

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not think it is necessary for me to deal with the speeches that have been made, but I just want to make a few remarks. I think repeatedly exaggerating the extent of corruption, the existence of which is not denied, will recoil on our society and on ourselves. We want our people to be clean, but the way to clean them and to raise their standard of purity does not lie through wholesale condemnation of the entire community. Our officers are being invited by distant countries and they often come back with laurels, with plaudits and with high praise. Our machine would have cracked if it had been corrupt to the extent some people allege it to be. It has a heavy burden to carry. It has to maintain peace in this vast land. It has to work for the uplift and progress, for the promotion of unity and security, and to a large extent, it depends on the morale of our people, on the morale of our services. I must say that the few black sheep that may be here and there should not in any way delude us and lead us to the conclusion that everything is black. Let us not look at things with a jaundiced eye. Our efforts should be not to have a single corrupt man in the services. Let us remember that all those in the services today are our own kith and kin. They represent and reflect the morale and the standard of our society. If there is bribery, there is some one who gives and there is some one who takes. There are a few who resort to such practices. Let us not then unduly magnify the evil. While sticking to the determination that no single public servant should be unclean in his methods or ways, let us remember that it rests with us to a large extent to build a society which is really high in morals and in its spirits and in its ideals. Keeping that before us, let us not exaggerate the deficiencies which are really of a very limited character. On the whole, those who are responsible for running the administration of this country have been doing a fine good job for which we all should thank them.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

Mr. Chairman: Maulana Azad.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): rose.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Is the Minister unable to be present here in the House?

Mr. Chairman: Evidently, he is absent.

Dr. M. M. Das: I beg to move:

"That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration".

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): On a point of order. Can a Parliamentary Secretary move a Bill? He is in the capacity of a private Member, no more than a private Member. This is not a private Member's Bill. Can he move it?

The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall): The Parliamentary Secretary is authorised to move the Bill, and the Deputy Minister is present here.

Shri Kamath: Under what rule of procedure can he move the Bill?

Mr. Chairman: Under what rule does the hon. Member want to object?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The Member in charge alone can move it.

Mr. Chairman: I understand the hon. Member cannot cite any rule or authority under which he raises the objection. The word 'Minister' includes Parliamentary Secretary according to the Rules of Procedure.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am sorry. You, Sir, are a lawyer. Negative is never proved. I can show a blank paper; a negative is not to be proved. What I say is that there should be a positive assertion on their side.

Mr. Chairman: According to the definition given in the Rules, Minister includes Parliamentary Secretary.

Shri Kamath: Where is the definition?

Mr. Chairman: I have seen it in the Rules of Procedure.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): In the Constitution, there is only mention of Council of Ministers; there is no mention of Parliamentary Secretaries. So it does not include Parliamentary Secretaries.

Mr. Chairman: Does he quote any rule in support?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: According to the Constitution, a Minister does not include Parliamentary Secretary.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I make a submission that this is not the first occasion when I have moved a Bill.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member himself moved the Bill on the last occasion.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Two wrongs do not make one right.

Dr. M. M. Das: The University Grants Commission Bill, which is before the House now was referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses on the 28th February 1955. The discussion that took place upon the motion of referring the Bill to a Joint Committee lasted for about six hours. During this discussion not only the broad principles and the objects and reasons of the Bill were taken into consideration but also each and every provision of the Bill was subjected to a detailed scrutiny by a large number of hon. Members who took part in the discussion. Thus both the Central Government and the Joint Committee

had an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the views expressed on the floor of this House by hon. Members and profit from them. The Joint Committee held ten sittings in all and submitted their report on the 29th July. The Committee had the great advantage of having among its members a number of Vice-Chancellors and Professors of great eminence and repute. With the advice and guidance of these eminent educationists who command the confidence of the country and who are universally respected, the deliberations of the Committee were conducted in most harmonious, non-partisan and cordial manner.

Shri Kamath: Did the Parliamentary Secretary attend the sittings of the Committee?

Dr. M. M. Das: Certainly I attended and that is why I speak with authority. I shall greatly fail in my duty if I do not at this stage pay a tribute to the pains and care that the Joint Committee took in discussing the pros and cons of every controversial question and trying to reach some agreed decisions. The Committee was fully conscious of the great importance of this measure and its far-reaching consequences. They never forget for a moment that they were dealing with the universities, the supreme, the greatest educational organisations of our country, upon whose well being and development depends the future of India. The House will remember that the majority of the Members who took part in the debate proceeding the referring of the Bill to the Joint Committee, without any distinction of party affiliations expressed great concern and laid great emphasis upon the academic independence and autonomous character of our universities. Many of the Members expressed the fear that the University Grants Commission will be nothing more than an appendage of the Central Government, and the Central Government through this Commission will exert undue influence upon our universities, with the result that the autonomy of the universities will be endangered. For the

[Dr. M. M. Das]

satisfaction of the hon. Members who expressed such a view, I may submit that the maintenance of the academic independence and autonomy of our universities were the keynotes or the guiding principles of the Committee. The Committee all through its deliberations was extremely anxious not to include any provisions—even a sentence, even a word—which would be construed to give either in the hands of the Central Government or in the hands of the Commission some authority over the universities. If the two Bills—the original Bill which was introduced in this House and the Bill that has come from the Joint Committee—are compared, hon. Members will be convinced that great care was taken by the Committee to eliminate everything which would be construed, according to some Members, to be detrimental to our universities. Not only that the provisions which were considered objectionable by the Committee were omitted but new provisions were added, words were added, sentences were added, which would ensure the full autonomy and academic independence of our Universities. In fact, if I may say so, the Committee has reduced the University Grants Commission into a mere advisory consultative body, having no power to enforce its recommendations or decisions.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hosharpur): Then withdraw the Bill.

Dr. M. M. Das: The penalty clause about which many Members spoke with great grievance has been drastically revised and today the University Grants Commission has been authorised to give only this punishment namely, that if a university does not agree or refuses to carry out its recommendations, then it can only withhold its grant; no other punishment can be imposed by it.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: That is the biggest penalty.

Dr. M. M. Das: The Government of India, in keeping with its true democratic traditions and as a true believer in

the academic independence and autonomy of our universities.....

Shri Kamath: The Minister or he?

Dr. M. M. Das: Both; I am acting on behalf of the Minister. The Government have accepted the report of the Committee *in toto*. The only amendment which we propose to move at a later period is about the disbursement of the maintenance grant to the four Central Universities—Aligarh, Banaras, Delhi and Viswa Bharati.

I may mention in brief the important changes made in the Bill by the Joint Committee. The first important change suggested is about clause 2, sub-clause (f). The Committee considered that affiliated colleges should also come under the purview of the Commission and the Commission should give financial aid to affiliated colleges of our country. But the Committee also realised that the limited resources at the disposal of the Grants Commission would not permit them to deal with all the affiliated colleges in the country, whose number is rather very large. The Committee, therefore, empowered the Commission to select for grants from affiliated colleges whom they think proper on the recommendations of the university concerned. The next important change suggested by the Committee is in clause 5, about the constitution of the University Grants Commission itself. Three changes have been proposed by the Committee. Firstly, as a result of this change, the number of members of the Commission has been fixed at nine. Secondly, non-official members are in a majority. Thirdly, the chairman will have to be nominated from among the non-official members.

Regarding the terms and conditions of the members of the Commission, two changes have been proposed, one is clause 6, sub-clause (1) and the other in clause 6, sub-clause (4). Firstly, power has been taken away from the Central Government to terminate the service of a member before the usual period unless he incurs some disqualifications according to the

rules framed under the Act. Secondly, the specific provision that the Chairman should always be a whole-time officer has been done away with.

5 P.M.

Mr. Chairman: May I know if the hon. Member will take some more time?

Dr. M. M. Das: About seven minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Then he can continue tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday the 23rd November, 1955.
