

Mr. Speaker: Did they carry any weapons?

Shri G. B. Pant: No, the constables do not carry any weapons.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Any firearms?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister says that they had no firearms.

12-21 hrs.

APPROPRIATION (NO. 8) BILL,*
1959-60

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Dr. B. Gopala Reddi): On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year, 1959-60.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1959-60."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. B. Gopala Reddy: I introduce the Bill.

12-22 hrs.

INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE
BILL

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): May I make a submission on a point of

order regarding the motion that the hon. Prime Minister is going to move? Certain constitutional propriety which has to be looked to has not been looked to. When the Constituent Assembly of India debated this particular Entry in List I of the Seventh Schedule, the consensus of opinion was.....

Mr. Speaker: Is it with respect to the motion to be moved by the hon. Prime Minister, regarding the Indian Statistical Institute Bill? The hon. Prime Minister may move his motion, and then I shall hear the point of order.

Shri Khadilkar: It would be better if, before he makes his speech, I raise this point of order, because he can take into consideration my submission. It is also a question of the privilege of the House.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): If it is a point of order, what is there to wait for?

Shri Khadilkar: I shall be very brief; I shall finish in two minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Everything that the hon. Member wants to say cannot be allowed, unless it is a point of order, at this stage. Is it a point of order?

Shri Khadilkar: In my opinion, it is a point of order, and you have got to give your ruling on it.

Mr. Speaker: Let him state the point of order first.

Shri Khadilkar: I shall make a brief submission. I have gone through the debates of the Constituent Assembly, and I find that there was a consensus of opinion among the framers of our Constitution, and again and again, this point was stressed also, that when a national status is conferred on any institution, certain formalities should be gone through. In that sense, in the present Bill, there is

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II—Section 2, dated 14-12-1959.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

no statutory structure mentioned anywhere at all, and yet we are going to confer a national status on the institution. This is a big lacuna, in my opinion, and is against the spirit of the Constitution.

Therefore, my submission is that the Mover of the motion may be pleased to look into this matter and accept a Select Committee to remove this defect in the Bill. I am appealing to you as the custodian of the privileges of this House....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; I am not going to hear him any more. If it is a question of reference to a Select Committee, that has to be done by way of an amendment to the motion for consideration. If he wants to introduce any changes in any particular clauses with respect to which he feels that there is any lacuna, he can table an amendment, and that may be considered.

There is no point of order in what the hon. Member has raised. A point of order must prevent the further progress of a Bill or the further consideration of a matter before the House. The hon. Member has not raised any such point of order.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:*

"That the Bill to declare the institution known as the Indian Statistical Institute having at present its registered office in Calcutta to be an institution of national importance and to provide for certain matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

This institute is well known. Nevertheless, I should like to give just a few facts in regard to it. It was started in the early thirties, and has grown since then very considerably. Till

now, it is not only the only but the very big institute doing statistical work in Calcutta, and in fact, all over India. There can be no doubt about its importance. In fact, its importance is recognised internationally, all over the world. It is one of the noted statistical institutes in the world, not only in India; in India, of course, there is no other doing that type of work.

I should have thought that there was no need to lay stress on this fact of its intrinsic importance, and its importance as a national institution. It is almost a formality that I am observing now by bringing forward this Bill before the House. So, I was surprised when I found an hon. Member referring just now to something which I could not understand, about some processes having to be gone through. I do not know what those processes are, except that a Bill is placed before this House for its acceptance now.

I do not propose at this stage to take the time of the House in referring to its importance and to the work it has done. Statistical work of this kind is always important, but now, today, with our planning etc. it is of the utmost importance. There can be no planning without statistical work on a big scale. And this statistical work too, in the present context, is not merely compiling of figures. There, all kinds of other aspects come in, especially planning aspects, what is called, I think, biometry and psychometry and various aspects of this where psychological and biological questions also come in. In fact, government today is largely based and would become progressively more and more based on accurate statistical information. Of course, we have had statistical information in the census statistics and so many other things; the censuses are important, and they do take place from time to time, but there are so many other types of

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

statistics which are essential, production, this, that and the other. These statistics, no doubt, are collected separately also by our Ministries to suit their purposes, and that is all right. But there is no other way to collect them in various ways, apart from those special matters, than through this institute in India.

I may point out that a fairly large sum of money is shown in this Bill and in these papers as having been given to or spent by the statistical institute. Of that, a considerable sum of money, a little over Rs. 50 lakhs is for the National Sample Surveys which are done more or less on a contractual basis. That is, in fact, previously, though, I think, not now, it was a pure contract; the Government of India used to give this piece of work, and whatever was left over from the money, they kept; it is not a profit-making organisation; so, that went into their other work. Now, I do not think that is done exactly like that. But the point is that all this National Sample Survey work is done even now on a more or less contractual basis.

This Institute has become a big centre, a developing centre of research, education and training in Statistics. It has organised quality statistical control, national sample survey and studies in connection with problems of economic development. The Institute was a private Institute, to begin with, and is still a private autonomous Institute, which did work for Governments, whether Central or State, and received payment for work done, as I said, more or less on a contractual basis. In addition, it has received in recent years some sums of money for specific types of activity. It has also received some money from UNESCO for having an international training centre in Statistics to which the Government of India has also contributed.

There can be no doubt about its vital importance in the scheme of

things, and secondly also in regard to its being one of the recognised institutions of this kind in the world and respected greatly for not only its normal work but for certain original work which it has done and which has benefited and profited the science of Statistics or, rather, the practice of it.

The whole question that arises in this matter is really how best to deal with this institution. Some people think that an Institute of this kind should, more or less, be a government organisation. This Bill is not meant to convert this into a government organisation. After very careful thought, we have come to the conclusion that it should maintain and retain the autonomous character which it has had thus far, subject to various checks etc. which Government or Parliament may have. Now this is a wider question which I should like to place before the House. We have been progressively coming to the conclusion that too much centralisation of our activities is not a good thing. Of course, Central control in some matters is a good thing, but too much centralisation and departmentalisation of our activities is not a good thing. Now, however that may be for our other activities, one thing is quite certain, in my opinion, that science and matters connected with science cannot be or should not be dealt with by the normal governmental routine methods. Art in a sense cannot be dealt with, or should not be dealt with, in that way. There are other subjects too. You cannot have creative impulses dealt with by routine methods. That is why wherever science has grown very considerably—let us say, in the United States of America or in the Soviet Union, two entirely different types of countries with different structures of government—they give the widest latitude, both of them, to their scientific apparatus to grow. Naturally they have checks to see that money is not wasted. But they give them latitude. These institutions do

not have to come for sanctions to people who usually have no ghost of an idea of science or that special thing. What happens in the governmental apparatus, normally, is that it is looked at, very competently looked at, but not looked at from the particular scientific or like point of view.

Now, we want science to grow, and I think it is quite essential that we should accept this broad approach to this question, that scientific work should have a certain latitude. Therefore, we have decided that in this particular matter, this should continue to be an autonomous organisation, but Government comes in all over the place to tell them what to do, how to do it, to check them, to inspect—all that kind of thing.

Now, it may be that if this type of approach is a successful approach, one may even consider enlarging it so that it may cover some of our own State-owned governmental enterprises, because as our work grows, as State-owned governmental enterprises grow, it becomes very difficult for them to grow if there is constant reference back to governmental agencies. However fast they may work, there is delay, and delay is the most wasteful thing from every point of view that one can have.

So that we are thinking, more or less, in terms of greater autonomy, whether in the administrative sphere or any other. If I may refer to something that is not perhaps quite relevant, in the administrative sphere, this House knows that many State Governments are going in for a great deal of devolution of authority and power to panchayats and the like—which is a very happy sign. That, of course, has no application here. It only represents a certain mental approach of devolution of authority with checks at the right places and not continuous references and the like.

For this reason and many others, we feel that scientific organisations should be treated in this way. In the present Bill, therefore, we have accepted this basis for the Indian Statistical Insti-

tute to function as an autonomous organisation. But having said that, we have put in quite a large number of ways in which Government can see that the work is done according to its wishes. Various checks and counter-checks are provided. But we have definitely and deliberately not put in Government Directors etc. which changes the whole nature of it. I believe there are eminent men in it. The present President of this Institute is Shri C. D. Deshmukh who has been there for some years.

If I may draw attention to some of the principal clauses of this Bill, one is the authority to give degrees and diplomas in Statistics. By some previous Act, it is stated that degrees and diplomas could only be given by Universities. Now this goes slightly outside that scope, but in this particular sphere of Statistics, there can be no doubt at all that is as competent a body as you can have. Some people have suggested, or may suggest, that these should be given with the approval of Government. Now, I happen to be a humble member of Government, but this proposal that some Secretary or Deputy Secretary should decide who should get the degree or diploma seems to be quite remarkable in a specialised subject.

Therefore, we have stated that they should give degrees and diplomas. As a matter of fact, I believe this Institute has in the last six or seven years trained 8000 statisticians of various degrees and kinds. It has trained several hundred foreign people who have come for training here—I think 200 and more. So that it follows naturally that it should be authorised to these degrees and diplomas in these specified subjects with which it deals.

Now, a question has arisen in this connection about the audit of the funds of the Institute. There have been two viewpoints: one was that the Comptroller and Auditor-General should undertake the audit and the other, that it should continue to be done by private auditors. This is an interesting question and much can be

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

said for either side, though, personally, I have for some time past held the opinion that it is better for such institutions—not only this but some other institutions too—that the Comptroller and Auditor-General be not charged with the audit of these institutions.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not that I doubt the capacity or ability of the Comptroller and Auditor-General, but I doubt the capacity of the governmental methods of audit suiting such institutions because they are meant for governmental types of work.

Perhaps, hon. Members might remember what Mr. Appleby said about it. One might agree or disagree with Mr. Appleby. Anyhow, in his report he strongly opposed this. He saw everywhere, quite rightly, the spectre of bureaucratic control checking growth. It is partly true and partly may not be true. Anyhow, he specially wrote a section in his report about this because essentially the auditor sees that the amount that has been spent has been spent properly or not. If it has the sanction, well and good. The auditor has nothing more to say and the auditor's function is not to challenge the policies governing it. He has just to see that proper sanctions have been accorded for the money spent.

The type of scientific work is somewhat different, obviously, from other types of routine office work. It is very difficult to judge of scientific work except by a scientist or a group of scientists. (*Interruption.*) So the problem comes up before us as to how one cannot give full scope for even a scientific organisation just to do what it pleases. About the money one must have checks.

The really important thing in this as in other matters is for an audit, if I may use that word, of performance. What has been achieved or what is

being done? All our audits are to see that certain sanctions are there and that money is spent according to certain sanctions. That is necessary, of course for normal governmental work. But what should be even more necessary, even for normal governmental work, is how much has been achieved by the money that has been spent. And I hope that gradually we shall be able to bring in this test of achievement in all our activities. Of course, it is very difficult to see the achievement in government offices.

The O. & M. Division sometimes considers this matter; how many letters have been received in an office; how many have been disposed; five thousand in a week or whatever the period may be. That is a check, perhaps, but not a very adequate check, because there may be formal letters and there may be very difficult letters.

In the Ministry of External Affairs we may send a letter let us say to the Prime Minister of China. That letter may take us weeks to consider how to deal with it, while hundreds and thousands of other letters are passing through, so that the relative importance of these things is not checked by the numerical issue—how many papers have been issued. Maybe, in the licensing department of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry that might hold good. Therefore, it is desirable to introduce this system of audit or check by performance as far as possible.

In fact, that system could really apply to each individual worker, I think. That is, it should be a check of what is the result of his work, not how many hours he sits in an office or factory, but what is the result. After all, the piece-goods system is one method of doing it. That is not so easy to apply it to an office. Anyhow, even in this Statistical Institute an attempt has been made to apply to each individual worker this check of work done and giving encouragement

to those who show greater promise and greater work.

Therefore, in this Bill it is proposed that the Institute shall appoint—of course, they shall have regular chartered accountants and auditors—

“such auditors as the Central Government may, after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India and the Institute, select.”

So, the first thing is that although it is done by so-called private auditors, they will, in fact, be selected by the Central Government in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General. Further,

“The Central Government may issue such directions to the auditors in the performance of their duties as it thinks fit.”

Then, there are various other clauses about the previous approval by the Central Government being obtained before the Institute can alter, extend or abridge any of the purposes for which it has been established or amend its memorandum or do various things, sell any property which is acquired from Government funds and so on and so forth.

Further—and this is important—

“The Central Government may constitute as many Committees as and when it considers necessary consisting of such number of persons as it thinks fit to appoint thereto and assign to each such Committee all or any of the following duties, namely:—

(a) the preparation and submission to the Central Government as far as possible before the commencement of each financial year, of statements showing the programmes of work agreed to be undertaken by the Institute during that year for which the Central Government may provide funds,

as well as general financial estimates in respect of such work; and

(b) the settlement on broad lines of the programme of such work.”

I would particularly invite the attention of the House to this and this sought to be our future approach to these problems elsewhere too.

“The Central Government may constitute a Committee consisting of such number of persons as it thinks fit to appoint thereto for the purpose of—

(a) reviewing the work done by the Institute and the progress made by it;

(b) inspecting its buildings, equipment and other assets;

(c) evaluating the work done by the Institute; and

(d) advising Government generally on any matter which in the opinion of the Central Government is of importance in connection with the work of the Institute;”

Now, the House will notice these all-embracing terms, “in regard to any matter”. This Committee can advise Government evaluate the work in every possible way and make recommendations to Government. That is what I call an audit of performance or achievement which is far more important—you see what you are getting out of it—than the otherwise technical audit of the money spent which is really the work of normal auditors. I think that this is a greater check and more useful from the point of view of Government or Parliament than those simple audits. The House will notice that all these various things that I have read give very considerable power to Government to deal with any situation that might arise.

I may add that after that committee has reported, the committee on per-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

formance, the Central Government will naturally have the right to issue any directions to the Institute which must carry them out. The directions may be broad and may include even the amendment of the memorandum or alteration of priorities of work to be undertaken etc.

Finally, if there is default on the part of the Institute in carrying out the directions of Government, the Central Government may ask it to show cause to the satisfaction of the Central Government for any purpose named and it may even, ultimately, if the cause is not shown to its satisfaction, take direct charge of the whole Institute and the organisation as it exists now will not function then, the Chairman, Members of the Executive Council and all that Government will take direct charge. Naturally, this is the last and most serious step.

Thus, we have tried to combine two major things in this, one flexibility and the other non-interference with its work. It can do its work properly and, at the same time, all kinds of subsequent checks will be there to find out whether it has done its work properly, with the ultimate authority to take over completely or for a period. I think it is on the whole a satisfactory compromise between these two different approaches, both of which have certain merit—the approach of autonomy and flexibility and the other approach of the Government seeing that public funds are not wasted and applied in the proper way in carrying out the policies laid down by the Government and ultimately having authority for even taking over this whole Institute for a period. I cannot imagine any more stringent provisions. The stress that may be laid on the audit part only is nowhere as satisfactory as it should be and speaking for myself I feel that it is better for this matter to be done not necessarily in the typical Governmental way which, I do not think, applies to scientific ways of work. In this Bill we have provided for authorised auditors to be appointed but these are chosen at

the instance of the Government of India in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General. I submit that the structure of this Bill provides for these various matters which should be adequate to safeguard that the money given to it is spent for the purposes mentioned.

But the main thing is the approach of this House to this Bill and it is that the institution should remain a non-Governmental, autonomous institution. If a decision is arrived at that it must be taken over by the Government and run by the Government, the whole structure of course changes. I find that many people have suggested this kind of thing. I do not think it would be a proper approach because it is a scientific institute, all the time probing into new avenues of thinking and action and all that which are not normally done by the Government offices. Government offices look to precedents and do not probe into the future. Individuals in Government offices may but I am talking as an institution. I do not want our scientific institutions to get tied up in precedents and all that but I do want proper checks to see that work is done properly and the money is not wasted. I submit that these are provided for fully here.

The Institute has been publishing annual reports—very full reports—for several years. I believe they are all in the Library of Parliament. Apart from them, it publishes a magazine and I think it is quarterly periodical—*Sankya*—dealing with statistical matters. It is a high-class paper and it also gives full account of the activities. Hon. Members who wish to keep in touch with these matters can always see these reports. I believe that the last annual report plus a pamphlet giving the history of this institution had been circulated to all the hon. Members. I need not go into all those details. I can assure the House that as a matter of regular practice these annual reports, accounts, etc. will be placed on the Table of the House and I do not think it is desirable to put a positive clause

in the Bill that this must be placed. They have been placed and they will be placed. I, therefore, submit that this Bill is a desirable Bill, meriting not only consideration of this House but passing by it.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Will this institution yet remain a private institution?

Mr. Speaker: It is one of national importance.

Acharya Kripalani: Maybe of national importance but it will be a private institution.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a private institution, meaning, non-governmental. It does not belong to anybody. It belongs to a non-profit making organisation, a registered society, which cannot make profit. But it is controlled by its elected members, chairman, etc., whatever it is.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan (Coimbatore): May I ask a clarification on one small point? The hon. Prime Minister has not made it quite clear. What is the difference between the earlier Bill that was introduced and withdrawn and this particular Bill?

Secondly, with regard to the Institute not being able to sell any property, clause 7(c) says:

"The Institute shall not, except with the previous approval of the Central Government . . . sell or otherwise dispose of any property acquired by the institute with money specifically provided for such acquisition by the Central Government."

I would like to ask a small clarification here. Sometimes, equipment may be brought out of a sum sanctioned for overall purposes but, maybe, not specifically given for that instrument.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think it is meant to cover that. It is impossible if one has to come back to the Government for every little thing. I do not think it should cover that.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to declare the institution known as the Indian Statistical Institute having at present its registered office in Calcutta to be an institution of national importance and to provide for certain matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

There are no amendments for circulation.

Acharya Kripalani: I have no doubt that the collection of statistics is a very important matter for the economy of the nation, especially for a nation that wants to develop its economy through periodical plans. Talking in this House on the Second Plan, I have stated that the Plan was defective because our statistics were neither exhaustive nor were they reliable. Therefore, an institution of this sort is very necessary. I also believe that this institution has been doing useful work. But what is being sought now is that this should be given a national status even though it remains a private institution. In the Deccan there are several education societies registered under the Societies Act and receiving assistance of the Government and yet are not considered fit to be declared national institutions. What marks out the Indian Statistical Institute from other societies is the unusual volume of assistance furnished by the State. After this Bill goes through, Rs. 80 lakhs will give every year to the Institute.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No Sir; that is not necessarily so. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Member but I just wish to say that out of the figure given there, Rs. 50 lakhs are contractual. It will be given, if you have a Bill or not, for the work done. If you do not get the work done, it will not be given. It is not a lump sum to be given to them; it is according to the work done.

Acharya Kripalani: Yet, it is proposed that about Rs. 80 lakhs would be given.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That was given last year; it was contractual. If the hon. Member sees how it is given, he will see that over Rs. 50 lakhs were given for contractual purposes. For instance, for national sample survey Rs. 5 lakhs were given. Similar sums for this and for that were given. It is given in that annual report. It is for specific projects.

13 hrs.

Acharya Kripalani: It may be that even more than that may have to be given Rs. 80 lakhs was given last year; even more may have to be given. The fact is that so much money is given. Of course, the quantum of money does matter, but Rs. 80 lakhs appears to me to be the least that will be given to it, because the work will be increasing and more money will be given to it by the Government. I think I am perfectly right in taking Rs. 80 lakhs which was given, as the Prime Minister says, last year as the minimum up to this time. It will be increasing.

What I mean to say is, so much money will have to be given to the hands of such an institution, especially a private institution, and the very fact of such assistance being furnished should lead Parliament to the conclusion that the institution must have a different qualitative value and should be removed altogether from the category of private institution on itself, what would be under the Registered Societies Act.

Sir, the Central Universities of Banaras and Aligarh between them receive Rs. 18 lakhs every year. The University of Bombay obtains about Rs. 15 lakhs every year. All these institutions which are doing valuable work and which receive much less than what the Indian Statistical Institute would be receiving have rightly been compelled to function through statutory bodies such as the senate, the academic council and the executive of the university. There is no provision for such things here. I have

no objection if this institution is organised on the same basis as universities are organised so that its policies and programmes may be regulated by statutory bodies which are responsible for the governance and laying down of proper standards for the institution.

The very fact that we desire this institution to have a national character, as stated, means that we should have within the proposed Bill adequate safeguards to ensure its national character. No safeguards worth the name have been proposed by the Prime Minister.

Further, a statute recognising the institution must be such as to prevent the possibility of abuse in the hands of those who run the institution. To ensure its proper functioning, to free it from being accused of being a private institution, there must be a greater financial control. As it is, in the Bill there is only control of a post-mortem character. This is achieved by the provisions relating to auditors, but it is most important that current check should be exercised on whether the monies are being properly utilised and applied.

Within the constitution of the Indian Statistical Institute there must be statutory programme and evaluation committees whose reports should be available to Parliament. There is no such provision made here.

Further, if we wish to ensure its national character we must see that proper recruitment and promotion procedures are also laid down. It is clear that the bulk of this large amount will be spent on wages and salaries of administrative and technical personnel. Even in the Government of India, the Central Secretariat organisation has to recruit people through the U.P.S.C., but the committee under the Registered Societies Act cannot fulfil the function of a statutory board. What I suggest is that we should have a proper recruitment board functioning within the constitution of the body and this

recruitment board should have its functions and powers determined in this very Bill; otherwise, Sir, this institution will be a grand field, may be, of exercising patronage or at least it will be suspected of exercising patronage.

What I am suggesting is for the benefit of the institution; it is because we know that all sorts of rumours are let afloat. If there are critical people or there are people opposed to the institution or to its director, there are likely to be rumours. In order to check these rumours it is necessary that in this very Bill these things should be provided.

Looking into the Memorandum of the institution I find that its membership is open to all irrespective of race, colour and creed. It is very good. But, if its functions without statutory bodies created by Parliament and if large sums of money are to be voted every year by Parliament, it would be possible and it may be an inducement to certain people to capture the institution. This has happened so many times about societies that have been registered through the Registered Societies Act.

Therefore, in order to safeguard all these things the Bill, I think, should be referred to a Select Committee for further probe into the matter and to see that Parliament does exercise its control when it is giving so much money to a particular institution which will remain a private institution and will have yet, a national character. This, Sir, is very necessary for the institution itself and it is very necessary for the reputation of those who are running the institution.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody has given notice of an amendment for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee. There is no such amendment before the House.

Acharya Kripalani: I would suggest that even the Prime Minister himself may make a suggestion that the Bill

be referred to a Select Committee of his choice.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no such intention, Sir.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): Sir, may I make one observation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am allowing opportunity to all Members. Before we proceed, let me have an idea about the time. 3½ hours have been allotted for all the stages of this Bill. We started at 12:30. We have spent already 30 minutes. Therefore, three hours remain. How do we distribute the time over the general discussion and the other stages. There are 12 clauses.

An Hon. Member: Make it five hours.

Mr. Speaker: Leave alone five hours. How do we distribute these three hours?

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: If we have five hours, we can have three hours for general discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is no good again and again modifying what has already been decided upon.

An Hon. Member: You have your discretion.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot extend the time. The original allotment was only three hours, not even 3½ hours. All right, if necessary I will allow half-an-hour more. Let it be 2 hours for general discussion and 1 hour for the clauses. Hon. Members will restrict their speeches to ten minutes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am happy to be able to welcome the Bill which has been brought forward by the Prime Minister. I agree, of course, that it would perhaps have been better if the Prime Minister could give more time as far as Parliament was concerned and the matter was referred, as my hon. friend Acharya

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Kripalani has suggested, to a Select Committee. But I do not wish to delay legislation on this point and that is why I feel that perhaps a way out might be discovered by the Prime Minister when the discussion has proceeded further.

We know that on two earlier occasions certain Bills were introduced in this House by the Prime Minister in order to regularise the position and stabilise, so to speak, the Indian Statistical Institute. This is an organisation of which we are all very proud, and on this occasion at least Parliament should not grudge the appreciation which is due to Professor Mahalanobis who has put India, so to speak, on the map of the world as far as the scientific study of statistics is concerned. And this institution has grown from such humble beginnings to a position of international importance, and naturally we are all very happy and proud about it.

But on two earlier occasions the Prime Minister had brought some tentative Bills which were withdrawn for certain special reasons, and he has now come forward with a Bill with which, as I said before, I generally agree. But there are certain points on which I wish to have some clarification.

Sir, it appears that the position of the Indian Statistical Institute, even after this Bill is passed into law will continue to be somewhat peculiar, somewhat paradoxical. I do not wish to impinge on its character of a private, non-profit making organisation. I do not wish Government to intervene overmuch into the affairs of an organisation which has already made good. But, at the same time, I know that there are many complaints in regard to the working of this organisation and it is better that Government takes very careful thought in regard to this legislation.

Reference has been made to the memorandum of association of the Institute, which has been filed with the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies. I fear that from what I have been told that this particular memorandum is by no means very satisfactory. Referring to this memorandum and giving it a certain additional sanction, so to speak, of legislation is perhaps not a very safe proceeding. In the terms of the memorandum, the composition of the administrative organisation of the Institute might very well be open to objection, and from what I have heard it seems that the memorandum requires to be overhauled, but without going into that matter at all, Government has come forward in order to put its final sanction, so to speak, on the composition of the governing body of the Institute as it is envisaged in the memorandum.

Naturally, when Government spends quite a good deal of money for this Institute, about Rs. 90 to Rs. 95 lakhs a year or more is involved—and that is the estimate given by the Prime Minister in the Statement of Objects and Reasons—and when that amount is going to be allotted under the head of recurring and non-recurring grants to this Institute, the country, must be satisfied that there is a sound relationship worked out between Government and this Institute. There should not be a violation of the independent initiative of the Institute, but it should be kept inside social control. It should not be beyond the purview of the control which the State represents. I therefore wish Government to work out a *via media*, something of a golden mean, between the initiative of those who are at present running the Institute and the initiative of the Government. I say so because there have been some serious complaints about the working of this Institute. I refer to this with some hesitation because, as I have said before, I am very sensible of the importance of the work, the very highly important work, which is being done

by this Institute and particularly I am sensible of the credit which this Institute has won in world academic circles. I therefore say whatever I have to say with very great hesitation. We know that in regard to the National Sample Survey, for instance, we are all very happy that this Institute undertook this job. As a matter of fact, I was very proud when I noticed that in a report of evaluation in regard to this survey which was signed by very eminent foreign statisticians they point out in so many words that when they come to the Indian Statistical Institute and try to evaluate national sample survey matters they come to learn rather than to criticise. They say so and I am very happy and proud about it. But, at the same time, it is also very clear that there are some perhaps avoidable defects in the operation of the National Sample Survey projects.

I cannot understand, and occasionally questions have been asked in this House as to why National Sample Survey results have not been published, so to say, promptly. Even now the majority of the work done by the National Sample Survey projects remains unpublished, and we have seen in articles contributed to learned journals by economists of our country some specific grievance in regard to the non publication of many of the results of the National Sample Survey projects. Certain results have been published but the majority of the work done so far has not been published. Also, there have been certain evaluations which point out how the National Sample Survey projects have occasionally not been adequate and the suggestion has also been made that much of the work which is now done by the Indian Statistical Institute over National Sample Survey projects could very well be undertaken with better results by other organisations, by Government organisations, the Central Statistical Organisation, by the statistical organisations under State Governments. Much of the work is of a routine na-

ture; much of that work at one time used to be allotted to the Indian Statistical Institute because it was a pioneer organisation and it had come into the field in a very remarkable way, and it was only proper that in the earlier stages of the National Sample Survey the work was done by the Indian Statistical Institute, but now it appears that it has become something like a desk job added to certain amount of routine functioning in the country side, and the results do not seem to be commensurate. As far as our information is concerned most of the results are not published as I have just now said.

Again, we do not quite know how far Government have been able to utilise the findings of the National Sample Survey. I have seen reports of statements made by eminent people, by Dr. Kuznets and others, to the effect that in regard to the evaluation of our national income the work the National Sample Survey has not been of real importance. When this kind of criticism is heard, I feel a little hurt and I wish that whatever lacunae there might be in the work of the Indian Statistical Institute and allied organisations are made up.

I am very glad that Government now contemplates that the Statistical Institute shall be declared to be an Institute of national importance, and I infer that it only follows that there would be a greater stress, as far as the Indian Statistical Institute is concerned, on research work so that the scientific study of statistics can continue in our country in a better way than it has done so far. But if most of the time and talent of the Institute's staff is now to be devoted to the work of the National Sample Survey and certain other miscellaneous jobs which perhaps ought to be evaluated a little more carefully than they have been so far, then the purpose of making this an Institute of national importance, of which we shall be prouder and

[H. N. Mukerjee]

prouder, may not be served. I wish that there is a greater emphasis on the scientific study of statistics and on the dissemination of the kind of information which pre-eminently the Indian Statistical Institute can convey to the country.

13.20 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I notice also that as far as the working of the Institute is concerned, there are many very serious defects. Occasionally we have heard from the staff of the Indian Statistical Institute that they are worried in regard to their pay and prospects. We have heard how there is a very serious disparity in the salary received by different categories of the staff. We have heard, for instance, that there is a kind of one-man control—I am sorry I have to say it—and the Director, who is a very eminent person and whose services we very highly appreciate, is entirely in control of every single facet and aspect of the administration, and there is hardly any opportunity of creating a wholesome cadre of administrators from the Director downwards.

The Director is not in Calcutta during most of the year—he has very valid reasons to go abroad and to be in Delhi, I know—but the fact remains that, when the Director is not in Calcutta, there is hardly anybody to take the initiative, because they cannot take the responsibility, because under the context of things prevailing in the Indian Statistical Institute, as far as I am informed, nobody wishes to take the initiative and everybody hangs upon whatever falls from the lips of the Director whenever he happens to be available. That is a bad thing. There must be a rationalisation of the structure of this Institute.

We know that this Institute has produced some very fine people who have gone to America and other

places and have won great distinction; but, there is a kind of atmosphere which kills initiative even among those who are fairly well-known in the scientific sphere and statistical work. That is something which ought to be looked into by Government a great deal more carefully than was suggested by the speech of the Prime Minister.

I see also that there is a very highly qualified staff in the Indian Statistical Institute, but their salary scales are not certain and that sort of thing. There is a precariousness about the stability of their jobs; there is no certainty about their promotion or anything like that. In an institute of this sort, where the Director has got round him very fine men and women; it is very necessary to give some encouragement to those who are lower down in the staff, so that they can combine and offer suggestions for the improvement of the work of the Institute.

I am a layman as far as this matter is concerned, but I can try to illustrate certain things which I have been told about. We have been told occasionally and things have appeared in the Press—in the reputable section of the Press—that everything is not lovely in the garden, so far as the Indian Statistical Institute is concerned. We have been told that certain computer machines are lying idle. We have been told that perhaps the latest Ural computer machine gifted by the Soviet Union is not being sufficiently utilised. When we hear these things, we are very unhappy. I may be wrong, but according to my information, I understand that some of the computer machines which are highly capable are not being put to the maximum possible utilisation, only because the results obtained by the field work associated with the National Sample Survey are not being properly systematised, only because certain jobs which ought

to be done by the instrumentality of these computos are not being done. I feel certain misgivings about the whole matter. I say these things subject to correction, but this sort of information has appeared in the Press in recent times and we get to know about it.

If the staff is taken into confidence a great deal more, if those who are subordinate to the Director are given the opportunity of developing their own initiative, it is possible that a great many of these defects would be eliminated very easily, naturally and inevitably. Those young men and women who are there in the Institute should be given an opportunity to offer their own suggestions in regard to the better working of the organisation. All that is not done.

The position of the employee in the Indian Statistical Institute is so precarious that even though there is a provident fund, that is not registered. If that is so, it is not at all a very light matter; it should be looked into at once. If there is a provident fund, it should be registered at once so that the monies deposited in the provident fund are properly administered. I do not wish to make any reflection on anybody; I do not say that the provident fund is not being properly administered. I cannot say that; I should not. But at the same time, things should be made to appear absolutely straight and above board.

We have been told that as far as the employees are concerned, in so many different ways, in regard to the stability of their tenure, in regard to disparity in pay scales, in regard to the precarious position of the provident fund and in regard to so many other matters, there are very many serious grievances to be corrected. Therefore, I feel that Government should go into this matter a good deal more carefully and if it chooses, should give us more information than can possibly be given in the report which we have got. These reports are very valuable; I appreciate very much

the summary of the information that we have got. But in regard to the actual working of the Institute, there are many matters about which we wish to be better informed than we are at the moment.

Therefore, I feel that while it is very necessary to declare this Institute to be an organisation of national importance, while it is very important that Government helps it with money and whatever advice it can give, while it is quite desirable, as the Prime Minister suggests, that we do not interfere at this particular moment with the nature of the Institute, which is a private, non-profit-making organisation, at the same time—we have now put certain social controls on that; all that is certainly acceptable—I feel Government should apply its mind a great deal more seriously in regard to the actual working of the Indian Statistical Institute and improve the working.

We have got a great deal from the Institute already, but we expect from it a very much greater amount of work and a better calibre. We wish that the people who work in the Institute have a feeling that the Institute really belongs to them and the whole country and that their talents should be unreservedly at the disposal of the Institute.

There is another matter to which I should like to make a reference before I close. Under this Bill, this Institute is being empowered to grant degrees and diplomas in statistics. As far as I know, the Institute perhaps even now gives certain diplomas in statistics; now, they would be given the power to grant degrees. I do not object to this at all. But I remember, and I read in the reports supplied to us, that sometime ago, the University Grants Commission, when it was asked for its opinion, gave it as its view that the Indian Statistical Institute in the present circumstances would not be considered to be of the stature of a univer-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

sity. The power to grant degrees, I expect, presupposes that the institution which grants degrees is of the same stature as a university. Therefore, when the Prime Minister replies later, I wish he makes clear how, without being allowed the stature of a university, the Institute can grant degrees. This is a matter on which also I feel that some kind of clarification ought to be given by the Prime Minister.

I repeat, therefore, that this is an Institute which we should certainly assist to whatever extent we can, but there are certain definite grievances which are bruited about in regard to the working of this Institute and they have got to be removed. There are certain very specific grievances of the staff, which have got to be taken care of, before Government offers the Institute the maximum assistance that it possibly can give.

Therefore, I feel that after some drastic searching of the heart takes place as far as the administration of the Institute is concerned, and after Government gives much more time to its actual working, it should be perhaps possible for us to derive from the Institute that amount of result which we have all in view. I would like to conclude again by referring to what I said earlier, that the Indian Statistical Institute is an organisation of which the country is proud and the Director has done work for which he should get the country's due meed of appreciation.

Shri Morarka (Sholapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to support the principles and objectives of this Bill, because this is a Bill which gives this Institute a certain special status which, I think, the Institute has well-earned. The need for a suitable and stable agency for collecting reliable statistics in this country cannot be over-emphasized and, as the hon.

Prime Minister said this morning, planning without statistics on a large scale is unthinkable. But it is equally true that when an institution grows to a certain size, or when it receives most of its funds from the Government, or when it achieves certain importance, then governmental control, State regulation, of that institution is inevitable.

A similar Bill was brought before this House in 1956 by Shri Deshmukh but, for reasons not known to this House, it was...

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): We know that.

Shri Morarka: You were not here then.

Shri Nath Pai: We know the reasons.

Shri Morarka: The present Bill, though it differs only slightly from the scheme of that 1956 Bill, differs materially from other Acts which give similar recognition to other scientific institutions in this country. Here I am referring to two institutions in particular—the Institute of All India Medical Sciences and the Kharagpur Technological Institute. There the scheme of the Government has been that whole the institutions were allowed to maintain their autonomy and flexibility of functioning, yet the Government did exercise the minimum control. The authority of the Government to nominate two persons in the governing body, the right of Parliament to appoint its nominees in the governing body, the right of Parliament to ask for the annual reports and, finally, audit of the report by the Auditor-General,—were some of the main safeguards provided in those Acts.

But, then, in the case of those institutions we did not give such big

grants. Here, this institution would be getting almost a crore of rupees, with which you can easily run a full-fledged university, and in the case of such an institution this Parliament, or this Government, not to have any control whatsoever, except under special circumstances when something goes wrong with the working of the Institute, is something understandable.

If you kindly look at the constitution—the memorandum and articles of association—of this Institute, you will find, after all, who are the real owners, who are the persons who would exercise control, who are the persons who would get and spend this huge amount of crores of rupees every year. The memorandum says that the general body, or the body of members assembled in a general meeting, would be the supreme authority. So far so good. But who are the persons who are entitled to become members of this Institute? There are ordinary members, life members, patrons and so on and so forth. The Council of the Institute can elect anybody whom it thinks proper. An ordinary member has to pay a fee of Rs. 25 per year. Similarly, if a person wants to commute it into a consolidated amount, he can become a life member. Now, there is no period of time up to which a person can be a member. I would like to know from Government how many members are there in this institution, how many persons attend the annual general meeting and how the elections have taken place in the past. Let us see whether in fact this is an institute of the public importance where public is interested and you can safely entrust your funds without running any risk, or whether it is just a one-man show.

I have been reading the history of this Institute and after I have read it—I must frankly confess it here—I could not help feeling this institution is more or less a one-man show. The history of this institution began from a certain day soon after the first world war when Professor Maha-

lanobis came on a short holiday to India from Cambridge and when his professor, Macaulay, drew his attention to certain statistical table which created a liking for him; and he came here and established certain statistical laboratories and he created this institution. The institution was officially registered in 1932. The Institute was lucky in having visits from very prominent personalities who lent the Institute not only dignity and prestige but also financial help. So, the first time we heard of it was in 1934 when Sir James Grigg, the then Finance Member, gave the first grant for training and research. Then many foreign professors, including Sir R. N. Fisher, visited this Institute and gave good testimonials for its activities. But the Institute did not get any State patronage till 1946, as the report says:

“Just before the general elections Shri Jawaharlal Nehru visited Calcutta and stayed for a few days in Mahalanobis' house in which this Institute was located at that time and thus came to know the work of the Institute intimately.”

In 1949, Professor Mahalanobis became the honorary adviser to the Cabinet and in 1950 the National Sample Survey Project was put under his charge. In 1954 he started collecting statistics for our Second Plan. It is the claim that the Plan-frame on which our Second Plan was based, was prepared by this Institute.

So far so good. And I do not want to suggest that this Institute has not done remarkable work. Professor Mukerjee said that Professor Mahalanobis is one of the first persons to put India on the map of this science of collecting statistics, and he is the first person to make some attempt to collect statistics on a national scale. But, then, the question is whether, looking to the amount that we have spent and the time which we have spent, we are getting the corresponding results, and for that you must apply three tests. For the statistics to be useful, first of all they must be

[Shri Morarka]

reliable; secondly, they must be current and, thirdly, they must be presented in an understandable form.

If you apply these three tests, what do you find? First of all, let us take the question of reliability. The statistics were collected primarily for three agencies—Planning Commission, National Income Unit Committee and the Food and Agriculture Ministry. None of these three agencies has yet accepted the statistics mainly on the ground of their reliability. I agree that the field workers of this Institute have put in hard work. I also agree that the amount of work which they have to put in is a sort of Herculean task. But the fact remains that the data they collected are considered to be not sufficiently reliable to be made use of by any one of the agencies for which they are collected. The Planning Commission made a very limited use of those data, that is, only for the purpose of studying the elasticity of the consumers' demand. 95 per cent of the data used by the Planning Commission are collected by other Government agencies and hardly 5 per cent of the data they have used are collected by the National Sample Survey.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): That is a good thing.

Shri Morarka: Similarly, in this case of the Food and Agriculture Ministry, they still prefer to use the data collected by the ICAR, or by other agencies of Government to that of this National Sample Survey. It is accepted throughout the world that statistics can be collected only by means of sample method. But then the question is: what type of sample? You can have the information collected by means of personal interview, or you may have the information collected by actual experimentation. For example, if you want to find out the crop production in a particular area, you can send your field workers to our peasants and ask them how much

they produce during a particular year; or, at the time of the season you can send your team, and they will select at random some field as a sample, cut it and then compile the statistics. Now, the ICAR has been using the crop cutting method whereas the National Sample Survey has been following the interview method.

What happens? I have seen one or two reports. At the end of the Report they gave a proforma questionnaire. In some of the reports I find that a villager is put as many as 4,000 questions. He is put questions like, how much salt he had consumed or how much clothing he had in a particular year. How is it possible, for him to answer correctly I ask. Leave alone a villager. Can anybody here, including the Director himself, say as to how much salt he has consumed in 1958? This is so far as this method is concerned.

The Review Committee, of which Professor Mukerjee spoke, suggested again and again the need for simplifying the questionnaire and for reducing its size and scope. They said that perhaps better results would be obtained by the NSS if they were to contract the size of these questionnaire.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): How much time would be required to read those 4,000 questions?

Shri Morarka: Then again, the interviewer, who goes, might misinterpret the question or the person to whom the question is put might misunderstand it. He might not have a proper record. Our villagers do not keep any record whatsoever. They cannot answer questions with the precision that is necessary in this science. Therefore a small mistake in one sample is bound to be magnified and make all our calculations erroneous. While the necessity of statistics is very great, reliable statistics are very helpful and are needed, at the same time wrong statistics can be very dangerous. They can completely mislead us.

The second point that I was venturing to submit was about the time taken in publishing these reports. Statistics to be useful, as I have said, must be current. Some of the reports which the Institute has published relate to the years 1949 and 1950. They have been made available to us some time in 1959, almost a decade later. Such statistics, no doubt, can be of historical importance or academic value, but they cannot certainly be of any practical use for the purpose of framing current Government policies, economic, fiscal or strategic.

There is another criticism and that is that this institution does not publish all the statistics which it collects. It publishes only those statistics which it considers convenient. On that point the Review Committee had an observation to make. The reason why the institution does not publish these statistics is that there is a lurking fear in its mind that these statistics are not reliable. At one place, on page 31, this is what the Review Committee says.

Shri Ranga: Which committee?

Shri Morarka: The Review Committee. A review committee was appointed consisting of eminent foreign professors to review the work of the NSS. The Committee had very little time at its disposal and therefore did not make an exhaustive report. But in the report that it has made, this is what it says:

"There is naturally a tendency, when discrepancies are brought to light, to delay or withhold publication of statistics to which they refer. In this respect we believe that NSS has in certain cases exercised excessive caution."

Then, they go on to say that publication of results even if they are erroneous is useful because they provide a basis for comparison with other statistics, otherwise you accept one set of statistics uncritically and without any change whatever.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: Where is the remark about the lurking fear? The hon. Member stated that the results were not being published due to a lurking fear in the mind of the Institute. Is there anything to that effect in the remarks of the Review Committee?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is the hon. Member's remark.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: That is hon. Member's remark.

Shri Morarka: That was my remark.

Now kindly see the objects of this Institute. This Institute is being given national importance and national recognition. According to me the objects of the Institute are too vague and its functions are too wide. I would only read the third object because my time is limited. It says:

"to undertake any other activities which in the opinion of the Council may be usefully carried out by the Institute in furtherance of national development and social welfare."

National development and social welfare, are the only limiting conditions. They have nothing to do with statistics. They may undertake anything, including a milk dairy, if it is in furtherance of national development or social welfare.

Now kindly see function No. 12. It says:

"to carry on directly or in collaboration with associated or subsidized agencies research for development of and to make, construct, manufacture or produce, computing and scientific instruments, machines, equipment, appliances and tools;"

Is it a function of the Institute to manufacture all these instruments, scientific and others? Not only this,

[Shri Morarka]

function No. 2 is most important. It reads:

"to establish, maintain and manage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of schools, colleges, training institutions, education centres, laboratories,...."

So far, so good. But further it says:

".....workshops, factories, experimental farms...."

and things like that. How can this Institute run factories, experimental farms or workshops? That certainly is not the function of a statistical institute. I know the Institute itself cannot do it and it may not be its intention to do these things. But still when you are giving statutory recognition to an institution and calling it an institution of national importance, the aims and objects of that institution must be precise, well-defined and there must be proper control and regulation by the Government and by the Parliament.

I would only refer to one or two points which are very small. First is about the amount spent each year by this Institute. On page 53 of this latest report, which is available, I find under item 9 on the Payments side that hire and maintenance of tabulating equipment, key punches and verifiers including freight, transport, electricity charges etc., amount to Rs. 8,67,000. This item occurs year after year and every time this item is almost of the same dimension. I wonder as to why we are paying such a heavy hire charge or rent for these machines if the machines are needed by the Institute, which I am sure are needed for all time to come. Why do we not buy them and keep them? Or is it that they have been purchased on hire-purchase system and we are paying some instalments? I do not know the actual position. But it seemed to me a very big amount to pay by way of hire and that too every year.

There is another point which I would like to mention finally and I hope I will not be misunderstood. Since this institution is being given a national character, I do hope that the Institute would in due course shed its bias for provincialism. I say this for two or three reasons. If you kindly see the Memorandum and Articles of Association, which is being adopted by this Act, you will find that it says:

"At least half the members of the Executive Committee shall be elected from members of the Council who are ordinarily resident in the City and suburbs of Calcutta or De hi."

Why this qualification?

Dr. M. S. Aney: That may be to keep the presence of members and quorum at the meeting.

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman (Kumbakonam): That is under the Rules.

Shri Morarka: If anybody says that a person who does not attend so many meetings would be disqualified, I can understand that. Or, if you say that a person should have this academic qualification before he can be taken as a member, I can understand that. But is it a qualification that a person must be a resident of such-and-such place, before he can become a member?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Morarka: Only one more point and I will sit down.

If you read the annual reports, every year you will find a heading "External activities of the Institute and tours abroad". I have gone through three or four reports for the past years, the last one being for the year 1958-59. Without exception I find Professor Mahalanobis accompanied by his wife went abroad and stayed in India only for a few weeks. Before they come, they have to plan

another tour. Every time the same team was out. When this Institute is a National Institute and broad-based, opportunities should be given to younger persons, more competent persons coming from all areas to go and represent this country. If not, at least, Prof. Mahalanobis could take out a delegation or team consisting of other persons also. Everytime the delegation consists of the same two persons. There may be some justification. I do not know. A person who is not well conversant with this, gets this unhappy impression. I hope my suggestion would be appreciated in the proper light and something would be done.

Shr.mati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I warmly support this Bill. I am indeed surprised when my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani says that adequate safeguards have not been offered in this Bill. In fact, adequate safeguards of every kind have been offered. Under clause 12, Government will have power to take possession of any part of the Institute and control it should occasion arise. In fact, I think, it has taken unto itself powers what the Government takes in a municipality. I do not see where the safeguards do not lie.

Secondly, my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee has remarked that the provident fund is not registered. I do not know if it is registered, but Sir, there are trustees who look after this provident fund. I think they do their best to utilise this fund in the most useful way possible.

Thirdly, I would say that remarks have been made about this Institute that all its statistics may not have been as much used as one would think they should be. I would like to put it to the House that this Institute in days as far back as 1922, took up the disastrous floods that happened in Bengal and recommended certain things which saved a large expenditure. This Institute took statistics about the floods in the Brahmani river in Orissa. That also forms the basis of the schemes for the Hirakud project Prof. Mahalanobis's

paper about the Burdwan-Hooghly-Howrah flushing and the Irrigation schemes, as early as 1930 formed the basis of the calculation of the Damodar Valley, years before any of these multi-purpose schemes were taken up.

This Institute, starting from small beginnings, when it had only an expenditure of Rs. 250 has gone up from strength to strength and is now in a status that is recognisable as a National Institute. I hope that that status will be given to it with the full support of India and this House, because the people who have worked in this Institute have considered service above self. I have, sir, had occasion as a young girl to see the beginnings of this Institute when it was not as big as it is today. I have seen the selfless devotion that has been Prof. Mahalanobis's contribution to this aspect of statistics in India.

I would also like to point out that certainly in India, we today need an approach to science that is very necessary. Science is the backbone of all plans. Science is what the soul is to the body. Statistics will provide the practical content to any science. If you look at it, this Statistical Institute has certainly done its work in the past and is carrying on valuable work in the present. It has been remarked that it takes part in routine statistics. Routine statistics only cannot serve the purpose of planning. Routine statistics have to be read by the people who work with them. The figures are there. Only figures in statistics mean nothing. They can be made to represent anything you wish. There is a saying which really does not apply but which is in the public mind that there are lies, damn lies and statistics. That is not so when you apply the statistics with a scientific mind. It is the scientific mind behind this institution that looks into the routine statistics and routine figures, studies the trends, sees the developments, and supplies the checks and balances for the plans. Without statistics, your plans would be just as if it were a

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri]

body without the framework of the bones. I would certainly say that the Statistical Institute has supplied that basis and done this work admirably.

There are some amendments that have been brought to this Bill. I am surprised at the amendment of Shri Bimal Ghose, in which he claims that the Government should give approval to a degree that the Institute would give. When an Institute of this stature, manned by men of eminence who know their job, which is going to be recognised, I hope, as an Institute of national importance, gives a degree, how does it convey any kind of prestige of the Institute if it is to go to the Government to ascertain as to how the degree should be granted? It should be autonomous. Now, regarding audit, Sir, the right to scientific research and scientific work should never be troubled by governmental organisation or governmental administration. Shri C. D. Deshmukh, when he attended one of the meetings of the Institute last year, I think, has given his opinion unequivocally over this point. Shri C. D. Deshmukh, I think, has a good idea as far as finance is concerned, as to what should be done about financial control in the Institution. He has said,—I am quoting the words of Shri C. D. Deshmukh—

“It was suggested to Government that the affairs of the institute should be audited by persons nominated by the Auditor General in the same way in which all other government transactions are audited. We feel here, on behalf of the Institute that this would be a very misconceived step.”

This will amply prove, when the opinion of people who have knowledge of the actual working of the Institute, which Shri C. D. Deshmukh has, of people who have actual knowledge of finance, which nobody can doubt that Shri C. D. Deshmukh has, is this, that any kind of audit by the Auditor General in an Institution like this would be entirely misconceived. It

would throttle the progress of science. What has been provided in this Bill is quite safeguard enough to look after the funds that the country is going to give to this Institute to go on with its work, and do what is needed for an institution of this description in India.

About internal matters, I would just like to place one thing before the House. Sir, this is not an industrial organisation, not a factory, not an enterprise. This is a scientific institution where the workers have to work always in close collaboration with the highest. Many of them have good opportunities of promotion. There could be no question of selection to cadres by any authority, because that, I think, would be automatically dealt with on their merit. People from this institution have gone abroad and have won fame for themselves in every sphere and for the institution. The fairness of the directors and the people working at the top has always been appreciated and spoken highly of. If there is any idea that there should be a kind of trade unionism in an institution like this, it will certainly defeat its object. It should never be thought of in these lines because this is an institute which is mainly scientific where people are studying the trends and trying to probe into the future, and from these studies of statistics and employment of the figures and studies, the country is benefited.

In the end I would only like to add what Mr. Holmes, an American poet and novelist, has said, which is very apt. Solmes says that science is a first rate piece of furniture for a man's upper chamber if he has common sense on the ground floor. Statistics supply that common sense on the ground floor, and science on the upper storey of India will, I am sure, be fully helped by the statistics that we will get from the Indian Statistical Institute when it attains and is given the glory and the sanction and the approval of a national institute and people who have worked for it will win the admiration and love of

the country for the work they have done for India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid I shall not be able to give any Member more than ten minutes.

Shri Mahanty.

14 hrs.

Shri Mahanty: I may be forgiven if I am not able to see eye to eye with the hon. Mover of the Bill regarding the underlying principles of this Bill. I feel the Government, by seeking to control the policy and the direction of the Indian Statistical Institute, is taking away an agency which could have been utilised possibly for checking up the various statistics which are offered on behalf of the Government from time to time. I fail to understand why the Indian Statistical Institute which has run all these years, for the last 20 years, without any kind of aid or subvention from the Government cannot continue as such, and why today it is being converted into a semi-Government organisation where the policy, perspective, direction, everything is being sought to be controlled by the Government. I thoroughly disagree with the proposition which has been made that it is going to maintain its autonomous, flexible character. Any one going through the Bill will find any number of clauses to show that it is the Government which will prepare the programme of work, which will appoint the reviewing committee, which will issue directions from time to time.

Ours is a welfare State where our life is being controlled from the cradle to the grave. So far so good, I welcome it. All Welfare States have survived on statistics. Somebody said, I do not agree with him thoroughly, that statistics was a lamp post which was not so much for showing the way, but for the drunkard to lean against. We know there are statistics and statistics. Even Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis five years ago in a public statement stated that India had produced and consumed much more foodgrains than was sought

to be established in the official statistics. The only point I am trying to make is this: the Welfare State which tries to control our life from the cradle to the grave will always produce such kind of statistics that will beguile the people. Therefore, if this institution maintains its original independence, it can render yeoman service for checking up the Government statistics which are being offered from time to time. Therefore, I am sorry I am not inclined to agree even to the underlying principles of this Bill.

Then, there are some other aspects which have been really confused. I believe much of the story will possibly never be told, much of the story will never see the light of day. I do not know why the Prime Minister has come with this Bill. The House knows that this sum of Rs. 93 lakhs provided for this Institute during 1959-60 comes under a Demand relating to the Home Ministry. It is Demand No. 52 which has been mentioned in Financial Memorandum. Possibly the Prime Minister owes an answer to this House as to why he comes to the House with a Bill which relates to a Demand under the Home Ministry. Somebody should also tell us, before we are asked to give our seal of approval like a dhobi mark, why the Bill was withdrawn in 1956-57. I do not find the hon. Mover here; I do not find the hon. Home Minister either, I find the Deputy Minister of External Affairs. Statistics is as external to external affairs as anything can be. I am speaking in all seriousness. Somebody should tell us why the Bill was withdrawn, why the Prime Minister moves this Bill while the Home Minister is quite hale and hearty.

Then there are some other aspects. For instance, under clause 4 this Institute is going to confer diplomas and degrees. When I look at the review of work by Prof. Mahalanobis I find that he himself was opposed to this idea. I may invite attention to page 67 of the report for 1958-59 wherein he has said:

"But I understand because of what was considered to be highly

[Shri Mahanty]

specialised nature of statistics, it was felt that it would not be proper to give us powers to award degrees."

This is the statement made by the Director of the Institute. Somebody should have told us why the Government is being more enthusiastic than the Director himself to confer power on the Institute to award degrees and diplomas.

The University Grants Commission was also opposed to it. I now give a quotation from the speech of the Chairman of the Commission, Shri C. D. Deshmukh. He said:

"They honestly felt (that means the visiting committee of the University Grants Commission) that from a purely academic point of view, the total range of discipline was too narrow to permit of their advising the Central Government that the Institute might be notified as deemed to be equivalent to a university."

This was the view of the University Grants Commission's Chairman, and I have also quoted the view expressed by Prof. Mahalanobis. The latter did not want the Institute to confer diplomas and degrees, according to his own statement. Now the Government ought to tell us why they are so anxious to confer this right on this Institute.

You know this is going to be declared as an Institute of national importance under Entry No. 64 of the Union List which reads:

"Institutions for scientific or technical education financed by the Government of India wholly or in part and declared by Parliament by law to be institutions of national importance."

It is true this Institute has been giving training, but the most important thing is: has this Institute a course of study? Will the hon. Prime Minister tell us whether this Institute has a course of study? So far as I know, Prof. Haldane

has been entrusted with this work, and I do not know as yet if the courses of study have been prescribed. In the absence of a course of study, how this Institute will conduct examinations and confer diplomas and degrees is frankly baffling my understanding.

Then there are one or two other minor points. Nobody disputes the proposition that our machinery for collecting statistics should be more streamlined, that it should be placed on a more fool-proof basis. But the House must remember that the following bodies of the Government of India are also engaged in the same task. There was the Central Statistical Unit established in 1949; then there was the National Income Committee established in 1949; there was the National Sample Survey formed in 1950 which is now, of course, under the aegis of this Institute. Then, the Reserve Bank is also covering more or less the same field of activity. Then the Central Statistical Organisation was established in 1959 for which a provision of Rs. 13.50 lakhs has been provided in the Budget. This Central Statistical Organisation has been doing the very same activities which the Indian Statistical Institute has been doing. The Central Statistical Organisation also has a training programme under which the trainees from this institute have their examinations. I would like to be corrected, if I am wrong; I would like to know whether it is not a fact that trainees from the Indian Statistical Institute have to appear for examinations conducted by the Central Statistical Organisation.

Besides, there are also the State Governments who are getting any amount of grants or loans from the Government of India. Therefore, in our enthusiasm to build statistics, we have got a motley crowd of statisticians in this country, to borrow a phrase used by our Prime Minister. We do not know where we stand. One set of statistics is being discounted by another authority. Therefore, we feel that it was time enough that there

was some kind of a co-ordinated effort to control these statistics.

I would have been personally very happy if the Indian Statistical Institute could have been left outside the purview of the State; and if the Statistical Institute could carry on for as long as twenty years, with fees or revenues derived from contract, they could have been allowed to do so even now without impairing their efficiency or accuracy.

Shri Khadilkar: I welcome the Bill which seeks to confer national status on an institution which has done pioneering work in the field of statistics in our country. But while we seek to confer national status on an institute of this character, the real problem is how far we as a parliament are entitled to exercise control over it, in regard to the financial provisions that we are making. Another aspect is how far an autonomous institution of this character should be left free, more or less, without any statutory structure laid down by this House to govern its functioning.

As I was trying to make out when I tried to raise the point of order, when I went through the reports of the debates of the Constituent Assembly I discovered that when this issue was discussed, there was consensus of opinion that when the Parliament tries to confer national status on any institution, the statutory structure must be defined, and some financial control also must be exercised. That was the general tenor of the discussion that took place in the Constituent Assembly.

In this Bill, what I find is that there is a half-hearted attempt on the part of Government, on one side to have financial control, and on the other side, to have a little administrative control, without laying down definitely a sort of charter that would govern the institute. I may point out one instance. Even the Royal Statistical

Institute of Britain, which is constituted under a Royal Charter, has not got such freedom.

I entirely agree with what the Prime Minister said while moving the motion, that in this country we must give greater freedom to scientific studies without any governmental interference. To give an instance from my own experience, of governmental interference, I can say that in 1946, when the food situation became very acute in the Bombay State, a friend of mine, a professor of the Bombay University, who was supposed to collect some statistical information for Government was invited by the Chief Secretary and told, 'Look, here, your findings are likely to create disaffection; so, do not publish them', because the study was financed by Government. So, this is a dilemma. In case there is Government interference, the statistical material is likely to be tainted by Government's policies, directly or indirectly, and it would not be taken as a reliable basis for scientific purposes. Therefore, I, for one, would say, give complete autonomy and give them a grant and get the work done by them on a contractual basis. I am connected in a friendly way with another institute in Poona, of equal standing and reputation, namely the Gokhale Institute, of which Shri D. R. Gadgil a friend of Shri Mahalanobis, is the Director; they have been doing work in this field, but they get donations; they get help, but there is no control. They have established themselves in this field as an authority. This is a good thing.

The Statistical Institute, however, is getting about Rs. 80 or 90 lakhs from Government annually. Government are trying to meet the demands made in this House and outside and also the criticism that some control by way of audit as well as administrative supervision must be there, by bringing forward this measure. I fail to understand what difference it would make if the Auditor-General examines the

[Shri Khadilkar]

accounts, or a body of independent auditors approved by the Auditor-General examines the accounts. After all, auditing is a science, just as statistics is a science, and those auditors also will be guided by the same rules and the same principles. So, where is the question of interference?

Then, Government want to allow this Institute to exercise the power of conferring degrees. I know that in the Gokhale Institute also, students are admitted for higher studies in statistics, and they get instruction there. I could understand such a thing being done in this case also; I could also understand a charter being given, just like a university charter, by which you create an autonomous body functioning within the statutory structure laid down by this Parliament. I think we shall be failing in our duty if we pass this Bill without giving much thought to a legislation of this kind.

The other alternative is this. The Institute should function absolutely independently. I have no grouse against that. For, there should not be any interference; there should not be any criticism, and Government could get the work done on a contractual basis or otherwise, and give them grants, without asking for accounts. Of course, there can be general supervision we can get annual reports and place them on the Table of the House. But, in the name of not throttling initiative, are we justified, and is this House justified in giving a body a national status without at the same time laying down certain conditions which the makers of our Constitution thought fit while this particular Schedule was being drafted in the light of the discussions in the Constituent Assembly? This is the main problem before the House. Therefore, initially,

I pleaded that this Bill should not be passed in haste, but should be referred to a Select Committee.

I do believe, and I subscribe strongly to the view, that there should be autonomous bodies completely free from Government interference, if we are going to develop science in this country. Otherwise, science will be made a handmaid of Government; and if statistics, particularly, is made the handmaid of Government policy, then nobody will rely on what is stated by Government in support of their policy. That danger is there.

Therefore, my humble submission is that instead of passing this measure hurriedly, it would be far better if it is referred to a Select Committee; because, once we pass this, then it will be a sort of model measure for conferring national status on other institutions of this nature without in any way violating or stultifying the wishes of this House.

There is just one small point, and I have done. Last year, suddenly, notices were served on the employees of this Institution, and there was a panic. What guarantee is there for the employees? There are about two thousand young scientists here, coming from all parts of the country. I do not want to go into the merit of the question, as my hon. friend Shri Morarka has done. For, how to collect statistics is also a science; so, it is not for me to say whether this method is right or that method is right.

The point is that when we legislate for institutions of this type, we must look to the interests of the employees as well. In this Bill, unfortunately, that part is completely lacking, because there is no control on that aspect i.e., recruitment, at all.

Therefore, before rushing through this measure, I would again appeal to the Leader of the House to see that we give a little quiet thought to it from the point of view of the development of independent scientific institutions which are doing very good work—and this Institution is a world-famous Institution doing a good work—and see what type of autonomy should be given to them. This should be demarcated properly. I should be thought out properly. Then this measure should be passed. In the end, I would once again appeal to the Mover to refer this Bill to a Select Committee which is the place where we can give enough thought to this matter. It would really help the Institute to function in a proper manner. This should be done while we are making this law.

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, quite justifiably tributes have been paid to the enormous work carried out by the Indian Statistical Institute. On the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of the Institute, the Prime Minister said in a message to the Institute with regard to its role in planning:

“The Indian Statistical Institute has gained a reputation for itself not only in India but in every country where statistics are studied. It has grown in recent years and has performed important functions in connection with our planning work. Indeed, it is an essential part now of our planning organisation. On the occasion of its Silver Jubilee, I send it all my good wishes”.

That was the tribute paid by the Prime Minister on the occasion of its Silver Jubilee of this Institute.

It is worthwhile noting—because some comment has been made—what Professor Fisher has to say with regard to the sample survey method and the census method. He says about sample survey:

“I have made four claims for the sampling procedure. About the first three, adaptability, speed and economy, I need say nothing further. Too many examples are already available to show how much the new method has to give in these ways. But why do I say that it is more scientific than the only procedure with which it may sometimes be in competition, the complete enumeration?”.

I am quoting this from the National Sample Survey General Report No. 1 for the period October 1950 to March 1951. The Report quite rightly says:

“From practical considerations, the choice is between organising sample surveys and having no information at all”.

That is the position so far as sample survey is concerned. So far as the interview method is concerned, again I find in the Report No. 2 of the National Sample Survey (April—June 1951):

“The information is collected in the NSS mainly by the ‘interview method’ in which the investigators visit each household included in the sample and make direct enquiries from the householders”.

The real trouble is that while these surveys are different abroad, for example, in England or America, where the people who are interviewed and questioned have a certain amount of educational qualifications and are not shy of dealing with investigators or government employees or answering enquiries—they have ‘gallup polls’ quite often in those parts—in our country the people are shy in answering questions or enquiries. But that does not mean that the method itself is bad. We are bound to improve in course of time.

Actually, it may not be out of place to mention in this connection that so far as the Faridabad Township is concerned, stupendous work was done by

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman]

three or four people headed by Shri Pitamber Pant. There you will find that a new township has grown and a lot of load has been taken off the Rehabilitation Ministry. Many industries have been started along with co-operative societies. Here is an excellent example of what a sample survey could do—in the growth of a township and in the provision of employment opportunities for displaced persons in industries.

Therefore, it is too late in the day to question the scientific aspect of the sample survey or the importance of the work done by the Indian Statistical Institute. Actually, as the Prime Minister pointed out, clause 6 of the Bill gives Government powers to issue directions to the auditors in the performance of the audit if they think fit. It can never be a hole and corner affair. This is a big Institute getting a recurring grant of Rs. 80 lakhs which with the other grant nearly amounts to a crore of rupees. Nothing wrong or namby-pamby can happen about it. Things cannot be concealed; they will see the light of day. As I said, the Central Government have powers to issue directions in regard to audit. Then there is clause 9 under which the Central Government may constitute a Committee consisting of such number of persons as it thinks for the purpose of evaluating the work etc. done by the Institute. There is another very important clause—clause 11—which deals with the power to issue directions to the Institute.

“The Central Government may, if it is satisfied that it is necessary so to do in the public interest, issue, for reasons to be recorded and communicated to the Institute, such directions as it thinks fit to the Institute, and such directions may include directions requiring the Institute”

to amend the memorandum or amend the rule etc.—for shortness of time, I am skipping over those items with

your permission. I come to sub-clause (2) of clause 11 which says:

“Any directions issued under this section shall have effect, notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force or in the memorandum or rules and regulations of the Institute”.

Therefore, we have got the overall power in the very Bill itself. Actually, I venture to state that the effect of the Bill itself is to increase governmental supervision. As has been pointed out by the Prime Minister, it is not necessary that all these institutions should become governmental institutions for they will then have the deadweight of governmental interference and the routine of bureaucratic action. An autonomous Institute like this, once it is included under item 64 of the Seventh Schedule becomes part of the First List in the Constitution. If I may say so, it is even the thin end of the wedge so far as the apprehensions of many Members are concerned. It can be stated that once it becomes an Institute mentioned in the Union List, Government can issue directions and I dare say they will do so and see that nothing wrong happens.

Some defects have been pointed out, particularly with regard to the non-publication of collected data and results of research. I dare say these are matters of detail. It is true that if data are collected and are just pigeon-holed and not used, the money and energy spent on them will be a waste. The data will be out dated by the time they are published. If data collected now are not published now but ten years later, they will become useless. This is also a matter of detail.

As regards the fear expressed that there will be one-man control, here again we can issue directions. Once it comes within the purview of this House, directions can be issued to see that there is no one-man control, that the Council is enlarged and the

machines, calculators etc. are put to the maximum use.

I do see that there is some force in the criticism that the provident fund has not been registered at all. I believe there are trustees of the provident fund. They will have to obtain some concessions from the Income Tax department before the registration. But that is a matter of detail which any lawyer will deal with. I am sure it will be registered in course of time. It is no doubt true that you cannot have a provident fund functioning in a public institution without its being registered.

With regard to degrees and diplomas being conferred upon candidates, this Institute can do so. This cannot be compared to the Kharagpur Institute, to which my hon. friend, Shri Morarka, was referring. The scope of the Kharagpur Institute is limited. This is scientific Institute with much broader scientific work and bigger canvas to work upon. So it cannot really be compared to the Kharagpur Institute.

I see some force in the criticism of the rule which appears to make this an exclusive club. I am referring to rule 3 which says:

"At least half the members of the Executive Committee shall be elected from members of the Council who are ordinarily resident in the City and suburbs of Calcutta or Delhi".

Let them by all means do this in effect, if there is reason for it but in modern India ten years after the inauguration of the Constitution, it is fantastic that any rule should say that half the number of members should be resident in Calcutta or Delhi. As I said, let them by all means bring this into effect, but to do so by means of a rule is improper. It is really ugly to have a rule like that. With regard to the membership, I do not think there can be restriction. Here

usually power is given to the Committee or Council to elect members. But that does not mean that it can become an exclusive club. The moment they do it, it will be open to criticism in this House.

I would however say that the criticism of its being really parochial is wrong. If any institution is parochial or confines itself only to Bengalis or to Calcutta or Delhi it is very wrong and I am sure it will be curbed and condemned by the House when the proper opportunity arises.

One more point and I am done. It has been said that the Planning Commission, the National Income Unit and the Food Ministry are not using the various data available. It may be a matter of adjustment if they are not using it at all. It is hardly my province to refer to that aspect of it. Then about work of the statisticians of other departments of other Ministries and other institutions not being recognised by this Institute, there again, it is a matter of detail which has got nothing to do with this Bill, which I am supporting whole-heartedly.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my hon. friend Shri Pattabhi Raman has made quite an able ministerial speech in defence of this Bill. I do not grudge him that privilege. But even the few points which he has taken exception to are bad enough to justify a motion being made by the Prime Minister for reference of this Bill to a Select Committee.

It is unfortunate that the Prime Minister has failed to study this Bill as well as one should have expected. If he had done so, I am sure he would have seen the reason for the justification of sending it to the Select Committee.

I do not know why this Institute should be singled out to be styled as a National Institute and, therefore, to be placed under the Schedule and given all these privileges. If only

[Shri Ranga]

they want that this Institute should do its work and also grant diplomas and degrees and so on, it is not necessary that it should be singled out in this fashion. There is the Indian Institute of Agricultural Research. It is also permitted to give degrees now and yet it has not been given this particular privilege. What is the special object which Government has at the back of its mind in making this proposal? Is it because they want to increase their control over this Institute? Speaker after speaker has said that there is not enough of control, not even half as much as we have over the centrally-managed and the centrally-financed universities. Or is it because we want to reduce the control that we have? It has been said that the control that we have is not enough and, therefore, more control is being given. Therefore, the dispute is over the quantum of control that Parliament and Government are to have over this Institute. Does it not merit serious consideration by a Select Committee?

It has been said that this Institute has been built up by one man and continues to be more or less one-man run institution. I have very great respect for the scientists. But it is generally recognised that scientists always do not make very good administrators. It is quite possible that this particular scientist started it on his own and built it up and won the approval of the Prime Minister before he became the Prime Minister. Therefore, the Institute has been able to make a very good harvest of this later on. Now that it has to employ 1,000 people it requires a good deal of administrative talent and it certainly merits very careful examination on the part of the Prime Minister whether its management is all that can be expected to be and whether there cannot be any improvement.

One suggestion has already been made by my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani that there should be some

safeguards in regard to the manner in which the staff is recruited, treated and promotions provided for. Those safeguards do not seem to be there at all in this Bill.

It is not as if statistics have come into this country in the train or along the footsteps of this Director. There were some people earlier than this attempt who organised statistics. In fact they initiated this very interview method of collecting statistics which has come to be adopted by this Institute and which now has been supported by my hon. friend Shri Pattabhi Raman. There were Dr. Slater, Dr. Mann, Mr. Fndlay Shirras and quite a number of others thereafter who had conducted a number of enquiries in different parts of the country. A number of statistics also came to be published based upon the results that they had obtained by those interviews. Thereafter, this Institute has grown into such prominence. Is it any reason why we should give this monopoly to this Institute in Calcutta to collect data, to sort them out and also to publish them? Can there be any justification for giving a sort of monopoly for a particular Institute alone? Is it so wrong for people to begin to fear that if you were to give this kind of privileged status to this particular institute alone other institutes will not flourish? First of all, it may not be possible for other institutes to come into existence. Or such of them as have come into existence or may come into existence may not be able to progress just as well because of this particular rival. Then, where is the guarantee that this Institute's researches are not liable to be based upon mistakes? Their results might also be mistakes. And any kind of plans that might be made by the Planning Commission or others may also go awry because they are based upon wrong statistics. It is a notorious fact that a number of departments have also their statisticians and economists. Therefore, is it not in

the interests of the country that there should be a number of institutions instead of one especially when there is not quite unanimity in regard to the methods to be followed and pursued, in collecting the information, sorting them out and in publishing them?

Sir, in America they have a number of institutes—but they are not called by the name of national institutes; there is an institute for import statistics; there is an institute for export statistics; any number of them for studying these facts from different points of view. Could we not also have similar institutes here in our country?

Recently one Institute has come into existence, the National Council of Applied Research and there are also a number of statistical sections in the various departments of Government in the various State Governments as well as the Government of India. What kind of cooperation or coordination is proposed to be brought about between the work of this particular Institute and its results and the work and results of these various departmental and other statistical bodies? Should there not be some coordination and some effort made in that direction?

Almost every one of our universities have developed their own faculties for statistics. Is it proposed that they should not have any interest at all in the management of this Institute? Take Parliament itself. On the Bangalore Institute of Science this Parliament has been given representation. One wonders why that kind of representation for Parliament has not been thought of at all here.

All these are very important points in regard to management, in regard to the status of this particular Institute. It would have been fairer to the House if it had been agreed to or even suggested that this Bill should be sent to the Select Committee.

A good number of points were made by my hon friend Shri Hiren Mukerjee and also by Shri Morarka. They have to be answered, not in a rhetorical manner but by facts. Why should it be that a good number of statisticians should go abroad in order to find recognition and employment? Why were they not considered here at all? Was it not the case that on several occasions in the F.A.O. and other organisations associated with the U.N.O. offered to organise seminars here for statistics on agriculture and other subjects and yet because the Prime Minister and the other Ministers were dependent mostly upon the advice of this Institute and its Director that those seminars were not invited to this country even when the U.N. Organisations were going to pay for it?

Therefore, I do hope that since it is now too late for the Prime Minister to think of sending it to the Select Committee, he would be a little more critical than he has been—I cannot say he has been, but he appears to have been—about the working of this Institute and see that in actual practice it would certainly grow into a reliable All-India National Institute—not, as it professes to be, confined to Delhi and Calcutta so far as 50 per cent of its own representation is concerned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: The rule to which reference is being made repeatedly is not in operation. It is put in the appendix, among the rules kept in abeyance. That rule about Calcutta and Delhi is not in operation . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Can you please give us five minutes? I am waiting without even taking my lunch.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry; I cannot help it.

Shri Joachim Alva: Shri Morarka had 25 minutes and I want only five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called the hon. Prime Minister. I can call the hon. Member during the Second reading stage.

Shri Joachim Alva: I will not be able to say many things; I would not be able to reply to some of the nasty things which Shri Morarka said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Enough has been said even now.

Shri Joachim Alva: You must have some human consideration towards us.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, my answer to the question which was put by some hon. Members as to why I am piloting this Bill and not the Home Minister is that this is under the Cabinet Secretariat and directly dealt with by me.

Shri Bimal Ghose (Barrackpore): The 1956 Bill was brought in by the Finance Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Any of my colleagues may bring in a Bill if I ask him to bring it up.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Sir, may I correct Shri Ghose. That Bill was not on behalf of the Finance Ministry. One of the Ministers in the Finance Ministry was acting on behalf of the Cabinet Secretariat and was in charge of that subject . . . (Interruptions.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is a matter entirely for the Ministers and any Minister can bring it in. But this is very much under the Cabinet Secretariat and the Cabinet Secretariat functions under the Prime Minister. I may ask the Finance Minister or any other Minister to deal with it but the proper course would have been, then as it is now, for me

to bring it forward and if by chance I could not have found it convenient to do so or easy to do so, I would have requested others.

Quite a number of points, I gather, have been raised. Many of them seem to be rather hardly relevant, if I may say so, with all respect. They deal with the position of the staff there, how the staff is recruited and other troubles. They hardly come into this Bill. If it had been suggested that it should become 100 per cent Government organisation, perhaps—even then I am not sure whether—it is proper for this House to go into those details. But here is an autonomous organisation which has been dealing with, more or less, success with the staff problem. Grievances there are; they are everywhere. But I gather that on the whole work has been done very satisfactorily there. Stress is laid on this being one man's show. I do not quite understand that except that naturally the director not only by virtue of his position as a Director but otherwise as an eminent scientist stands rather above many of his expert colleagues—eminent colleagues there. So far as the administration, etc. are concerned, they are naturally left to the executive council which consists of very eminent people like Shri C. D. Deshmukh, Shri Dhiren Maitra and others who look after that. In fact, the Director is not always even present at these meetings. But perhaps so far as the main scientific direction is concerned, naturally it is largely due to his own enthusiasm in the subject.

Prof. Ranga said something about the statisticians and economists and others quarrelling. Well, perhaps they differ in their view sometimes even as, I believe, known politicians differ sometimes in their views . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Ranga: Politicians are also scientists like yourself.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is nothing surprising about that except that the politicians are not usually

scientists and therefore they differ much more. If they had a little scientific background they will differ a little less perhaps. There are eminent statisticians working in our Government departments, universities and elsewhere in the country. There is no question of our considering them not eminent. They are doing good work. They should do good work. The main thing was this. Here was an institution which has grown up. If it had not grown up during the course of these years, we will have to think how to have such an institute because statistics had grown into a very vital part of the nation's activities, planning, etc. It is hardly possible to plan without it. Fortunately, we have this institution which has grown up. It has been doing work for the Government on a contractual basis for these many years. Before Independence too, it did that work—sample surveys, etc. It is being paid for that work—I repeat—on a contractual basis. Suppose this Bill was not passed, either the Government should stop giving that work or give it to this body. Nobody else can do that on that scale. Individual things can be done; individual projects are there. Steps may be taken up and are rightly taken up by our Government departments and statistical departments in various Ministries. This is important and I do not wish to say anything against it. But if we take up any Ministry or any individual and ask him to audit his own accounts, in all honesty, there is a danger of his having a certain bias in his own favour. It happens even with high-souled people. Even high-souled people, such as the Ministers are subject to bias, so that, when audit is concerned, one likes an outside auditor to do it. In the same way where statistics are concerned, there is a weakness. Some hon. Member has pointed out how statistics differ and said that you could produce any statistics you liked. It may be so. It is desirable for an outside, non-governmental organisation to undertake this work. That is much

less likely to suffer from any conscious or sub-conscious bias. It is desirable that we have this check on the purely governmental statistics. In fact one of the reasons why there has been an unfortunate delay in the publication of these reports has been the fact that one set of statistics taken by some governmental authority did not quite fit in with the other and so they were being compared and examined. In future, I think this should be less because it is important that whatever the various statistical agencies might do, they should co-ordinate their activities as far as possible. In statistics also it is found desirable to take two different approaches to get the same type of statistics and then compare the results. If the results are very near, one gets the assurance of their correctness more than if one approach had been there. Take even the sample surveys. If we take two sample surveys and the samples are different—not in the same place but in the same wide area—and you get the same results, the results of the sample survey are more definite and more reliable. They may differ one per cent or half a per cent. Therefore, there is necessity for having an Institute of this kind; there is no other institute in statistics.

Prof. Ranga asked me: why don't you have an institute, perhaps for agriculture or other thing? I cannot answer that question here. If a necessity arises and if there is something to take that place well and good. As it is, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research is a very fine body doing good work. It is almost entirely a governmental body. Well and good. Whether it can develop into a certain institute—it may be a possibility in future. However, we are dealing now with statistics and not other institutes or other departments of human knowledge. It is necessary to have this. If it had not been there, we would have had to find it out somehow and built it up.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

It is desirable, I submit, for such an institute not to be a purely governmental institute because then that inevitable bias may come in examining governmental statistics or other statistics. At the same time, one cannot give an absolutely free hand to do what it likes, in the manner it likes and dispose of considerable funds that it gets. It is, I admit, a slightly novel approach and, as I submitted in my earlier speech, if this succeeds we can adopt it for other purposes too. This approach has a great deal of decentralisation, autonomy and independent approach, and yet governmental, not control but governmental checks in a variety of ways ultimately going so far as to issue directions to have audit of performance, enquiries about performance, are there. It is the most important thing. I think, in any kind of audit, because, after all, when you spend money, the main thing is to see if it has been properly utilised and it has produced the results aimed at. It is not after all, very satisfactory if the money has been spent strictly as laid down in the rules and yet not produced adequate results. That is the most important audit, not that I leave out the other audit.

Therefore, this has been devised after very considerable discussion. I can assure Shri Ranga—I may be at fault; of course, that is a different matter—that the amount of thought that has been given to this matter is something prodigious. There were discussions with the various ministries concerned, notably, of course, the Finance Ministry, and so many other people inside and outside. Enough thought has been given to it. If we still find some faults, they are our human failings which I cannot get over.

A number of relatively minor points have been raised. But I submit this is the main thing that has to be remembered, this approach of an autonomous organisation with governmental checks, directions etc., but not control

in its normal working, internal working. It is not correct to say that it is run by a single individual. No individual can run a big organisation like this. He can give directions, he can suggest ways of working etc.

Professor Mahalanobis, undoubtedly, has been the heart and soul of this institution. He started it. It has been our good fortune that we have such an eminent man doing such important work. It has found recognition not in India only but almost over the entire world. That, among other things, can be seen from the fact that he is continually being badgered by invitations from Governments of Asia, Europe, America and other places. In fact, a certain amount of his time has been spent abroad. I might say one thing here. An hon. Member asked: "Why does he take his wife with him always?" It is rather a minor matter, but usually when he is invited abroad it is the other party that pays for him and his wife—both. Sometimes there is a fund there, I am told, which is the fund of the undrawn salary of Professor Mahalanobis which he had not drawn for years, for a considerable time, and out of that fund the money comes for his travelling expenses and not out of these grants etc. He does take others too with him, young people, to help him and to be trained. In fact, some of his best people have all had training, have all gone abroad with him. When he is invited to deliver certain lectures for a few days he cannot take others with him then.

Something was said, some constitutional question was raised—I am sorry I have been unable to follow it—about the Constituent Assembly having said something or the other. To say that this organisation, this institute has not got a structure is not correct. Obviously, it has got a structure. You may not agree with the structure, you may want to improve it, that is a different matter; but it has got a structure.

One of the purposes, of giving recognition to this organisation in the

manner suggested is to give it more of permanency. What I mean is, when people talk about staff being recruited there, it is a little difficult for them to recruit indefinitely for ten or fifteen years. They are usually taken in on contractual basis for a certain period, because nobody knows, they do not know, how much work they may have during the next year or two years later. As I said, the work itself is contractual for Rs. 50 lakhs. If the Government does not give that work the people will have to go, large numbers of people who work there will have simply to go. That is the difficulty. Therefore, if it will get greater permanency it will be good for the staff and others.

Shri Bimal Ghose: Does that mean permanency for the staff who are there now?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not saying that. Scientists normally might well be taken on a contractual basis for a period of years, five years or something like that. I think that will be good for them and good for the institution—of course, in universities and others there might be other ways of dealing with them.

Now, I should like to make one thing quite clear. Someone suggested about recruitment. He asked: "Why should not these people go through the U.P.S.C. and those other processes? I think that would be not at all desirable.

Shri Ranga: What he suggested was some internal statutory arrangement for recruitment and promotion?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Obviously, the people are recruited, by some internal arrangement; they do not drop from the sky. As a matter of fact, speaking from some personal experience about recruitment of statisticians etc., I found that great care was taken.

The Public Service Commission is an admirable body, an essential body

for government service. But a difficulty comes in. Necessarily, they are conditioned by the normal government service outlook, the kind of work that a government servant has to do in our administrative apparatus. That outlook does not quite fit in with the scientific outlook, the work for scientific purposes. It does not. And, with all respect to the Public Service Commission, I have sometimes found that a brilliant scientist who had a very bad presence of mind and who stumbled when he was asked questions is passed over. I do not blame them because they judge from a man's presence and all that. There are also degrees which they consider. If a man is nervous he gets a bad mark. Scientists are very often nervous about these things. On the other hand, I have seen a person with more brass about him gets through easily enough although he does not have as much intelligence as others. That is not anybody's fault, if I were in their place I will do the same thing. Therefore, a slight improvement has been made even in the Public Service Commission. Now when they choose such people, a scientist or a specialist is attached who has some influence. But I do not think for this type of appointment of specialists and experts it should have a body of specialists and experts as a rule. The main thing, as I said, is the test of performance, not a test of degrees; of course, degrees count originally, but then it is how best a man develops. It is not by flux of time that he develops from lower ranks to upper ranks, but by what he shows, the ability he shows. Take the army. After all, except for the very lower ranks it becomes a question of not merely time, service, but also merit.

There was a reference to a rent of Rs. 8 lakhs or Rs. 9 lakhs paid to various firms—American and Britain—for tabulating equipments which are not made in India. I have just enquired and I am told that these particular machines are not available in India. Till they are available—it would be a different matter—they

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

have got to get them from there on rent. In fact, these complicated sets cannot even be purchased. That is the normal practice, I am told, in other countries too. As a matter of fact, the Indian Statistical Institute has already devised some new statistical machines which they are using and which they are selling too—of a simpler type—and they hope to make other types also.

15 hrs.

Regarding training, there are regular courses of training. Why should hundreds of foreigners come here to be trained? Because they find the training is worth-while. About 240 or thereabouts of foreigners have gone through the training, apart from 8,000 Indians. It is a high-class training institute, and so far as the international training centre is concerned, it is associated to some extent with UNESCO which also provides the funds.

Some hon. Members have said that the National Sample Survey has not always done good. Perhaps not; I do not know. But broadly speaking, it is rather good and has naturally improved. Where you have to deal with the human factor, there is always the liability of error. As a matter of fact, it has been found, I believe, that sample surveys are likely to be more correct than what you might call a full census. Why? Normally, a full census is better. You get everything, but the full census is carried on by untrained people. You cannot have hundreds and thousands of trained people to do it, while the sample survey is carried out by trained people. The result is that, because of their training, they can get more accurate results even though they are for samples, only, and the importance of sample survey has grown tremendously in some places. I think in America they have census by sample surveys, apart from the decennial census. It is found remarkably accurate.

I do not know if I have left out any matter, but, Sir, I would beg this House to look at this Bill in this wider aspect. We are doing something which is essential, that is, developing a big Institute. If the other institutes develop, well and good, but it is difficult enough to have one major Institute of this kind. We are giving it a certain status.

So far as money is concerned, whether we give this status or not, we have been giving them money. Why? Not to the Institute as such but because we want certain definite precise work done. We have to do it anyhow, if we want the work to be done. There is nobody else in India who can do that work with that skill. We prefer to give that status because that will help them to do the work better and give them a certain forward-looking sense and they can prepare for the future, and we want trained statisticians.

Regarding getting degrees, etc., it is said that the University Grants Commission said something against it. They did not. What they said was that this should not be called a university which is a different thing. They did not come in the way of their giving diplomas or degrees.

Shri Mahanty: From the review of Professor Mahalanobis himself, it is seen that he was not inclined to the idea of conferring degrees or diplomas. It is in the report.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe he has changed his opinion.

Shri Mahanty: In the report itself.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I suppose he must have. We have discussed this matter. The point was that the conception of a university, in the minds of the University Grants Commission, is something which deals with a variety of subjects, a large variety of subjects, scientific, literary, and so

on and so forth. Now, we are dealing with a definite set of specialised subjects. They do not think that that represents a university. But they do not come in the way of their giving degrees and diplomas. It is a different thing.

Shri Mahanty: In the report, it is said—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Prime Minister said that he might have changed his opinion. What is there to do now?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: The reference Shri Mahanty makes does not bear the interpretation that he seeks to put on it.

Shri Mahanty: May I quote it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even if it does, the Prime Minister said that he might have changed his opinion. What does the hon. Member want? (*Interruption*)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Many criticisms were made about the inner working of the Institute, but these are things which can be dealt with. They have nothing to do with this Bill. I therefore, submit that the Bill as it is, on merits, should meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to declare the institution known as the Indian Statistical Institute, having at present its registered office in Calcutta to be an institution of national importance and to provide for certain matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. We shall take up clause 2 first.

Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): Today, I gave notice of an amendment, but perhaps it was a little late. But I seek a clarification. According to the Financial Memorandum....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it on clause 2?

Shri Narasimhan: Yes. I want just a clarification. In the Financial Memorandum of the Bill, it is said in paragraph 4:

"All moneys placed at the disposal of the Institute will constitute the Fund of the Institute".

In the Bill as such there is no such provision. In all the Bills of a similar nature, it is the usual practice. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That has been corrected in my copy. The sentence now reads as follows:

"All moneys placed at the disposal of the Institute will be credited to the accounts of the Institute".

Therefore, no clarification is necessary. It has been corrected.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes; in the last line of paragraph 4 of the Financial Memorandum.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: "All moneys placed at the disposal of the Institute will be credited to the accounts of the Institute". This is what it says. The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3. (Declaration of the Indian Statistical Institute as an institution of national importance).

Shri A. C. Guha: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the Bill

[Shri A. C. Guha]

has been placed before this House and we are discussing the question of putting this Institute on a proper footing. This Institute developed practically as the result of the enterprise of one man. Some complaint has been made that it is a one-man-show. It was a one-man-show because the Institute developed as such. That person took some initiative and worked hard for the development of this Institute. Now, the Institute has attained an international reputation and India has also achieved some international prestige in the academic world for statistics. Some foreign students also are coming there for training. Apart from Indian students, this Institute has given training to foreign students also. Moreover, this Institute has been doing some work on behalf of the Central Government as also on behalf of the other Governments.

The work that was being done in this Institute on behalf of Government was practically on the basis of contracts. There is another institute recently developed in Delhi; it is called the Institute of Applied Economic Research. That institute is also doing the work assigned by Government; it may not be the work assigned by the Central Government but I know many State Governments have assigned important work to that institute for which that institute has received grants from those Governments. But I do not think there was any question of any Government audit or audit by the Comptroller and Auditor-General being imposed on that institute. Similarly, there are other institutes like the Bangalore institute, which have been receiving considerable grants from the Government of India and which have been working as private institutes. Those institutes also were not under the direct control of the Government of India or the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. These academic institutes should better be private and free from direct Government control.

It is true that the Government have been giving near about Rs. 80 lakhs or Rs. 90 lakhs of grants to this Institute every year. It may also be said that practically the entire revenue of this Institute was coming through the grant of the Central Government. But all these grants were made on a contractual basis for rendering some service to the Government. In consideration of certain things to be done, certain money was given. It was more or less like a contract. So, in that sense, this Institute was not getting any grant from the Government of India for other activities, except Rs. 15 lakhs or Rs. 16 lakhs for its own research activities. Most of the grants were for particular jobs allotted to it. So, the question of audit by the Comptroller and Auditor General should not come as such.

Under clause 6 of this Bill, sufficient care has been taken which would enable Government to see that any money given by Government for research work or for the development of the Institute or on contractual basis may be spent properly. But I think it would not be difficult for Government to accept a suggestion I am going to make, viz., that the report of the auditor which will be submitted to the Government may be placed by the Government before the Comptroller and Auditor General. Then with the remarks of the Comptroller and Auditor General, that report may be placed before this House, so that the House may be seized of the report in due course. I think that will satisfy at least the point which my friend, Shri Bimal Ghose, has raised, if the House gets the report with the remarks of the Comptroller and Auditor General. Whether the report comes through the Auditor General or not does not matter, but I think Government may by convention agree that the report of the Auditor will be placed before the Comptroller and with his remarks Government will place the report before this House.

I am surprised that Shri Mahanty has raised objection to the clause which will enable this Institute to confer degrees and diplomas.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When we come to that clause, I will give another opportunity to the hon. Member to speak.

Shri A. C. Guba: Yes, Sir; I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity.

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir, it is right and proper that this Institute be declared as an institute of national importance. I think this is the largest and the best-known institute of its kind in Asia or Africa. I am not sure about China; I am excepting China, because I have no knowledge about it in this regard. This Institute was started with a part-time worker as long ago as 1932. Today it has on its rolls, 2,000 members. When there are 2,000 workers working in an institute of this type, it really needs a lot of money to run the institute.

Sir, the way Professor Macaulay handed over two volumes of *Biometrika* and Karl Pearson's *Biometric Tables* to Professor Mahalanobis is indeed a romantic story. I am reminded of what the late Rev. Father Henry Heras told me. He did not know a word of English and he read just two volumes of Cambridge History of India and Havell's Indian Art. That is how the spirit of the angel is fired; he started the Institute of Indian Historical Research and become one of the great historians of India. I would like the Government of India to take notice of this institute and not allow it to die after the death of that man.

Sir, two or three points have been raised, one in the matter of appointments by Shri Mukerjee, another in the matter of rumours by Acharya Kripalani and a third by Shri Morarka, who came to praise and remained to bury the proposal. In regard to the rumours, I think Acharya Kripalani walked over and sat behind Shri

Morarka to inspire my friend, Shri Morarka. So, I need not say more about rumours. In regard to appointments, I agree with what the previous speaker has said. We must have a regular statute of appointments, fixity of tenure, pensions, promotions, etc. They are very very valuable indeed. If a man works for five years in a Government office and is kicked out, he is not able to support his family and his father, when he is alive. These are very valuable considerations and I am sure the learned professor, who is running the show, will take care of these points raised in Parliament. Perhaps that is the most constructive thing mentioned in this discussion.

Then, it is no use anyone saying that it is a one-man's show. The opposition says, the Congress Party is a one-man's show. Every institute is a one-man's show in the sense that the institute has to be inspired and run on those lines. The Institute which won a donation of Rs. 5,000 as early as 1935 from Sir James Grigg, who became a member of the British Cabinet, is really worth the name. An outstanding man of integrity like Shri C. D. Deshmukh has been the Chairman of this Institute. Another important industrialist, Sir Edward Benthall, has also been a former Chairman. The late Shri Nalini Ranjan Sarcar has also been the Chairman of this Institute. So, if an institute has been able to command the services of three outstanding men from different fields, there is something worthy in it.

So far as statistics are concerned, are you going to search for a cat in the dark night with blind-folded eyes? You cannot run the Government without statistics. There can be no activity of Government without statistics. So far as audit is concerned, I would like to say one thing. When I went to our Embassy in Moscow two years ago, I saw that the carpet was in a bad condition. When I went to the Polish Embassy, I saw a perfect

[Shri Joachim Alva]

carpet. When I asked about the bad carpet, I was told, "We have to obtain sanction for Rs. 15 from the Finance Ministry". When I came to the Finance Ministry and asked about it, the Finance Minister was surprised. Everybody pleaded ignorance. So, here is the Institute which has to do those things. That is where the auditor comes in and perhaps in an institute which runs on its own initiative, quick decisions and implementation may carry the day.

Sir, I will finish in 2 minutes. You allowed 25 minutes to Shri Morarka

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is speaking on clause 3. He should restrict himself to that.

Shri Joachim Alva: In regard to people travelling abroad, I want the House to have one human consideration. I do not know the age of Professor Mahalanobis. If he is nearly 60 or 70, I want to know whether a man's wife is not entitled to accompany him. He goes abroad; he is in a different place. I want you to have some human consideration. Every one of us wants to have a secretary or a *chaprasi*. Why should not a man take his wife? These are important human considerations before us. The countries that have invited him have perhaps taken care of this consideration and invited his wife also. Much was made about this point by Shri Morarka. I want him to bear in mind the human aspect. When a man is in an age when he should not work perhaps and when he likes his wife to accompany him, I think it would be less than human to find fault over this point.

We have known about the All-India Medical Institute. It is run as an autonomous body. I wanted to ask Acharya Kripalani why he should object. The Bombay University is the wealthiest money-getter amongst the Universities in India. It is the wealthiest university; it pays

as it goes; it earns as it goes. This statistical Institute cannot earn money. They send out their hand-out but with it they cannot make money. But they have done very valuable work. If hon. Members go through the papers which they have produced on a variety of subjects—I would rather like to read them if you give me enough time—about dozens of subjects, they will find that they are matters which affect our national and public life.

Shri Nath Pai: But they are not reliable.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Why?

Shri Joachim Alva: Reliability is a measure of one's mind, and I do not have time to dwell on that aspect. So, I would say in the end that this is a very important Bill, and the one constructive thing said there is about the staff, and the staff will be put right when the Bill is implemented.

Shri Bimal Ghose: I want a clarification. What would be the status of the Institute after this Bill has been passed? Like my friends, I have all admiration for the work of the Institute, and also the services rendered by its director. The Institute does three things—research, training and computation and collection of statistics. The question arises whether it is necessary that the Institute should do all the three things and whether it is not better if the statistical and computation part alone is given to one body. Now we have the C.S.O., N.S.S. and the I.S.I. Is it proper to have all these organisations for the purpose of collection and computation of statistics? I do not know if in any other country there are as many statistical organisations of the Government; there may be private organisations but I do not know of a country where Government statistics are produced by three or four different agencies; at least I have

no knowledge of it. In Great Britain it is done by the C.S.O. only.

I also want to know another thing. After the Institute has been declared as an institute of national importance, will the work that it will do on behalf of the Government also be on a contractual basis, or whether after that, whatever is necessary for the running of the Institute will be provided by the Government? I do not see why it should be on a contractual basis, because there have been many complaints of the very high fees charged. One does not know, it may or may not be true, but eminent economists have also referred to the fees charged.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does not clause 5 say that Government must give them financial assistance?

Shri Bimal Ghose: It is not quite clear to me whether after we have passed this Bill funds will be given to the Institute to carry on its work and there will also be contractual basis for carrying on work on behalf of the Government. It is not clear to me and I want a clarification on that.

So, I would ask the Prime Minister to consider—not now, because the Bill is going to be passed now, but in future—whether statistics and computation should not be centralised in one body so that this Institute could devote itself to research and training, which is a work of extreme importance and significance, which it continues to do today. It is an Institute of which we are all proud and I hope this Institute will flourish.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: I welcome this Bill whole heartedly and I am happy that it has been brought. It should have been done years ago, considering the important work that this Institute does for our country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should welcome the clause now.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: I welcome the clause, because it declares the Institute an institute of national importance. That is for the good of all of us and for India as well.

While some of my friends on the other side, and also some on this side too, were speaking about this Bill they were seeming to praise and welcome it, but what they spoke made me remember the English saying—“damning with the faint praise”. I only request hon. Members not to indulge in that particular pastime of “damning with the faint praise”—apparently to try to praise a matter and then try to damn it. It is not a good thing to do. In fact, the clauses in the Bill are more for the control and restraint of the Institute than for its help or growth. I believe in future we shall get the picture more developed as to how the Government will come to help this Institute to grow into its fullest capacity and do its work to the utmost extent.

Acharya Kripalani was afraid that the Institute, if it was a private or non-governmental institution, might be captured. Acharya Kripalani might have forgotten history. Even statutory bodies can be captured. He has forgotten the capture of councils, the capture of municipalities, the capture of other local bodies. So, even if you create statutory bodies, they may be captured, not to speak of non-governmental institutions.

I thank the Prime Minister for not putting this institution under the departmental control of the Government. The administrative machinery is an engine, and at times it works like a steam roller, stifling initiative and crushing down genius, stunting growth and dwarfing genius. So, the hon. Prime Minister has been kind enough, while bringing in a clause in this Bill to check the possible misuse of funds, or the Institute exceeding its powers, to see, at the same time, that the Institute is left sufficient scope to grow into an autonomous body where the specialists and the experts may

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharya]

have full play for their initiative and genius.

One more thing and I am done. The rule which Shri Morarka referred to and which was dealt with by Professor Ranga is not an operative rule till today. So, none of us here need have any fear at all.

Shri Ranga: Why should it be there at all?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: That rule has been in abeyance. I request Professor Ranga to go through the memorandum again. Though that rule has been framed, it has been kept in abeyance and not put into effect. So, let nobody have any fear now when the whole memorandum is going under the control of the Government.

One word about the one-man show. These things happen when individuals have capacity to work and have genius; when they have capacity to control their environments and create their environments, institutions grow with them and, for the time being, they look like one man institution. What was the Calcutta University Science College? That was a one-man show of the late Acharya P. C. Roy. What was the Bose Institute? It was a one-man show of the late Dr. J. C. Bose. What was the Bhandarkar Institute of Poona? It was the one man show of the late Sir Ram Krishna Gopal Bhandarkar. These things happen. So, we need not be very much afraid, or scared away, because there is a particular person whom we cannot class with the commonplace and who has capacity to work which exceeds the measurement we apply to ordinary people.

Shri Narasimhan: May I seek a clarification?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On this clause?

Shri Narasimhan: Yes. The University Grants Commission has enough

power to make any institution capable of conferring degrees and also giving grants.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is the next clause.

Shri Narasimhan: About this clause also. For getting grants and State aids and for functioning as an institution, the University Grants Commission has enough powers to do the needful. Why was that power not made use of in this case?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Nothing has come in the way of Government giving grants in the past. In fact, they have given grants. So, the question does not arise.

I want to give some explanation on one or two matters. First of all, Shri Guha suggested that we might lay down a convention that the auditor's report is sent to Government, it is sent by Government to the Comptroller and Auditor-General and then with his comments the matter might be placed by the Government before Parliament. I am perfectly agreeable to that convention. Indeed, we intend doing that. I shall also place the annual report of the Institute before Parliament.

One hon. Member asked: what is the status of the Institute? Now, I find some difficulty in answering this question of status. Status is a very vague thing. The only status that I know of is the Warrant of Precedence—who goes before whom—and that is not very important here.

But one thing I should like to say and that is that I entirely fail to agree about the separation of research and teaching from practical work. That, I think, will be bad for both. In fact the tendency today is for teaching itself to do partly practical work. Both the teaching and research part will become ivory tower people unconnected with what is happening in the wide world and the others who

have not been in touch with the latest research mind will go. Therefore they have to be combined.

There is one thing else. I think Shri Ghose asked whether they will in future be worked on a contractual basis. Yes, certainly. In the next clause, if you will permit me to say that, it is said that Government will give them such money as it considers necessary by way of grant, loan or otherwise. Part of the work must, I suppose, inevitably be done on the contractual basis.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.— (Grant of degrees and diplomas by Institute)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We now proceed to clause 4.

Shri Raghunath Singh and Shri Shree Narayan Das rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is Shri Ghose going to move his amendment?

Shri Bimal Ghose: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like to say that hon. Members who speak on a particular clause should restrict themselves to the significance of the clause and what its import is.

Shri Bimal Ghose: I think I was misunderstood.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): I am making a suggestion if it is acceptable to you.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am coming to that side also. First, he has to move an amendment to this clause.

Shri Bimal Ghose: Sir, I have been misunderstood when the hon. Prime Minister first spoke. My purpose is not to confer any power on Government or on any officer of Government to decide as to who will be given or conferred a degree. My purpose is merely that Government should know something about the conferment of degrees and standards that should be set up. Here, everything is left to the Institute. It would probably be better for Government to know because now it may be all right but in future the Institute, while giving degrees, may not conform to the standards that are desirable. Therefore the knowledge of Government as to what the Institute would be doing would be preferable. That is why I move this amendment, namely,—

Page 2, line 8,—

after "as may" insert "with the approval of Government". (2)

श्री श्रीनारायण दास (दरभंगा) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस क्लॉज ४ के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने अभी बताया कि इस संस्था को वह स्वतंत्र रखना चाहते हैं और यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि सरकार का उस पर ज्यादा नियंत्रण रहे। इस संस्था को राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्था घोषित किया जाये, इस में तो मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी भी सदस्य को विरोध नहीं होना चाहिए। यह बहुत ही गौरव की बात है कि एक व्यक्ति-विशेष के उत्साह और उद्यम से स्थापित की हुई संस्था राष्ट्रीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महत्व की हो गई है और इस माननीय सम्मानित सदन को उस को राष्ट्रीय संस्था घोषित करने का सुभवसर प्राप्त हुआ है। जैसा कि अभी हम ने क्लॉज २ में पास किया है, इस इन्स्टी-ट्यूट के क्लॉज और रेगुलेशन और मेमोरेण्डम आफ एसोसियेशन सोसायटीज रजिस्ट्रेशन एक्ट के मुताबिक बनेंगे। वही नियम और कायदे अभी इस संस्था के रहेंगे, लेकिन आगे चल कर क्लॉज ७ में यह प्रोवाइड किया गया

[श्रीनारायण दास]

हे कि यह संस्था नियमों में तब तक परिवर्तन नहीं कर सकती है, जब तक कि सरकार की अनुमति या मन्जूरी न ली जाये। मैं इस का स्वागत करता हूँ। लेकिन जब इस संस्था को राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्था घोषित किया जा रहा है और इस क्लॉज के जरिये से उस को डिग्री और डिप्लोमा देने का अधिकार दिया जा रहा है, तो अच्छा होता कि इस विधेयक में—इस कानून में—इस संस्था के संगठन, उस के कार्य-क्षेत्र, उस के मुख्य मुख्य काम और उस को चलाने वाले प्रशासक मंडल या परिषद् के बारे में प्रसादजली, संक्षिप्त रूप में एक विवरण दे दिया जाता। जिस तरह जब हम कोई यूनिवर्सिटी बनाते हैं, जिस को डिग्री और डिप्लोमा देने का अधिकार देते हैं, तो वह उन के लिए चार्टर के तौर पर होता है। एक एकेडेमिक काँसिल होती है और उस के द्वारा स्टैच्यूट्स बनाये जाते हैं। उन स्टैच्यूट्स में जब परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता होती है, तो यूनिवर्सिटी के विज्रिटर जो होते हैं, उन को सरकार की तरफ से उन में परिवर्तन करने का अधिकार होता है। एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण काम इस संस्था को दिया जा रहा है। यद्यपि ये शब्द नहीं हैं कि वह शिक्षा देगी या नहीं देगी, लेकिन हम ने देखा है कि वर्तमान मेमोरेण्डम आफ एसोसियेशन के मुताबिक वह एक स्कूल जैसी संस्था चला रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि पढ़ाने का अधिकार भी उस को है। डिग्री और डिप्लोमा देने का अधिकार उस को दिया जा रहा है। जो डिग्री और डिप्लोमा देने वाले होंगे, जो संस्था का काम करने वाले होंगे, जिन की राय से डिग्री और डिप्लोमा दिये जायेंगे, इस विधेयक में उन के कार्य-क्षेत्र, इस संस्था के निर्माण और उस के कांस्टीच्यूशन वगैरह का विवरण अगर दिया गया होता, तो अच्छा होता। अभी माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि खड़गपुर इंस्टीच्यूट भी एक संस्था थी, जो सरकार से सहायता पाती थी, लेकिन वह राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्था नहीं थी। कई बरस

पहले हम ने ऐसी संस्थायें बनाई थीं। अभी भी खड़गपुर इंस्टीच्यूट और दूसरी संस्थायें अपने काम में स्वतंत्र हैं और उन के हर एक काम में सरकार का निबन्धन नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी जिस विधेयक के द्वारा उन को राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्था घोषित किया जाये, उस में इन संस्थाओं के निर्माण की बात भी रहे। मेरा ख्याल है कि यह विधेयक सम्पूर्ण नहीं मालूम पड़ता है, यद्यपि, जहां तक मेरा ख्याल है भागे चल कर क्लॉज ७ के जरिये से जब कभी आवश्यकता होगी, तो सरकार उन नियमों में परिवर्तन ला सकेगी। ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है, फिर भी मेरा ख्याल है कि इस संस्था के संगठन का या उस के कार्य-क्षेत्र का पूरा विवरण इस में संक्षेप में दिया गया रहता, तो यह ज्यादा स्वागत के योग्य बात होती।

Shri Halder (Diamond Harbour—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I want to move my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His amendment is not to this clause.

Shri Halder: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has none to clause 4. He might look into his papers again.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am unable to accept Shri Ghose's amendment, that is, we should be given the power of approval. I really cannot understand it. Shri Ghose is apprehensive about the standards etc. It will be for Government to send a direction or have an enquiry made. That I can understand. That is provided for. I am quite sure that the Institute is far more competent to give degrees than a Government office here.

Shri A. C. Guha rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Have I to put the amendment to the vote of the House?

Shri Bimal Ghose: Certainly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then I will put it to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 2, line 8,—

after "as may" insert "with the approval of Government". (2)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now there is amendment No. 10 of Shri Halder for inserting new clauses.

Shri Halder: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 2,—

after line 9, insert—

"4A. In addition to the existing members provided under the Memorandum of Association of the Institute, the Council of the Institute shall include one member elected by the employees of the Institute.

4B. The Council of the Institute shall forthwith prepare proper rules regarding the recruitment, employment, conditions of service, wage rates and such other connected matters in regard to the employees of the Institute." (10)

Though the Bill incorporates the Memorandum of Association of the Indian Statistical Institute into it, hon. Members were not given the opportunity to examine the same. A cursory glance suggests that the Memorandum to say the least, not a flawless piece

of document. For example, the controlling body, that is, the Council of the Institute is nowhere specified except that certain members will form a council. There is no provision for either representatives from Government or other important institutions like the Calcutta University or the Poona Institute or the Delhi School etc. When Government representatives are taken, they are taken as persons not representative of anybody.

The need for having a workers' representative suggests itself from the very fact that the workers are pressing for certain changes in the form and functioning of the Institute. Charges in the form of gross arbitrariness in their employment, terms and service conditions, have been levelled. As far as I know they submitted a memorandum last year and tried to represent their case to the hon. Prime Minister himself. The study of their memorandum suggests that they showed a constructively critical attitude towards their institution and works. Moreover, in such an institution it always helps in giving the workers' organisation a chance to represent their cases before the supreme body of the Institute.

The second amendment follows from the first. With the declaration of the Institute as an institute of national importance gross irregularities in the form of complete absence of any service rules, rules of appointments are removed. Workers doing such an important national work should not be allowed to suffer from a continuous sense of insecurity. This is my amendment.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am unable to accept this amendment. It is a matter of internal administration into which this Bill is not going. Apart from this, I might state that a number of employees are there in the Council, elected by the members of the Institute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 2,

after line 9, insert,

"4A. In addition to the existing members provided under the Memorandum of Association of the Institute, the Council of the Institute shall include one member elected by the employees of the Institute.

4B. The Council of the Institute shall forthwith prepare proper rules regarding the recruitment, employment, conditions of service, wage rates and such other connected matters in regard to the employees of the Institute." (10)

The motion was negatived.

Clause 5.— (Grants, loans etc. by Central Government to the Institute)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put clause 5.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I desire to speak.

सर, हमारे भाई श्री भाल्वा ने कहा है कि एशिया में यह इंस्टीच्यूशन अपने ढंग का एक इंस्टीच्यूशन है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एशिया और अफ्रीका दोनों महाद्वीपों में यह इंस्टीच्यूशन एक ढंग का है, लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक हिन्दुस्तान का सम्बन्ध है, इस वक्त वह एशिया और अफ्रीका में जापान के बाद सैकंड शिपिंग पावर है। इस वक्त हम डिपेंड करते हैं लायड रजिस्टर पर। इंग्लैंड में लायड रजिस्टर एक इंस्टीच्यूशन है। वह स्टैटिस्टिक्स तैयार करती है और न सिर्फ़ सारा एशिया, बल्कि सारी दुनिया उस पर डिपेंड करती है। उस के स्टैटिस्टिक्स एक-तरफ़ा होते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान का उस में बहुत कम हवाला दिया जाता है। लिहाजा हमारी सिर्फ़ एक प्रार्थना है कि शिपिंग के सम्बन्ध में समय समय पर स्टैटिस्टिक्स दिये जायें और वे हम ढंग से दिये जाय कि

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या ग्रान्ट्स देने के वक्त वह लिख दें कि शिपिंग के लिए इतना खर्च हो ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक शिपिंग का सम्बन्ध है, जापान में भी अभी तक स्टैटिस्टिक्स तैयार नहीं होते हैं। सारी दुनिया लायड रजिस्टर पर डिपेंड करती है। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि एशिया और अफ्रीका की प्रवस्था को देखते हुए ऐसे स्टैटिस्टिक्स तैयार किये जायें, जो कि शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री के विकास में हम को सहायता दें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No answer is necessary, I suppose. The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Insertion of new clause—5A: by Shri Morarka. It is not being moved. I come to clause 6.

Clause 6.— (Audit of accounts of the Institute)

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member any amendment?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I had tabled an amendment. I am not moving it; but, I would like to speak.

Shri Bimal Ghose: I believe the Prime Minister has given an assurance that a convention would be established by which the purpose of my amendment will be served. In that case, I do not propose to move my amendment.

Shri Narasimhan: I move:

Page 2,

for clause 6, substitute—

'6. Audit of accounts of the Institute.—

- (1) The Institute shall maintain proper accounts and other relevant records and prepare an annual statement of accounts including the balance sheet in such form as may be prescribed by the Central Government in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India.
- (2) The accounts of the Institute shall be audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India any expenditure incurred by him in connection with such audit shall be payable by the Institute to the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India.
- (3) The Comptroller and Auditor-General of India and any person appointed by him in connection with the audit of the accounts of the Institute shall have the same rights, privileges and authority in connection with such audit as the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India has in connection with the audit of the Government accounts, and, in particular, shall have the right to demand the production of books, accounts, connected vouchers and other documents and papers and to inspect the offices of the Institute.
- (4) The accounts of the Institute as certified by the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India or any other person appointed by him in this behalf together with the audit report thereon shall be forwarded annually to the Central Government and that

Government shall cause the same to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.' (9)

Adequate financial safeguards are not there as we see in the Bill. Placing of the annual report before the Parliament is not statutorily provided for. The Prime Minister has, no doubt, given an assurance. I wish to point out that the growing allergy to audit by the Auditor-General is disquieting.

Equally disquieting is the desire to avoid accountability to Parliament. Under the scheme of the Bill, there is neither autonomy for the institution nor control by Parliament which is to give financial aid. Both the advantages are totally lost. It is therefore no surprise that Shri Mahalanobis himself in the report submitted to us commented—the Bill originally was given up and he was left to his own resources without any of these measures—that this may be a real gain and put us on the right track. This is what he mentioned. Therefore, I would like to know what effective steps will be taken to make up for the absence of active safeguards.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I had tabled an amendment, suggesting that the Auditor's report should be placed invariably before the Comptroller and Auditor-General. In view of the assurance that the Leader of the House has given, I do not think there is any need to move that amendment. I should merely like to say that so far as this Bill is concerned, I am sure that it is a very proper thing that it has come up in the House because, this Statistical Institute is already an Institute of national importance and it is right that it should get legal sanction to be one. At the same time, while we should give as much autonomy as possible, the fact of accountability to Parliament remains. Therefore it is that we have suggested this. I am very grateful that the Prime Minister has accepted this suggestion that the Comptroller and Auditor-General

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

should come into the picture and that his comments should be placed on the Table of the House. I expect that this will be incorporated somewhere in the Bill.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: There is a small point with regard to sub-clause (2). I would like to know what is the idea behind. In matters of audit, I think the auditors are independent. The Comptroller and Auditor General is there. In matters of audit, it is said that there should be direction from the Government. I do not know what the idea is. So far, I have not seen this provision in any Bill that the auditors are to be given directions, with regard to their duties. I am not able to appreciate the idea. I think, if it is not there, there will be no harm. Why should the auditors be given any direction? They are independent; they should be allowed to be independent and they should be allowed to work independently as regards their duties. I am not able to appreciate what the importance of this sub-clause (2) is:

"The Central Government may issue such directions to the auditors in the performance of their duties as it thinks fit."

They know their duties. They know what they have to do with regard to the auditing of any account. Therefore, any direction from the Central Government will jeopardise the independence of audit. I would like to know what the idea is. Although I have not submitted any amendment, I think, if it is not there, there will be no harm.

Shri A. C. Guha: I think sub-clause (2) should be retained. The Central Government may get certain information for which it may be necessary for the Central Government to give certain directions to the auditor. I am not sure, but I think a similar provision has been put in other enactments also. This sub-clause should be retained.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: How will they put it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Normally audit means just, as I said previously, a question of finding what is the sanction and what has been spent is according to sanction. The Central Government may well request the auditors to enquire and to look at it from another point of view and give us some facts. It is not limiting the auditor, but requesting him to give some further information.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No amendment is pressed?

Some Hon. Members: No.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, I put the clause.

The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause 6A.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: May I ask for an explanation? Will it be a convention or is anything to be incorporated....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In which clause?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: In the clause that we have passed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That cannot be asked. We have already passed it.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I want to know whether it will be....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us come to a later stage: not at this moment. Clause 6A: not moved. Clause 7.

The question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clauses 7A to I—new clauses. Shri Morarka absent. We shall take up clauses 8 to 10. Motion moved:

"That clauses 8 to 10 stand part of the Bill."

Shri A. C. Guha: I have one thing to say. I think the Prime Minister has stated with reference to a certain amendment of Shri Bimal Ghose that it may be possible for the Government to give certain directions regarding the standard of teaching, syllabus, curriculum, etc. I think the only power of the Government to give directions is under clause 11. There, I think, the scope is very limited. I do not find there is any power to the Government to give any direction as regards the standard of teaching, curriculum, syllabus, etc. I do not know under what other provision, the Central Government can give such a direction. I think the standard of training and education should be a point of concern for the Central Government to look into.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not see any difficulty at all. To begin with, apart from any Act or anything, the Central Government's directions cannot be ignored easily; otherwise the finances will stop. That itself is sufficient. This is quite clear as it is that if a committee is appointed and it reports that standards are not high enough, well, the Central Government will certainly tell them about it. It is obvious.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 8 to 10 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 8 to 10 were added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause 10-A, Amendment No. 7. Not moved.

Clause 11.—*(Power to issue directions to Institutes)*

Clause 12.—*(Power of Central Government to assume functions of control)*

Shri Narasimhan: In page 5 where clause 12 is continued, it is said that for two years only the order will be effective. Why not more? What is the meaning?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have to fix some time; otherwise, it would be an indefinite thing, it would not be right. Two years is quite ample.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clauses 11 and 12 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 11 and 12 were added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments seeking to introduce new clauses 13, 14, 15 and 16. Are they being moved? No.

The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed".

Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I cannot congratulate the Government of India for bringing forward this Bill after such a long time. At best, it is a very tardy recognition, and the institution should have been given this status long ago.

I believe that, judged by all standards, this institution fulfils the requisites of a national institute, an institute of national importance. Its history is a history of struggle and achievement. Its efforts have been in the field of pioneer social service and social sciences. I think in the twentieth century we do not think only of the humanities and physical sciences, but also of the social sciences. Social sciences are playing a very important and an increasingly important part so far as the national development of any country is concerned, and I believe this is one of the few institutions that is doing a very valuable work in the field of social sciences. Therefore, I think that this institute should have received recognition much earlier.

A lot of things have been said about the eminent director of this Institute. I have had the privilege of working with him in certain committees, and I have also had the privilege of knowing him in other capacities, and I believe that the director of this institute is a gentleman of great integrity, a gentleman of great knowledge, and a master in his own field.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Much cannot be said now when we are passing it.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I therefore feel that all that has been said about him shows a kind of criticism which I believe is not warranted by facts.

I wish the Government of India gives more and more work to this Institute. I believe this Institute brings to bear on its work a more

proficient outlook, a more specialised outlook, than all the other statistical institutes in our country. I wish it is expanded and its resources augmented as much as possible.

I have the honour to be connected with the Punjab University. Some of the teachers from that university have gone to this Institute for training, and they have all come back without feeling that there is any kind of provincial bias in that Institute. They have all been very happy and the training they have received has given our students some taste of the good work that is being done there. All the same, I would say that so far as the teaching department of this Institute is concerned, the Government should give it a liberal grant, and if it is to award degrees I think the Institute should be given as much grant as any Central University or any other university, so that it becomes a fit instrument for the propagation of the social sciences which are one of the most favoured things in the world today.

Shri Bimal Ghose: I wish this Institute further success in future. Certain points were raised which the Prime Minister, in his reply, pointed out were matters of administration and were therefore not relevant. They are really not relevant, but I would request the Prime Minister to look into the complaints of the staff there that they are on a contractual basis which does not appear to me to be an efficient method of having work done, since they are unsure and uncertain about their future. I would make a request that he or somebody else should make an enquiry and find out the position and rectify things if they are not right.

Shri A. C. Guha: I am really glad that this Bill is going to be passed by this House, and I think this is the consummation of the life's work of Prof. Mahalanobis.

Much criticism has been made outside and inside the House about the working of this Institute. There may be some justification for such criticism, but most of it, I feel, was not justified. But these are matters to be looked into for proper steps to be taken.

Now that this Bill is going to be passed, I should like to say that this nation has something to be grateful to Prof. Mahalanobis, for his creating and building up this Institute. It is a national asset; and any small failings of this Institute should not be used for undermining its reputation and prestige. I feel today Prof. Mahalanobis would be the happiest man, and he will feel assured that his creation will have a stable future in the service of this nation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

15.9 hrs.

TRIPURA LAND REVENUE AND
LAND REFORMS BILL—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Datar on the 11th December, 1959, namely:

"That the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to land revenue in the Union territory of Tripura and to provide for the acquisition of estates and for certain other measures of land reform be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 members; 20 from this House, namely,—Shri Bangshi Thakur, Shri Rangsung Suisa, Shri Dharamidhar Basumatari, Shri Etikala Madhusudan Rao, Shri Ghanshyamlal Oza, Shri Bihuti Mishra, Major Raja Bahadur Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri M. Gutam Mohideen, Shri Shobha

Ram, Shri Raja Ram Misra, Shri J. B. S. Bist, Shri N. B. Maiti, Shri H. Siddananappa, Shri Dasaratha Deb, Shri Laisram Achaw Singh, Shri Pramathanath Banerjee, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shri Ram Chandra Majhi, Shri Bijaya Chandrasingh Pradhan; and Shri B. N. Datar

and 10 members from Rajya Sabha; that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

Shri Yadav is not there. Shri Amjad Ali.

Shri Amjad Ali (Dhubri): I congratulate my hon. friend Shri Datar for bringing this measure before this House, a measure with which I and my party are in complete agreement.

15:59 hrs.

[SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN in the
Chair]

It is a noble attempt to provide lands to the landless, to do away with the distinction between the landless and the land owners. An attempt has been made in this Bill to introduce certain land reforms in the territory of Tripura, namely the regulation of the rights of owners and tenants, abolition of intermediaries, fixation of ceilings on existing holdings and future acquisitions, and prevention of