

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Mr. Amolakh Chand.

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

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Mr. Chairman, it is with a genuine and real feeling of grief and sorrow and pain that I rise to support the Bill which is for consideration before this House.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I do not only belong to the city of Banaras, but I have got all that I have today by being in that institution. For six years, from the year 1923 to 1929, when the revered Mahamana Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was the Vice-Chancellor, I recollect the love and affection which the University teachers and the Vice-Chancellors used to bestow upon the University students. That was the practice then. Every student had some contact with every professor and the Head of the Department and the Principal. Now, Sir, it was so even in the case of those day scholars who were not residing within the campus of the University. I am also one of those who, having left the University, have never participated in this University's politics or anything of the sort, and I have no desire even today to do any such thing. My approach to this Bill, therefore, is—I would respectfully submit before the House—a disinterested unprejudiced approach, and it is from the point of view of a layman living in the city of Banaras that I have been reading the Report which has been submitted by the Mudaliar Committee. As I have already indicated, I am supporting the action that has been taken by the Government. I would probably have avoided and would not have been tempted to go through the Mudaliar Committee Report, but what I found yesterday was that even learned

Vice-Chancellors like Dr. Kane have got an impression that whatever is written in the Mudaliar Committee report is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, except that there may be some exaggerations here or there. It is with pain that I refer to this Committee. This Committee was appointed in July 1957 with five eminent persons of India. We know what a five-person committee means. The whole system of ancient panchayats had been drawn from wise persons, independent persons who looked into things. In fact, they were no less than the *Panch Parameshwar*. I do not know whether in the city of Banaras, they went to gain *darshan* of Viswanathji, when they had no idea to enter even the campus of the University. What they did and what we know about it is that they sat at Nadesar House. Some members were present on some days; some were absent on some days and the Vice-Chancellor was the person who was representing the University before that Committee. Now, Sir, I have tried to understand with all compassion and sympathy as to how these five persons could come to such a conclusion. If you see with the experience which we have of the committees that are appointed, we always find that there is some secretariat provided for the committee. Here, if you see page 1 of the Report, what do you find? You find: "The following be appointed to enquire into and report on the said matters relating to the University." You find only five names. If you see any report which has been published, or which has been submitted to the Government, you will find in the end an acknowledgement of the services of the secretariat, the secretary and other persons who have co-operated with the committee. I wanted to find something like that in this Report but I could not lay my hands on it.

SHRI T. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): The Vice-Chancellor was there.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I know the Vice-Chancellor was there. I

would like the House to look into the document of this Committee. He was acting as the Secretary of the Committee. That is why I have begun like this. Let us come to paragraph 3. What do we find there? The Committee had given some date. As the time is very short, I would not like to go into details, but I would like to convince the House that all that has been done has tarnished the name of the great University, has put us all to shame, and that is not because the Government is going to take this action. We are proud, at least I am one of those who feel that this was a proper occasion when an Ordinance should have been issued, and probably to maintain the discipline in the University among the students and the teachers it is necessary that more serious steps may be taken. I am proud of that action. But, Sir, I hang my head in shame, being an ex-student of that University, that such a document was published. What I was pointing out was there was not sufficient time. The memoranda could not be sent and all that. And what do we find in the end? As the time was inadequate the time was extended. In addition to the several letters sent, the Vice-Chancellor was also requested to notify that the Committee would be glad to receive any memoranda and would consider any requests for interview. That is why I was submitting, Sir, all these inaccuracies, errors of fact, non-shifting of evidence, and so on would not have happened if there had been an efficient secretariat attached to this Committee.

Now, Sir, what do we find? We find in para. 5 "that the Committee arranged to hear evidence in three places: Banaras, Madras and Delhi . . . in addition to representatives of unions, etc. etc., some prominent citizens of Banaras and such other persons as wished to give their views gave evidence." I have gone through the list of witnesses who appeared before the Committee. I have been born and brought up in the City of Banaras. I know who are the persons prominent there, and any person

coming from the U.P. does know who are the prominent citizens of Banaras. But what do we find? Not even the respectable citizens who were not attached to the University were called. Whether they are Members of the State Legislature or Members of Parliament, was any one of them contacted by this Committee to enquire and to find out what the actual difficulties were in the administration of the University? Sir, I would go a step further. I do know that the hon. Minister of Education does know the Education Minister of the U.P. Does he know or does he not know—the Enquiry Committee might not have known—that he happens to be a citizen of Banaras? I mean Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi, the present Education Minister of the U.P. We find in this Report that the State Government also contributes something towards the University, and the contribution of the State Government in the year 1957-58 was non-recurring Rs. 1,72,498 and recurring Rs. 2,98,250. This figure may not be impressive, but my learned friends, the Vice-Chancellors and ex-Vice-Chancellors, in the House, will agree that it was the duty of the State Government to provide more colleges, and that they would not have allowed a change in the character of the University which was a residential University. Do those hon. Members who have argued thus know how many degree colleges there are in the City of Banaras? Is it not provided in the Banaras Hindu University Act that the campus of the University will be extended to a radius of fifteen miles? Where are these colleges to be affiliated? Only recently we heard about the Gorakhpur University. It has been suggested in the Report that now colleges may be affiliated to the Gorakhpur University. I know that the Queens College of Banaras was affiliated to the Allahabad University till the Montford Reforms came, and thereafter it became only an intermediate college. Now that has been again turned into a Sanskrit University with Vice-Chancellors and all that.

[Shri Amolakh Chand.]

Sir, what I was submitting was that a proper enquiry was not made. A fair and impartial enquiry was not made. The whole Report gives an impression that an only one-sided case was put. Sir, as Dr. Kane was telling, that he had received a pamphlet from Professor Mukut Behari Lal, witness No. 8, there have been lot of other pamphlets. I have got one or two. I did not care to get more or to know more about these things, because after reading one or two pamphlets and knowing things as they are, it does appear that the whole Report is not very fair. (Interruption) I do not want to use adjectives indiscriminately because I know that what we say here is going to have repercussions on the education that is going on in the Banaras Hindu University. Therefore, Sir, I want to speak with great restraint. When I submit that the Report is not fair, I had no mind to speak on the Report for the very simple reason that persons knew that there was sufficient discussion, but when I found that even learned persons are misled, I thought it was proper that I should present these things before the House.

Now, Sir, I come to paragraph 8, and that is about the present Vice-Chancellor. I had no intention to say anything about the Vice-Chancellors; they are big persons; but the way in which the name of Dr. Jha was included to be recommended to the Visitor is rather surprising. I refer to the speech of Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar where he says on the 8th April 1956:

“Very soon after I sent my letter to the Visitor I had contact with the President of India who is the Visitor of this University, and with the Ministry of Education, and I feel that I could take this House into confidence when I mention that the persons contacted in the Ministry of Education suggested the name of Dr. V. S. Jha as the person who may be selected as the Vice-Chancellor. It so happens that I have never met the gentleman

before and I have never known him. So I have absolutely no knowledge of what is the background for the nomination of Dr. V. S. Jha. But I may mention that persons in the Ministry of Education seem to be very highly impressed of him and consider that he is very highly suitable.” He may be very suitable, Sir, but how many votes did he get? Anyway, I am not at all concerned with it. I know and I have heard something about Dr. Jha. He is a very respectable man and a very social man. He happens to be one of the sons of the Principal of the Banaras Hindu University Training College. I have had the privilege of knowing his father very well—the late Rai Bahadur Lajja Shankar Jha.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): He is living.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I am very sorry. Somebody told me like this, I have very great respect for him for the very simple reason that I had the occasion to see him very closely.

Anyway, that is not the point. The point is whether there was interference and manipulation. When they are mentioned in this Report, I would like that a proper perspective should have been taken.

I would like to bring another important point before the House which deals with the students. I know there are people here who have worked in committees and committees and I would like to know if any of those honourable persons would be able to endorse the whole Report and sign such a Report. I pointed out what the difficulty was. Had there been any secretariat, then, there would have been a draft of the Report; it would have been circulated to the members, they would have rewritten the whole thing. What do we find here in paragraph 30? They say that the Divisional Commissioner has said about 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."

I do not know what they mean by this. Do they mean that the students of the Banaras Hindu University were running these brothels? Or what were they doing? I know something about that and I do not want that such dirty things should come before the House.

I was surprised yesterday when two very respectable persons, who were very brilliant students of the Banaras Hindu University and who were not at all examined, have been condemned. I refer to Justice Balaram Upadhyaya and to the Advocate-General of Uttar Pradesh, Shri Kanhaiyalal Mishra. I know them for years and years from the University itself. They are the most brilliant people which Eastern U.P. has produced. But now, what has been said about them? I thought Mr. Sapru who knows them both very intimately at Allahabad (Interruption.) They are your intimate friends, I know. Then, was it not a courtesy to know about a person and then write something about him—a man who holds the position of the Judge or a man who holds the position of the Advocate-General of a State and both of whom are ex-students of the Banaras Hindu University? I leave it to the judgment of . . .

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I am winding up.

As you are asking me to wind up, I would not go into the details of the case. But if you permit me, I would say that I can prove to the hilt that more than 50 per cent. of the information on which this Report has been based is not correct. But as regards the general feature, the general

scheme, for the administration of the Banaras Hindu University, I wish that there should be a trial given to this. This is a temporary Act. I am sure the hon. Minister would like to bring in, as soon as possible, a comprehensive measure and get it referred to a Select Committee. I might remind the hon. Minister that this House was pleased to name the late Maulana Abul Kalam Azad as a member in regard to the Children's Bill on which the hon. Minister was also a member. There is no bar that a Member of another House—a Minister—may not join that Committee. He may not vote. I refer to Article 88.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Amolakh Chand.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: One or two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken seven minutes. If every Member takes time like this, I am afraid many Members will not be able to speak.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I want only one minute more.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): What he is saying is informative. Let him say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is limited, Mr. Sharma. If all the U.P. Members must have a chance, then there must be a restriction on time.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Please give me one minute. I will say about the students and the teachers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken seven minutes. Please wind up.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: As a Member of this House, I am proud that four of our Members are on the Executive Committee of the University. Yesterday, a point was made—and I think that it is acceptable to all—that all political parties made it

[Shri Amolakh Chand.]

clear that they had nothing to do with the things that were going on in the Banaras Hindu University. Let us make an appeal to those boys and girls to come and join those colleges where their parents have sent them and ask them in the name of this House to work and get their minds healthily geared. At the same time, let us appeal that the Government of India will sympathetically look into their grievances and see that a Principal is appointed to the Ayurvedic College and that the whole strike is finished. To all those who are not functioning—either the Principal or the Vice-Chancellor or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar—let us make a request and appeal to the good sense of all the boys and the parties, let the University function in a proper way so that it may be able to produce better boys and girls for the future of India and let the dream of the late Malaviya mature. Thank you.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should like to begin by paying a tribute to the high sense of duty of the teachers of the Banaras Hindu University who have carried on their work in somewhat difficult circumstances. It is their sense of discipline and duty that has been an example to those students in these difficult days. The morale of the teachers is high and they have consistently conducted themselves in such a way as to raise the dignity of the University. I must also, Sir, express my appreciation of the attitude of the vast majority of the students of this University. They have shown a sense of discipline and a regard for their University which deserve a word of recognition from the House. They are regularly attending to their studies and the classes are going on in spite of the efforts made to create excitement amongst them.

Sir, I shall give some example of the way in which both the teachers and the students have conducted

themselves in trying circumstances. Some time ago, a hunger-strike was undertaken by a student of the Law College. How did the students of the Banaras Hindu University react? I have copies of the resolution passed by the students of the Mining and Metallurgical College, by the students of the College of Agriculture resident in the Radhakrishnan Hostel and by the students of the Department of Pharmaceutics. The resolution passed by the students of the College of Agriculture who are living in the Radhakrishnan Hostel says:

"This meeting of the students of the College of Agriculture resident in the Radhakrishnan Hostel has learnt with deep concern that some students of this University have organised a hunger-strike by Shri Shiv Nath Tiwari of the Law College to protest against the Banaras Hindu University Ordinance passed by the President of India and the Mudaliar Committee Report. Without expressing any opinion on the Report and the Ordinance, we feel very strongly that this move by a small minority of students is calculated to disturb the peace and the academic atmosphere of the University and inflict needless suffering on the large majority of students who are sure to pursue their studies unhampered by such disturbances. The inmates of this hostel condemn unreservedly this move of hunger strike."

1 P.M.

The resolutions passed by the students of the other institutions mentioned by me are on the same lines. I, therefore, need not read them out. I should only like to read out a sentence from the resolution passed by the students of the Department of Pharmaceutics. They say:

"Without going into the merits or the demerits of the Mudaliar Committee's Report, we feel that such an act . . ."

—that is, an act of the kind mentioned in the previous resolution—

“ . . . on the part of the students is not only unjustified but also very much unlike educated citizens of a democratic nation and we are afraid this might bring a bad name to the student community in general and the University in particular”.

I am sure, Sir, that everyone will appreciate the courage with which the students acted in the face of a threatened hunger strike. They refused to get excited and continued actually to pursue their studies. Sir, there is a hunger strike still going on. This has been undertaken by another student but a large body of students, whatever their views about the Mudaliar Committee, realising that the entire future of the University is at stake, have refused to allow themselves to be misled by those who wanted to bring the good name of the University into disrepute. Sir, they have shown a regard for the dignity and rehabilitation of Malaviyaji's University which is above praise.

Sir, I should like to refer to another point also before I deal with points relating to yesterday. The teachers and the students are pained by certain remarks made by the Mudaliar Committee. A great deal has been said about the phrase “the Eastern Group” by several speakers. I shall not, therefore, consider myself justified in referring to it. I shall only say that I regret as much as other hon. Members that a phrase lending itself to so much misconstruction should have been used by the Committee when it had no desire to condemn either all the teachers or all the students. In fact, it recognises the praiseworthy attitude of the majority of the teachers and the students. As regards the remark about the students going to brothels, well, this again, is somewhat un-

guarded and everyone acquainted with the students of the Hindu University will say that in general they are as upright and honourable as the students of any other University. Though I have said this, I feel sure that it was not the intention of the members of the Committee to tar all students with the same brush. They have brought certain facts that came to their notice to light but that did not imply a condemnation of the entire body of students of the Hindu University.

I should also like to refer to the inadequate appreciation of Acharya Narendra Deva's work as Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University. I was a member of the Executive Council while he was the Vice-Chancellor and I know the difficulties that he had to contend against in the discharge of his duties. It is a matter of ordinary knowledge in Banaras that he considerably improved the discipline in the University and gave it a tone which it had not possessed for some years.

Sir, I have already said a word in praise of the students of the Hindu University generally but I fear that I cannot include the students of the Ayurvedic College among those to whom I have paid a tribute. These students have certain grievances which were referred to yesterday by some speakers. They have a body which calls itself, “The Banaras Hindu University Students' Action Committee”. This body has put forward six demands, two of which relate to the Ayurvedic College and the degrees of the Ayurvedic College. They are:

- (1) appointment of a permanent Principal for the College of Ayurveda having expert knowledge of modern medicine and Ayurveda, and
- (2) recognition of the degree of the College of Ayurveda.

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

As regards the first point, the Selection Committee recommended a particular person for appointment. The Executive Council of the University approved of the selection and the Vice-Chancellor has made every effort to secure the services of this person for the University but some thing or the other has happened and he has not been able to take up the appointment that the University wants to offer to him. I understand that he is not willing to take up the Principalship of the Ayurvedic College. More light ought to be shed on this point than has been shed so far and I hope that the Minister in-charge of the Bill will make it a point to place all the facts on this point before us so that both the public and the students of the College may know what the exact position is. However, the grievances of the students in this matter, I think, deserve sympathetic consideration. They ought to have a Principal who will be sympathetic to them and, at the same time, be an efficient surgeon.

As regards the recognition of the degree of the College of Ayurveda, I do not know what exactly is meant. If it is desired that this degree should be recognised as equal to the M.B.B.S. degree, I wonder whether the Indian Medical Council will agree to it. But in any case, I should like to know what consideration this demand has received from the authorities. Has it been considered? If so, at what stage does the matter rest?

DR. R. B. GOUR. May I inform the hon. Member that just this morning, I have received a letter from the Health Ministry that this question cannot be considered because the Indian Medical Council does not want to discuss this type of a question.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: What?

DR. R. B. GOUR: The Consultative Committee of the Health Ministry in response to my query has, in a memorandum, stated that the Indian Medi-

cal Council has never thought of recognising such a degree.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, I have already referred to the body which calls itself "The Students' Action Committee" and I have read out two of their demands. They made four more demands and they are:

- (1) Restoration of the University's autonomy.
- (2) Withdrawal of the Mudaliar Committee's Report and the Ordinance.
- (3) The institution of an open judicial enquiry into the charge of moral turpitude; and
- (4) Removal of the present Vice-Chancellor in case he fails to contradict and condemn the portions of the Mudaliar Committee's Report which are based on wrong facts and wherein the students and the teachers in general, have been scandalised.

Sir, we can see that when this Bill is passed, it cannot be expected that the Mudaliar Committee's Report will be withdrawn, or that anything will be done to give satisfaction to the students on this point. I am full of praise for the attitude of that large body of students of the University who, whatever their feelings with regard to the Mudaliar Committee's Report might have been, decided themselves and counselled their fellow-students to observe self-restraint and to remember that if they did not attend to their studies and keep up the reputation of their University, their interests would be permanently injured.

Sir, I have read out these demands to the House now so that the House might know what their character is and who are the students that we have to deal with in connection with what is going on in the Hindu University. Though I have recognised that the students of the Ayurvedic College have a genuine grievance, I cannot admit that they have, therefore, a right to adopt any method, to draw public

attention—the attention of the public and of the Government—to their demands. I think their attitude to which reference was made yesterday cannot be approved of by anybody here. Indeed, it must be condemned, both in their own interests and in those of the University.

My hon. friend, Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour, referred to the demands of the students of the Ayurvedic College yesterday, but never said a word to show his disapproval of the manner in which they were acting. Consider the attitude of the students on the one side, the self-control that they have exercised and the courage that they have shown in condemning those who want to bring about hunger-strikes and to create excitement in the University, and the attitude of some Members of this House, particularly my hon. friend Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour, who went to Banaras recently in regard to this matter. Sir, my hon. friend, Prof. Wadia, yesterday referred to the . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: You are worried about the consequences, while I am worried about the causes.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend, I am afraid, when speaking yesterday, did not bear in mind that we were discussing the affairs of one of the premier educational institutions of India. He could not resist the temptation of dealing with this matter as if it were a political affair.

My hon. friend, Prof. Wadia, referred yesterday to the picketing of the house of the Pro-Vice Chancellor and that of the Registrar by the students. He also referred to their demand that the Vice-Chancellor should not return to the University. Can anybody with the interests of students at heart, who cares at all for education or for discipline or for the progress of the Banaras Hindu University ever overlook this attitude, the students of the Ayurvedic College wanting to cut off the telephone lines of the Registrar, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and then the Proctor and surrounding the Registrar's

office? Whatever the Mudaliar Committee may have written, is this to be overlooked? Is this not to be explicitly condemned? Is there any justification for this attitude? I cannot see, Sir, any reason for the continuance of this state of things.

Sir, a great deal has been said about the Mudaliar Committee's Report and the agitation that has been carried on against it. I should like to read out the last paragraph in this Report which is given the heading—Epilogue. It runs as follows:

"It is not surprising even before steps were taken to draw up the report, there should have been representations, made to the President and an 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."

These are the things, Sir, to which many of the Members here referred.

"We are not surprised at the insinuation that the Committee has been guided by the Vice-Chancellor and others connected with the University that persons were prevented from expressing their views. Nor is it a matter of surprise that a certain number of persons should have been asked to send to us or to the Visitor complaints about the Vice-Chancellor and others and about the whole procedure of this Committee. From our inside knowledge of the working of this University, we feel that these manoeuvres and these doubtful methods of prejudicing the report even before it has been published have been involved because of the fear entertained by those who are largely responsible for the present state of affairs that their part in the deterioration of the University would be taken serious notice of."

Sir, I have read this out in order that it may not be necessary for me to deal with the allegations that have

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

been made by several hon. Members with regard to the matters mentioned in this extract. Anyone who reads this extract will know the character of the criticism that has been levelled against the Mudaliar Committee's Report.

Sir, Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour suggested yesterday that in order to restore normalcy in the Banaras Hindu University, the Vice-Chancellor should resign. Sir, while Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour condemns the Vice-Chancellor, there are others who have borne testimony to his worth, men like Pandit Iqbal Narayan Gurtu, Shri Achhut Patwardhan, Shri Rajaram Shastri, Shri Rohit Mehta and others. What have they said? After referring to what the Prime Minister had said in the Lok Sabha regarding courage and integrity, they say:

"He has courageously borne the attack of the demonstrators and has, in spite of severe provocations, kept his balance of mind. We would like to express our sense of appreciation of the way in which the Vice-Chancellor and other officers of the University have faced the situation. They have prevented the situation from taking an ugly turn by bearing all attacks with a grand sense of courage."

Sir, this paragraph the P.T.I. did not think fit to wire when it wired the substance of the other paragraphs of the statement. Now here is the testimony of people who have no reason to be prejudiced in favour of or against the Vice-Chancellor.

Again, Sir, let us consider what the Vice-Chancellor's resignation would involve. It is thought by some people here that it would be a simple matter, one officer would make way for another, but I am sure that their experience of life enables them to realise that the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor would have far-reaching consequences. What would his resignation mean, Sir? It would mean that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and the Treasurer

against whom also an agitation is going on, will have to resign, and it may be, Sir, that later on the Registrar may be compelled to resign. Now, Sir, if this happens, if none of the responsible officers of the University is left, what will the Reviewing Committee do? If you want that the provision relating to the Reviewing Committee should be deleted from the Bill, say so clearly. But you cannot achieve your purpose in this indirect manner.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Will the the Reviewing Committee review the cases of the opposition group people also?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend should read the clause relating to the Reviewing Committee as amended by the Select Committee. Shri Raj Bahadur yesterday also said that while he knew that there was a pressure group in the University he must also point out that there was another pressure group formed by the Vice-Chancellor. Suppose my hon. friend is the Principal of a college and some teachers band themselves together in such a way as to lower the discipline and prestige of the college, will it be his duty or not in these circumstances to speak to the other teachers, to point out to them what their duty requires under these circumstances? And to save the reputation of his college it will clearly be his duty to act in this manner. Can the Vice-Chancellor be regarded as the head of another party because he has persuaded a large body of teachers to act in a way consistent with the best interests of the University and can the demand justifiably be made for his removal on the ground that he is also the leader of a party? Sir, the Vice-Chancellor would have failed in his duty if he had not met the teachers and the students, tried to raise their morale and to impress on them their duty at this juncture. I have nothing but praise for him for having carried out this difficult duty, and the success that has attended his efforts is his best reward.

Sir, there is only one other point that I should like to refer before I sit down, and that is the provision relating to the Reviewing Committee in the Bill before us. Sir, I greatly regret that the amendment made by the Select Committee has been accepted by Government. There are two reasons why I do not approve of this amendment. It is possible, under the Bill as amended, as pointed out by the Education Minister, that the very people on account of whose conduct an Enquiry Committee had been appointed, may bring complaints against the Vice-Chancellor, and when they are received by the Executive Council it will have no right to comment on them. Its only duty will be to forward them to the Solicitor-General. Now, Sir, is this amendment likely to conduce to the maintenance of discipline? Is it likely to encourage that large body of teachers and students who have stood by the University and who have had the courage to face the possibility of undergoing odium by condemning hunger-strikes? What was the Government thinking of when it accepted this provision? Now, Sir, consider the introduction of the Solicitor-General in the provision relating to the Reviewing Committee. What has the Solicitor-General to do, Sir? References to him will only mean more delay when it ought to be our duty to expedite the settlement of all matters which have to be placed before the Reviewing Committee, as much as possible.

Sir, I have heard a great deal about the autonomy of the university. We have all, Sir, in our own way, I mean those of us who belong to any university, have tried to resist Government interference in its affairs. I am connected with more than one university and I remember no occasion when I did not do all I could to prevent any encroachment on the rights of the Executive Council of the University in administrative matters. But the autonomy of the University must be used wisely. If it is not

wisely used, if there are complaints against it, an enquiry will have to be made into its affairs. Well, an enquiry was made, Sir, into the affairs of a university with which I have been connected for forty years, the Allahabad University; I mean the character of the report of an Enquiry Committee will depend entirely on the manner in which the autonomy has been used. If it has been flagrantly abused, if it has been taken advantage of to mislead the students and to create conditions in the university to compel one Vice-Chancellor after another to lay down his duties in disgust, then it is not autonomy but autocracy of those who by gathering a few people round them are able to create conditions in which neither administration nor academic work can be properly carried on. And in these circumstances it was the duty of the Government to take adequate measures to curb the power of some people to do mischief. I am glad, Sir, therefore that this Bill has been brought forward and I give it, notwithstanding the change made in the clause relating to the Reviewing Committee, my full support but I hope that the Bill which will comprehensively amend the Banaras Hindu University Act will soon come before us so that this temporary state of things may come to an end as quickly as possible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. B. B. SHARMA. Fifteen minutes.

श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा : उपसभापति महोदय, आपकी कृपा है। मुझे सिर्फ दो तीन बातें कहनी हैं। मैं बहुत थोड़े में ही कहूंगा। मैं आपका समय व्यर्थ में नष्ट नहीं करूंगा।

पहली बात यह है कि यदि इस विश्वविद्यालय के इतिहास को देखते हैं तो उसके दो भाग होते हैं। एक तो १९१६ से—जबकि यह विश्वविद्यालय कायम हुआ और इसकी नींव पड़ी—१९५१ तक का इतिहास है और १९५१ में पुराना इतिहास खत्म किया गया। जो विधान उस वक्त बना था उस विधान

[श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा]

में साफ तौर से लिखा हुआ है कि क्या क्या अथारिटीज होंगी, उनके कौन कौन से आफिसर्स होंगे और उनके क्या अधिकार होंगे। वह समय अशान्ति का और देश की स्वतन्त्रता के लिये युद्ध का समय था। महामना मालवीय जी जब तक जीवित थे तब तक विश्वविद्यालय में छात्रों, वहाँ के अध्यापकों और वहाँ के अधिकारियों में किसी प्रकार का वैमनस्य नहीं हो पाता था। उनका व्यक्तित्व इतना ऊँचा था कि वह सब पर किसी न किसी प्रकार से हावी हो जाते थे और परिणाम यह होता था कि यदि कहीं इधर उधर कुछ झगड़े भी होते थे, तो वे शान्तिमय रूप से तय हो जाते थे। इसमें कोई शूबहा नहीं है कि उस वक्त भी डिफरेंसेज होते थे और मुझे बड़े दुःख के साथ, अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उस वक्त भी एक ग्रुप ईस्टर्न यू० पी० के खिलाफ था। एक ग्रुप ऐसा था जिसने डा० गणेश प्रसाद को हाउण्ड आउट करके निकाल दिया। वह ग्रुप उत्तर प्रदेश का नहीं था। वह ग्रुप अन्य प्रदेशों का था। डा० गणेश प्रसाद एक ऐसा आदमी था जो कि हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय में पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में एक ख्यातिनामा एकेडेमिशियन हो चुका है। लेकिन मालवीय जी के व्यक्तित्व की वजह से वह ग्रुप कोई ऐसी गड़बड़ी न पैदा कर सका जिससे कि आपस में प्रादेशिक झगड़े उत्पन्न हो सकें।

उसके बाद हमारे वर्तमान उपराष्ट्रपति डा० राधाकृष्णन् १९३९ से लेकर १९४८ तक उसके वाइस चांसलर रहे। उनके जमाने में भी कोई गड़बड़ी नहीं हुई। उनका जमाना ९ वर्ष तक का था, तीन मर्तबा उनका चुनाव हुआ, क्योंकि तीन तीन साल के लिये चुनाव होता है। तो उनके समय में भी—यदि कुछ आन्तरिक झगड़े रहे हों तो वे रहे हों—शान्ति से, बड़ी शान से और बड़े उत्साह के साथ वहाँ कार्य होता रहा। कोई ग्रुप उस वक्त तक नहीं हुआ, किसी प्रकार का आपस में ग्रुप का झगड़ा नहीं हुआ, लेकिन उनके वहाँ से चले

जाने के बाद से एक बात में थोड़ा अन्तर पड़ा और वह अन्तर इस बात का पड़ा कि क्यों न श्री गोविन्द मालवीय साहब वाइस चांसलर हो जायें।

श्री उपसभापति : यह सब इतिहास सभा के सामने आ गया है।

श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा : मैं बिल्कुल थोड़े में कह रहा हूँ। मैं अपनी बात को सूक्ष्म में कहूँगा। तो डा० राधाकृष्णन् के बाद भी कोई झगड़ा नहीं हुआ, श्री गोविन्द मालवीय के जमाने में भी विश्वविद्यालय के अन्दर कोई झगड़ा नहीं हुआ, किसी प्रकार की इनडिसिप्लिन नहीं हुई। हाँ, उस जमाने में देश स्वतन्त्रता की लड़ाई लड़ रहा था और इस विश्वविद्यालय के छात्रगण ने तथा प्रोफेसर्स ने स्वतन्त्रता के युद्ध में बहुत ज्यादा कष्ट उठा कर भाग लिया। आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव के जमाने में भी किसी प्रकार की अशान्ति हुई, ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता है। लेकिन एक-ब-एक सन् १९५६ के बाद यहाँ इनडिसिप्लिन हो जाती है और इनडिसिप्लिन इस हद तक होती है कि सारे विद्यार्थी शान्तिमय रूप से काम करते हैं—जिसका सार्टीफिकेट पंडित हृदय नाथ कुंजरू देते हैं—पर कुछ लोग वहाँ उपद्रवी हो जाते हैं जैसा कि हर जगह होता है। श्रीमन्, मैं किसी भी प्रकार से उपद्रवकारियों के साथ कोई सहानुभूति नहीं रखता, चाहे वे कहीं के हों, किसी वर्ग के हों, किसी पार्टी के हों। मुझे किसी प्रकार की सहानुभूति इनडिसिप्लिन या अशिष्टता से नहीं है, किन्तु मुझे शिकायत इस बात की है कि यह अध्यादेश जो निकाला गया है तथा जो वर्तमान सारी कार्यवाही की गई है वह महज इस भाव से की गई है कि जिन लोगों ने एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल की मीटिंग में वर्तमान वाइस-चांसलर को वोट नहीं दिया, वे विकटीमाइज किये जायें।। मालूम होता है कि कुछ ऐसी कोशिश है। जिस वक्त

सर सी० पी० रामस्वामी अय्यर चले गये उस वक्त एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल ने जिन नामों का प्रस्ताव किया उनमें हमारे वर्तमान वाइस-चांसलर महोदय को सब से कम वोट मिले थे । उनको सिर्फ ५ वोट मिले थे । एक साहब को ११ वोट, एक साहब को १० वोट, एक साहब को, जो कि पंजाब के रहने वाले थे उनको ७ वोट और वर्तमान वाइस-चांसलर साहब को सिर्फ ५ वोट मिले थे । कायदा यह था—कांस्टीट्यूशन आपका यह बतलाता है—कि एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल ३ या ४ नामों को देती थी और उनमें से किसी एक शख्स को विज़िटर नामजद करता था, उन ३ या ४ नामों में से जिसको चाहे विज़िटर नामजद कर देता था, लेकिन यह जरूर होता था कि वह उन्हीं को नामजद करता था जिनको कि बहुमत प्राप्त होता था, लेकिन यहां उल्टा हुआ; क्योंकि "Old order changeth yielding place to new"

पुराने साहबान यहां नहीं रह गये थे । खास लोग मंत्रित्व में आये । सरकार को विज़िटर को राय देनी होती है; क्योंकि राष्ट्र-पति—(विज़िटर)—कोई काम स्वयं अपने विचार से तो नहीं कर सकते । गवर्नमेंट के इशारों पर उनका हर काम होता है, जैसा कि होना चाहिये । मिनिस्ट्री ने चुना और सजेस्ट दिया । जिनके बारे में मेरे लायक दोस्त अमोलख चन्द जी ने एक पत्र पढ़ा था, वे सर सी० पी० रामस्वामी अय्यर लिखते हैं कि मैं तो नहीं जानता लेकिन एजुवेशन मिनिस्ट्री के लोग और खासकर सैयदीन साहब और हुमायुन् कबिर साहब झा साहब को बहुत अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, वे चाहते हैं कि उन्हीं का नाम रिक्मेंड किया जाये । लेकिन उनको वोट फिर भी नहीं मिले और तब भी वे महाशय आखिरशः वाइस चांसलर कर दिये गये । परिणाम उसका यह है कि जिन लोगों ने उनको वोट नहीं दिया वे विकटमाइज्ड किये जायें । उनके खिलाफ रिव्यू कमेटी आने के पहले ही इन्क्वायरियां शुरू हो गई हैं और मैं बतला सकता हूं

कि किन किन के खिलाफ इन्क्वायरियां शुरू हो गई ह ।

डा० श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द (मध्य प्रदेश) : कौन कर रहे हैं इन्क्वायरी ?

श्री बज बिहारी शर्मा : पता नहीं कौन है ।

These are:

1. Dr. Gopal Tripathi, Principal, College of Technology, President of Teachers Association;
2. Dr. Daya Swarup, Principal, College of Mining and Metallurgy;
3. Dr. Ram Dev Misra, Head of the Department of Botany;
4. Dr. Virendra Kumar, Lecturer, Ayurveda College;
5. Dr. V. S. Dubey, Honorary University Professor of Geology;
6. Professor Radhey Shyam Sharma, College of Technology;
7. Shri Gauri Shankar Tiwari, College of Technology; and
8. Dr. Jagdish Sharma, Librarian, Banaras Hindu University.

SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Did they belong to Eastern U.P.?

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: That is very difficult to say. But every evil-monger resides in Eastern U.P. including that venerable gentleman known as Shri Raj Narain Singh, whose name so prominently figured in the discussion this morning. That is a poor area and men cannot go to public schools. These big guns, whether they reside in Banaras or whether they reside outside, have no sympathy with poor men or poor students whom the Mudaliar Committee so violently attacks. Here I would like to read a little portion of it. It is said:

"Of greater significance is the fact that this University has come to be looked upon by the student com-

[Shri B. B. Sharma:]

munity of Uttar Pradesh in particular and parts of Bihar as a University to which admission should be guaranteed for all students who wish to join the University. The result has been that at the time of admission, a great deal of pressure is exercised on the University authorities to increase the number of admissions, to admit candidates who may not come up to the standards prescribed, and so on and so forth."

कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि हर एक . . .

(Time bell rings.)

अच्छी बात है, अपनी बात जल्दी जल्दी कह देता हूँ, दो मिनट दे दीजिये ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry there are only two hours and fifteen minutes more.

श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा : मैं दो मिनट में पढ़ देता हूँ । मुझे और भी बातें कहनी थीं ।

श्री उपसभापति : दो मिनट में खतम कीजिये ।

श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा : अब मैं और कुछ न कह कर इतना ही कहूंगा कि जब से, इन दो साल के अन्दर ज्ञा साहब वाइस चांसलर हुये हैं, बहुत सी नियुक्तियां हुई हैं, 191. persons have been employed in the University. उनमें ३० यू० पी० के हैं, बाकी लोग बाहर के हैं । इसके अलावा और भी कुछ थोड़ी सी बात मैं कह दूँ, कि इनमें से कुछ साहबान कदाचित् ज्ञा साहब के रिस्तेदार भी हैं और बहुत क्लोजली कनेक्टेड हैं । उनकी भी नियुक्तियां हुई हैं । यह निपोटिज्म थोड़े ही कहलाता है । यह काम अगर कोई उत्तर प्रदेश वाला करे तब तो निपोटिज्म है और अगर वे करें तो कभी भी निपोटिज्म नहीं है । और अगर

उनकी नियुक्ति में उनके गुरु-भाई स्वयं सहायता दें तो वह निपोटिज्म थोड़े ही है—वे बड़े इमीनेंट हैं, बड़ा सार्टिफिकेट उनको कुंजरू साहब दे रहे हैं, बड़े इफीशियेंट हैं, बड़े करेजियस हैं । कहां तो यह कहा जाता है :

Hindu University is depleted and deserted. हमारे लायक दोस्त मल्कानी साहब बड़े जोर से अशेम्ड थे—और कहां इन सारी बातों को छोड़ देते हैं । उनके केस में निपोटिज्म वाली बात नहीं आती है, वह तब आती है जब श्री रमाशंकर त्रिपाठी का नाम आता है जिनके किसी प्रकार के कोई रिलेटिव्ह वहां नहीं हैं । अगर समय मिलता तो दिखाता कि जितने फैक्ट्स इस रिपोर्ट में दिये हैं वे—यहां तो सत्तर पर सेंट कहते हैं—मैं कहता हूँ सर्वथा, अक्षरशः बिल्कुल गलत, मिथ्या, अनर्गल और झूठे हैं ।

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am in agreement with the general provisions of the Bill. (Interruption) Sir, I would like to make one or two particular generalisations, first about the Report itself about which a great deal has been said. But one of the documents that has been distributed to us by Prof. Mukut Behari Lal, I think, deserves consideration. He is a man of eminence and a great scholar, and I think in presenting this pamphlet he has displayed a good deal of discretion and restraint. I would like to quote just a few lines. First he says about the Report that the Committee was hardly justified in casting aspersions on the national character of the University. Sir, I am inclined to agree with him. The time does not permit me to go into any detailed discussion. Later on, he says that:—

"It is true that a certain pressure group has been trying for many years to give such a shape to the University as was detrimental to its interests and could not be approved by the Mudaliar Committee.

But it will not be proper to hold it responsible for all of what it is accused in the report."

There again, Sir, I fully agree with him. There is one more quotation. He says:

"The Mudaliar Committee is hardly justified in alleging that 'in the Banaras Hindu University only particular types of persons from certain geographical areas have any chance to be appointed as teachers.' More than three-fourth of teachers of professors' grade appointed in the University in the last seven years belong neither to the pressure group nor to the Eastern Districts of Uttar Pradesh referred to in the Report as particular geographical areas."

There is enough material, Sir, in this pamphlet to indicate that the report has not been altogether fair and that it was one-sided. But having said this I fully support the Bill because I feel that the conditions in the Banaras Hindu University had been deteriorating, and I think the Ministry perhaps should have taken some steps much earlier. But unfortunately it is the habit of many of our Ministries that only when they are confronted with a crisis, they rush and improvise some solutions. Now the mere fact that so many eminent Vice-Chancellors were compelled more or less to resign one after the other is enough to show that things have not been going on all right there. There is a speech by Dr. Radhakrishnan in which, while referring to the appointment of Dr. Jha as the Vice-Chancellor, he says that he is sure that if the affairs of the University were favourable, he would serve for a longer period; that means more than three years. But he resigned after ten months. Later on Shri Aiyar says that a certain group has been trying to win their already lost battle through vilifications, false propaganda and misrepresentations. And there are many other quotations from different Vice-Chancellors to show that they were rather disturbed

at the conditions that prevailed in the University.

Now, Sir, as for the Bill itself, I have one or two remarks to make. I apprehend that this rather forced intervention may necessitate a longer interference in the affairs of the University. I do feel that when a comprehensive Bill comes, it would be possible to restore the normal autonomy of the University. I personally feel that we should re-examine the whole proposition whether it is desirable for the Central Government to have any direct say in any of the Universities. I am not quite sure whether it is advisable, I think we will have to re-examine the question. I do not say that the Central Government is not competent, but it has so many things to do that I think it would be well-advised to leave the affairs of the universities in the hands of the local people and restore their autonomy. I think that some of the things that are going on in other universities also are not very happy. Some of us have been receiving reports of a very disturbing nature, and I do hope that the Ministry of Education will take some steps to find out what exactly is going on in Aligarh. I do hope that we will not be confronted with another startling report when things really go too far. I do not wish at this time to go into any of the problems that the University is confronted with there, but I do wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Education to some of the things which are alleged to be going on in Aligarh.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Worse things happened but nothing was done there.

DR. ANUP SINGH: Worse things happened, and the University is going on.

Sir, with these few remarks I would like to extend my complete support to the Bill that is before us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]
to speak on this particular Bill with some measure of diffidence, because I do not have that intimate personal knowledge of the affairs of the Banaras University which some of the other hon. Members possess. Yet, Sir, as the controversy came up before us, we took special care to familiarise ourselves with the recent developments, and from our group in Parliament we sent two representatives, one from this House and another from the other House, to Banaras to study on the spot what was happening there. They came and reported to us. We summoned from there our party members, responsible party members and others, to meet us in Delhi and they came, and we got some more facts from them. We had also met other eminent men here in this city as well as elsewhere in order to find out how they viewed this matter. Naturally, Sir, we approached this question objectively and with a view to offering some suggestions for the improvement of the state of affairs in the University of Banaras.

I feel, Sir we will be completely misunderstood if our point of view were taken to be some sort of politicising the issue. There is always a tendency on the part of hon. Members opposite to attribute politics to whatever we say as if they are free from all political touches. Here it is not a question of politics at all. In fact we have little touch with the management of the University. We are nowhere near the picture that way. Maybe, some belonging to our party are supporters of the students and some supporters of the teachers. I do not know that. Therefore, Sir, I would ask the hon. Minister not to understand what I say from a distorted political angle just because a Communist spokesman is speaking on the subject.

Sir, the very first thing that I would like to say in this connection is that something, according to us, is very wrong in the affairs of the University

there, and some things have been also pointed out in the Mudaliar Committee's Report. Sir, why Banaras? Almost all other universities are liable to some charges, and some are not above some suspicion in the matter of management. I am not going into that. Sir, I was distressed to read this Report of the Mudaliar Committee for two reasons. Firstly, the authors of the Report are supposed to be men of importance and eminence, and I was at a loss to understand how such eminent people could produce so miserable a Report. I was a little surprised by it. Not that everything they have said is wrong. In fact they have stated that there are cliques and other things. I agree that there are cliques. But then, Sir, many other things have been said which no responsible man, talking about a University, should have said in the manner in which it has been said. Sweeping observations have been made against the student community in the Report, and no qualification has been made in making such observations. I will just read out from paragraph 30:

"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."

Such a statement is made in the Report. It is a libel against the University of Banaras, it is a libel against the student community, it is a scurrilous statement which no responsible person, no matter whoever he is, should have at all made. Sir, I am very sorry that such a thing was said because it is a public document now and something which has been said will continue to be there. I do not know if they will disown the statement. Then, the whole thing was said on the basis of certain memorandum submitted by a *Divisional Commissioner*. Was he cross-examined?

Was his evidence put to test? Have we got the memorandum that is spoken of here? Nothing of the kind.

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

We are called upon to accept the statement as it comes just because some Divisional Commissioner has cared to say something of that nature. We reject that kind of statement as a scurrilous statement. Our student community is a fine community. You may have sometimes some complaint against them, but all through history you have seen that our students are generally patriotic, decent, polite, democratically-minded. This is what I say. I do not think that the Banaras Hindu University with such great traditions of patriotism is an exception to this general rule that obtains in our country. Why then was the Banaras student community singled out for this vicious and malicious vilification on the part of a Committee or for that matter, a Divisional Commissioner? I cannot understand it.

Many other statements have been made about the University and these also rouse grave suspicions about the competence of these people to go into these affairs. I have understood from my enquiry that these people did not even visit the University. One of them went there; others did not. They were living somewhere, in some hostel or in some guest house, from where they conducted their enquiry. They finished their job anyway. What sort of an enquiry is this made by these people who lived miles away from the University and laid down the law and set out their findings without testing the evidence before them? I would like to know. Many other things have been said. I need not go into those things because this Report, according to me, but for some of the true statements, is not worth the paper on which it has been written and it should be rejected. I make it very clear that it should be rejected. To understand

that there are cliques and all that in the University, we need not appoint such a flamboyant Committee to go there and record its findings. This is an endorsed fact that this state of affairs exists not only the University, but even in the Treasury Benches of the Congress Party. For that, you do not need an enquiry committee.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: What about the Communist Party?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the most important point goes out of the purview of the enquiry—finance. You are not asked about it. Yet, we find that the University Grants Commission has made a contribution of a crore and a half or so and this University gets this money. Is it not right for the Committee—a Committee which one has to take seriously—to go into the question of finance and administration? Why do you keep these out of the purview of the enquiry? I would like to know.

Therefore, let us not build up a very big case out of this Report which could not bear examination. Place it before any committee or group consisting of people who will deeply go into this matter, and the entire Report will be regarded as something which is unworthy of the gentlemen who have produced. I cast no reflection on them. Good men have done a wrong thing. This is my view. I wish this was not done. This Report has resulted in the loss of prestige of the University at Banaras. Let there be no mistake about it. I understand that fewer people are getting into the University than before because of that particular Report. Banaras University is being talked about in a derogatory way in very many places outside the State of Uttar Pradesh. Why is it so? What have they done? If something is wrong, you put it right, but do it objectively, in a balanced way. But there is no such approach in this Report.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Many suggestions have been made and we have heard the speech of hon. Dr. Kunzru. To him, everything is fine. Mr. Jha has got his support. Nothing is to be said about him. He has only praise for him. Nothing but praise. Well, Sir, I wish I could share his feelings. Hallelujah to the gentleman under whose management such crises have arisen. Much was spoken yesterday about development. And it is surprising, when the situation was bad, this gentleman was in Delhi, met people spending much time. Why was it necessary? What sort of an educator is he who comes to Delhi for doing a little canvassing, rather than facing the situation there and trying to tackle it? I would like to know how long he had been in Delhi and whom he had met, what he had said. These are relevant questions to be asked. I do not know Mr. Jha personally, but I would like to know these things. What did he do here? He did not see any of us. He saw many others, we know. Why are we untouchables to him? If his was a strong case, it should be brought to us also. We are also a part of Parliament. He went in a partisan direction. The pressure group of Banaras was projected here to do a little pressurising. This is what we saw. Sir, I say very clearly that the management is at fault. The Treasurer, the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor have to answer this. What is happening? It is no use trying to accuse the other men when things go wrong and here, in this Parliament, it is the Government who is answerable. We are told that the University is under the Government and the Education Ministry should give a better account of its work in regard to the University than it has so far done. Things have gone wrong. It is said that the people of Eastern Uttar Pradesh are responsible for this clique. Well, I do not know that the people of Eastern Uttar Pradesh were so bad as all that. They are as respectable, as decent and as honest as, I believe, the people of Western U.P. What is the use of saying . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): As honourable as the people of any part of the country or any country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, that is so. But this does not seem to be the view of some honourable men. The people of Eastern Uttar Pradesh are being needlessly maligned. I do not like it. I do not know what the honourable man from Kumaon who had migrated from Maharashtra, the tiger of the Himalayas, will say. I did not see him roar at all. I saw him this morning

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): Tigers do not roar.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, I do not know what tigers do. Of course, they become vegetarian, I believe. Sir, the hon. Member has discovered that tigers are mute. That is not right.

Therefore, let us not go into that thing. Maybe, there may be some bad people in Eastern U.P. Maybe, there may be some bad people also in Western U.P. They are also equally distributed. In that way, you cannot find a solution to the problem. I think it is a very justifiable demand that the Vice-Chancellor should resign. Hon. Dr. Kunzru may not wish so. The resignation of the Vice-Chancellor may change the position and it will not be necessary for the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and others to resign. Well, I think the Registrar, the Vice-Chancellor and the Treasurer should be placed under the searchlight of an enquiry a little bit. As far as the Vice-Chancellor is concerned, he has mismanaged the affairs. I am not going into the educational accomplishments of his, because he is not particularly known for these. But as an administrator, he has mismanaged the whole thing. That is the point. Why do you stick on when you have lost the confidence of the students and a section of the teachers? When the people of Banaras feel that you have gone wrong, I do not think that the Vice-Chancellor should be foisted

upon the University in this manner. I think it is good for you, good for the University, good for the people of Banaras, good for the people of Eastern U.P., good for the entire U.P. and good for the whole of India for this Vice-Chancellor to find some other good and useful job. This is what I feel. Therefore, this demand should be considered. I am not pressurising. I think that if he is out of the picture, it will be better for the present and things could be set right.

You will find that much has been said about the students. Dr. Kunzru was in full cry against the student community. Why does not Raj Bahadur Gour condemn the students? Why don't you, Dr. Kunzru, condemn the management? I can return the question like that. It is they who have taken the position that no student can go wrong and the elder people start condemning them. What sort of a father will he be if he runs the household and his family by always accusing his children and not looking at himself? I would like to know . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The hon. Member has taken sixteen minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing.

Appoint the Principal and let the other things go to the Medical Council. Bring that into the picture and then appeal to the students. The students want education; they want sympathetic treatment. They are not rowdies collected there. Now, it is possible to bring about a change in the situation but if you stick to your decree, if you stick to your position, not make any change, then I do not think any solution would be found. Sir, the pressure group exists and I am told so from my independent sources. Mind you, they are all Congressmen, not Communists. If I produced the evidence of Communists, you will be prejudiced. Therefore, I talked to Congressmen, P.C.C. Member also. All of them

have said that the pressure group exist but the pressure group is in the pockets of the Vice-Chancellor. He presses the button and the group moves. That is the thing. I do not say that the other party is above all reproach. That is not at all my suggestion but it is they who are responsible for it and for that the Ministry of Education here is answerable. That is my contention.

Sir, a comprehensive measure will be necessary. This measure will lead us nowhere. I know that some patch work may be done but a solution would not be found at all. I would beg of the House not to give encouragement to the maligning of the students or the teachers. That is the thing that vitiates the atmosphere, that makes the solution of the problem difficult, that estranges feelings and that brings in new difficulties instead of removing them. Therefore, my submission to the House is that the problem of the Banaras University should be viewed dispassionately and both sides should be prepared to see where they have gone wrong. As far as I am concerned, when things are wrong in the University, the main responsibility should be borne by those who are in the management but then the other side sometimes does not do this. That is my trouble; over this matter, of course there is difference, Eastern and the other. The Congress monolithic structure is somewhat shaken. I know that. I sympathise with them for that but you see, if there is something wrong in the Vidhan Sabha in the U.P., the opposition is to be blamed. That side is all angles, all pure characters, nothing but Godly and divine, all of them. We are only to be blamed. Such talk does not lead to any solution. Therefore, Sir, this approach should be given up. Let us discuss about this University; let us sit together, objectively study the various issues that have been raised here, the divergent points of view, put them to cross-examination, test the evidence coming from the various sides and then come to our own conclusion through an

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

objective searching and vigorous enquiry. Then only we shall know what has been happening there. For the present, I think the Vice-Chancellor and the others there are guilty and they are on the management and even this Bill retains them in their installed position. I would like them to step down a little, vacate for others. I think the Congress Party itself can find good people from among the Members. The Lady Member would be a better Vice-Chancellor than being a Deputy External Affairs Minister. You can put such people there. I am not saying that the choice should be from the Opposition side, from our side. Take one from the Congressmen, followers of the Congress, men of letters who can take this place and, with a clean slate, start clearing the Augean stable and remedying the ills of the University. I am prepared for it. Why should that not be done? Why should there be this advocacy? Why this strong powerful advocacy for Mr. Jha whose name came fourth in the Panel and who got the minimum number of votes? For the life of me I cannot understand. His name was suggested from the Government of India and was added to the list in the Panel which was submitted to the Visitor and now that advocacy comes for him. Are we the Counsel for Mr. Jha? Are we the collective Counsel for Mr. Jha or, are we the people who have to judge the affairs of the University on merits and take our decisions? This is what I would like to know. Sir, I very much regret to have to make certain remarks about the Vice-Chancellor but then, Sir, much has been said in his praise. The paeans of praise have been sung in favour of the Vice-Chancellor by Members opposite and from some Members on this side of the House. I do not deride him but I say that his need in the Banaras Hindu University has come to an end; he is a misfit there. He is rejected by the students and by the people there. I think, therefore, in all fairness to him and to the University, it would be better

for him, more worthy of him, to step down. Along with him should also step down the other two of what is known as the 'trio'. If we do this, I think we can make a good beginning. The Banaras Hindu University is a pride which we all share no matter to which political party we belong. It is a pride and it is a precious heritage of our cultural resurgence and we want it cherished. We want to place it above such corruption, above pollution, above pressure groups, above those people who look for patronage rather than to the students and the teachers. We want to remake it after our image of culture and education. Therefore, Sir, it is essential that we get out of the ruts and the webs into which we have been put. We should sit together and find some solution. This is a solution which may please Mr. Jha or his friends in the Government but this is a measure which would not be offering any solution. I tell you that it has been rejected by large sections of the teachers, by large sections of the students. In Calcutta, people are opposed to it. "What kind of a Report is this Mudaliar Committee's Report?"—that is the question which is asked everywhere. There is indignation against it. Why is it so? Have they all gone mad? Have they lost their head? Have they lost their balance that they would all be opposed to this Mudaliar Committee Report when it is supposed to be a very good Report? Ask this question of yourself; come to your own conclusion. It is no use, Sir, trying to brow-beat Parliament by making all kinds of statements that the Government wants to make. Government, to me, is responsible for all this. You have allowed things to accumulate. I leave it at this stage. I do not know how far we are going with this measure. I know it will be passed but it will not offer any solution. Government should declare here

- (1) that they are going to come up with a comprehensive measure after mutual consulta-

tion within a definite time;
and

- (ii) that the management will be cleared of these people who have lost the confidence of the students, of the teachers, of the people of Banaras and of the other students, teachers and the people of the Eastern districts.

If you do this, then the people of the Eastern Districts will not be maligned in the way they are being maligned today for the sake of expediency of the Party—not the Party in power perhaps but the Department in office.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to give general support to the Bill firstly because it is an emergency measure and will be replaced by a comprehensive measure as already promised by the Deputy Minister.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: He is not a Deputy Minister.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: I am sorry, Minister of State.

Sir, it is really a painful subject because the University autonomy is what the country has believed in, fought for and wants practised but when circumstances compel one to put things right which have gone wrong, then false ideas of idealism should not make us hesitate or afraid to call a spade a spade and take the correct step. For that reason, I congratulate the Ministry and the Government in having come forward to take this unpopular step not with a view to curtailing the liberties of the University or the autonomy granted to them, but with a view once and for all to put things right.

Sir, the Banaras University was founded with great idealism by the revered Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. But that does not mean that when things founded by great people, when in the hands of their not exactly

worthy followers, go wrong, we should not set them right. If we do reverence them, when things founded by our worthy countrymen go wrong, we should see that they are put right, out of our respect for their memory and we should see that the institutions founded by them do credit to them and to the country.

Sir, the Banaras Hindu University is a Central university, and it is good that it has been a Central university because it is only because it is a Central university the Government and Parliament where people from all the States are there, will have the courage to come forward to put things right. Nobody need hide the fact that matters are not right, things are not all right in various other universities. As a matter of fact, without mentioning the name, I would like to say here that a very high official of the police department has told me about very much worse things happening in another university with regard to the behaviour of certain persons who are to be blamed. Of course, we need not blame the youth, the young. They only do things according to the examples before them. There are these things not only with regard to the behaviour of youth, but also with regard to the scheming of things by teacher politicians, this fall in standards, intrigues with regard to examinations, leakage of papers, lack of discipline among the students, intimidation of teachers and locking them up and threatening them with murder and things like that. Such things have been happening even in a place like Calcutta, mentioned by the hon. Member who spoke before me. It is not surprising that he should be surprised and the people in Calcutta could not believe that such things could happen in a university. I would only say that to some extent, even there, things are not what they should be with regard to discipline and on other sides. The usual saying is that when danger is far ahead, if you make a hue and cry, that danger may not come to you. Maybe that we shall see, not only in Calcutta but in many other universities, that all these evils in our acade-

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]
mic affairs are high-lighted and put right. It is high time that we do that.

For the moment, I would not say that this Report should have been as explicit as it has been in pointing out some of the evils, because giving publicity to these things does good to nobody. There could have been another way of focussing attention on these evils and on these matters so that the necessary steps could be taken. Probably it was felt by those who have written this Report that unless the real gravity of the situation was pointed out in full, there would be absolute unwillingness to touch the autonomy of the University. That is one way of looking at it. But all the same, I do not think that some of these minute details have done any credit even to us, not to talk of the students and the teachers affected, and they need not have been given with that much of graphic description.

Having said this much, I would like to point out some of the features of this Report—only one or two of them—because the time at my disposal is too short for me to show in what way the University was allowed to function. First and foremost, I would like to mention indiscipline among the teachers. It may be the policy of persons on the opposite side to blame only a few individuals and leave out the class, because they have to thrive on the support of the class and as such it is not surprising that they should have said what they did.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have given blame where blame was due.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Were some of the students not to be blamed? Or were some of the teachers who were misguided, were they not to be blamed? Not a word was said about that. Similarly, Sir, to encourage provincial feelings also seems to be part of the policy of the opposite party, because by fanning the members of parochialism or provincialism, while the party in power

tries to unite the country, the opposition party would like to make headway.

I would also like to ask the Opposition party why it was not pointed out that they did not like to have as the president of the students union a man of 35 who was doing his LL. M. and who was working perhaps with what political motive I don't know because I do not know his political affiliations. But there are, according to what is stated on page 13 of this Report, the headquarters of various political parties there. I would like to ask the hon. Member who spoke before me, how many of his followers are there. He said that their party had some teachers and students who . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say so. I don't know their politics. There may be some there who support our party, out of the 12 million votes we got. But I don't care who they are.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: But he did admit that he had . . .

श्री टी० पांडे : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस विद्यार्थी के बारे में कहा गया है वह दिसम्बर, १९४५ ई० तक मेरे साथ फतेहगढ़ सेन्ट्रल जेल में था। रिपोर्ट में यह कहा गया है कि १५ वर्ष से वह विद्यार्थी है, ऐसी मिथ्या रिपोर्ट पर क्या विश्वास किया जाय, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ।

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: The Report says that he is a student of the LL.M. I was speaking of the academic principle and I do not know to which party this person belongs; but that really does not matter where academic principles are involved. I may say that in all colleges and universities the presidents and other office-bearers of students' unions should be students and not people from outside who may be politicians, or students of this nature. This should not be permissible under the rules and regulations of the students' body and nobody

who has left or finished his studies in the institution for five years should be allowed to be the president or secretary or any office-bearer of any student union. Otherwise it cannot really be called a students' body and the students may easily be misguided.

I would like to point out some of the things that had crept into this University, as has been mentioned in the Report. For want of a Physical Director for physical training, the students are left to themselves for recreation in the campus. Similarly it has been pointed out that women's education was not properly looked after inasmuch as for a number of years since its very start or inception, the college had no Principal and the Vice-Principal's post was continued and there was general discontent among the staff of the college.

Sir, administrative ills, when they come in, there is a landslide and there is no way of stopping them and for this reason I feel the Government has done very well in coming forward with this Bill which is, of course, of a temporary nature. Before long another and comprehensive measure will be brought forward and then I hope all people who did not get enough time to speak or who had much to say may send in notes or even draft Bills before Government so that they may draft the comprehensive Bill. I will also support the demand of the last speaker that there should be an enquiry *in camera*—I would not like to make it again public—into the conduct of the staff or particularly those members of the staff who have, even after retirement not vacated their quarters or who pay half-rent or nothing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say all, but only about the Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar and the Treasurer.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I request I may not be interrupted, otherwise I would require more time. The hon. Member had more time than was due to his Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please give her more time.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Thank you very much for pleading on my behalf.

Therefore, I would like to say that this University which was our first effort in modern times at making a university, instead of having a prosperous and very honourable career without any interruption like those of the universities of the West which have lasted for thirteen and fourteen hundred years, has come to this state, in such a short time. That has been due to our own actions and particularly of the politics of the teacher-politicians. I may add that the word "teacher-politicians" is not an honourable word and in American phraseology the word "politician" has a bad meaning, is an abuse.

Sir, as I told you, since other universities are suffering from this defect, only by the Centre taking firm action the States which are afraid of taking any action in their universities will be emboldened to straighten out these affairs in their universities.

Sir, everybody knows about the way in which examinations are managed in universities. I would not like to refer to that here because it is not something that would do credit. So commercialisation in universities also has been introduced. Similarly, Sir, papers leak out and the stories that are given there about the research papers being written by some of the staff working under the student's father for the student and some other things like that we just heard are indicative of what is happening in other universities also. It is no use trying to flatter any body of teachers or any body of students. Students on the whole, as was so well pointed out by Prof. Wadia yesterday . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The question is one of degree.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Yes, Sir, not only that there has been such a decay there, I feel a failure of this type in our local admi-

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]
nistrative bodies, etc., and that is due to our ignoring things and letting them slip.

Sir, our universities are the breeding places for our future leaders, are training places for them, and if we do not see that they are kept to the best mark, I do not think there is any hope for our country. Sir, with these preliminary remarks I will just mention one or two points in regard to the Bill.

It is but natural that everybody should have spoken more on the Report because the Report itself forms the basis of the Bill and gives strength to Government to take the action that it did. Sir, nobody should blame Government but, if anything,—as I have already said I will repeat—should congratulate Government for having taken courage in both hands and come forward with this type of measure to put things right.

Now I would turn to the Bill, to page, 3, to the provision regarding the Pro-Chancellor. I would like to point out here that there is hardly the necessity for a Pro-Chancellor in a university where there is already a paid Vice-Chancellor. This is with reference to the proposed statute 14(1) (b). Then in the proposed statute 14(1) (f) it says: "five persons from among the old students of the University, nominated by the Visitor." It is usually customary to say how many years before they should have been students of the University and it should also be necessary to say that they should have been graduates of the University. It is no use talking of students who may not have finished their courses of study or who may come a year after they pass as representatives on the body. That will keep the real old students out.

Then in clause (g) there is provision for three members of Parliament, two to be nominated by the Speaker of the House of the People from among the members thereof and

one to be nominated by the Chairman of the Council of States from among the members thereof. With regard to this I would like to point out that it would have been better to trust the House and leave it to the respective House to elect the allotted number.

So, Sir, with these few words I would like to support this Bill and to hope that before Government comes forward with the comprehensive Bill it would appoint a committee of enquiry to go into all evidence *in camera* and without having any person from among the present University officers sitting there they should take evidence. Sir, it was a most extraordinary procedure—I would like to say that before I sit down—to have the Vice-Chancellor against whom most of the allegations were, sitting all the time along with the Committee. That is not at all a satisfactory procedure and it is surprising how the Committee allowed that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): May I remind you that the Saddler Commission was appointed to review the activities of Mr. Justice Ashutosh Mookerjee as Vice-Chancellor, and Mr. Justice Ashutosh Mookerjee was a member of the Saddler Commission and he dominated the deliberations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No wonder that there is a lot of bad things in the Calcutta University even after the Saddler Commission.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I am glad at this confession. When that was the state of affairs in the Calcutta University, why were the people surprised that such a report should have been there or the Committee should have been appointed? Many of us know about the affairs of many universities, but leaving that point I would like to submit that in any enquiry committee, not only with regard to universities but with regard to other matters also, school or any other thing, the persons most

concerned, even if they are allowed to stay in the committee, should voluntarily retire from there and refuse to be there so as to let everybody, who may have to say something, say without fear or favour, whatever they have to say in which nobody can lay the charge that the evidence was engineered. I would like to appeal to people from eastern Uttar Pradesh not to take this affairs as a question of demanding so many things from the Banaras University to the exclusion of other but treat this University entirely as a Central University, and things should go on merit. There are a thousand and one points made here in the Report about which one would like to give suggestions but one could, as was pointed out, pass them on to the Ministry.

One remark that fell from the Opposition I would like to refer to and it is this. Yesterday, when Dr. Gour was speaking, his tone of speech was such as if instead of the Banaras University affairs being under enquiry the Ministry was under enquiry, and that was not the way of looking at things.

AN HON. MEMBER: He always does.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: There is a point in it, Sir. I would like to point out that our speeches on this side are never meant for being printed and quoted, for being shown to the students and the teachers, to show how we are fighting for them, how we are fighting for their cause, right or wrong. Our criticisms are made on principle, not with any other idea.

(Interruptions.)

In this case at least where the welfare of the younger generation is concerned, the Opposition should keep party considerations or propaganda out and only think of the welfare of the next generation. They never do that; otherwise I would not have said that bringing such an

unpopular measure was the best thing Government could have done in the interests of the students.

Thank you.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU, RAMAMURTI (Madras): Sir, I give my support to the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill, 1958, though I feel that the Bill should have come very much earlier to deal with the situation and should have been more drastic in its remedy, namely, to cut root and branch the evil, the canker, the veritable poison that has corroded into the body politic of this once famous University.

We in this House, Sir, have been always great admirers of this great Hindu University of Banaras. In fact, who among us have not been so and who among us have ever doubted its all-India character, its high national and cultural traditions and achievements in the past, who have not held in high esteem and veneration that great son of India, the founder Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and the band of eminent Vice-Chancellors, scholars and philosophers like our Vice-President, who have served this institution well and truly and who have added to the funds of the University? It is because we are all lovers and admirers of this all-India institution that we are anxious to save this temple of light and learning from the various maladies that it has become subject to, in fact to avert any further catastrophe in this institution. We who have been connected with universities are all for the autonomy of universities. In fact when we first heard that the Government was going to enter upon this course we felt very much disturbed, but I find now that this governmental interference, though generally not to be tolerated in university administration, was found necessary in this case. It might be an agony; it might be painful, as all Members have expressed, but the operation had to be performed. The

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]

situation in the University is such that those who should have been the guardians of the University—professors and teachers—have belied their trust and hence the Government had to enter to save the situation. No one felt it more than the Minister of Education who said he had been a student of this University.

Sir, the Mudaliar Committee Report had been viewed from various angles and some criticism has been offered that it had not examined all parties both in public life and inside the University—the opposing groups—and it had exposed certain factors that need not have come into the light of the day. But I personally congratulate the Mudaliar Committee on its splendid work. In my opinion it is a frank and fearless Report of whatever was available for investigation. I know Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, the Chairman of this Committee, for several years now and who does not know that he has always stood as the stoutest champion of University autonomy even to the extent of sometimes causing displeasure to the administration and Government? So we may be sure of this that when he yields or surrenders this principle, in however small way it may be, there is something rotten in the state of this University which requires urgent surgical operation. It has been pointed out that Members of this House should have been on the Select Committee. The Minister of Education explained that it could not be done because of time factor, because of the anxiety to deal with the case urgently. But I hope that this practice of omitting the Members of this House will not be treated as a precedent though we understand now its reasonableness and we hope that in future the Members of this House would also be included in such Select Committees.

Now, reading the Mudaliar Committee Report and the Report of the Select Committee, one cannot but be shocked at the sad deterioration in the ideals and standards of the Hindu University of Banaras, once far-famed for its national character and aspiration to build and shape the youth of this country in ideals based on the best traditions and culture of our people irrespective of State and linguistic boundaries. Sir, I wish to bring to the notice of this House one or two salient points which have struck me most forcibly against my background of having been actively an educationist for more than 30 years. The first point that shocked me is the scandalous state of affairs in the University namely, the growth of groups partly political and partly personal in character and this has been described by Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer, the ex-Vice-Chancellor of the University in his letter of resignation to the Visitor dated the 4th February 1956. That letter makes such an astounding reading that I could never imagine that such a state of affairs would ever exist in a University which was so closely associated with such personalities as Dr. Mrs. Annie Besant, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and others. What pains me is that the Government of India is paying this University a recurring block grant of Rs. 55 lakhs—vide page 4 of the Mudaliar Committee Report. The total recurring grant paid by the Government of India for the past 15 years from 1942-43 to 1956-57 amounts to nearly Rs. 3 crores and about Rs. 1 crore by way of non-recurring grants. So in all, it comes to Rs. 4 crores nearly. In my opinion this is a colossal waste of public funds in the light of conditions now brought to the notice of this House. I feel that we in this House, who are generally vigilant, have not been sufficiently vigilant in guarding against this wastage, particularly when there are so many other deserving institutions in the country, both educational and medical, which require funds. However, the original

objective of this University was its all-India character and this objective has been embodied in the fundamentals of the Constitution of the University and stressed very much by the Mudaliar Committee in very clear terms. This being so, it is surprising that the Government has been spending the nation's money belonging to every State in the country on an institution that has so completely departed away from the ideals of the University. The only solution to this state of affairs would appear to be a drastic action which the Government has rightly taken. A thorough cleansing of the Augean stable, by getting rid of the undesirable members of the teaching staff and pressure groups who have lent themselves to undesirable party and group agitational activities in the University. What can the poor students who—many of them—are in my opinion some of the finest in character and achievement, do when they are exploited and used as pawns in the game of party and group politics? Education, Sir, is an art, as all know, of drawing out the best in an individual to promote its highest possible development to enable the individual to reach his highest stature, but here the contrary has been aimed by the so-called guardians of youth. In this context I cannot help quoting what my esteemed sister, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, a member of the Mudaliar Committee, said on the floor of the Lok Sabha. When we come to know that one of the Professors—he may be an eminent scholar—used forged students' concession passes for taking a marriage party—it might be a trivial thing apparently but it is a serious charge and this matter came up before the Railway Corruption Enquiry Committee also—and this gentleman was given some title 'Vidya Bhushan' and that honour was bestowed by the Government, what respect . . .

SHRI T. PANDE: Was this title awarded on the advice of the Education Ministry?

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): The award was

given by the President on the recommendation of the Uttar Pradesh Government and the Chief Minister of U.P. wrote to me saying that he regretted that he made such a recommendation because he did not know the facts.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: I am only giving the version of one of the members of the Mudaliar Committee. Sir, what respect the students will have for such a professor?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have exhausted your time.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Not 15 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Your 15 minutes are over.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: All this is given in the Report in paragraph 34.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: It says that students and professors enter into all sorts of undesirable quarters and very often the Rector has to be called in the middle of the night to handle the situation. All this is due to the fact that the original ideal of the residential University has deteriorated and the system of Tutors, student-teacher contact of close supervision has tumbled down due to increase of numbers and the recent trend to turn out from the portals of the University factory products, mass products, at the sacrifice of character training. Further, referring to a specific case of recruitment for the post of professor of botany the same thing we find. It will be seen that recruitment to the post was made purely on group politics, ignoring the three candidates on merit drawn up in order of preference by the expert committee for selection to this post. Further, (*Time bell rings*) sons of a professor, a Head of the Department, submitted theses, but the theses were written by the other members of the staff

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]

in the same department and doctorates were awarded to these students. Permit me to complete my say that with regard to the women's college, the complaint is that it has not been given proper attention and the appointment of a Principal has been long pending. As has been pointed out already, a considerable amount of frustration seems to be prevalent among the teaching staff of the colleges, some of them with long experience and very high qualifications. (*Time bell rings.*) Thus all the elements that go to make the ideals of the University degenerate have been there and it strikes me that the House is right in urging drastic action. I congratulate the Minister of Education for having undertaken to bring this Bill in good time and I hope, and I agree with others when they said, that a more comprehensive Bill would be brought forward soon. With these words, I extend my support to the Bill in question and I hope that some of the questions raised outside regarding renaming the University appropriately to emphasise the secular character of our country will be considered by this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I must ask the hon. Member to bring her remarks to a close. I am sorry to interfere, but it cannot be helped.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: I hope the answer will be found by the House.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to offer my observations on this Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill, 1958. This Banaras Hindu University is one of the great national institutions of India. We all regarded this University with a sense of pride. It might be that certain shortcomings and failures and deficiencies might have occurred in this University, as in other universities. The Government of India

appointed a committee to go into the question. The Report of the Banaras Hindu University Enquiry Committee was submitted to the Government some time in April 1958. As has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the Committee commenced its sittings on the 31st July and submitted its Report in April 1958. The Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha ended their sessions on 10th May. I do not know why the Minister of Education did not take the Parliament into confidence before promulgating an Ordinance and bringing this Bill before us as a *fait accompli*. It was an insult and a challenge to Parliament. Sir, the remedy that has been suggested to cure the disease is worse than the disease itself. I have great respect for the members of this Committee, but it should not debar me from making some charges against this Committee. I must say with regret that this Committee has made sweeping generalisations against the teachers, against the students, which should not go unchallenged. I am sorry that the Minister for Education has brought this Bill, after promulgating an Ordinance, to get legislative sanction. I strongly disapprove of the pressure tactics of the Government in first promulgating an Ordinance and then bringing it before the Parliament for its sanction. It is true that there is indiscipline in the student community, that there is unrest in the student community. But it is not peculiar to the Banaras Hindu University. Such things are prevalent in almost all the Universities in India. It is not peculiar to the student community itself. It is a reflection of what is prevailing in the general masses of the people. Just because there are certain shortcomings, just because the management of the Banaras Hindu University did not take care to see that things improve in a way in which we all wanted, the Bill that has been brought forward is not the remedy. The University autonomy has been given the go-by. The Minister for Education has dealt a death-

knell to the university autonomy. We know for certain and it cannot be denied that the Congress Government for the last eleven years have committed blunders and bunglings and unpardonable at that and just because they have committed such things, we do not for a moment say that we have lost our faith in democracy, that we have lost our faith in the Parliamentary system of Government, and therefore we call other methods into action as they have been called into in France. Just because this Government has failed to fulfil the aspirations of the people, we do not want that a second demagogue should be established in India by calling another De-Gaulle to power. That is exactly what the Education Minister is doing by bringing this undemocratic Banaras Hindu University Bill for our consideration and sanction. I never expected that a Congress Minister at that and who takes pride that he was a student of this University, would bring in such an ignoble piece of legislation before us. I could have understood if he had followed all the recommendations of the Mudaliar Committee. He gives an explanation to say that this Bill has been framed on the basis of their recommendations. But some of the vital recommendations that have been adumbrated in that Report have been given the go-by. I do not think that this Report has suggested that this university autonomy should be put an end to and that the powers of the Education Ministry should be extended to this University as if it forms part of the Education Ministry. If you look into some 3 P.M. of the provisions that have been put into this Bill, I am afraid you will see that this is nothing but an extension or a glorified extension of the Education Ministry's activities into this University. Some of the bodies that have to be constituted under this Bill have lost all their democratic character, all their representative character. It looks as though the Education Ministry is directly handling the affairs of the University. The Court which is one

of the important bodies under this Bill has been turned into an advisory body. I could understand that the way in which the Court was constituted under the 1951 Act was not proper. Certain weightage was given to certain interests, and if some radical changes are made in the constitution of that Court, nothing would happen, and we will not feel sorry if that Court is constituted democratically with all the powers . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): It was the supreme governing body and a reviewing authority, save in the matter of those things for which the Executive Council or other bodies had exclusive control. It may lead to many complications.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want that the powers and functions of the Court should remain as they were before this Ordinance was promulgated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): With all the old complications?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Some of those complications can be got over and some of those irksome things can be dropped. But the main powers and functions of the Court should remain, and the Court after all would be meeting once a year as per that University Act. It is the Executive Council that will carry on the day-to-day administration of the University, and therefore investing such powers and functions in the Court would not in any way bring down the prestige or would not in any way ruin the University.

Sir, the provisions constituting this Court are not at all welcome. It is filled mostly with nominated elements. This is how the Court is going to be constituted under this Bill.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

The Court shall consist of the following members, namely:—

the Chancellor;

the members of the Executive Council;

two representatives of the Departments and Colleges nominated by the Visitor;

two representatives of the teachers of the University other than Professors nominated by the Visitor;

five representatives of old students of the University nominated by the Visitor;

three representatives of Parliament, two to be nominated by the Speaker and one by the Chairman;

twenty-nine persons nominated by the Visitor from among persons who have special knowledge or practical experience in education or have rendered eminent services in the cause of education.

Sir, if proportional representation is adopted in electing representatives from the old students of the University—or they may be termed as registered graduates of the University—that would be better than old students of the University. This weightage will not come in. Representatives only from a particular area or a particular State will not have all the votes to get elected to this highest body. If that system of election is adopted, much of the evils that were seen during the last ten years could be easily avoided.

Again, Sir, the representation that has been given to Parliament is very meagre. We know it for certain that we are contributing nearly Rs. 60 lakhs annually to this University, and Parliament is very much interested in this University as it is a Central University. We should have larger representation instead of three. I would suggest that at least twelve

Members of Parliament should be on this important body of the University.

Then, these “twenty-nine persons nominated by the Visitor” should be done away with. I can understand if there are three or four persons to be nominated by the Visitor.

Another important thing that should be taken into consideration is that this is a Central University and therefore all the States in India are interested in this University, and it is but right that all State Assemblies should be given an opportunity to send one representative from each State to serve on the Court of this University.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: I have a lot of things to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time. You have taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: I will take another ten minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. I am sorry.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Then I am finishing. Again, Sir, the way in which the Executive Council is constituted is not at all satisfactory. Only seven persons will constitute this Executive Council, to be nominated by the Visitor. I do not know why people who profess so much faith in democracy should give a go-by to this important principle in constituting the Executive Council which is a very important body in this University. Sir, it should be democratically constituted with a membership of fifteen and in that the Court should have adequate representation. The Academic Council should have some representation on this body. The Solicitor-General as well as the Auditor-General of India should be made *ex-officio* members of this Executive Council.

Sir, last but not the least, the pernicious provision of this Bill is one that refers to the Reviewing Committee. I am glad that some wisdom has dawned on the Minister who brought forward this Bill in agreeing to rename the Screening Committee as the Reviewing Committee. I am afraid, Sir, it looks as though some brain-washing will be done by this Committee. I do not want to be a party to such an obnoxious procedure. The University teachers and professors are all intellectual people. There may be one or two who have gone wrong somewhere, but to have this pernicious procedure of screening their activities and antecedents does not seem to be justified. I, therefore, urge that the entire clause relating to this Reviewing Committee or the Screening Committee should be dropped.

I am not in agreement with the provisions of the Bill. I would earnestly request that the hon. Minister would do well to withdraw this Bill and he should bring in a comprehensive Bill wherein the full academic autonomy and the University's autonomy are guaranteed.

श्री नवार्बासिंह चौहान : उपसभापति, महोदय कृपा करके जब मेरा समय हो जाये तो उससे दो मिनट पहले मुझे सूचित कर दें, ताकि मुझे मालूम पड़ जाये कि कहां पर मुझे समाप्त करना है ।

श्री उपसभापति : अच्छा ।

श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : बनारस हिन्दू-यूनिवर्सिटी की जो रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने है, जब मैंने उसको पढ़ा तो मुझे ऐसा मालूम पड़ा कि न मालूम वहां पर क्या एक भयंकर स्थिति पैदा हो गई है, जिससे एक समय ऐसा आ सकता है कि सारे वायु-मंडल में आग लग जाय या आसमान फट जाय और न मालूम क्या क्या चीज हो सकती है । लेकिन जब मैंने आज माननीय कुंजरू साहब का भाषण सुना

तो मेरा यह विचार कुछ बदल गया । उन्होंने कुछ विद्यार्थी संस्थाओं के प्रस्ताव पढ़ कर सुनाये जिनसे मालूम होता है कि कुछ थोड़े से विद्यार्थी हैं, व कुछ थोड़े से टीचर्स हैं जो इनडिसिप्लिन के; जिम्मेदार हैं, वरना उन सब टीचर्स और विद्यार्थियों ने जिनको उन्होंने बधाई दी है, मैं भी उन्हें बधाई देता हूं जिन्होंने उन स्टूडेंट्स या टीचर्स या कहिये टीचर पालिटिशियन्स को रिजोल्यूशनों के जरिये कंडैम किया है । माननीय कुंजरू के भाषण से मेरा विचार बदल गया और मैं समझ गया कि उन्होंने ठीक ही कहा है, वहां पर कोई खास बात नहीं है । थोड़े से टीचर्स पालिटिशियन्स और विद्यार्थी हैं जो गड़बड़ करते हैं । अगर यह स्थिति है तो फिर इमरजेंसी का क्या सवाल था ? थोड़े से टीचर्स और विद्यार्थियों को आप निकाल सकते थे आर्डिनरी ला के जरिये । क्या यूनिवर्सिटी इस तरह से विद्यार्थियों और टीचर्स को नहीं निकाल सकती थी ? मैं साफ़ कह देना चाहता हूं कि मैं कभी भी इनडिसिप्लिन का हामी नहीं हूं । यह किसी तरह से भी और कही से भी हो, मैं इस चीज को मानने वाला नहीं हूं कि यूनिवर्सिटी के अन्दर आटोनोमी के नाम पर इस तरह की तमाम चीजें चलती रहें और फिर भी गवर्नमेंट इंटरफियर न करे । जहां पर इस तरह की स्थिति हो वहां पर सरकार को इस तरह की कार्यवाही अवश्य करनी चाहिये और जहां पर इस तरह की स्थिति नहीं है वहां पर फिजूल इंटरफियर नहीं करना चाहिये । जहां तक मेरी सूचना है, वहां पर इस तरह की कोई विशेष बात नहीं है । तब इस तरीके की चीज क्यों लाई गई, क्या इमरजेंसी पैदा हो गई ? थोड़े से लोगों के कारण एक आर्डिनंस लगाने की क्या इमरजेंसी हो गई ? एक मच्छर को मारने के लिये एंटी-एयरक्राफ्ट गन इस्तेमाल किया जाय, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती ।

दुराचार का अन्वेल तो वहां पर कोई सबूत नहीं है । और अगर वहां पर कुछ लोगों

[श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान]

की गड़बड़ी का सबूत भी था तो उनसे जवाब लेना आवश्यक था। अगर किसी प्रोफेसर के लड़के ने, कोई गलत तरीके से रेलवे कंसेशन का इस्तेमाल किया, तो क्या प्रोफेसर अपराधी हो गया? और उसकी पंच-विभूषण की उपाधि का भी मजाक उड़ा दिया गया। इस तरह की बातों को, रिपोर्ट में नहीं लाना चाहिये था। लोगों को अपनी व अपने बच्चों की तरफ भी देखना चाहिये कि वे क्या क्या नहीं करते हैं। जब वे बाजार में जाते हैं तो क्या कहीं कहीं वे लड़कियों को नहीं छेड़ते हैं और वे क्या कोई दूसरी गड़बड़ियां नहीं करते हैं? मैं इन चीजों को दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूं जो कमेटी के माननीय मेम्बरों ने दोहराई हैं। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि इमरजेंसी नहीं थी। हां, मैं यह मानता हूं कि वहां पर थोड़ी बहुत गड़बड़ी थी। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह की गड़बड़ी किस जगह नहीं है? इसलिये एकतरफा इस चीज को लेकर और इमरजेंसी का बहाना ले कर इस प्रकार की कार्यवाही नहीं करनी चाहिये थी। जब इस तरह की चीजें सब जगह हैं तो आल इंडिया बेसिस पर इस चीज को टैकिल किया जाना चाहिये था, जो कि नहीं हो रहा है। मैं देखता हूं कि बहुत से एजुकेशन एक्सपर्ट्स हैं, इन एक्सपर्ट्स के मारे जान आफत में आ गई है। वैंस्टेड-इंटेरेस्ट का एक ग्रुप बन गया है जो कि किसी को भी अपने करीब नहीं आने देता है व खास स्थानों पर दूसरे लोगों को फटकने नहीं देता है। इन एक्सपर्ट्स का हाल यह है कि इतने दिन हो गये हैं कि वे हमारे देश के सिस्टम आफ एजुकेशन को नहीं बदल सके हैं। उसी की वजह से आज हमें इस तरह का वातावरण देश की शिक्षण-संस्थाओं में देखने को मिल रहा है और इस तरह की ये तमाम चीजें हो रही हैं।

डा० कुंजरू साहब और डा० वाडिया साहब से मैं अदब के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं

कि जब तक हमारे देश में शिक्षा का सुधार नहीं होगा तब तक इस तरह की चीजें हमारे देश की शिक्षण-संस्थाओं में बन्द नहीं होंगी। आज आप यह बिल लाये हैं, ठीक है, कोई बुराई की बात नहीं है। माननीय मंत्री जी और कुछ माननीय सदस्यों को यह आशा है कि इस बिल से यह तमाम चीजें बन्द हो जायेंगी। अगर यह हो जाता है तो बहुत ठीक है, वरना और कुछ करना पड़ेगा; यानी शिक्षा-पद्धति को तब्दील करना ही पड़ेगा। इस सम्बन्ध में जो कमेटी बनाई गई थी, उसके टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस विस्तृत नहीं थे उन्हें बहुत ही संकुचित रखा गया था। वह कमेटी वहां पर गई और उसने जिस तरह की रिपोर्ट दी, मैं समझता हूं उस तरह की रिपोर्ट यहां बैठे बैठे भी दे सकते थे। कुछ लोगों ने यह इलजाम लगाया है कि कमेटी ने राजा बनारस के पैलेस में बैठ कर रिपोर्ट दी, लेकिन मैं तो यह कहता हूं कि यह रिपोर्ट उन लोगों के दिमाग में दिल्ली से ही तैयार हो गई थी। उनके दिमाग में दिल्ली से ही क्या, बल्कि इससे और पहले से एज ओल्ड प्रिजुडिस के आधार पर तैयार थी। जिस तरह की रिपोर्ट इन महापुरुषों ने तैयार करके दी उसकी आशा किसी को भी नहीं थी। महान् पुरुष महान् बातें किया करते हैं, पर साथ ही उनसे महान् भूलें भी हुआ करती हैं, जिनमें से एक बड़ी भूल यह रिपोर्ट है। हम अंग्रेजों के जमाने में पढ़ने थे कि विलायत से "मिस मेयो" नाम की एक देवी आई जिन्होंने "मदर इंडिया" नामक पुस्तक लिखी थी जिसमें हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में तमाम बुराइयां छांट छांट कर लिखी गई थीं। अगर वह आज जिन्दा होतीं तो इस कमेटी के पांचों देवताओं को धन्यवाद देतीं कि इन्होंने उनका शेष काम पूरा कर दिया। आज किस प्रकार इस रिपोर्ट के द्वारा गन्दगी उछल रही है, यह बड़ी चिन्ता का विषय है। उन आदमियों को छोड़ दीजिये जो आफिशल सर्किल में हैं या जो वहां के एक दल से सम्बन्ध रखने वाले हैं। लेकिन एक साधारण आदमी

रिपोर्ट के आधार पर आज यह महसूस करता है कि इस लोकतंत्रीय बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी में क्या हो गया है, यह तो गन्दी हो गई है।

हमारे एक मित्र श्री काणे साहब ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि यह बिल जो बना है वह चन्द फाईडिंग के आधार पर बना है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि कुछ ऐसी फाईडिंग है, जिनके आधार पर यह बिल बनाया गया है। और तमाम फाईडिंग को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया है। लेकिन अन्य फाईडिंग द्वारा जो मिसचीफ हो सकती थी वह तो हो चुकी है। मुझे ताज्जुब होगा, यदि पाकिस्तान, अमरीका इत्यादि के भारत विरोधी अखबारों में यदि यह न निकला कि महामना पंडित मदन मोहन मालवीय द्वारा स्थापित बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के विद्यार्थी और टीचर्स अप्राकृतिक व्यवहार करते हैं और ब्राथेल्स बनाए हुए हैं व वहां जाते हैं। ऐसी चीजें जो इस रिपोर्ट में दी गई हैं, जिनका आप यदि खंडन नहीं कर सकते हैं तो समर्थन भी नहीं, जब तक कि आप उसकी स्वयं जांच न करें। अगर ऐसी चीज है तो आपको चाहिये कि आप सभी की अग्नि-परीक्षा करायें न कि एक वर्ग की। जिस तरह की सीता जी की अग्नि-परीक्षा राम ने कराई थी, उसी तरह से ही ताकि सत्य-असत्य का निर्णय हो सके और किसी वर्ग को शिकायत न रहे।

श्री शीतभद्र यादव (बिहार) : अग्नि-परीक्षा किस तरह से होगी ?

श्री टी० पांडे : यहां भगवान् तो नहीं हैं।

श्री नारायणसिंह बौहान : अग्नि पर चलें, और कैसे होगी ? तो मैं आप से कह रहा था कि वहां पर इस तरह की इमरजेंसी नहीं थी। अगर वहां पर किसी तरह की गलती थी तो वहां के कोर्ट द्वारा उसको क्यों नहीं ठीक करवाया गया था ? वहां का अपना कानून था, कोर्ट के सदस्य थे, जो कि इस गलती को

दूर कर सकते थे। कानूनन किसी जांच व निरीक्षण की पूर्व सूचना यूनिवर्सिटी को मिलना आवश्यक है, किन्तु यह नहीं दी गई। वाइस चांसलर स्वयं रिप्रेजेंटेटिव बन गये और उन्होंने जो मेमोरेण्डम पेश किया वह कभी कोर्ट के सामने नहीं रखा और न एक्जीक्यूटिव कमेटी के सामने ही। अगर उन्होंने यह किया होता तो आज इस तरह की चीज हम लोगों को देखनी नहीं पड़ती और बहुत सी बातें साफ हो जातीं।

हमारे वाडिया साहब ने कहा कि अगर वाइस चांसलर साहब गवाही लेते समय बैठ गये तो क्या बुरी बात की। जहां तक बड़े बड़े अधिकारियों का सम्बन्ध है उन पर तो कोई असर नहीं पड़ता। लेकिन जहां पर छोटे छोटे तबके का विरोधी पक्ष गवाही देता तो उस पर असर अवश्य पड़ जाता है। अगर हम बिल्ली के पास चूहों को बुलायें और कहें कि देखो बिल्ली के पास एक कुत्ता भी बैठा है, बड़े जोर का है, तो क्या कुत्ते के रोब के कारण चूहे बिल्ली का डर भूल जायेंगे ? हमारी सरकार ने इन्क्वायरी के समय साफ कह दिया होता कि गवाही देते समय जो बातें कही जायेंगी उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की जायेगी, तब सही बातें पता चलतीं। मगर वहां पर यह बात नहीं हुई। उन्होंने लोगों ने वहां पर गवाही दी, जिनको यह बात मालूम थी कि उनके बड़े बड़े लोग इधर उधर हैं, एनुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री में हैं, वे सब उनको बचा देंगे, उनकी रक्षा करने वाले हैं। इस तरह से यह सब चीज की गई, जिसका नतीजा आज हमारे सामने है।

इसके बाद सब से बड़ी चीज हमारे साथियों ने अपने भाषण में जो कही वह यह है कि इस संस्था का आल इंडिया कैंक्टर अब नहीं रहा। आल इंडिया कैंक्टर का अर्थ क्या प्रोपोशनल प्रतिनिधित्व से है ? क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि हर एक स्टेट का इतना शेयर होगा, इतने इतने सड़कें रखे जायेंगे, इतने इतने टीचर्स इस इस प्रान्त

[श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान]

के होंगे, इतना यह होगा, इतना वह होगा ? अगर सभी सेन्ट्रल अंडरटेकिंग्स का यह उसूल है और यह देखा जाता है कि किस स्टेट से कितना रैवेन्यू है और वहां के लिये कितना एक्सपेंडीचर है, उसके कितने विद्यार्थी, टीचर्स और अफसर हैं और उन पर कितना खर्च होता है तो ठीक है, यह भी कर लीजिये । लेकिन यह बात ठीक नहीं है । मैं इस उसूल को नहीं मानता हूं । और हिसाब लगाने पर दूसरों को घाटा ही पड़ेगा । बहुत से लोगों ने बताया, पांडे जी ने भी बताया और मैं भी बतला सकता हूं कि जो ठीक फिगर्स हैं—चाहे स्टूडेंट्स को ले लीजिये चाहे टीचर्स को ले लीजिए—वे यह साफ साबित करते हैं कि यू० पी० से अधिक टीचर्स और स्टूडेंट्स—अधिकतर विभागों में—बाहर के हैं । फिर भी अगर कोई स्टूडेंट बाहर से न आवे क्योंकि हर जगह कालेजें खुल गये हैं, हर जगह यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं, तो इसमें किसी का क्या कुसूर है ? कुसूर तो तभी हो सकता है जब बाहर के स्टूडेंट्स आवें और वे न लिये जावें । तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि यूनिवर्सिटी का आल इंडिया कैंरेक्टर कैसे नहीं रहा ?

इस तरह की बहुत सी चीजें कही गई हैं । बहुत से लोगों के दिलों में कसक है । कल मैं डा० काणे साहब का भाषण सुन रहा था तो उन्होंने कहा कि इतना रुपया यहीं खर्च हो जाता है, और भी यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं, बड़ौदा इत्यादि यूनिवर्सिटी हैं । अभी हमारी एक बहन का लेक्चर हुआ तो उन्होंने कहा कि यहां केन्द्र का इतना रुपया क्यों खर्च किया गया है । कह नहीं सकता कि किस भावना से यह सब कहा जा रहा है और यह बहाना लिया जा रहा है कि इस यूनिवर्सिटी का आल इंडिया कैंरेक्टर नहीं रहा । आल इंडिया कैंरेक्टर के लिये क्या चीज चाहिये ? टीचर्स, स्टूडेंट्स और दूसरे लोग अगर दूर से नहीं आते हैं, स्थानीय लोग ही वहां पर

कुछ अधिक आ जाते हैं, तो इसमें क्या एत-राज की बात है ? यह तो एक बहाना ले करके उसको खत्म करने की साजिश मात्र है । इससे जो बदनामी हुई है, इससे जो जल्म हुआ है, वह कभी भुलाया नहीं जा सकता । जैसा कि हमारे पांडे जी ने कहा था कि एक पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन का आदमी कह रहा था कि ऐसे विद्यार्थियों को क्यों लिया जाय, आप देखेंगे कि इसका रेकॉर्डमेंट के ऊपर भी बहुत ज्यादा बुरा असर पड़ेगा । इस तरीके से जब कहा जायेगा तो विदेशों में भी यह चीज जायेगी । इसलिये सरकार को चाहिये कि जिन चीजों को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया है उनका खंडन किया जाय । अगर उसमें हिम्मत है तो वह अपनी तरफ से इसकी जांच करवाये ।

(Time bell rings.)

बहुत सी तकलीफें उन्होंने बयान की हैं, किन्तु समय नहीं है । इसलिये अब मैं केवल इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूं कि वहां के कमिश्नर साहब ने यह बयान दिया है कि लड़के ऐसी बुराईयां करते हैं, टीचर्स ऐसे अफेंसेज करते हैं जो अनैतिक होते हैं—*involving moral turpitude*. रिपोर्ट में कहीं यह भी कहा है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के किसी आदमी ने भी ऐसी ही बात कही है । वह कमिश्नर साहब हमारे यहां भी रह गये हैं । वे हमारे यहां नये नये ज्वाइंट मैजिस्ट्रेट हुये थे और उनकी शादी भी हमारे यहां हुई थी । हमारे यहां बहुत से लोग उनसे परिचित होंगे । बहरहाल, प्रश्न यह है कि इस तरह की बातें कहना कहां तक शोभनीय था । सरकार को चाहिये कि वह इस बात की जांच करवाये कि एक संस्था को इस तरीके से क्यों बदनाम किया जा रहा है । क्योंकि इससे हमारे भारतीय चरित्र पर असर पड़ता है, इसलिये यह आवश्यक है । इस बात के लिये पांडे जी ने चैलेंज दिया था और मैं भी चैलेंज देता हूं कि ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है, किसी टीचर के विरुद्ध किसी लड़के की मामूली बेबुनियाद बात को ले करके

व्यर्थ पार्टीबन्दी के आधार पर बदनामी उड़ा दी गई है जो बिल्कुल गलत है। बड़े बड़े लोग क्लबों में बैठ करके शराब पीते हैं और जुआ खेलते हैं, किन्तु छोटे आदमियों को इस तरह से बदनाम किया जा रहा है और फिर यह छोटे आदमियों का भी प्रश्न नहीं है; बल्कि यह एक संस्था का व एक देश के नागरिक चरित्र का प्रश्न है।

मेरा बोलने का समय समाप्त हो रहा है और आप भी शायद कुछ कहने वाले होंगे, इसलिये अब मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहूंगा। अब मैं सिर्फ यही कहूंगा कि रिपोर्ट में जो गलत चीजें आ गई हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में जी इस बिल और इस रिपोर्ट के समर्थक हैं उन्होंने भी यह माना है कि ये चीजें खराब हैं और इनको नहीं आना चाहिये था।

श्री टी० पांडे : प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने भी कहा है कि कुछ गलत बातें हैं।

श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : गलत बातें हैं तो उनका खंडन होना चाहिये। जन्हीं बातों का तो बहुत ज्यादा बुरा असर पड़ा है। इतनी बातें कहते हुये मैं अपने समय के अन्दर अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not propose to be very long in my observations. This Bill has evoked considerable interest and some amount of resentment so far as the Mudaliar Committee's Report is concerned. The large numbers of Members who have taken part in the discussion have approached this question from different angles. There has been very strong support to the Bill as well as some aspects of the Mudaliar Committee's Report. At the same time, it cannot be again said that considerable feeling has been evoked by some observations in the Committee's Report for which there seems to be some justification. Sir, at the very outset, I might tell you that my feeling with regard to these

observations regarding the regional aspect of the matter is that these remarks were uncalled for and unnecessary. The hon. Minister has made it absolutely clear, Dr. Kunzru has said so, Mr. Wadia has said so and many others have also stressed it. If this University is situated in a region which is called Eastern U. P. it is inevitable that Eastern U.P. students may seek admission to this institution and no objection can legitimately be taken so long as those admissions are kept within bounds. Therefore, Sir, I consider it, from one point of view, justified that my esteemed friends from the Eastern U.P. districts should take that line to some extent. but coming at the fag end of this debate, it is futile for me to plead for a calm and dispassionate consideration of the provisions of the Bill as well as of the Report.

There is one outstanding circumstance, however, upon which it seems there is complete, almost cent. per cent. agreement. It is this that this national institution which has acquired such world-wide reputation and international status as a great centre of learning should be maintained and developed to the fullest possible extent. On that point, there is absolutely no difference of opinion in this House although various points of view have been put forward with regard to other matters. Sir, it is agreed on all hands that this institution has to be protected from the machinations of self-seeking groups and individuals, from indiscipline and defiance of rules and laws by students and teachers alike and from the incitement and exploitation by outsiders seeking to fish in troubled waters. That is also a common ground and, Sir, what is the underlying reason for this fundamental agreement on this point? It is that the present generation of students may derive the maximum benefit, intellectual, moral and spiritual, out of this great institution and that the sacred trust which has been left to us by its noble founder may be handed down in untarnished glory

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu]

and utility to succeeding generations of India's youthful students. That is the general purpose, the general agreement at which all Members of this House have arrived. That is a most welcome common purpose to my mind, Sir, which has emerged out of this debate from all sections of the House. That being the position, I feel that the criticisms of the Mudaliar Committee's Report have been offered more in sorrow than in anger and it will be necessary to deal with them in a spirit of sympathy and understanding.

Now, Sir, the need for the appointment of the Mudaliar Committee has been questioned in some quarters but on different grounds by different Members which appear to me to be somewhat self-contradictory. It has been asked, 'Why this University should have been singled out while admittedly similar evils exist in other Universities?' The obvious answer is that a beginning has to be made somewhere. This institution is the foremost of the four Central Universities, and it has a long history of grave indiscipline, going to the very root of the university administration and affecting its academic standards. All well-wishers of this institution would, therefore, welcome this probe rather than object to it. This objection seems to have been cancelled by the contrary objection, namely, "What was the Government doing so long? And why is this being done now?" The reason is because in the effort to build up the new India, this University is destined to play a large and important part in providing the human material, fully equipped in intellectual and moral strength. That is the special reason why this probe has been carried out in this particular institution from which so much is expected so far as the building up of the future India is concerned. And that is ample justification, in my opinion, for undertaking this probe at the highest level. The Government of India deserve the gratitude of the entire nation for rising to the

occasion and for instituting this much-needed enquiry.

Hon. Members are practically unanimous in paying their tribute to the eminence and the ability of the personnel of that Committee. But criticism has been offered regarding the terms of reference of the Committee, by some friends opposite. These terms of reference appear to be fairly comprehensive. The main trouble in the University proceeded from the indiscipline and power-politics prevailing there. Well, concerning the question of student indiscipline, the Committee has gone deeply into all aspects of the matter, some of them admittedly unpleasant. But that is, by no means tarring the entire student community with the same brush as has been pointed out by my esteemed friend Dr. Kunzru. The impression that has been sought to be created among these unfortunate and misguided students is that the entire student community of the University has been sought to be brought within that calumny which has been addressed in respect of some of them. That is what has been impressed on the students by those who are interested in inflaming and inciting them. But I find this on page 13 of the Report and I shall make a brief reference to what the Commissioner of the Division says. It has been quoted there on page 13. Please give me a second so that I may find the exact place, because so much has been said on that particular point. Here it is. The Divisional Commissioner refers to "students visiting houses and lodges of disrepute and to certain students being associated with these."

Most surely, the Commissioner was referring only to those limited number of students who, according to his information had been doing so, and certainly not to the general body of students, in that particular passage. He referred to those students visiting such places. He does not mean that the entire body of students were indulging in these malpractices.

Every right-thinking person would resent any such statement if the Commissioner had referred to the entire body of students. A plain reading of that passage would certainly not bear out that interpretation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was it necessary to mention teachers?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I am talking about the students here. The Committee did not stop there, merely with pointing out the evil and ending with such a negative approach. They were very conscious of the fact that student-discipline was very largely connected with the students' welfare, their living conditions and their sporting activities and their intellectual and social contacts with their teachers for which a residential university is primarily intended. So they have made elaborate recommendations in that regard. I find reference to that on page 6, paragraph 13 of the Report where they say this: Talking about lodgings and hostels, they say:

"The result has, therefore, been that there has been a great deal of pressure for admission into the hostels of the University. The hostels have been overcrowded, the conditions of residence have been far from satisfactory and the bulk of the students have had to face considerable difficulty in securing admission outside the University."

And again, and more elaborately, they deal with this matter under the heading "Students' welfare". They have gone very deeply into this matter and have suggested far-reaching and fundamental improvements in several directions. The whole passage is instinct with sympathy for the students. That has been the approach of the members of this Committee.

Now, coming to the point which has been raised by my esteemed friend, Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan, and several others, that this has caused great damage and injury to the reputation of Indian students here

and possibly abroad, I feel that some damage might have been caused and is likely to have been caused. And we are sorry for it. But when there is a canker, is it advisable to conceal it for all time? Why should we not probe into it in the interest of the whole nation? After all, we are the arbiters of our own destiny. We can stand abuses by other people. Well, if in trying to solve a problem abuses come to us, in the usual course, we cannot stop it. But those who are right-thinking men, those who are of generous bent of mind in this country and outside, will find that this nation, even if it suffers from a little canker, has also got the courage and the strength to face it and to own it up and to try to heal it. Therefore, Sir, I would only say this much.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I will take only two more minutes. This approach will not be of any advantage if we tried to conceal what is really obnoxious in our body politic.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: That magistrate's evidence alone was enough?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: He was the Commissioner. He was not giving any evidence. He was giving the Committee the result of his own experience in these matters, and it is a very good kind of evidence even in a court of law, because he is an officer who is specially charged with the duty of looking after this matter.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: But what is the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order order. Let him go on.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: After all, the Committee has proceeded on certain accepted material and the Commissioner has stated that the matter is like this. And *prima facie*, it is of some importance.

Well, that is not the final word. Steps will have to be taken by the

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu] appropriate authority, after this Bill has been passed, to mend matters. I take it that the members of the appropriate body, the Executive Council, or whoever they may be, will not proceed merely on what the Commissioner has said or upon the findings of the Committee. They have to find out for themselves whether all this is true or not. They will have to look into it afresh, so to say, from all points of view and they should satisfy themselves and their own conscience whether all these allegations are really correct.

That is not the final word. It was enough for starting this legislative process. But that is not enough to condemn the students.

SHRI T. PANDE: Just one question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish; there is no time for questions.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I will speak to you later on outside.

SHRI T. PANDE: Just one question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the point at this hour?

SHRI T. PANDE: The point is this: There is a list of relations given in the Committee Report; that is my grievance . . .

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I am not discussing that. I quite appreciate Mr. Pande's point. I am discussing far more important matters, student-discipline and observance of decorum on the part of the students; that is far more important than the list of some individuals, relations or otherwise. I am not on that point at all. Therefore, Sir, I just conclude by saying that from my own experience I have seen how the students are conducting themselves in keeping in confinement or laying siege to the house of that old man of seventy-five years, the Pro-

Vice-Chancellor. A solid wall of human beings had been put up at his gate; nobody can get in; nobody can get out; and that gentleman whose health and life depends on his morning walk has been deprived for a period of about fifteen days from having any such amenity. So is the Registrar of the University. His old parents, father and mother, are suffering from heart trouble and they also have been kept confined inside the House and with no amenities being provided to them. That is the position. So if the Mudaliar Committee Report in this particular matter of student indiscipline requires any corroboration at all, the students concerned are offering it in abundance at the present time for the last few days. Those students are showing such indiscipline and lack of decorum by completely dominating the University campus that by their action and conduct, they are providing the fullest justification and strongest support to this Bill.

Sir, I conclude with only this observation that these students have been misguided. When they are approached and talked to in a reasonable manner they seem to return to the path of reason, but then some outsiders intervene and again deflect them from that path and lead them astray. That is the unfortunate position. They have got to be saved; they have got to be rescued, and that too with no further delay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena. Just ten minutes.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, my only point in rising up to speak on this Bill is to add to the congratulations that my friend, Mr. Sapru, conveyed to the hon. the Minister of Education who deserves our meed of tribute for having brought this Bill at the most appropriate time although perhaps because of that Ordinance the bringing in of this measure here has been delayed for some time. The obvious reason for this measure is

that this national University, as I am pleased to call it, has been suffering from this canker in the body politic of the University for a long long time and no remedy has yet been discovered to set it right. So I give this Bill my wholehearted support.

Now, Sir, I am a champion of the students. I spent the prime of my life from the age of seventeen, when I was myself a lad of 17, amongst the young people, and I have not spent all these long years in vain. I know and have studied human psychology. I know that the students are very disciplined and a good set of people, and there is nothing wrong with them if the approach made to them is friendly, brotherly or fatherly. So there is nothing wrong with the students. I give me them a *carte blanche* that they are absolutely innocent and they have got nothing to be blamed for. The only thing is that the teachers, they too should have a mirror before them. They should search their hearts and have an introspection into their own selves and then see who is responsible for this indiscipline, if there is any among the students, because it is they who put the model before the students, and when they are themselves in the day to day life of the University indulging in this pressure tactics, pressure politics as it is called, when these teacher-politicians set naughty and wicked examples before the students, what else can the students do? They only copy their leaders, and therefore I submit that the students are entirely free from any mischief or any indiscipline whatsoever. My friend, Mr. Basu, was speaking of their indiscipline, that they are besieging the house of this Registrar or that Registrar. In this long history of turmoil and confusion in the Banaras Hindu University was ever any concrete approach made to the students, to befriend them and to bring them to the right path? I am afraid none worth the name was ever made and therefore the students came to be misguided. They

are only misguided; you can put them on the right path, on the right track in no time if you have got any confidence in yourself and if you are capable of putting them on the right path.

Sir, the only one point that I want to deal with this Mudaliar Committee Report is this, that it is open to severe criticism; whatever else one may say in praise of the Committee, I am afraid that the Report is open to severe criticism, and much of what it has embodied in the Report should better have been left unsaid.

Sir, the hon. the Minister of Education has given us a directive that the Parliament should give a constructive lead to the Banaras Hindu University. What lead are we capable of giving, Sir? That is my grievance. We are ready to help him and to give him all the constructive lead that we are capable of. But then unfortunately our hands are themselves tied. We suggest so many things but they go unheeded; they are very seldom taken notice of and very rarely perhaps acted upon.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): He is asking for constructive suggestions.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: So far as these constructive suggestions and the lead to be given are concerned, it cannot be done in the ten minutes' time that I have been given and therefore this matter will have to be deferred to a more convenient and more appropriate time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can write to them. Think over the matter deeply and write to the hon. Minister.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Thank you for the suggestion. It had never escaped my notice. Please bear in mind that innumerable men of eminence, benevolence, knowledge, leaning, and philanthropy, ruling princes,

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

business magnates and common people, all have contributed towards the founding of the University and that was all due to the veneration in which the entire country, the entire nation, held Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the founder of the University. Sir, the whole country is one, is unanimous in recommending that the University should be allowed to maintain and preserve its national character. It should not be allowed to suffer in any sense whatsoever.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान) :

उपसभापति महोदय,

श्री पा० ना० राज गेज (मुम्बई) :

दूसरे प्रांतों के लोगों को भी बोलने का मौका दिया जाय। यू० पी० के लोग बहुत कह चुके हैं, हमको भी कुछ कहने दीजिये।

श्री उपसभापति : चार बजे मिनिस्टर साहब को जवाब देना है।

श्री पा० ना० राज गेज : यू० पी० के बारे में हम भी दिलचस्पी रखते हैं। मैं उन्हें बोलने से नहीं रोकता हूँ। मेरा कहना है कि यू० पी० के मेम्बरों ने ज्यादा बोला है, हमें भी चांस मिलाना चाहिये।

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Bhargava, go on.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : उपसभापति महोदय, विश्वविद्यालय सदैव ही सरस्वती का मंदिर माना गया है और ज्ञान का भंडार भी। और जिस बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी का नाम लिया जाता है उसके प्रति बहुत ही श्रद्धा बाल्यकाल से ही हमको है। और यह भी हम सभी—हिन्दुस्तानी ही नहीं बल्कि विश्व के लोग भी—जानते हैं कि बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी कितनी श्रद्धा का पात्र रही है और किस बड़े महामान्य प्रातः स्मरणीय महामना मालवीय जी के द्वारा यह बनाई गई थी। यह सब सोचने के बाद आज जो

यूनिवर्सिटी की दशा हम देख रहे हैं, उसके लिये हमको बहुत दुःख होता है।

यह विधेयक जो शिक्षा मंत्री जी हमारे सामने लाये हैं, इसका मैं स्वागत करती हूँ और साथ ही मैं शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय को इसने लिये बधाई देना चाहती हूँ। यह भी मैं जानती हूँ कि इससे पहले जो आर्डिनंस सामने आया था वह भी बहुत आवश्यक था। क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि यूनिवर्सिटी स्वतंत्र रहनी चाहिये और यूनिवर्सिटी की स्वतंत्रता एक बहुत आवश्यक चीज है। मैं बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी से तो सम्बन्धित नहीं हूँ, परन्तु राजस्थान यूनिवर्सिटी से, इसके प्रारम्भ से ही सीनेट और सिडीकेट की समस्या के नाते, सम्बन्धित रही हूँ। इसलिये मुझे भी कुछ यूनिवर्सिटी का अनुभव है। यही कारण है, मैं कह सकती हूँ और बड़े जोर से कह सकती हूँ कि यूनिवर्सिटी की स्वतंत्रता बहुत आवश्यक चीज है। परन्तु साथ ही यह भी स्मरण रखना जरूरी हो जाता है कि स्वतंत्रता या गणतंत्र प्रणाली जन कल्याण के लिये होती है। किसी भी बहुत सुन्दर वस्तु को हम बहुत अच्छा मानते हैं और प्यार करते हैं परन्तु जब उस सुन्दर वस्तु में कोई खराबी आ जाती है तो उसको दूर करने के लिये भी हमें उसी प्रकार प्रस्तुत रहना चाहिये। हमारे कोई बहुत ही प्रियजन हैं और बहुत ही स्वस्थ और सुन्दर हैं परन्तु यदि उनका कोई जहरीला फोड़ा हो जाय और जिसको अगर हम बने रहने देंगे तो शायद उस शरीर का ही नाश हो जाय। इसका हमें डर हो तो सभी सम्बन्धी जो उसको प्यार करते हैं दुखी होंगे। पर चाहेंगे कि उसका आपरेशन करवा डालें। वही हाल आज हमारे बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का हुआ है। भारतवर्ष के कोने कोने के हर एक लोग, और भारतवर्ष की ही नहीं संसार के लोग, इस के प्रति श्रद्धा रखते हैं। फिर इस श्रद्धायुक्त संस्था को हम कैसे इस प्रकार

बिगड़ जाने देंगे ? यह हमारा सब से पहला उद्देश्य है कि इसको बिगड़ने से बचायें । इसीलिये मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत करती हूँ ।

दूसरा कारण यह भी है कि यह विधेयक अस्थायी है । इसलिये यदि यूनिवर्सिटी की स्वतंत्रता का अपहरण भी होता है तो भी मैं सहमत हूँ। यद्यपि मैं शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगी कि वे जो स्थायी विधेयक या विस्तार से विधेयक लायें, उसमें यूनिवर्सिटी की स्वतंत्रता का ध्यान रखते हुये, उन अव-गुणों को दूर कर लें और इस प्रकार उसको ऊँचा उठाने वाला विधेयक लायें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

इस यूनिवर्सिटी के बारे में जैसा कि कहा गया है कि हमारे इतने माननीय और हमारे सदन के अध्यक्ष डा० राधाकृष्णन तक भी, जिस समय वे उसके वाइस चांसलर थे, वे बहुत खुश नहीं थे । कारण इसका यह बताया जाता है कि इसके अन्दर दलबन्दी थी । तो उस दलबन्दी को दूर करने में इतनी कठिनाई आई कि इतने इतने महान वाइस-चांसलर भी उसको दूर नहीं कर सके । ऐसी दशा में सिवाय इसके कि इस तरह का प्रस्तावित विधेयक लागू किया जाय, कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं रह गया । और तभी हमारे शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने यह सोचा कि इस विधेयक को ला कर उसको सुधारने का प्रयत्न किया जाय ।

मुदालियर कमेटी की भी बहुत चर्चा हुई है। यद्यपि मैं मानती हूँ कि इस विधेयक पर हमें इस बात पर ज्यादा जोर देना चाहिये था कि यह अच्छा है या बुरा, या इससे क्या फायदा होगा । तो मुदालियर कमेटी रिपोर्ट की बहुत ज्यादा चर्चा करना बहुत आवश्यक नहीं था । तो भी चूँकि चर्चा की गई है इसलिये मैं भी अपनी राय देना चाहती हूँ । मुदालियर कमेटी को चाहे आप फ्रैंक कहें—और ठीक है, फ्रैंक कह सकते हैं क्योंकि उसमें दूर दूर की बातें निकाल कर रखी गई हैं —

पर मैं यह जरूर कहूंगी कि उसमें भी बहुत काफ़ी गलतियाँ हैं । जैसा कि मैं एक आध उदाहरण दे कर कह सकती हूँ । उन्होंने उत्तर और दक्षिण का प्रश्न बेकार का सा उठाया है । एक जगह उन्होंने पेज २१, पैरा ५० में कहा है : *This college (College of Music) has been under the direction of a distinguished musician of North India*”.

अगर वे खाली यह कह देते कि एक डिस्टिग्विश्ड म्यूजीशियन थे और नार्थ इंडिया, साउथ इंडिया का क्वेश्चन न लाते तो मैं समझती हूँ बहुत अच्छा होता । इतने बड़े बड़े विद्वानों से हम यही आशा करते हैं और भविष्य में भी आशा रखना चाहते हैं, कि इस प्रकार की प्रादेशिक भावना, यह उत्तर या दक्षिण की भावना, अगर इसमें न लाई जाती तो हम उनकी रिपोर्ट का इससे अधिक स्वागत करते ।

श्री टी० पांडे : वह सजेशन बड़े इंटर-नेशनल आदमी का है, वे दक्षिण भारत के हैं । पंडित ओंकार नाथ ठाकुर दक्षिण भारत के हैं ।

श्रीमती शारदा भागव : दूसरी बात यह है कि उन्होंने डिविजनल कमिशनर की रिपोर्ट दी है जिसमें यह कहा गया है कि टीचर्स या विद्यार्थी बहुत ही गलत स्थान में जाते हैं । एक तरफ वे कहते हैं कि ईस्टर्न यू० पी० की दलबन्दी है, और दलबन्दी के माने मैं समझती हूँ, राजनीतिक दल बन्दी । राजनीतिक दल बन्दी के कारण अगर कोई खराबियाँ आई हैं तो उस दलबन्दी को रोकने के उपाय देखने चाहियें । मगर दलबन्दी के साथ मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि इस प्रकार के दुराचरण भी मिला देने से उस दल वालों का क्या लाभ होता है जो दलबन्दी करते हैं । मैं यह नहीं कह रही हूँ कि कोई दलबन्दी करता है या नहीं, ईस्टर्न यू० पी० वाले करते हैं या नहीं, मगर मेरा सिर्फ यही कहना है कि इस तरह की बातें रिपोर्ट में न लिख कर के अगर एक ही विषय पर, जो मेन था, उस

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

पर केन्द्रित हों तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता । इन सब उदाहरणों से मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि जितनी सुन्दर यह रिपोर्ट होनी चाहिये, उतनी नहीं है । जहाँ इतने बड़े विद्वत्तापूर्ण व्यक्ति थे, जो विद्वान हैं, हमारे राष्ट्रीय व्यक्ति हैं, अगर वे अपनी उस राष्ट्रीयता का और ज्ञान का अधिक उपयोग करके रिपोर्ट बनाते, तो, ज्यादा अच्छा होता ।

श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा : उन्होंने रिपोर्ट थोड़े ही लिखी है ।

श्री टी० पांडे : यह तो उनकी हस्ताक्षर की हुई है ।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : यह कहा गया है कि विद्यार्थी स्ट्राइक करते हैं और उन्होंने प्रो-वाइस-चांसलर के और रजिस्ट्रार के घर में पिकेटिंग की और उनको जाने नहीं दिया । यह बात मैं सही मानती हूँ और इसके साथ ही साथ यह भी कहती हूँ कि कुछ सदस्यों ने यह कहा है कि यह बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी में ही नहीं, बल्कि और भी यूनिवर्सिटीज और स्कूल कालिजों में होता है । मैं इससे पूर्ण रूप से सहमत हूँ कि दूसरे स्थानों पर भी होता है । परन्तु जब हम सोचते हैं कि दूसरे स्थानों पर होता है तो उसके माने यह नहीं है कि हम जिसमें सुधार करना चाहते हैं वहाँ न करें । आखिर कहीं से तो प्रारम्भ होगा । कोई तो पहली संस्था होगी जिससे सुधार प्रारम्भ करेंगे । उसके बाद दूसरी, तीसरी और चौथी संस्थाओं में उसे लागू करें । अगर पहली संस्था में सफलता मिल गई तो उसी प्रकार का प्रयत्न दूसरी संस्थाओं में भी करेंगे जिससे उस तरह की बातें न हों ।

रही विद्यार्थियों की बात, मैं इसे पूर्णतया मानती हूँ और अनुभव करती हूँ कि जो असली विद्यार्थी हैं वे इस तरह के काम नहीं करते । जयपुर का मुझे अनुभव है । वहाँ जयपुर में

जो कालिज की स्ट्राइक हुई, मैं आपको बता दूँ, करीब ६५, ६६ प्रतिशत विद्यार्थी ऐसे थे जो स्ट्राइक में भाग लेना नहीं चाहते थे । वे अपने माँ, बाप टीचर्स और प्रिंसिपल से कहते हैं कि हम पढ़ना चाहते हैं । माँ बाप कहते थे कि हमारे बच्चे पढ़ना चाहते हैं । मगर पाँच दस विद्यार्थी जो सचमुच में कुछ पढ़ने लिखने के बाद भी कालिज में एडमिशन इसलिये ले लेते हैं कि वहाँ जाकर हम कुछ लीडरशिप कर सकें, उनको लीडरशिप की भूख है वे राजनीति में पढ़ना चाहते हैं और वे ही इस तरह का विष फैलाते हैं ।

(Time bell rings.)

दो मिनट और ले कर इस प्वाइंट को खत्म कर देती हूँ ।

4 P.M.

तीसरी चीज जो है वह यह है कि हमारे जो स्थानीय राजनीतिक दल हैं वे उनको बढ़ावा देते हैं । यह मैं मानती हूँ कि कुछ टीचर्स दलबन्दी में पड़ते हैं, परन्तु मेरे पास समय नहीं है इसलिये मैं इस विषय में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहती । मैं इस समय केवल इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों से तथा उनके द्वारा सारे देश के राजनीतिक दलों से यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि वे किसी भी अपनी राजनीतिक सफलता के लिये कालेज और युनिवर्सिटी के विद्यार्थियों को राजनीति में न घसीटें । अगर वे लोग इस बात को तय कर लेंगे कि हमें विद्यार्थियों को अपनी राजनीति में नहीं लेना है, तो मैं इस बात को कह सकती हूँ कि विद्यार्थी कभी राजनीति में नहीं आयेंगे और इस प्रकार की जो उनमें अविवेकता या इनडिस्प्लिन आ जाती है वह सब बन्द हो जायेगी । इसलिये हमारे राजनीतिक दल, खास कर इसके लिये दोषी हैं । अगर वे अपने इस दोष को निकाल देंगे तो युनिवर्सिटी, कालेज और जितने भी शिक्षागृह हैं वे सब पवित्र हो जायेंगे और उससे हमारा भविष्य उज्ज्वल होगा । ये विद्यार्थी ही हमारे भावी नागरिक, लेजिस्लेटर

और सब कुछ होने वाले हैं। यदि वे अच्छी बातें सीखेंगे तो हमारा भविष्य भी उज्ज्वल होगा और हमारा वर्तमान भी उज्ज्वल होगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two more speakers. They may take about fifteen minutes; and if the House is prepared to sit, if necessary, fifteen minutes extra after five, I would like to give them a chance. I hope we can do that.

(No hon. Member dissented).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ram Sahai.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उप-सभापति महोदय, इस बिल को, जो रिपोर्ट है उसको, और इस पर श्री रामबालक शास्त्री, प्रो० मुकुट बिहारी लाल और श्री नन्द दुलारे बाजपेयी और उनके साथियों के जो अलग अलग कमेंट्स हैं उनको मैंने देखा है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि जो बिल लाया गया है वह अपनी जगह पर आवश्यक है। लेकिन मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जिस वक्त इस कमेटी को मुकर्रर किया गया था उस वक्त या कम से कम जब गवर्नमेंट के सामने रिपोर्ट आई थी उस वक्त जो भी वहां यूनिवर्सिटी में अथॉरिटीज थीं उनसे इस सम्बन्ध में उनके कमेंट्स या उनसे जवाबत ले लिये जाते, तो जो आज तरह तरह की गलतियां इसमें नज़र आ रही हैं या जो कुनबावाद और दूसरे आक्षेप लगाये जा रहे हैं, वे शायद नहीं लगाये जाते।

एक बात मैं अपने अनुभव से कहता हूं जिसके बारे में कमेटी ने खास तौर से आब्जेक्शन लिया है और यह कहा है कि इसमें बलिया आदि दूसरे पूर्वी जिलों के ज्यादा आदमी हैं। मैं भी एक कालेज का सेक्रेटरी हूं और उसके नाते मुझे २५ वर्ष का अनुभव है। मेरे यहां एक पालिटेकनिक इंस्टिट्यूट शुरू किया गया है और उसका भी मैं सेक्रेटरी हूं। इस लिए मेरा यह

अनुभव है कि लौकैली या जिस जगह कोई संस्था होती है, उस जगह के आदमी आम तौर से उसमें ज्यादा आ जाते हैं। इसका एक कारण यह है कि लोकल आदमियों को वहां सुविधाएं अधिक होती हैं, इस लिये वे वहां आ जाते हैं। और दूसरा कारण यह है कि वहां बाहर के जितने आदमी होते हैं वे हमेशा इस टोह में रहते हैं कि किसी न किसी तरह वे दूसरी जगह बेंटर जाव पावें और बेंटर जाव पाते ही वे वहां से छोड़ कर चले जाते हैं। इस तरह की एक नही बल्कि कई मिसालें मैं आपको बता सकता हूं। इसके अतिरिक्त जिस तरह के व्यक्ति वहां होते हैं उनके आसपास का वातावरण ऐसा होता है कि उसमें जो इस तरह के सम्बन्धित व्यक्ति होते हैं वे अनायास ही ज्यादा आ जाते हैं। मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर केन्द्रीय मन्त्रालय के बारे में इस तरह की विवेचना की जाय तो मैं समझता हूं कि जो त्रुटियां इसमें बताई गई हैं उनसे ज्यादा त्रुटियां उसमें निकल सकती हैं। मैं यह देखता हूं कि इसमें छोटी मोटी बातों को लेकर कै बढ़ा दिया गया है जिस की वजह से यह बिटर-नैस किएट हुई है। अगर ऐसी बातें, जिनकी आवश्यकता नहीं थी, हाउस के सामने न आतीं तो अच्छा होता।

बनारस यूनिवर्सिटी का जो भी लक्ष्य रहा है, जो भी उद्देश्य रहा है, और उसके प्रारम्भ करने वाले हमारे पूजनीय नेता पंडित मदन मोहन मालवीय ने जिस भावना से उसे शुरू किया था, मैं समझता हूं कि वह भावना और उस प्रकार की शिक्षा आज भी वहां मौजूद है और चाहे भी जिस प्रदेश का कोई व्यक्ति वहां जाय वह उससे वंचित नहीं रहता है। इसके अलावा मैं यह समझता हूं कि वहां स्टाफ में भी कमोबेश सब तरह के आदमी मौजूद हैं। यह हो सकता है, जैसा कि मैंने पहले निवेदन किया कि कुछ आदमी और कहीं अच्छी जगह देख करके वहां से छोड़ कर चले गये हों। लेकिन इन सब बातों की

[श्री राम सहाय]

वजह से वहां जोखराबी कही जाती है, वह खराबी करीब करीब सब यूनिवर्सिटीज में है। यह जो पाप का घड़ा फूटने वाला था वह बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के सिर फूटा है। मेरे ख्याल में अगर इसके बारे में गवर्नमेंट थोड़ा सतर्कता से काम लेती और सभी यूनिवर्सिटीज के सम्बन्ध में एक काम्प्रिहेंसिव बिल लाती और जिस प्रश्न पर इसमें विचार किया गया है, उस पर उसमें विचार किया जाता, तो ज्यादा उचित होता। इसमें शुबहा नहीं है कि इससे जो हालत पैदा हुई है उससे यूनिवर्सिटी की एक प्रकार से बदनामी हुई है। हमारे वह साथी, जिनको इसके बारे में बहुत दुःख हुआ है और जो इस तरह से अपनी एक संस्था को बदनाम होता देख कर अपने को बहुत बेचैन पाते हैं, उनसे मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस बात को देखें कि परिस्थिति दरअसल क्या है। अगर वाकई वहां की परिस्थिति इस प्रकार की बन गई है, चाहे वह किसी तरह से बनी हो, तो मैं यह समझता हूं कि हमारा और आपका यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि हम उस परिस्थिति को सुधारने का प्रयत्न करें और उसको सुधारने का इस बिल से अच्छा उपाय नहीं हो सकता है।

सन् १९१५ में जबकि यह यूनिवर्सिटी शुरू हुई, उस वक्त गवर्नर जनरल और लेफ्टिनेंट गवर्नर उसके लार्ड रेक्टर और विज़िटर होते थे। लेकिन आज यह हमारे सौभाग्य की बात है कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति उसके विज़िटर हैं। जब हमारे देश के इतने बड़े नेता उसमें हैं तो उन्होंने इन सारी बातों को जरूर देख लिया होगा और मैं समझता हूं कि वहां की सारी हालत देखने के बाद ही यह चीज हमारे सामने आई है। इसके लिये हमें ज्यादा संकोच नहीं करना चाहिये और बुरा नहीं मानना चाहिये। वास्तव में यदि वहां किसी प्रकार की गलत बातें हैं तो हमें उनको दूर करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये।

मैं एक निवेदन और करना चाहता हूं कि ज्ञान, विद्या या विज्ञान, ये चीजें चरित्र से बिल्कुल अलग रहती हैं। हम किसी टीचर, प्रोफेसर, लेक्चरर आदि का जब सिलेक्शन करते हैं तो हम उसकी सारी क्वालिफिकेशन्स देखते हैं, लेकिन उसके चरित्र के बारे में हम कुछ भी जांच नहीं करते हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि इस कमेटी कि रिपोर्ट भी इस बारे में खामोश है। इस कमेटी के टर्म्स आफ रिक्रेंस में यह बात अवश्य आती है और अगर वे चाहते तो इस बारे में कुछ संकेत जरूर करते। लेकिन आजकल जिस तरह की पद्धति चल रही है उसमें असली सवाल जो चरित्र का है, जिससे सारे विद्यार्थियों का जीवन सुधर सकता है उसकी ओर मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे अधिकारीगण बिल्कुल सचेत नहीं हैं, किन्तु उदासीन हैं। यही कारण है कि हमारे यहां की यूनिवर्सिटीज और हमारे यहां के कालेजेज दुस्त होने को नहीं आते हैं। हमने यह देखा है कि फर्स्ट क्लास एम० ए० या डाक्ट्रेट की डिग्री पाये हुये लोग प्रोफेसर या प्रिंसिपल बन जाते हैं, लेकिन उनके चरित्र के बारे में हम कभी विचार नहीं करते। ज्ञान या विद्या चरित्र से बिल्कुल भिन्न हैं। ये दोनों चीजें, विद्या और ज्ञान, चरित्र को उज्ज्वल बनाने में अवश्य कामियाब हो सकती हैं, लेकिन जो बुनियादी बातें चरित्र की हैं उनको सुधारने में ये पूर्ण रूप से कामियाब नहीं हो सकतीं। इसलिये मैं शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस बारे में विचार करें और विचार करके कालेजेज में और यूनिवर्सिटीज में किसी प्रकार से ऐसी व्यवस्था करें। जितने प्रोफेसर हैं, टीचर्स हैं, जितने और स्टाफ के लोग हैं उनके चरित्र के बारे में कुछ जानकारी ली जाय, यह तो हो ही, लेकिन मैं तो यह चाहता हूं कि ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि जो विद्यार्थी हैं उनकी परीक्षाओं में, उनके एग्जामिनेशंस में, किसी प्रकार से चरित्र के सम्बन्ध में भी मार्क्स प्राप्त करने का समावेश हो जिससे कि वे चरित्र के मार्क्स को पाकर वे ही अपने को कामियाब बना सकें। अगर हम

इस तरह से काम शुरू करेंगे तो मैं समझना हूँ कि निश्चय ही हमारी दिक्कतें दूर होंगी और यह जो अनुशासन और इन्डिस्प्लिन की बात राज ब रोज हमारे सामने आती है, वह नहीं आयेगी ।

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ । जब मैं इस बिल पर बोलने के लिये खड़ा होता हूँ तो मेरे हृदय में दुःख होता है । सदन में जो भाषण और वक्तव्य हुए, उनको मैंने सुना । और उनको मुन कर मेरे दिल में दुःख होता है कि बनारस जैसी यूनिवर्सिटी में ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये था । बनारस हिन्दुओं की एक पवित्र भूमि है और बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी भारत में ही नहीं, बल्कि दुनिया में एक मशहूर यूनिवर्सिटी है । उससे संस्थापक मदन मोहन मालवीय जी थे और उनके साथ मेरा बहुत पुराना सम्बन्ध था । मुझे पक्की याद है कि जब पंडित जी ने जैसे के लिये अरील की थी तब देश के सब लोगों से, उनकी स्वयं की प्रेरणा से उनको पैसा मिला था । इतना ही नहीं, किन्तु बड़े बड़े विद्वान् अध्यापकों ने बिना वेतन लिये काम करके यूनिवर्सिटी की प्रेस्टिज को बहुत बढ़ाया था । लेकिन आज अफसोस की बात है कि वहां बुरी आदतें, बुरे व्यवहार बन चुके हैं और बन रहे हैं ।

हमारे चेयरमैन साहब डा० राधाकृष्णन् जी, डा० अमरनाथ झा तथा आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव ऐसे लोग इस विश्वविद्यालय की गद्दी पर विराजमान हुए थे लेकिन उन्हें भी यह विश्व-विद्यालय छोड़ना पड़ा । उसका कारण आप सब को मालूम है और बनारस विश्वविद्यालय समिति की रिपोर्ट में मौजूद है । इस सब का अर्थ एक ही है और वह यह कि इस विश्व-विद्यालय को पुनश्च स्थिर करने की आवश्यकता है । और इसीलिये सरकार ने सोच कर, विचार कर, आर्डिनेंस जारी किया । सरकार इसके लिये अभिनन्दन की पात्र है । यह मेरी

राय है । इसके अतिरिक्त दूसरा कोई और तरका सरकार के सामने नहीं था जिसका कि ऐसी हालत में सरकार अवलम्बन करती । सरकार विश्वविद्यालय की आन्तरिक व्यवस्था में हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहती, किन्तु जब ऐसा एक समय आता है जैसा कि अभी आया है तब सरकार शान्त नहीं रह सकती है । यह एक विश्वविद्यालय का ही हाल नहीं है बल्कि सभी विश्वविद्यालयों में, कुछ में कम और कुछ में ज्यादा यह बातें ऐसी होती रहती हैं । लेकिन सरकार इसमें यकीन करती है कि आज नहीं तो कल व्यवस्था सांघे रास्ते पर आ जायगी । आन्तरिक व्यवस्था में विश्वविद्यालयों को पूर्ण स्वायत्तता है और दूसरी बात यह भी है कि उनके पैसों के लिये तथा अन्य जरूरतों के लिये यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन है लेकिन उसके माने यह नहीं है कि जमा चाहें वैसा बर्ताव करें ।

आखिर, यह सवाल क्या है ? यह सवाल हमारी शिक्षा-व्यवस्था का है, हमारे नवयुवकों का है जिनके कंधों पर देश की जिम्मेदारी है । जब हमारे नौजवान ऐसा बर्ताव करते हैं तो हमें बहुत खेद होता है । जो मुदालियर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है उसको मैंने पढ़ा है । उसको पढ़ने से मुझे बहुत दुःख हुआ, मुझे बहुत चोट लगी । उस रिपोर्ट में कई ऐसी बातें हैं । जोकि उसमें नहीं आनी चाहिये थी । तो जब हमारे नौजवान ऐसा बर्ताव करते हैं तब हमें बहुत खेद होता है । यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि विद्यार्थियों में बदतमीजी और और इन्डिस्प्लिन बढ़ रही है । उन्होंने भी इसके लिये एक कमेटी नियुक्त की है । इस प्रश्न पर विचार करने के बाद—मैं यहां आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ—इन्डिस्प्लिन का मुख्य कारण यह बतलाया गया है कि राजकीय पक्ष, पोलिटिकल पार्टिज, विद्यार्थियों को चेतना देती है और अपने स्वार्थ के लिये, अपने हित के लिये, उनका उपयोग करती है । चुनाव के लिये, सत्याग्रह के लिये, उपवास के लिये, उनका उपयोग करती है । बनारस

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

विश्वविद्यालय में ऐसे टीचर-पालिटिशियन्स और स्टुडेंट-पालिटिशियन्स हैं जिनका काम अशान्ति प्रस्तुत करना ही है। उपसभापति महोदय, आपको मालूम है कि अहमदाबाद में—जो हमारे बम्बई प्रान्त में आता है—जो कुछ हुआ उसके पीछे भी ये पालिटिशियन्स हैं . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:.. Please don't refer to Ahmedabad. Confine yourself to Banaras.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : बनारस विश्व-विद्यालय में जो पालिटिक्स है वह किसी पालिटिकल पार्टी ने खड़ा किया है और वैसे ही अहमदाबाद में भी किया था। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि जो पोलिटिकल पार्टीज हैं वे विद्यार्थियों से भी लाभ उठाना चाहती हैं और उनमें भी असंतोष फैलाना चाहती हैं। इसीलिये, उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपकी दृष्टि में यह लाना चाहता हूँ कि बनारस में भी यही पालिटिक्स वाली बात है। जो पालिटिकल पार्टीज हैं वे अन्दर अन्दर काम करती हैं और इसको रोकने के लिये सरकार को कुछ न कुछ कोशिश करनी चाहिये। यह हिन्दुस्तान का सवाल है। हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत सी पार्टियां हैं, कोई जनसंघी है या और कुछ है, कोई कम्युनिस्ट है। तो जो पोलिटिकल पार्टी के लोग हैं वे अपनी पार्टी का नाम बढ़ाने के लिये लोगों को पीछे ले कर काम करते हैं।

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Congress !

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : आपको खराब लगा, लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि यह अन्दरूनी कार्यवाही चलती है और बनारस युनिवर्सिटी में भी यह थोड़ा बहुत जरूर है। इसी वास्ते मैं आपके जरिये, उपसभापति महोदय, यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके लिये सरकार को कुछ न कुछ रास्ता निकालना चाहिये। राजकीय पक्षों को, पोलिटिकल पार्टीज को, यह बात सोचनी चाहिये।

इस बिल से बनारस युनिवर्सिटी की व्यवस्था कुछ बदल जायगी ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है। विजिटर को ज्यादा अधिकार दिये गये हैं इसलिये वह पूर्ण जांच करेंगे और जो कैसेज पेंडिंग हैं उनको भी जल्दी से जल्दी निकाल दिया जायगा। विश्वविद्यालय में जिनके खिलाफ गम्भीर शिकायतें हैं उनको निकाल दिया जायगा। क्योंकि जो जो बातें रिपोर्ट में हैं उनकी पूरी जांच होनी चाहिये और लोगों को सजा होनी चाहिये।

इसके अलावा मेरा यह कहना है कि युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन को ज्यादा से ज्यादा अधिकार दिये जायें। इस बिल के पास होने के बाद जल्दी से जल्दी सरकार को एक स्वयंपूर्ण बिल लाना चाहिये जिसमें उन सभी सिफारिशों को जो कि अभी तक सरकार को दी गई हैं अमल में लाना चाहिये। इसके अतिरिक्त, कई लोगों ने जो यह माग की है कि “बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय” से “हिन्दू” शब्द निकाला जाय उसके ऊपर भी विचार किया जाना चाहिये। क्योंकि “हिन्दू” शब्द की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। “बनारस युनिवर्सिटी” ठीक है। इसी तरह से “मुस्लिम युनिवर्सिटी” नाम नहीं होना चाहिये। अब हमारा देश आज़ाद हो गया है और इसमें किसी संस्था का नाम धर्म या रिलिजन पर नहीं होना चाहिये, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है॥

और भी कई बातें मुझे कहनी थीं लेकिन उसके लिये समय नहीं है। ऐसी हालत में आपने मुझे जो १०, ५ मिनट का समय दिया है उसके लिये मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ। मैं बंबई प्रान्त में रहता हूँ, वहां भी मैं देखता हूँ कि विद्यार्थियों का राजकीय दृष्टि से उपयोग किया जाता है, उनके साथ पालिटिक्स होती है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि विद्यार्थियों को आदर्शवान बनना चाहिये, उनको देश का एक आदर्श सेवक बनना चाहिये। जब तक हमारे विद्यार्थियों का आचार-विचार और संस्कार अच्छा नहीं होगा, तब तक हम देश को आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे। इसी दृष्टि से मैं कहता हूँ

कि हमारे विद्यार्थियों को पालिटिक्स में नही भाग लेना चाहिये और जो उन्हें बहकाने वाले लोग हैं उनके चक्कर में नही आना चाहिये । वस, इतनी ही मेरी प्रार्थना है ।

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the outset I would like to express my feelings of gratitude to the hon. Members who have participated in the debate. The debate has been marked throughout by seriousness of thought, sincerity of purpose and depth of feeling. It was quite natural, because an institution which is trying to serve the whole nation is dear to our hearts, and therefore it is understandable that strong feelings should be aroused when we are discussing a measure like this

Sir, in spite of all such feelings and some disagreement in approach, in details, the debate has been very constructive and I am grateful to the House for having given general support to this measure. Throughout the discussion, there has been a fundamental unity of outlook. It is generally felt that all is not well with the University, that there is a deep-seated malaise which has to be cured and therefore, it is imperative that we set the University in order. As far as this is concerned, I believe there is unanimity of opinion in this House.

I shall confine myself briefly to certain matters of detail which have been referred to by hon. Members with regard to the Mudaliar Committee Report and also the Bill. Hon. Members have referred to the Mudaliar Committee Report and they have pointed out that the Report is erroneous in certain details and extravagant in judgment. I have already conceded the point that the Report contains certain unfortunate expressions and references. The members of the Committee were motivated by the highest considerations for the good of the University, but in the deep concern for the good name of the University, they condemned, undesirable things which they found, very strongly and probably in sweeping terms. When all this is said,

however, the fact stands out—and it is the most important fact—that the situation as it had developed in the University was so unpleasant and so dangerous that it could not be tolerated any longer without inviting disaster not only for our universities, but also for our national life. I expect that the House will agree with me as far as this matter is concerned. I can understand the feelings of the Members coming from Eastern U.P. and I can also understand that those references should have hurt them. There are moments in our national life when we subordinate our personal feelings in the larger interests of the universities, social institutions and the country. I wish the Mudaliar Committee had not made a reference to any group by name. It is not the intention of the Committee. I am sorry that some references were made to the students. We all know that the members of this Committee have held high positions in public life and it could not be their intention to cast aspersions on the student community of the Banaras Hindu University. The students of this University are as good as those of any other university in India or as a matter of fact, of any university in the world. The Mudaliar Committee only wanted to emphasise that the University must uphold the ideals of good life.

(Interruptions.)

I have listened with great patience to the hon. Member. I have got the full report of his speech here. Sir, I am surprised that my hon. friend, Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour, thought that the Committee had come to hasty conclusions. I have already placed certain documents before the hon. Members and I am surprised that even after looking at those documents,—the letter of Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer, the report of Shri Govind Malaviya and the speeches of Dr. Radhakrishnan—my hon. friend should think that they had come to hasty conclusions. Dr. Gour also said that the Mudaliar Committee and the Government were mainly concerned with the problem of indiscipline in the University. Sir,

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

though this has been the major problem in the University, the terms of reference of the Enquiry Committee are comprehensive and I must say that the Mudaliar Committee has dealt with practically all aspects of the University life including office reorganisation, auditing, stock-taking, construction of buildings, ministerial staff and the reorganisation of the various academic bodies. Because they have made some mistakes, let us not condemn the whole Report.

Sir, to my mind, the issue that was raised, as to wherefrom the majority of the teachers come, is irrelevant. A national University like this should invite leading professors, eminent scholars, from all over the country wherever they are. In fact, in the early stages, the founder of the University tried to collect great scholars from all over the country. We are aware of it. Sir, I would not like to go into details. I have certain facts with me which, as far as I am concerned, clearly show that the University has, to some extent, lost its all-India character. I would not like to enter into this argument at this stage because I do not want to create any further unpleasantness and controversy in this matter.

Dr. Gour raised the question of the Ayurvedic College. I would like to say that the Vice-Chancellor has made all possible efforts to obtain the services of Dr. Udappa. I personally begged of the Health Minister to let us have the services of Dr. Udappa. The Minister of Health has written to say that Dr. Udappa has expressed his unwillingness to accept this post. He is again coming here tomorrow morning and it will be my earnest endeavour to persuade him to go to the University and accept this post. But ultimately, if he declines, what am I to do? The students of the Ayurvedic College are demanding that this particular person should go and take the responsibility of the principalship. If the person declines, what has the Government to do? The students

are on hunger-strike; hostels are being picketed. This is the situation which we have to face and face with patience and understanding.

With regard to the question of the Ayurvedic College, I would like to assure the House that it would be my earnest endeavour to give my personal attention to this problem. It is a complicated problem which not only concerns my Ministry, but also other Ministries and the whole question of Ayurveda and its place in the scientific medicine has to be considered. It will be my earnest endeavour, in co-operation with the Health Ministry, to try to tackle this problem. But, at this stage, I would like to convey my request and earnest desire that the students of the Ayurveda College should give up their agitational approach. I have just got news that one of the students is on hunger-strike; his condition is serious; his father came to take him away but the students would not allow him to go. These are things which are happening in the University and which might destroy the University altogether, if such things continue to proceed.

Sir, I was rather surprised that my friend, Dr. D. P. Singh, had described the Mudaliar Committee Report as Miss Mayo's "Mother India". Sir, I am sorry that he should have thought it fit to condemn the Report in these terms. I think it is wrong to attribute motives to such distinguished members of the Committee. Certain facts were placed before them and they arrived at certain conclusions and let us not attribute motives to these people. It would be difficult for any Government to invite any people who hold such public responsibility if this House condemns this Report in these terms. These people are as patriotic as anybody.

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar): I said that in a somewhat different spirit, not in the spirit . . .

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am glad that my hon. friend says that was not

his meaning. These people are as patriotic as anybody else in the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not competent for the job.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I suppose they are competent for the job. I would ask the House to suggest any better names for a Committee like this, a Committee consisting of an eminent ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, a Committee consisting of two eminent ex-Vice-Chancellors of Indian Universities, a Committee consisting of an ex-Judge of the Bombay High Court and two distinguished Members of Parliament, one of whom was connected with the University itself—Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani. I would ask the House to suggest any better team than this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Go by the Report. I can give the names from that side.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would not like to say much more about this matter. There are one or two things which I shall place before the House.

My hon. friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, I think, condemned the Report for certain inaccurate statements. I do not want to defend if there are any inaccurate statements in the Report. I think when we appoint a Committee like this, we should naturally expect that it should be accurate, that it should be precise and that there should be no factual errors. That is what we wish and we want higher standards in our public life. I do not want to defend if there are any inaccurate statements but I do not think my hon. friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh was well informed when he said that the Central Government was giving only one-fourth of the total of about two crores of rupees. He said that out of nearly two crores of rupees, the Central Government was giving only about fifty-five lakhs of rupees.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Before he passes on to another problem, may I ask the hon. Minister about the recognition of the A.B.M.S. because I have just got the information in the Consultative Committee of the Health Ministry that the procedure is that the University should apply to the Indian Medical Council? The Indian Medical Council will then send its inspectors to examine the course, curriculum, etc., but even this has not taken place. May I know from him about the position? Even an application has not been sent in.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may table a separate question. It is a different matter altogether.

DR. R. B. GOUR: No, Sir, it is not.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would like to inform the hon. Member that, as I have already stated, in consultation with my colleague the Health Minister, I would try to tackle this problem. The Indian Medical Council is an autonomous organisation. It is not a Department of the Government; it cannot work at the order of the Government and I think the whole thing will have to be examined. It will be my earnest endeavour to get this matter settled as quickly as possible. That is all that I can say at the present moment.

I think my hon. friend, Shri Jaswant Singhji, said that only 25 per cent. of the total budget of two crores was being contributed by the Central Government and, I think he said that the rest was coming from donations.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I took the figure from the Report of the Select Committee. It may be wrong.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I do not know from where the hon. Member got the figures but I shall place the figures as they are. The revised Budget Estimates for 1957-58 are as follows: Receipts—Rs. 1,20,98,229 and

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]
the total expenditure is—Rs. 1,26,94,859. Out of this the following grants are proposed to be given from the Government of India:

- (i) Rs. 55,50,000, and
- (ii) Rs. 1,29,300 for specific purposes and development schemes.

From the State Governments—

- (i) Rs. 2,73,350 from the State of Uttar Pradesh, and
- (ii) Rs. 27,000 from other States.

Now, in this, the Central and the State Governments contribute approximately 50 per cent. of the total receipts and the Central Government alone contributes nearly 46 per cent.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: What about the rest?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It comes through fees and various other sources but donation is practically negligible.

Well, there is one thing which is distressing. I think this is a matter which should concern not only the people from other parts of the country but also from U.P. Here is a Central University where the Central Government is giving the maximum grant. Let us look at the results obtained in the Indian Administrative Service and allied examinations. This is an analysis of the successful candidates at the I.A.S. and the allied services examinations contained in the Seventh Report of the U.P.S.C. for the period 1st April 1956 to 31st March, 1957. The first five Universities, I will name them, are Madras, Punjab, Delhi, Allahabad and Agra and the successful candidates number 79, 45, 45, 30 and 26 respectively. The next are Calcutta, Lucknow, Bombay, Nagpur, Poona, Rajputana, Patna, Karnatak, Saugar, Gauhati, Travancore, Utkal and Banaras. The figures are 15, 13, 11, 11, 10, 6, 6, 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, respectively. Banaras comes nearly almost at the end. Now, Sir, why is this hap-

pening? I would like the House to consider this. This is a Central University and the Government of India are giving the maximum grants to this University. We are also giving them maximum salaries in this University. Why is it then that at the competitive examination in the I.A.S. and allied examinations, even some of the new Universities like Rajputana and Saugar and Utkal have surpassed the Banaras Hindu University? I would like the House to consider the matter seriously. The truth is that the teachers and professors in the University are not giving attention to the studies and to the guidance of the students. I understand . . .

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): May I enquire from the hon. Minister about the medium of instruction in the Banaras Hindu University? Could that be responsible for this backwardness of standard in the University?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There may be various other factors but this is a matter which has to be . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Banaras has had a rather low standard for some time.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: . . . considered. This should be a matter of great concern and anxiety to this House which sanctions large amounts of grants to this University. The fact is that the teachers there are dissipating their energies in various other activities and leave out their main work, that is, teaching and research. If the Mudaliar Committee says this and brings this to the notice, we are all offended. I would like to ask the House to find out the cause of this. What can be the explanation for this state of affairs? Why have things come to this pass in the Banaras Hindu University? Why can't the Banaras Hindu University produce leaders in society who might hold high positions in our public life? Oxford and Cambridge contributed the largest share in

building up the elite of the country and in the building up of the public life and the administration of England. Why can't Banaras Hindu University which is our national University, make a similar contribution to the national life of the country?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did you ask that question of the vice-Chancellor?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Thanks to my friends sitting over there, the Vice-Chancellor is not allowed to function.

DR. R. B. GOUR: This is an insinuation.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This is not an insinuation. I am stating a fact. I would like the hon. Member—he has been there—to find out as to who the people are who are trying today to disturb the academic life of the University, who are the students, what their party affiliations are, who are trying to ruin the University today, etc. I would like the hon. Members to find that out.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You are running with the hare and hunting with the hound.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It was not my intention to introduce this heat at this stage but the hon. Members would not allow me to finish. They are not prepared to face the facts that I place before them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do it.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The only thing is that they are not facts.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Reference was made, I think by Mr. Amolakh Chand and also by Mr. Sharma, with regard to some speech which was made by Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyer when he was leaving the University. Some reference was made to the present Vice-Chancellor and we thought that that was a demaging statement to make regarding the new Vice-Chancellor who was coming in. My Ministry wrote to him on 28th

April, 1956, and asked him whether that statement which he had made about Dr. Jha was correct. I would read that letter which he wrote in reply. This is dated the 4th May, 1956. This letter was addressed to Mr. Lakhani:

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

"There was a meeting of the Executive Council at which I had to mention the fact that I had communicated to the President of India and to the Education Minister"—the late Maulana Saheb—"my resignation of the Vice-Chancellorship of the Banaras Hindu University. It is also true that Shri Humayun Kabir and Dr. Saiyidain had both spoken highly of Dr. V. S. Jha in response to my request for suggestion."

It was open to Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar to make enquiries of Shri Humayun Kabir, who had, I think, left the Ministry by then, or of Dr. Saiyidain or of anybody in the country or in the world; it was open to him and he was quite free to go and ask for suggestions and people were also free to give suggestions if they were asked for such suggestions:

"It was understood and taken for granted that the Executive Council in whom lay the right of choosing a panel should be given some sort of guidance and advice by the Vice-Chancellor as on previous occasions. I relied on the opinions of my good friends Humayun Kabir and Saiyidain and told the Council in strict confidence that persons in whom I had full confidence had suggested Dr. Jha's name and that I was willing to sponsor his choice though I was not personally acquainted with him."

That, Sir, is very different from the statement that was quoted:

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

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

This is a very damaging statement and he wrote this letter after he had left the University and he had no axe to grind.

"Evidently the news has leaked out from one of the members of the Executive Council".

There is nothing confidential in the University.

"and has been deliberately distributed and circulated with an ulterior purpose."

I need not say anything more about this statement. I am sorry to state that the statement has been quoted, but the full statement has not been placed before Members of Parliament in the pamphlets which have been distributed. I am also sorry to say that in the short span of my public life, never have I seen such propaganda being done against a measure as has been done by members of the University and I think that itself discredits the teachers who are in that University today. A statement was quoted, but the remaining portion has been left out and the remaining part I shall read out. Some hon. Members quoted out of that pamphlet:

"The other name mentioned to me is that of Dr. R. S. Tripathi. Last evening Pandit Govind Malaviya also came to see me".

He steps in whenever there is trouble in the University and whenever there is vacancy.

"and asked me whether I was against him and he said that he hopes to receive considerable support from the members of this body. The name of Justice B. Mullick, the retired Chief Justice of Allahabad High Court, has also been mentioned to me.

I have stated myself that at least three persons should be chosen as panel and it is now open to the House to suggest individual names.

If a large number of names are suggested, the ballot will have to be adopted."

"The Executive Council decided that the names of four persons should be sent to the Visitor. The following names were proposed:".

An hon. Member mentioned the number of votes, but it is not contained in the official proceedings of the Executive Council. I do not know wherefrom the hon. Member got his information. He seems to have more information than I.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This resolution which . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Let him go on.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am reading from the proceedings of the Executive Committee.

"The following names were proposed:

Shri M. C. Bijawat,
Shri Gurmukh Nihal Singh,
Dr. R. S. Tripathi,
Pandit Govind Malaviya,
Dr. P. Parija,
Shri V. S. Jha, and
The hon. Justice B. Mullick.

"Votes were taken by ballot and the following four persons secured the largest number of votes:

Shri M. C. Bijawat
Dr. R. S. Tripathi

Shri Gurmukh Nihal Singh
Shri V. S. Jha."

There is no mention of the . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He was the fourth.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Visitor has got unfettered power in the selection of the Vice-Chancellor out of the panel of names suggested to him. The Constitution has given him full powers.

SHRI T. PANDE: On a . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please sit down, Mr. Pande, let him finish.

SHRI T. PANDE: We want the number of votes given.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Will the hon. Member tell me where he got the number? Here in the proceedings of the Executive Council no number is given. It is for him to tell me wherefrom he got his information.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Wherever he got it from it is not in this. It is not contained in the official proceedings of the Council.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He came fourth.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: We want to know the number of votes obtained.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It does not give the individual votes.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: There has been voting, I think?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. No disturbance, please.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, there are one or two other points which I would like to touch. It is not my intention to enter into any further controversy, for already we have had a lot of controversy about this matter. But I must state the facts as they are. Let the House give me permission to place the facts as they appear to me.

AN HON. MEMBER: And as you know them.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, and as I know them, because I cannot concoct things as they have been concocted in the pamphlets that were distributed here.

Some hon. Member had suggested that there was no need in the new Bill to have a court. Sir, our attitude in this matter has been that we should not disturb the academic bodies as they exist in the University. The Mudaliar Committee suggested that drastic changes should be made and the whole thing should be suspended. But we said that is not necessary. Let us keep these bodies as they are, the Court, the Executive Council and the Selection Committees and others. What Government did was to eliminate the electioneering element from these bodies, and to nominate the bodies for an interim period. There is no other alternative, with all these things happening in the University. Hon. Members have seen not only what one Vice-Chancellor has to say, but what several Vice-Chancellors have to say. With the kind of things happening in the University, Government had no other alternative than to nominate the members to the Executive Council and the . . .

SHRI T. PANDE: May I . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, Mr. Pande,

SHRI T. PANDE: May I with your permission . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot speak when the hon. Minister is on his legs.

श्री टी० पांडे : मे बोल नहीं रहा हूँ। मैं एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। मुदलियार कमेटी ने यह सजेस्ट किया है कि रिश्तेदार उसमें न हों। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो सिनेट नामिनेट किया है, विजिटर ने जो एक्जिक्युटिव नामिनेट किया है, क्या उसमें दो भाई हैं ? मेरा यह पहला प्रश्न है ? आपसे मैं दूसरा प्रश्न यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के जो अध्यापक हैं, जो कोर्ट के मेम्बर हैं—मुझ को भी आपने नामिनेट किया है—वहाँ के स्टाफ के जो लोग हैं, और वहाँ की एक्जिक्युटिव के जो मेम्बर हैं, उनमें आपस में विवाह शादी की जाय या न की जाय ?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The hon. Member is raising questions which have no relevancy to the points that I am dealing with.

As I said, under the present circumstances, there was no other alternative than to nominate people to the Court and to the Executive Council and we have selected people of the highest integrity and character, people who have rendered great public service to the community and to the country, for this Executive Council. It is after great care and careful selection and deliberation that we have nominated these persons on the Executive Council. After all, the heavens have not fallen down. The Court is given certain functions. I do not want to disturb the Court, because I think it would be a sad day when public men are not associated with our universities. There is something fundamental involved in these matters. Even though they are nominated, they must be associated with the University. It would be a very sad day if the University were to be run by an administrator. People here want to maintain the autonomy of universities. People want to preserve the academic life of the University

and they are here criticising the Government for having kept the Court as it is. Members have been nominated, but we have not scrapped the Court because it has certain important functions in the University's life. Those who are connected with the University are fully aware that public men should be associated with the Court so that they can give their advice from time to time. And therefore, it was necessary to keep the Court and to nominate the members. After all, this is an interim measure. The heavens have not fallen down. We have selected the best men available in the country. Why are people so disturbed and worried about this matter, I cannot understand. After all, this is a short-term measure and we are proposing to bring in a comprehensive measure when people will have full opportunity to discuss these things more fully. An emergency had arisen . . .

SHRI D. P. SINGH: How long will it take?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am coming to that also. Well, Sir, another proposal was made, and I think it was made by my hon. friend Shri Mahesh Saran, and he suggested that the present Vice-Chancellor should have nothing to do with the Executive Committee, a most fantastic suggestion that I can think of.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN (Bihar): Not this Vice-Chancellor.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: How can any university run without a Vice-Chancellor? It is something which I cannot understand. If the Vice-Chancellor has lost confidence, the Vice-Chancellor must go, but the university cannot run without a Vice-Chancellor and the Executive Committee cannot function without a Vice-Chancellor. This is the basic principle of university administration which I think we should understand.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Not this Vice-Chancellor.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: That is a different matter. Now objections were raised by hon. Members why he was present at the Enquiry Committee. Well, Sir, I would like to say that the old Executive Council where representatives of some of these so-called groups were also present passed a resolution at its meeting held on 27th July, 1957 to the effect that the Vice-Chancellor will represent the University at the enquiry instituted by the Visitor. This was the resolution passed by the old Executive Council, as required under the Act itself, and therefore the Vice-Chancellor was present according to this provision. Sir, he had not lost confidence at that time; he lost the confidence of these people only after the Report was out. What has happened in the interval? Let us examine the whole situation. This Executive Council, the old one, was a duly constituted Council and it had passed this resolution that the Vice-Chancellor should be present at the Enquiry Committee. As soon as the Enquiry Committee Report was published the Vice-Chancellor lost all their confidence. Well, we can understand the reasons why this has happened.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Even in the Allahabad University the Vice-Chancellor was associated with the Enquiry Committee while the enquiry was going on.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: The circumstances were different.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Circumstances were different but the circumstances that you are thinking of don't exist.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Well, Sir, I would not like to enter into further controversy about these matters. What is happening in the Banaras Hindu University is only a symptom of the greater and more deep seated disease in our academic life and in our universities. At present there is great unrest and confusion in the minds of young people who study in the universities. The present instabi-

lity, confusion, and sense of futility are largely the result of undesirable influences exercised by unscrupulous groups and individuals on the student population. I do not blame the student community. They are as good anywhere in the country; I think it is a failure of leadership, and we don't realise what great harm we are doing to the future generation by exploiting them for selfish political purposes. Sir, these influences have to be rooted out from our universities so that the students might be able to pursue knowledge and seek truth and work in an academic atmosphere. If this does not happen, the younger generation in our seats of learning will drift into indiscipline and futility. Such a drift threatens serious consequences to the health of our society. We cannot afford to wait in indecision and apathy in this matter; we have to act swiftly, wisely and purposefully. Sir, we are dealing with the future welfare of the youth of the country and I would like to appeal to the House again and the members of the various political groups. Let us, in the interest of the future generation, rise above party politics and party affiliations and help the future generation by making them fit to serve our society. All parties and sections must unite to eradicate the evil influence which poisons the atmosphere of our universities. I hope this Bill will find ready response among all sections of this House and among all groups and parties in the country. This Bill is merely a step towards establishing better conditions and higher standards in our universities and making them truly academic bodies of which the nation can be proud. Well, Sir, I have done.

There is one more point about which I must explain. It will be my earnest endeavour to bring forward the comprehensive measure as quickly as possible, but I would also like to tell the House that the Mudaliar Committee have made certain recommendations which entail certain consultations. The U. P. Government will have to be consulted. I must also

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]
consult the University Grants Commission. They are vitally concerned.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Other Governments too.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have also to consult the academic bodies of the University, and all this process will take some time, but I will assure the House that I am most anxious that normal conditions should be restored in the University as quickly as possible. I have great respect for university autonomy. I would myself feel unhappy if this situation is prolonged for a long period, but at the same time we must understand that university autonomy also means certain social responsibilities. We must understand the nature of university autonomy. If we allow that anything may happen inside the campus and inside the University, nobody can touch them from outside, that is not what we understand by university autonomy. University autonomy, as my friend Mr. Sapru rightly pointed out, always means greater social responsibility, and I would like to warn here the various teachers and groups who are functioning to-day in the University that unless they show a greater sense of social responsibility, unless they understand that they have a responsibility towards their students and towards the society, I am afraid we shall soon lose whatever autonomy we have inside the universities.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

There are no amendments to clauses 2 to 6.

Clauses 2 to 6 were added to the Bill.

Clause 7—Amendment of Statutes

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are four amendments—two are in the name of Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar. He is not here. You move yours, Dr. Gour.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I move:

2. "That at page 3, after line 27, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that no officer or member of the staff who had been a member of the Court on the 14th June, 1958, shall be renominated during the operation of this Act.'

3. "That at page 3, after line 37, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that no officer of the University or member of the staff who had been serving on the Executive Council on the 14th June, 1958, shall be renominated to the Council during the operation of this Act.'

(The amendments also stood in the name of Shri V. Prasad Rao.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause and the amendments are before the House.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I am not going into other things and I shall confine my remarks to these particular amendments. As regards other things at the third reading stage I may have to say something. Sir, I would beg of the hon. Minister to consider this question, these two amendments Nos. 2 and 3 are very important in the sense that you have said that the Executive Council is a new Executive Council, the instrument of your new approach to reform the University and it is going to have the main responsibility in do-

ing the new job that you have taken in your hands. Let me also remind the hon. Minister that he has accepted a lot of responsibility directly or indirectly by accepting the proposal of nomination to all these bodies, the Court as well as the Executive Council. Therefore what is the wrong in accepting my amendment that those gentlemen of the staff or the officers of the University who were members of the Executive Council on the day you promulgated your Ordinance will not be renominated for the period you want this Act to be in operation because it is this Executive Council which is going to present a *prima facie* case to the Solicitor-General. It is this Executive Council that is going to take the final decision after the case has come back from the reviewing Committee and it is this Executive Council that is going to be the main vehicle, the main instrument of your new approach, the new responsibility and the new reforms that you want to bring about in the Banaras Hindu University. I therefore, feel, and very strongly feel, that my amendment should be accepted by the hon. Minister in the very interest which he has in view.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I am not accepting this amendment for the simple reason that the argument which has been advanced by my hon. friend does not convince me. Now, the Bill, as it is, has made all the necessary safeguards. Those people who were in the old Executive Committee would not influence the decisions in any way. Take for example the Vice-Chancellor himself. He was a member of the old Executive Committee. He will again sit in the new Executive Council. What will happen? Suppose a complaint comes to the Executive Council—it is a very unhappy thing—about the Vice-Chancellor. Then the Executive Council will not discuss that matter. They will just pass on all the papers to the Solicitor-General and the Solicitor-General if he is satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case he would then send the thing to the Reviewing

Committee and when the Reviewing Committee is convinced that there is a case against the Vice-Chancellor, then he will not sit in the Executive Council when the case is being considered. These safeguards have been made in the Bill.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): Is 'Vice-Chancellor' included in the definition of 'Members of the Executive Committee'?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes; naturally he is the Chairman of the Executive Committee.

*Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That at page 3, after line 37, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that no officer of the University or member of the staff who had been serving on the Executive Council on the 14th June, 1958, shall be renominated to the Council during the operation of this Act.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 8 and 9 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I move:

7. "That at page 1, the existing clause 1 be renumbered as sub-

*For text of amendment, vide col. 2942 *supra*.

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

clause (1) thereof, and after the sub-clause as so renumbered, the following be inserted, namely:—

“(2) This Act shall cease to remain in force at the end of six months from the date of its commencement.”

1. “That at page 1, lines 3-4, for the brackets and word ‘(Amendment)’ the brackets and words ‘(Temporary Amendment)’ be substituted.”

(The amendments also stood in the name of Shri V. Prasad Rao.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar is not here.

The clause and the amendments are before the House.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I was rather tempted to accept the amendment of Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar if he had moved it. I did not know he would be absent; otherwise I would have asked someone from my party to just send a note to add my name to it, but I did not know this was going to happen. Nevertheless, I would request the hon. Minister to let me know when he is going to bring the other Bill since he is very emphatic about the fact that very soon he is going to bring forward a comprehensive Bill. Prof. Wadia has explicitly said that he does not want this for more than a year. He said six months or if that is not practicable . . .

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I am not a Member of the Government; it was only my personal view.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You are a member of the House and you can vote for my amendment because you are not bound since you are a nominated Member. Sir, I would like to make a test of this to see whether this amendment is accepted or not.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I have already explained to the House that certain consultations will have to take place between the various bodies and the Governments which are connected with the University. I have already given an assurance that it will be my earnest endeavour to bring forward this comprehensive measure as quickly as possible and I think after this assurance the hon. Member should withdraw the amendment rather than press it to a vote.

DR. R. B. GOUR: He can give us an idea at least. We are not going to catch him by the throat.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Prime Minister himself . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How can he commit himself?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I can't commit myself to any date; I shall be very happy if it can be brought forward even before one year, but I cannot give a firm date right now.

*Amendments No. 7 and 1 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That clause 1 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The enacting formula and the title were added to the Bill.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Bill be passed.”

Sir, I would just say one or two words; I would not add anything more. The greater task still lies ahead. We have passed the legislation but the problems which lie

*For texts of amendments, vide cols. 2944-45 supra.

before us are of great magnitude and we will need the co-operation of all the Members of this House as well as of the public and I do hope that after this debate, after the decision has been taken by this House, normal conditions will be restored in the University. Things are pretty serious there. The Vice-Chancellor was not allowed to enter the campus. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor's house is being picketed and the University life is completely paralysed, and I would make an appeal to the Members of this House to exercise their personal influence. I know my friend there has been to the University and he knows what is happening and if only he would exercise his personal influence he can set matters right and I would request hon. Members to make an earnest effort. This is not a political matter; this is a matter which concerns the vitality of the nation; this is a matter which concerns the whole country, the whole society and not any particular political group. I would like the House to take this measure in this spirit and try to help the Government in building up and rebuilding this University and making it a real national University of our country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think, Sir, we can sit for some time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: For two or three minutes. He has made an appeal to you. Respond to him and be done with it.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Responding to appeal must also be accompanied with a certain amount of words. Some uncharitable remarks have been made about me by some speakers in the first reading debate and therefore I think it would be . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes; take five minutes and be done with it.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, well, I have heard with patience and with a sufficient amount of coolness—I do not get hot very frequently—the speeches of hon. Members during the first reading stage and also the sweet appeal of the hon. Minister of Education just now. But I think . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, yours also must be a sweet speech

DR. R. B. GOUR: But there is a little salt in my speech. Now in his reply to the first reading stage the hon. Minister travelled from placing the responsibility for indiscipline among the students on the teachers—which was done by the Mudaliar Committee—to pinning the responsibility on my party for the trouble that is going on.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I do not think it was so. Let us not accuse each other. I think all the political parties are responsible for this state of affairs that is prevailing in the University today and all of us must share the responsibility. I am not blaming any particular group.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am very happy.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Therefore, much of that thing has gone.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That salt has gone. Now, I must very seriously tell the hon. Minister that we never for a moment disagreed with him on two counts and I think on this matter there is an element of unanimity in our House. In spite of the fact that certain temper or heat was generated because of certain remarks which I have already said, two points of agreement are there. One point of agreement is that there was some trouble in the University; and the other point of agreement is, let us boldly tackle this University. Nobody has brought the point, as it was brought in the other House, that there is trouble in every University, so why not simultaneously do it? Let us begin and let us do this here. Now,

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

therefore, on these two points there is agreement. I must tell him that he must have been warned sufficiently about the whole debate. I think that there are certain things which are really responsible for certain tempers that have arisen, for certain emotions that have arisen, certain excitements that have been caused. I, therefore, feel that so far as reforming the University is concerned, in any democratic method that he takes, with proper care and consultation, he has our good wishes for it. After all we can only give our good wishes from this side so far as we are concerned in Parliament, because we are not parties to the decision. At least we were not parties to the Mudaliar Committee, we were not parties to their findings, we were not parties to the Ordinance, we were not parties to the policy decisions that they had taken and that are being taken. That margin will have to be there always. So, we wish him every success in his approach to reform the University. On that account let there be no difference of opinion, let there be no mincing of words, let there be no conflict. Another good news he has given this afternoon is that Dr. Udappa is coming tomorrow and consultations are going to be there. Much of the difficulties are no more existing after certain decisions that have already been taken, after making him permanent in Himachal Pradesh. I, therefore, again give all my good wishes to the Government for their success in persuading him to accept it in the interest of the University and College. Also, I think on behalf of the House Dr. Shrimali will be absolutely justified if he tells him that here is Parliament, Rajya Sabha, which wants that he should take it as a matter of public interest, even though it may cause him certain difficulty and certain inconvenience. Therefore, if tomorrow evening that is possibly decided, I am sure day after tomorrow there will be peace in the Banaras Hindu University so far as the Ayurvedic College is concerned. As far as the

recognition side of it is concerned, I know it will require time, inspection, everything. I think when this matter is being tackled at the highest level between the Education Ministry, Health Ministry and the Indian Medical Council, when they have waited for twenty years for the recognition of the A.B.M.S., another few months, another year would not matter. But, nevertheless, I think we have realised the fact that for the last twenty years the boys are getting educated, getting their degree, without any prospects in life. Therefore, the anxiety is absolutely genuine. Now, I have been categorically asked by Dr. Kunzru and Prof. Wadia as to why is it that I had not a word of condemnation for the tactics that the students of the Ayurvedic college have adopted. Well, I could put squarely the same question to him. Why is it that he has not got a single word of regret for the tactics that the present administration of Banaras Hindu University has been adopting for the last few years during which they are in power? Therefore, I openly tell him. Let you and I together decide on this. You condemn the trio, then I disapprove of the tactics, and then let us go together. There will be no problem.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Go where?

DR. R. B. GOUR: To the students. But Dr. Kunzru and Prof. Wadia are very cleverly shielding the cause and raising the consequences to a very high pitch unnecessarily. Well, that is wrong. That is a wrong approach. You may not be able to solve it and, therefore, I beg of the hon. Minister not to . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He said the University authorities have done everything to satisfy the desire of the Ayurvedic college students.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am sorry. It is not correct. For heaven's sake it is not correct. In February they said in three months it would be done, and in August again the problem has

arisen. Even now, I have to tell you that a formal application from the University has not come to the Indian Medical Council for recognition. A formal application, according to the rules, ought to go to them. I cannot say, but for the last twenty years this has been a problem. Let the formal application go. It has to be viewed very seriously and I read out to you from the minutes and the decisions that were taken in the standing committee of the academic council on the demands of the Ayurvedic college students, where it is said that a letter is being sent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. He has promised to look into that.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Therefore, I do say that here is a problem that has to be looked into. Again I have my own doubts about these some important people; well, now, at this stage there is no use going into the details of the case. I ask only one question now whether with the present set of gentlemen who hold the reins of administration, it will be possible to reform the University. They may be very good men. In fact, the Banaras Hindu University has had to part with very good men, Dr. Radhakrishnan, Amar Nath Jha, Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Acharya Narendra Deva. I do not think the present Vice-Chancellor is more eminent than all these gentlemen. Without casting any aspersion at this stage, let me ask you one simple question. Without changing the administrative head of the University today, do you think you will be able to carry conviction to the students of the Banaras University, the citizens of Banaras and the people of U.P.? Let us see to this very simple thing. Much water has flowed. Therefore, in your own interest, in the interests of the University, you have to take a practical view of the thing and take a decision on that. I have not got much to do with it, but my own apprehension is that without doing that there will be obstacles in your way.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: It is rather unfortunate that Dr. Gour has considered it necessary to condemn the new Executive Council and those who have been installed in power before . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sorry, I have not done it.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: . . . they are given an opportunity of functioning.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I have not done it.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: My friend had another opportunity of condemning the action of the students, but he has not done so. Now, the thing that we placed before the students who came to meet us two weeks ago in the University campus was this, let the Executive Council function, without which nothing whatsoever can be done by way of removing their long-term grievances. That is the first condition which has to be satisfied before any forward move can be taken in the matter of meeting their grievances. They agreed, but what was the result? When the Councillors, along with the Vice-Chancellor who is an integral part of the Executive Council, were intending to enter the campus to hold their meeting, two thousand people were collected and their entry was barred. The result was that nothing whatsoever could be done. The Executive Councillors were overwhelmed with one supreme consideration as to how law and order could be established, in order that they might get into the campus and start functioning. Therefore, these matters which my friend has very legitimately referred to are administrative matters which have got to be dealt with in the usual course as laid down by the rules and the Act, and for which the Executive Councillors have got to meet, which was effectively barred by the persons on whose behalf my friend raised this plea. I would, therefore, beg of him not to emphasize this aspect of the matter so much but to join in a

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.]
common endeavour to persuade these young people away from the path of unreason to the path of reason, so that their real grievances can be met for which every member of the Executive Council is anxious and desirous to discharge his function as early as possible and as effectively as possible. I would beg of him once again during this Third Reading stage to respond to the earnest and sincere appeal which has been addressed by the hon. Minister and to join us all in trying to persuade these misguided people back to the path of reason so that their own best interests can be effectively safeguarded by all concerned.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mr Deputy Chairman, my hon. friend Dr. Gour said that he did not condemn the students for the very same reason for which Prof. Wadia and I did not condemn the administration. I mean he meant that he would ask the students to give up their present attitude only when the Vice-Chancellor and all those connected with the present administration were sent away. He spoke first. He did not know what anybody else was going to say. He condemned the administration of the Banaras Hindu University. He acknowledged that there was a pressure group in the University, yet he would not say one word against the students. I know the reason, and I can tell him the reason in the lobby.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not here?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is not necessary to go into it. The hon. Member has further said that when eminent men like Dr. Radhakrishnan, Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar and Acharya Narendra Deva left the University, why should not a man of lesser distinction be asked to leave it? Did the fact that these people severed their connection with the University improve the state of affairs there? Was it for the good of the University that they left it? Or has their departure from the University only

strengthened the wire-pullers there and made them bold enough to bring the University to this pass?

DR. R. B. GOUR: According to you they should go after the Reviewing Committee condemns them.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I do not mind his disturbances. He can interrupt me as many times as he likes because I can deal with him effectively. He regards the dismissal of the present administration as a very simple matter. He is not so immature or so inexperienced as not to realise the consequences of his suggestion. I am sure he realises them. He knows that if the Vice-Chancellor was removed, no Vice-Chancellor in future will ever find it easy to carry on the work of the University. He said that the students would never be satisfied unless the Vice-Chancellor was removed. I have told you already, Sir, what the students of the several colleges of the Banaras Hindu University did in order to express their disapproval of the conduct of the students of the Ayurvedic College and the Law College. I can give you one more instance of the discipline and courage shown by the students, the general body of students. Sir, a short while ago there was a meeting of the Standing Committee of the Academic Council. It considered a request made by the students of the Ayurvedic College and came to a decision which was not satisfactory to them. When the members came out, the students asked them what the decision was, and then they prevented the members of the Standing Committee from leaving the office where the Committee had met.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Until the decision was changed in their favour.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Yes, they said they would allow these members to go home only when the decision was changed in their favour. The other students of the University came to know of it, and I believe the students of the Mining and Metallurgy

College, of the College of Agriculture, and some other students went to the office building in large numbers and asked these people that they should leave the place.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am sorry, Sir, unfortunately Dr. Kunzru is going into an incident which will again create a big controversy. I am sure that a false rumour was spread that the Principal was detained and then those students came.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend is always very sure of what he says. That is what he has been told by interested people.

DR. R. B. GOUR: In fact the leaders of the Action Committee were responsible for dispersing the students.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Not the Action Committee. It was this large body of students that made the Action Committee realise that it could not continue to act in the improper manner in which it had already acted. And the students did not merely belong to the Engineering College. They belonged to the other Colleges also. To say, therefore, that a false rumour which was spread, that the Principal of the Engineering College had been detained by the Ayurvedic students, brought the students of the Engineering College to the office building is absolutely incorrect. So far as I remember, the Principal of the Engineering College was there. But that does not mean that the students of the Engineering College came simply because their Principal was not allowed to leave the office building by the students of the Ayurvedic College.

Sir, in these circumstances there is no justification for asking the Vice-Chancellor to resign. If this is done, the consequences will be serious, not merely to the Banaras Hindu University but to every University in India. If you want that indiscipline should prevail everywhere, that a few unruly students should be put in a position

in every University to do what they like and to compel the authorities to bow to them, certainly ask the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University to go away. But if you want the Universities to be temples of learning, to be places where the students will learn both to obey and to command, where they will learn discipline and spend their time in diligently acquiring that knowledge which will fit them for any position of leadership that they may occupy in future, then for heaven's sake do not yield to this clamour against the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor in the difficult circumstances in which he was placed has done extraordinarily well. He has shown courage and efficiency in the discharge of his duties. No action has been taken by him in any important matter except with the concurrence of the Executive Council, and I can say from personal knowledge that he has never withheld any important fact from the Executive Council. Even when action had to be taken against a Professor, all the facts were placed before the Executive Council which contained people who were against him. There was a full discussion in the Executive Council and it was only then that the Executive Council decided to appoint a Committee of Inquiry. Sir, the only fault of that Vice-Chancellor is that he has stood up to those who wanted to make his work impossible. The real desire of those who are opposing the Vice-Chancellor is to compel the Government to drop the Reviewing Committee. If the Government is prepared to do that, there will be no outcry against the Vice-Chancellor or against any other authority of the University. But I am sure it is clear that the Government is determined not to yield to this unreasonable demand. It has made up its mind to utilise this crisis to shape things in such a way as to enable the Hindu University and all the other universities in India to function with full vigour and efficiency, so that the rising generation may receive the training that will fit them for the citizenship of the India of the future.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, I desire to congratulate Dr. Shrimali on piloting this measure successfully. The House is entitled to say that much of the trouble that has arisen in regard to this Bill is due to the sketchy character of the Mudaliar Committee's Report. The House is entitled to expect accuracy of statement and fullness of treatment from eminent men who undertake to serve on committees. Of course, broadly speaking, the picture given in the Report, as I said, is true. But there should be even no minor inaccuracies in a report of this importance. Unfortunately, the impression is that the Report is of a slipshod character, not expected of men of the eminence of distinguished men who constituted the Committee. It should have been of a monumental character.

Having said this, I would emphasise that there should be no undue delay in bringing forward a comprehensive measure. I am sure there will not be any undue delay in this.

Reference has been made to the sex-life of the students also. There must have been some evidence to that effect. The sex-life of our students is, generally speaking, good. I think it compares very favourably with the sex-life of students in other parts of the world. I think we can take pride in the fact that our students have a good and healthy outlook on sex.

I would also like to say that this House should give all the support that it can to the Vice-Chancellor. It would be a great tragedy indeed if the Vice-Chancellor were to retire as a result of this agitation and the work of other universities would become very, very difficult. The task of maintaining discipline in the universities will become well-nigh impossible. Our students have to be encouraged to learn the art of self-restraint and self-restraint alone can make them great.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say that I share the feelings of my friends of Eastern U. P. in regard to things that have been said about Eastern U.P. but I would not attach too much importance to some stray remarks here and there.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: Sir, I would take only one minute. I would make a request to the hon. Members of the House that, after all the discussion here, after getting a full opportunity to put their views before the House, they—particularly those from U.P.—should now take the opportunity to go to the University as a sort of Peace committee and impress upon the students to forget the past and take everything in a new spirit. I would also like to make a suggestion on the floor of the House that the Vice-Chancellor should take all the criticisms as a sort of suggestion and he should take it as a challenge of those unruly elements to bring order in the University.

My request to the people in the Opposition would be to stop using the student population for whatever purpose it may be, as their future may be . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am not going to accept that the Communist Party is responsible for this.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: I would like to say this to any other party also. There is no doubt that there are many parties which have got their political offices in the Campus. I would like to say that judging from the trend of the speeches in this House, the Opposition also has joined in this move to the Campus. After all, the students are of an impressionable age. They would even like to go to the Vice-Chancellor and shake hands with him and say, "Let us forget the past in the interests of the country" as was so nicely put by Dr. Kunzru. Let us begin a good era for the country and this will be a good lesson for the other universities. I hope Dr. Shrimali will

appoint a small Committee and we wait for the next comprehensive Bill in the proper atmosphere.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I have nothing more to add. I would only like to say that, now that this House is passing this Bill, the students and teachers will bow to the decision of this House and accept this Bill. I would also like to say that the future of our country is at stake. The Banaras Hindu University is a test for us. If we can put this University right, this will have its effect on other universities of our country. We must look at this as a national problem and if this is not handled properly, it will affect our whole national life.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-eight minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 12th September 1958.