

(Amendment) Bill, 1974 (to amend articles 75 and 164)."

The Motion was adopted.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1974

(To amend Article 312)

DR. RAJAT KUMAR CHAKRA-BARTI (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

Sir, I do not think in the course of the last 30 years a Bill proposing an amendment of article 312 of the Constitution has been brought before either House of Parliament. The idea behind bringing forward this Bill, proposing an amendment of article 312, briefly, is that the Indian Administrative Service was created as a continuation of the past colonial legacy but in the present-day context of development in the highly technical or professional fields, it has become imperative that the professional people must have their say in the decision making positions. The maintenance of law and order for which the I.A.S. had initially been created, just subsequent to the I.C.S., has assumed alarming dimensions because instead of concentrating in their own fields, the administrators have been proliferating into various functional fields which could best be left to these functional officers themselves. The only way this may be achieved is by allowing lateral entry from other services to the top decision-making positions in every sphere of our administration and managerial work. Now, Sir, if we read the second part of sub-clause (1) of article 312, it says:

"Parliament may by law provide for the creation of one or more all-India services common to the Union and the States, and, subject to the other provisions of this Chapter, regulate the recruitment, and the conditions of service of persons ap-

pointed, to any such service".

Sir, I emphasise the words "regulate the recruitment, and the conditions of service of persons appointed". If we read sub-clause (2) of article 312, it says:

"The services known at the commencement of this Constitution as the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service shall be deemed to be services created by Parliament under this article.

Sir, even in sub-clause (2) we find the mention of two all-India services, the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service. Now, the question that naturally comes to mind is, who framed the rules and regulations, at least, for these two services which came into force at the time of Independence, at the time of framing of the Constitution? Naturally, the I.C.S. framed these rules at that time. The question that then arises is why this discrimination? If these services are all-India services, then why such a vast discrimination between one all-India service and another all-India service? Sir, can you show me a single case where the I.P.S. has got the same status and privilege of I.A.S. or where any I.P.S. officer can go up to the top and occupy the position of Secretary or Chief Secretary in the State Government or Joint Secretary or Additional Secretary in the Union? I do not think anybody will be able to say or tell me a single case of an I.P.S. officer who has occupied such a position. Why was there a discrimination kept, while framing such rules, from the very beginning? Why was this discrimination created amongst the All-India Service people? Afterwards, there are other Services also introduced, for example, Indian Foreign Service, Indian Forest Service, Indian Railway Service of Engineers, and so on, in the country. They are All-India Services according to Article 312 of the Constitution. According to this Article, their rules and regulations and service conditions are to be framed by the Government and probably approved by Parliament.

[Dr. Rajat Kumar Chakrabarti]

But, Sir, when we look into the other All-India Services, we find that these services are practically much inferior to this one particular service, namely, the Indian Administrative Service, which is the successor of the previous I.C.S.—Indian Civil Service, created by the British people in order to maintain law and order and in order to run the country with a handful of such trained officers.

Sir, before I give my personal opinion or personal view today, I would like first to quote extensively from a conference on Personnel Administration—The Need or a Change. This conference was held during March 5th to 9th, 1968 by the Indian Institute of Public Administration—IIPA—New Delhi. I would also be quoting from the debate in both Houses of Parliament on 16th and 23rd August, 1972. Sir, in the conference, held by IIPA in 1968, Mr. J. N. Khosla said in a forwarding letter:

“One thing on which the Conference was unanimous is the need for change, radical change..”

I emphasize the word ‘radical change’.

“...in the existing personnel system, to make it more task-oriented, to make it more professional....”

Sir, mark these words ‘more professional’.

“...to make it more egalitarian in the matter of advancement and manning of higher administrative positions so as to utilise the best talent, develop the best talent and reward the talent in a productive manner.”

Sir, can we think of any service system anywhere in the world where a person can start from a lower rung at an initial salary and go to the highest position of Secretary without any promotional stage, efficiency bar or regardless of the number of posts sanctioned in each category? A boy

starting his career at the age of 22 or 23 as an S.D.O. or A.D.M. will automatically wind up in life as Secretary, Chief Secretary in the State or a Joint Secretary or Additional Secretary in the Central Government, irrespective of his performance and total output during this time. But one police officer, Sir, or say an engineer, however bright and efficient he may be, may retire simply either as Superintendent of Police if he is from I.P.S. and if he is fortunate enough, or as Executive Engineer if he is an engineer. He may be a first-class degree-holder, may be very honest, having secured first division in the higher secondary and a top-ranking engineer in the State Service, cannot end up or wind up his career as Secretary. He will wind up his career only as an Executive Engineer or if he is a very fortunate one, he may go up to Superintending Engineer and only one or two may wind up as Chief Engineer. And this position is also too far below the level of even the Under Secretary or the Joint Secretary in any State Service. Sir, the participants who attended the State conference organised by IIPA concluded:

“The existing personnel administrative policies and practices inherited from a colonial administration have remained substantially the same even though political, economic and technological changes have added a new dimension to the size and complexity of the Government.”

Sir, Shri H. C. Mathur who was the Chairman for two sessions at the said conference, said—I quote:

“...felt that more than three-fourths of the needed administrative reforms would be achieved if only we could have the right type of men in top places.”

In this context, he mentioned about the proposal being considered by the Fulton Commission in UK to merge all classes above the level of Assistant Secretaries and man these senior positions with reference only to qualifications, skill and experience of the

individual. I will come back to the Fulton Commission later on. This was an important step towards harmonising the contribution of scientists, engineers and other specialists who are at the top policy-making level and also towards removing the feeling that non-professional administrators have the monopoly of such senior positions. He then pointed out that in France and in the U.K. the need for radical reforms in personnel administration has been felt. But we still cling to what we have inherited in the past, from the British regime at the time of Independence. Sir, the existing practice based on the traditional concept of manning the higher administrative positions in the services only by generalists must be given up. The recruitment to higher positions should not be made automatic and should not be confined only to generalists. Persons should also be taken from outside the Government. Talent also exists outside the Government and this needs to be harnessed. The requirement of the job must be the paramount consideration and not the preeminence ascribed to any service or the seniority attached to it. In the present context of a highly industrialised society, one cannot simply become a bright young man...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. Member take long?

DR. RAJAT KUMAR CHAKRA-BARTI: I will take five minutes now and after the lunch recess. I will take at least half-an-hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then we can adjourn now.

DR. RAJAT KUMAR CHAKRA-BARTI: I will take only five minutes. I will complete this paragraph. In the present context of a highly industrialised society, one cannot simply become a bright young man with liberal education and eventually put in positions requiring competence in fields as far apart as manufacture of steel, health and family welfare, agriculture and irrigation, atomic energy, space science

and so on. What would be the result? In this connection, I would like to point out what Shri N. Dandekar said at that conference. This is a very interesting point. Let us see what he said in the same conference held in 1968. Sir, I have got this book. I do not think Government has allowed this book to come out since 1968. This book is not available in the market because the people at the top were very much afraid about the resolutions passed at that conference which was held in 1968. Sir, Mr. Dandekar has said:

"The maxim of a good civil servant would seem to be—if you can, don't move; if you must, move slowly; if you are pushed, move in circles; and if you are cornered appoint a committee."

I do not think I can improve upon this remark made by Mr. Dandekar in 1968. Sir, I stop here and I would seek your permission to take another half-an-hour or 40 minutes after the lunch recess because I have something more to say. This is one of the vital Bills which nobody had taken up during the last 30 years. With your permission, I stop now.

श्री उपसभापति : अब सदन की कार्यवाही ढाई बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है ।

The House then adjourned for lunch at five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-five minutes past two of the clock. MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

DR. RAJAT KUMAR CHAKRA-BARTI: Sir, I was quoting from the conference of the IIPA when the House adjourned for lunch. Further, I would like to point out that today a mere B.A. candidate recruited after UPSC examination can rise to the top of the Indian Administrative Service, having no efficiency bar and no question of vacancy and competition for

[Dr. Rajat Kumar Chakrabati]

promotion, virtually dictating over people who are helping the country in peaceful nuclear tests, sending satellites, doing space research, building intricate dams and trying to build our society as an industrial society.

Sir, the personnel system is a part of a total system of administration. Even though in theory, all higher administrative positions were open to all services, in practice, the pre-eminence of the most generalists of the services was always maintained. The present system of examination and recruitment is outdated not only in the industrial management world but also in the administrative world in advanced countries. But in our country, we are sticking to the system that a place on an examination list—these examinations are being held by the UPSC when the age of the boy is 21 to 23 years—establishes a fixed merit rating for an entire working life. There is no system of evaluation of the work done by that particular candidate who may have secured a position 5 years ago or 25 years ago in one UPSC examination. The selection system should not be a closed system. It should permit a lateral entry from outside Government. Persons filling these posts should have subject matter competence as well as managerial skills and experience. In terms of pay scales of 1968, an IAS officer went up to Rs. 1800, and depending on the seniority in the State cadre, went up to Rs. 2000 irrespective of the post he occupied. Then he got into the super-time scale of Rs. 2500-2750. That was the prevailing scale of IAS officers in 1968. After that, he was automatically eligible for promotion to the post of a Joint Secretary as soon as he had done a number of years of service. Let us compare this and see what happens to a non-IAS officer, say a postal man. He goes up to Rs. 1250/- as Senior Postal Superintendent; then earns promotion as Director in the scale of Rs. 1300-1600; and finally as PMG in the scale of Rs. 1800-2250. So no officer of the Postal Service can

even get to a scale of a Joint Secretary irrespective of the man's merit, potentialities and other factors. But for the IAS personnel, there is no bar and sky is the limit.

Sir, now I would like to quote what our eminent political leaders said on the floor of both the Houses. This is from the Lok Sabha debate held on August 16, 1973 on the Third Pay Commission. Shri Madhu Limaya said—and I quote:

"Meanwhile in 1965 there was a conflict between India and Pakistan. At that time, when 10,000 of gallant soldiers were sacrificing their lives at the battle-field, the IAS officers helped themselves to salary increases of Rs. 200 to Rs. 500. And for what level of posts such increases were allowed—Joint Secretary, Additional Secretary and Secretary.

During the father's rule the ICS officers dominated and during the daughter's rule the IAS officers are dominating. Maybe the Chairman and Secretary of the Pay Commission have felt greater concern for their own children because it is mostly the children of IAS officers who later join IAS".

I quote again from Shri Madhu Limaya's speech:

"For the Specialists and Technical personnel, however, there are no opportunities in what calls itself a modern Government. Just as during the British regime before Independence, the ICS officers were looked upon as all-rounders, similarly today under the rule of Indirajee the IAS officers are looked upon as all-rounders capable of performing all kinds of functions."

This is a translation of his Hindi Speech.

Mr. Kartik Oraon says:—

"Here is a Service which I consider to be a special tribe because it enjoys all facilities. Those who

join I.A.S. can become the heads of Health Deptt. and become doctors; they head Technical Departments and become engineers; similarly they can also become scientists. In fact, they can become anything. It looks as it is an insult to human intelligence that we cannot identify who can deliver the goods: whether it is a scientist or a technologist or an administrator. I hold nothing against I.A.S. But they have got a limited field of work. I do not see any reason why they should be given so much advantageous position in matter of pay scales."

"As a matter of fact, if there are I.A.S. officers for administration, there should be all-India Service for other branches, for scientists, technologists etc."

"The Pay Commission should have taken special care to see that the pay scales are worked out in such a manner that they should be able to develop a team-spirit among different services."

Sir, let us what Shri Krishan Kant said in the Rajya Sabha. I quote:

"...both in regard to changing the administrative pattern and building up a new culture by the Development of Science and Technology."

"You have to see whether this Report and the pay scales recommended therein will be able to sustain and help in the growth of a new society based on science and technology, because it is not the same old society, it is not the same old law and order situation, and it is not the same old revenue system now, as were in the British days."

"It is not merely a question of parity, it is how the I.A.S. officers think of themselves today: They think they are the rulers of this country. In some States under the President's Rule they think they are keeping the country together."

"The scientists about whom this House and the other House discus-

sed, why they go away to foreign countries and why the scientists cannot be brought back to our country. If you want to make them remain in this country, then why does it not occur to you that you should give them a higher salary, a salary at least equal to that of an I.A.S. man?"

And, Sir, what does Shri Vitthal Gadgil Say? He says:

"But, by and large, as Mr. Krishan Kant said, they have an attitude as if they are the rulers. I asked one of the I.A.S. Officer, why Don't you go on strike? He said if we go on strike, nobody would notice the difference. I said: In other words, you don't work. Why don't you work? He said that the tradition in India is that the ruling class never works. This is the kind of feeling that they have. They think that they are the rulers and the politicians and the people's representatives are merely to be tolerated. As Mr. Krishan Kant said, it is in their case unfortunately that the Third Pay Commission has been more considerate which is something that cannot be understood."

Sir, now I quote the Deputy Chief Whip of the Opposition Party, Shri Bipinpal Das. I am happy he is present in the House:

"Today administration does not mean merely maintenance of law and order; today it does not mean administration of human beings. Today administration means administration of the productive forces, the productive mechanism, the distribution mechanism of all that."

"If we want to have a planned development of our economy, if we are going towards socialism, if we have to increase production, if we have to build up an efficient distribution system, if this is the main job before us which we have to do, then certainly we have to pay more attention to those who really add to production, who really add to the wealth of the country and therefore,

[Dr. Rajat Kumar Chakrabarty]

I think a little more justice should be done for those so-called specialists whom I would "Call technocrats rather than to the administrators and this should apply also in the case of appointments."

Sir, these are just a few extracts from the speeches of political leaders in this country in the two Houses. What I am trying to say is that I do not think these are merely the lip services. I do not want that our political leaders, especially those people who are in power today, should give only lip service to this system. They must look deeply into this thing and see what other countries have done in this field. I will only quote from two countries, Sir. Let us see what our neighbouring country has done. I quote from a report, a Paper presented in a Conference of the I.I.P.A. under the heading "Administrative Reforms" by Lawrence Ziring. I quote:

"In his initial address to the nation then President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto announced that the country was in desperate need of a new dynamic administrative system that could put the colonial legacy to rest."

This is what Minister Khurshid Hasan Meer said:—

"Well, all that must change. Because there has been a big change. The people have voted for revolutionary changes. They have rejected the old system and they want it to die giving birth to the new system. A socialist system. A people's system.... The time and the people demand a revolution. Let us usher it in peacefully and, above, all willingly. The sense of rulership must yield place to a new sense of service."

Further I quote:—

"Apart from being unequal, authoritarian and unscientific and

an instrument of colonial rule, the administrative system in Pakistan has doggedly defied the winds of change and in the process has earned a nation-wide disgust and dislike. It has blighted creative and professional talent everywhere and has vitiated the educational system. It has hindered the founding and flowering of democracy and people's sovereignty."

Further I quote:—

"Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto adhered to his party's Manifesto when he declared an end to the administrative system originally fashioned by the British Raj. On March 20, 1973, addressing the nation by radio and television, Bhutto soberly announced the termination of what he chose to call 'Naukarshahi'. The use of the term was deliberate. Civil officials had become rulers, not servants of the people. Another term which cropped up in the Prime Minister's speech was that of 'bara sahib', a description which in the colonial period was reserved for the white European overlord. The term held on after independence and was thenceforward usually ascribed to leaders in a variety of sectors, but especially to the high-placed administrators."

Sir, about the new civil service, according to Hassan Habib—I quote:—

"The impact of the system on high policy-formulation and execution, on professional standards, and on the availability of expertise and leadership, in the complex tasks of technological development, socio-economic planning and administration has been disastrous, making the country pay dearly in terms of a widening management gap, acute maladministration, and a colossal waste of human and physical resources. In the political field it has nourished and supported autocratic military or dictatorial regimes, and prevented the march of democracy and promoted the continuation of

British imperial rule; *only the pigment of rulers (was) brown Instead of white.*"

Sir, what they have done is what I will be going into afterwards.

"The All-Pakistan Unified Grades is an attempt to simplify the bureaucratic system. There are currently only 22 grades where once there were several hundred. All service cadres have been merged into a single structure and equality of opportunity is supposedly assured."

Further I quote:—

"Another aspect of the new administrative system apart from that already noted in this presentation is the opening of the heretofore closed cadres so that horizontal movement between them is made possible."

That is what I am trying to put in my Bill, so that that horizontal movement between them is made possible.

"In this way technical personnel can take up positions in the past reserved strictly for generalists. This also makes it possible for outstanding officers to earn out-of-turn promotions. On the whole the grading of each post is to be done through scientific job evaluation and seniority ceases to be a principal consideration."

Sir, I won't take much of your time. There was a news item which appeared in the Hindustan Standard on 4-8-1977, headlined "UK MOVE TO CUT CIVIL SERVANTS' POWERS"

Now, here it says—I quote:

"Sir Harold Wilson's demand for an inquiry into the allegation that the Prime Minister's office was hugged when he was Prime Minister seems to have coincided with the move which some MPs are making to curb the powers of senior civil

servants and tilt the balance of power at Whitehall back in favour of the elected government by giving Ministers the authority to chop and change senior civil servants and re-organise their own departments.

An all-party select committee on the civil service is preparing its report which is expected to be released next month. It is gathered that this report may outline the supreme power of the elected government and prevent the senior civil servants from joining any outside firm as it is alleged that highly paid jobs are often dangled in front of top officials to get access to inside knowledge which can sometimes be of high commercial value."

Sir, even a few days ago—and it was published in the Sunday Standard of 16-10-77 under the headline "Something is wrong with foreign service"—our External Affairs Minister said—I quote:

"Something is basically wrong, he said at a news conference today, with the services, be they IAS or the IFS. "Somehow they get cut off from their moorings." The officers also tend to live in ivory towers. "They develop a peculiar superiority complex" and "do not mix with the Indian people." This has to be corrected, Mr. Vajpayee said."

And then with regard to personnel administration, it has been suggested in a conference that there should be one unified Civil Service. I am quoting from the report of the conference—page 48:

"Unified Civil Service.

Whatever the name or structural framework, the concept of a unified civil service is desirable, so that the basic ingredients of equality of pay-scale and advancement prospects of higher administrative positions, for specialists and generalists alike, and lateral entry for outside experts as well as for "late bloomers" should be secured."

[Dr. Rajat Kumar Chakrabarty]

Sir, the reason why I am raising this question in detail is that in the last 30 years these things have happened. I have quoted only partially, for, if I go on quoting from what our leaders and other experts have said, not only of this country but also of other countries, then I think it will take me hours. Instead of dwelling on that, Sir, I should merely say a few things.

As I have already mentioned from some of the experts' reports and some of the speeches by our colleagues, this Service is actually ruling the country. It is a fact. And regarding this, I will give you only two stories which I have heard myself. In one case, I was on the same platform with Shri Radha Rath, a very respected leader and editor of the *Samaj Patrika*. We were the only two speakers and it was a meeting of the technocrats. I had heard that Shri Rath was not in favour of the technocrats. But after he listened to my speech he agreed with me. And then he said that at one time he had gone to the Secretariat when he asked the Secretary of the Health and Family Welfare Department why the Secretary of that Department was being changed so every three or four months because they had changed three Secretaries in a period of one year. The then Secretary said, "This is supposed to be a punishment post. Therefore, nobody wants to stay here. We all come here for three or four months. As soon as we get the opportunity, we try to move to a better Department or try to go to a Central Ministry." Sir, though apparently it looks that the political leaders or the Ministers control the country, have the whole power, take policy decisions and so on, I do not believe very much in those things. In my opinion, as I have observed during the last six years, the Ministers may come and go, but they are at the whims of those people. If this coterie tries to work, they can shift any Minister from any Ministry to another

Ministry. Even they can shift him away from the Ministry for good.

Sir, at one time, about a couple of years ago, one of the new Cabinet Ministers joined the Cabinet at that time during 1973 or late in 1973. I had a talk with him. He told me a revealing story. He said that when he became a Cabinet Minister, he was given a Deputy Minister and he wanted to find a room for the Deputy Minister in the building. While he was moving around, he found a room empty, and he said to his Personal Assistant that that room should be allotted to the Deputy Minister, but then after 15 minutes, the Secretary came running and said, "No, Sir, that room cannot be allotted to the Deputy Minister because it is too big for a Deputy Minister, it is meant for the Joint Secretary." I do not know and I would like to ask the Government whether according to the CPWD instructions there is any restriction on the area to be allotted to a Deputy Minister, a Minister of State, or a Cabinet Minister and whether a Secretary or a Joint Secretary should have a larger room than that of a Deputy Minister. I do not know, Sir, but this is what that Cabinet Minister told me. Because he was very new in the Ministry at that time, he was very frank at heart, and he told me that that was the way the Government functioned. That is why I moved this Bill.

Whatever examinations the UPSC may be holding for various services, all the services must be equal, not just in the sense of pay but they should be equal in the sense of parity, respect, status, power and all that. That is to say that the personnel from all the services, whether the Indian Administrative Service, the Indian Foreign Service, the Indian Forest Service, Indian Railway Service or the Indian Audit and Accounts Service, should be equal. You should see that the people from all these services come to the Secretariat at the level of Under Secretary, and, depend-

ing upon their qualification and experience, they should be allotted jobs as Under Secretaries in different Ministries and different Departments of the State Governments. From there on there should be an evaluation of their work, there should be a merit system and a record of the efficiency of the persons concerned and preferably the function or the field to be given to the functionaries, technocrats or doctors or other professional people, should be maintained. This way, we can just at least break the strangle-hold of one particular community or one particular class.

Then, Sir, you will be surprised to know, as I mentioned on an earlier occasion, that one of my students also appeared in the IAS examination. He was selected and sent to Dehra Dun for one or two years' training. All the services people, Indian Administrative Service, Indian Foreign Service I.R.S., etc., take training there together. He told me that he had a very bad experience in the Administrative Staff College there because even the class IV staff, the cooks and even the servants treated them as a lower category of people. They think that the IAS trainees should be given more importance, more facilities and more service than the other cadres because in future this category of people will become their masters one day. Sir, the whole psychology in the country has been faulty because of the continuation of this particular class of people from the ICS down to the IAS at the present moment. They are having such a strong hold on the whole of the administration in the country.

Sir, there must be the All-India Services. It is a very big country. It is a federal union. It is a union. There must be the All-India Services, but there should not be any discrimination, the people from all the services must have an equal opportunity to come to the Secretariat and it should not be confined to only a coterie or a group or a class of people or a class of service. Thank you, Sir.

The question was proposed.

3.0 P.M.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I just want to make a few observations with regard to this subject. I am very happy that my friend, Dr. Chakrabarti, has focussed the attention of this House on this very important subject which, for the first time, is coming up in the form of a Bill for amending the Constitution, that is, article 312 relating to the All India Services. Sir, this subject has been discussed on various other occasions both in this House and in the other House. Unfortunately they were at a time when there was such a feeling against the ICS and the IAS. So it took a pattern altogether different.

So far as the present suggestions are concerned, I am inclined to support my friend, Dr. Chakrabarti. Actually the IAS is something which is following on the pattern of the ICS which was originally set up by the British Government, when we were under their colonial regime, to look after the interests of their administrated. So it has a historical background. After independence, the Indian Administrative Service and various other State Administrative Service and various other into existence. But the pattern has sufficiently changed and the time has come to review the whole thing afresh. What has happened in the past is that after the ICS, the IAS came in and they were handling the administration both in the States and at the Centre, in all the different departments. I do not want to minimise the great administrative effort which has been made by these two services, and they have done very well. But now we have reached a stage when there is this clash between the specialists and the generalists. So, Dr. Chakrabarti's argument is that this difference should be done away with, and that there should be facilities for the specialists also

[Shri K. K. Lakshmana Gowda]

to come up to the same standard, both in pay scales and also in involving themselves in policy matters.

Now, at the beginning, when the Constitution was framed, there were only two All India Services the IAS and the IPS, and they used to be interchanged, even though the IAS had precedence over the IPS. Both at the Centre and in the States, the IAS officers manned all the departments. They headed the Police Department, they headed the Agriculture Department, they headed the Education Department, the Health Department, every department. As Dr. Chakrabarti said, whether they had a particular technical knowledge or not, because they were in the Administrative Service, they were put in charge of these departments. Now things have changed. Now a large number of moribund specialists are coming into the field and it is necessary to see that they are not debarred from being actively associated in policy-making matters. Now even though there are several All India Services—the IAS, the IPS, the Railway Service, Accounts Service, Revenue Service, Forest Service, Foreign Service and so on—as Dr. Chakrabarti said, it so happens that there is a psychological feeling that it is the IAS which has precedence over the others and that they are a better class of administrators. So that has to be done away with. From that point of view, it is necessary to see that these specialists also get sufficient merit-oriented positions both in policy-making matters and also in the pay scales, both at the Centre and in the States. But, Sir, the suggestion that he has made, of one recruitment and one examination up to the level of Under Secretary might put us into some difficulties because the enormity of selection of candidates for all these unified services might create some practical difficulties. So far as IAS is concerned, the position is different

in the examination. Specialists in Indian Foreign Service are separated. Then so far as other ones are concerned, the States which are having their cadre-based administrative services are facing difficulties. I think the States themselves have certain vested interests in resisting these other services coming into existence. For example, last year or the year before, engineers wanted an all-India service for engineers. Only thirteen States out of all the States were prepared to accept this suggestion with the result that proposal did not come through. The States had vested interests. They did not perhaps want to lose certain people for various reasons, maybe, political or otherwise. They did not want them to get into the All India Services. So this is a matter which has to be taken up with State Governments themselves. As a preliminary to the suggestion of a wholesale amendment of Article 312 certain facilities could be provided to the specialists by the State Governments decadring some of their cadre personnel and providing for appointment of engineers or agricultural experts or doctors for Health Department and other services directly from the IAS cadre. Even though IAS is a Centrally administered machinery and selection is made by the Union Public Service Commission, after selection the officers are allotted to different State cadres. In the States what happens is this. The IAS cadre is so tightly held that any higher appointment naturally goes to the IAS cadre and specialists do not get any opportunity. So if the States themselves could take up in their hand and see how in their cadre they could introduce specialists, to a great extent this difficulty could be overcome. Now we have reached a stage where subject-specialists are available in different fields, a specialists who have enough merit to associate themselves in the administration of this country, who can associate themselves in the policy-making. I support the view held by Dr. Chakrabarti. I, therefore, support this Bill.