

FOURTEENTH REPORT
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1985-86)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED
STUDY, SIMLA**

**Action taken by Government on the Recommendations
contained in the Eighty-Eighth Report of Estimates
Committee (Seventh Lok Sabha)**



सत्यमेव जयते

Presented to Lok Sabha on

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

September, 16, 1985/Bhadra, 25, 1907 (Saka)

Price: Rs. 1.05

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE STUDY GROUP ON ACTION TAKEN REPORTS OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1985-86).	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
CHAPTER I. Report	1
CHAPTER II. Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by Government	7
CHAPTER III. Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies	14
CHAPTER IV. Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee	15
CHAPTER V. Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are awaited	18
APPENDIX Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 88th Report of Estimates Committee (7th Lok Sabha)	19

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1985-86)

CHAIRMAN

Shri Chintamanj Panigrahi

MEMBERS

2. Shri Jai Parkash Agarwal
3. Shri Sarfaraz Ahmad
4. Shri T. Basheer
5. Shri Manoranjan Bhakta
6. Shri Birinder Singh
7. Shri Saifuddin Chowdary
8. Shri Somjibhai Damor
9. Prof. Madhu Dandavate
10. Shri N. Dennis
11. Shrimati Sheila Dikshit
12. Shri G. L. Dogra
13. Shri H. N. Nanje Gowda
14. Shri M. R. Janardhanan
15. Shri Keyur Bhushan
16. Shri Lal Duhoma
17. Shri Mahavir Prasad
18. Shri Hanan Mollah
19. Shri Ajay Narayan Mushran
20. Shri Ram Pyare Panika
21. Shri Uttamrao Patil
22. Shri Jagannath Patnaik
23. Shri B. B. Ramaiah
24. Shri Navin Ravani
25. Shri Bhola Nath Sen
26. Prof. Nirmala Kumari Shaktawat
27. Shri Satyendra Narain Sinha

28. Shri P. K. Thungon
29. Shri Nissankara Rao Venkataratnam
30. Shri D. P. Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N. N. Mehra—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Bipin Behari—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*
3. Shri Ram Kishore—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

STUDY GROUP ON ACTION TAKEN REPORTS
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1985-86)

1. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi—*Chairman*
2. Prof. Madhu Dandavate—*Convener*
3. Shri G. L. Dogra
4. Smt. Sheila Dikshit
5. Shri D. P. Yadav
6. Shri Manoranjan Bhakta
7. Shri M. R. Janardhanan
8. Shri Hannan Mollah
9. Shri B. B. Ramaiah

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Estimates Committee having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Fourteenth Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Eighty-eighth Report of Estimates Committee (7th Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Education and Culture—Institute of Advanced Study, Simla.

2. The 88th Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 22 August, 1984. Government furnished their replies indicating action taken on the recommendations contained in that Report by 22 February, 1985. The draft Report was adopted by the Committee and their sitting held on 4 September, 1985.

3. The Report has been divided into the following Chapter:

- I. Report
- II. Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by Government.
- III. Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies.
- IV. Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee.
- V. Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government are awaited.

4. An analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 88th Report of Estimates Committee is given in the Appendix. It would be observed therefrom that out of 11 recommendations made in the Report, 7 recommendations i.e. 63 per cent have been accepted by Government. Replies of Government in respect of 4 recommendations i.e. about 36 per cent have not been accepted by the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
September 16, 1985
Bhadra 25, 1907 (S)

CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI,
Chairman,
Estimates Committee.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1.1 This Report of the Estimates Committee deals with Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their 88th Report (7th Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Education & Culture—Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla, presented to the Lok Sabha on the 22nd August, 1984.

1.2 Action Taken Notes on the recommendations of the Committee have been categorised as follows:—

1. Recommendations|Observations that have been accepted by Government :—

Sl. Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11.

(7 Recommendations—Chapter II)

2. Recommendations|Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply :—

(Nil—Chapter III)

3. Recommendations|Observations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee:—

Sl. Nos. 2, 3, 6 and 8

(4 Recommendations—Chapter IV)

4. Recommendations|Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are awaited:—

(NIL—Chapter V)

1.3 The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some of their recommendations.

Submission of works by Fellows

Recommendations Sl. Nos. 2 and 3 (Paragraphs 97 and 98)

1.4 The Estimates Committee in their 88th Report (7th Lok Sabha) had observed as follows regarding Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla:—

“Since its inception in 1965 the Institute had enrolled 154 Visiting Fellows. Every Fellow was expected to submit a Progress Report of his research work to the Director of the Institute at the end of each academic term. At the close of the term of Fellowship (maximum of 3 years) each Fellow was required to hand over the results of his research in typescript form to the Director. However, complete manuscripts were received only from 69 and part manuscripts from 9 Fellows. The remaining 76 Fellows did not submit any manuscript. This shows that there has been neither proper selection of Fellows nor meaningful periodic review of the work done by them. It is doubtful whether all of them submitted Progress Reports of their work as required. It is, however, clear that since 50 per cent of them failed to hand over the result of their research, the outlay on research has proved to be infructuous. It should be noted that the Institute has paid substantial honorarium besides providing free furnished accommodation to the Fellows.

It is a pity that the Institute did not pursue the question of submission of manuscript by the defaulting Fellows properly. To the Committee it appeared to be a breach of the implied contract accepted by them. At the instance of the Committee opinion of the Law Ministry has been obtained belatedly. The Committee presume that the Fellows concerned have been warned suitably by issue of notice about their liability to pay back what they have received plus compensation as advised by the Law Ministry. The Committee would await the outcome. The inaction of the Institute in this regard until the Committee intervened, cannot but be deplored.

1.5 In their reply the Ministry of Education have stated as follows:—

“One of the conditions of the appointment of Fellows was that the Institute will retain the first right of publication

of the endproduct of the study and research done by the Fellows at Institute. On completion of the Project, each Fellow was required to submit his type-script in triplicate to the Institute. It is, however, unfortunate that some of the Fellows did not realise their responsibility and did not submit their manuscripts to the Institute after expiry of their term of Fellowship.

Soon after the Estimates Committee visited the Institute in May, 1984, a letter was addressed to all the ex-Fellows, who did not submit their manuscripts to the Institute. In response to this letter, replies have been received from 29 ex-Visiting Fellows. A few of them have promised to send their manuscripts to the Institute shortly, while some of them have regretted their inability to submit manuscripts for reasons beyond their control.

The matter was further discussed by the Estimates Committee with the Special Secretary, Ministry of Education, at their meeting held at New Delhi in June, 1984. The Estimates Committee advised the Ministry of Education to obtain legal opinion as to whether the Institute could proceed legally against the ex-Fellows, who had not submitted their manuscripts. The Ministry of Education accordingly made a reference to the Ministry of Law who advised in July, 1984 that without prejudice to the rights of the Institute a notice may be given to the Fellows concerned asking them to send their manuscripts within a period of six months, failing which the Institute may take such legal steps as may be considered necessary. This advice of the Ministry of Law was considered by the Governing Body of the Institute at its meeting held on 18th August, 1984 and the decision taken was that no fresh notice need be given to the ex-Fellows, as the Institute had already on its own, addressed a letter to all of them. In response to this letter a number of ex-Fellows had given either plausible reasons for not submitting their manuscripts or had promised to submit their manuscripts as soon as possible. On the expiry of six months period, further action would be taken in consultation with Ministry of Law."

1.6 The Committee regret to find that the Governing Body of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla took a 'decision' contrary to the advice tendered by the Ministry of Law and the views expressed by the Estimates Committee which in fact amounts to soft paddling the issue. What surprises the Committee further is that

this 'decision' could be taken by the Governing Body despite the Ministry of Education being represented on the Governing Body of the Institute. Besides, the Ministry of Education being the controlling Ministry could and should have exercised its power to issue directions to the Institute when the financial and administrative impropriety was brought to their notice. In the instant case, the Ministry of Education have also acquiesced in the 'decision' of the Governing Body and have acted merely as a post office to communicate the same to the Committee. This is highly regrettable and the Committee take adverse note of it.

1.7 The Committee learn that the 'letter' was addressed to all the defaulting ex-Fellows soon after the Committee visited the institute in May, 1984. Since then more than one year has elapsed. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education to take a serious note of the lapse on the part of the Institute and issue directions to the Institute to apply such correctives as may be advised by the Ministry of Law without showing any indulgence to any of the defaulters, howsoever highly placed they may be. The Committee would like to have a report on further and conclusive action taken in the matter without delay.

Publishing of Works by Fellows

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Para 101)

1.8 Commenting on the works published by the Fellows of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, the Estimates Committee in their 88th Report had observed that Institute was not in a position to state whether any of 76 defaulting Fellows had got their works published elsewhere without permission of the Institute. The Committee suggested that this aspect should be examined for appropriate action, if necessary, in consultation with the Law Ministry.

1.9 The Ministry of Education, in their reply, have stated: "In response to the letters, which the Institute addressed to the defaulting Fellows, the Fellows have given information about the publication of their manuscripts outside the Institute. Such cases are, however, very rare. The Committee's suggestion regarding legal action against such Fellows will, however, be considered in consultation with the Ministry of Law."

1.10 The Committee are informed that cases where the ex-Fellows have published their works elsewhere without permission of the Institute are very rare. The Committee would, however, like the Institute to take prompt and severe action in all such cases in con-

sultation with the Ministry of Law so as to serve as a warning to all those who intend to join the Institute that the terms and conditions of the fellowship are to be honoured by the Fellows both in letter and spirit. The Committee would like to be informed of the final outcome of the action taken in the matter.

Financial Management of Institute

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Paragraph 108)

1.11 The Estimates Committee in their 88th Report had taken a serious view of a series of irregularities highlighted in the successive Audit Notes that has remained pending without settlement till then. These Notes related to non-maintenance of stock registers in Publication Branch, losses/deficiencies, double payment of honorarium to visiting Fellows, embezzlement, non-recovery of leave salary/pension contribution, unauthorised possession of Institutes' premises, non-recovery of rent and water charges from CPWD employees, irregular payment of pay and allowances, improper checking of Estimates, infructuous expenditure, unnecessary/irregular purchase of library books, irregular special repairs, accumulation of unsold publication, losses on publication of books. The Committee had urged that the financial management of Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Simla should be thoroughly investigated and suitable action taken *inter-alia* to put it to sound footing.

1.12 The Ministry of Education in their reply, have stated:

“Out of 241 audit objections pertaining to the years 1974-75 to 1982-83, 210 had already been disposed of by June, 1984. Out of the remaining 31 audit objections, another 8 had since been dropped by the Audit on our explaining the correct position. Efforts were being made to settle the remaining 23 audit objections as expeditiously as possible.

In the new administrative set-up introduced by the Government with effect from 19th July, 1985 the post of Registrar had been abolished. Instead, two posts of Secretary (Administration & Finance) and Secretary (Academic) had been created. It was expected that with the new set-up, the financial management of the Institute would improve and there would be no recurrence of such irregularities in future.”

1.13 The Committee note that with a view to prevent recurrence of irregularities pointed out by the Audit in the past, the post of

Registrar of the Institute has been abolished and instead two posts of Secretary (Administration & Finance) and Secretary (Academic) have been created. The Committee do not appreciate how the creation of an additional post would prevent irregularities and improprieties being committed. The irregularities and improprieties may not necessarily be due to laxity in supervision and control in every case. However, the Committee join the Ministry of Education in hoping that with the new set-up there would be no recurrence of irregularities pointed out by the Audit in their past reports.

1.14 The Committee also find that 23 Audit objections still remain unresolved. The Committee are unaware of the gravity of the irregularities pointed out by the Audit in these audit objections. They would like the Ministry to go into the Audit objections and find out how serious these are and ensure that prompt remedial action is taken by the Institute on each of these objections, if necessary, by calling for periodical reports from the Institute.

1.15 The Committee would like to emphasise that the Ministry of Education cannot absolve themselves of their final responsibility for the smooth and efficient running of the Institute. The State of affairs disclosed as a result of the inquiry by the Committee leads the Committee to conclude that in the matter of control and general supervision over the working of the Institute, the role of the Ministry has been, to say the least, lackadaisical. They would like the Ministry of Education to exercise their role and function vis-a-vis the Institute more seriously so as to improve the overall functioning of the Institute as a centre of excellence, which it was intended to be.

Implementation of Recommendations

1.16 The Committee would like to emphasise that they attach the greatest importance to the implementation of the recommendations accepted by Government. They would, therefore, urge that Government should keep a close watch so as to ensure expeditious implementation of the recommendations accepted by them. In cases where it is not possible to implement the recommendations in letter and spirit for any reasons, the matter should be reported to the Committee in time with reasons for non-implementation.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Sl. No. 1, Para 86)

The Indian Institute of Advanced Study at Simla was established in 1965 as an autonomous residential institution. It was expected to function as a centre of advanced study and research in humanities and social sciences and to disseminate knowledge in collaboration with other institutions. The Committee's examination of the working of this institute revealed that the Institute has not made any real impact either on the academic community or on the wider public whom it was intended to educate. Among the subjects of study and research, History and Anthropology have received great predominance obviously as a result of the bias of two Directors of the Institute. In the matter of research, there has been reportedly duplication of efforts of specialised institutions and universities. No joint research project has been undertaken although the Institute was to encourage multidisciplinary projects. In short, there has been no distinctive contribution of the Institute. The Committee have also come across serious shortcomings and irregularities which are dealt with in the succeeding paragraphs.

Reply of Government

The observations of the Committee have been noted for future guidance. The other shortcomings and irregularities are dealt with in the Institute's replies to paragraphs 97 to 103 infra.

[Ministry of Education O.M. No. F. 6-24/84-U-3 dated 22nd Feb. 1985]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 4, Para 99)

The Committee learn that out of the 69 manuscripts submitted by the Fellows only 34 have been published by the Institute 13 manuscripts have been returned to the authors for being published elsewhere and of these two were not considered suitable for publication by the Institute. The remaining 22 manuscripts are still lying with the Institute obviously because they are not considered fit for publication. This again shows that the standard of Fellows and

their research financed by the Institute was so low. The Committee at this stage can only express a hope that the proper care will be exercised at the time of selection of Research Fellows in future.

Reply of Government

On the recommendations made by the Expert Committee for the reorganisation and restructuring of the Institute, the pattern of fellowship Scheme has been completely changed. Instead of four categories of Fellowships, there is now only one category of Fellowships. Fellowships will now be awarded for duration ranging from three months to two years, extendable by another year in some cases. Instead of salary, the Government have decided that a grant ranging from Rs. 1500 to Rs. 3000 may be given to the Fellows. The Governing Body has recommended that the existing emoluments of teachers, salaried persons selected for the award of Fellowships should be protected. The proposal is presently under consideration of the Government. The main features of the revised scheme of Fellowship is that the Core Fellowships have been abolished. Another notable feature of the Scheme is that as against the earlier practice to allow the scholars to choose their own topic of research, the Institute will hereafter select the topics and award Fellowships to candidates interested in research in only those specific research projects.

2. The Fellowships for 1984-85 were advertised in all the national dailies and also circulated to Universities and other Institutions of higher learning. Selection Committees for each discipline consisting of Experts nominated by the Governing Body were set up and the Experts were requested to evaluate each candidate in an Evaluation proforma devised for purpose, consisting of gradation on different aspects of each candidate, namely educational qualifications, research and teaching experience, publications, quality of research project and likely academic benefit to be accrued to the scholars and their parent organisations.

3. The Selection Committee after evaluating all the candidates, made recommendations for the award of Fellowships. The Governing Body examined the recommendations of the Selection Committee and took the final decision for the award of Fellowships. It is hoped that the reorganised scheme of Fellowships and the new procedure of evaluation of candidates will ensure proper selection.

[Ministry of Education O.M. No. F. 6-24/84-U-3
dated 22nd Feb. 1985]

Recommendation (Serial No. 5, Para 100)

The Institute pays royalty to the authors in respect of their works published by it but surprisingly no royalty is recovered by

the Institute from the Fellows who were allowed to get their work published elsewhere. The Committee regard this as a serious lacuna. They hope that as promised before them, remedial steps would be taken by the Institute.

Reply of Government

Before the year 1979, the Governing Body of the Institute, on the advice of the then Director, used to give permission in certain cases to the Fellows to have their manuscripts published outside the Institute. This permission was mostly unconditional, but in some cases the Fellows|Publishers were requested to supply complimentary copies of the publications to the Institute and also duly acknowledge, at a prominent place in their publication, the fact that the manuscript was prepared by them during their stay at the Institute as a Fellow. In view of the Government's decision to wind up|suspend the academic activities of the Institute in September, 1979, the Governing Body of the Institute took a decision at their meeting held on 7th September, 1979 that the printing of the manuscripts, which are in the press may be completed and other manuscripts may be returned to the Fellows. In terms of the decision of the Governing Body, some of the manuscripts were returned to the Fellows who wanted the same to be published elsewhere, without any condition of payment of royalty to the Institute.

2. The recommendations of the Estimates Committee have been noted for future guidance. The Institute has still with it 22 manuscripts of its ex-Fellows and is processing those manuscripts with a view to publishing such of them as are evaluated to be worthy of publication.

[Ministry of Education O.M. No. F. 6-24/84-U-3
dated 22nd Feb. 1985]

Recommendation (Serial No. 7, Para 102)

A large number of copies of the publications brought out by the Institute including those of the research works of Fellows have remained unsold over the years. The annual sales realisation is insignificant. Admittedly there is a great deficiency in regard to publicity and arrangement for sale. It is indeed distressing that whatever has been the result of the working of the Institute, people at large have remained ignorant of it. The Committee feel that it could well be that the worth of the publications, barring a few exceptions, was such that there were no buyers. They hope that appropriate steps would be taken to improve the image of the Institute.

Reply of Government

As the Institute did not have any arrangement of its own to give publicity to the books published, the Institute had appointed certain known Booksellers as its sole distributors. The Institute also used to take part in World Book Fairs held at Delhi periodically and display its publications there. Experience has been that the sales of Institute's publications at these fairs was quite substantial. The Institute is now taking necessary steps to streamline the procedure for production, sales and publicity of its publications. Steps are also being taken to dispose of the pending stock of publications by allowing attractive discounts to the buyers. The Institute also proposes to take part in National Book Fairs held in various regions of the country with a view to boost the sale of its publications.

[Ministry of Education O.M. No. F. 6-24/84-U-3
dated 22nd Feb. 1985]

Recommendation (Serial No. 9, Para 104)

From the foregoing facts it should be clear, that all was not well with the Institute. A committee appointed by the Govt. of India in September, 1977 to review the functioning of the Institute reported in April, 1978. That Committee came to the conclusion *inter alia* that the performance of the Institute had fallen short of expectations, that the contribution of the Institute through the published works was disappointing and that the Institute suffered from isolation besides the atmosphere around it not being congenial for genuine intellectual work. They felt that there was hardly any case for the continuance of the Institute and that if it should continue, its character should be changed and its objectives reviewed. Having considered the possibility of restructuring the programmes and activities of the Institute on receipt of the report of that Committee, Government finally decided in June, 1979 to close down the Institute. This decision was however, later reviewed and deferred. In April, 1980 it was decided to continue the Institute subject to its activities and programmes being restructured and for this purpose an Expert Committee was appointed in September, 1980. The Expert Committee submitted its report in April, 1981. It took a year and four months for the Govt. to accept its recommendations (August 1982). It took another one year and eight months to place an Officer on Special Duty in position to take 'Preliminary steps' (April 1984). In the meantime owing to uncertainty about its future, the Institute was languishing with virtually no academic activity. Since 1981 there were hardly two or three

Fellows continuing but there was undiminished strength of non-academic staff. The annual expenditure ranging from Rs. 23 to Rs. 32 lakhs was largely on maintenance of buildings and running the administration. The governing body of the Institute did not meet even once after August, 1976. The annual reports of the Institute were not placed before Parliament all these years. It is such a sorry state of affairs that the Committee are constrained to deprecate the delay and prevarication in taking a decision about the future of the Institute and the time taken in implementing the final decision. The Committee expect that no further time would be lost in strengthening the Institute so that it may at least in future live up to expectation with which it was started. They would await the steps taken.

Reply of Government

The following steps have been taken for the strengthening etc. of the Institute:—

- (i) An Officer on Special Duty was appointed in April, 1984 to take preliminary steps for implementation of the scheme of reorganisation and restructuring of the Institute drawn up by the Government on the lines recommended by Krishna Kripalani Committee.
- (ii) The Society and Governing Body of the Institute were reconstituted in May, 1984 in accordance with the then existing provisions of the Rules of the Institute.
- (iii) The following decisions were taken at the meetings of the Governing Body and of the Society held in June, 1984:—
 - (a) 20 Fellowships may be awarded during the year 1983-84 to carry out research on one of the topics of research in priority areas.
 - (b) The Institute should hold three seminars during 1984-85.
 - (c) The Memorandum of Association and Rules & Regulations and Bye-laws of the Institute were amended in accordance with the scheme of reorganisation and restructuring of the Institute approved by the Government.
 - (d) The Annual Reports and the Audited Statements of Accounts for the years 1977-78 to 1982-83 were adopted.

- (iv) The process of selection of Fellows has since been completed and the Fellows are likely to join shortly.
- (v) One seminar on Composite Culture of India and National Intergation has already been held and the second seminar on Alternative Economic Structures will be held in March, 1985.
- (vi) A Selection Committee has been constituted for appointment to the post of Director of the Institute.
- (vii) All the pending Annual Reports and the Audited Statements of Accounts *i.e.* 1977-78 to 1982-83 as also for the year 1983-84 have been laid on the Table of both the Houses of Parliament.
- (viii) The Governing Body and the Society were reconstituted in August, 1984 in accordance with the recommendations of Krishna Kripalani Committee, as approved by the Government.

Recommendation (Serial No. 10, Para 105)

The Committee would in particular suggest in the context of the strengthening of the Institute that the Institute should undertake research and dissemination of knowledge in specific areas so as to make its contribution distinctive. Emphasis should be on multi disciplinary approach. There should be an endeavour to present out composite culture and heritage in proper perspective without any bias whatsoever. Our history ought to be presented in an objective and authentic manner. In short the endeavour should be to attain peaks of excellence and the research projects should fill gaps in knowledge. The Institute should attempt to pool the results of research for dissemination.

There should be periodic review of the working of the Institute at an interval of, say, 5 years.

Reply of Government

The observations of the Committee have been noted for future guidance.

Recommendation (Serial No. 11, Para 106)

The Institute is housed in the palatial building of 'Rashtrapati Nivas' on payment of a token rent of Rs. 1500 per month and it entails a maintenance expenditure of the order of Rs. 10 lakhs per annum

This is a priceless historical building. The Committee are strongly of the view that the building ought to be put to better use and that it could be handed back to the President. Keeping in view the observations of the Das Gupta Committee about the location of the Institute, should be considered whether it would not be proper to move the Institute out of Simla or construct a functionally more suitable but less costly building for it at Simla itself.

Reply of Government

The Government of India in consultation with the Government of Himachal Pradesh is exploring the possibility of getting alternate suitable accommodation at Simla for shifting of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study from 'Rashtrapati Nivas'.

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT REPLIES

— NIL —

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Sl. Nos. 2 & 3, Para Nos. 97 & 98)

Since its inception in 1965 the Institute had enrolled 154 Visiting Fellows. Every Fellow was expected to submit a Progress Report of his research work to the Director of the Institute at the end of each academic term. At the close of the term of Fellowship (maximum of 3 years) each Fellow was required to hand over the results of his research in typescript form to the Director. However, complete manuscripts were received only from 69 and part-manuscripts from 9 Fellows. The remaining 76 Fellows did not submit any manuscript. This shows that there has been neither proper selection of Fellows nor meaningful periodic review of the work done by them. It is doubtful whether all of them submitted Progress Reports of their work as required. It is, however, clear that since 50 per cent of them failed to hand over the research has proved to be infructuous. It should be noted that the Institute has paid substantial honorarium besides providing free furnished accommodation to the Fellows.

It is a pity that the Institute did not pursue the question of submission of manuscript by the defaulting Fellows properly. To the Committee it appeared to be a breach of the implied contract accepted by them. At the instance of the Committee opinion of the Law Ministry has been obtained belatedly. The Committee presume that the Fellows concerned have been warned suitably by issue of notice about their liability to pay back what they have received plus compensation as advised by the Law Ministry. The Committee would await the outcome. The inaction of the Institute in this regard until the Committee intervened, cannot but be deplored.

Reply of Government

One of the conditions of the appointment of Fellows was that the Institute will retain the first right of publication of the end product of the study and research done by the Fellows at the Institute.

On completion of the Project, each Fellow was required to submit his type-script in triplicate to the Institute. It is, however, unfortunate that some of the Fellows did not realise their responsibility and did not submit their manuscripts to the Institute after expiry of their term of Fellowship.

2. Soon after the Estimates Committee visited the Institute in May, 1984, a letter was addressed to all the ex-Fellows, who did not submit their manuscripts to the Institute. In response to this letter, replies have been received from ex-Visiting Fellows. A few of them have promised to send their manuscripts to the Institute shortly, while some of them have regretted their inability to submit manuscripts for reasons beyond their control.

3. The matter was further discussed by the Estimates Committee with the Special Secretary, Ministry of Education, at their meeting held at New Delhi in June, 1984. The Estimates Committee advised the Ministry of Education to obtain legal opinion as to whether the Institute could proceed legally against the ex-Fellows, who had not submitted their manuscripts. The Ministry of Education accordingly made a reference to the Ministry of Law who advised in July, 1984 that without prejudice to the rights of the Institute, a notice may be given to the Fellows concerned asking them to send their manuscripts within a period of six months, failing which the Institute may take such legal steps as may be considered necessary. This advice of the Ministry of Law was considered by the Governing Body of the Institute at its meeting held on 18th August, 1984 and the decision taken was that no fresh notice need be given to the ex-Fellows, as the Institute had already, on its own, addressed a letter to all of them. In response to this letter, a number of ex-Fellows had given either plausible reasons for not submitting their manuscripts or had promised to submit their manuscripts as soon as possible. On the expiry of six months period, further action would be taken in consultation with Ministry of Law.

[Ministry of Education O.M. No. F. 6-24/84-U-3
dated 22nd February, 1985.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Paragraph 101)

The Institute is not in a position to state whether any of the 76 defaulting Fellows have got their works published elsewhere without permission of the Institute. The Committee suggest that this aspect should be examined for appropriate action, if necessary, in consultation with the Law Ministry.

Reply of Government

In response to the letters which the Institute addressed to the defaulting Fellows, the Fellows have given information about the publication of their manuscripts outside the Institute. Such cases are, however, very rare. The Committee's suggestion regarding legal action against such Fellows will, however, be considered in consultation with the Ministry of Law.

Recommendation (Serial No. 8, Para 103)

The Committee take a serious view of a series of irregularities highlighted in the successive Audit Notes which have already remained pending without settlement until recently. These related to **non-maintenance of stock registers in Publication Branch**, losses/deficiencies, double payment of honorarium to visiting Fellows, embezzlement, non-recovery of leave salary/pension contribution, unauthorised possession of Institute's premises, non-recovery of rent and water charges from CPWD employees, irregular payment of pay and allowances, improper checking of estimates, infructuous expenditure, unnecessary/irregular purchase of library books, irregular special repairs, accumulation of unsold publications, losses on publication of books. The Committee urge that the financial management of the Institute should be thoroughly investigated and suitable action taken *inter alia* to put it on sound footing.

Reply of Government

Out of 241 audit objections pertaining to the years 1974-75 to 1982-83, 210 had already been disposed of by June, 1984. Out of the remaining 31 audit objections, another 8 have since been dropped by the Audit on our explaining the correct position. Efforts are being made to settle the remaining 23 audit objections as expeditiously as possible.

2. In the new administrative set-up introduced by the Government with effect from 19th July, 1984, the post of Registrar has been abolished. Instead, two posts of Secretary (Administration & Finance) and Secretary (Academic) have been created. It is expected that with the new set-up, the financial management of the Institute will improve and there will be no recurrence of such irregularities in future.

CHAPTER V

**RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES
ARE STILL AWAITED**

— NIL —

NEW DELHI:
September 16, 1985
Bhadra 25, 1907 (Saka)

CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI,
Chairman,
Estimates Committee

APPENDIX

(Vide Introduction)

Analysis of action taken by Government on the 88th Report of the Estimates Committee (7th Lok Sabha)

I.	Total number of Recommendations	11
II.	Recommendations which have been accepted by Government (Sl. Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11)	7
	Percentage to total	63%
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies	NIL
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by Committee	4
	Percentage to total	36%
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited	NIL
