।

श्री अमोलख चन्द : उसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं समझी ।

श्री नवाब मिह चौहान : वे दिव्य दृष्टा थे ।

श्री टी० पाण्डे : तो उन्होंने इसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं समझी । मुझे सूचना है कि वाइस चांसलर डा० वी० एस० झा वहां उस कमेटी में बैठे रहते थे । मैं निश्चित रूप से जानता हूं, मैं आरोप लगाता हूं और मैं गवाही देने को तैयार हूं कि इसके पीछे एक मन्थन षडयंत्र है और इसमें हमारा जो शिक्षा मन्त्रालय है, वह सूत्रधार है । मुझे इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है और मैं एक नहीं, सैकड़ों आदमियों को उपस्थित कर सकता हूं जिनको गवाही देने से रोक लिया गया है और उस राजमहल में पहुंचने नहीं दिया गया है । जो गवाही दी गई है और जो स्मृति पत्र उपस्थित किये गये हैं वे एकतरफा हैं । सिर्फ एक तरफ के स्मृति-पत्रों को लेकर के सारे विवरण को तैयार कर लिया



गया है। यह नहीं देखा गया है कि जो तथ्य इसमें उपस्थित किये गये हैं, वे तथ्य हैं या नहीं। इसलिये जो तथ्य हैं वे कई स्थलों पर गलत रखे गये हैं।

डा० राधाकृष्णन् की बड़ी चर्चा की गई है। मैं डा० राधाकृष्णन् को—मैं ही क्या सारा देश उनको आदर से देखता है और उस सरस्वती के पावन-मन्दिर में उन्होंने एक युग तक हमारी सेवा की है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि डा० राधाकृष्णन् जिन परिस्थितियों में अलग हुए, क्या वह इस हाउस को मालूम नहीं है, देश को मालूम नहीं है? क्या उन परिस्थितियों को—जिन हालातों में विश्वविद्यालय से उन्होंने त्याग पत्र दिया उनको यहाँ व्यक्त करने की आवश्यकता है।

डा० अमरनाथ झा की इन्होंने दुहाई दी। मैं कहता हूँ कि मैंने शिक्षा मंत्री का भाषण सुना तो मुझे बड़ी निराशा हुई कि इस देश का भविष्य क्या होगा। मैंने एक स्थल पर अपने प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का भाषण सुना तो उससे मेरे ऊपर उस भाषण का जो असर पड़ा वह यही असर पड़ा कि जो कुछ भी हो गया अब उसे क्या लौटाया जा सकता है। मैंने सोचा था कि इसको पी लिया जाय, पीने को जब मैं तैयार हुआ तो यह भाषण मैंने सुना और मुझे बड़ी निराशा हुई। और इसीलिये मैं बोल रहा हूँ। तो डा० अमरनाथ झा के बारे में आपने कहा। मैं किमी के ज्ञान को चुनोती नहीं दे सकता हूँ। डा० अमरनाथ झा को मैं जानता हूँ, मैंने उनसे बातें भी की हैं, आज वह यहाँ मौजूद नहीं हैं। डा० अमरनाथ झा उत्तर प्रदेश के पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के चेयरमैन थे। वह चेयरमैन भी रहना चाहते थे और वाइस-चांसलर भी। ये दोनों बातें चल नहीं सकती थी। और उन्होंने चेयरमैन रहना अधिक पसन्द किया और लाइस-चांसलर होना नहीं पसन्द किया और त्यागपत्र दे दिया। और जो बातें कही जाती हैं वे तथ्यहीन और मिथ्या हैं।

श्री गोविन्द मालवीय की चर्चा की गई है। वह उस हाउस में हैं। वह स्वयं अपनी बात कह

चुके हैं। यह कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि उनका नाम आया था लेकिन उनको चुना नहीं गया था। उनके एप्लेकेशन को अवैध घोषित कर दिया गया था। यह बिल्कुल मिथ्या है कि उन्होंने त्यागपत्र दिया था। इस संसद् में इतने महान् पुरुषों के सामने मिथ्या बोलना क्या आपको शोभा देता है? कभी नहीं शोभा देता है।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) :** राजनीति में यह सब होता है।

**श्री टी० पाण्डे :** श्री सी० पी० रामस्वामी अय्यर की चर्चा की गई है। वे वृद्ध पुरुष हैं, वे हमारे उप कुलपति थे और मैं जानता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने काल में इस बात की प्रतिज्ञा की थी कि किसी प्रकार की खड़मंडली में हिस्सा न लेंगे। लेकिन उन्होंने देखा इस में हम कामयाब नहीं हो सकते हैं। वृद्ध पुरुष अनेक पुस्तकें लिखना चाहते हैं। वे विश्वविद्यालय में उन सर्कमस्टान्सेज में, उन स्थितियों में, नहीं रहना चाहते हैं। वे प्रपंच में नहीं रहना चाहते थे, इसलिये वे चले गये। मैं आप से कहूँ, आर्यद आपको पता न हो, कि वे यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के उम्मीदवार थे। मैं आप से कहूँ कि अगर मंत्रिमंडल से उस वक्त फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर महोदय त्यागपत्र न दिये होते तो आज वे ही यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के अध्यक्ष होते। जैसी कि देश में चर्चा थी। जिसको मैंने सुना और आज उसको व्यक्त कर रहा हूँ। और भी अनेक कारण हैं उनको अलग करने के। विद्यार्थियों से इसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव की चर्चा उसके दाद आती है। आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव का मैं विद्यार्थी रहा हूँ। मैं हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का विद्यार्थी नहीं हूँ, काशी विद्यापीठ का विद्यार्थी हूँ। आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव का अध्यापक, जनता और विद्यार्थी कितना आदर करते थे, इस विषय में हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के साथ उसकी सोभा नहीं बांधी जा सकती है। वे अस्वस्थ थे, इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं है। आप स्वयं देख लें वे एकजी-क्यूटिव की बैठक में कितना हिस्सा लेते थे।

[श्री टी० पाण्डे]

कई और भी कारण हो सकते हैं जिनसे उन्हें अलग होना पड़ा। सभी विद्यार्थी चाहते थे कि वे रहें, अध्यापक चाहते थे कि रहें, एक्जीक्यूटिव कमेटी चाहती थी कि रहें। लेकिन वे नहीं रह सकते थे। जो कारण शिक्षा मंत्री ने बतलाया है वह कारण मुनासिब नहीं है।

अब आज की स्थिति क्या है? आप क्या करने जा रहे हैं? आप एक सीनेट की रचना किये हुए हैं जिसमें सब लोग नामिनेटेड हैं। एक-एक्जीक्यूटिव कमेटी की रचना की हुई है जिसमें सब लोग नामिनेटेड हैं। सीनेट को कोई अधिकार नहीं है सलाह देने के लिये। किस किस को कहिये कि एक्जीक्यूटिव कमेटी को नजदीकी सलाह दीजिये। It has got no meaning, meaningless. निरर्थक लोगों को आने जाने का कष्ट देना और यूनीवर्सिटी का रुपया बर्बाद करना है। एक्जीक्यूटिव कमेटी जो आपने बनायी है उसको भी हम ने देखा है। इस बारे में अब मैं अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन हमको उससे संतोष नहीं है। अधिक बहुत कहना भी कभी कभी गैर मुनासिब हो जाता है।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** खतरनाक भी हो जाता है।

**श्री टी० पाण्डे :** मैं आपसे कहूँ, एक बात से मुझे बहुत आश्चर्य हुआ। भवन निर्माण के लिये यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के चेयरमैन रुपया खर्च करते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में इस रिपोर्ट में कमेटी ने कहा कि विद्यार्थी लोगों की कमेटी ने यह सजेस्ट किया है कि अपनी तरफ से एक एक्जीक्यूटिव इंजीनियर और स्टाफ नियुक्त कर दो। यूनिवर्सिटी पर तो उनका विश्वास नहीं है, ये खुद नियुक्त कर दें।

स्क्रीनिंग कमेटी की जो चर्चा की गई है उससे मैं कोई डरता नहीं हूँ, बड़ा अच्छी है। आप यही समझते हैं कि आपके अध्यापक

जिनको आपने नियुक्त किया है वे अच्छा काम नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन जिस रूप में इसको पेश किया गया है वह अवांछनीय स्थिति को उत्पन्न करेगा यह मैं आपको सूचित कर देता हूँ। इस वक्त स्थिति क्या है, आतंक का राज्य है।

अभी शिक्षा मंत्री ने विद्यार्थियों के बारे में बड़ी चर्चा की और उसका विश्लेषण किया। विद्यार्थियों में उन्होंने बहुत काम किया है। मैं भी विद्यार्थियों में रहा हूँ। मैं कहता हूँ, हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में स्वयं मैं नहीं गया हूँ पर दो चार दिनों में मैं उसके सम्पर्क में हूँ। आज की स्थिति क्या है, मैं आपको बताता हूँ। प्रो० वाइस चांसलर और रजिस्ट्रार के मकानों पर इन लोगों ने धरना दिया है। आयुर्वेदिक कालेज के विद्यार्थियों द्वारा, दूसरों के द्वारा नहीं धरना दिया गया है। मेरी जो सूचना है मैं आपको बता रहा हूँ। सभी कालिज ज्यों के त्यों चल रहे हैं। लड़के जलूस निकालते हैं, प्रदर्शन करते हैं, मीटिंग करते हैं, अपने घर जाते हैं, किसी को मारते नहीं किसी को पीटते नहीं, किसी का पैसा नहीं मारते, न किसी प्रकार की अशान्ति है। जो मुख्य भी स्थिति है वह आपकी इस रिपोर्ट के कारण है। क्योंकि आपने उनके चरित्र पर आक्षेप किया है, उनके गुरुओं के चरित्र पर आक्षेप किया है। इस कारण यह असंतोष है।

आज की स्थिति क्या है, मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ। हमारे यहां इंजीनियरिंग कालिज में ७८ परसेंट लड़के बाहर से भरे जाते हैं, भर्ती होते हैं। यूनिवर्सिटी ने क्या किया, ७५ परसेंट कर दिया। तो भी पच्चीस, तीस जगहें खाली हैं। आर्ट कालिज में, टेकनिकल कालिज में सर्वत्र आपको विद्यार्थी नहीं मिल रहे हैं। एक बात और आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। हमारे एक मित्र हैं जो कि पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के सदस्य भी हैं। किस स्टेट के हैं, इसकी चर्चा करना मुनासिब नहीं है। ट्रेन में वे हमारे साथ आ रहे थे। उन्होंने कहा, एक

लड़का मेरे पास बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी का आया। मैंने उससे कहा कि तुम उस विश्वविद्यालय के हो जहां के लड़के प्रास्टीट्यूट्स के यहां जाया करते हैं। क्या तुम्हारे गुरु यही सिखलाते हैं। एक समय था हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के विद्यार्थी जिस कोने में जाते थे, बड़े गौरव से कहते थे कि मैं हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का विद्यार्थी हूँ। अब उस गौरव के साथ क्या कह सकेंगे यह महापुरुषों के विवरण का नतीजा है।

अंतिम बात मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि रिश्तेदारियों का बड़ा जिक्र किया गया है, खास तौर पर मेरे जिले का। उसकी भी मैं सफाई करना चाहता हूँ। रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि बलिया, गाजीपुर, गोरखपुर, देवरिया आज़मगढ़, ये सब जिले नजदीक के, पास के हैं और इस सम्बन्ध में रिश्तेदारियों की चर्चा हुई है। मैं क्या बताऊँ, सदन के सामने कह रहा हूँ, एकजीक्यूटिव के मेम्बर एक साहब नामिनेट हुए हैं। हमारा यह जो शिक्षा मंत्रालय है, उसने उन्हीं के एक भाई को कोर्ट का मेम्बर नियुक्त कर दिया है। नाम कहियेगा तो मैं बता दूँ। लेकिन मैं यहां मुनासिब नहीं समझता हूँ। लेकिन अगर शिक्षा मंत्रालय इस पर ऐक्शन लेने को नैयार है तो मैं बताऊँ कि जब रोये वाइस चांसलर चले गये हैं तब से जो कमेटी के मेम्बर हैं और गवर्नमेंट में हैं उनके रिश्तेदार कहां कहां से नियुक्त किये गये हैं। तो उनकी तालिका क्यों नहीं पेश की गई। (समय की घंटी) क्या उन महापुरुषों के पास इंक नहीं थी, कलम नहीं थी, कागज नहीं था, दावात नहीं थी? फिर क्यों नहीं उपस्थित किया।

दूसरी बात मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुकदमों का जिक्र किया गया है। मुकदमे के भी फिगर्स मैं आपको देता हूँ। बहुत से गलत फिगर्स इसमें भी दिये गये हैं जैसा कि रिश्तेदारियों के दिये गये हैं। यह रिपोर्ट जो है मुझे हास्यास्पद मालूम होती है, अतिरंजित मालूम होती है, अवांछनीय मालूम होती है। और इसके आधार पर आपने जो विधेयक उपस्थित किया है उसमें मुझे कुछ षड्यंत्र मालूम पड़ता है।

मैं तो सिर्फ महान् नेता पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू की तरफ देख रहा हूँ। इसलिये मैंने सोचा कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के बारे में भी आपको बता दूँ जहां का मैं रहने वाला हूँ। यह बड़ा पुराना इलाका है। यह काशी का पुण्य क्षेत्र है। लेकिन उसकी पवित्रता से आप अपरिचित हैं। मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज के जो हमारे राष्ट्रपति हैं वे भी उसी क्षेत्र के रहने वाले हैं। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि १८५७ में जिस प्रथम विद्रोह का सूत्रपात हुआ, उसमें भाग लेने वाले मंगल पांडे—और पांडे लोगों का कई कई बार इसमें जिक्र आया है—भी वहीं के निवासी थे। सन् बयालीस में जो स्वतंत्रता की महान् क्रांति हुई उसमें बलिया की एक इंच भूमि में अंगरेजी शासन न रहने के विद्रोह के प्रवर्तक पंडित चित्तू पांडे बलिया के ही रहने वाले थे। आपने हमारे उस रूप को नहीं देखा है। हमारी गरीबी को आपने देखा, आपने हमारे उस रूप को नहीं देखा है जो हम ने पाया है। अब हमारे ऊपर यह आरोप है कि काशी की सड़क में हम पड़े रहते हैं और म्यूनिसिपैलिटी की लाइट की नीचे किताब लेकर पढ़ते हैं। इस दरिद्रता को आप नहीं देखिये। पैसल से चश्मा पहिन कर आप हमारी ओर देखते हैं।

इसलिये इन महापुरुषों को शत शत नमस्कार करता हूँ और यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह विधेयक न विश्वविद्यालय के लिये, न समाज के लिये, न आगे आने वाली संतति के लिये कभी अनुकरणीय हो सकता है। शिक्षा मंत्री जी से मैं जरूर और व्यक्तिगत रूप से यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि विश्वविद्यालय में शान्ति हो, अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि विश्वविद्यालय का वातावरण शुद्ध हो, अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि विश्वविद्यालय की उन्नति हो, उसका अखिल भारतीय स्वरूप बना रहे, तो उसको ऊंचा उठाने की आवश्यकता है। मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इन सारे सम्बन्धों को जानता हूँ। आप हिन्दू विश्व-

[श्री टी० पाण्डे]

विद्यालय के विद्यार्थी हैं, आप अपने को जानते हैं, मैं अपने को जानता हूँ। आप भी . . .

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Pande. There are still 22 names before me, 14 from the Congress side and 8 from the Opposition side. If every Member goes on taking half-an-hour, there will not be time. Even supposing we sit through lunch hour tomorrow, we will be left with only 6½ hours. I would request hon. Members not to take more than 15 minutes each.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have very intimate connections with the Banaras Hindu University. I have been its student for nearly 4 years. Two of my brothers have also been graduates from this University and apart from this, my late master, the late Maharaja of Bikaner—Maharaja Gangasinghji—was one of the founder members of this great institution and with the help of the late Maharaja of Darbhanga and the late Maharaja of Bikaner it was possible for the late Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to establish this great institution. Later on also it was my good fortune to be the Private Secretary of His Highness for about 12 years—from 1928 to 1939-40—and during this period I had connections with the late Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and whenever the University passed through vicissitudes, it was the late Maharaja of Bikaner who always came to its help financially, politically and also with the then Government of India. In my capacity as the private secretary, I had to deal with this case very intimately. Therefore, it is but natural that when the future of this institution was at stake, it was a matter of very great concern to me. If the conditions have gone bad, it is but right for the Government that in an institution of this nature which is of all-India importance, that those things should be remedied and the aims and objects of the founders of this University should be kept in view and the conditions in this University should be put right again. The

Government took care to appoint a committee to enquire into the affairs of this University. As far as Government was concerned it took care to appoint very eminent men, both educationists and public-workers and administrators and it was expected that the report from the members of this eminence would be very useful, throw some light on the state of affairs and this University would again be in a position to serve this great country. So far it was all good. In this connection I very carefully went through the report of this Enquiry Committee. I read every line of it and indeed I found it very painful reading. I wish that if this report was to come out, this Enquiry Committee was never appointed at all. Even if the conditions were what have been stated and depicted in this report, they could have been fair to the University and its good name and reputation and the services that it has rendered during the last nearly half a century and they could have put the same thing in a different way but the method they have chosen and the language they have used are a matter of very great anxiety to the well-wishers of this institution. If this very Committee is appointed to enquire into the affairs of other universities, then only we would be able to see what their report would be. You spoil a case if you over-emphasise the matters or you go out of the way to harm an institution. The members of this Committee, as I have submitted and as everyone in this House has submitted, are very great people, eminent people and therefore it cannot, for the moment, be thought that they will go to the extent and the limit to which they have chosen to do. I am fully aware of the predicament in which the Government has been placed when this report reached their hands. The Minister stated this morning that he was wondering whether this report should be published or not and he was quite right too. I can well understand his feelings but having had the report from such a Committee, this could not be kept as a confidential matter. It would have other-

wise leaked out but it has always remained a matter of very great regret that the Committee, for some reason or other, was persuaded to put the report in the words in which they have done. There is no sphere of activity of this great University which they have not criticised in the strongest terms possible and if there were harder words available to them in the dictionary, probably they would have employed them too with very great pleasure. It seems that instead of expressing regret, they have enjoyed the bad things they have seen in the University.

It will not be an exaggeration if we were to say that either they went to make enquiries with a previous bias or prejudice or that their ears were already poisoned and that they just did not care to see what service this University has been rendering and what were the good points in the University. They just went out of their way to find fault there and the manner in which they conducted the enquiry is not also clear.

**DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:** Is there anything untrue about that?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** May be stated and have been stated on the floor of the House.

**SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI:** Does the hon. Member attribute motives to the Committee?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I did not quite catch the question. Because of the shortness of time, I am sorry, Madam, I cannot give ground.

Sir, I would compare this report with Miss Mayo's book, "Mother India" to which Gandhiji gave the very proper name "Drain Inspector's Report". This report can very well be considered a Drain Inspector's Report of the Banaras Hindu University. Sir, there are a whole series of subjects on which the Committee have reported. There are the national character of the institution, the appointment of teachers, the discipline of the students, law and order and so on. In view of the shortness of time, it is not possible for me to go through

each item but take the question of the appointment of the teachers. My friend, Mr. Raj Bahadur Gour, by facts and figures, showed that the number of teachers in this institution from a particular region was not very great. They come from all over the country. The students also come from all over the country. You can take any Central institution and compare the figures of the students going there from all parts of the country with the figures of the Banaras Hindu University. There is naturally congestion there but the University cannot be at fault. It has got great buildings, many big and spacious grounds and, within its capacity, it has built many many hostels. If the U.P. Government was not in a position to give education of the college standard to a large number of students, the University had to take this stand and in this, the University is not much at fault. However, Sir, I would submit there are two or three things regarding which I have not much fault to find with the Government. They have been put in a predicament. They do not know how to get out of it as a result of the enquiry. Sir, it is a matter of very serious concern that inaccuracies have been committed by this great Committee. The hon. Minister referred to certain minor inaccuracies but there are many inaccuracies. In para. 40 of the report, the Committee is not prepared to accept the services rendered by the students in the freedom struggle. They say that the last struggle was in 1942 and that now, with the Britishers having left, there is no more freedom struggle but they fail to understand that the traditions are left behind which would influence the succeeding generations. Sir, I would submit that the services that this great institution has rendered to the country are unparalleled. I know of other universities also. Even though I was not a student of either the Allahabad or the Lucknow University, as a sportsman of the Banaras Hindu University I have played many games on the playgrounds of Lucknow and Allahabad Universities and

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

I can say that the discipline shown by the students of the Hindu University can be compared to any university. This applies to the services rendered for the freedom struggle also. When the students of the other universities dared not raise a finger we, both teachers and the students, put our whole weight to serve the country. In the short time at my disposal, I will just give you an instance. In 1923, when the Congress decided to fight the elections under the Swaraj Party, I was a student and one Professor, Professor Telang of the Banaras Hindu University, was contesting the election for the U.P. Assembly. The Congress had put up his student of the fourth year against this Professor Telang. He was a great scholar, a renowned man but the students were goaded by the Congress leaders of the stature of the late Motilal Nehru to fight Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya who was sponsoring the case of Professor Telang. In the Town Hall a meeting was held to which Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya came in a procession with Prof. Telang. We were advised that for the country, an institution was nothing, discipline was nothing and that we should disturb the meeting and stone the meeting. Actually stones were thrown at Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and he was hit. He got up on the table and literally turned the table in favour of his candidate. After him Pandit Motilal Nehru spoke and eventually the student won by a thumping majority. What I would like to ask, Sir, is as to who is responsible for this kind of discipline? It is the political parties, whoever they may be, which have created these traditions in this institution to fight for the cause of the country and you will notice that they did not spare even Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya who was the soul of the institution. He was stoned by the students. This is the tradition which has been going on and in subsequent struggles also, this has been the tradition. The Committee in para 40 of its report puts forward a very queer argument and it says:

"To put forward this as an argument for the state of thorough indiscipline in the University is to fail to understand the essentials of proper conduct and rectitude".

Then, Sir, if the institution was so bad, I fail to understand why they were afraid that this report should not reach the authorities of the University? Sir, section 5(4) of the University Act provides that the Visitor may address the Vice-Chancellor with respect to the result of such enquiries, etc., but the Committee recommend that this should not be done. I do not know that fear the Committee had. Is it their fear that if their report reaches the University, the heavens will fall? If they were clear that the position of the University is as bad, then certainly they should have the courage of their conviction, when they were so eminent and big people on this committee, to face the music and tell them that here they are wrong. But they were so afraid that they recommended that this report should not reach the authorities of the University even when they have made such serious criticism against both the staff and the students and the authorities of the institution. Sir, we would have expected, when such things have happened, and the law and equity required that every accused should have the right of being heard in this case. How can the Vice-Chancellor and the Executive Council be deprived of an opportunity to submit their explanation? It is an ordinary thing. And in the end, after signing this report, the Committee has put an epilogue. It cannot be understood why they were frightened. Frightened of what? I mean, their lives were safe. There could not have been any revolution; they would not have been kidnapped by any authority. They have done their duty, and having done their duty, why were they afraid of anybody? And in the epilogue they said—after submitting the report—that "It is not surprising even before steps were taken to draw up the report, there should have been representations made to the President and

agitation should have been set up regarding the composition of the Committee, the manner in which the proceedings were conducted, the defects in regard to selection of witnesses and the receipt of memoranda, etc. We are not surprised at the insinuation that the Committee has been guided by the Vice-Chancellor and others connected with the University”.

It is very surprising and therefore a report of this nature should not be taken note of. It has done very great harm to the country and to this great institution which needs full support at this time. Sir, I would like to ask: Which is the university, Centrally-administered or otherwise, in which defects could not be found? I mean, there are Central Universities in our country where you will find even anti-national activities are carried on under the eyes of the very Government. But Government dare not take any step. Why is it that they do not appoint committees to go and report on their affairs? The one thing that can be said of this great university is this, that it had always been national, it has maintained its national character, and as long as it exists—and let us hope and pray that it will exist—as long as this country exists, it will continue to serve the country. But it is a matter of very great regret—and it is deplorable—that against institutions where even anti-national activities are conducted under the very nose and eyes of the Government, not a little finger is lifted. That is a very sorry state of affairs.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up. You have taken twenty-five minutes. Thirty minutes have been allotted to your party.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Just two minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe you have another speaker to speak.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: You will give me two minutes, Sir, and I will

finish; I will conclude by saying this, Sir.

Now I have gone through this Bill which is before us. I have got no fundamental objections to the Bill. But one thing I should say, that the Government has been influenced very badly by this report and all the personnel on these bodies are nominated as if it were a department of the Government. Well, it amounts to that, but I do hope that the Minister and the Government would not consider taking this great University as one of the Government departments. It appears that they would treat it as a Government department, which should be avoided. It is on a par with other universities. Its autonomy should be maintained.

Then, Sir, one thing more I have to submit and then I will resume my seat. It is this that on the Court there are a large number of donors, and very big donors, and they are life members. They have given to the University lakhs and lakhs of rupees. Even at present the budget of the University comes to Rs. 2,01,65,126; Government contribution is only about 25 per cent. that is, Rs. 55,19,515; 25 per cent roughly is the Government's contribution, both Central and State. The remaining three-fourths come from the public charities and public donors. Apart from that there are living life members on the Court who have given lakhs and lakhs of rupees, and they have completely been eliminated from the membership of the Court. That is a thing which, I hope, Government will take note of and see that their interests are not overlooked. Otherwise, Sir, as far as this Bill is concerned, well, the only thing is this that more or less it has been taken for granted that it is a Government department. That should not be. Its autonomy should be on a par with all other like institutions and let us hope that a new Bill will come soon where the objectionable things will be removed and a healthy atmosphere will be allowed to prevail in this University and it will be allowed to serve this great nation according to

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

the ideals and aims which were before the founders of this institution.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, let me repeat the good note with which the last speaker ended. Let me hope that this great University which has been doing great service in the past will continue to do the great job by way of training our young men for their future. This Bill itself, in my opinion, is an assertion of the power of the people to set things right. To my mind, Mr. Deputy Chairman, autonomy of the University is a very sacred thing. If educated people, people of eminence, people of erudition, people of education, people of culture, if they cannot be allowed to do their allotted jobs, then indeed it is a poor state of affairs in our country. But still there are times when certain crises have happened, and when those crises have happened, certain extraordinary actions have been taken.

Sir, many things have been said about this report. I am very sorry that this report had to be made against this Banaras Hindu University. The Banaras Hindu University is a very great institution founded by the great Malaviyaji. We, who are far away in the south, have very great esteem and veneration for this great University and many of us have had and are having the benefits of the best education imparted there in the different subjects. When we first read the excerpt from this report in the papers we said: What is coming on us?

Mr. Deputy Chairman, today we have student indiscipline in our country and there is no subject which is more discussed in this country's educational forums than this. It finds expression in various ways. May be the reason for this indiscipline is to be found in our recent historic traditions. It is possibly true that the association of political parties with the students

and *vice versa* has resulted in the indiscipline. Maybe that we who were fighting for freedom then thought that students' association with the freedom movement was good. As soon as we attained our freedom we ought to have advised them that they should take to student life only, as long as they were students, that they should equip themselves for the future and not involve themselves in further party politics. Possibly we did not impart that lesson. The result was that later on political parties began to utilise them for party politics, and till today that has not stopped. May I appeal to this House, as it has been done in Madras, where my friend, the Education Minister, summoned a meeting of the political parties so that all political parties will desist from using students for political purposes. You know, Sir, even in one of the universities in South India there have been exhibitions of some kind of temper, as happened in this University. The way to solve them is to create the necessary atmosphere in these universities, not merely by bringing in this kind of legislation, about the provisions of which I shall speak later. But no discipline can be brought about and no atmosphere can be improved without public co-operation in the creation of that atmosphere. The public—in a sense it will mean political parties—should co-4 P.M. operate in the making of that atmosphere. So I believe that some wisdom will come, that people in Banaras and people all over the country will learn that students must be regarded as something sacred, that student life must be regarded as the period of preparation for future life so that it will be a national calamity if we allow students not to involve themselves in higher education, in the way in which they should. May I also appeal that this should be a warning to many other universities so that the people may know that the university precincts are sacred and they must not be used for party politics or to serve their own ends. With these preliminary remarks, Mr. Deputy



Chairman, let me come to the provisions of this Bill.

Sir, this University was founded with two main objectives; one is the all-India character of the University and the other is the residential character of the University. Both are laudable objectives but later on it has become such, in spite of the speech of my hon. friend over there—whatever may have been the position in the ancient past, many things that were there in the old days were very very good—that today from the things that we see, from the news that we get, from the information that we get, we see that the University is gradually losing the all-India character. Not only is it losing the all-India character but also the residential aspect. The virtues of residential life are good when a proper atmosphere is maintained. But when too many numbers are admitted, when proper facilities are not provided, when even the minimum facilities that are necessary for decent living are absent, then this residential aspect becomes a curse and that is what has happened today. It is not good for us to blame anybody as to why this has happened. It is for us to take the thing in our hands and see what can be done to improve the position. Certain things that I have read in the report have shocked me. I am not speaking in defence of the eminent writers of the report; they are great by themselves; they are distinguished by themselves and their report stands by itself and it does not require any defence. When I see that in the academic field the professors attach to themselves their own sons, their own sons-in-law, their own daughters-in-law, when these are produced in one month, of 500 pages by students, and doctorates are given on that basis, I say, where is the academic character of that University? When promotions depend not on academic considerations but on other considerations of party politics among teachers, where is the academic nature of the institution? If the students are not selected, if the staff are not selected on merits—I can understand weightage being given to backward com-

munities; every State does that—but apart from the legitimate concessions given to the backward communities if the staff are selected simply because they will be supporters of a party, that they will be valuable additions to the party, then I say the whole academic life is lost in this country. It is no more a university. Just as there are many temples which we have been worshipping as something great for thousands of years but today we find that the necessary atmosphere is not there. We say, let the temples be rebuilt and let a good atmosphere be created. I think that is the way reform should function. They may have been there for thousands of years but that is no reason why they should continue to exist. Many superstitions exist in the Hindu society; they have been there for thousands of years but that is no reason why they should continue to exist. Even so because that University has been going on in a particular manner for a number of years, that is no justification that it should continue to go on just in that manner. The point is whether it serves the ideals for which it was established, whether it serves the purpose for which it was established. What are the ideals of any university education? Apart from the special objectives of this University, what are the purposes of university education? Academic attainment of the highest kind, a higher academic background, that is the first and the most important fulfilment of any institution for higher education, and secondly, if I may say so, the moulding of character, making men and women who can fight, who can lead a higher life, who can face disaster, who can face difficulties and overcome them with will and with strength—these are the purposes. Now, these boys and girls in these universities, they are the future leaders; they are the people whom we expect to provide future leadership for the nation. The universities are the places which are training the future leaders of the nation and therefore we expect to find there a certain amount of integrity, a certain amount of character, a certain feeling that a right thing

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar] can be expected and can be achieved. If in a place like that we find such things what will happen. Sir, I am very unhappy to read this report about the students. I am one of those who have lived with students for the last quarter of a century. I have spent the best part of my life with them and I would like to spend the rest of my life with them. Our students are a fine lot. They have intelligence; they have integrity and if a good example is set before them they can be moulded into men of the finest character. What they lack today is proper leadership, proper atmosphere in the institutions which give that leadership. Any institution which provides that atmosphere will turn out some of the best men whom the world will envy. Those young men in Banaras who are students of that great University are no better or no worse than anybody anywhere else. They have capacity; they have strength and they can be led into noble paths but the atmosphere that is prevailing there is not suitable for that. The students were on hunger strike the other day; then the things—for which I was not prepared—that were related in the House by my hon. friend from Bombay, how the students choose to allow or not to allow some of the officials of the University into the campus whatever may be their defects, all these amazed me and I am very sorry, I am very unhappy to observe that there is no healthy academic atmosphere in the University. If the facts that are stated are true that doctorates are being given to sons-in-law of professors. I am afraid that the degrees obtained from that University will not command very much respect.

So a crisis like this needs to be remedied. Many times we get sores. For the body to be healthy the sores must be operated. People get appendicitis, an incision becomes necessary. It has to be cut off and there is no other way. Even so, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I regard this measure as an operation that has necessarily to be performed. Not that anybody likes to perform this operation; not that

anybody likes to cut off any limb of the body. If the body is to be healthy, the operation has to be performed. And here let me hope that this is going to be a temporary phase. There is a danger that if this phase continues for a long time, it may become a mere subordinate department of the Government of India and that danger should not be allowed to develop. While I am sorry that this Bill has been introduced, I accept it only as a temporary measure and not in any sense as a measure that will continue for any length of time. We know the Ministries of the Government of India and the Education Ministry. They can administer but they can never run a first-rate institution like a university. If for everything you have to come up here, for okaying and for approval, that would be the end of all academic education and so let us hope that this promise that has been made that before long another Bill will be brought forward will be kept and that the administration subject to such restrictions as are usually provided in any University Act will be left to them. Let us hope that this arrangement that is proposed to be made is only a purely temporary measure.

One other matter I would like to refer to before I sit down and it is this. I do not know why the Solicitor-General was brought into the picture here. Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Solicitor-General is a legal authority. When there are difficulties of law, we refer to the Advocate-General or the Solicitor-General or the Attorney-General. But the reviewing Committee has to do something different. The subjects that will come to the Reviewing Committee have nothing to do with legal matters. The questions, as far as I know will be whether a person has been good or whether he has been bad, what are their academic qualifications and whether they are good enough to serve as teachers in the university; whether their past has been to the good of the university or whether it has been bad for the university. I mean that on a Reviewing Committee or body like that, there should be somebody connected with

education, some retired Vice-Chancellor who has some time. It passes my comprehension why the matter should go to the Solicitor General. No explanations are forthcoming. I believe that name has come in because no other person was taking it up.

DR. R. B. GOUR: To give it a respectable appearance.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I don't think it looks respectable with that name. But whatever, it is, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not think the Solicitor General makes a very good appearance in this portion of the Bill.

Next, I would like to mention, Mr. Deputy Chairman that in the Madras University, when we select professors and other persons for the highest grades in the University, we not only associate distinguished professors and educationists from other universities, but we have prescribed it as a principle that we select some distinguished educationists connected with the subject, eminent in the subject, from the neighbouring States. I would suggest, to maintain the all-India character of this University, we should be able to associate eminent men in letters, in the sciences, and in other subjects, in the selection of professors of the highest grades. I am anxious, Mr. Deputy Chairman that this should be done. I am not bothered about the money that the Government of India gives this University—Rs. 25 lakhs or is it Rs. 55 lakhs? I don't know. I would also like the word "Hindu" in the name of this university and the word "Muslim" from the name of the Aligarh University, should be omitted. It serves no purpose and it is an anachronism that we have these names. It is not as if only Hindus are admitted to this University or that only Muslims are admitted into the other university. The Britisher thought when he produced the Banaras Hindu University Act, that he must give a Muslim University to balance it and put in the words Hindu and Muslim in these names. He thought perhaps that we might for-

get that we are Hindus and they are Muslims and to make the thing permanent, he named this as the Hindu University and the other a Muslim University. But even in the original Act the provision is that students of all communities and of all religions must be admitted into the colleges. And even today there is no difference in these things. And I suggest that the all-India character of this institution must be maintained in this as in many other ways.

Sir, I hope the Banaras University will have a great era in the future, and will serve the country well.

I would only like to add, Mr. Deputy Chairman that though a time limit may not be put in the Bill, because of certain difficulties, I feel the Government should themselves for their own safety and in the interest of maintaining this great institution, fix a time limit within which the comprehensive Bill proposed is brought in, so that after some time, when this university returns to normal, the normal university atmosphere, university facilities and the university autonomy should be available to this university as to any other.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have listened to the speeches of hon. Members for a long time; but with great respect to them I regret to say that it seems to me that we are drifting away from the exact point that is before us for decision. At present we are on the point whether the present Bill which is also of a temporary character, should be passed or not. The Education Minister has promised that a very comprehensive measure will be brought forward shortly in the near future. But I find that many of the speakers travelled outside the scope of what we have before us. We have before us only the Bill. The report of the Committee, no doubt, is at the bottom of this Bill. But the Bill does not say that every word in that report is correct. Whether we are going to allow this Bill to pass or not is the

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]  
only thing to decide. All the other matters will be irrelevant. The relevancy of the report comes in only in that it is on the general evidence of that Committee that this special measure, this temporary measure, has been based. Therefore, if the report is to be referred to at all, it should be referred to in broad terms. You cannot find fault somewhere in the report and then say, therefore, the whole thing is wrong. Nothing turns on that. About the Committee, everybody agrees that it was the best committee. Nobody has said anything against the Committee. Five eminent men—one of them was a lady—had sat down and written a report of about 40 pages or so. If you find a fault here and there in it, it does not matter at all. Supposing it was a judicial enquiry and if an appeal lays, the appellate court would not have come to a different conclusion if, out of one hundred facts, two or three were found to be incorrect. That would not have mattered. I have been in practice some 45 years and I know.

DR. R. B. GOUR: But out of 100 facts only two or three are correct.

DR. P. V. KANE: That is what you feel. We do not feel that way. Even if one-fourth of what they have said is correct and accurate, then I would say the Banaras Hindu University is in a very bad way.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are the others?

DR. P. V. KANE: We are just now on this question and not on the others. You have no authority for saying that others are like this. You have no authority for saying anything about any other university now. You don't know. We know about this University because of this report. The Committee examined 74 witnesses and one hundred memoranda and on the basis of that examination they have come to certain conclusions. Most of them are conclusions of fact. They may be wrong in one or two conclusions. That does not matter. The

whole point is whatever you have asked them to do whether they have done that job properly and whether this Bill is based on the evidences which are most prominent evidences.

The original Act of 1915 says:

"Whereas it is expedient to establish and incorporate a teaching and residential Hindu University at Banaras,"

Then it goes on to specify the fundamental characteristics of the University namely, that it shall be a teaching university, not an affiliating university and that it shall be a residential university. For this purpose the Banaras Hindu University was founded. But this character has been entirely given up.

AN HON. MEMBER: How?

DR. P. V. KANE: You find so many colleges having been affiliated. The residential character has gone. Students come from outside and they lead a life nobody knows of what kind. So both the characters which distinguished this University at the time this Act was passed, from the other universities in India are gone and it has lost that character and has become like any other examining universities. They wanted to find out how this happened. They found ultimately that somehow or other there was pressure brought upon the University. People had a wrong notion that this was not an all-India institution, that all students who passed should be admitted. Nobody has denied this. Nobody said that it was not the case, that it had not happened. You know that originally there were hardly two thousand students. You will find in the Appendix at the end the figures are given. Now there are more than eight thousand students for the last five years. Most of them are outside the campus. They stay elsewhere. The fundamental character of the University is gone.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: It is because the University cannot provide their own hostels for them.

DR. P. V. KANE: That is not your concern. It is the business of the State. University education is in the hands of the States. The Centre is only concerned with institutions of national importance. You must remember that. We have only four items in the Union list about Universities, none of which would be applicable here. With your eyes open this was done. This University was founded in a particular manner. They may be good reasons or bad reasons, that is not material. (*Interruptions.*) Please do not interrupt me. I am only developing my own point. My point is that they wanted to find out what was the result of this state of affairs and why it happened, both. So, they write in the report that gradually there has been this particular thing and all sorts of students have flocked to it. Not only they find that nobody had denied that standards were lower in particular cases, but where children of teachers were concerned lower standards were applied. So far I have never heard anybody saying that this was wrong. My point is, the principal thing that they wanted to stress was that the University should resume its original character. In dealing with that issue, several other matters crowded upon them. There were 100 memoranda and 74 witnesses. Seventy-four is rather an understatement, when applied to the word 'witnesses'. In many cases the word 'witness' includes several people. Look at page 36 of the report. They put down item No. 57 like this: "Shri Rai Satya Vrata and four others", etc. They were examined. Then item No. 60 comprises five people, all students of the University in the M.Sc. Tech. Class. Proceeding further, in 61, V. K. Lal and four others—they were all examined. The point is the students were examined, and sometimes they put down one group under one item, one item containing four people. So, more than 74 persons must have been examined. All I am

saying is that they had an enormous volume of evidence before them. And remember what were their terms of reference. That again is a very important matter. Many people have lost sight of the fact that the terms of reference were restricted and definite. You will find that the terms of reference of the Committee are these. Somebody said that none of the good points in favour of the University was stressed. But where are they? That is outside the jurisdiction of the Committee. These are the terms of reference:

"To examine the general state of discipline in the University, keeping in view the recent disturbances in some of the Institutions;

To enquire into the adequacy and effectiveness of the existing rules and procedure for ensuring proper conduct and discipline amongst the employees of the University"

that is, the teachers—

"To examine the working of the Act, the Statutes and the Ordinances of the University in general and with particular reference to—

- (a) the composition of the Authorities of the University;
- (b) the institution of the principals and their *ex-officio* appointment as Chief Wardens; and
- (c) the powers of the Vice-Chancellor *vis-a-vis* the administrative and the teaching personnel of the University;"

To suggest such "remedies and measures", etc. That is, there was nothing said about going into the work done by the University. That was not the point. If they had gone on describing the good points, I should say that that would have been not called for. They would have been travelling outside their terms of reference.

Then, another difficulty is this. The terms of reference should have really said that this Committee will be of a quasi-judicial character, that they will have power to call witnesses, and

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

that while they are doing that, they will be like a civil court. Nothing of that nature was said. That is one lacuna.

Then, their terms of reference were definite. They had to find out the causes of indiscipline not only amongst the students but also amongst the teachers, and they had to examine also the working of the Act of 1915 as amended by the Act 1951. They had to do all that. Those are the things for which they were appointed and they had to suggest remedies. They have suggested remedies on which this Bill is based. My point is at present you are not on the different facts, on the one hundred and one facts that they have found. Twenty of them may be wrong. I say 40 per cent. may be wrong. What of that? Ultimately 60 per cent. remains. There are so many people whose evidence is not going to be published, I suppose, because the evidence was given on the understanding that names would not be given. Therefore the evidence has not been published. My point therefore is that you are not very much concerned with the shortcomings, inaccuracies etc. in the report. You are concerned with the actual findings of fact. Some inaccuracies might have crept in. I do not go into that question. My point would be only inaccuracies as regards the relationships and as regards the suits field.

I have got a flood of pamphlets sent to me. I did not read all of them. I read one or two of them. One of them is by a retired Professor, Shri Mukut Behari Lal. This person is witness No. 8. He must have given his evidence. And he now puts out this pamphlet of about sixteen pages. Ultimately he says in the last paragraph of the pamphlet:

"In the end, it may be said that though the dissolution of the pressure group is necessary for healthy academic life . . ."

That is what he means—

" . . . it forms but a section of the University Community and the

nation will hardly be justified in making the entire community suffer conditions of servitude."

Nobody says that the entire community should suffer. You are going to clean the Augean stable by appointing the Committee. But this man finds fault with it, and he is a retired Professor of Political Science in the University. Sir, I am connected with the Poona University and the Bombay University and the Bombay years, beginning from being a simplest member of the Board of Studies, then member of the Academic Council, then member of the Senate, and then the Vice-Chancellor. I have been connected with all the Universities as examiner. In this very particular University I had been an examiner for more than ten years. Of course that was long ago, and some of you may have been just born then. So I am connected with University affairs. Supposing there is something wrong here or there, that is not the point. This national University had so many donors and so many distinguished people and the heart of that great and noble patriot Pandit Malaviya. I may tell you that I agreed to be an examiner because I was taken to Pandit Malaviya by Professor Dhruva. I told Professor Dhruva that I was a busy man, that I was a lawyer, and that I could not be an examiner. Still he took me to Pandit Malaviya, and the old gentleman, revered by everybody, got up and said "you must be our examiner". So, I had to be an examiner in that University for ten years. I agreed to take only one paper. The point is that I am connected with that University. I am even now on the Senate of the Poona University. So I have been connected with almost all the old Universities of this country. What I am saying is that you must try to see how the report was made. The report is made with these restrictions that they have only to find out the cause of indiscipline. One hon. Member said it is not the students who are responsible but it is the teachers. I agree, and this report does not mince matters. Somehow or other my friend on my

right said that the teachers were bad and not the students. But the report does not say that. I shall read one or two passages from the report and try to show what they have said. They say at page 7 bottom:—

“We have some names mentioned of such teachers holding very responsible positions and we note with a great deal of regret that the present state of indiscipline in the University is due as much to some of the teachers in the University as to the students thereof.”

They have brought in the students as well. As compared to that there is something more coming. Looking at pages 9, 10 and 11, there you will find that they have given another certificate to some teachers.

This is what they say about a Principal and they have said about a man who had a complaint that he was not allowed to have his own daughter as a student.

“The examiners themselves were bewildered and one of them is reported to have said that it was a marvel that such a thesis could be presented by a student working for a degree and within a short period. In this case, it has been suggested that this student, who is related to a Principal, submitted a thesis the bulk of which was done by members of the department”.

This Principal is at fault.

Another very interesting case is about a Principal who did not take any roll-call for four months and he had detained four students. You will find about this at page 10, in paragraph 20. The whole thing is there.

“Early in 1957, there was a strike in the College of Technology which led to some confusion. The following students of the College were detained for shortage of attendance . . .”

There are the names given:—

“On account of their detention, the students of the third year class of the College boycotted the

examinations on 23rd March, 1957. They accused the authorities for not taking regular attendance and also for improper maintenance of registers, etc. We enquired into this question carefully. The students were afraid of victimisation because, at the time of the examination, the persons responsible held a dominant position in assessing their results. When the Principal was interviewed, he was specifically asked how he came to the conclusion that the attendance of these students was wanting when it was reported that the attendance register was not maintained; he admitted that the attendance was not taken for some months, probably four months . . .”

This is the way in which the Principal was behaving. So, they have spared nobody. What they got, they have put forward. Then, what happened? The Principal admitted not having taken the roll-call for four months. Somehow or other, he found that it would land him in a bad state. Therefore, he put forward some students. Read the next paragraph.

“A curious and somewhat comical incident in regard to this taking of attendance happened which was a revelation to the Committee. The students who had been detained represented to the Committee their fears of victimisation. Another batch of students appeared before the Committee. They stated that they were students of the same College of Technology and volunteered the information that the attendance was regularly taken . . .”

Then they say—

“When confronted with the statement of the Principal himself as transcribed from the shorthand record of his evidence admitting that attendance was not taken for four months, the students were confused beyond measure, a significant fact which reveals how evidence should have been manipulated.”

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

I do not want to read all these things. There are so many things. Now, the question is . . .

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, may I be allowed five or ten minutes more? I find that some have taken an hour and some 35 minutes. I do not think that I will take more than five to ten minutes.

What I am driving at is that they have spared these students. This matter is on page 11. But, I will read from page 10, paragraph 23:

"We have had irrefutable evidence from diverse sources, including many members of the academic staff . . ."

This is the most important passage I wanted to read.

" . . . that the real menace to the satisfactory working of the University lies in the teacher-politicians and the formation of groups which dominate in all affairs of the University. This allegation has been fiercely contested by some who have themselves been styled as leaders of such groups. Recently, the Chairman of the University Grants Commission visited the University and after a thorough study of the present conditions prevalent there referred to the part played by teacher-politicians to the ruin of the University. The Teachers' Association sent a letter to him asking to withdraw these remarks."

To address the Chairman of the University Grants Commission! How can they ask a man of that position to withdraw his remarks? He is an authority and he would like to do as he wishes. This is the result. The Commission is appointed and they are to find out the defect in the administration of the University.

"Incidentally, it may be mentioned that the so-called Teachers' Association itself seems to be dominated by a

group and several teachers stated that they had not joined such an association . . ." and so on.

I do not go into all these. The point is that this furnishes sufficient evidence that the blame lies with the teachers in the first place and with the students in the second place. That is quite clear. Somebody has said . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: It is the other way about. The blame lies primarily with the students. (Inter-ruption.) I mean, with the teachers.

DR. P. V. KANE: I agree with it. I am saying the same thing. Generally, the students are good. My experience has been very long, as a teacher of even a small school, and I can endorse everything that my learned friend, Dr. Wadia, has said that students are all human. You must argue with them patiently. Sometimes, it may take two hours. But they will come round. They see the other man's point of view much better than many of us can do. Therefore, the students are good at heart. They are all emotional. They are not experienced about the world. They have an unpractical mind. Then just as the Gita says—

यद्यदाचरति श्रेष्ठस्तत्तदेवेतरो जनः ।  
स यत्प्रमाणं कुरुते लोकस्तदनुवर्तते ॥

Whatever a great man does, other people follow him; whatever he regards as good and authoritative, people follow it. They see that all professors are doing this, they are doing that. They say, "The Vice-Chancellor *murdabad*". Then why should we not also do the same thing? Such things are there. In my student days, I might have also joined such things. But then, there were no such things. There were no such difficulties. I am talking of about 60 or 65 years ago. Then there was nothing of this kind.

My point is, really this report should be read as a condemnation of the professors in the first instance and



secondly, as following and flowing from it, of the bad discipline amongst some of the students. They never say that all the students are bad. They say that about 150 students are bad; no more. This is what they have expressly stated. My point is, really the report should not be condemned on that. As one of my friends has said, they only said that both are to be blamed and the teachers more than the students. That is what they have said.

What I wanted to show is that really, you have taken a wrong view of the report. The report is not before you in the sense in which the Bill is before you. The report is only the base upon which the Bill has been drafted. Let us look at the Bill. I would say that the Bill is as a temporary measure and I hope that you will think it your duty to bring this University back to the way from which it has fallen. That should be really expected. You may make here and there some changes. There are four principal points. They are, the constitution of the Board, the constitution of the Executive Council, the constitution of the Selection Committees and lastly, the constitution of the Reviewing Committee. These are the four principal points and every one of them, I should say, is well drafted. In a sense, there may be corrections or there may be amendments suggested. But it is drafted with the view that the whole dirty thing that has come before the public should be cleared up and washed. I do not refer to other things. They have said that the teachers are guilty of moral turpitude and so on. I do not refer to it at all because that is their opinion and nobody has said that their opinion is wrong. They only say that, for the sake of a few, why do you condemn the rest? A bad potato spoils the whole bag of potatoes. So, this is a canker that is in the teaching community and you must try to eradicate it thoroughly. Otherwise, suppose all these fellows are there—I expressly use the word 'fellows', I have a very bad opinion

whoever they are. But these people who are charged with the sacred task of moulding the minds of the growing generation—graduates and post-graduates—stoop so low that really my blood boils. When I see that the University Grants Commission has given to this great University a large sum and probably two crores of rupees have been spent last year there and the Government placed with it Rs. 67 lakhs last year. That is one-third and not one-fourth as somebody said. When the Budget was discussed, I said that the Government gives step-motherly affection to the other universities and motherly affection to the four Central Universities. That I still hold. A sum of Rs. 1,85,00,000 is spent on four Central Universities and only Rs. 1,42,00,000 are spent on the remaining 28 or 30 other universities by the Central Government. And the States have very little money. In Bombay State, how many universities are there? They are, Ahmedabad, Baroda, Bombay, Poona, Nagpur and now Marathwada. All these are in Bombay State. Rupees two lakhs to each. What does it mean? That is my view. Let these Central Universities have Rs. 1,85,00,000. But let these other universities also have three or four crores of rupees. That is my point. Somebody said, "Oh! we are in India. If the Centre spends Rs. 1,85,00,000 or Rs. 1,76,00,000, that is for all India." No. This is all India's money. What is spent on the other universities is the States' money. Remember. And the University Grants Commission has got very few crores—I think, for the plan, they had about twentyseven or so. That has been cut down to nineteen or twenty-one crores. My point is that the Centre does not feed the other universities as it feeds this University. This is the premier University as it were in the whole of India. And as I said, even if one-fourth of what has been stated about the Report is true, it deserves condemnation.

Then, Sir, as regards the particular items that have been incorporated in

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

the Bill itself, well, I have been in the Bombay University as a Fellow, and hardly more than two or three times . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: 'Fellow' I hope not in the earlier sense?

DR. P. V. KANE: During the last forty years. I am not talking of the bygone ages. I was a member of the Senate—and that too practically ended in nothing. Now, they say that there are only two or three suits pending. Then another thing that I noticed was that the report refers to suits that have been filed and disposed of. Some people who have sent me big brochures have said that suits are still pending. These people—some of them—say that only three or four are there and the rest are disposed of. That is half-truth. In law you must deny that no suit was brought at least in the last ten years. I think this is purposely put in in a doubtful manner. They say that only three or four suits are pending. So that is not clear.

Then as regards relationship, as I said, that is not a very important matter at all. (*Time bell rings.*) Just I shall take only two or three minutes. I like to point out only some good points in the Bill. I entirely agree with many of them. Well, I do not want to go into the question of provincialism. Dr. Gour said something about it. He probably said that out of 500 teachers only one-fourth are outside U.P. That is rather a suspicious thing, and I do not rely on that. Here we are considering mainly the Bill, and not merely the report. That is what I want to emphasise. Well, Sir, I have nothing more to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Members have to be here at 5-30 P.M. If the House agrees, we can sit till about 5-20. In that case one more Member can have a chance.

(No hon. Member dissented.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I should like to congratulate Dr. Shrimali on the courage that he displayed in promulgating the Ordinance which is the basis of the Bill before us.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): What is that courage?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: He is courageous because you gentlemen are opposed to what he did.

(*Interruption.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, had he postponed action until July or until August, the situation which we are facing in the University today might have been even worse. There are occasions when a Minister must act courageously and boldly. I hold certain strong views on this matter. I witnessed scenes in the University Executive Council of 1951 and 1949 and I can claim to have some knowledge about this University matters. I can say that things are much worse in Banaras than in any other university.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have been a firm believer in autonomy for universities. I have always felt that we should plan our universities in such a way as they plan their universities in European countries. I would like universities to be self-governing; I would like teachers to govern themselves and even students also to govern themselves. There is no attack on academic autonomy under this Bill because there is absolute freedom to teachers to teach what they like and teachers have freedom to conduct their classes in any way they like. But what we have done here is to interfere only with the constitution of the governing bodies of the University. I should like the governing bodies of the University also to be entirely in the hands of teachers one day. But I cannot shut my eyes

to realities. Self-Government, Mr. Deputy Chairman, carries with it certain responsibilities, and it is a matter of very deep regret for me that our teachers have not cared for those responsibilities. We find that teachers in British universities, in American universities, in Canadian universities and in many other western universities, are leaders of thought and they give direction to the national life of their country. There summer schools are organised by political parties. There, Sir, hard thinking is done by teachers and students. But here the whole atmosphere is different. Unfortunately, Sir, many of our teachers—I am not saying all; of course, there are many exceptions—believe in pressure politics. The Vice-Chancellor's position was described in noble passages in the Saddler Commission's Report which is a monumental document. He has been described as the pivot round which the life of the University centres. And the objective of these pressure groups is to make the life of the Vice-Chancellor—whoever be the Vice-Chancellor, howsoever eminent he might be, howsoever fair he might be and howsoever impartial he might be—an absolute hell. I was rather amused, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to find that Mr. Govind Malaviya, who was the Vice-Chancellor in 1951 and who resigned and sought re-election because he was being hampered by a certain pressure group—I am sorry that the Committee has called that group as the Eastern U.P. Group—has now discovered that the real cause of his resignation was not dissatisfaction with the way that those pressure tactics were operating, but his ill-health.

I don't want to reveal the personal conversations that I had with Mr. Govind Malaviya on these matters but we have got his letter to the Visitor and you can read the passages from that letter.

**SHRI B. B. SHARMA:** We wanted the whole correspondence to be placed on the Table of the House. That was not done.

**DR. K. L. SHRIMALI:** I have placed the whole correspondence which was in my possession and nothing was left out.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** The whole correspondence is not necessary. It is on page 45 of the report of the Select Committee:

"Interested parties are trying to create the foulest of atmosphere by trying to undermine the authority of the Vice-Chancellor and his control over the affairs of the University. The students are being incited to restart the old era of protests and opposition, of strikes and demonstrations, of agitation and excitement, which have been conspicuous in the University by their complete absence during the past three years. On account of the non-receipt of the approval so far, everything in the University is hanging in suspense. No work can be done. The group mentioned before is making normal work in the Council of the University impossible. Chaos is being created by them at every meeting. Truth, propriety and correct procedure are being thrown to the winds. They are proceeding everywhere with the one object of wrecking the present Vice-Chancellor's administration."

This is what he wrote to the Visitor on the 9th October 1951 and let us see what Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar had to say. I will give you an instance of the ethical standards of some of the teachers of the Banaras Hindu University. It is narrated in the report. The students' union had been inaugurated and the usual thing was to give a holiday on the occasion of the inauguration. Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar was advised by some teachers that holiday should not be given. He did not give the holiday and these very teachers—this is the finding of the report and they must have had some evidence before coming to that conclusion—engineered an agitation against him. They incited

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

the students to rebel against the authorities, to question what they had done. Can you conceive of anything worse than that? Are these the men to whom you are going to entrust the responsibility of educating your citizens of tomorrow? I have been a teacher, Dr. Shrimali has been a distinguished teacher and it could not have been a pleasure to him to bring forward a Bill of this character. It must have been a most painful duty for him to bring forward a Bill of this character but he had to do a certain duty by this country, he had to do a certain duty by our new generation, by the men who will lead the India of tomorrow and day after tomorrow. Therefore, I think that one has got only to go through the report to discover for himself how critical the situation in the University was. I am not a very great admirer of the manner in which this report has been written. Speaking with all respect to the learned and eminent men who wrote this report, I think they did not bring to bear upon the work that carefulness of statement which Parliament had a right to expect from the eminent men who occupied these distinguished positions.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. R. B. GOUR) in the Chair.]

I can refer you to a report of a Committee which was presided over by the Chief Justice of our court Mr. Mootham—he was then a Judge—and it is a monumental document, it is an educative document, it is a document which anyone can read with profit. I think this report is a survey, this is an essay on things as they have seen in the light of the evidence tendered before them. We expected something more from this report and I am sorry that the report fails in this respect. But speaking quite frankly, the broad picture that it places before us is a true picture, is a correct picture and what is that broad picture? That picture is that academic standards have gone down. They have pointed out

in the report that no sanctity attaches to examinations.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: That happens in other universities too.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Not to the same extent, not to the same degree. (Interruptions.) Difference of degree can amount to difference of kind. The Allahabad University, when all is said and done, is much superior to the Banaras Hindu University as at present.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Has there been any examination of that University?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am prepared to accept that challenge. Let an enquiry be held into the affairs of the Allahabad University.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. R. B. GOUR): May I request hon. Members not to interrupt because that would cost time?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I may say that in the University Executive Council, that I know in 1950-51—things are perhaps much worse since then—there used to be regular pandemonium and we used to start at eight in the morning and go on talking even without having proper meals till about eight in the evening and what were we talking about? We were just wasting time. Everything that the Vice-Chancellor would say would be opposed by a certain group. There was no examination of any question on merits. People used to come to the Council with prepared minds. When the report of appointment boards came up for decision, no consideration on merits was given to their recommendations. The whole thing had been arranged before and the dominant group or the vocal group would canvass support and very often succeed in securing support for men of inferior qualification. The University had lost its all-India character. Malaviyaji had dreamt a very great dream. His idea

was to have a University on an all-India basis which would provide instructions in Hindu religion but the residential character of the University had disappeared.

5 P.M.

The majority of the students are not living in hostels. They are residing in lodgings over which there is no proper supervision. There is no contact or, very little contact, very little healthy contact—I shall put it that way—between the teacher and the taught.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. R. B. GOUR): You have taken sixteen minutes so far.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: But there have been so many interruptions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. R. B. GOUR): Three minutes for interruptions and two minutes more for you. In all, you can take five minutes.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): We can go on without limit of time, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. R. B. GOUR): No, Mr. Deputy Chairman has allotted fifteen minutes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I would suggest, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that it was in the interests of the University that the Executive Council should be re-constituted. I think it has been re-constituted on sound lines. There were discussions about the word supreme reviewing body and I am glad that this has disappeared and the Court has been reconstituted as an advisory body. I am, on the whole, in favour of the Reviewing Committee but I do not like the changes which have been made by the Select Committee. I would have had a different type of Reviewing Committee. I would have left it to the Executive Council, as was originally contemplated, to frame charges. Then, the matter could have been investigated by what is called the Screening Committee and thereafter, the matter could have come up before

the Executive Council. The person concerned could have been given a chance of clearing his conduct. The alternative suggestion which I have in mind is this. I would leave it to the Executive Council to frame charges on such *prima facie* evidence it has against the teacher, charges of various kinds. Then, I would appoint a Judge of the High Court and an eminent educationist along with a Chairman of one of the Public Service Commissions to act as the reviewing authority. Thereafter the report of the reviewing authority, could come before the Executive Council which, after giving a fair hearing to the party concerned, would pass orders. From that order, an appeal might be provided to two Judges of a High Court nominated by the President. I think, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is still possible for us to revise the procedure of the Reviewing Committee on those lines. What I fear is that this Reviewing Committee will not work. The Solicitor-General is a very very busy man and it will take months before he is able to come to a definite conclusion as to whether there is a *prima facie* case against a person or not and, for just finding out whether there is a *prima facie* case or not, you do not want the opinion of the second highest law officer of the Republic. This is a work which can be done by the Executive Council assisted by competent local counsel.

Then, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think the selection committee should be constituted in a somewhat different manner. I would like a panel of names fit for selection as members of the Selection Committee to be maintained by the Visitor and it should be left to the Visitor to nominate two or three on the expert committee. There should be no manipulation so far as these committees are concerned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. R. B. GOUR): Your time is up, Mr. Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: One last word.

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

What we want to do and what we need to do today is to hearten the Vice-Chancellor. Many hard things have been said about the Vice-Chancellor. I have not the pleasure of knowing him myself but I have heard good reports from men who know him and, in any case . . .

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Hearsay evidence is a very poor source to depend upon.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: My distinguished friend may grudge his eminence but I do not. Always we must give all support to the Vice-Chancellor. There must and there cannot be any question of his resignation. There can be no question of a new Vice-Chancellor at all till conditions settle down and we have a new set up. I do not want even that. I want the present Vice-Chancellor to be continued because it is essential and it is in the interests of discipline that we must not allow ourselves to be dictated to by our young friends as to who their Vice-Chancellor shall be. We must not allow ourselves to be dictated to by aspirants in the teaching profession as to who their Vice-Chancellor shall be. I saw some disgraceful things and scenes three years back in regard to the manner in which the Vice-Chancellors are treated. I think authority has to be asserted. I am not one of those who is unfriendly to the younger generation. Believe me, I have an immense faith in them. I have an immense liking for them. I want them to be self-governing but self-governance requires self-restraints and I think we shall not be doing the right thing if we attacked the Vice-Chancellor in this House. I think that we should not do or say anything which would undermine the authority of the Vice-Chancellor.

May I also say, before I close Mr. Vice-Chairman, that it would be a good thing for us to visit that University? Some of us should visit that University, not now but after order

has been restored, after the students have called off their agitational activities, after the staff is in a reasonable state of mind. Political parties should not exploit the occasion for their own ends.

Finally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would say with regret that a reference was made in the report to Eastern U.P. It happens that the University is situated in Eastern U.P. It is not their fault that students from Eastern U.P. flock to the Banaras Hindu University. I can say one thing about my State and that is, we are free from all regionalism and provincialism.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. R. B. GOUR): Let us for a moment depart from the debate.

Yes, Mr. Amolakh Chand.

#### REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE PARLIAMENT (PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION) BILL, 1957

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to declare that certain offices of profit under the Government shall not disqualify the holders thereof for being chosen as, or for being, members of Parliament.

#### THE BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958— continued.

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am in general agreement with the objects of this Bill. I was glad to hear from the hon. Minister that some fuller Bill is in preparation. I was impressed by the earnestness of his remarks and I am quite confident that soon there will