

certain companies, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri Naushir Bharucha, Shri Mulchand Dube, Shri Aurobindo Ghosal, Shri Bimal Comar Ghose, Shri Mool Chand Jain, Shri Prabhat Kar, Shri M. R. Masani, Dr. G. S. Melkote, Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka, Shri Narendrabhai Nathwani, Shri P. R. Ramakrishnan, Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha, Shri G. D. Somani, Shri Ramsingh Bhai Verma and Shri Morarji Desai with instructions to report by the 5th December, 1960."

*The motion was adopted.*

13.03 hrs.

INDIAN MUSEUM (AMENDMENT)  
BILL

**The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Museum Act, 1910, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Indian Museum, Calcutta, is one of the premier institutions of Asia and was formally established in 1866, but it came into existence some eighty years earlier through the initiative of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, whose collections still form a substantial part of the Museum's rich treasure of antiquities and scientific and art objects. Of the six sections of the Museum, namely, Archaeology, Anthropology, Art, Geology, Zoology and Industry, only the Art section is directly under the control of the Trustees while the others are under the administrative control of the respective Surveys or Departments. With the exception of the Geological Survey, the remaining Surveys and Departments are now attached to the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs.

According to the Indian Museum Act, 1910, which is the substantive Act of the Museum, all the exhibits in the Museum vest in the Trustees, but they are *de facto* properties of the concerned Departments of the Government of India and the Trustees have only visiting powers. The administration of the Museum is also vested in the Trustees, but again, the different sections are in fact run directly by the different Surveys to which they belong.

This dual control was not satisfactory at any time but in the past this has not mattered so much as today. In recent years, the work of the different Surveys has expanded enormously and demanded more and more of time of the Directors of these Surveys. I may just give two examples.

In the case of the Geological Survey of India, you know how in recent years exploration work has been greatly expanded and the Geological Survey has really come into its own only in the course of the last five or at the most ten years. Similarly, in the case of the Botanical Survey and the Zoological Survey, the establishment of regional stations, the exploration of the flora and fauna of India have been undertaken on a much larger scale and more intensively only in the last five or at the most seven years. As a result today the Directors of these Surveys have to give far greater time to their own Departments and also to tour different parts of the country so that their staying in Calcutta for the Museum where the Board of Trustees meet almost once a month, if not more frequently, is very often difficult.

Simultaneously, great advances have been made in museology all over the world in the last fifty years. Thus, while the Indian Museum has one of the richest collections in Asia, it has grown in an unplanned manner and the whole present organisation is a result of compromises and expedients.

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

Since 1931, there have been repeated attempts at reforming the work of the Museum. It was then proposed to put the various sections of the Museum under the administrative control of a Director, but as there was a world-wide economic recession in the early thirties, this proposal was not pursued. At least that is the explanation that I can find why the proposal was not vigorously pursued at that time. All of you remember that the years 1930 to 1934 were a period of great economic distress and there was stringency and reduction in almost every department of Government's activities. So this idea of a whole-time Director was not pursued.

In 1946, Colonel Sewell, the then Director of the Zoological Survey observed:

"The impression that I came away with was that the Trustees instead of acting as the trustees of a great and extremely valuable museum were behaving more like the caretakers of a mausoleum."

This coming from one who was himself a trustee is, I think, ample reflection of the way in which the growing needs of the Museum could be met by people who did not have the time to spare for its activities.

I need hardly say that the Indian Museum Act, 1910 has today become completely out of date. Fifty years is a long time for any legislation to retain its usefulness, especially legislation which deals with a growing service. When to that fact you add that during these fifty years there have been vast changes in the Indian political scene and in the Indian educational world, you can easily understand that the Act of 1910 is completely out of date today. I will have occasion to refer later while discussing the constitution of the Trustees how things which were easily accept-

able in 1910 but cannot be accepted today have been allowed to continue simply because the Act has not been amended till now.

Museology in the last fifty years has made tremendous progress throughout the world and we are today planning our National museums not merely as static repositories of relics of the past but dynamic instruments for the cultural and scientific education of the people. This requires that there should be far greater attention paid to the planning of the museums and that the different services of the Museum are properly organised. The present Bill is, therefore, a long overdue measure for improving the working of the Museum, but at the same time we have tried to make the changes as moderate as the circumstances will permit.

Those hon. Members who have seen the Bill will recall that there are 13 clauses in the Bill. Out of these 13 clauses of the Bill which I am placing before the House, eight are of a purely formal, consequential or verbal nature so that only five clauses have some importance. For example, there is a section in the old Act that members who had been appointed under the Act of 1876 ceased to function from such and such a date. Obviously there is no point in continuing that section any longer. As I have said, out of 13 clauses, eight are of a purely formal, consequential or verbal nature. Three of the remaining five clauses seek improvement of existing provisions based on experience and normal practice of administration. Only two amendments are major.

I will take first the three amendments which deal with procedural matters. Of the three clauses dealing with the improvement of existing provisions, the first is for prescribing a date for submitting budget estimates for the next financial year. Even under the existing Act, annual reports and audited accounts have to be submitted to Government, but there is

no provision for preparation and submission of annual budget estimates or for advance intimation of the programme of activities for the coming year, with the result that there is very often no proper planning, and we do not know beforehand what would be the kind of programme that the museum would like to follow in the next year. It is obvious that it will make for better working if the trustees prepare and submit to the Central Government before a prescribed date budget estimates for the next financial year. I may add that this is a normal administrative procedure adopted in all recognised institutions, and it is surprising it was not done earlier in the case of the Indian Museum.

The second of these three amendments deals with the rules for recruitment and the conditions of services of officers and other employees of the museum. At present, the trustees have the power of appointing officers or servants on such pay as they may think fit, but subject to the previous sanction of the Central Government; which means that in every case where it is proposed to appoint anybody or create a post, an ad hoc reference has to be made. Instead of such ad hoc reference, we are now proposing that general rules should be made which, after approval by Parliament, will become the governing regulations of the museum. This will also lead to the removal of ambiguities and doubts. Under section 13 of the existing Act, all employees of the museum are deemed to be public servants, and this had naturally led them to expect that they would have exactly the same conditions of service in respect of salaries, allowances and pensions. As one who is not a legal expert, this was also my view, but we have now been advised by the highest legal authorities in the land that this is not so and that the employees of the museum cannot claim the same prerogatives as government servants, even though they have been described as public servants for other purposes. Therefore I felt that if

this is the position then it is much better that the position should be clearly stated and that the employees of the museum should be governed by rules framed specifically for the purpose. And, as I have said, these rules will be framed in consultation with the trustees and will be placed before Parliament before they become operative.

The third of these amendments dealing with the improvement of the administration gives Government the power to frame rules subject to approval by Parliament. This rule-making power is of a normal character and deals with matters of detail which cannot be provided by statute. These rules will be laid before Parliament and would be subject to approval, disapproval or modification by Parliament so as to ensure the full control of Parliament over the rule-making powers of Government. Further, I have provided that in making these rules, the trustees will be consulted and any suggestions that they may make will, of course, be given due consideration.

I now come to the two substantive changes proposed in the amending Bill. These deal with the constitution of the Board of Trustees and the assumption by the Central Government of the power to issue directives in matters of policy.

At present there are 18 trustees, of whom seven are officials—six serving the Government of India and one serving the Government of West Bengal. These are government servants. In addition, the Central Government has, even under the existing Act, the power of nominating four persons: so that, if Government at any time wished it could have seen that eleven members of the Board of Trustees were people who always represented its own point of view. But Government has not as a matter of fact tried to exercise any such control and has given full freedom to the Board of Trustees. But at the same time we feel that a bigger body has

## (Amendment) Bill

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

not been as effective as a smaller body would be; and this was also the recommendation of the Committees of 1931 and 1955. I have already mentioned that the responsibilities of these officers have increased vastly. Their areas have expanded and they are undertaking today work which was not even thought of before. In spite of their best intentions, therefore, it has not been possible for them to give the necessary time and attention to the Museum as trustees. We have also to remember that the Trustees of the Indian Museum are not only trustees but they are also for all practical purposes the managing body. The result has been that because these officers have not been able to give sufficient time, sometime it has turned out that one or two persons have been able to do practically whatever they liked with the Museum and some of the difficulties of the Museum in the last seven to eight years have been due to this fact.

Since 1931, it has been repeatedly suggested that there should be a more compact managing body. The two Committees appointed in 1931 and 1955 went so far as to suggest that the Museum should be taken over completely by Government and run under a Director. We did not, however, consider this desirable or feasible. This institution was originally set up and has been developed by voluntary effort and has a long tradition of its own. We therefore decided to retain the present character of management but reduce the membership of the Board of Trustees from 18 to 11.

The first major reduction is to bring the number of *ex-officio* official trustees from seven to two. We are also deleting the provision giving representation to the British Indian Association and the Bengal Chamber of Commerce. You can well appreciate the reasons why in 1910 the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, which is really a chamber of the European

industrial and commercial interests in the country, was given to such interests representation—and that was the only representation given by the Act in 1910. The British Indian Association was also in those days a fairly important body representing mainly the landlords of Bengal—and you can, again, understand why they of all bodies were given representation on this Board. Their existence on the Board is a relic of the past times and their continuance today can no longer be justified. For, there are many other Chambers of Commerce. And, so far as other bodies are concerned, there are many bodies, even in Calcutta, which are far more active and far more representative than the British Indian Association.

In the existing Act, the Calcutta University is represented by a nominee of the Syndicate. We are suggesting instead that the Vice-Chancellor of the University should be a member. Similarly, in place of an officer of the Government of West Bengal, namely, the Principal of the Art School, we are suggesting a nominee of the Government of West Bengal. There is no radical change: even previously, the West Bengal Government had a representative through the Principal of the Art School. We are giving a wider choice. They may now nominate either the Principal of the Art School or anybody else they wish.

We are also proposing to strengthen the Board by the appointment of two new trustees, namely, the Governor of West Bengal as the Chairman and the Mayor of Calcutta. The appointment of the Governor as *ex-officio* Chairman will give both dignity and status to the Board and also ensure co-operation of the State Government. It seems to me surprising that there was no representative of the Calcutta Corporation on the Indian Museum, and I feel that the Museum must have some connection with civic life, and therefore we are suggesting that the Mayor will be a member of the Board of

Trustees. The association of the Mayor with the Board of Trustees will enable the Museum to function more effectively in co-operation with civic life.

This is the one substantial change, namely, reducing the number of trustees from eighteen to seven and reducing very drastically official representation. For instance, my Ministry had five nominees on the Board of Trustees. In place of that, under the new proposals, there will be only one, namely the Secretary.

The only other substantial change that I am introducing in the Bill is to give the Central Government the power to issue directives to the trustees on matters of general policy. Such directives are not issued except in extraordinary circumstances, but whenever they are issued they are subject to the control of Parliament. In the case of an autonomous body like the Indian Museum, I feel that the power of issuing directives by the Government is more necessary, as otherwise, the Board of Trustees, though largely appointed by the Government, is not responsible to anybody. It is not responsible to the Government because it is an autonomous body and it is not responsible to Parliament because it can say, as an autonomous body, we are not bound to give any reply. The only control that the Government can exercise is through grants, by withholding grant if it came to such an extreme position, I am sure you will agree that that is a measure which should never be adopted. It is far better that, instead of leaving the entire control to a small group, there should be the final overriding authority of Parliament.

**Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur):** On a point of order, Sir, the hon. speaker should address the House and not a few Members sitting on that side.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I am sorry if I had turned this side. I thought I was addressing the Chair. From this place, the angle is on this side.

In the case of an autonomous body like the Indian Museum, this power of issuing directives is necessary as otherwise, the Board of Trustees, though largely appointed by the Government, is not responsible to anybody. The museum is maintained mainly from public funds and it is both desirable and necessary that Parliament as the supreme body of the nation should have a control over all questions of policy. Even then, we have provided in the Bill that, before any directive is issued under this clause, the Trustees will be given an opportunity to express their views. Of course, full consideration will be given to any such views.

In moving this Bill, I would submit that it is of a nature which is non-controversial. Eight of the clauses are purely of a verbal legal nature. Three are improvements in procedure which have been generally accepted in almost all other Bills which have been enacted by this House in recent times. The two substantial things are about reduction in the number of Trustees and about the issue of directives. These are matters which have been considered by this House again and again and in fact, in recent times, the general tendency of the House has been to see that, even in the case of autonomous bodies, ultimately authority remains with Parliament, since Parliament, as the custodian of the rights of the people and is the body which votes all the moneys that are expended for public purposes, it should have a say in the matter.

With these words, I commend my Bill for acceptance of the House.

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Museum Act, 1910, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

**Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu):** Mr. Chairman, I wish to enquire of the Minister one point: whether he has

[Shri Morarka]

taken into consideration the provisions of the Indian Statistical Institute Act which was recently passed by this Parliament and which institution was given the recognition as a national institute. Since this Bill is of the same type, I would like to know whether the provisions of this Bill are similar to the provisions in that Bill or if they are different, why they are different.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I will deal with these when I reply.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Minister will reply in the course of his reply.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani** (New Delhi): It will help us to understand the point if he makes it clear. There is no radical difference between the two institutions. They are similar institutions.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** On this point, I will have one remark to make. The Indian Statistical Institute is primarily an educational and research institute. It is doing new exploration work and therefore, it is quite different from a museum. In the case of the Indian Museum, we adopt the same procedure as in the case of the other national museums in the country and of similar museums elsewhere in the world.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** I had given notice of an amendment that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I have not received any such notice.

**Mr. Chairman:** I do not find any. It is not here.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** I had sent it. Where is it?

**Dr. Samantsinhar** (Bhubaneshwar): What about my amendment?

**Mr. Chairman:** May I know when the hon. Member gave notice of it.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** In the morning.

**Mr. Chairman:** Then, it is out of order. At least 24 hours' previous notice is required.

**Shri Morarka:** You may waive it. It is in the discretion of the Chair.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** It can be accepted.

**Shri D. C. Sharma** (Gurdaspur): Mr. Chairman, I welcome this Bill. As it has been described by the hon. Minister, it is a non-controversial Bill. It is true that our country has taken about 50 years to wake up to the status, functions and objectives of the Indian Museum. But, still it is good that we are doing something to give a new set-up to this Indian Museum.

I feel very proud of the fact that the Minister wants to make this museum a full self-governing national museum for the eastern region of India. It is a very hopeful sign of the times that we are going to have such museums in all the regions of India and that these museums are going to be not a collection of old and antiquated things, but something that is being renewed every year, every month, every day. That is to say, these museums would represent not something static, but something dynamic, and these museums will be responding to the needs and urges of our people as they arise. I hope that something would be done to have museums of this kind in all the other regions of the country also, so that India is not deficient in this particular kind of educational apparatus.

I think the hon. Minister was very right when he said that the art and science of museums has advanced greatly. If one goes to some of the progressive countries of the world, one finds that the museums are the most cherished objects of those countries. They are not only show pieces to be shown to visitors and travellers.

They are also very effective instruments of public education. There are days which are set apart for school boys and they can go and visit these museums on those particular days. There are days which are set apart for University students. They can go to the museums on those days. At the same time, museums are not thought to be merely silent places where you can look at things and admire them. Some of these museums have very effective service guides. These guides are always there to explain to the visitors the beautiful places and the beautiful spots and the objects which are there. There is no mention of this in this Bill. But, that would be one of the functions of the administrative service to see to it that we have a very adequate number of guides. Unfortunately, guides in my country have not been trained and educated properly. These guides should be such as are well versed in the lore which the museum has to show. I remember I visited last year the museum in Moscow. I was amazed to see the richness of its collection. I was more amazed to see the knowledge of the guide there and the way he explained and interpreted the things and the interest that he took in showing the people round. In my country, guides are generally tired and exhausted persons. They are generally those persons who know little of the museum and less of the things that it contains. Therefore, it is a very sorry tale that they tell. I hope something will be done to make up this deficiency that exists.

I believe that while this Museum will be doing all those services which it should render, at present, it will be, as the hon. Minister said, a very adequate medium of cultural and scientific education. These words are very weighty words. I believe that the scientific aspect of this museum will be more strengthened. This museum is now meant more for scholars and savants than for anybody else. It should be seen to it that some of the popular aspects of this

museum are augmented so that the general public can take more advantage of it than before.

Coming to Clause 2, I am glad that the hon. Minister has reduced the number of trustees. Whether there is any virtue in reduction or increase I do not know, but since he has thought it fit to reduce the number of trustees, I do not want to have any quarrel with him on that score, but there is one thing which makes me very unhappy then I go through the constitution of the board of trustees. I think every autonomous body that we have set up in this House has enlisted the active interest of the members of this House; that is to say, some kind of representation has been given to the members of the Lok Sabha on that body. It has been done so that the Lok Sabha is kept constantly in touch with the activities of that body so that it can, on the floor of the House, present a very clear and coherent picture of that institution. Though according to the hon. Minister the British India Association and the British Chamber of Commerce are things of the past, I must say that the constitution of the board of trustees in this Bill has been done in the same old spirit of the British India Association and the British Chamber of Commerce. Generally they used to rely on nominations, and here also I find that it is one string of *ex-officio* members or nominated members. Of course, I have nothing to say against the Governor of West Bengal. She should be there. I have nothing to say against the Secretary to the Government of India; he should be there. I think sometimes the Calcutta Corporation has two mayors, but I am glad they are going to have only one mayor on this board of trustees. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Calcutta should be there; he represents learning and scholarship and the educational interests of that State. The Accountant-General is a necessary evil everywhere, and I do not

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

see any reason why he should be kept out of it. Then there are four persons to be nominated by the Central Government and one by the Government of West Bengal. I think this has been done in accordance with the laws of proportion that since the Government of West Bengal is having one representative, the Central Government should have four, or *vice versa*. It is very good arithmetic, and I think it redounds to the credit of the hon. Minister that he has been able to fix such a proportion. Of course, one person should be nominated by the Asiatic Society of Calcutta.

Therefore, I say that when I took at the composition of the board of trustees I find one unrelieved, dreary panorama of nominations. I respectfully submit that the board of trustees should be constituted by giving some representation to the members of the Lok Sabha and some representation to the members of the Rajya Sabha also. Since the Rajya Sabha consists mostly of nominated persons, they may think that it is in agreement with the character of the present composition of the board of trustees to some extent, but here we all come after fighting very big elections, and I believe that we are wedded to the principle of elections and democracy. I think this undemocratic edifice in democratic India will be an anachronism. It will be a museum piece in itself. Therefore, I think something should be done to take away this aspect of officialese from this Bill.

In Clause 3(1) the quorum has been reduced from 9 to 6, and in Clause 3(2) from 6 to 4. This quorum is a ticklish business. When they are discussing such intricate matters, it is not right that six persons out of eleven should constitute the quorum. After all, these persons represent certain academic interests. So, in a body like this where the academic interests take precedence over all other kinds of interests, the quorum

should be higher, for the simple reason that all these interests should have a proper and adequate say in the matters which affect them. If the hon. Minister thinks that the person whose business is going to be transacted on a particular day will alone be present and the others absent, that assumption will not be conducive to the efficiency of the board of trustees.

In Clause 6 a distinction has been made between rules and bye-laws. I am not a constitutional *pundit*, but I think that it is not very proper to bring in these two things. When we talk of bye-laws we talk of some commercial concerns. I think I am right when I say that. When we talk of rules we talk of things which are subject to the rules and enactments of Parliament. So, I would say this thing should be clarified, and this difference between the rules and bye-laws, which is a very invidious kind of distinction, should be done away with.

In Clause 7 it has been said that the trustees may appoint such officers and servants as they may consider necessary or proper for the care or management of the trust property and determine their functions, and that the recruitment and conditions of service of such officers or servants shall be regulated by rules made under the Act. I think the rules have some validity here, but my feeling is that in free India we are trying to make appointments not subject to any boards which are constituted but subject to the Public Service Commission. In my State, a very progressive State, we have two Public Service Commissions; one deals with gazetted appointments, and the other with non-gazetted appointments. That is to say, the appointment of persons has been taken away from the purview of the Government, and handed over to the Public Service Commission. I think that provision should have been kept here also, so that the appointments that are made may not savour

*(Amendment) Bill*

of any kind of favouritism or nepotism. I do not say they will savour of that, but there should be the impression that these appointments are made on the basis of selection by the most competent body we can think of. I think this is a provision that should be there.

Then, I come to the question of issuing directives. I do not quarrel with the term 'directives'. I think directives are necessary. But what do Government think of this board of trustees? Are they to be waiting all the time for directives from the Central Government? Are they non-adults? Are they not competent to deal with the subjects which they are asked to deal with? I think this is undue interference by the Ministry in the work of the trustees. The hon. Minister has said that they are doing away with the dual system, but here I think they are introducing the dual system; that is to say, the board will not be autonomous in the real sense of the term, but it will always be looking up to the Ministry for directives. I do not see what reason is there for giving directives, when the secretary to the Ministry is going to be there, but probably the Minister must also give directives, and the higher officers also should give directives. I think this is something which is going to cramp the initiative of board of trustees. This is something which is going to spoil the good effect which this autonomy will have.

As I said in the beginning, I welcome this Bill, and I think that the Bill is mainly non-controversial. But I hope that even though this has been passed by the Rajya Sabha already, the hon. Minister will kindly accept some of the suggestions which I have made for making this Bill more effective.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** I have heard the hon. Minister with great care. Generally, I agree with him that this Act needs to be amended and there is scope for improvement in the functioning and management of

the Indian National Museum of Calcutta. But I want to draw your attention to certain aspects of the present situation.

This Bill has been passed by the Rajya Sabha and has come here. Now, we are seized of this Bill. During this period, representations were made to us that the matter of amending this Act was before the Government for some years, in fact during the time of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who was our Education Minister then, the trustees of the Indian Museum had met him and they had carried on lengthy discussions with him in this regard. They had also some correspondence. They had represented to the Maulana Saheb that when a revision of this Act was contemplated, the members of the Board of Trustees should be given a proper hearing, and they should have a full opportunity to place their case before Government. With your permission, I would just read out from a letter of 1957, which the chairman of the board wrote to Maulana Saheb after he had discussions with him, in order to put it on record. He wrote:

"If any modifications in detail be found to be desirable, and if the revision of the Indian Museum Act, 1910 (Act X of 1910) be undertaken by Government, the board of trustees would be given a hearing, and the facts and circumstances as then existing would be examined and considered by Government before any Bill is drafted, which will be done in such consultation with the board or its trustees as the Government may deem fit."

This occurred in 1957. Soon after that, Dr. K. L. Shrimali visited Calcutta, went to the museum, sat with the trustees, and reiterated this assurance. Now, after so many years, the proposal for amending the Act has come before us. I want to know why an opportunity was not given to the board of trustees to discuss it with the Minister and his Ministry.

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

They have complained to us that they never got any opportunity.

As you know, this Indian National Museum of Calcutta is a very important institution. It is an institution which is held in high esteem. The Board of Trustees have during all these years built up an institution of which we can be proud. There may be some defects in their administration, but generally they have acquitted themselves rather well. And there are people, members who are experts, members who have a right to speak about the future of this institution, but no opportunity was given to them to place their case. Perhaps, if I may anticipate the reply that the hon. Minister will give, that letters were sent to them but they did not reply. The information that I have received is—how far it is correct, I cannot say that letters were supposed to have been despatched from the Education Ministry, but they never reached them. Even supposing the letters did not reach them, it was such an important matter that efforts should have been made to get the opinion of the Board of Trustees before the Bill was introduced. But no opportunity has been given to them.

That was why I tried to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. If the Bill had been referred to a Select Committee, the board of trustees would have had an opportunity to place their case; in fact, not only the board, but the Asiatic Society also would have had an opportunity. As the hon. Minister himself has admitted, much of the property belongs to the Asiatic Society. But neither the members of the Asiatic Society nor the members of the board of trustees have been given an opportunity to place their case before Government. I should think that in fairness, such bodies which have done so much work should have been given a proper hearing.

There may have been some defects in the running of the institution, to which the hon. Minister has referred.

I do not belong to Calcutta, and, therefore, I do not have much opportunity to be in touch with the affairs there. But, on the whole, it was functioning normally. There was no crisis of immediate urgency which necessitated that the Bill should be passed in this way without any reference to the Board. I want to support this Bill, but I do not like the manner in which this Bill has been placed before us. Nobody has been given an opportunity to place his case or to suggest what amendments should be brought forward; after all, the Board members have the welfare of the institution at heart, and they could have made very valuable suggestions.

I support most of the provisions of this Bill, but there are certain things which I find it very difficult to support, and to which reference has already been made by the previous speaker. In clause 10, under the new section 12A, Government are taking the power to give directives. Generally, Government have always the power to give directives to autonomous bodies, but I do not know why Government want to take this kind of power here. We have seen that this autonomous body has done a good piece of work, a work of which we can be proud of building up a museum is a thing where experts, connoisseurs of art and others who are really interested in the subject can perhaps give more valuable help, even if they be non-officials. I find that the Board's main objection to this clause is this that not only have Government the power to give directives, but what is "policy" is also to be decided by the Government. So, they fear that in the name of giving policy directions, they may interfere in the day-to-day affairs, and they may interfere in their administrative matters. If Government are so much involved in the actual administration of the museum, perhaps, the normal development of the museum may be retarded. I think I am right in saying that if this institution had been run by the Government as such,

under the actual control of Government, it would not have made the headway that it has made today. Therefore, I have certainly objection to this kind of control or attempt to control on the part of Government. There is a tendency in recent years on the part of the Government and their departments to interfere more and more in the working of the autonomous bodies. This curbs the initiative of the people. This does not allow for free growth of institutions. We want this institution to grow properly. We want that connoisseurs of art and people who are interested in the museum should participate freely and fully and thus build up this institution. In fact, I had tabled certain amendments in this regard, but as they were tabled late, they could not be accepted.

As far as the composition of the Trust is concerned, I am glad that the official element has been reduced. But there are a number of *ex-officio* members. I have no objection to them, but if you notice carefully, you will find that the Government feel that these *ex-officio* members would not be able to function because they will have too much of other preoccupations. Therefore, you find that there is a proviso to clause 2 which says:

"Provided that if any of the Trustees referred to in clauses (b), (c), (d) and (e) is unable to attend any meeting of the Trustees, he may, with the approval of the Chairman, authorise a person.... to do so".

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** In writing.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** All right. I have no objection to the words 'in writing'. Let it be in writing. That is not my point. The point is that these people will be too busy. Take, for instance, the Mayor of Calcutta. He may be a very perfect gentleman. But we know how much politics there is in the Calcutta Corporation. He may have no time to

attend these meetings. He may authorise somebody to attend the meeting. Next time, he may authorise somebody else to attend the meeting. So people who are not equipped with the background knowledge of the institution will attend these things and as such, they will not be able to contribute to the discussion. The Government themselves feel that these *ex-officio* members will not be able to function; therefore, this provision is there. It shows the weakness of the whole proposal.

**Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri):** Even the quorum has been reduced. That means they are not sure that there will be attendance even.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** Exactly. That means, they will put such people there who are not vitally interested in the institution. Put some non-officials there who are interested in this job of building up a museum. People whose primary and first interest is museum work should be put there. Therefore, in the amendment I had given notice of I had pleaded that the Trust should be given power to co-opt some members, at least two or three, so that people who are really interested in the subject can be on the Trust.

As regards the provision that the Governor should be *ex-officio* Chairman, I certainly object to it, because the Governor has too many things to do. The Governor is too busy. You should have a chairman who is really interested in the subject and can devote time to it. Only when somebody takes it up as his first job can this institution be developed. I am, happy that the hon. Minister has reduced the number of officials, but I strongly feel the Chairman should be a non-official, somebody who is really interested in the work, who can devote full time to it.

Another very interesting point raised by my hon. friend, Shri Morarka, is that the rule and bye-law-making powers have been taken away from this institution.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** Where?

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** Government are encroaching into them.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** No, no. Let the hon. Member read it again.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** Government are taking more powers in their hands.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** That is a different matter.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** I qualify it by saying that Government are taking more powers in their hands. If it is an autonomous body, we want the autonomous body to have sufficient powers to function in an autonomous way. If you reduce the rule and bye-law-making powers, you certainly curtail its authority and power. What is the justification for this? The hon. Minister has said that that he is raising the status of the institution by making it an institution of national importance. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this was already an institution of national importance. This institution is listed under the Government of India Act, 1935, Second Schedule, List I, item 11. Under the Constitution of India, in the Seventh Schedule, List I, item 62, this institution is listed. So this was already an institution of national importance.

Very recently, during this year, we had passed the Indian Statistical Institute Act as well as the Visvabharati University Act.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** This year?

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** In the previous session of Parliament.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** No.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** We passed the Indian Statistical Institute Act last session. The Visvabharati University Act was passed before. These are institutions of national importance. The Government have not taken away the bye-law and rule making power from these institutions, but

from this particular institution these powers are being taken away. It was said by the Minister that the other one is a research institution; therefore, it should have greater powers. If I understand the functions of a Museum correctly, attached to the Museum a good deal of research can be conducted. I fail to understand how in the case of one institution higher powers are needed and in the case of another national institution, less powers will suffice. Therefore, there must be some other reason which is motivating the Government in reducing the powers of this institution. Hence, I strongly oppose these clauses of the Bill. Otherwise, I am in favour of this amending Bill. I agree that the management of this Museum should be properly conducted, but I do not believe that by taking more powers in their hands Government are going to improve the administration or will be acting in a way which will be conducive to the proper, free and good growth of the Indian Museum.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta-South West): The Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to this Bill is, of course, very praise-worthy and nobody can quarrel with it, because the main object, as stated here, is to reorganise and improve the administration of the Museum and ensure conditions for its proper development on modern and scientific lines. But if one looks into the clauses of this Bill, one is apprehensive that something very different from this object will be achieved. After all, we are dealing here with a technical matter, and as far as I know, the administration of museums and what one may call museology, has become a science in the modern world. It is not a thing which laymen can play around with. But if you look into the amending Bill and the changes it proposes to make in the Board of Trustees, you find that the very few people in the existing Board who have any sort of technical or scientific qualifications to deal with these matters or who claim

to have an expert knowledge of such matters are the very people who are being eliminated from the Board, that is to say, people like the Principal of the Arts School, Director of Geology, Director of Zoology, Director of Archaeology etc. who were there in the previous Board. Of course, the hon. Minister may say that this is a means by which the official element is being reduced, but I would say that in this particular context of museum, surely we cannot regard these people simply as officials. At least if they are not replaced or substituted by some other people who are equally qualified, technically speaking, and who have got the scientific knowledge, we cannot accept that these people should be removed simply because they happen to be in the legal sense officials.

Who are these people being replaced by? I agree with most of what Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani said. But she said that the official element was being cut down and that was a good thing. But I find on a proper scrutiny of this Bill that that is not what is happening. If these people are considered in the narrow sense to be officials—the people to whom I have referred—that may be so. But if you look into it, who are the people who are being put in the new Board as proposed by the amending Bill? For example, the Secretary of the Ministry will be there *ex-officio*. Then there are four people to be nominated by the Government of India. Of course, one can theoretically argue that they will nominate people who are not necessarily people who will toe the official line. But that is no assurance as far as we are concerned because more or less, the tendency as we see it today, as Shrimati Sucheta Kriplani has also mentioned, is increasingly to strengthen the official element or to nominate such people who tend to be what one may call conformists. We fear that the same thing may happen here.

Then there is a nominee of the West Bengal Government. As far as

the position of the Mayor of Calcutta and the Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University and the Governor is concerned no doubt they are eminent public men. But as Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has mentioned, they will be far too busy to attend the meetings of the Board. Therefore, provision has been made in the amending Bill to the effect that if they are too busy to attend, they can authorise persons in writing to attend on their behalf. That is probably what will happen in 90 per cent of the cases.

Therefore, I do not see that the official element is being cut down at all. What will actually happen is that the proposed composition of the Board of Trustees will, if anything, make it even more amenable to subserviance to the Government, for the simple reason that, firstly, the number of officials has proportionately increased; secondly, there is not a single person on the Board, as far as I can make out, except perhaps the representative of the Asiatic Society, who is in any way qualified to deal with these matters or their various scientific, cultural and other aspects. Therefore, I am really surprised at this proposal taken with the other proposal to which reference has already been made about the powers which have been taken under section 12A to bind the trustees by certain policy directions of the Central Government. I do not know what has given inspiration to the Ministry.

14 hrs.

The British Museum in England is, certainly, not conducted in such a way. In the British Museum, the Board of Trustees are, really speaking, the sole authority. Financial control is, certainly, exercised by Government. But, subject to that, the Board of Trustees is the sole authority. And, nobody has ever complained that the British Museum is badly run or not properly administered.

I do not claim for a moment that the Indian Museum in Calcutta is

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

above all criticism. It happens to be situated in my constituency. But that is not the reason why I am speaking on this. The point is, there are many criticisms and complaints which we hear, and of which we have some knowledge ourselves, relating to such matters which require, if anything, more detailed supervision by people who are technically and scientifically qualified to exercise that supervision. There are complaints that a number of rare manuscripts and other things are not kept as well as they should. Some of these things may be getting spoiled due to not being preserved properly. Who is going to go into these matters? How is the Board of Trustees that is going to be set up qualified to go into these matters and understand the problems when that element which was there with scientific knowledge is being abolished altogether?

I must also add my voice of protest at this. The existing Board of Trustees, as far as I know, have never been consulted as to the provisions of these things. It is very strange. People who have been carrying on the administration of the museum for so many years were not even taken into confidence and their views were not ascertained before the Bill was drafted. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether there is something behind it. I want to know whether the same procedure is being followed anywhere else. This has given rise to certain apprehensions of which, I am sure, the Minister is aware.

When the Bill was first brought up very many reports appeared in the daily newspapers of Calcutta, including respected papers like the *Statesman* and the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. They have written leading articles commenting on this Bill and none of their comments are favourable by any means. They have all voiced the apprehension which is widely felt by the public everywhere that this Bill aims at officialising the administration

of the museum, making it a sort of a sub-department of Government. We do not know what sort of policy directions are going to come in future. There is the apprehension among the people in Calcutta that this may be the first step towards some breaking up and dispersal of these collections.

I am grateful to the hon. Minister that, in the course of the debate in the Rajya Sabha where this apprehension was also expressed, he made some sort of amendment which means that the Board of Trustees has to come to a unanimous decision if it wants to dispose of any part of the collections. But the grace of this amendment is lost by the fact that this section 12A lays down that the trustees have got to be bound by the policy directions of the Central Government of which we are completely in the dark. We do not know what they propose to do in future. They may do anything.

We also find that there is no representative of the public at all on this Board. Why not? I want to know. Of course, this is a scientific, technical and cultural institution. All of us who live in Calcutta know—and I am sure the Minister must be aware of it—that it has now become really a place of public pilgrimage in a way it never was in the days of the British regime. The people who go there in thousands, particularly on holidays, to see the museum are, of course, poor people, perhaps uneducated, perhaps illiterate; but those are the people who make up the majority of people in our country. They are shown around this museum not in a way which is always very conducive to their understanding and intelligent appreciation of what there is. There are very many questions involved in this. I should like to know why at least some representative of the public should not be also taken there, on this Board of Trustees. Why should not a Member of Parliament be there? There are very many unhappy provisions of that type in this Bill.

This institution is a really unique institution; everybody accepts that. It is an institution which is regarded as the pride of the whole country; it is not something so peculiar to Calcutta or to Bengal at all.

I welcome the suggestions made by the Minister in the other House that they propose to bring in a more comprehensive legislation later on to set up a whole chain of national museums in different regions of the country. That is all to the good. But that does not mean that the existing institution of this type which is there at the moment, should, at this stage, be suddenly subjected to this kind of legislative amendment of its Board of Trustees which will, in the long run, make the administration much more bureaucratic, if I may say so with all respect to the persons who are being proposed as trustees, who are nevertheless laymen in every sense of the word. It will be deprived of scientific or technical assistance from people who are in a position to give it to them. I would like to know what is the real purpose, what is the urgency. Why can't this Bill be considered a little more at length; why can't it be referred to a Select Committee? I do not see the hurry for it. The museum is not going to fall down; it is there; it has survived all these years. If there is something else of which we have not been told, I hope the hon. Minister will, of course, tell us what it is.

Therefore, while welcoming the objects and reasons of this Bill I find that the clauses of the amending Bill are such that the objects and reasons may be defeated. It is very difficult to support a Bill of this type. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister not to hurry. It is not a question of prestige; it is a thing which should be looked into a little more carefully. I think the Board of Trustees should be set up in a rather different way so that it can really be adequate and efficient enough to cope with the administration of a great institution like this.

**श्री यादव नारायण जाधव :** (मालेगांव) सभापति महोदय, यह जो बिल सदन के सामने लाया गया है, यद्यपि जितना मकसद इसको पूरा करना चाहिये उतना वह नहीं करता, तो भी मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ ।

आजादी के बाद भारत की प्रगति के वास्ते जो कदम हमने उठाये हैं उनमें एक खास कदम यह म्यूजियम का भी है । यह जो बिल सदन के सामने है वह खास तौर से कलकत्ता के म्यूजियम के बारे में है । मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि इस तरह का पीस-मील बिल सदन के सामने क्यों लाया जाता है । पूरे भारत के लिए जो म्यूजियम हम बनायेंगे वे अकेले कलकत्ता शहर में नहीं होंगे, बल्कि भारत के जो बड़े बड़े शहर हैं उनमें हर जगह ऐसे म्यूजियम बनाना जरूरी है, और इसके बाद यह भी हो सकता है कि हर स्टेट का जो कैपिटल है वहां भी म्यूजियम बनें ।

हमारे मान्यवर मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी राज्य सभा की तकरीर में यह भी कहा है कि ऐसे म्यूजियम डिस्ट्रिक्ट सेंटर्स में भी बन सकते हैं । जब यह बात बढ़ने वाली है और हमारी शिक्षा और संस्कृति की दृष्टि से इसकी बहुत जरूरत है, तो सारे देश के लिए बिल लाना चाहिये था । जैसा कि मान्यवर महोदय, प्रोफेसर शर्मा जी ने कहा, खाली विद्यार्थियों के लिए ही नहीं लेकिन हमारे जैसे पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को भी ये म्यूजियम एक प्रकार से शिक्षा की चीज हो सकते हैं । हम भी उनसे मालूमात हासिल कर सकते हैं । जब हम बड़े बड़े म्यूजियम देखते हैं और उनमें आर्ट और साइंस की चीजें देखते हैं तो हमारे ज्ञान में भी वृद्धि होती है, यह बात मैं मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ ।

### [श्री यादव नारायण जाधव]

इसको अच्छे तरीके से बढ़ावा देंगे । इतना ही नहीं जो बात उन्होंने कही मैं भी उसका समर्थन करता हूँ और वह यह है कि म्यूजियम्स में जो हम गाइड्स रखते हैं वे कुशल और अच्छे गाइड्स होने चाहिए जो कि अपने कर्तव्य को योग्यतापूर्वक निबाह सकें और उनको म्युजलोजी का शिक्षण देने का समुचित प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये और इस तरह के शिक्षण की व्यवस्था मैं जरूरी समझता हूँ ।

अभी एक कम्युनिस्ट सदस्य और श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी ने यह बात कही कि अगर यह बिल अभी सदन के सामने इतनी देर से लाया जाता है । यह बिल जवाएंट सेलेक्ट कमेटी के सामने आ जाता तो बहुत से लोगों को उसमें शरीक होने का मौका मिला होता और काफी लोग सामने आते । जो मौजूदा ट्रस्टीज हैं उनकी तरफ से भी एक शिकायत हो सकती है कि यह नया बिल सदन में पेश होने के पहले यदि उनके सामने जाता तो वे उसमें कुछ नई बातें सामने ला सकते थे ।

इस बिल में इस बात की व्यवस्था की जा रही है कि जो म्यूजियम के ट्रस्टीज होंगे उनमें से चार विश्वस्तों में से करीब ३, ४ विश्वस्तों को इस बात की इजाजत और छुट दी गई है कि अगर वह ट्रस्टीज की मीटिंग एटेंड करने में असमर्थ हो तो वह अपनी जगह किसी अपने प्रतिनिधि को उसमें भेज सकता है । दूसरे आदमियों का भेजा जाना यह बात मैं बिलकुल पसन्द नहीं करता । अगर हमें उसको ठीक और अच्छी लाइंस पर चलाना है तो ट्रस्टीज का खुद हर मीटिंग में रहना जरूरी होगा । ट्रस्टीज द्वारा अपना कोई प्रतिनिधि उन मीटिंगों में भेज देना उचित न होगा । जिन शख्सियतों को हम बतौर विश्वस्तों के ट्रस्टीज के भेजना चाहते हैं और जिनमें से कि इन विश्वस्तों

की इज्जत बढ़ने वाली है अगर वे स्वयं उन मीटिंग्स में हिस्सा नहीं लेंगे और अपनी जगह कोई अपना प्रतिनिधि भेजेंगे तो यह बात अच्छी नहीं होगी । इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस इंडियन म्यूजियम (प्रमेंडमेंट) बिल में यह जो ट्रस्टीज द्वारा अपने प्रतिनिधि भेजे जाने का प्राविजन रक्खा गया है कि अगर वह हाजिर न हो सकें तो वे अपने प्रतिनिधि वहां भेज सकते हैं, इस प्राविजन को इस बिल में से निकाल दिया जाये ।

दूसरी बात सदन के सामने जो श्री दी० चं० शर्मा ने रखी कि पार्लियामेंट के कुछ सदस्य और कम से कम एक सदस्य हर इण्डियन म्यूजियम्स पर रहना चाहिए । तो मैं उनकी इस बात से किसी कदर सहमत हूँ । पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को हर जगह पर अपना प्रतिनिधित्व मांगना चाहिए ऐसा मैं नहीं कहता हूँ । लेकिन यह बात जरूरी होगी क्योंकि हमारे देश में म्यूजियम्स बढ़ने वाले हैं अगर ऐसे लोगों को ऐसे पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को जिनको कि साइंस का इल्म है, आर्ट का इल्म है ऐसे लोग अगर उधर जायेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे संग्रहालय होंगे म्यूजियम्स होंगे उनके सुधार में उनके द्वारा काफी मदद पहुंच सकती है । इसलिये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि ऐसे पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर्स जिनको कि जानकारी है, इल्म हासिल है ऐसे लोगों को अगर वहां पर प्रतिनिधित्व मिले तो मैं उसका जरूर स्वागत करूंगा ।

यह ट्रस्टीज की कम सदस्यों की जो मंनैजिंग बोडी बनाई गई है मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि उसमें ज्यादा सदस्य होने से हमेशा तकलीफ होती है । कम्पैक्ट बोडी रहने से काम करने में सुविधा होती है ।

बोर्ड आफ ट्रस्टीज का एक्स प्रोफिशियो चैअरमैन ई ड आफ दी स्टेट रहेगा यहां पर

वैस्ट बंगाल का गवर्नर उसका चेअरमैन होगा, ऐसा इस बिल में कहा गया है। लेकिन उस बोर्ड आफ ट्रस्टीज का सेक्रेटरी कौन रहेगा इसके बारे में कुछ यहां मालूमता नहीं दी गई है। इस के बारे में बिल में अगर कुछ कहा गया होता तो अच्छा होता।

हिन्दुस्तान में अलग अलग स्थानों पर इंडियन म्यूजियम्स बनने वाले हैं। दिल्ली में बनने वाला है, कलकत्ते में है, मद्रास में है और बम्बई में भी होना जरूरी है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो एक पीसमील में कलकत्ते के लिए या, दिल्ली के लिए या बम्बई और मद्रास के लिये बिल बनेगा तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह अलग अलग बिल लाना गलत बात होगी। एक कम्पैक्ट बांचा तैयार करके एक ऐसा बिल हमें सदन के सामने तैयार करके रखना चाहिये जिससे भविष्य में जो अन्य बड़े बड़े म्यूजियम्स बनने वाले हैं उनके लिए भी यह बिल उपयोग में आ सके और उनको भी कवर कर सके। जो स्टेट्स या डिस्ट्रिक्ट म्यूजियम्स बनेंगे उनसे इसको रोशनी मिलनी है। इतना कह कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya** (West Dinajpur): I appreciate the anxiety of the hon. Minister to make this Calcutta Museum a dynamic instrument for culture and progress. I also appreciate his anxiety to turn it into a full-scale National museum—'though I would not accept the latter qualification—for eastern region'. It is an Indian museum and let it remain an Indian museum and let it retain its all India character; let it not become an institution for eastern region only. I would feel myself hurt if the scope of the museum is limited in that way as stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons in the original Bill in the Rajya Sabha.

**Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav:** The situation is in the eastern region.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya:** The situation has got to be somewhere in the Indian territory, in the west or east or south or north. But let us learn to pride ourselves in having institutions of all India character, in any part or corner of India. I feel that it would have been proper for the Minister to have consulted institutions interested in the museum, which has been built up by the care and anxiety of generations of people of culture and learning. The Asiatic Society is one of the constituents of the governing body. I believe that the Minister has already received the resolution that the council of the Asiatic Society. In that resolution, they say:

"The Indian Museum was brought into existence by the Asiatic Society and the great bulk of the collections of various sections and galleries of the Indian Museum is legally still the property of the society."

Therefore, that body should have been consulted. The Government of West Bengal is another constituent of the new body that is being formed. That body as well as the present Board of Trustees which has been running this institution so long should have been consulted when this Bill is introducing very radical and substantial changes in the constitution and working of the body (*Interruption*). At least, I believe, the request of the Asiatic Society to give it two representatives instead of one was provided in the present Bill should be acceded to. That is the least they deserve to have.

Regarding the other aspects of the Bill, though it is introduced in the name of an amendment there are certain changes so radical that I feel it almost amounts to a new Act. The hon. Minister has stated that a large number of these changes are formal, consequential, verbal and procedural. But the substantive changes that he has introduced are sufficient to give it

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharya]

a completely different character from what the Board and the institution is now.

One of these is the constitution of the Board and the second is the vesting of the power of control in the Central Government. Practically it means centralising the whole institution. And that is a radical change which is being introduced and which cannot be put into one of the other categories like formal, consequential, verbal or procedural.

Another change is contained in clause 12 of the Bill which introduced a new section 15A in the Act. In sub-clause (2) (d), of clause 12 it is said:

“(d) the conditions subject to which the Trustees may deliver possession of any property in their possession to any other person.”

This introduces a completely new element in the Act which was never there. Why is this power being given to the trustees?

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** Has the hon. Member seen section 7(b), (c) and (d) of the original Act?

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya:** I shall be obliged if the hon. Minister kindly reads it for my benefit.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** There it is said:

“Subject to the provisions of any bye-laws made in this behalf, the Trustees may, from time to time,—

- (a) deliver, by way of loan, to any person the whole or any portion of,.....
- (b) exchange or sell duplicates of articles contained in any such collection.....

(c) present duplicates of articles contained in any such collection to other museums in India; and

(d) remove and destroy any article contained in any such collection.”

All the powers are there. There is nothing new.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya:** I see, Sir any way, the framers of the present Bill have chosen to deviate from the wordings of the relevant section in the present Act. I do not know why. It requires examination. There the powers of the trustees are definitely stated, but here it is a general power. It is said here: “The trustees may deliver possession of any property in their possession to any other person”. This amounts to giving them a very general power of a sweeping character.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** It is almost exactly the same.

14.24 hrs.

[**Mr. Deputy-Speaker** in the Chair]

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya:** I do not know whether it is exactly the same as in the original Act. That I may say after I compare the two and just set the wordings of one by the wordings of the other and find their meanings and implications.

Sir, I say this with one purpose. The Bill is coming in a background, it is not coming in a vacuum. Shri Gupta referred to some criticism in the Calcutta Press. He referred to some comments. Sometime before this, the hon. Minister must be knowing, there was a proposal to transfer this institution to Delhi and the trustees opposed that move. I had myself the opportunity to see one of the communications that went from the Government of India in the Education Department to the Trustees suggesting some such thing. Of

course, that has been abandoned. But the impression lives still in the minds of the people. It is in that background that this Bill has come, and the way shanges have been introduced in its constitution rather, I should say, if the hon. Minister does not mind it, smacks distrust of the trustees. The suggestion for directives, the taking away from the trustees the authority to make rules, these do not taste well on the tongue. These should, rather, not have been made. This has created some concern about this particular Bill—changing the constitution, taking away the autonomy of the Board on the one hand and, on the other, to put it under official control from non-official control.

About non-official control I want to say one thing. There are five all-India institutions in Calcutta or near about, institutions of research and culture. They are the Indian Museum, the Victoria Memorial, the Zoological Survey, the Botanical Survey and the Asiatic Society. These are institutions which are centres of research and culture, and when we deal with them there should be some caution so that the tradition that they have built up might not be interfered with. Of these five institutions, the Indian Museum and the Asiatic Society were founded by non-official initiative. In fact, Bengal showed the way how non-official institutions of research and culture may be built up by private initiative, and I would request the hon. Minister to maintain the tradition that has been built up for so many years.

Coming to the Bill and its clauses, the hon. Minister has suggested a smaller body—11 members in place of 18. I would request him to note that out of these 11 people the Government of India has got 6—the Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry concerned with matters relating to the Indian Museum, *ex-officio*: four persons to be nominated by the Central Government and the Accountant General. Practically they form the quorum. These 6

people who may be taken to represent the Government of India form the quorum. The quorum has been reduced to 6 and the six representatives of the Government of India form the quorum. So I may say that in the process of reducing the number of trustees the Government of India has come to get the majority in the Board of Trustees.

I should like to make an observation about the appointment of the Chairman. There has been a suggestion that the Chairman may be a non-official. That, Sir, is a very eminently reasonable suggestion. The hon. Minister has stated that he wants to bring this institution under the control and survey of the Parliament. I am perfectly one with him in this move. But when he puts the Governor of Bengal as the Chairman of the body he should be aware that he exposes the Governor as Chairman of the body to the criticism of Parliament. Would it be proper? The conduct of the Chairman may be open to criticism or may require criticism in the Board of Trustees, in the public and in Parliament. Would that be proper? I request him to consider whether these factors should not persuade him to put somebody else as the Chairman and not the Governor of West Bengal. In the British Museum, I might say, the Lord Chief Justice is the Chairman. If the Lord Chief Justice may be the Chairman of the British Museum, some such thing may be done in the case of the Indian Museum too. The Museum should be entirely in the hands of non-officials. Some hon. friend suggested Editors. I thank him for that suggestion and request the hon. Minister to accept it, though it has not come from me.

I have already referred to the Board of Trustees. Clause 9 says that the trustees may appoint such "officers and servants". The word "servants" does not read well; I wish that word could be changed. Between officers and servants there is a gap and that gap remains to be filled, and instead of putting the word

[C. K. Bhattacharya]

"servants" if the Minister agrees to change it to "officers and other employees" I would have been happy. I also suggest that the four persons to be nominated by the Central Government should be non-officials. If he accepts that amendment, the objection that I am taking to this Bill would be removed. That will perfectly fit in with the amendment which he has accepted in the Rajya Sabha—"one of whom to represent commerce and industry". If he agrees that the other three also should be non-officials much of the objection that has been raised against the Bill would be removed.

Then again about the directives to be issued to the trustees, I believe the Asiatic Society itself has made a suggestion. Would it not be proper to accept this suggestion? The suggestion of the Asiatic Society is:

"Provided if there be a difference of opinion between the Central Government and the Board of Trustees, whether the question is one of policy or not, it shall be referred to for decision by a serving or retired Judge of the Supreme Court."

That is the suggestion of the Asiatic Society which has been one of the constituents of this Board and to which he has given representation. These are certain suggestions that I want to make and I request him to note the concern that is existing in the minds of people about the officialisation of this body which has all along continued as a non-official institution. I would request him to do nothing which would freeze non-official initiative in setting up and conducting such bodies which add to the glory of our country.

**Shri Aurobindo Ghosal (Uluberia):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I would also like to express certain doubts which have already been expressed by Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and Shri Gupta. The hon. Member has already expressed in the Rajya Sabha that he would later on bring

a comprehensive Bill. If he has got an intention to bring such a comprehensive Bill, what was the necessity of bringing a piecemeal legislation like this.

Now, Sir, there was an Expert Museum Survey Committee. They recommended that the National Museum should be a multi-purpose museum; they also suggested the development of Victoria Memorial Halls as a Modern History Museum and the Indian Museum as a National History Museum. Of course, the Victoria Memorial Hall has now been turned into a dumping ground of all statues of Calcutta. Government are now trying to reduce the powers of the present Board of Trustees, who, in spite of certain minor defects are very much interested in developing the institution.

The main apprehension of all the speakers, including myself, is this, whether the motive of the Government is to officialise the main functions and policy of the Museum. The Expert Museum Survey Committee said:

"The administration must be progressive, flexible and free from too much red-tapism. For this purpose it will be effective to place the museums under governing bodies with members specially chosen for their interest and experience in museums."

If this is the standard of selecting the members of the Governing body, is the Board of Trustees which is going to be set up under this Bill; sufficiently dynamic to carry on the progressive and flexible lines free from red-tapism. Many previous speakers have referred to the gifts from the Royal Asiatic Society; the Art Section and a substantial portion of the industrial section belonged to the West Bengal Government. But neither the Asiatic Society, nor the West Bengal Government have been

consulted on this matter before bringing this Bill before the House. This raises suspicion in the minds of all concerned as to whether there is any motive on the part of Government behind this Bill. Now a days many offices and institutions functioning in West Bengal are being shifted elsewhere. Even the head offices or commercial undertakings which are located in West Bengal are being shifted to other places. This has created apprehension in the mind of the people. In most of the dailies in West Bengal this has been badly commented. They apprehend that there is some motive in Government bringing forward this Bill.

As regards the composition, I quite agree with the suggestion made by Shri Indrajit Gupta. This composition cannot work for a specialised institution like this. The four persons who have been deleted and on the basis of which Government are telling this House that they have reduced the official element from the body, should be included in this Board in order to get the benefit of their advice to the institution. Therefore, I would like to submit that the present composition should also be changed as has already been suggested by some previous speakers.

Then, the hon. Minister has already stated in his opening speech that due to dual control and due to unplanned manner in which it was being run, it was necessary to take up the administration and to introduce this Bill in Parliament. From our personal experience, I can say this. The year before last, when the Public Accounts Committee visited the museum, the trustees complained against the Government of India that the Government were not willing to give any amount for purchasing art items and whatever had been given was spent on establishment and building purposes. The complaint was that enough money was not given to purchase art antiquities. Naturally they requested the Public Accounts Com-

mittee to put some pressure on the Government so that the Government may grant them some money for purchasing art items.

There are some people working there as guides and attendants, and gallery keepers. They should be trained for the particular job which they are doing. They should be qualified persons. There are some qualified persons but their number is very low, and it is impossible for the museum authorities now to appoint qualified persons as guides and gallery keepers for financial reasons. For that reason, the Government instead of bringing in this Bill, should have taken into consideration the improvement aspects of running the administration in respect of this museum and also the grant of adequate money to the museums and guidance to the trustees for developing the administration of the museum. I would like to request the hon. Minister not to take too much power in their hands while other institutions of a similar nature are being given more power and their governing bodies are given more powers to run as autonomous bodies.

In the composition of the governing body, I find that four persons are to be nominated by the Central Government. I suggest that these persons should have experience in archaeology or should belong to the scientific personnel. Who will be these four persons who will be nominated? Some conditions regarding qualifications for these persons should be stipulated. Then we will be able to restrict the coming in of all sorts of officials by way of nomination by Government.

With these words, I would request the hon. Minister to see whether the Bill can be amended in a better way and can be brought after consulting the committees which have given representations and have made complaints for not being consulted. I would also request the hon. Minister to consider the reduction of official control over this institution.

**Dr. Samantsinhar:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank the hon. Minister for having come forward with this Bill and I also welcome the Bill. Of course, there are some things which should have been considered a little earlier, but in spite of that, I do not think the Bill deserves the criticism which some hon. Members have been pleased to make. Some hon. Members described the Trustees of the museum to be an autonomous body and that the Government are interfering too much through the provisions of the Bill. This is not an autonomous body. It is managed by a board of trustees. Trustee means, some property is kept under him and that property naturally and truly belongs to the nation, that is, the Government of India, and on behalf of the Government of India, it is only the board of trustees that will have to look after the property according to the directions of the Government of India for the nation.

While making these remarks, I may also draw your kind attention to the Statement of Objects and Reasons given in the Bill, wherein it is stated that it is proposed to step up the pace of development of the museum and make it a full-scale national museum for the eastern region of India. So, it is a museum for the eastern region of the country. If I may trace the history a little, this museum first belonged to the then Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. The original Act was passed in 1910 when Bengal meant also the present East Pakistan and the provinces of Orissa and Bihar. So, Asiatic Society then meant a body covering all those provinces. Prior to that, that is, in 1905, Assam also was a part of Bengal. So, this is not a museum of West Bengal alone. It is a museum, as has been mentioned, of the eastern region. Therefore, while forming the board of trustees, I am sorry that the hon. Minister has not considered this aspect of the matter.

According to the provisions of the Bill, there will be 11 members on the board of trustees. Out of these 11 members, five will be from the Government of India; that is, one will be the Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry concerned and four will be nominated by the Central Government. There will be five from West Bengal Government. So, the museum will be controlled equally by the Government of West Bengal and the Ministry here, and only one would be the representative of the Council of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. When the hon. Minister says that it is a museum for the eastern region, it will be better that the eastern region is also represented in the board of trustees. He has not done that. Therefore, I would request the Minister to consider the suggestion that at least some vice-chancellors of the universities in the eastern region should become members in the board of trustees. Of course there are many universities now. At least the Vice-Chancellors of the universities of Calcutta, Patna, Gauhati and Utkal should be included in the Board of Trustees, because while having the Board in this way, he has not changed the old pattern. I say this because then there was only one university, viz., the Calcutta University, in the eastern region and no other. So, its Vice-Chancellor was there in the Board. Now there are many universities in the eastern region and so the Vice-Chancellors of those Universities should be included in the Board. This will also add to the non-official strength of the Board, because in this 11-man Board, there is the Mayor of Calcutta who can be considered to be a non-official and there is the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University. If the strength of the Board is increased according to my amendment, the proportion of non-official members would be more. The present position of its being full of officials would go.

There is a provision that regular members can be represented by their representatives. So, there would be

no difficulty if the members from outside Calcutta are not able to come; they can also send their representatives. In the rules, there must be a provision that those members who are absent from three consecutive meetings should be deleted from the committee and new members should be appointed in their places.

I request the hon. Minister kindly to consider the suggestions I have made, and bring in the necessary amendments.

**Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri** (Nabad-wip): With the objects of the Bill, I am in complete accord, because we all want the institution to improve. But how is it being brought about? That is the point to which I would like to draw the attention of the Minister.

The Calcutta Museum as situated in Calcutta is quite rightly taken to belong not only to Calcutta or Bengal, but to India as a whole. The treasures are there available for all people to be proud of, to enjoy and to learn from. But there has been a Board of Trustees who have been a sort of guardian and looked after this institution for years. Naturally they feel they have performed their duties and there has not been any great criticism to make about this august body, represented by men of eminence and men of letters.

The members of the Board of Trustees feel they have been left out while this Bill has been brought forward. There might have been private consultation here and there through some letters, but it is true that the Minister has not called a meeting and ascertained their views. I do not think this has been done. Otherwise, there is no reason why they should feel they have been left out in the cold!

It is also true that this Bill has not been brought in a vacuum, so to speak, because there has been an apprehension that some parts of the museum might be shifted. I am very happy that the Minister has given the

assurance time and again. Even here he said so and in the Rajya Sabha also he has said there is not fear about that. Even as far back as 1954. If I remember aright, there was some question like this and the Deputy Minister—he was, I think, parliamentary Secretary then—went and had lengthy consultations about it. There was this apprehension that something might be shifted. However, it was abandoned; thank God!

There is one thing I would like to point out to the Minister, though it becomes repetitive. If it is the opinion of all sections of the House, it has to be repetitive. I feel it would be better if more time is taken to pass this Bill, because there are clauses in it which do not really find favour with many. There are six Central Government people on the Board and the quorum also is six! In what way do the Board of Trustees have any say? Supposing just those six people are present and you pass something. You have taken unto yourself the right to dictate policies. It becomes rather difficult if policies are decided without the unanimous consent of the Board.

I think the Minister did write to the Chief Minister of West Bengal on 28th August that this amendment to the Bill will be made to clause 15A(1) by adding the words "by unanimous decision". But this amendment was not made when the Bill was taken to the Rajya Sabha. Dr. B. C. Roy, I think, pointed this out. Even though this is put in clause 15A, what about clause 12A? It is not contained in that clause. That is rather dangerous. Why should not "in consultation with the Board of Trustees" or "with the unanimous decision of the Board of Trustees" be embodied in clause 12A also?

There are other institutes which are considered to be of national importance. They have their rights and their internal autonomy is safeguarded by various clauses. But this institute does not seem to have any safeguarding clauses for its internal autonomy.

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri]

On the top of that, they have no power to co-opt!. In an institution like his, there must be power to co-opt, because by and large you have eliminated people who, as the hon. Member opposite, Shri Indrajit Gupta said, are specialists in their own line like the Director of Geological Survey or the Director-General of Archaeology. About museums, who is more competent than the Director-General of Archaeology? Certainly not the Secretary of the Government of India.

I feel a museum should not be judged by how much money it is spending, whether all the money is being utilised, etc. Of course that must be looked into, but surely a member from the Commerce and Industry Ministry has no very high place, whereas a co-opted member who may be very vitally interested in museology as such and who may be a connoisseur of art, should have a greater place, because that forms the backbone of any museum. It is such people who will conduct and formulate the programmes and the lectures that are going to attract thousands of people and also benefit the students.

So, I think this Bill should really have more time to be considered by people who are actually vitally interested like the Asiatic Society who were the nucleus-forming body and the Government School of Art. The Asiatic Society gave their collections to the Indian Museum because they could not find suitable premises to keep them. They should be consulted more fully. Also, the words "in consultation with the Board of Trustees" or "with the unanimous consent of the Board of Trustees" should be included in clause 12A and if possible the Bill be put aside for a time so that there may be fuller consultations. Perhaps it will make people feel that they are consulted and the feeling of apprehension will be allayed. I personally feel that this particular provision that six members or nominees of the Central Government will be

there on the board and six constitutes the quorum a very dangerous provision. If anything is to be taken out, I think that should be taken out first. Because, these institutions form a very vital part in the life of the nation and contribute largely to the atmosphere of the place where they are situated.

I agree with my hon. friend that Vice-Chancellors of various Universities should be co-opted to the Board. The eastern region comprises Assam, West Bengal and Orissa. So the Vice-Chancellors of universities of those States should be co-opted or at least their opinion should be taken. Also, if there is delegation of power, if somebody cannot attend a meeting he can delegate somebody. Otherwise, if a member cannot attend three meetings consecutively, he will automatically be removed from the board of trustees this should be in the Bill. So, there, must be power at least to co-opt people for the time being who will be of real service to the cause of culture, well being and education of the nation, which is the first work that a museum is supposed to do to enthuse and educate the people. I hope the hon. Minister will consider all these aspects.

15 hrs.

**Shri Supakar (Sambalpur):** The idea of a museum is associated with some bad ideas and some good ideas. When we think of something like a fossil or when we want to put something into cold storage, we call it a museum piece. That is a bad aspect. It is also associated with good ideas; when we wish to preserve something for ever or for a pretty long time because we have affection for it, that is also associated with the idea of museum. Unfortunately, the present Bill has more of the bad concept, bad ideas of museum, than the good ones.

I will illustrate it. The original Act contained some very respectable

persons in the board of trustees, people like Director General of Archaeology, the Superintendent, Archaeological Section of the Museum, the officer-in-charge of the Industrial Section of the Museum, the Director of the Geological Survey of India and so on, who were specialists in some branch or other, who were expected to take some keen interest, specialised interest in the functioning of the museum in a proper manner. Now we have removed them. In the present Bill we have introduced persons who may or may not take so much interest. At least, they cannot take specialised interest in the government of the museum as such.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Who would be the persons that Government would nominate?

**Shri Supakar:** That is not mentioned in the Bill.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Would Government not take in to consideration all those specialists or persons who have special knowledge of the subject?

**Shri Supakar:** But they could be mentioned. My point is that no name has been mentioned and Government have simply taken the power to nominate whom they please.

**Shri Narasimhan:** That class of people could have been mentioned.

**Shri Supakar:** We find it included in the list the name of the Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry concerned with matters relating to museum. But the Secretary, as we know, has several functions to discharge in New Delhi and also in other States. He has to look after the museums in all the States. I do not know whether he will have sufficient time to look into the affairs of all the museums.

**Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh):** To say that these persons have been removed from the board, that gives a wrong impression.

**Shri Supakar:** What we find is that though these persons were included in the board of trustees under the old Act they are not there under the present Bill. Therefore, what my hon. friend has just now said is absolutely incorrect. If my hon. friend goes through the Bill he will find that their names have not been mentioned in the Bill.

Now they have mentioned the Mayor of the Corporation of Calcutta. The Mayor is a busy person. So, also the Accountant-General, West Bengal and others. Government should have taken special care to see that persons who are really interested in the affairs of the museum are included in the board.

The most precious thing in the constitution of the board of trustees is that they are supposed to be represented by proxies. Categories (b), (c), (d) and (e) need not attend personally. They can send their representatives.

Then, Government, like Rip Van Winkle, do not seem to be aware of the present needs of the country, so far as the development of museums are concerned. They look at it from the standpoint of the position prevailing in 1910 and not what it prevails in 1960. There is a lot of difference between the condition that prevailed in the year 1910 and the condition that prevails now in the year 1960. In 1910 India was not a developed country; India was under the British rule. Now we have become independent. We propose to develop tourism to a large extent and we find that a lot of tourists from all parts of the world are coming to India and they are travelling through the length and breadth of India.

Then, there are reports that important articles are being removed from places of national archaeological interest. Government should have given thought to all those problems that have cropped up during the last five decades in an intensive

[Shri Supakar]

manner and they should have seen not only to the better administration of the Indian Museum but also to the administration of other museums that have cropped up during the last five decades in the different States of India and they should have come up with a more comprehensive and more exhaustive Bill to cover all the museums in the country.

Whatever the Minister might have said, in the present Bill we find there is too much of officialdom in the administration of the board of trustees, and we know that red-tapism is the usual concomitant of official control. If we bring this redtapism into the Museum, I think things may not improve.

My hon. friend, Dr. Samantsinhar, suggested the inclusion of the Vice-Chancellors of Patna, Utkal and Gauhati Universities in the Board of Trustees of the Indian Museum. In 1910 Bengal also consisted of areas which are now the Bihar and Orissa States. There are also collections from Assam probably. When we revise the Act and give it a new shape in the year 1960, I think, some representatives from the neighbouring States should be included. If this Bill is to deserve the name Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill and as the hon. Minister made the statement when he introduced the Bill that this is to cater to the needs of the eastern zone, it should have representatives of the neighbouring States also along with West Bengal. Probably the Vice-Chancellors may or may not be sufficiently interested. But, I think, the hon. Minister may include the Superintendents of the Patna Museum, which is a fairly big museum, and of the Orissa Museum at Bhubaneshwar. They can make valuable contribution to the proper administration and looking after of the Museum.

So, I feel that this Bill, as it has been brought before the House, is not very satisfactory. If the House passes it today, Government should

lose no time in bringing another comprehensive Bill to cover all the museums in India and also to see the administration of the Indian Museum at Calcutta is carried on by a Board of Trustees which has a greater non-official and specialist element in it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Originally two hours had been allotted for discussion of this Bill during the last session. We had to complete all the stages by three o'clock. That was the decision of the House and unless the House takes another decision we cannot go on with it.

**Shri Supakar:** The House may agree to extend the time.

**Shri Narasimhan:** Time may be extended.

**An hon. Member:** It is an important measure.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Time may be extended up to 5 P.M.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** Sir, I beg to move:

That the time allotted by the House on the 3rd September, 1960 *vide*, the fifty-fifty Report of the Business Advisory Committee) for consideration and passing of the Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill, 1960 as passed by Rajya Sabha, be increased from two hours to four hours.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the time allotted by the House on the 3rd September, 1960 (*vide* Fifty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee) for consideration and passing of the Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill, 1960 as passed by Rajya Sabha, be increased from two hours to four hours."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Shree Narayan Das** (Darbhanga): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I welcome this measure. While doing so I would like to make some general observations with regard to the importance of museums in our national life.

A museum is an institution which is both cultural and educational. It is an institution which is taken advantage of by the most ignorant people as well as by the most wise. It is utilised both for the purpose of entertainment and for educational and scientific research. Therefore, although I am aware that the hon. Minister is doing all that is possible for the development of museums in all parts of the country, I would like to request him that a national policy and a national programme should be laid down for the development and maintenance of museums at different levels.

There are museums of national importance. A National Museum is going to be started in Delhi. Other museums are of State importance. But I would like to say that in a country like India where the population is so large and the distance from one place to another is such that poor people residing in villages cannot take advantage of the opportunities provided by these national bodies, it is necessary that there should be museums of regional as well as of State importance. Not only that, I would request the hon. Minister to see that every educational institution from the village level to the level of Capital is provided with a small museum. Therefore I would suggest that a national fund should be created at the Centre so that local initiative, initiative taken by individuals or by institutions is encouraged. If certain people who have collected important things of art and culture during their lives want to dedicate those things for the use of the public and if there is some such fund, with the aid of that fund such individuals may be encouraged to start

such institutions in various parts of the country.

As far as our educational institutions are concerned they are lacking in equipment. Although the number of educational institutions is increasing day by day, their equipment is very poor. For the education of the children and also to educate them in things of historical importance and to make them at least inquisitive, it is very necessary that every school and library is provided with a small museum. That can be done only with the help of the State. I know that the State cannot do everything, but if local initiative is taken that initiative should be encouraged.

In our district town one generous person came forward with the collection that he had made during his life. He dedicated all those things and wanted to establish a museum. The hon. Minister had gone there and was very much pleased to see that. Then a sufficient amount had been given for the encouragement and establishment of the institution at the district headquarters. I am very grateful to him for that. Therefore I would like to suggest that there should be a fund so that it may be possible for local people to initiate schemes with the aid of the Central as well as the State Government and there may be museums at least at the district headquarters.

It has been stated in the statement of objects and reasons of the Bill that was introduced in the Rajya Sabha that this Museum at Calcutta is of national importance. There is no doubt about it. Before the establishment of the National Museum in Delhi, this institution was of national importance. This national importance should not be reduced now. But at the same time I would say that in a country like India there should be national institutions of this kind at various important centres, not only on a regional basis but in some of important towns in each State. I have been told that it is the policy of

[Shri Shree Narayan Das]

the Government to have such museums on a regional basis and this is one of them. Although it is of national importance, it is generally to be used by people residing in that region. It is of importance to the States that comprise the eastern zone and they should be given representation on the Board. According to a provision in the Bill the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Calcutta is going to be a Trustee here. Some hon. friends have suggested that Vice-Chancellors of other Universities should also be given a place. So many hon. Members have said that those persons who have been given a place here may not be able to find time to attend the meetings and may not take active interest in it. Therefore there is going to be a provision that nominees should be allowed to represent them in order that there may be a meeting. I think that is defective. Efforts should be made, and I think the Government in the eastern zone should have power to nominate experts or persons of special knowledge or such other persons that might take interest in it. If you just nominate Vice-Chancellors and others on the board of trustees they will not find time or take active interest in it. That will not help the development of the museum. These powers should be given to the Government to find out persons, who may be non-officials or officials, who may be experts in archaeology or museum affairs, and they should be nominated. Therefore the composition of the board of trustees, as has been provided here, seems to be inadequate; rather it may prove in the end to be defective and perhaps an amending Bill will become necessary in the future.

Therefore, I would suggest that the four persons to be nominated by the Central Government, under sub-clause (f), may be either officials or non-officials—because in the administration of these bodies it is a question of cultural, scientific and educational knowledge and background and such persons might be both official and non-official persons—but the qualifying

clause should be that it should be those who are experts or who possess special knowledge with regard to museums. If that is provided, it will be good.

Then, with regard to representation of the Government of India in the capacity of the Secretary of the Ministry concerned, that is for financial reasons and that is necessary. I support it. But, I do not know, in another sub-clause, sub-clause (f), representation from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Ministry is also being provided. I think it will be better if we confine it to experts in whatever capacity it may be. It should not be that the Ministry should be represented, but if such a person is found to be there he may be nominated to the board in his individual capacity, but not by the Ministry. So the composition of this board of trustees is not quite suitable.

The second point is this. Certain hon. Members have objected saying that Government will have the power of issuing directives. Shri C. K. Bhattacharya claimed that this institution is of national importance. I would like to submit that every autonomous body which is formed and which has to spend money allotted to it by Government has got a provision like this. Because, the board of trustees does not concern itself with the policy matters but with the administrative matters. There should be no interference by Government in those administrative matters. But as regards matters of policy I think every institution of national importance should provide for these powers of issuing directives by Government, so that a policy matter may be controlled and regulated by the national body. Now, Government works on behalf of Parliament. Therefore, Parliament should also have the power to issue, through Government, certain directives to be observed by the administrators of such institutions. Therefore, the objection that has been taken is, I think, not a valid objection and should not be there.

I am sorry I was not present in the House when the hon. Minister moved

this motion for consideration. But I would like to know whether this institution has been able, and if so to what extent, to collect some finance for the administration of this museum. One source of income is the contribution from Government grants. What are the other sources of income? I would like to know what the administrators, the board of trustees, who were administering this institution have done, what were their activities. As a whole or as individual members, did they take any interest in this matter? I am not quite conversant with the administration of this institution. I would like to know the present finances of this body and to what extent Government is going to contribute towards its development, as it has been stated that this institution is of regional importance.

15.24 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO *in the Chair*]

Then, my hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma suggested that Members of Parliament should also be given a place in the composition of this body. Although in a body like this here it is of national importance we have made such a provision, since this institution is going to be of regional importance I see no necessity for representation of Members of Parliament being provided them. May be a Member may be an expert in this subject. If that is so, in that capacity he may be nominated by the Government. But as Members of Parliament I think there is no necessity to allot a place for them there, because I think they will not be able to contribute to an appreciable extent.

Therefore I would not support that suggestion.

With these words I support the Bill.

**Shri Kalika Singh :** Sir, the Indian Museum Act was first passed in 1876. At that time there were no State Governments, and therefore it was a Central Museum, established at Calcutta. The intention of the British Government then was to reduce the

status of that museum from an Asiatic Museum to an Indian Museum. Because, before 1857 the British Government were not sure where they were going to establish their region in Asia—in India, or in some other parts of Asia. The British people having their nucleus in Calcutta established the Asiatic Society. They were issuing a Journal of the Asiatic Society. It was only after 1857 that the British people knew that they had to confine their activities to India. Therefore after 1857 they took the first opportunity, in 1876 to pass the Indian Museum Act and to reduce the status of this Asiatic Museum to an Indian Museum.

After 1876, when in 1911 the capital of India was transferred from Calcutta to Delhi, just before that, in 1910 this Indian Museum Act was passed. I think the idea then was to ensure that this museum was not transferred from Calcutta to Delhi. Therefore, they constituted a board of trustees under that Act, and they made that board strong enough to make rules for its own governance. Therefore, that board of trustees was represented by persons who could look to the interests of Calcutta also and at the same time be of an all-India character.

But I find that in the present amendment a great change has been introduced. In the 1910 Act, while constituting the board, they put in 13 persons of an all-India character out of 18 persons who constituted the board. Those 13 persons are, the Director, Geological Survey of India, the Director, Zoological Survey of India, the Director General of Archaeology, the Superintendent of the Archaeological Section of the Museum, the Officer in charge of the Industrial Section of the Museum, four other persons to be nominated by the Central Government, one other person to be nominated by the Council of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and three other persons to be nominated by the Trustees—I take these three persons also to be of all-India character, because then the persons who were represented on that body on an all-India basis were the persons in a

[Shri Kalika Singh]

majority. Therefore, out of 18 persons thirteen were those who were represented there on an all-India basis. Now, in the present Bill, the Board is constituted of 11 members. Out of those 11 members, six are from Bengal and five are represented on an all-India basis. The six persons who are from Bengal are very formidable. Previously, the persons who were from that region were, Accountant General, Bengal, Principal, Government School of Art, Calcutta, one person to be nominated by the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, one person nominated by the British Indian Association, Calcutta, one person nominated by the Calcutta University. These were persons who did not have so much of a strong voice against those persons representing the Government of India. But, now, the six from Bengal are very formidable. The first is the Governor of West Bengal himself. Second is the Mayor of Calcutta Corporation. The third is the Vice Chancellor of the Calcutta University. Then, Accountant General West Bengal and one person to be nominated by the Government of West Bengal, and one to be nominated by the Council of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** The Accountant General is an all-India figure.

**Shri Kalika Singh:** Out of the 11 persons, six are now associated with that region.

I take it that this museum is now being reduced from an Indian status to a regional status. Previously, it was reduced from an Asiatic status to the Indian status. It is stated that it belongs to that region and therefore, this sentence has come in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. That is not a fact. The sentence runs like this:

“Subject to the availability of funds, it is proposed to step up the pace of development of the museum and make it a full scale

national museum for the eastern region of India.”

If it is the intention to establish a museum for the western region, one for the northern region and one for the southern region, and also one Central museum at Delhi, it is quite all right. Such Boards should be constituted throughout India but on a national basis. This word ‘regional’ should not have crept in here. It is a very unfortunate word. Considering, for example, the language policy, we find the word ‘regional’ nowhere in the Constitution.

**Shri Narasimhan:** What about Zonal?

**Shri Kalika Singh:** All the fourteen languages in the Schedule are considered to be national languages. The word ‘regional’ is not there. Wherever we go, we find people are under the wrong impression that these are regional languages. Here, for the first time, instead of saying national museum, the word ‘regional’ has been introduced in the Act itself. The regional nature of things we should now avoid because, it creates a wrong impression. If it had been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that since we were going to establish 4 or 5 other museums in other regions, it was proposed to make it a regional museum, then in that case, it was quite all right. But to make it an all-India museum and at the same time to say that it is for the eastern region is something contradictory.

I support clause 12A. That is very important. That gives a very big power to the Central Government. Previously that power was not given to the Central Government. I think that was for some good reason. The good reason was that the Board was really a Central Board and it was not a regional Board. Therefore, that Board used to have all the powers. That Board had the rule-making power also. Now, when the Board is being constituted on a regional basis,

I think it is quite right. If it is a Central museum, the Government of India must be vested with powers to make rules and to issue directions which should be binding on that Board. Under the 1910 Act, the Central Government had no power to issue any direction or any order which could be binding on that Board. There, the only provision was under section 10(1) that the Trustees shall furnish on the first day of December, each year, to the Central Government a report of their proceedings and to such Auditor as the Central Government appoints in this behalf the accounts, etc., and the trustees shall cause the reports and accounts to be published for general information. The Government of India was only the repository of the documents sent by the Board of Trustees. It could not pass any orders after perusing that report. Now, section 12A has been added. That is a very good provision. Section 12A says:

"In the discharge of their functions under this Act, the Trustees shall be bound by such directions on questions of policy as the Central Government may give to them from time to time."

This is as it ought to be. This is a Central museum and a national museum. In that case, it is a very good provision. The Central Government must possess all the powers of issuing directions and even, I think, it should have the power to dissolve that Board. I am ready to grant that power to the Central Government.

Then, under clause 15A, the Central Government may, in consultation with the Trustees, by notification in the Official Gazette, make rules to carry out the purposes of this Act. This also gives power to the Central Government. Previously, the Board had the power to make rules and bye-laws to carry on the administration.

There are two reasons why this new Bill has been brought forward. First, to step up the pace of development and to make it a regional institution. To the first part, I object. Second part

is to re-organise and improve the administrative efficiency by introducing certain changes in the Act. To that part, I quite agree. Whatever new changes are introduced in the new Act are quite good.

An hon. Member said that the Government of India should establish museums throughout the country. In India, a large part of the population is practically illiterate. For such a country, a museum is the best medium of education. If we have museums attached to all the Universities, all the educational institutions, in all the States, in all the districts, everywhere, small and big—a chain of museums throughout the country—that would be a very good policy. It will really be a medium of education for the whole of India and that should be welcome.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I welcome this Bill because it comes at a time when the Government of India, as it is constituted at present, is committed to a policy in which cultural progress and cultural activities play a very prominent part. My friend says, it should be. I say, it ought to be. Our negligence of that aspect of our life is one of the great defects from which we have been suffering. Some of the present disabilities of the people of India are due to the fact that this important factor of cultural life had practically gone unheeded, unnoticed by the Government of India then existing. Even in those days, there were people who were thinking of at least a nucleus of an institution which will contribute to the cultural progress of this country and the institution with which we are dealing today is one of those institutions which were started with an object like that. During British days, in spite of their imperialistic and autocratic rule, there used to be some persons who had a broader mind, who used to act with laudable motives. Institutions like the Royal Asiatic Society had come into existence not because of the imperialists but because of such persons who had a broad outlook on humanity, who wanted every country with which they came into contact to develop.

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

When I was a student the idea of a museum was that it was a collection of curios. People used to go and pass some time there just to see things unusual which you do not see in life outside. The museum was not treated as an institution of education, an institution giving incentive to the people for scientific and cultural progress. But now, in view of the fact that we have taken to a very broad programme as our idea, it is necessary that this institution which had come in in an informal way in those days should be developed on proper lines. From that point of view, I think the step that is being taken today by introducing this Bill is a very important one, and so I welcome it.

The Calcutta Museum is really a national museum, but they are thinking of giving it the shape of a regional museum under this Bill. If that is the idea, the Calcutta people will really feel hurt. I am one of those who do not mind where an institution is located in India. If it serves a national purpose, we shall call it a national institution. Because the capital is in Delhi, it is not necessary that every national institution should be in Delhi. In fact, real democracy requires decentralisation in many ways, and if it is essential in any direction, it is in the direction of cultural progress, connected directly with the wishes of the people and their aspirations. It is the people who can give it a proper direction. So, there is nothing wrong in having a national institution in a place like Calcutta; we should welcome it. It is an old institution, and it has now to be developed to cope with our present requirements. From that point of view, the observations made in the Statement of Objects and Reasons are, to some extent, misplaced. That is all that I can say. The idea of regional institutions may be good; you may start them where you want, but let not this institution which has been existing to demonstrate our idea of a national institution so long be looked upon hereafter as a regional institution by any part of India. It

should be so developed as to keep the old reputation and its old prestige also.

The title of the Bill is The Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill.

**Shri Narasimhan:** Museum is amended!

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** I think care should be taken to see that this idea of the institution being a national one is properly represented in the title itself.

About the board of trustees, so many hon. Members have made observations. The number of persons has been reduced, but there is a proviso in Clause 2 that if any of the trustees referred to in clauses (b), (c), (d) and (e) is unable to attend any meeting of the trustees, he may, with the previous approval of the Chairman, authorise a person in writing to do so. This is very ambiguous in my opinion. In the first place, I want to know if that person is required to authorise somebody who is already a trustee or not. If this only gives the power of proxy, there is some meaning constitutionally, though personally I do not like the idea of proxy at all, but if it enables the man to authorise anybody who is not a trustee at all, you are introducing a dangerous element. The six officials may meet, induce some three or four friends to remain absent, and get in their place those whom they want. A mischief like that can be played at times. You must try to ensure that there is provision against such a dangerous possibility.

I am glad that this board was an autonomous body till now. Now it is not going to be entirely autonomous, but you have kept it under your control by certain provisions under Clause 10 where you have stated that in the discharge of their functions, the trustees shall be bound by such directions on questions of policy as the Central Government may give them from time to time. They only exercise the limited powers that you have given them,

but the board of trustees are not exactly on the same footing as certain autonomous corporations which you have created. I do not quarrel with this provision because this being a national museum, after the pattern of which other museums will be created, there ought to be a co-ordinating body. The provision enabling the Central Government to keep the ultimate decision in its own hands is therefore important, but does the Central Government consider itself competent to exercise the functions and powers that are to be exercised for purposes of giving a proper national direction to these bodies? For that purpose they may have a board of experts to advise them.

**Shri Narasimhan:** A Director-General or something like that.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** They will take a decision and that will be binding upon the trustees. That will help you in two ways. The power will be exercised in giving proper direction, and secondly, it will co-ordinate the policies to be followed by the various museums, so that cultural progress is expedited.

The board of trustees has been given the power of making recruitment and appointment of persons. This is a departure from the usual policy followed by the Government in the case of these autonomous institutions. The appointments will be of two kinds. Some will be of an administrative nature, and some will be of a technical nature. I do not know whether the board of trustees that you are constituting will be competent enough to make a proper selection of men for both these kinds of appointments. I want the Select Committee to consider this point very carefully.....

**Shri Narasimhan:** It is not being referred to a Select Committee. It was only a plea made by some hon. Members.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** I am sorry. I hope the House will consider this point carefully when the clause-by-clause discus-

sion is taken up. Some provision should be made to ensure that the body which makes the selection has got competent men on it for making proper selection of persons for the functions which are expected to be performed by them.

With these remarks, I congratulate the hon. Minister on having brought forward this Bill, and I hope that the board of trustees that will come into existence will administer it in the same spirit with which my hon. friend the Mover has been actuated in bringing forward this measure before this House.

**Shri Narasimhan:** It is quite patent that the hon. Minister has not succeeded in enthusing the House in favour of the Bill. On the other hand, hon. Members have criticised this Bill rather drastically. I think in fairness to the House he should really reconsider whether it is more desirable or not to bring forward another Bill in a better form, which will be more universally acceptable. No doubt, such a thing is rare, but that can be done. The whole House has examined the Bill in its various aspects and found several types of defects, and, therefore, it is not unreasonable on our part to expect that the hon. Minister would respond to the generous sentiments expressed here.

The subject of museology, like all other scientific subjects is becoming a very complicated one. It is not as if the subject of museology and museums in India have not been studied by experts in this country. One important fact which the House has not so far been able to realise, for want of sufficient data here is that the subject of museology has been studied by various experts. The Government of India themselves had called some experts from the UNESCO, and some experts from the British Museum Association; and a committee was also constituted in India for an examination of the conditions and methods of improving the efficiency of this museum. Those reports have been made available, and some of them are in the Library of

[Shri Narasimhan]

Parliament. They are of a very revealing character.

As for the Bill itself, from the Statement of Objects and Reasons, we find that the object is to reorganise, improve the defects, and arrange proper development on modern scientific lines and the like. But from the introductory speech of the hon. Minister, we have not been able to understand what the defects were and what the remedies were, and how they are going to be remedied by this Bill. This Bill, as compared with the Act which it seeks to amend, appears to be just the same. The original Act and this Bill are nothing but Tweedledum and Tweedledee. There are ten members there, and there are nine here.

I was referring to the report of some of the committee appointed by the Government of India for examining the work of this museum. One of them consisted of Mr. S. F. Markham, Empire Secretary, Museum Association, and Mr. H. Hargreaves, Director-General, Archaeological Survey of India. They have submitted a huge report which is available in the Parliament Library. It makes very interesting reading. Criticising the parent Act, they have said something which applies even to this Bill in spite of the amendment that is proposed. They had stated:

"Trustees are there powerful in name but powerless in action."

They have also stated:

"To put it briefly, it would seem as if the Act governing this Museum, and its bye-laws, have been devised to create a number of trustees with no powers, a series of officials with no supervision, officials with little time to give to their duties, and immense opportunities for procrastination."

This is the kind of comment which has been made by Mr. S. F. Markham and Mr. H. Hargreaves.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** In which year?

**Shri Narasimhan:** In 1936. Twenty years or more have passed, and the hon. Minister thinks as if things have changed, and this is out of date. In their report, they had referred to the organisation of trustees, which it is being proposed to change only now. I think the original Act was passed in 1910.

**The Deputy Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Dr. M. M. Das):** Only 50 years are over!

**Shri Narasimhan:** What I am saying is that the organisation is the same, and Government are not making any change, instead of somebody else, they are only putting a Governor there.

Coming to the Governor, I take objection to it. Shri C. K. Bhattacharya has already referred to it. I take strong objection to it for the simple reason that the rules of this House preclude us from criticising the Governor. We do not know which will prevail, whether this rule or whether our right to criticise an institution created by an Act of this Parliament, when something goes wrong. Therefore, it is really a matter of our privilege to see whether such a thing could be done. I would like you, Sir, and the Speaker to pay attention to this matter, as to whether when there is an express provision in the rules that a Governor should not be criticised here, it would be proper to make him chairman of a body which gets grants from the Centre.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** What about universities?

**Shri Narasimhan:** We are not criticising them here generally. Whatever it is, when there is so much of criticism by everybody over this question . . .

**Shri Morarka:** Two wrongs cannot make one right.

**Shri Narasimhan:** My hon. friend here remarks that two wrongs cannot make one right. This point requires examination. As a proposition, this is not good; as a model, this is not good.

When an institution of this type is being reorganised under statute, we should always have the benefit of the advice of the State Government concerned in all these matters. For instance, there is an excellent museum managed by the Government of Madras. It has received excellent praise from all these bodies. According to museology, it is an ideal institution. The Government of Madras are proud of it. Supposing tomorrow it is decided to centralise it, what would happen? After all, such an attempt is not called for in these days of democratic decentralisation. If our cultural and educational sites and State institutions of that nature are managed fairly well, it should be our duty to encourage such State institutions, such State enterprise and such State initiative rather than take them over. Therefore, even with the present object, it is not in accord.

Then, there was a committee on museums set up by the Government of India. They made certain recommendations about the National Museum and so on. These were considered by the advisory committee on museums in India; I think those recommendations were approved by the Advisory Committee. They have clearly stated that let us have one national museum in India, let us not have a multiplicity of these institutions. They have defined what a national museum should mean. They have said that it should deal with zoology, anthropology and what not. All these things must be there in a national museum. But a national museum need not be located in one place. The nucleus may be in one place, but it may have several branches in other places; all these could be considered as a unit and as a

national museum. That is what they have stated.

But, now, our Government's proposal is that let us have a multiplicity of these national museums. In all humility, I would say that it is just like making Generals out of ordinary soldiers. Simply by calling the soldiers as Generals, you do not make them Generals. Merely calling a soldier as a General does not make him a General. So, likewise, merely modifying your statute is not going to prove useful. Therefore, I do not think that merely calling a number of institutions as national museums is desirable. On the other hand, there may be a consolidation of existing institutions, instead of dispersing our resources in these difficult days.

Then, there was also a UNESCO committee. One American by name Mr. Lothar P. Wittebourg has also recorded his impressions. I know, Sir, that you are looking at the clock, but by way of explanation, I may tell the House that I had given notice of a resolution on museums in India, and I have fairly studied this matter. For want of time, I would not go into the details. The hon. Minister asked me about the year in which the report I quoted from was made, in regard to some other matter.

16 hrs.

In the summer of 1958, Lothar P. Wittebourg, Chief of Exhibition of the American Museum of Natural History, was invited by the Government of India to advise them on the National Museum.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** On a particular problem. He is not a general expert.

**Shri Narasimhan:** While in India, he visited a number of regional, state and archaeological site museums located in this country. He has recorded his impressions in the journal entitled *Curator* (Vol. III, No. 1, 1960)—a quarterly publication of the American Museum of Natural History, New York. A

[Shri Narasimhan]

friend of mine had showed it to me. I wanted to lay it on the Table of the House. I searched for it, but could not get it. I even asked our Librarian to request the National Museum Delhi to send it to me, but till now I have not succeeded in obtaining it. The following are extracts from the article by Lothar P. Wittebour. . .

**Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Puri):** He may reserve them for his Resolution.

**Shri Narasimhan:** I have here four pages of quotations, but I will read only two paragraphs.

**Mr. Chairman:** He may reserve it to a later date.

**Shri Kalika Singh:** He may lay it on the Table.

**Shri Narasimhan:** He says:

"The world-wide trend towards relating the great wealth of contents in museums to the needs of people in all walks of life, and to furnish intellectual, social and cultural opportunities not merely for scholars but for everyone, has accelerated greatly since the end of the last world war. Stimulated by the needs of the ordinary people, a few museums for various parts of the world have become newest as well as one of the most effective means of popular education. They reveal to people the extent and importance of their culture; they explain, and they expand the understanding by people of their present way of living; and they show paths of advancement that no other means can convey".

Coming to Indian museums, there is a small paragraph which says:

"Indian museums—are principally store houses of antiquities and oddities of nature, and the 'museum' as it is perceived in reality by the general public..is

a dingy structure containing dingy objects that are piled on top of one another much as in an attic or store cellar. Of all the sources of public education in the world today, the museum is probably the most neglected and least supported and its full potential is the least appreciated or realised".

Then he refers to the Government of India. I would draw the attention of the House and the Minister to what he has said:

"Unfortunately, the present governmental bureaucratic system has many weak points, which many of India's leaders admit. A tendency to shift key personnel from Ministry to Ministry or from one specific job to another within the Ministry is very detrimental to the proper carrying out of long-term projects. As a prime example, no one connected with museum administration in the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs know of the work carried out in Mysore by UNESCO in 1953—55 on 'Museum Techniques in Fundamental Education'. The Mysore work was an extremely worthwhile undertaking which could have been a valuable experiment in general education for a vast illiterate population; so far as I know, nothing further has been done regarding it. The whole problem of the role of museums in India comes to one main point: a lack of insight and direction by the State as the Central Governments which do not yet possess the experience and knowledge to carry out a long-range programme plus a general ignorance of the role and function of the 'progressive museum'."

Therefore, what is needed is a regular Director-General to control the National Museum and attached institutions all over the country. Any other arrangement to look after the National Museum is not good. This

Bill is full of defects; it does not improve matters. It is regressive in character. It is really necessary for Government to consider the opinions expressed in the House. There is nothing wrong if the Minister rethinks and brings forward a more acceptable Bill.

**Dr. Melkote** (Raichur): I entirely agree with the remarks made by the previous speaker. I had occasion sometime in 1953 and 1955 to visit Europe and came back with an idea of sponsoring a museum of the nature which existed in London. I must say that while the speech of the Minister has been revealing and showed that Government are aware of the necessity and importance of museums, this House has shown a greater awareness of its importance.

The Bill, as it stands today, does not provide fully for all the things that Members want the Government to do. I personally feel that these museums should come up to the mark to serve the needs of different sections of the population. Children go there, students go there, adults as well as the aged go there to learn. So the scope of these museums should be so shaped as to subserve the needs of these different age groups. Children are allowed to go and play at these places. There are instructors posted in these museums to teach the different age groups. A good deal is learnt by the community at large. I had thought that the scope of the Bill would emphasise all these things.

While the remarks of the Minister were quite cogent, in saying that many of the members oftentimes absent themselves and in order that the business of the museum is carried on properly it would be necessary to limit the number, I must say that it is a thing which does not appeal to us. If any members who do not take interest are there, they should not find a place there. Who are the people who naturally take interest in these museums? It is, by and large, people who understand these things, who have the necessary knowledge—essentialy scientists,

historians and other people. There should be representation of such groups there. This by itself is a big task. People have to take it as part of their duty.

When I tried to study the way the British museums are run. I came to understand that, by and large, many of these museums have large subventions given to them by the Government, but essentially private agencies, private philanthropists as well as other private people who have knowledge of these things, manage these things. They collect millions of pounds annually and run them efficiently. The only duty that they have in their life is to run these museums and manage their affairs efficiently.

I therefore felt that while it is a good thing that the Government are taking interest in these museums, all the same the views expressed by Members should be respected. For instance, it was said here that the Chairman of this Board should not be a Governor because he is likely to be criticised. Apart from that, I feel that prominent Members of this Parliament who can understand these things ought to be on this body. These museums should become institutions of vital importance for catering to the needs of the different sections of the population. Also there should be scientists, may be those people who are in service, may be those who are retired, who have a good knowledge of these things and who could devote their time and possibly their money also, who should be on this body. In addition, there may be philanthropists associated with it. There are many industrial sections which have various associations. The name of the Asiatic Society was mentioned. I personally feel that some of these industrial and commercial sections could find a place there. These museums should cater to the needs of that community also. They may be able to donate large sums. So the scope of this body should be such as to include all these people, who take a keen interest in these museums.

[Dr. Melkote]

More than this, I personally feel that the selection of personnel there should not be left to any particular individual. I wonder if Government can find it possible to see that the recruitment takes place through the UPSC. Therefore, the scope of the Bill as now proposed being limited, I wonder if the Minister could agree to withdraw it or at least refer it to a Select Committee so that they may incorporate further amendments—even though Government themselves could do it—and bring it before the House for its acceptance. I would then be able to place further ideas before you.

**Shri Chintamani Panigrahi:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to participate in the discussion with a view to seeking some clarification. I think most of the confusion which has taken place is due to the title of the amending Bill, which is misleading. It refers really to the administration and control of one particular museum in the country and that is the Calcutta Museum. So, more particularly, this Bill should have been entitled, 'The Calcutta Museum Administration and Control Bill, 1960.'

The discussions show that the House is really very anxious to impress upon the hon. Minister to have a very comprehensive legislation dealing with all aspects of the development of museums in this country since 1910. I also would try to add my voice and request the hon. Minister to see if it is possible to have a really comprehensive amending Bill for looking into the developments which have taken place since 1910 in the field of museums in this country.

The scope of the present Bill is very much limited. So, the discussions are somewhat out of place. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is stated:

"Subject to the availability of funds, it is proposed to step up the

pace of development of the Museum and make it a full scale National Museum for the Eastern Region of India."

I was going through the report of the Expert Museum Survey Committee and their recommendations. They have laid down a pattern for museums in India which are divided into 4 categories, National Museums, State Museums, Regional Museums and Local Museums. To what category does this Calcutta Museum, which the hon. Minister wants to develop as a Regional National Museum, belong? I hope the Committee never recommended 4 or 5 National Museums in the Eastern, Western, Northern and Southern regions of India.

Naturally, the Calcutta Museum serves as a State Museum for West Bengal also because it seems that by developing it as a State Museum it has developed into a National Museum also. It has its own historical development and historical specimens; and archaeological remains from Orissa are there; from Assam are also there and also from Bihar. Naturally, it has developed in to a kind of National Museum. If the hon. Minister wants to develop it as a Regional National Museum, naturally, the question will arise whether representatives from the Eastern Region of India will not be associated with it. Therefore, some of my hon. friends have suggested the association of representatives from the Universities of Utkal, Assam and Bihar also. I think they are right because if the Minister wants to develop it as a Regional National Museum, it must have the representatives of those parts of the region.

So far as the central administration of the Indian National Museum and its improvement are concerned. I share what other friends like Shri Gupta have suggested. I would request the hon. Minister to clarify whether this is going to be another

National Museum in the Eastern part of India and, if so, whether he wants to have piecemeal legislation for the administration and control of the individual museums like the Salarjang museums at Hyderabad and other museum in the country. It is wrong to attempt to have piecemeal legislation for the control and administration of individual museums in the country. If the hon. Minister really wants to have proper control of all museums in India, it is necessary that there must be a comprehensive amending Bill to the Act of 1910, which would look into all these aspects.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Minister.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya:** Before the hon. Minister rises to reply, I would like to put him a question which he may reply in his speech. When I took objection to the newly inserted clause 15A(2)(d), he said that the powers were already there in section 7 of the Act. He may kindly explain why, with that section 7 existing, this paragraph has been felt necessary to be added. So far as I understand, it would have been enough for his purpose to say—

'conditions subject to which the Trustees may exercise their powers under section 7'.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I am grateful to the House for the interest it has shown in this Bill. There has been a large number of speakers—I confess much larger than I expected. Anyway, it is a good sign; it shows that subjects of cultural interest do attract the attention of the House; and especially in areas where there is no political controversy, the discussion is on individual lines and people approach the problem from their own points of view.

While complimenting the House on the interest shown, I must say that I confess I was a little surprised by some of the remarks. There has been a certain amount of the criticism: I do not deny that for a moment. Of course, a lot of criticisms cancelled one

another. But, what surprised me was that most of the criticisms repeated things which I had already disposed of in my opening remarks. Either the hon. Members were not present here when I made my opening remarks, which, I think, was certainly the case with regard to one or two members, or I failed to make myself sufficiently clear; and it is certainly my failing that I was not able to point out to them that the things which they were saying had already been disposed.

I shall take the remarks of the hon. Members seriatim and try to dispose of every one of them because I do not think that any really valid criticisms have been made. The first comment was by my hon. friend, Prof. Sharma, about the guides and paying attention to the scientific aspects in the development of museums. There are two reasons why the museums have not been able to give better service, and I entirely agree with him that lack of guides is one of them. The second is that in many cases the administrations of the museums are not geared to satisfy these needs. And, that is why, in the present Bill, which is before us for consideration, the greatest emphasis is on the improvement of the administration of the Indian Museum.

My hon friend also asked about the representation of M.Ps. In museums of this type, it is not customary anywhere in the world to have Members of Parliament as such represented; but, certainly, there is no bar either for Members of Parliament to enter as individuals. There is the nomination of 4 members. How they will be nominated, it is difficult to say. It is not that there are no suitable persons; I am sure that there are many in both the Houses.

My hon. friend said something about the quorum which I could not understand. I do not know why he was so much excited about quorum. Really there are not very many changes. Originally, when there were 18 members, the Council or Board could function when there were 9 persons—half of them. Now, when there are 11

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

members, we are providing that the Board of Trustees could function if there are 6 members. So, there is a slight improvement; it is little more than 50 per cent. Similarly, with regard to quorum, when there were 18 members, the quorum was 6. Now, when there are 11 members, the quorum is 4. Here again, if there is anything, there is slight improvement rather than deterioration which my hon. friend fears.

My hon. friend referred to appointment to the Museum Service through the Public Service Commission. I must say that this completely took my breath away. On the one hand, there is a demand that this should be an entirely autonomous organisation and it shall have nothing to do with Government, that the Trustees should be given all powers; on the other hand, they say that the appointments should be through the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission can appoint only persons who are employed by Government. I do not see how the two can be reconciled. In any case, I do not think that the Public Service Commission is the proper authority for recruiting candidates to museums or other autonomous organisations and I say so with great respect to that body. Next time, we may be told that professors in the universities should also be appointed by them or employees in the district boards and municipalities and corporations should be recruited through them. I do not know where we shall end. I am sure my hon. friend, reasonable man as he is, will see the force of this comment and will be satisfied.

Quite a number of hon. Members referred to the directives. I was glad that my hon. friend, Dr. Aney, pointed out how the directives are essential and necessary when large funds are placed at their disposal out of public money. There must be some answerability to Parliament. These directives are only in matters of policy and not of administration. In many new Bills, this power has been assumed by the Government. Reference was made to

the Viswa Bharati Bill passed in 1951. Since then we have learnt a lot. When the U.G.C. Bill was passed, you may remember that there is a definite provision to this effect. Parliament wants to reserve to itself the general power to issue directives in respect of policy while giving the greatest amount of autonomy in matters of administrations. If there were not this power, they would not be subject to the control of Parliament and they can act as they like. I am sure that it is not the intention of Parliament. There has been a lot of misunderstanding about these directives.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani referred to the question of consultations; she is not here now. Some other hon. Members also referred to this point and they also said that the Bill was being hurried through. I do not know what it means. The consideration of the amendment has been before us since 1935. There were discussions in 1950 and 1955. At every stage, the general pattern was before everybody. The Bill itself could not be sent to all because it was in the process of being drafted and I felt that till the Cabinet had approved it, it was not proper to send it to any outside body. But the main outline or the substantial elements in it were sent to the Asiatic Society on the 1st and to the Trustees on the 2nd of August. There were further letters also but no reply was received from the Trustees. Today, I heard for the first time—it seems—that the trustees did not receive that letter. At that stage, no comments were received. They were received at a latter stage. If the hon. Members go through the Rajya Sabha proceedings, they would find that I had taken into consideration every one of the comments made by them and I had gone as far as possible in meeting their wishes.... (Interruptions.)

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** Were these proceedings made available to the Members of Rajya Sabha? If so, why were they not made available to the Members here?

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** The amendments do not come here. If the hon. Member sees the Bill as it was originally introduced and also the Bill as finally adopted by the Rajya Sabha, he will see the changes.

It was also mentioned that the Bengal Government was not consulted. I do not know wherefrom my hon. friends got this information. At every stage, they were consulted. Some of the changes, for instance, the composition of the board of trustees was made at the suggestion of the Chief Minister of West Bengal and he himself acknowledged that fact. That is why there has been no comment from the side of the Government of West Bengal.

One demand of the Asiatic Society which I could not accept in full was their request to have two nominees of theirs. They had one nominee in a board of 21, originally. Now, we are giving them one in a board of 11. Even though we have not given them an additional nominee, the weight of their nominee has gone almost by 100 per cent. I have also written to them that in making nominations—Government has to make 4 nominations—we will take into consideration their views. I have asked them to send some names so that if we find suitable persons from the list suggested by them, we will certainly nominate at least one other member who has the confidence of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta.

One hon. Member—I think, Shri Panigrahi—had certain comments about the name of the Bill. He said that it was misleading because it deals with the Calcutta Museum but it is named 'The Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill'. I am afraid he has not looked at the original Act or other amendment. This is known as the Indian Museum for at least 80 years, if not longer. The Act which we are trying to amend is the Indian Museum Act. How can I introduce a 'Calcutta Museum (Amendment) Bill'? I was surprised at his suggestion, because he is generally a very careful student and he does not usually make suggestions which are irrelevant.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):** There is no difficulty in changing the name.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I will come to that in a moment. My hon. friend, Shri C. K. Bhattacharya, referred to the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill and asked why it should be called a National Museum for the eastern region of India. He seemed to suggest that by using that term the dignity and status of that museum was somehow being reduced. Shri Kalika Singh also suggested the same thing. He went further—I do not know where he undertook researches into the history—and said that at one time it was an Asiatic Museum. I have never heard it being called by that name. It was at one time a small museum attached to the Royal Asiatic Society, as it was called at that time. It developed into an Indian Museum and its title was the Indian Museum and that title has continued throughout. So that, it would be seen that there had been no reduction from the Asiatic Museum to an Indian Museum. Certainly, there is no intention of reducing it now to a regional museum.

Shri Panigrahi asked why the advice of the expert committee was not accepted. That committee had suggested that there should be one national museum of India with the natural history section in Calcutta, with archaeology section in Delhi, with scientific section in Bangalore and with agricultural and plants section somewhere in U.P. I told the distinguished experts who constituted that committee that nowhere in the world had I heard of such a thing. This, if accepted, would have meant that in order to get an idea of the culture of the country, one has to travel from Calcutta to Bangalore, to U.P. and Delhi and—God knows how many other places. The whole conception of the national museum of that type was completely wrong. . . . (*Interruptions.*) We rejected that idea, whatever might have been the expert advice, as an absurd idea.

**Shri Chintamani Panigrahi:** I want one clarification.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** Sir, let me continue. In a country like India, I have said, it is absurd to expect that you can have only one national museum in one place. Because of the vast distances, you must have national museums in different parts of India. It is on that basis that I have looked at the Indian Museum of Calcutta, it is on that basis we are trying to develop the National Museum in Delhi, it is on that basis we are trying to develop the Salar Jung Museum in Hyderabad. I hope there will be one or two other national museums of the same status and standard in different parts of the country. I would go further and say that while we cannot have perhaps more than four or five great National Museums maintained by the Government of India, we want that every State museum will be a miniature national museum. Therefore, we have also stepped up considerably the assistance which we are giving to the different State museums so that they can develop those museums as national museums in the real sense, not national museums with a capital letter but national museums in the real sense.

It is in that light, Sir, that I have described here in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that the Indian Museum is the national museum for the eastern region of India. I have said 'eastern region of India' because it is located in the eastern region. Nobody can gainsay that fact. Similarly, take the national museum in Delhi. Even though it is in the capital of India, from the very nature of the case it is obvious that people in Delhi and its surroundings will use it far more than a person from, say, Cape Comorin or a person from the borders of Assam or a person from Gujerat. You cannot expect everyone to come to any one centre. That is why we have this conception of a series of national museums, at least three or four to start with. But for that independent bills will be necessary because of the past history. The Indian Museum, Calcutta has a history of its

own. You cannot suddenly merge all that into a general Act. The Bill relating to the Salar Jung Museum, Hyderabad, I hope will be taken into consideration during the current session and passed, and by that we shall establish a national museum in Hyderabad for that region of the country. We have a separate Bill because in that place we have inherited certain things and certain things have come to use with their past history. You cannot lump all of them together into one Act. It may be that a time will come—not today but after ten or twenty years when at least I shall certainly not be here—when we may plan a comprehensive Museum Act for the whole of India, when the different national museums have been established, the State museums have been properly developed and there are district museums in every district and other museums also which will cater to the scientific, archaeological and aesthetic needs of the country.

Then, there was a reference by Shrimati Kripalani to the bye-laws. I do not know where she got this impression that under the new Bill the power of the trustees for making bye-laws was being curtailed. The power of making bye-laws is given in sections 7 and 8 of the original Act. Section 7 of the original Act has not been touched at all. The only amendment that is sought to be made to section 8 is that after the words "consistent with this Act", the words "and the rules made thereunder" are to be inserted. This is a logical development, because in every Act there are rules and if there were no Rules in the past, that was definite lacuna which had to be filled up. Therefore, the power of making bye-laws has not been touched at all. The initiative remains with the trustees. I have also told them, with regard to certain of their apprehensions, that if they frame bye-laws the Government will accept them. If the trustees have not framed bye-laws, certainly the responsibility for that is not the Government's but it is the responsibility of the trustees.

A question was asked, why should there be a difference between the rules and bye-laws. The difference is obvious. The bye-laws are framed by the trustees. The rules can be framed only under the Act and they are subject to the approval of Parliament. Therefore, the rules are those things which will be placed here whereas bye-laws will deal with comparatively minor matters and the trustees will make them. So long as they are not inconsistent with the Act or the rules under them, nobody will raise any objection about the bye-laws.

Shrimati Kripalani also raised some difficulty about the Governor being the Chairman. I think having the Governor as Chairman will help in many ways. The Governor is the head of the State. The Governor is not the head of the Government. In this way, there is a connection with the State. At the same time, the Governor being outside party politics, not being a member of the Government, not being a member of the party in power, he can take a more detached view of many of these things. Another objection raised was that the Governor's conduct may be subjected to questions in Parliament. I do not think it is ever likely. In any case, Governors are already chancellors of universities. Therefore, if being a chancellor of a university does not in any way prejudice the Governor's status, I do not see how making the Governor, the Chairman of the Indian Museum will do so. Anyway—hon. Members are probably not aware or they have not looked up the law—I may say that the Governor is already the Chairman of the Victoria Memorial in Calcutta. The Victoria Memorial is also one of our monuments for which money is voted by Parliament. The Parliament has a right to criticise that expenditure, if need be. That has not in any way interfered with the Governor being its Chairman. Therefore, this objection also, I submit, is not founded on reason.

My hon. friend, Shri Gupta, raised two or three points one of which I thought was very interesting. He rais-

ed the objection that in place of the Director of Zoological Survey and the other officers of the Government, we are putting only the Secretary. I gave one reason for that. At present my Ministry has four or five representatives there, and it is, if I may be permitted to say so, rather surprising that when you have the Director-General of Archaeology you have simultaneously the Superintendent of Archaeology also. How this clause came into the Bill originally is very difficult to understand. Where you have the Director-General of Archaeology why should his deputy also be simultaneously a member? (*Interruption.*)? Further, all these experts are advisers to Government. All these experts are officials and, therefore, their advice is always available to Government. It is not, therefore, necessary to put them in the Board of Trustees. On the contrary, as I stated in my opening speech, their responsibilities have increased so much that they are not able to give that time and attention to the affairs of the museum which is required of them. The Director of Geology, the Director of Zoology, the Director-General of Archaeology and other officers are always on tour during most of the time of what is called the camp season. For the rest of the time they are busy studying their finds, studying and analysing the work which has been done during the winter season and presenting reports to us. Their advice will be available wherever and whenever necessary.

I may also draw the attention of the House to the clause where we have provided that if a trustee, not any trustee but only the *ex officio* trustee is unable to attend, he may send a representative with the previous permission of the Chairman. The reason for that is, it may be that in some particular meeting the agenda deals with archaeology and the Secretary of the Ministry instead of going himself may send the Director-General of Archaeology for that particular meeting. It may be that

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

in another meeting the major subject for discussion is zoology or botany. The Secretary in that case will have the right of sending the Director of Zoology or the Director of Botany as the case may be. Therefore, by making this provision we have kept the way open for securing the advice of these experts and, at the same time, reduced considerably the size of the Board. As I have said, all the committees which have gone into the question of this Indian Museum were agreed on one point, that the size was unwieldy, the size of 18 was unwieldy and it should be reduced.

However, I would add, we are considering the setting up of a number of expert advisory bodies. My own personal view is—I have mentioned this to one or two trustees also—that a museum of this type must have a whole-time Director. Till there is a whole-time Director to look after the different departments and co-ordinate their work, the museum cannot render that service of which it is capable and which we expect from it. I am hoping that as soon as the new Board of Trustees come into being, they will probably take action in this direction.

I have said earlier that there is dual control at every stage, that the trustees are the legal owners, but the real powers are with the departments of the Government of India. That position will be removed when we have a director who will be directly under the Board of Trustees and will be able to pay whole-time attention and not part-time attention.

**Shri Narasimhan:** There is no provision to that effect.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** There is no necessity for that provision. My hon. friend is a sufficiently experienced Parliamentarian to know that in an Act we do not say so and so should be appointed. These are matters of detail which should always be settled by the Board of Trustees themselves.

**Shri Kalika Singh:** It is now being suggested that the directors will not be appointed. But I think in the Bill, as it stands now, they may be appointed.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** My hon. friend has not understood me. What I said was that directors of Botany or Archaeology or Zoology or Geology cannot give whole-time attention. In a museum of this type you must have a director of the museum which is entirely a different thing.

Then there was the question of dispersal of objects. I have made it perfectly clear more than once that there is no question of any dispersal of objects, and therefore I gave an assurance in the other House, and which I would repeat here, that nothing will be taken away without the unanimous consent of the trustees and I said on behalf of Government that if the trustees framed by-laws to that effect, we shall accept them.

Then there was the question of a public representative. My hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta mentioned it. Who are the public representatives? It is very difficult to decide who is a public representative and who is not. In any case, how are you to select one? Are you asking the people of Calcutta to have a vote to elect one representative to the Indian Museum, and the people of Orissa and the people of Assam and the people of other parts of the country to do so? The mayor is there in a representative capacity.

Shri Indrajit Gupta and some other hon. friends mentioned—I do not understand how—that official control was being increased. I really fail to understand how this statement was made when we are reducing the number of officials. The Governor is certainly not an official. The Mayor of Calcutta is not an official. The four persons to be nominated by the Government of India will almost certainly not be officials. Perhaps one may be an official and he may perhaps be the

representative of the Geological Survey which is not attached to my Ministry, and I may have to give some representation to the Asiatic Society. Even in the case of the West Bengal Government, it is a nominee. They have greater freedom today than was the case in the past. If you feel that the vice-chancellor of the university, the mayor, the Governor—all these people—are going to knuckle down to the two or three officials who are there, I am afraid you are not paying a compliment to those officers and, may I respectfully submit, not probably showing a proper appreciation of the realities of life.

**Shri Subiman Ghose** (Burdwan): They might send their their P.A.s.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** The Governor will preside and under the Act you will find that there is no question of sending any substitute in the case of the former.

Then, Shri Aurobindo Ghosal asked about piecemeal legislation. I have already replied to that point when I said that a comprehensive legislation may come, but this is not the time for it. He also spoke about dynamism. I do not know what exactly dynamism is. It is a very difficult word and different people understand dynamism differently. But I do hope that a smaller Board will be more dynamical than a bigger Board. It is almost a law physics and I think it is also equally true of human dynamics.

Then he also referred to the question of purchase of objects. We have been increasing the grants. Actually, if I gave you the figures, you would find that the grants are increasing and the way in which grants to this and other museums have been enhanced over the last two or three years. I am speaking off-hand, from meory, but I think out of the provision which was made in the second Five Year Plan, practically the whole amount will have been spent in the last two and a half to three years. We will spend the whole amount, and I have no doubt about it.

Dr. Samantsinhar raised an interesting question, about the vice-chancellors of Patna, Utkal and Gauhati universities. I may frankly admit that at one stage I had myself thought that there should be provision for a number of representatives from outside Bengal. But I was advised and advised very strongly from many sources that though it may add to the size of the body, it does not add strength, because they cannot all attend the meetings, especially when you remember that meetings are held once every month and sometimes even twice. But I do say that wherever the Government of India nominates a number of people, I will certainly keep in view the various opinions, wishes and suggestions made in this House and I will see how far I can go in meeting those suggestions and views which I consider to be quite legitimate.

I have, I think, covered practically all the points. I hope that after this clarification, the House will be satisfied that the Bill is intended to improve the Indian Museum and make it a truly national museum and also enable it to function with distinction and with despatch and develop into a chain of museums which will cater to the artistic, scientific and cultural education of this country. I have the Bill will be passed without any dissenting voice.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

“That this Bill further to amend the Indian Museum Act, 1910, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration.”

*The motion was adopted.*

**Clause 2—(Amendment of section 2)**

**Dr. Samantsinhar:** I beg to move:

Page 1, for lines 15 and 16, substitute—

“(d) the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities of Calcutta,

[Dr. Samant Sinhar]  
Patna, Gauhati and Utkal;"  
(1).

Page 1, omit lines 22 and 23. (2).

I have nothing much to say except that in sub-clause (d) of clause 2, "the Vice-Chancellors of the four universities" mentioned in my amendment be substituted. Further, the Governor of West Bengal is the Chairman. The Mayor of Calcutta is also there. Again, the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University and the Accountant-General of West Bengal are also there. So, what is the good of having another person to be nominated by the Government of West Bengal?

The hon. Minister has also replied in the course of his speech that among the four persons to be nominated by the Central Government, he has kept one for a representative from a different Ministry, and out of the remaining three, he has promised one for the Lok Sabha and the other two for other States also. As I said earlier, in the eastern region, there are at least four States, and the nomination is four. So, I do not know how the hon. Minister is going to have representatives for the different interests and different States. I do not think his promises will materialise. Whatever it may be, I have moved these amendments.

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I have already said that I would try to see how far I can accommodate the other representatives. But I am sorry I cannot accept the amendments.

**Mr. Chairman:** I shall put the amendments together to the vote.

*The amendments Nos. 1 and 2 were put and negatived.*

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 3 to 13 were added to the Bill.*

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted.*

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

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed".

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

16.50 hrs.

COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

**Mr. Chairman:** The House will now proceed with the next item on the Order Paper, viz., the Bill further to amend the Companies Act, 1956, as reported by the Joint Committee.

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo):** We have got about 10 minutes now and my speech is likely to take nothing less than half an hour. If you permit me, I will just say that I am moving the Bill and I will deliver my speech tomorrow.

**Mr. Chairman:** He may move the motion.

**Shri Kanungo:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Companies Act, 1956, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

I beg your indulgence that my speech may be permitted to be made tomorrow.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

16.52 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, November 16, 1960/Kartika 25, 1882 (Saka).*