

what the causes are. I wish this had been pointed out to me by the Secretariat so that it could have been corrected. In view of the fact that the omission has not been only from one side, I would request you to put it to the House as to whether they would like in this particular case to condone this little omission which can be rectified at a later stage.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): May I know whether the House has that right?

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated): We see no harm in making that little correction and allowing the Bill to be proceeded with.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: I agree with my hon. friend that the House cannot condone a defect like this. It goes to the root of the matter. She might make a complaint that it was not pointed out to her. But suppose it was pointed out and in spite of that it was not done. In such a situation will the House condone it?

(Interruptions.)

3 P.M.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: It is not within the right of this House to condone this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not a little mistake; I tried to point out to the hon. Member that it was a serious mistake; it is not a little mistake.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR (Nominated): Sir, when the hon. Member is concerned with the soul of the Bill, why should we bother ourselves with the body thereof?

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: Sir, when the hon. Member herself says that she intends this Bill to extend only to Part C States, that ought to be enough and for a little technical error, it is not proper to disallow consideration. Supposing there is a printing mistake or a mistake of grammar, we would have corrected it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not a technical mistake. This Bill is made applicable to the whole of India. Parliament has got powers to pass such a law only for Part C States and even the Bill that has been introduced by the Government refers to Part C States. I refuse to allow the Bill.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: Sir, I would like to make a request. When the Ancient and Historical Monuments Protection (Amendment) Bill was before the House, the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill was allowed to take two hours for correcting some faults and introduce it.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That was only an addition to a Schedule; the body of the Bill was not altered.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Sir, may I submit.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mazumdar, I have given the ruling; I will not allow the Bill to be proceeded with.

SHRI RAMA RAO: Is there any provision in our Secretariat to help us with the technical and legal knowledge required.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is for the hon. Member to take the necessary help from the office.

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS AND STATES (DR. K. N. KATJU): You consult me; I shall help you.

THE STANDARD WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL, 1953

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall go to the next Bill, the Standard Weights and Measures Bill. Shri Kishen Chand.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the standardisation of weights and

[Shri Kishen Chand.]
measures in harmony with the metric system be taken into consideration."

At the outset, I may point out that this has been included as coming under the powers of Parliament under the Seventh Schedule. Under this Schedule, item 50 has "the establishment of standards of weight and measure", as an item in the Union List and therefore this Bill can come before Parliament.

Well, Sir, under the British rule, the standard weights and measures were established. In the case of weights, on a curious basis, it was fixed that a tola will be equal to 180 grains avoirdupois; and on the basis of one tola it was decided to partially introduce the decimal system so that 5 tolas should make a chhatak; and because a rupee had 16 annas, it was considered that 16 chhataks should make a seer. A seer was considered to be of 80 tolas and a tola was 180 grains and, therefore, a seer was 14,400 grains while a pound was only 7,000 grains: so, our seer was slightly more than 2 pounds.

Then, if you compare this with the other system that is prevalent throughout the world, the metric system, a kilogram is equal to 15,432 grains. Therefore, our seer is different from 2 pounds as well as the kilogram. It has no international status for scientific purposes, and for this we have to use the pound or the kilogram.

Then it will be found that there are different kinds of this seer. It is 80 tolas according to the Government regulations. In various parts of the country, we have a seer of 100 tolas, 32 tolas; 24 tolas and so on; and so various other seers are prevalent in different parts of the country. The confusion does not rest there. The maund is the most confusing unit of weight. When we want to refer to a maund of 40 seers, we refer to it as the "Bengal maund" and this Bengal maund is equal to 82-2/7 pounds.

We find the curious figure of 82-2/7 pounds coming in. Then, in Bombay, there are two types of maunds: one is of 28 pounds and the other is of 24½ pounds. If you consider the maund of 24½ pounds it will be seen that 4½ maunds is equal to a hundred-weight.

In some other parts, there are seers of other denominations in existence. Then, after a seer, we have got a palla. In certain provinces, we use a measure called palla which is equal to 3 maunds. In South India there are certain measures equal to 3 seers and 1½ seers. So, in this way, there is a confusion right through from this end to the other end. I suggest, Sir, that the basic figure is a tola and a tola is 180 grains; and a tola is equal to 12 mashas. One masha is equal to 15 grains; by coincidence, a gram is 15.4 grains; thus there is a small difference of .4 grains only. If we change our masha from 15 to 15.4 grains it will be exactly equal to a gram. My suggestion, therefore, is to change our masha from 15 to 15.4 grains; a change of less than 3 per cent. and a very small change.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: (Uttar Pradesh): Why are you so much in love with grains?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: We must remember that we are not in either of the two world systems of weights—the British or the metric. There are only two systems prevalent in the world, the pound and the kilogram.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: What if.....?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The seer of India cannot be used for any scientific measure because it has got no other connection with any scientific or practical measure. You have got to ally with the pound or with the kilogram; then only you can use it for any scientific purpose. If we think that we must have a separate unit of weight and a separate unit of measure—separate from the entire world—and we must have a separate

system of units for all the scientific uses, I am afraid, no other Member will support Mr. Saksena in that type of contention. We have got to make up our mind. Either we go in for the pound or for the kilogram. And by a slight alteration we can convert our unit into a world unit. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that we should change our masha from 15 grams to 15.42 grams and make it exactly equal to one gram: That is the first alteration suggested by me. The second alteration is that at present a seer is equal to 960 mashas and it should be made into a thousand mashas. The result of all this will be that one seer will have 10 chattaks instead of having 16 chattaks. A chattak will have 10 tolas and a tola will have 10 mashas and a masha will have 10 rattis. They will all be multiples of 10. We retain our old names and with very slight variation in the units, we bring them in conformity with the world units. Similarly, Sir, in the matter of measure, we use yards, feet and inches. That is an international unit. And although I have suggested the metric system, I have said in my preamble that it shall come into force from such date or dates as the Central Government may fix by notification in the Gazette for the whole or parts of the Act. And in the Statement of Objects and Reasons I have pointed out that the unit of measure may be brought into force after seven years while the unit of weight may be brought into force immediately because the unit of weight is a unique unit different from the international units while the unit of measure is at least following one system of international unit, i.e., a mile and a yard. It would no doubt look odd that the unit of weight is on the metric system and the unit of measure is on the British system, but as the unit of measure would involve certain large alterations like the area of all lands—because then we will not be able to measure our lands in acres—I have suggested that the notification for that alteration may come after several years, but the notification for changing this weight mea-

sure may come in immediately. Some years back—about four years back—a committee was appointed by the Government of India to go into this question of lineal weights and measures, and they have studied the whole question and recommended to the Government of India unanimously that the metric system should be adopted. I think the Government in due course will take up this question, and my object of bringing forward this Bill is to focus the attention of Government to this urgent need. I submit, Sir, that such a simple measure as this, which is not going to involve any hardship, should be adopted. The total difference in the masha in our unit of weight is going to be only about 3 per cent. and we will thus standardise our maund. A maund will be equal to 10 seers. You know even now in Bombay we have a maund of 12 seers. And this new maund will more or less be equal to the maund prevalent in Bombay. Sir, I beg to submit that this Bill may be accepted and passed into law. Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

“That the Bill to provide for the standardisation of weights and measures in harmony with the metric system be taken into consideration.”

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not know if I correctly understood the hon. Member who moved this Bill when he used one phrase that the object of this measure, in his view, was to focus the attention of Government to the urgency of this measure. Sir, although I am in full agreement with the object of this measure, nevertheless, I am afraid I have to oppose it. Sir, the hon. Member did give the glimpses of the history behind the movement to standardise weights and measures. I have no desire, Sir, to take this House through a very tedious narration of the vicissitudes and the attempts to standardise the weights and measures.

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

But I would, Sir, just take the House to 1947. In fact, prior to that, in 1946, a Bill was introduced in the Legislative Assembly to convert the currency of this country into the decimal system.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND That is coming up a little later on. There is a Bill for that also.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I am not saying that the hon Member has committed any default by not bringing that Currency Bill. But I am merely mentioning this that in February 1946 a Bill was circulated to elicit public opinion. In fact, in 1946 the Indian Science Congress passed a resolution. And the Interim Government which was in power during 1946-47 requested the Provincial Governments in February 1947 to take up the question of adopting the metric system of weights and measures. So that is the background. And the Government of India, in 1946, simultaneously with agreeing to a circulation motion in respect of currency decimalisation, asked the Indian Standards Institution to recommend to Government national standards for these things. And that Institution which was inaugurated in February 1947 has sent to us a report. Here is with me the Report of the Indian Standards Institution. Sir, some of the recommendations made by that Institution do make it almost impossible for us to adopt short cuts such as the one suggested by the hon Member in regard to standardisation of weights and measures or decimalisation of currency. In fact, Sir, I think it is more or less agreed not only in India but also all over the world that the world must move towards standardisation of weights and measures and it cannot escape from adopting the only logical method, *viz.*, the decimal method. But, Sir, the factors are the readiness of the various component units of the Government of this country, not merely the Government of India, but the various in-

stitutions functioning under the Government of India and the Governments of the States to change over, and not the least being the question of costs. Even the sub-committee appointed by the Indian Standards Institution has mentioned:

"The Committee is aware of the expenditure required for the change-over to the metric system, which is likely to be considerable. It is, therefore, recommended that the transition period be extended over a number of years and the actual change-over carried out in three stages as detailed below."

Now, Sir, the Committee recommended three stages over a period of fifteen years:

(a) The preparatory stage of three to five years when no extensive changes would be enforced but intensive education and dissemination of information on the metric system of weights and measures,

(b) The change-over stage of about five years in which the change-over will be effected in the agencies under the control of Central and Provincial Administrations and in public life, and

(c) The final stage of three to five years when the country would be brought over to the metric system entirely and after which no other system would be regarded as legal."

That, Sir, is the starting point so far as the Government is concerned in regard to the question of standardisation, and we are committed more or less to this principle of change-over and standardisation. Therefore, if the objective of my hon friend is more or less to anticipate the Government move in the matter and educate the public, well, Sir, I welcome this opportunity, because I am in a position to say that we are one with the hon Member with regard to his objective. The country should mentally get prepared, as was envisaged

in the report of the Sub-Committee of the Indian Standards Institution. Over a period of five years, people should mentally get prepared for the change over to the only logical system I have mentioned, *viz.*, the decimal system.

Government has not been idle about this matter. I must pay a tribute to a colleague of mine in the other House who has been putting pressure not by means of a Bill but by asking questions and frequently writing to me. I refer to the very well-known scientist, Dr Meghnad Saha. His anxiety was that, with all this rapid industrialisation that we are envisaging, unless we changed over, immediately, to the metric system, we would probably be involved in a lot of cost in changing over to the decimal system later on, and I think it is a very sound view. Sir, after I came to Delhi to take over this Ministry, I greatly appreciated this view expressed by Dr. Meghnad Saha and we have set up a machinery in order to set it in motion. On the 22nd October this year, we had an inter-Departmental Conference initiated by my Ministry under the guidance of the President of the Indian Standards Institution, Dr. Lal C. Verma. If I only read the proceedings of that particular meeting, and the various opinions expressed, I am sure the House will be convinced that the matter cannot be dealt with in such a simple manner as envisaged by the hon. Member, who moved this Bill. Sir, the various Departments of Government like the Railways, Defence, Posts and Telegraphs, etc. raised objections primarily because of cost. The cost would be enormous. I am not in a position today to say what the cost will be. In fact, it was suggested to me by my legal officers that because of the cost factor, this Bill has not been taken into consideration—which is a very vital point—there might be a preliminary objection on the ground that it requires Presidential sanction, but I did not want to sidetrack an important issue of this nature on purely a preliminary and technical point.

The cost factor is something immense. We have not been able to evaluate what it will be. However, the Government are convinced that we should change over to the metric system and the sooner the better, because the point which was made by Dr. Saha is that, as we go on progressing as I hope we would, the cost factor will increase rather than diminish. I would like to assure the hon. the mover of this Bill that we are moving with this, but it cannot be done like this. It might take at least fifteen years. Incidentally, I might mention that an attempt was made in the U.K., a far more advanced country than ours, and they suggest that the time taken should be a period of twenty years, and originally the British Committee decided that it should be phased over a period of twenty years. The Government, after considering the recommendations of the Committee appointed for the purpose, came to the conclusion that they would not be prepared to go ahead with this plan in view of the cost factor, but they have compromised on an interim position, *viz.*, that they should take up the long-needed step to define the existing standards of length and weight in terms of the metric unit. This means putting away this question of change-over to an indefinite period, and this difficulty in a country far more advanced than ours. It may be argued that they are more advanced and that is why the change-over is difficult, and that when we are less advanced, we might have the change-over. But I assure the House this will take some time. It has to be dealt with in a comprehensive way. All the interests concerned, the Central and the State Governments, all the agencies of the various Governments, the public bodies, the scientific bodies and educational bodies and above all, the universities, must come into this picture, and we in the Ministry hope to be able to put up concrete proposals before the Government in order to take a move forward, and then perhaps we might formulate a draft Bill and send it to the various bodies, universities and, research bodies pri-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]
 marily. It will take time. It may be that the hon. Member and myself may not be here to see the culmination of our wishes, but it is good, Sir, that the Bill originated by the hon. Member has given me an opportunity to put the Government's point of view on a matter which, I think, is of very fundamental importance for the present and the future. Nevertheless, I have to oppose it.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): Sir, I would just take a few minutes to get further clarification from the hon. Minister. So far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, there is no one in this House who would oppose it. First of all, he alluded to possible financial objections. I do not want to argue this, nor is it likely to be raised.

I cannot understand why Government should oppose the Bill, even if the change-over would take 15, 20 or 25 years. It would have been quite acceptable to the mover of the Bill, I am sure, if the Government had moved an amendment saying that this should be circulated for eliciting public opinion or even referred to a Select Committee. The reason is this that, if the Bill is on the anvil, its urgency is more apparent, and the Government machinery, the public machinery, and everything else will start moving. Therefore, Sir, I do not understand why the hon. Minister should oppose this Bill. He could, for instance, move an amendment asking that this should be circulated for eliciting public opinion, and since this matter is a very complicated and comprehensive one, naturally we would like to know what the different sections of the public think about it.

I am aware that there have been conferences, before, but we do not know what the public thinks about it. We would like to know in what manner and at what time we can start operations for the change-over. If the hon. Member agrees to withdraw the Bill, that would mean that

it may perhaps take another four or five years for Government or anyone else responsible for this to start moving in the matter. According to the hon. Minister's own admission it would probably become more and more complicated and more and more expensive, and, therefore, will face more and more opposition if this matter is left over for another year or two or for five or ten years. Therefore, I would ask the Government to accept the principle of the Bill and if they like, move an amendment asking that this Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion or that it should be referred to a Select Committee which can go into the whole question and call upon people who are interested to let us know in what manner this can be done.

So I am not able to understand why this should be opposed. I can understand that he should oppose the Bill as it is, but I cannot understand why he should oppose the Bill in whatever form it may emerge after eliciting public opinion, after going through a Select Committee and after the various procedures it may have to go through.

Therefore, I would like to appeal to Government not to oppose the Bill as such. He accepted the principle and therefore, there should be no opposition to the Bill. It can only be because of certain difficulties. Let him see if this opportunity can be utilized for examining and overcoming those difficulties, and finding out in what way we can amend this Bill, in what way we can put this into operation. I would appeal to Government not to oppose it at this juncture but perhaps urge on the House to see that the Bill is sent out for certain things to be done to it so that it would finally emerge as a measure which will be generally acceptable, not only by the Government but also by the interests concerned.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman I also

think that my friend Mr. Reddy has offered some suggestions which the Government should accept. After the speech of the hon. Minister I don't understand how Government oppose this Bill. There is no dispute with the principles of the Bill. The only difficulty is that it will take time. The hon. mover of the Bill did not say that it should be put into practice immediately. Mr. Reddy has explained the position. So what was proper on the part of the hon. Minister was either to suggest that this Bill should be sent for circulation to elicit public opinion or to move an amendment, or the matter may have been referred to a Select Committee in order to work out all the complicated procedure, etc. He himself said that the mover of the Bill has set the ball rolling. It will serve the purpose of educating the public. So I don't understand the Government taking up the attitude to oppose the Bill. So I support Mr. Reddy's suggestion.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I am not satisfied with the principles of the Bill. It may be acceptable to the rest of the House but I don't see any wisdom in forsaking the age-old standards.....

AN. HON. MEMBER: Is it age-old?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Yes, in India at least, it is a very very old practice which should not be so lightly given up. Our country is a country of uneducated.....

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: We originated the decimal system. It belongs to us.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Yes, I claim its parenthood but I would remind you of the time, of the period—long long ago when we gave it up. Now it will be a very difficult job for our countrymen to switch on to this new decimal system under which it will be very difficult for them to calculate and to understand. Now I am reminded of our changing the word 'Cawnpore' to 'Kanpur'. Similarly.....

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR (Madras): What happened?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Nothing happened. Nothing could have happened. Similarly, nobody will use it, I assure you. The same old practice of 5 tolas for a chhatak, 16 chhataks for a seer and 40 seers for a maund will continue and I don't see any.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: For the hon. Member's information I may say that it is not prevalent in the South.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: It is for the Chair to point out to me, Mr. Reddy, if I am irrelevant. As a matter of fact I have not yet started. Sir, I don't understand what it is, that is troubling the mover of the Bill. Government did not think it proper to bring it. I do not even agree with the urgency of the measure. It was left to our hon. friend Mr. Kishen Chand to see the urgency of it and to bring forward a measure. Now the hon. Minister for Industries has just now admitted that it will take a very very long time for the change to finalise and to take place. It may take 15, 20 or 25 years. Now it is no use spending our energy in a matter which is not going to materialise soon. Therefore, from my part, it can have no sympathy.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Andhra): Sir, I have much sympathy with the Bill and I deeply appreciate the moral support—not very material though—which the Minister has given it. Sir, if I remember aright—and somebody in the House may correct me if I am wrong—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru expressed the view in favour of the metric system some years ago, while Mahatma Gandhi was opposed to it. We have moved far since, judging from the speech of the Minister today.

It strikes me that the metric system is a hall-mark of civilisation. We make too much, in this country, of the innate conservatism of our people.

[Shri Rama Rao.]

We make too much also of their so-called illiteracy. We used to call thirty tolas sawa seer in my boyhood in my part of the country. Today the Agra seer, as we are calling it, is 80 tolas and is in use. People have adapted themselves to it; I see no reason why if we go in for the proposed change—and changing wholesale, I don't fear—people should oppose it. I also think that a measure of this kind would be helpful as a unifying force. If we talk of very big unifying factors, people don't understand us; but if you tell them in their language about common measures and weights for the whole of the country, they understand easily. Surely, it is incongruous with our nationalism that there should be one measure somewhere in far South India, another in Madras, a third in Nagpur, a fourth somewhere in the North. I would, therefore, suggest that since this matter is fairly urgent, we should put it to the country and take its opinion on it. It will be a very good compromise.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Has the hon. Minister anything to say about the suggestion?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, I don't think I have very much to add. As I said, this is an oversimplification of a very difficult problem. In fact my hon. friends opposite, Mr. Reddy and Mr. Mazumdar want me to say something on this particular Bill, which I just avoided saying. When I said I accept the principle of the Bill, the principle is 'let there be a change'. I accept the principle of the change but I don't accept the Bill. I cannot be a party to the circulating of this Bill which I feel will be nullifying the very objective that I have in mind, namely the bringing about of a proper change. I cannot confuse people's mind which is already confused and which might be confused for a long time to come. **without educating them in the proper way.** I think it will be doing some-

thing wrong, if I allowed this Bill to be circulated for eliciting public opinion. It will only add another element of confusion in regard to a subject where clarity is very rare and difficult to obtain. Therefore, I do not want to go into the various clauses of the Bill. I think the Bill will not be appropriate from the point of view of the needs of the country. It may be very good from the point of view of the mover himself and his knowledge of the subject. But I am advised by people who are in the know that it does not suit us. We cannot circulate a Bill where the proposals have not been examined, where the various scientific and technical people who are ultimately to help us to implement the change-over, have not applied their mind to it. It will be doing distinctly a dis-service not only to this generation but to the generations to come also. It is not the simplification of a problem. It is not a question of being charitable, not a question of accommodating anyone. Really it is a question of seeing that the objective, that we have, is ultimately attained in the proper manner over a period where the expenditure could be spread out, where the necessary amount of education could be undertaken and all the necessary things could be done. Therefore, it is impossible for me even to accommodate my friend who says, "There is nothing wrong with it. What is wrong? It is an innocuous measure. Circulate it for public opinion. Mr. Kishen Chand is satisfied. I am satisfied. You are satisfied." No, it is not so. It is not a question where we aim at the satisfaction of individuals. Our aim ultimately is the good of the country and for the ultimate achievement of that aim, it is necessary for me to stick to the view that I expressed at the outset.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I am surprised at the attitude taken by the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry. He agrees with the principle of the Bill but thinks it will take

a very long time to put it into force. I only want to say a few words in reply to the criticism that he has made regarding this Bill.

He said that first of all, this Bill has to go to the universities. I submit that the universities have nothing to do with it for the universities use only either the pound system or the kilogram system. In the universities, in scientific or research work, people never use seers. So it is useless to offer the argument that this Bill should go to the universities for investigation. I fail to see how the universities come in here. Universities never use the unit of seer. Universities only use the pound or the kilogram unit because they are only concerned with the scientific part of it.

Secondly, the railways use the unit of ton and I would like to know how this unit is connected with the seer or the maund. It is not a multiple of a seer or a maund. What happens in our country is that all the machines are imported and they are first of all put in the pound system or the kilogram system. Then there is a small thing called a "rider" which is slightly changed to adjust the markings in seers. Even in the railway stations, you will find all the weighing scales are marked in pounds, and as a subsidiary thing, the markings are shown in seers. I fail to see how this change is going to be spread over fifteen years. It is a simple problem which is sought to be made to appear a difficult one, and all sorts of wrong reasons are given. They say it is a huge thing costing crores and crores of rupees and so nothing can be done now. The biggest users of these measures are the railways and they can change over without any difficulty. They are now using the ton unit which is not related to the seer or the maund. What I suggest is this, that the weight of the seer may be changed from 14,400 grains to 15,432 grains. There is a mistake in the printing of it, in that the decimal point is in the wrong place. They have printed it

as 1543·236 in clause 3, instead of 15,432·36 grains. It should read: "The unit of weight shall be one seer equal in weight in vacuum to one kilogram of France or 15,432·36 grains avoirdupois. What I want to impress is that it will not adversely affect the common man. He is only concerned with the seer. He goes to the bazaar and gets a weighing unit, called one seer. He does not know how that one seer conforms to the standard unit kept in our country. He accepts it because it is printed "1 seer". What I have suggested here is that in future also we will continue to call it "1 seer" but the weight of that seer will be 15,432 grains in place of 14,400 grains.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: And the poor people will remain hungry. They will buy a seer of flour from the bazaar but there will be four persons to be fed with it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am glad to hear that objection, because it is really in my favour. I say this because this unit of seer will really be more than the previous unit and if prices remain at the same level, the result will be that the man who buys the article will get it about 7 per cent. cheaper than previously. So there will be a reduction in the price of the commodity and it should be a welcome change to the consumer.

As I have pointed out here, there are two units—one of weight and one of measure. I admit that there are difficulties in imposing the unit of measure. Therefore, in the preamble as well as in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I have pointed out that after passing this Bill it is to be enforced by notification in the Gazette. I cannot see any reason why the unit of weight cannot be introduced immediately. I have pointed out that the universities do not come in. The railways can make the change very easily, without any diffi-

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

culty at all, because all their weighing scales are now based on seers, but they have been made on the basis of pounds and only the disc has been changed. You can change the disc again and put in the word "seers" a little lower and the same weighing scale will continue to operate. The only difficulty, that may be created, will be in the markets. In the markets, we have got the market inspectors and they can see that the weighing unit is changed. You see, in the weighing unit at the bottom there is a hole and if we put in a little lead in this hole it can be brought to the proper weight of one seer. That slight change can be effected without any difficulty.

If we are going to spread this change over 15 years, I think, Sir, that many complaints will come. As the country goes on advancing scientifically, we will have two units, one scientific unit and one common unit, in use. The scientific unit will continue to be kilogram whether we like it or not. The question is: Do we want our practical unit to be in conformity with the scientific unit or do we want to have two separate units? Do we want to have a gulf which can be bridged very easily and very quickly? Therefore, I suggest that without referring it to the universities, without referring it even to public for their opinion we can bring this into operation immediately and the change over will not cost very much. The cost will be very nominal and in view of the benefits, it can be ignored. Therefore, I would submit, Sir, that this Bill be taken into consideration.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the standardisation of weights and measures in harmony with the metric system be taken into consideration."

The motion was negatived.

THE STANDARDS OF HIGHER
EDUCATION CO-ORDINATING
BILL, 1953

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad):
Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to co-ordinate and regulate standards of higher education in post-schools, colleges and universities in all branches of knowledge be taken into consideration."

Sir, when a simple Bill has received a straight negative, I am afraid that this much more controversial Bill to co-ordinate the standards of higher education.....

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR
NATURAL RESOURCES AND
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (SHRI K. D.
MALAVIYA): There is no controversy about it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND:.....is rather a difficult subject.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar):
To be explained or understood?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I will try to explain the salient points in as few words as possible but unless the Members realise the gravity of the problem, and unless they realise that our higher education should be changed to make it a national education, it will not do. If this Bill is going to be thrown out, we will not be doing a proper thing for our education and for our future generation. People always say that we have got independence, a national culture, and a national tradition—age-old tradition. We want a special system which will fit in with that culture as the present education is a foreign education which does not suit the soil.

I may point out in the very beginning, Sir, that this is in the Union List, if there is any question about that. Entry 66 of List I of the Seventh Schedule reads as follows: Co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific