

(8) Discussion on the Dandakaranya Project for the rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan and its implementation on a motion to be moved by Shri Bhupesh Gupta on 31st August, at 3 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, now you will see that a number of "No-date-yet-mentioned" motions have been admitted by the office here. The Chairman was good enough to do so. State Trading is there, and Preventive Detention Act is there. Now I would request the hon. Minister that these two should be taken up during this session—Preventive Detention and State Trading. Then I demanded a discussion on the report regarding the Mathai affair. That is also pending. These are three things from our side and I hope the hon. Minister will make it possible for us to take them up. They are all pending. They have all been admitted except the report on Mr. Mathai. If necessary, we can sit on Saturday. They discuss so many resolutions there. I do not know why. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA) in the Chair.

RESOLUTION RE REORGANISATION AND DECENTRALISATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION—*continued*.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the other day, on the first Non-official Resolutions day, Mr. Pendse moved his resolution which on the face of it looked very innocent and innocuous, and the general impression was that there would be no harm if the resolu-

tion was adopted. I myself had no intention of taking part in this discussion, but during the lunch hour I just went through this question and tried to find from the Library and other sources whether in fact this is a new question or it is a question which has been engaging the continuous attention of the Government since independence. A little later I will show what has been done during these twelve years for reorganising the function is properly defined and Services and for meeting the purpose of the resolution which is at present before the House.

Immediately after independence the Government of India appointed a Sub-Committee of five senior Secretaries to the Government of India of which Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai was the Chairman. This Sub-Committee went into the question of the Services, how to reorganise them and how they could be more useful in the changed circumstances of the country, and so on. Thereafter in 1949 Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar who was a Minister at that time was appointed by the Government of India to study the working of the various Departments of the Government of India and suggest such ways and means for reorganising them as may be necessary. He made certain recommendations and these recommendations came up before the two Houses of Parliament.

Later, one of the foreign experts, Mr. Appleby, about whom so much has been heard, about his capability and efficiency—he is supposed to be one of the authorities on Public Administration—came here and studied the working of the Government of India. He went round some of the States also. He studied the working of the Centre as well as the States and submitted his recommendations which were printed by the Government of India and placed on the Table of both the Houses; later, opportunity was given to both the Houses to consider the recommendations in full. Those recommendations

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

were considered by the Government of India and they took certain steps to implement some of the suggestions which were very valuable suggestions, and they were given effect to.

Then in the first Lok Sabha, the Estimates Committee also went into this question of the Services, and I find that in their Second and Ninth Reports they have made suggestions on this subject. These suggestions again were considered by the Government, and the action taken on the various recommendations of the Estimates Committee are incorporated in their Thirty-sixth and Fifty-seventh Reports. All these four Reports are in the hands of the Members of Parliament and they must be acquainted with the recommendations made therein and the action taken by the Government on the various recommendations. Moreover, the Home Minister himself, as you all know, is very keen about this subject of the Services. He is a great champion as far as the efficiency of the Services and their usefulness are concerned. He has been doing his best to tone up the administration wherever it was required, and he has been taking all steps to improve the administration, if there was any improvement necessary, from time to time. Then, the Home Ministry itself has appointed a Special Officer who is of the status of Joint Secretary whose work is to study constantly this question and he studies, *inter alia*, the structure and organisation of the services, the system of recruitment, the principles and procedures of promotion, training, the further education of the civil servants, the staffing of superior posts at the Centre, the maintenance of discipline and morale and how public relations should be maintained. He has been giving self-contained reports to the Home Ministry and the Government of India, which have been taken note of, considered and the suggestions thrown therein have been implemented from time to time. To consider his notes and suggestions, the Home

Ministry has also appointed an informal committee of senior Secretaries whose function is to meet from time to time, study the notes sent by this Special Officer and then take such action as may be necessary. This is on the executive side

In 1951, the Planning Commission came into being. The Planning Commission itself has tackled this problem and it also appointed a Committee on Plan Projects. This question was even considered in the National Development Council which, as you all know, consists of all the members of the Planning Commission, all the Chief Ministers of States and various other people. This is in fact a very high-power body which takes into consideration, besides the Plan projects and all that, this question of services also. A special Reorganisation Unit as it is called has also been working at the Centre from 1952.

Another method was brought into being by the Home Ministry and that was the appointment of the Administrative Vigilance Division. This Division looks into what is happening in the various Ministries whether the day-to-day work is being done properly by the officials, whether the requirements of the Plan are being met from time to time and whether the officials are doing their work properly. This Division has one representative in each of the Ministries who is called the Vigilance Officer, and their main work is to examine all aspects of the work, initiate prompt action and pursue it with speed and vigour if any lapses are found anywhere.

Hon. Members must also be aware that there is another organisation called the Organisation and Methods Division which also deals with this subject. It lays down the proper procedure for the disposal of work. This Division has also evolved a system of regular and periodical inspection. Then there is the machinery which sees to it that there are no delays in

the disposal of papers, and the various departments in the various Ministries are asked to submit monthly reports about the progress of their work. This division also arranges for the proper training of the staff and sees to it that proper, trained personnel are given to the various Ministries so that they can cope with the work which they are supposed to carry out. Besides all these, there are several other bodies which, if I may say so, are for contact with the public, Members of Parliament and others. Firstly, all of us are aware how Informal Consultative Committees have been formed for each of the Ministries. They meet at least once during a session; some of them hold more than one meeting. Briefs are supplied on the various questions raised by the Members in Committees, and any misunderstanding is removed in the Informal Consultative Committee. I have no hesitation in saying that Informal Consultative Committees have proved a very useful forum for contact between Members of Parliament and the Central Government. I personally feel that if Members of Parliament take these Informal Consultative Committees more seriously—I do not mean that they are not taking them seriously—and if they read the briefs sent by the Ministries, many of the problems which come up before us can be solved. In the Informal Consultative Committee, as the name signifies, the atmosphere is most informal, and as you know, Sir, all parties are represented there. It is not that they are manned by Congressmen alone; our friends from the opposite side are also there, and I have found that in the informal Consultative Committees with which I have had the honour of being associated, my friends from the benches opposite have been very very active. If this kind of co-operation is maintained, I can say that we can do our bit as far as the working of the Central Government is concerned.

Then there is the Central Advisory Board for Harijan Welfare. This, as

49 RSD—4.

the name signifies, is only an Advisory Board, but the Ministry concerned pays attention to all its recommendations and they are seriously given consideration to.

There is also another organisation called the Central Advisory Board for Tribal Welfare. It makes recommendations about the welfare of the tribal people and the Scheduled Tribes.

(Time bell rings).

Well, if my time is up, I will not take any more time. I will only say that in view of what I have said, the Resolution that is before us is not required at the present moment. All kinds of action are being taken, and if I may be permitted to say so, the present Resolution is uncalled for and unwarranted at the present time.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by the hon. Member. The hon. speaker who spoke previous to me smelt something in the Resolution and sought to oppose it. He meant to say that people are participating in the developmental plans and there are adequate machinery and agencies to secure their co-operation. As an instance he cited the Informal Consultative Committees and some other committees and boards formed by the Government. But I do not think that he is right in pointing to these committees and boards and saying that people are really participating in the developmental activities.....

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I did not touch that point; I was coming to that.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: But the hint was enough. What I mean to say, Sir, is that people are really not participating. Even the Government has come to realise this. It will be seen that responsible Government officers as well as hon. Ministers have been

[Shri Harihar Patel.]

saying time and again that the targets fixed in the First Five Year Plan and in the Second Five Year Plan are not being achieved, because there is no adequate response from the people; that means there is lack of co-operation from the people's side. All along it has been the habit with the Government to explain the shortcomings and shortfalls by saying that the people are not co-operating and hence this deficiency.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh): Will the hon. Member put in instances like that when the State Governments or the Central Government have said so?

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: I will cite instances. On previous occasions also I have complained that people are really not consulted while developmental schemes are framed, and the hon. Mover's intention was possibly in that direction to focus the attention of the Government to decentralise administration in such a way that the *panchayats* and other agencies in the rural area, which are the roots, are given powers, are invested with responsibility, so that a spirit of co-operation can be aroused in them. But that has not been so.

In the beginning, Sir, everybody knows that committees and boards, etc., to secure people's co-operation were all set up by the Government. Members were nominated. Coming myself from an ex-State area I know the kind of democracy we were given just after merger. Committees and boards were set up in which people were all nominated either by the District Collector or the Government. I know what sort of people were being taken in the committees—they knew nothing about the place. They never spoke for the people. They were afraid of the District Collector. Whatever the District Collector used to say was their opinion. It is therefore not surprising that the targets fixed in the First Five Year Plan could not be

achieved. It is improper to say that because the plans evolved by the Government are for the benefit of the people, it is the duty of the people to pledge their co-operation. Everybody knows that good Government is no substitute for self-Government. I do not mean to say that this Government is good, but even if it is good Government, it should be no substitute for self-Government. The people should be allowed the ways and means to participate themselves in the schemes meant for them. I mean to say that the developmental schemes, etc., have always been imposed upon them. No officer ever took care to go to an area in the rural side and ascertain from the people whether they needed some tank for drinking water or some tank for irrigation purposes, or some hospital or school. No officer has done like that. The schemes are evolved either in the District Collector's office or in the Sub-divisional Officer's office. It is then announced and the people are called upon to form committees and take money for work, and I think hon. Members of this House have sufficient experience as to how that money is spent. Almost in each project there has been extravagance, wastage and a lot of things to be complained of. That is why I complained on a previous occasion that the Government is in fact investing also in corruption while investing in projects, because I know of instances when the officers themselves asked the people to do a lot of undesirable things. For example, in the project schemes the people are asked to contribute one-fourth of the total share. Now the people cannot contribute a single pie. Then the authorities in charge of implementation of the projects advise to give some false vouchers and show some portion as people's contribution. Like this there has been manipulation; there have been false vouchers in case of every project. My friend wanted some instances. I would like to speak of some such from my own State.

There is an irrigation project in a village in my district. The tank it

self is within the boundary of one village and the irrigation channel from that tank has been dug out within the boundary of another village, and it will irrigate the lands of that village. Now the potentiality of the tank is such that it could reserve enough water and another irrigation channel could also be excavated to irrigate some more lands. Instead of doing that, the Block Development Officer and the authorities in charge of that project are obstinate enough and they have been trying to let out the surplus water in one direction, whereby most fertile lands of some tenants will be damaged. Now, when they were making this effort to dig out that channel, those persons whose lands would be submerged submitted a petition before the Sub-divisional Officer saying that that will be damaging to them and with the balance of the money that had been sanctioned for the project another channel for irrigation could be safely dug out, and if they were not able to do that, they were prepared to dig out that channel on their own initiative. But no consideration was given to that petition and this year, owing to continuous rain for some days, and possibly because of some mischief by some people the water has broken the channel on one side and their lands which were sown and where crops were thriving have been submerged under water. The people of this village were never consulted before this irrigation tank was constructed.

There is another village. An irrigation tank has been constructed but nobody is entrusted with its control and last year, when there was a drought situation, the villagers of one village took water to irrigate their paddy-fields. In fact they would not have been able to reap any harvest had they not taken water for the purpose. But then, the people of the other village who also take water from that tank, well, they manipulated a case against them saying that they drained off the water from the tank unnecessarily, and their contention was that they could grow

vegetables but because of this action of the villagers they were not able to grow vegetables, that year. Now there is litigation between those two villages. Sir, this incident occurred only because there was no administrative decentralisation. Nobody is in charge of that tank. The B.D.O. comes and intervenes according to his own convenience.

3 P.M.

In another place a tank has been excavated, probably for drinking water purposes. Near about that tank there were already two or three tanks. I do not know why, in spite of these tanks, the Government have allowed this additional tank to be excavated there. There are a number of such instances. If the Government is serious enough to hold an enquiry into them, it will come to know of such highhandedness on the part of Government officials. It is, therefore, necessary that administration should be decentralised.

The *Panchayat* should be invested with more power. They should be taken into greater confidence. To experiment in democracy, if we can give adult franchise to the people, I do not know the reason why we should not extend the facility in the matter of local-self government and administration of developmental projects, etc. It is not sound in principle to rely more and more on officials and distrust people. As long as we are doing that, people's co-operation will surely be lacking.

From the language of the resolution, the Mover's intention seems to be quite clear. It reads:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take necessary steps forthwith to reorganize the administrative structure of the country with a view to decentralise the administration and to enable the active participation of the people in developmental activity."

[Shri Harihar Patel.]

My submission is that if the hon. Minister and the Members of the Planning Commission have come to realise the importance of administrative decentralization, why should they not take up this matter in right earnest? We can preserve our democracy only if people voluntarily extend their co-operation in such matters. The days of dictation are gone. If we resort to that method, I think we will not go ahead much.

With these words, I support this Resolution and do urge upon the Government to take immediate steps for decentralisation of administration so that voluntary co-operation of the people in developmental activity may be forthcoming.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have read the resolution moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Pendse, and I think the House should be grateful to him for bringing such an important matter to the notice of the House.

Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Bhargava, has already tried to point out the steps the Government are taking as far as the first part of the resolution is concerned, namely, the reorganisation of the administrative structure of the country. As hon. Members know, after independence one of the first things which any democratic Government could have done was to secure the utmost co-operation of persons interested in the welfare work of the country. I would not like to take more time of the House, but would certainly like to point out that all possible steps are being taken in that direction. If we remember the extent of non-official co-operation with the Government in the year 1945-46, can we honestly say that it is to the same extent in the year 1959? My hon. friend from Orissa complained that non-official co-operation was not being sought in developmental activities. I can understand that. But there is another problem, namely, what non-

official co-operation should or should not be secured. I have got a list of the members of the District Development Board of Bolangir in Orissa. If you look into it, you will find that the Board consists of about 30 members. The District Magistrate is there. All the M.Ps.—belonging either to the Congress Party or the Opposition Parties—and M.L.As. and some other non-officials are also there. All possible officers of the District, who are connected with any welfare activity, are also members of that Committee. When my hon. friend, Mr. Pendse, wanted decentralisation of administration to enable active participation of the people in the developmental activity, certainly I would like to know from him as to what sort of co-operation should the Government secure and what the source for drawing people for these activities should be. Those of us who are connected with it, and who know something about the National Extension Scheme and all that—I would not go into its details—do know that all possible co-operation from the locality is being taken. I think the hon. Member who moved the resolution should have thrown more light on how extra steps should be taken to seek the co-operation of the people or persons who are interested in developmental activity. But the mover of the Resolution referred to the Balvantray Committee Report, a copy of which was circulated to the Members of Parliament. I think it would be discussed here in detail. Now, what has that Committee recommended? The Mover referred to those recommendations also. Sir, in all possible ways steps are being taken in right earnest to get public co-operation, and if this House passes a resolution like that, I am afraid, in spite of giving more powers to the Government, we would not be helping them to come to some right conclusions, and there will be a general impression that the Government are not proceeding on right lines. Therefore,

if the House feels that there should be some other method I would welcome it. Therefore, in all humility,

I submit that we endorse all the steps taken by the Government in this direction, and we hope that the spirit of the Resolution, the spirit in which the Government themselves are proceeding, will be speeded up and more and more co-operation of the people will be secured.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am glad that such a Resolution has been brought forward before the House. The fact that it has been brought by a Member of the Opposition should not come in the way, I feel, of Government accepting it. In fact, the mover of the Resolution himself knows what steps are being taken to decentralise the administration, and as a pointer, I would give the example of the appointment of the Study Team for the projects of the Social Welfare Board, the Report of which has just been published. They have also recommended that the administration should be decentralised.

I would give another example, *viz.* the award of scholarships to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes candidates. So far, the Education Ministry and the Home Ministry were giving away those scholarships. Finding the procedure cumbersome, they have, from this year, handed over their distribution to the State Governments.

I had not the good fortune of being in the House when the Mover spoke today on this Resolution. It has to be remembered that the mere principle of decentralisation cannot be worked out howsoever good it may be. The reason is that in our democracy, when we got our freedom and when we accepted this democratic Government all of a sudden, there was not the necessary time to teach the people below how to take the responsibility that is required when the administration is decentralised. Our unfortunate experience has been that even on

bodies where Government, with a view to enabling people to gain experience and to come forward and participate in the administration, has established such bodies like the District Advisory Committees and similar bodies, the attendance in these bodies is so low that often it is difficult to get even a quorum which is to the tune of one-fifth. I can speak for so many Block Development bodies in my district and the same is the fate of very many bodies otherwise and the reason for that is that in their very nature, naturally, they are of an advisory character and people feel that even if they may make certain recommendations, they may not be acceptable but that is not the only thing. Our people have not been initiated in the proper functions and sharing their responsibilities in the carrying out of the powers delegated to the bodies. The failure of our municipalities after municipalities and Janpads—Local Boards—in the different areas is a pointer to this effect. In my own State, the Janpad Act which was passed about 8 or 9 years ago will soon be repealed and all the Janpads will be abolished because they have proved a complete failure and the functions delegated to them have, according to the complaints, been usurped. So while accepting this principle that administration should be decentralised, apart from the reason that it should be decentralised because the democratic power given to the people should be exercised by them, there is another reason why it should be decentralised and that is, to avoid the delays that are unavoidable when it is centralised. The word 'centralised' can be used in connection with both administration connected from States to the Centre and even in the States, as connected between the divisional or district administration and the State administration. Well, the Mover of the Resolution on the first day referred to the corruption or Dharmaglani as pointed out by the Chairman of the University Grants Commission and ex-Finance Minister, Shri Chintamani

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]
 Deshmukh. He himself drew attention to the lack of morality in public administration and I feel the remedy for all these things, if we want to give the best possible administration, is not by decentralisation or over-centralisation but by making an all-out effort to raise the morale of the people and that would be by paying more attention to our education. The Education Ministry, while doing all the things possible under the sun, taking from America down to perhaps the most backward country in the world by way of experimentation, is doing what it can except the one thing that it should do and that is the reason why I have come to speak on this Resolution even at this late hour when perhaps most of the speakers who wanted to speak have finished. Everywhere in our public life, right from the highest level to the lowest rung of the ladder, we find very many lapses as given out in the papers which point to one thing and that is, in this secular State, when religion is not to be even mentioned in the schools, when religion is being neglected in the homes due to the stress and strains of life, when the mother is not able to spare the time, when the father has to be busy with wage earnings, with the joint family system having broken, the grandmother or the grand parents are not there in the house to point to the children the tradition in which they are born, as a result of these, the greatest teacher today is the cinema films and through the films what do we see? That is the worst can be seen of Western life and that is gangsterism and crimes. It may be somewhat irrelevant to bring them here but it has very close connection with the object's behind this Resolution and the superficial touching of this Resolution will be missing the real reason which has brought the things to the present stage. When our children are not able to understand English properly, the old type of classical films which have some moral in them and which we consider as based on higher

principles, are not even understood and what is understood by our students today with their half-English is the Western films and the films copied from these Western films are full of sensationalism, gangsterism and crimes. You would hardly find a picture where there is not some sort of showing of dagger or intimidation. I would like people to make a list of pictures that would miss these heads. The administration which is to be carried on really at the lower level by the younger generation, the clerks and the others, who are in the Third or the Fourth Grade, and even the Second Grade servants, is being carried on by people who have not had the best opportunity for education, who have not had much chance of reading literature of a higher type, who do not get much chance of listening to old-age talks of people—I am talking of religious lecturers and others—who would be there in the interior areas. In the first place these people have no interest also in these things because with the present impact on life of the cheap literature that is available even for the asking, these people of the younger generation, have no time or taste to attend to anything that is different in nature from that. Has the Mover of the Resolution cared to see what type of literature is read by 60 per cent. of the population who can read and spend money on it? So it would be necessary, in my opinion, in order to enable active participation of the people in developmental activity, not to decentralise the administration so much as to train people in the correct things necessary for them, to become good citizens and that makes it necessary for them, to not only learn something of public administration but something of higher values on which that administration is to be based. So everyone of us, who feels concerned about the slow progress of things, who feels concerned about the low tone of things should make it a point, without being asked by anybody, without being given the authority in a statutory manner

by anyone, with all the power at their command, to change the morale of the younger generation and make them better citizens through the various means at our disposal. The present-day education where the curriculum has become so heavy with umpteen new subjects, leaves very little time for the very many things which brought about a better contact between the teachers and the students outside the school-walls through the extra-curricular activities in vacations and so on. Those on the staff of these institutions have also lost heart and they take no real interest in their work or in the future of their students, though in olden days our Vedic system aimed at it.

The ideal before the teacher was to see that he should develop his pupil to such a level as even to be defeated by the pupil. He should prepare the pupil in such a way that he will excel—the teacher in everything. But, Sir, you hardly find any teacher of that type, except a few of the older generation who love their work and do it and not for the few rupees they get. Now you find most of them have not their mind in their work and all the time they have an eye on other jobs. Many teachers appear to have half their heart and one foot on some executive job, on some job in some office. That is their attitude and that is the type of teachers that we are recruiting by the scant attention we are able to pay them and the small pay that we give them from our limited resources. In such circumstances it is not possible to expect that the teachers would be able to give us the type of material that will raise the tone of our administration. So while agreeing with the intention of the Resolution, the intention behind it—and nobody can disagree with it—and there is nothing in the Resolution on which one can disagree—I feel that the real point is missed if the Minister in the Home Ministry sitting here replies to this debate. I wish that the Education Minister had been here to reply to the points raised, or

it had been the joint responsibility, of both, when there is such a Resolution worded in this manner. I feel that every time the Education Ministry is able to get away with it. Every time the Information and Broadcasting Ministry which is allowing all these sins to be committed day in and day out against the community, is able to get away with it, because nobody tries to drive the nail on its head. So here they are guilty of the many evils in the country though the younger generation is said to be guilty of them.

SHRI GOVIND CHANDRA MISRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rarely take part in the debates in this House because of my physical inability; but today over this Resolution I feel that I must speak something. I must thank the mover of this Resolution for giving this opportunity to this House to discuss this point that has been raised in the Resolution.

The Resolution seeks the reform of the administration and on this point Mr. Bhargava has already spoken and I do not feel competent to speak on that point. But there is another thing, namely, the spirit of the Resolution which is to get the co-operation of the people in developmental work, and to hand over responsibility to the people. So far as getting the cooperation of the people is concerned, I think the Government has been doing as much as is necessary and that is quite enough and I do not think anything more can be done now. From the level of the village *panchayat* right up to Parliament you have machinery for this. There is the village *panchayat*, there is the block *samiti* and there is the district development board and so on; through these the work is being done. What do we find today? How do these bodies work? I am now speaking from my own experience in my State of Orissa. Sir, I may give you one example. Formerly up to the high school standard the power was given to the people to have managing committees for the school to manage them. The Government went to the

[Shri Govind Chandra Misra.]

aid of these schools and they met the financial deficits that the schools might be suffering from. It was, however, found that these managing committees were not managing the schools properly. The Government asked the managing committees, which were not able to manage them, if they were willing to hand over their institutions to the Government, since Government was ready to take over those institutions. Sir, you will be surprised to know that almost all the committees handed over the responsibility to the Government. So you see that though the Government had given power to the people, they could not use it properly and so they handed over the institutions to the Government. After going back from the sessions of Parliament I give every minute of my time to village work and I come into close contact with village life and I know how the village *Panchayats* work and how the people live in these villages. I know how the block committees function and how the district development boards function. I am connected with most of these committees. What do we find? Nobody is taking any interest in the working of the *samitis* and committees.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): That is the fault of hon. Members.

SHRI GOVIND CHANDRA MISRA: The Community Development Ministry is trying to educate the people to shoulder their responsibilities. We should understand and the people should understand how this Ministry is preparing its programmes for educating the people. These programmes are meant to educate the people and to enable them to take responsibility. The report of the Mysore Conference of Development Commissioners contains the decisions and the programmes drawn up and from these it can easily be understood how they are trying to educate the people in order to enable them to shoulder res-

pensibility. The aim is to link up the work from the village *Panchayat* right up to Parliament and that is what the Community Development Ministry is trying to do by means of its plans and programmes. I do not think what else can be done by the Government. Anyway, this Resolution has given us an opportunity to discuss this subject here and I thank the mover for that though I do not think this Resolution is necessary at the present moment. It is all right for discussion. We must know how the people are thinking, in what stage they are now and how their mind is working. I may be excused for saying that I feel that today our people do not look to their country as their own and behaving as foreigners, they do not think their villages and the villagers as their own and so do not work sufficiently for the people. In such circumstances how can Government do anything more? I do not think anything more can be conceived or done.

With these few words Sir, I conclude my remarks. I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this Resolution.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I am really surprised at the Communist Party bringing in such a mild Resolution as this one. This appears to be quite mild and innocuous.

AN HON. MEMBER: Apparently.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Yes. Probably it would appear that they have changed their mood after the last Kerala discussion here.

* SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, notice of this Resolution was given in the month of June or May.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Sir, my own personal opinion is that this Resolution should have

been worded differently, I sometimes think that we ought to reorganise our administrative machinery. But that should be done in order to remove slackness or delay or indiscipline or corruption and such things that are sometimes apparent. In that direction something must be done. But it will be seen that the Government is already doing what is necessary in this direction. Already what is asked for in this Resolution is being done. This Resolution asks for decentralisation of the administration in order to get the active participation of the people in developmental activities.

That is already being done and there is nothing in the Resolution that is new. In fact, the much-talked of Nagpur Resolution of the Congress Party also says that we have to decentralise and give more powers to the *gram panchayats*, the district boards and the local authorities.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I do not know what the Lady Minister will say but I think that the Resolution is not necessary. In fact, I would have called upon the Government to do something to review the administration in the country. That would be the more appropriate step. Well, Sir, I have already said that decentralisation is the policy of the Congress itself and this is already in operation. We have so many advisory committees. For the Third Five-Year Plan, suggestions are being asked from the lowest level, the village level, the tehsil level, the district level, etc. These bodies are being called upon to send their suggestions for incorporation in the final Plan of the country. From this point of view, also, the recommendations contained in the Resolution are being acted upon and there is no need to bring forward such a Resolution but I am with all those who would like the whole administrative machinery to be improved and for that purpose, I will request the Government to take necessary action.

I have nothing more to say.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not able to understand the reason behind this Resolution which looks so simple and straightforward and something which nobody can really oppose but I am wondering what the consequences of this will be. I am particularly referring to the question as to how things are going on in Gujarat. We have heard a lot about projects, developments, association of the people and so on, but does this decentralisation mean that the projects that are being worked there will be decentralised, that is, handed over to the State Governments for execution and that they will fall out of the purview even of questions in this House? Since I came here last year, I have tried to ask questions, interpellations, about many of the projects in Gujarat which are going completely astray. I was able to get a straight answer in the Consultative Committee of the Planning Commission last year when I asked about the schemes in Gujarat, particularly the Tapti River Scheme. The Minister for Planning was fumbling but the Chairman straightway said that crores of rupees spent had all gone down the drain and not an acre of land had been irrigated. When this thing was initiated, the people of the district were asked to contribute towards it and they were told that this project would feed them. They contributed a loan of nearly a crore of rupees. Congressmen went from house to house to get the active co-operation of the villagers. Does active co-operation mean their contributing money which is to be wasted by the Government engineers? I would like to be clear on that before I can support this Resolution.

The other point is this: By decentralisation of this type, this matter is taken out of the purview of questions in this House and the Legislature at Bombay has not yet framed rules about questions. A question may be answered one month, two months or

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

three months after it has been given notice of. They do not even say that the information is being gathered, as very often Ministers here condescend to say, and after a few months circulate a statement. There they do not simply put it on the question list. Does this Resolution mean that? I give you another example of decentralisation. The Mahi River Scheme is something about which Gujarat feels very strongly. Gujarat feels that its problem of electric power, irrigation and shortage of drinking water in dry areas, particularly of North Gujarat, will be solved by this one scheme. A retired engineer with an unprecedented record in the Bombay State Irrigation Service, who had worked as Executive Engineer in the Sukkur Barrage, offered to form a corporation by money raised from the cultivators themselves who were going to benefit and asked the Government to come into it, nominate its members on the Board. He wanted to run this like the Tennessee Valley Authority. He said that he would complete the project in five years but the Bombay Government said, "No, nothing of the kind." In regard to Gujarat, for anything, it is only the Bombay Government and nobody else exists. They started on the Mahi River Project and after ten years perhaps ten thousand acres at the most have received irrigation benefits but not one kilowatt of electricity has been generated. Thanks to the vigilance of the engineers in Gujarat, the canals were at least levelled properly as against what has been done with regard to the Tapti Valley Scheme, the Khakra-para Scheme as they call it, the first phase of the Tapti Valley Scheme. There they started digging canals without taking levels. What they dug up was really good agricultural land which went waste because they dug holes and pits and when the water came, that land became waterlogged. At least that did not happen in the case of the Mahi Scheme. There was criticism about it by the engineers but Government was unable to say

anything. They had used a gradient steeper than necessary. As soon as a hue and cry was raised, Government spent one crore of rupees more and supplied a lining, either of cement or lime. That protected the bund of these canals but irrigation has not come.

So far as power schemes are concerned, Gujarat is crying for power. There is no power. There is one Power House in Ahmedabad that is run by a foreign company, Killick Nixon and Co. When the Electricity Bill was being discussed in this House, I was wondering why this one particular Company had been excluded, why there was no provision enabling Government to acquire this Company and more particularly, for the speedy acquisition of such companies. Last year, there was a big hue and cry at the shareholders' meeting of that Company. The British Officers of that Company tried to take away a lot of money in the name of ordering large equipment for that Company. Thanks to the vigilance of the Indian engineers who had the courage to go and report the matter to the Indian Directors of the Board, risking their jobs, the whole thing came out and much money of this country was saved. The Britishers quietly took their boat to England. Whatever electricity could be generated by the Mahi River Scheme was not being generated because the Government of Bombay refused to build the dam at Kadana where it was necessary. All sorts of excuses are being put forward. This is the example of decentralisation in Gujarat, the Tapti Valley Scheme and the Mahi Scheme, where you have got people willing to give their advice free. This engineer whom I mentioned earlier, with so much of experience and an unprecedented record in the construction of the Sukkur Barrage, is prepared to work free of cost, is prepared to give advice free of cost, but the Government does not allow him to form a corporation. His advice has never been taken. When

there was some trouble at one of the Congress committee meetings, Shri Morarjibhai said that this engineer's advice would be taken. His advice was never taken. Eventually, when there was such a hue and cry, when even after spending ten crores not even ten thousand acres were being irrigated, they asked him about it. They are corresponding with him. He has pointed out the difficulties. Now, Sir, instead of making cheap power available to the people of Gujarat by an irrigation and hydro-electric scheme combined through the Mahi river scheme, they are talking of giving us atomic power. It is all right if the Ahmedabad millowners need atomic power; they have got a lot of money to spend. Let them spend it but the people of Gujarat are against it. We have neither the treatment nor the means of preventing people from suffering for the ill effects of atomic fall-outs. Japan is still suffering from the effects of atomic bombing.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): There is no atomic fall-out.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: My friends are trying to tell me that there are no fall-outs in atomic energy. I say that there is danger. Of course, precautions are taken to prevent it but are you sure that they are fool proof? I am not.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He cannot be a better scientist than Dr. Bhabha.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I do not claim to be a better scientist than Dr. Bhabha but I do understand rupees, annas and pies as much as he does, perhaps a little better. And let me tell you that atomic power is going to be much too expensive to meet the needs of industry in Gujarat and we do not want it. If there are people who have got the fad of wanting to do something novel, something that nobody else has done, or if there are people who want to compete with the whole world and go

about saying that this is the most advanced country, they are welcome to do it. But let them not do it at the expense of the poor tax-payer of the country. What is being done for the benefit of the people must bring real benefit to the people—and not such costly experiments. That is what I suggest. If it is necessary to conduct experiments in science, certainly do that, but that should not be the excuse for preventing the availability of cheap power to Gujarat. Again and again, every time, some excuse or other is brought forward whenever a scheme is taken up for Gujarat.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: All this has nothing to do with decentralisation.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It has got to do with the association of people in public utility schemes. I gave one example of the Tapti scheme where people came forward to give money but the Government made a mess of it. I was telling you of another scheme where the people offered to set up a Corporation but the Government said 'no' and like a dog in the manger they are not doing it either. And now they are spending money which they collect from us as taxes on such experiments, pompous experiments I would call them, which this poor country cannot afford. This country wants irrigation; this country wants food. Only recently, we spent hours on the food debate. How is the food going to come? Is it going to come by spending money on such pompous experiments? Sir, it is going to come through irrigation, through more production by making cheap water and cheap power available to people. That is what is necessary. I do not see how it is going to come through this. Certainly I would welcome the association of people but the association must be real. It must be either here or it must be at the State legislature level. Today, the position is that they do not know where they are. It is not the State legislature that sanctions the schemes. Ultimately

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

the scheme is sanctioned by the politbureau of the Government of India, that is, the Planning Commission. That is the body that sanctions schemes. And then we are supposed to approve them. How are they put before the House? They are put before us in the form of a Report of the Planning Commission which the House approves. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, I will take only two minutes. Are the schemes put before us year after year, as the Budget is placed before us, saying that this is what they are going to do next year? No, Sir. They are put before us as a Five Year Plan drawn up by the politbureau, and that body is not elected by this House or by anybody. It is nominated by certain people and therefore I call it the politbureau of the country. That body has arrogated to itself the functions of a politbureau, and the whole Government machinery is geared to the will of that politbureau. Therefore I welcome the association of people in all schemes of public utility so that the knowledge of the people is taken advantage of by Government instead of the Government themselves wanting to do things. We are failing in our agriculture. Why? Because we do not take the help of people who have knowledge of agriculture and agricultural production. Similarly, we fail in all these big schemes because we do not take the people who have knowledge of such schemes into confidence and who can advise us, but we just go our own way, making up our own mind, or a few people making up their own mind as to what way they want to drag the country, and we can see very well where they are dragging us.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while fully appreciating the effort the mover of this Resolution made in bringing this Resolution before the House, I failed to catch in his speech any concrete suggestions by which he could make

this Resolution of any consequence. Sir, it is true that since the days of our independence in 1947, as one of the speakers from this side has already surveyed the historical background, we have laid before ourselves the concept of the welfare State and we are striving towards that goal—the running of a good government, an efficient government, an incorruptible government and all the good things he said. I would have liked hon. Members, especially of the Opposition, to give us some alternate concrete suggestions by which we could reach that goal as quickly as they envisage. It is not an easy task in a country as big as ours to take the people with us. Decentralisation has been going on from the 15th August, 1947. As has been said, it began with five Secretaries sitting together under the Chairmanship of the late Shri Girja Shankar Bajpai in a committee, followed by the recommendations made by the late Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar. Then came the two Reports of Mr. Appleby. The second Report was discussed in both the Houses and the recommendations which were found feasible were accepted and were tried to be implemented, and those that were not workable were rejected and so on till we come down historically to the present day. In the meanwhile, we have our own machinery to take our people with us. At the parliamentary level we have the Estimates Committee and the various other committees. Of course, you will sidetrack and say, 'what have they done?' But remember we have to carry millions of people with us and as Dr. Seeta Parmanand rightly said, unless the people are with us in a land where there is so much of illiteracy, in a land where we are not used to being our own masters, it takes time, and as was mentioned again by Dr. Seeta Parmanand, there is no quorum at the committees at the district level or the village level. Why go that far? What about this very House? If that is so, we need to be all the more vigilant.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is, as usual, trying to lay his charge against us but may I tell Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that they observe it in breach most? Nevertheless, we have gone ahead with this concept of co-operative commonwealth and welfare State and therefore we want to meet the changing and dynamic requirements of the present-day society and form the Government as we would like it to be. Now, the mover of the Resolution cited a number of Reports and opinions of a number of experts. He cited Mr. Pimputkar's Report in which he said that the Collector of a District is over-burdened. I do not think the hon. mover has read the Report carefully because in the 248 pages of the original Report there is a 30-page or more commentary given by Mr. Dehejia who used to be the Home Secretary of the Bombay Government and who does not agree with Mr. Pimputkar. Nevertheless, I do not want to go into the details; I am only pointing it out because he made it a point to cite this Report of Mr. Pimputkar. In the old days, in the British regime the Collector was the boss but today the Collector has to come down from that pedestal to work with us. Therefore, though some of our civilians may not have changed their outlook, we certainly say that reorientation is taking place and taking place at a fairly measurable speed. The Collector today in the district may be overburdened with conferences and other jobs where he has to make his presence. Nevertheless, that should not stand in the way, because if he wants to work as the captain of a team, he has to step out more as a welfare worker in a welfare State rather than as a bureaucrat. The charge laid by the Opposition at our door is that bureaucracy does not die. It is true that we have inherited the set-up which was there in 1947 before independence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Our charge is there. Our charge was that in this welfare State the exploiters and the bureaucrats are faring well.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: I do not agree. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will have to draw up statistics and lay them on the Table of the House, if he wants to prove his charge. But it is not so. What I wanted to say is that at the district level and even at the village level, if I come directly to the point—because I do not wish to go into the details of the historical background, Mr. Bhargava having given it and, also, I think Mr. Amolakh Chand who followed him gave a survey—we are trying to reorientate the policy and coming to decentralisation as fast as a welfare State can. But one must remember that it is going to be an evolutionary process, an evolutionary process in which the people are going to count. Therefore, we want to take the people with us at every stage. Now, we come to the Planning Commission.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: What they want is a devolutionary process.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: What they want is a revolutionary process and see what happened to them with that process in Kerala. We shall continue with the evolutionary process and we shall get to our goal. The evolutionary process is that the people have to be enlightened. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel who spoke and the other friends who spoke from that side, talked about their local schemes. Their local schemes have to be discussed with their State Governments. Situated as we are, within the framework of our Constitution, the States are autonomous in many respects. The Planning Commission is there and the Planning Commission, I say, must be a co-ordinating body all the time. It is no use decentralising it, because that will create problems amongst the States and between the States. The schemes that every State makes go before the people of the State, the rightful representatives of the State, and through them, the schemes come to the Planning Commission and then money is distributed to fulfil the implementation of our Five Year Plan. Of course,

[Shrimati Violet Alva.]

many other things were said by Dr. Seeta Parmanand and most of her speech should have been reserved for the Resolution that would follow, namely, the working of the Young Persons (Harmful Publications) Act, rather than that they should have been given out on this Resolution. I do not venture to say whether the Minister of Education should be associated with this Resolution that deals with the question whether the administration should be centralised or decentralised. I do not think so. But if she were to speak about the silver screen or publications of obscenity and all that, then she should have reserved her remarks to the Resolution that follows.

Sir, here again they talked of Panchayats and Zila Parishads. May I here bring to the notice of the House that the movement for Panchayats goes back to 1947 itself. If you analyse it State by State, I think Bombay and U.P. lead in this Panchayat movement and they have a comprehensive legislation for this purpose. The Law Commission has recently recommended that there should be not only Panchayats, but judicial Panchayats. Now, if this is not decentralisation, may I know what would be decentralisation—judicial Panchayats, to which the Chief Justices in the old days were opposed? Now, the Law Commission itself has recommended this that there should be judicial Panchayats in the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have not accepted it.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Uttar Pradesh has got judicial Panchayats known as 'Nyai Adalats'.

SHRIMATI VOLET ALVA: I am very happy that he has enlightened me on this and if U.P. has led, let us hope that the rest of the country will follow.

Sir, now coming to the Resolution, as I said, reorientation is going on and

the hon. Mover's motive was good. But he had no concrete suggestions and I do not see how, when he has not given us any concrete suggestions, such a Resolution would be welcomed. Of what consequence will it be to us when we are already in the process of rebuilding the whole system according to our concepts and according to our goal of a welfare State?

AN HON. MEMBER: They have their own concepts.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Each Party can have its own concepts, but we shall carry on with our own concepts, under the democratic system, in the evolutionary process.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We want to discuss it with you.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: In the Second Five Year Plan, I just wanted to point out that directly under the Home Minister things have been moving fast from 1956. Under his direct care improvement for effectiveness has been undertaken on many fronts. First, to cover the structure and organisation of the Services, including the system of recruitment, principles and procedures of promotion, training and further, education of the civil servants. The House will be aware that the training of civil servants has undergone so much change that we want to bring them in actual touch with what is happening in the countryside. Then, Sir, the Home Minister appointed an informal Committee of senior Secretaries and action on the recommendations of this Committee on the general problems relating to recruitment policy and other policies has been initiated or is in the process of being implemented.

Then, on the front of efficiency and economy, we have not lagged behind. The question of achieving maximum economy and efficiency in the use of the financial and other resources has assumed special significance in the context of the Five Year Plan. Sir, in

the context of the Five Year Plan we have seen that from the village upwards everyone is associated. It has been mentioned here that the N.E.S. Blocks are not functioning. But then, the whole thing depends on how much activity the people can bring to bear. It is a fact that today public opinion counts so very much. Every issue is brought here, not only on the floor of the House. We have appointed committees and advisory boards at every level and at the level of every Ministry, so that we could function as the people want us to function. Only where the committees do not function, we have given up those committees. Where we have found that certain boards and advisory councils are not of any value to us, we wound them up and we produced something else which would function better and give us better advice. Suggestions are always accepted by the Government, though the nature of these boards and councils is advisory. Some member on the other side said that **the right people** are not taken on these committees. I do not know how to assure this House that **the right people** are taken on the committees. It is not the whims of the officers and Collectors that prevail very often—maybe one here and there. But on the whole the elected representatives of the people are there in a large number. I think one-third of any committee or any council formed has representatives of the people and, therefore, what they say and what they suggest is always considered very seriously.

Then, Sir, at the village level we have co-ordinating committees. Now, at the village level and the N.E.S. block level it is the will of the people that always ultimately succeeds. If the people do not want a project, we even give it up. Often on receiving complaints from various States on various projects we have revised our plans. We have tried to decentralise. But even in decentralising very often what happens is this. We have decentralised this year the scholarships for the tribal and scheduled caste

students and the States have not been able to pick it up, the States are not ready. The States themselves have so much work on hand that decentralisation does not sometimes work all at once. Therefore, time has to be given. Very often when we think of decentralisation, of delegating powers to the States or to some organisations, they are not ready and then better counsel prevails. We take it back. It is not the intention of this Government to make it a unitary Government in the sense that the Centre will do everything and strangle the States. We have left the States to manage their own affairs from the village level right up to the top excepting certain subjects that are laid down in the Constitution which belong to the Centre. Therefore we are improving and strengthening the machinery of general administration all along.

4 P.M.

Then, Sir, great emphasis is being laid now on co-operative societies and on gram panchayats. Now this is a method of decentralisation. But what I feel is, unless each one is active at the level of the village or the district or the town, how can we awaken the masses? Of course the charge that the Opposition will make is that the people are not sort of enthused in the work that is going on in the country. Maybe, but the leeway has to be made up. As Mr. Amolakh Chand has said, before 1947 the temper of the people was one of non-co-operation with the then Government. It has changed in the last eleven years and more and more people are beginning to understand that this is a welfare State. Well, faults may arise here and there and other corrupt practices may prevail, and, as some hon. Member, I think Mr. Patel, said, so many crores of rupees may have gone down the drain. Well, these things happen even in the best administered countries and the most advanced countries. Not that it is anything new, but we want to minimise it to zero if we could. But it will take time and it is only when

[Shrimati Violet Alva.]

the morale goes up, when the standard of people's thinking goes up and when each Indian begins to feel that this is his land and this is his Government, can he also with his opinion press the Government to bring in the right type of changes. Nevertheless, we at our level are emphasizing on co-operation at all levels and the Government is able to fully appreciate the importance of decentralising the administration and increasing popular contacts from Delhi down to the last village in India.

Sir, I need not go into the details of popular participation. But to convince the Mover of the Resolution and the opposition Members, I will have to give a few of the points that I have here. If we did not mean to decentralise, we would not have appointed so many committees for so many purposes at various levels in the various Ministries. To promote contacts between the Members of Parliament and the Government so that Members may have a clear acquaintance through organised but informal discussions with the principal problems and the working of the different policies and public administration, informal Consultative Committees, one for each Central Ministry consisting of about 30 Members of Parliament of both the Houses, are appointed. Now someone has pointed out that the members must be more active, and at least in these Consultative Committees you can speak freely even criticising our schemes or our plans or our administration. And here it is that great courage is to be shown, but great courage comes out of great study, and therefore unless you have the subject within your grip, you cannot give us concrete and valuable suggestions to carry on. Of course there are a number of Advisory Boards in the field of Harijan welfare and tribal welfare, and there is a Customs Advisory Committee at the different ports of Bombay, Madras, Calcutta and Cochin. Then we have the Railway Users Com-

mittee, the Zonal Railway Users Consultative Committee, the Regional Advisory Committee for Posts and Telegraphs, the Advisory Committee on Telephone Services, the Central Programmes Advisory Council, and so on, and so on. I need not give the whole list. But in all these Committees the participants are M.Ps., and it is in this field that you could help to give suggestions of how best work could be decentralised without sacrificing efficiency and economy.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: It concerns the State Governments also.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: It concerns the State Governments also. But I am confining myself to what we do at this level.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have some Advisory Boards in West Bengal where the opposition Members are not taken.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta could reserve his remarks later, but here are the Advisory Boards. They are at the State level and they are at the Central level, and it is here that we want to decentralise because we know that the people's representatives must help us to delegate powers little by little to such bodies and organisations as could take it up and show us the defects in the working or in the administration all along the long chain.

Then, Mr. Balvantray Mehta's report was also referred to. Mr. Balvantray Mehta's team of which he was the Chairman submitted a report. They made many very far-reaching recommendations regarding democratic decentralisation, and I do not want to wink at them because we agree with this principle of decentralisation. Whatever we think we will be able to implement we shall accept, but most of the recommendations fall

within the purview of the State Governments, and it is for the State Governments to implement these recommendations that come from this inspection team. The report is already before Parliament as some hon. Member has quoted from it. Those recommendations that are feasible and could be implemented we shall take up as soon as we can, and when they are implemented, they will go a long way to effect a radical transformation. Therefore, I do not wish to go again into the historical background, but we come straight here to the Balvantray Mehta Committee, the Estimates Committee's 9th and 10th Reports and the hon. Home Minister's efforts in this direction. I shall not divert now to what is happening in each Ministry—the Organisation and Methods Division, the Vigilance Division and so many other departments are actively looking into efficiency all the time. Of course Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may laugh, but they are there and certainly we are going ahead. We are not as bad as we were, and even foreign experts from outside are of the opinion that India is one of the best administered countries. It remains one of the best administered countries. It is our opinion. Therefore with this consciousness and with the conscience of the people brought to bear on this great aspect as laid down in the resolution for decentralising the administration to enable the active participation of the people in developmental activities—it is going on from day to day and from State to State—there is nothing to be pessimistic about it, and I do not think that this resolution will help us and, even if accepted, will take us any further. Most of the ground proposed in the resolution has already been covered by individual experts, by the Estimates Committee, by the Planning Commission, by the four permanent organisations, namely the Committee on Planned Projects; the Special Reorganisation Unit of the Ministry of Finance by which even the financial assistance has been made easy all through the year. They demand returns every quarter and at the end of the year, in the last quarter,

they have to show their actual expenditure and then finance is given. The Organisation and Methods Division of the Cabinet Secretariat and the Administrative Vigilance Division of the Ministry of Home Affairs are continuously engaged in the study of matters mentioned in the Resolution. Therefore, Sir, by pursuing this subject in the manner in which Shri Pendse has tried to do in this Resolution, I do not think that we shall go any faster than we are doing. We are making every effort in the right direction and we are going ahead in every direction, and therefore I oppose the Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, we are going in every direction.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have heard with all care and earnestness the many speeches delivered on the Resolution. At one stage, I thought that there was a dearth of speakers, but then the list had come up to quite a respectable number. I shall take up the last speaker first, because there are only one or two points to be dealt with there.

We, of the Vedanta philosophy—she may not know about it—put the individual above everything else and relate Brahma as the illusory object to the individual. The hon. Deputy Home Minister put democracy and decentralisation in that perspective...

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Do the Communists believe in Brahma?

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Yes, I am not for a discussion on that, if you want it.

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ (Bombay): Vedanta philosophy also?

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): You are a great *mayavadi*

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: You would interpret it differently and I would interpret it differently. But you are not qualified to speak on that. You will have many other subjects. (*Interruptions.*) You cannot write about it correctly or grammatically. What do you talk? Write the word correctly on paper and show me.

What is her concept of decentralisation? She gave us some instances of the process of democracy and decentralisation. She reminded us of the many non-official advisory committees. She has given out the object. What is it? "This is done so that people may help us in the Government." Who are these 'us'? Who gave you the monopoly to govern? That is the question my Resolution poses. My Resolution, when it contemplates decentralisation, aims at making people progressively assume power and not put them in a revolutionary mood at all. If you look at me, you will find that I am the most quiet and pious person. I am not quite a revolutionary. I am quite spiritual. So, dragging Kerala and revolution does not make one's arguments very powerful. But then here the illusion is blown up. Decentralisation implies that the governance of the country, political power of the country, the administration, is to be progressively transferred to the people who are the real masters. If this is conceded—and I am sure it would be conceded in theory—then the next point, as I said in my previous speech, is that precept and practice must go together. Then, Sir, it logically follows that instead of having any number of advisory committees and non-official committees, you ought to have elected committees from among the people themselves direct, no matter what their moral is. Moral is a commodity on the stock exchange under the capitalist system. It could be bought and sold just for a little pittance. Don't tell me about morals and morality. Whatever their morality, if it is low, then it is a crime perpetrated by us for ages together, including the twelve years that we are here. Don't make it a convenient

argument to deny what is implied in my Resolution.

Then, Sir, the hon. Deputy Minister covered many points and gave us a long, imposing list of committees and all that. I thought that was already done by another hon. Member just sitting behind her, and I would come to that later, so that there would be a common reply.

So far as the Resolution is concerned, I am happy that almost every speaker has agreed with the objective of the Resolution. That is one good point—the object is not disputed. The hon. Deputy Minister said that there were no concrete suggestions made. Yes, true. In a speech of 19 minutes, there cannot be an imposing list of suggestions.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Thirty minutes in all.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Eleven minutes on the previous day and 19 minutes today.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In all thirty minutes.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: But the time was split up. That I was speaking for nineteen minutes is a hard fact.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): It is good arithmetic, it is not bad.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: It was not possible that one speaker would give all the suggestions. But if she wanted, she could have referred to other speakers. The hon. Shri Sekhar, my colleague, gave us some suggestions. I say, if the Resolution is accepted even now, we will give you suggestions to the extent we are capable of. It is not a question of my holding the monopoly of giving certain suggestions. It is a question of common thinking, from the lowest level to the highest. Therefore, the fact that suggestions have not been made should not debar her from considering the Resolution on its merit.

Now, so much has been said by the other hon. Member and he gave us a long list of organisations and spoke about services. He told us about the various committees and commissions which went into the question and the recommendations they made. I agree with him, and I am thankful to him for having given me a very instructive discourse, because I am comparatively a new Member. I may not have known some of the committees. I concede, Sir, that enquiry into the routine work of any government—benevolent or welfare or autocratic or this or that—is a necessary process and therefore it is not a very extraordinary thing if the morale of the services, the conditions of recruitment and such other formal questions have been examined periodically or occasionally. That is all what he spoke about. Therefore I thought that my hon. friend was arguing at the other end. The contention of my Resolution was decentralisation and my hon. friend was arguing how the government and the Congress were examining these formal questions so far as the services, their conduct, behaviour and efficiency in given departments were concerned. Barring these two speeches there have been no two opinions about the Resolution. Friends have unnecessarily brought in Kerala, this and that. I suppose that is going to be a stock argument for some time more, until either another Kerala somewhere else happens. I hope it does not. . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY
(Andhra Pradesh): I hope not.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I also hope that it will not happen in U.P. You have had enough of this. (*Interruptions*).

Therefore, Sir, it is decentralisation which is the theme of my Resolution. The hon. Deputy Minister referred to Mr. Pimputkar's report. Happily for us I have got a copy, and I know what the other member of the Secretariat has said about it. Mr. Pimputkar has said something. He was a Collector once, and a very noted Col-

lector at Godra, and now a Secretary. He may have said that the Collector is overburdened. But when he said 'overburdened' he meant the extra developmental work and not the routine executive work, and the main burden of Mr. Pimputkar's suggestions was that this work should be handed over to other institutions invested with proper power and authority. That is the burden. Whether the Collector had 75 per cent. of burden or 60 per cent. of burden, and whether Mr. Dehejia disagreed with him, is besides the point, is a very minor point, and we cannot have a jugglery on that. So, Mr. Pimputkar's main point was that that was taken up in the Balvantray Committee Report also and that was the point to which Dr. Gadgil made a reference in his speech which I quoted.

Yes, I am told that so many committees have been set up, that they have been doing this work, and reference to the Balvantray Committee Report was made very often almost by every Member. But the hon. Members appear to have forgotten—I am not referring to every Member—the quotation I gave from the Balvantray Committee Report. That quotation referred to transference of power. Delegation of power was no substitute for decentralisation which is a process which delegates certain functions in higher departments to these bodies. Therefore there have been no tangible arguments or weighty arguments put forward against my Resolution. I would again beg of you, do not bring in your party politics—with which I have no concern whatsoever. Consider the Resolution on merits and if you think—as you have submitted that the Resolution looks innocent—that the Resolution has nothing objectionable about it—some glorified it by some other adjectives—and if you are all agreed, then I do not see why it should be opposed. Make a record of your courtesy extended to the Resolution and if on merits a Resolution coming from the Opposition is correct and is acceptable, then start setting up democratic traditions by accepting

the working of the

[Shri Lalji Pendse.]

that also as you would expect your Resolutions to be accepted by others.

Tank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take necessary steps forthwith to reorganize the administrative structure of the country with a view to decentralise the administration and to enable the active participation of the people in developmental activity."

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO GO INTO THE WORKING OF THE YOUNG PERSONS (HARMFUL PUBLICATIONS) ACT, 1956.

श्री जुगल किशोर (पंजाब) : श्रीमन् उपसभापति महोदय, मैं एक निहायत जरूरी रेजोल्यूशन इस हाउस के रूबरू रखने लगा हूँ। रेजोल्यूशन यह है :

"इस सभा की यह सम्मति है कि युवा व्यक्ति (हानिकर प्रकाशन) अधिनियम, १९५६ के कार्यकरण की जांच करने तथा उस पर प्रतिवेदन प्रस्तुत करने के लिये और देश में आने वाले अश्लील साहित्य तथा भयोत्पादक प्रहसनों के वर्तमान प्रवाह को रोकने के उपायों को और दृढ़ बनाने के तरीकों और साधनों का सुझाव देने के लिये सरकार को संसद-सदस्यों तथा सामाजिक संगठनों के प्रतिनिधियों की एक समिति नियुक्त करनी चाहिये।"

एक कानून पार्लियामेंट ने सन् १९५६ में पास किया था जिसका मतलब यह था कि नवयुवको और नवयुवतियों में जो खराब बातें आ रही हैं उनको रोका जाये और उनके

आचरण को ठीक किया जाये। वह कानून यह था जिसमें कि "हार्मफुल पब्लिकेशन" की तारीफ करते हुए पार्लियामेंट ने यह पास किया :

"harmful publication" means any book, magazine, pamphlet leaflet, newspaper or other like publication which consists of stories told with the aid of pictures or without the aid of pictures or wholly in pictures, being stories portraying wholly or mainly the commission of offences; or acts of violence or cruelty; or incidents of a repulsive or horrible nature in such a way that the publication as a whole would tend to corrupt a young person into whose hands it might fall, whether by inciting or encouraging him to commit offences or acts of violence or cruelty or in any other manner whatsoever."

उसमें "हार्मफुल पब्लिकेशन" की यह तारीफ की गई और उसमें "एनी परसन" की तारीफ में यह कहा गया कि २० साल से नीचे-नीचे जितने नवयुवक और नवयुवतियां हैं वे "एनी परसन" कहलायेंगे और इसके लिये यह सजा मुकर्रर की गई कि अगर इस किस्म का कोई पब्लिकेशन होगा तो उस पब्लिशर को ६ महीने की कैद और जुर्माना होगा और उसका जो पब्लिकेशन होगा वह जब्त कर लिया जायगा लेकिन मैं आज इस हाउस के रूबरू यह अर्ज करने की जुरत करता हूँ कि यह कानून सन् १९५६ में बना, इस कानून को बने हुए तीन साल हो गये हैं लेकिन आज तक मेरी नालेज में कोई ऐसी पब्लिकेशन नहीं आई जोकि इस एक्ट के तहत जब्त की गई हो या किसी पब्लिशर को सजा दी गई हो। जहां तक पंजाब और दिल्ली का ताल्लुक है, मैं तो समझता हूँ कि ऐसी कोई पब्लिकेशन न तो जब्त हुई है और न किसी पब्लिशर को आज तक सजा दी गई है। कहा यह जायगा कि शायद इस कानून के बनने के बाद ऐसे पब्लिकेशंस शायद होने ही बन्द हो गये,