

1357 Committee of Experts [23 AUGUST 1957] present Administrative Machinery of Government
to examine the
WHITE-WASHING IN 'E' TYPE QUARTERS IN KAROL BAGH

350. MOULANA M. FARUQI: Will the Minister of WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the annual repairs, white-washing and spreading of gravel in all the 'E' type quarters in Karol Bagh were not done during the year 1955-56; and

(b) whether any complaints have been received by Government in this regard and if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY (SHRI K. C. REDDY): (a) Repairs and white washing were done to all the 'E' type quarters in Karol Bagh except nine where the allottees did not make them available for this purpose. Spreading of gravel is done once in two years; it was not done during 1955-56.

(b) One complaint was received in regard to white washing and that was promptly attended to.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATIONS PUBLISHING AMENDMENTS IN THE TEA RULES, 1954

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI N. KANUNGO): Sir, I lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 49 of the Tea Act, 1953, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry:—

- (i) Notification S.R.O. No. 2494 [No. 8(8) Plant (A)/57], dated the 30th July 1957, publishing certain amendments in the Tea Rules, 1954.
- (ii) Notification S.R.O. No. 2495 [No. 32(14) Plant(A)/56], dated the 30th July 1957,

publishing an amendment in the Tea Rules, 1954. [Placed in Library. See No. S-207/57 for (i) and (ii)]

REQUEST FOR HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION REGARDING DEVELOPMENTS IN OMAN

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I would request the Chair to arrange for a discussion on the matter arising out of the answers given to my short notice question No. 3. I am afraid we have not got the clarification we sought over this question of Oman. I will give, Sir, a motion for a half-an-hour discussion following from the question, as provided for under the rules.

RESOLUTION REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS TO EXAMINE THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up private Members' Resolutions.

Under rule 142 there will be a time limit of half an hour for the mover of the Resolution and the Minister concerned, and 15 minutes for the other Members. The time limit will be rigidly enforced. Now it is 7 minutes past 12. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, we know of this rule of half an hour and fifteen minutes and I can assure you that it will be very rigidly followed whether you are in the Chair or not.

Sir, I move:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of expert and public men be appointed to examine the present administrative machinery of Government and to suggest comprehensive measure for reorganising the structure, the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

rules of procedure, recruitment, training and all other connected matters, with a view to (i) making the administration more democratic and responsive to popular aspirations; (ii) decentralising the administration so as to increase the extent, scope and effectiveness of popular control at all levels, (iii) achieving greater efficiency and promptness (iv) decreasing the incidence of corruption and wastage, and (v) promoting popular enthusiasm and conscious participation in nation-building activities."

Sir, the purpose of my Resolution is to raise some important issues connected with the administration of our country. I have not come here with any pet notions. I have only demanded that a committee be appointed to go into the question and to make such recommendations as it thinks fit in order that certain radical changes could be brought about in the system of our administration. I would, therefore, invite the hon. Minister to approach this question from this broader angle, because we are all interested, whatever may be our ideologies, in improving the state of affairs in our public administration.

An administrative structure was created by British and it is this structure that the present Government has inherited. As you know, Sir, the main function at that time of the administration was the maintenance of what they called "law and order" but actually the function was to keep the people down in order to help the exploitation of the people by the British and to bolster up and maintain this regime. Such an administration naturally could neither come near the hearts of the people nor feel their desires. In fact, such an administration inevitably remained isolated from the people, developed certain hostile and alien tendencies and began to function against the interests of the people. I need not go into that lamentable story here but, at the same time,

even in the freedom struggle, we did acquire a lot of experience of public administration and the leaders of the Congress Party some of whom happen to be now in positions of authority in the Government, came to their own conclusions. I need not here refer to the very many resolutions that had been passed from the platform of the Congress in which the administrative set up under the British was strongly condemned and in which certain very good and constructive ideas of public administration were formulated. These again would be found in the various records of the Congress Party itself. Therefore, Sir, when we discuss this question, it is not as if we are discussing it on the basis merely of ten years of experience or that we have developed certain ideas all on a sudden or even within ten years. In fact we know that the Britishers had given us an administration but we too have our own experiences and we also have got certain ideas that we formulated even before the transfer of power took place. Now, Sir, here I would like to read out what one very eminent national leader wrote:

"But of one thing I am quite sure, that is, no new order can be built up in India so long as the spirit of the I.C.S. pervades our administration and our public services. That spirit of authoritarianism is the ally of imperialism, and it cannot co-exist with freedom. It will either succeed in crushing freedom or will be swept away itself. Only with one type of state it is likely to fit in, and that is the fascist type. Therefore, it seems to me quite essential that the I.C.S. and similar services must disappear completely, as such before we can start real work on a new order. Individual members of these services, if they are willing and competent for the new job, will be welcome, but only on new conditions. It is quite inconceivable that they will get the absurdly high salaries and allowances that are paid to them to-day. The new India must be served by

earnest, efficient workers, who have an ardent faith in the cause they serve and are bent on achievement, and who work for the joy and glory of it, and not for the attraction of high salaries. The money motive must be reduced to a minimum."

Now, Sir, I do not know if the hon. Members will remember these words. These words came from the pen of one who was just here, namely, the Prime Minister of India. He will find this thing in his autobiography. I have read this thing out because I do not think I can put it much more eloquently, much more effectively and in a much more incisive understanding of the situation than has been put in these very constructive words of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in his autobiography. Unfortunately for us today, in the eleventh year of freedom, it seems that the Government finds it difficult to co-exist with the people. The co-existence exists with the I.C.S. bureaucracy, a reversal of the process. One should have expected that it would have been difficult to ensure the happy co-existence that we see there and, instead, there will be efforts to introduce reforms and measures whereby the entire organisation will be changed and brought in line with the democratic awakenings and the urges of the people, to fit in with the conditions of our times. That is not so. The choice of the Home Minister now is between a rifle and a musket; we thought the choice would be between a highly bureaucratized administration which is there, repugnant to the tenets of democracy, hostile to the people, on the one hand, and, on the other, effective and proper representation to the people, an administrative system ever sympathetic to the people's urges, sensitive to their desires and devoted to the cause of their service. That is not so. I do not know whether any new addition to the Autobiography—life is long and it marches on—has been written but I at least have not come across any and, therefore, I take it, Sir, that these words stand valid and we stand by them. If this Govern-

ment does not want to be impressed by these words or does not want to remember them, we shall, time and again, remind this Government of these words and we shall, time and again, whenever we get an opportunity, remember these sentiments stated about the living reality of our administrative system. Since then, what has happened? The transfer of power took place on the 15th August 1947. The prison-birds of yesterday became the masters of the land today; the autobiography writers of yesterday became law-makers of the land today. This is what happened and there have been no changes, no radical changes, at all in the administrative set up. I think it was Sardar Patel who made the statement immediately after Independence paying a wholesome tribute to the permanent civil services of the land and the others joined in the chorus. The Cinderella Ministers in the State one after another also copied the Centre and paid tributes, I do not know how profusely, but it came like the Niagara Falls as far as the I.C.S. officials are concerned. That is what happened; there was no attempt to alter, change and to improve the situation and for some reforms. Some tinkering was done with this system. I know various commissions and committees were appointed. First of all, they got Mr. Gorwala. He is a very doubtful personality to be trusted with a responsible job. Mr. Gorwala was commissioned to present a report and a report he produced. I do not mind the Government not having taken any action on this report or not taking the report very seriously but since it came from one of the retired men of the steel-frame and since he had pointed his fingers on some of the ugly spots where he had spent some time, it deserved a little meritorious consideration at the hands of the Government. That was not forthcoming. Then there were invitations sent to the United States and from there came Mr. Appleby. On the basis of the administration there, he produced another report which contained many ugly and fantastic statements which

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

had no relevance to our Indian living conditions, the conditions of the Indian administration and certainly was completely oblivious of how our hearts beat. Here again, certain ugly spots were found and brought to their notice but nothing has been done. I do not blame the hon. Home Minister for not giving much credence or importance to the reports of that kind but then in Parliament, in other places and, above all, among the public, discussion goes on as to how the administration should be reformed. Countless millions, in their day to day life, come across many instances which tell them that the administration has got to be reformed; they make demands on the Government and they make criticisms which sometimes get ventilated and echoed through the columns of the press. It seems to me, Sir, that the whole thing has fallen on a stony soil and there is nothing but arid desert as far as the bureaucracy is concerned. Therefore, I would say that these things have got to be taken into account. There is now what is called an Organisation and Methods Division. I do not blame the officer who runs it. Personally I have nothing against him. I knew him in Bengal. He is very efficient and he appreciates the things. His name is Mr. Bapat or something. They are all very efficient people. I am not concerned with all that. All that this thing tells us is how the files shall move, who shall carry a file, how the noting shall be made, how it will be fastened and which Minister will read what and which Minister will sign the file and with which pen. That is all. This is our administrative reform which says how to pass on the file from one person to another. Does the democratisation of administration simply mean this—how from one party it goes to the other, how the stenographer should fulfil his job? It is nothing of that kind. It is much more deeper; it is much more bigger than what this Report would make out.

Then, Sir, we have found another department, the Administrative Vigilance Division. The Government is frightened of the Frankenstein it has created, namely, corruption. Nepotism and corruption are running riot in the Congress administration to-day.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN (Bihar):
No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Home Minister or his predecessor has been good enough to set up what is called the Administrative Vigilance Division. What they are vigilant about I would like to know. I do not know what it is. We find a report here. It is a very interesting report. Sometimes they give reports. Here in this report you will see that complaints have been made for the year ending March, 1957. Here you will find the list of complaints made against the gazetted officers and others of the various Ministries. Now according to this latest one it seems that 1,397 complaints had been made against the gazetted officers. Against this number I think that the Government had instituted only 36 cases in court. This is how it happened. Similarly in the whole report you will find that the complaints are too many but the actions taken are too few; the prosecutions launched in court are too few. By the way there is a feeling that it is the common man, the poor employee who is guilty of all corruption and the masters at the top are all Caesar's wife. That is not at all so if I may tell the hon. Home Minister, because you will find that complaints had been made against 332 gazetted officers in the Defence Department. Take again the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply. Well, it is a very inviting, a tempting and lucrative department. There I find that complaints had been made against 339 officers and I think prosecution had been launched against one only. This report does not tell us much. Now, Sir, I do not know whether any vigilance squad would be necessary to be vigilant over the Vigilance Divi-

sion. That is a pyramid going up. At the top of it somebody sits like a godhead and knows nothing about it. Well, things go on merrily. The wheel moves on and the corruption goes on and we all watch this thing as the helpless victims of it

Then, Sir, about this department I have already said. Now there is the problem before the country and the question is to make up our mind as to where we are going and change the structure of the administration. It is unsuitable to our genius. It does not fit in with the needs of democratic growth and the republican spirit at all, and I would like only to recall what Gandhiji himself had said. They do not remember such things. It has fallen to our lot, Sir, to read Gandhiji's writings and to remind them of what that great man had said.

THE MINISTER OF HOME
AFFAIRS (SHRI GOVIND BALLABH
PANT): A good conversion!

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The ideal and principles for which Gandhiji stood and himself practised have been given the go-by and in the Bhangi colony where he used to stay and practise the principles he stood for, muskets have taken the place of his high principles. Here is what Gandhiji said, "India's independence must begin at the bottom. Every village should be a republic or a panchayat having full powers. The greater the power for the panchayats, the better for the people." This is what Gandhiji wrote about the panchayats. I would ask the hon. Home Minister how he likes those words. Will he accept those ideas? I am satisfied with that statement, whatever may be my ideology and political affiliation. Certainly they do differ from the ideology of the Congress in very many ways, but if a chance were to be given to me to implement his

statement, the ideas contained therein, I shall be only too happy and I would consider it to be my proud privilege to see what Gandhiji had said come into the reality of the administration in our country. That is all that I can say.

Then, Sir, there is the Directive Principle of the Constitution. There again it is stated, "The State Governments shall take steps to organise village panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government." So here is the Directive Principle more or less spelling the sentiments of Gandhiji? Has that been respected? Not at all. The panchayat to-day, as far as the Government is concerned, is viewed as the tax squeezing machinery of Government. Let me take, for example, the home State of the hon. Home Minister, Uttar Pradesh. There the panchayats have been stripped of all power. On them have been superimposed the secretary and circle inspector, who are overriding the decisions of the panchayats and imposing taxes as they like and collecting the same oppressing the people. Such is the working of the panchayat system there. Is it or is it not a fact? And the people of U.P. have risen in protest against this bypassing of the panchayats and are challenging and fighting the authorities. Of course on paper there is the panchayat system there. Now, whereas the panchayat system should be developed into organs of power and organs of self-government, they are being used as a sort of rubber stamp for carrying out the bureaucratic depredations, excesses and tyranny against the people. Nothing could be more insulting to the memory of Mahatma Gandhi than this kind of thing. This is what I would like to tell the hon. Home Minister. Also the Directive Principle of the Constitution has been violated in this respect: there is no doubt about it because there in U.P. for instance, if the panchayat decides

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

not to impose taxes these bureaucrats can order otherwise and the circle inspector and the secretary can say taxes must be imposed. And there is no escape from this thing and the panchayat has to carry out that behest of the bureaucratic officers and other imposts of the State. Now so much for the panchayats. There again, Sir, co-ordination is not there. Now in the countryside there is development going on. The panchayat is there. Then there are other institutions doing the development work, the community projects and the national extension service blocks. But there is conflict running riot where there should be co-ordination, where there should be co-operation. Each of the little bureaucrats there is carrying a portfolio of his own, each having his own notion of his work and each working on the tips of his own master. The master gives him the tip as to how to carry on with the work. So those officers at the village level are not in a position to co-ordinate their activities with the result that the villagers suffer and a lot of duplication and waste is there, with the result that these people, the common men, are not brought into the functions of administration, not even in the developmental activities of the country in which they must be drawn. I stress the panchayats because, Sir, 80 per cent of India live there, in the villages. Our republicanism and our democratic ideas become a mere cry, become a mere slogan until and unless in the countryside we strengthen, develop and expand democratic institutions by which the people of the land become the masters of the land, by which the common man should feel that he is ruling the country and not some people somewhere else. Democracy does not mean some of us going on talking here all the time and the bureaucracy rules whereunder the people get crushed under the cruel wheels of a very malevolent administration. It is no democracy. Democracy means that in the economic field, in the social field, in the political field and in

the various other walks of life the people become the masters, where the creative genius of the people is unleashed and it is they who rule the country after their own image and in a way which they consider the best. Unless we can set in that process this talk of democracy is the worst kind of rigmarole that we can think of. So much, Sir, about panchayats.

Now, Sir, coming to district boards. Elections to the district boards in Bihar and Assam do not take place and the district boards are being denuded of all their functions and powers. They are made to function in such a manner as though they are to die out in due course. You must take a decision. If the district boards are to remain—I think they should—in that case they should be given proper functions and proper powers just as the panchayats should be given proper powers and proper functions delineating their scope of activity. Again municipalities are being superseded and corporations are being superseded. You find the magistrate issuing an order suddenly superseding elected bodies like the municipalities and corporations. A corporation like the Calcutta Corporation does not have adult franchise. I can understand the feeling of the Congress in this matter because I know that if the Calcutta Corporation were to have universal adult franchise as is the case in the general elections to fill the seats in the State Assemblies and in the Parliament, immediately the gentlemen of the Congress Party there would be out of authority in the Corporation and the Left will capture that Corporation. That is why they are afraid. I can understand their anxiety and concern in the matter. Their wounded heart was bleeding, I can understand it. But democracy demands forthrightness. When you have such institutions in Bombay elected on adult franchise, similar institutions should be there in Calcutta and there should be no denial of it. I have mentioned it because I want to stress that such bodies

should be given powers based on proper elections and all that on the basis of adult franchise.

Now, I come to the question of the top elements. In our country we have got a very top-heavy administration. A lot is said about it. I think nothing provokes so much joke, so much fun, so much irritation and so much anger at times than the top-heavy administration in our country. Since Independence battalions of Secretaries have grown into armies; squadrons have grown into big battalions. Such things are happening. I do not know how many Under Secretaries you have—about 365 or so. The number of gazetted officers is increasing—Deputy Secretary, Joint Secretary, Additional Secretary, Deputy Magistrate, Additional Magistrate, Joint Magistrate and the whole army of bureaucracy stands to hold to ransom the country's administrative advance along democratic lines. Am I to understand that this is necessary for efficiency? The test of the pudding is in the eating. After all it is a very bitter pudding which is served to us. We know that during this period efficiency has declined and hundreds of miles and miles of red-tape have grown in the country and absolutely efficiency is at a very great discount at the higher level. Now, the pattern is that. Then, again, you see about the Secretaries and other things, I need not say very much. They are the happiest lot going on earth. We should have thought that there would be a little austerity drive there. We are bothered about the Prime Minister's House. It is true some times it should be so, but what about the bungalows of I. C. S. officers getting Rs. 4,000 a month. What about the heavy loss we have in the I.C.S., in all branches of bureaucracy? Am I to understand that Indian patriotism and talent is at such a discount today that until and unless we pay Rs. 4,000 to the I.C.S. official, there will be no one forthcoming to serve the nation and build the country? If that were the statement, I would consider it to be the most unimaginable libel on the

people and I hope the Government will not be guilty of such a libel on the people.

Now, here again, in the bureaucracy concentration of power has taken place. This is a serious thing. During these past ten years, the more you are removed from the people, the more your officers are removed from the people, the greater is the power concentrated in your hands. Similarly, the nearer you are, close to the people, the less power you enjoy. It is democracy in reverse gear. I therefore say that the administrative set-up should be so reorganised that it is put in proper gear, so that we can move along right lines.

Then there is the magistrate. Now, I am not talking about the Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Joint Secretaries. Sometimes they look a very lovable crowd. I have no personal quarrel with individuals. I think some of them may be very good people in private life. I am dealing with the system here, the institution here. Therefore, I say that there is concentration of power at the top in such a way as to be very harmful to the democratic growth of the country. It is contrary to the Directive Principles of the Constitution. Now, Sir, coming to the district, here you have got the district magistrate. I think Sardar Panikkar called them the 'Trimurtis'. He said the magistrate, the superintendent of police and the judge are 'Trimurtis'. The three musketeers are there; so many things we know. I do not know what they are. They are 'Trimurtis' all right. But here the pivot is the district magistrate. He is the administrative head; he is the revenue head; he is in charge of health and education. He presides over certain other things. He looks after the police, general power of superintendence, all these things. So much power is concentrated in one man's hands. Why is that so? It goes against democratic Government. In London, for instance in Britain, we have got the county council. They

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

discharge many of the functions that are given to the district magistrate. Here he is not responsible to the people at all, neither to the district board neither to Government, nor to the elected institution and all the time he is in the area. When the Assembly meets and when questions are put, some Home Minister would get up and white wash everything. We are told that there are some sins which would not be washed away by all the waters of the Arabian Sea. But it seems that the Ministers possess much more powers to wash all the sins of the bureaucrats under them. This is what is happening. Now, therefore, the main problem here of administration is to break the centralisation. Decentralise your administration. This is most important. At the secretariat level—administrative staff—there should be various officers commensurate with their responsibility and function. They should be given powers to take decision. It should not be a rule that their task is to report to the officer and only top-men take the decision. I am told that whether there should be a bridge over the Godavari is to be decided here in Delhi because it is a national highway and it takes six months after the rains or before the rains. It takes six or eight months or even one year. I do not know why this system should be so. This system should go. What should be done by you is to fix the responsibilities at different levels—departmental head or branch head. Give them proper responsibility and adequate power to take decision within their limitations, within their confines and implement them. That is very essential. Otherwise, if there are too many intermediaries between the reporting authority and the decision taking authority, there will be delay, there will be bottleneck, there will be corruption and the administration's work will suffer. How much time I have, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have just two minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is what I would suggest. That is very important.

Then, Sir, about the Public Service Commission, I think it is good, but unfortunately in a State like Bengal, the Public Service Commission is bypassed, especially in regard to appointments and promotions in the Rehabilitation department.

Now, about the police. The police has got to be reorganised. I would beg of the hon. Home Minister, if I may with your permission, that the problem is not one of whether you kill me with rifle or a musket . . .

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Or lathi.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Lathi, of course, we can take. If you use musket it will put us to an end and there will be one Member less in Rajya Sabha. Therefore, I am concerned with it. Lathi beating, of course, is a very common thing from the hon. Minister. We have got accustomed to lathis so much that sometimes unless it comes we miss that. I am talking about muskets. Now, this is not all. What is important for me is to change the Police Code altogether. Do not tell the people to give up the right to strike; the right to struggle; the right to demand peacefully. Otherwise, we shall shoot you. That does not speak well of the Government. I think the people have an inalienable right to struggle for the demands peacefully and democratically and it is not permissible in any civilised administration for any Home Minister to shoot upon them. That is what I say. The Police Code has to be changed and the police should be brought more and more under popular control. I would suggest in this connection that the Government should seriously consider whether cities like Bombay, Calcutta, Madras or big municipalities at least should not be brought

under the control of elected corporations, just as they do in France or in the country councils in England. This is a matter to be considered. The police should be more and more under the impact of democratic public opinion. This is vital for the growth of democracy. The police is very important.

Then, Sir, about the promotions, I would only say that promotion should be made from the bottom as far as possible. This gives incentive to those people at the bottom and this also gets efficiency and experience upward. Today certain posts are shouldered by the I.A.S. and the I.C.S. I do not know why we are in so much love with the I.A.S. Is it not possible to promote the man at the bottom, to come up to the top and discharge the responsibility? The Law Minister is there. He will tell you. How can a man of 22 be more efficient just because he has passed the I.C.S. than one who has been there for 25 years. (*Time bell rings*). Therefore, I say that this method of promotion which becomes a patronage and promotion through confidential reports from the superiors should go and the I.C.S. and the I.A.S. and the All-India Services should not be made into a separate caste isolated. These posts should be open to the people at the lower bottom.

As time is short, all that I would like to say is that along these lines certain things have to be gone into, matters have to be discussed and I think if we put our heads together we can find a solution to the administrative problems; we can re-shape our administration and the administrative system to bring it into line with the democratic needs and urges and ideals that the country has set before itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved.

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of experts

44 RSD.—5.

and public men be appointed to examine the present administrative machinery of Government and to suggest comprehensive measures for reorganising the structure, the rules of procedure, recruitment, training and all other connected matters, with a view to (i) making the administration more democratic and responsive to popular aspirations, (ii) decentralising the administration so as to increase the extent, scope and effectiveness of popular control at all levels, (iii) achieving greater efficiency and promptness, (iv) decreasing the incidence of corruption and wastage, and (v) promoting popular enthusiasm and conscious participation in nation-building activities."

श्री श्री नम्र याजी (बिहार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता ने जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा है, वह देखने में बहुत सुन्दर और दृढपुक्त मालूम पड़ता है लेकिन अपनी तकरीर के दौरान साथी भूपेश गुप्ता ने जो बहुत सी बातें कहीं—शुरू में उनका इशारा आफिशियल्स की तरफ, कर्मचारियों की तरफ था और इस सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने जवाहरलाल जी के किसी कथन का उद्धरण भी किया और वह बात बताई—लेकिन जाते जाते उनका इरादा कुछ दूसरा ही हो रहा था।

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

यदि जिस चीज का हवाला साथी भूपेश गुप्ता ने दिया है उसको मान लिया जाय तो मेरी समझ में आज अगर रूस में या चीन में यहां तक कि कण्टिलिस्ट देश अमेरिका में भी इस तरीके से भूपेश गुप्ता जी के प्रस्ताव को माना जाय तो साथी भूपेश गुप्ता उस तरह से हाउस में नहीं बैठ सकते थे जिस तरह बैठे हुये हैं और उनका समर्थन करने वाले लोग भी जहां तहां नहीं रहते।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where shall we sit? I will be there.

श्री शील भद्र याजी : इसकी वजह यह है कि यहां तो कांग्रेस के सदस्य ८० लाख हैं। अगर और देशों की तरह की हुकूमत यहां भी होती तो बड़ी बड़ी पोस्टें हमारी पार्टी के हाथ में दे दी जाती। नौकरी और शासन प्रबन्ध की बात तो आप छोड़ दें, और जगहों में दूसरी पार्टियों को गैर कानूनी भी करार दिया जाता है। कांग्रेस के हाथ में हुकूमत आने के बाद यदि कांग्रेस वही काम इस देश में भी करती जिस तरह रूस और चीन में वहां की शासनाखंड पार्टियाँ ने किया है तो ऊपर से नीचे तक कांग्रेस की पार्टी के लोग हुकूमत के अन्दर होते। मैं इस चीज का बहुत हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ। हालांकि साथी भूपेश गुप्त उसका विरोध करते और जो प्रस्ताव वे आज लाये हैं उसको नहीं लाते। उन्होंने अपनी स्पीच के दौरान में बहुत सी बातें कही हैं। जो बातें उन्होंने शासन प्रबन्ध या सरकारी कर्मचारियों के बारे में कही, उनके बारे में जवाहरलाल जी के नेतृत्व में वर्तमान कांग्रेस सरकार की भी यही कोशिश रही है कि शासन प्रबन्ध को ठीक किया जाय। लेकिन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में जिस तरह मन्द गति से काम हो रहा है, उसके बारे में मैं समझता हूँ कि भूपेश गुप्त हमसे मतभेद नहीं रखेंगे। लेकिन, अगर आज उसके फलस्वरूप किसी की बदनामी होती है तो कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट की होती है और आफिशियल्स की और कर्मचारियों की चल दनती है। ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के वक्त जो शासन प्रबन्ध की मैशीनरी थी, मैं कहता हूँ कि वह विकृत और गलत मैशीनरी थी। उस मैशीनरी में कुछ सुधार तो जरूर हुआ है, और बहुत से अच्छे लोग उसमें लाये गये हैं। मैं आपसे और खास तौर से गृह मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जो इतने योग्य लोग, बुद्धिजीवी लोग, त्यागी और तपे तपाये लोग पड़े हुये हैं उनका समुचित उपयोग क्यों नहीं करते? आज एक मामूली सी

सिचन कमेटी बनती है, तो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर, लेजिस्लेटर्स वगैरा तो उसमें होंगे लेकिन उनसे ज्यादा और अच्छी राय देने वाले उन लोगों को उसमें हम नहीं ला सकते। आज हमें इर्षा बात की जरूरत है। इस प्रस्ताव की मंशा के मुताबिक एक कार्य करने की जरूरत है। इसमें किसी पार्टी को लाने का सवाल नहीं है। आज सारे देश में समाजवाद की चर्चा है और हमने अपन इस नीति की घोषणा लोक सभा में कर दी है। तमाम पार्टियाँ हमारे देश में हैं और सबसे बड़ी पार्टी कांग्रेस भी समाजवाद के लिये प्रयत्नशील है। चाहे सोशलिस्ट पार्टी हो, चाहे हिन्दू महासभा हो, या जनसंघ हो, सब की एक स्वर से जब यही आवाज कि देश का आदर्श, देश का अकीदा, देश का सिद्धान्त समाजवाद हो इस व्यवस्था में हमारे शासन प्रबन्ध और अफसरों में नीचे से ले कर ऊपर तक परिवर्तन लाने की आवश्यकता है। वे सुधर नहीं रहे हैं, और काम में उतने सहायक नहीं हो रहे हैं, इसको आपको, ट्रेजरी बैंक वालों को सोचना है, विचारना है। आपके चार सौ, पांच सौ आदमी पार्लियामेंट में जा सकते हैं, एसेम्बलियों में जा सकते हैं लेकिन उनसे काबिल आदमी, हमारे ८० लाख आदमी जिन्होंने गोлияं खाईं, लाठियां खाईं उनका उपयोग हम नहीं कर सके हैं। इसलिये साथी भूपेश गुप्त ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसका भाव तो बहुत सुन्दर है परन्तु उस बारे में कुछ सोचने और विचारने की जरूरत है। पंडित जी कह चुके हैं कि, हम समाजवाद लाने के लिये लोगों का हृदय परिवर्तन कर रहे हैं, उनको देशभक्त बना रहे हैं। लेकिन वे लोग जो समाजवाद की परिभाषा ही नहीं जानते वे समाजवादी क्या बन सकते हैं। लेकिन उनकी ट्रेनिंग होनी चाहिये। जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विस करने वाले होने हैं उनकी ट्रेनिंग होती है, उनकी समाजवाद में शिक्षा देने के लिये भी ट्रेनिंग होनी चाहिये, और उसके लिये पोलिटिकल लीडर को जाना चाहिये।

आपने इंडियन सिविल सर्विस के श्री गोरवाला का नाम सुन लिया है। तो उन्होंने क्या किया आप जानते ही हैं। ऐसे लोगों से काम चलने का नहीं है। आज बड़े बड़े पोलिटिकल लीडर्स और कांग्रेस की बड़ी भारी फौज है। मैं कहता हूँ कि आज जब समाजवाद की बात आई है और कांग्रेस ने उसको मान लिया है तब हमारे जो साथी अलग बैठे हैं उनको अलग बैठने की जरूरत नहीं रह जाती। जितने भी समाजवाद चाहते हैं वे सब साथी आ जायें, चाहे कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त की पार्टी के हों, चहे प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के हों। यह चीज है जिसको कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट को करना है क्योंकि कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि हम अपनी पंचवर्षीय योजना के द्वारा देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना करेंगे। लेकिन हम तब तक उस समाजवाद की स्थापना नहीं कर सकते जब तक कि हम मौलिक परिवर्तन नहीं करेंगे। और मौलिक परिवर्तन सिर्फ आफिशियल्स से नहीं होगा, दिल और दिमाग के परिवर्तन की भी जरूरत है और उसके लिये जितनी भी हमारे यहां पार्टियां हैं जो समाजवाद में विश्वास करती हैं उनको एक साथ बैठ कर काम करना होगा। इसलिये कामरेड गुप्त ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, ऊपर से देखने में उसमें बहुत सुन्दर भाव है, लेकिन उस पर बोलते हुये जब वे आगे बढ़ गये तो मैंने समझा कि शायद कुछ खतरा है क्योंकि इस प्रस्ताव के सहारे वे कुछ दूसरी चीज की पहल करना चाहते हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Vote for my speech.

श्री शील भद्र यात्री : प्रस्ताव और स्पीच दोनों को ही मैं साथ मिला कर आपका सच्चा इरादा बताना चाहता हूँ।

तो उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव के महत्व को मैं समझता हूँ। जवाहरलाल जी के नेतृत्व में हम उसी दिशा में काम तो कर रहे हैं, लेकिन उसमें और आगे बढ़ने की जरूरत है क्योंकि यदि हम प्रस्ताव की मंशा के मुता-

बिक काम करे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा जो समाजवाद की स्थापना का मूल ध्येय है, उसे प्राप्त करने में हम समर्थ हो सकेंगे। हमारे देश में बहुत से योग्य, प्रतिभाशाली लोग पड़े हुये हैं, उनको हमें उचित रूप से काम में लगाना है। आप यह कानून बना दीजिये कि ६० वर्ष की उम्र हो गई या ५५ वर्ष की उम्र हो गई तो फिर सर्विस में दोबारा नहीं लिया जायेगा। अपने देश में जो देश-भक्त लोग बैठे हुये हैं, चाहे वे किसी पार्टी के हों, उन्हें आपको लेना चाहिये। सबसे पहले आप समाजवाद की इन अलग अलग दूकानों को बन्द कीजिये। यदि सम्मुख में हम इस प्रस्ताव के अनुसार काम करना चाहते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एक कांग्रेस के अलावा जितनी भी वर्तमान सोशलिस्ट या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टियां हैं उनको तोड़ दें। ऐसा हो जायगा तो गोरवाला प्रकार के लोग, और भी कैंटिलिस्ट लोग या गुंजिपति स्त्रोत्रों के सब एक तरफ हों और दूसरी तरफ समाजवादी शक्तियां एक हो जायेंगी। मैं समझता हूँ ऐसी अवस्था में कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त की मंशा पूरी हो जायेगी। जैसा मैंने कहा, सरकार तो यह चाहती ही है और जिस तरह से नेहरू जी के नेतृत्व में काम हो रहा है उसमें उनका उद्देश्य पूर्ण हो जायेगा। इस उद्देश्य को पूर्ण करने के लिये शासन प्रबन्ध में परिवर्तन करने की जरूरत है।

साथी भूपेश गुप्त ने अपने भाषण में लाठी चलाने और गोली चलाने की तमाम बातें उठाईं। हमारे गृह मंत्री साहब को तो इस चीज का काफी अनुभव है। वे खुद लाठी के शिकार हैं। आप उनको देखते ही हैं कि किस तरह वे चलते हैं। पुलिस की लाठी की वजह से उनके स्वास्थ्य और शरीर पर यह असर हुआ है।

इन सब चीजों को समझते हुये, आज-कल की परिस्थिति को देखते हुये, जिस रूप में यह प्रस्ताव रखा गया है, अगर उसको मान लिया जाये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उपयुक्त नहीं होगा। प्रस्ताव रखने में आपका मतलब

[श्री शील भद्र याजी]

अच्छा है, यह मानते हुये भी आपका भाषण सुनने के बाद मैं इस प्रस्ताव का हार्दिक समर्थन नहीं कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन मैंने सरकार को इस प्रस्ताव के मुताल्लिक कुछ सुझाव दिये हैं, अगर इन सुझावों के मुताबिक काम हो तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के ध्येय की पूर्ति होगी।

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I support this Resolution though I do not agree with all the remarks made by the hon. Member while moving that Resolution. I submit, Sir, that this steel frame of I.C.S. was established by a foreign power to carry on the administration of this country as economically as possible. They were importing the I.C.S. officers in the beginning cent per cent. from the foreign countries. When they came here, they found that they had a separate way of living and a society of their own. They were paid very high salaries to carry on the administration of this country, and because they could send only a few people, there was concentration of power in the hands of those few people. There were about 250 districts of India and there was a Collector in charge of every district who was almost the final authority there. He carried on the entire administration of that district. He was the head of the executive; he was the head of the judiciary; and he was the head of everything, and he carried on the administration there. Collectors were responsible to Commissioners who were in turn responsible to Governors, and the Governors were responsible to the Viceroy. That was the hierarchy. And in that hierarchy when we became independent, so many things were added on. The whole pattern of society changed, but our administration did not change. And so, when I support this Resolution, I will request the hon. Home Minister not to take it that anybody supporting this Resolution is criticising all I.C.S. or I.A.S. officers. We do not say that

they are inefficient. Our criticism is against the system itself. Some of the I.C.S. and I.A.S. officers are good officers. They are carrying on their work very diligently and are carrying on very well, but they cannot help the system. They are put in a system. If certain defects have crept into the system, they can only be removed by reshaping or remodelling the whole system.

Sir, in our present condition economic matters have become very important. We have got now nationalised industries. Before 1947, excepting the Railways, there were no nationalised industries. Now even in the private sector almost all the industries have been controlled. You have a set of officers for controlling those industries; you have a set of officers for controlling and managing the industries in the public sector. Then, Sir, ours is a Federal Constitution. We have got the States; the States have got elected Members, and it is the States and the State Governments that are directly responsible for the welfare of the people. They come in direct contact with the people. And therefore it is very essential that we should take account of these changed conditions and try to remodel our administrative system at the Centre as well as in the States and the Districts right up to the bottom. The mover of the Resolution pointed out that the Government took advice from Mr. Gorwala, brought in Mr. Appleby from the U.S.A. and also the Government took advice from the late Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar in regard to the details of this administrative machinery. He also suggested certain changes in it, but so far no drastic consideration seems to have been given to the fundamental changes in the administrative set-up of our country. We have been just adding on. A new department is opened and a new set of Secretaries is added on. At the present moment, Sir, the number of Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and Under Secretaries—and I suppose there are some more names by adding prefixes

—is at least ten times what it was in 1947 is the Government fully convinced that there is justification for this ten-fold increase? If the Departments have increased, there is no doubt bound to be a certain increase in the number of officers. But is the Government justified in having this ten-fold increase? Is the Government satisfied that the present recruitment of IAS officers is suitable for manning the economic service which has been introduced now? The hon Home Minister will perhaps reply that they are considering the matter and that a new Service is going to be started. But at the present moment people are being recruited who are not suited for this economic side of our administration. The result is that we have competitive examinations, and on the results of those competitive examinations recruitment is made. And in that recruitment adequate consideration is not given whether the candidates, even after subsequent training, will be suitable for running the industries in the public sector or for managing and controlling the industries in the private sector under the Industries (Control and Development) Act. That is one side of the administration.

In the States also, Sir, the same pattern is being followed, and the same IAS officers are being taken there. I agree with Mr Bhupesh Gupta that the salaries paid to these ICS and IAS officers are a little too high. They are out of proportion to the general economic condition of our country. The appointment of a Pay Commission is therefore most essential and that Pay Commission should go into the details of the emoluments given to the various sectors of our administrative services. I submit, Sir, that there may be a covenant with the ICS officers that they should get Rs 4,000 if they reach the grade of a Secretary. But for IAS officers there is no such agreement, and the Pay Commission can certainly revise the maximum salary to be given to them.

SHRI J S BISHT (Uttar Pradesh).
It has been revised.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND. I now, Sir, that an IAS officer can only receive Rs 3,000 even if he becomes a Secretary. But there is a possibility of further reduction. There is no covenant there, and if the Government thinks that the maximum of Rs 3,000 is too much, it can be brought down to about Rs 2,500. But, Sir, my support to this Resolution arises from a completely different point of view. It is decentralisation. I think that in a democracy of our type it is most essential that we should decentralise. I lay the greatest emphasis on this fact that at the district level even now the Collector continues to enjoy the same powers which he enjoyed before the advent of freedom. In some States there has been separation of judiciary from the executive. But in many States the executive and the judiciary are combined. So, even if there is separation of judiciary from the executive, the present Collector, even after this division, will have too many powers.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. I think you will continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P M.

The House adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND. Mr Deputy Chairman, I was saying that at the district level it is very essential that we democratise the administration. The hon Home Minister, when he was the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh introduced the Gram Panchayats, and in many other States also Gram Panchayats have come into existence, but the Gram Panchayats have no fund, they have no finances; they just settle petty quarrels among the villagers. I submit that a begin-

[Shri Kishen Chand.]
ning should be made. These Gram Panchayats should be given fund. It may be 50 per cent. of the land revenue collected in that area, to allow them to carry on the administration of the village according to their wishes and according to the wishes of the villagers. That will be Swaraj. It is not Swaraj for orders to be issued at Delhi and conveyed right down to the village. Only when the villager feels that a large part of his contributions to the revenues of the State, i.e. land revenue, is kept in the village itself and utilised for the improvement of that village, will he feel that there is Swaraj. Then at the district level, there should be district boards and some part of the funds should be placed at their disposal. They can manage those areas which are small urban areas according to the wishes of the citizens living in those areas.

Then I come to the very controversial point regarding the relationship between the police and the civil population of a country. The hon. Home Minister lays great stress on law and order; he thinks that it is the duty of the police to maintain law and order. I beg to submit that it is the duty of every citizen to maintain law and order in a democratic country. The citizens of a country will assert themselves, and if there are any excesses perpetrated by a small section of the population, the rest of the population would oppose it. During the last 150 years there has not been a single firing in the United Kingdom. After all, there are riots there, there are processions, and I know at least that, when the students of Cambridge and Oxford come there in connection with the boat race, they do plenty of rioting in the city of London. They loot many shops and yet we never hear that the police fires. In all democratic countries the police never fires on the civil population. In our country, the citizen thinks that it is the duty of the police to look after law and order, and

the hon. Home Minister very vehemently supports this idea that it is the duty of the police to do this. I submit that, if in one or two cases the police is withdrawn and if the crowd or the mob commits excesses, the rest of the population after a few days will assert themselves and subsequently a tradition will grow up that the police will not be required to keep law and order. The police is a help, but it should not take control of the entire situation in their own hands. If there is co-operation from the public, I am sure that very soon a healthy spirit will grow up, the rest of the citizens will assert themselves and will not need the protection or help of the police, but we do not want to try it. Whenever there is the slightest demonstration or just a procession is going to the house of a Minister, the police will surround it, and the very presence of the police creates a clash. If we do not want a clash to grow, the best way is to withdraw the police. I know that in the beginning there may be one or two excesses, but after one or two such experiences, the civil population will realise their responsibility, will assert their rights and will see that every demonstration is peaceful. Unless that experiment is tried, we are not going to get any better results.

Regarding the number of employees in the civil administration, hon. Members know that the cost of the civil administration is going up. New departments are being opened. We agree that in a welfare State new departments are bound to be opened, but the number of persons employed for doing a job is very much in excess of the requirements. I believe that the present scale of the lower paid staff is low. If we increase it, the cost will go up unless we reduce the number. I submit that it will be far better if there is about 33 per cent. reduction in the strength of the staff but the salary is increased by 25 per cent. The result will be that the lower grade staff will be paid better, will bear greater responsibi-

lity and will perform their duties in a better way. That is possible within the present means of the Central Government only if we increase the salary but reduce the number. This will not increase the work-load on the clerical staff, because at present there is too much unnecessary notings and transfer of files from one table to another.

I will in conclusion say that this resolution does not criticise. Our I.A.S. officers and it does not criticise the Home Minister. This resolution only suggests that after freedom new problems have arisen, there is a new structure of society where the aim is to establish a socialistic society, with decentralisation right down to the district and village level, and therefore the Committee suggested by this resolution should be very welcome. This Committee is going to carefully examine the various requirements of the Central Government and State Governments and make proper suggestions.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should like to say that I find some difficulty with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's resolution. The resolution is a very comprehensive one, and the Committee he would like to be set up will have to deal with a number of matters; it will have in fact to deal with the whole structure, organisation, recruitment, of our administration. I think that is a stupendous task for any Committee. It is a task which no one Committee can perform. This does not mean that the question of our administrative structure or the future administrative structure should not be considered by us from the angle of our declared objective of a socialistic pattern of society. That does not mean that the question of our district administrative structure should not be considered by us from the point of view of certain fundamentals which underlie democracy. In the old days we had a system of Government which was of a personal character. You had

the Governor-General at the top who was responsible to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State was responsible to the people of another country, to the Parliament of another country. You had Governors who were responsible to the Governor-General. You had the District Officer who was responsible to the Governor or, to be more accurate, through the Commissioner to the Governor or the Governor-in-Council. Then you had the Sub-Divisional Officer who was responsible to the District Officer and so on. The District Officer was a person who had to perform multifarious functions. He was the agent or representative of the Government of the day in his district. He had to coordinate all the activities of the administration in his district. He was the head of the magistracy, he was the head of the police because the Superintendent of Police was ultimately responsible to him. He was the supervisory head as it were of the Health Department. He had a say in the Education Department, in the P.W.D. and practically every Department was under his control or was ultimately under his control. Then he had to supervise the administration of the local bodies and he could recommend the suspension of municipal or district or local boards.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): Before that they were Chairmen also.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: At one time they were Chairmen of these boards also. Now that system was all right for days when we had no democracy but today we are working a democratic system of Government and it is necessary for us to consider the question of whether this pattern fits in with the new structure of society that we are hoping to build up. That is a very large question. I have no doubt that Government is alive to the urgency and importance of this problem. They must have given consideration to it and I was intrigued the

[Shri P. N. Saprū.]

other day to find that in our State there is a proposal that the office of the District Officer should be abolished. Now I don't like to dogmatise on that point. My mind is such that it works in democratic channels and I am not very much in love with the concentration of authority in a single hand. I think what we want is a system which would substitute Departmental control over these various departments and make it unnecessary for us to have the District Officer in the way that he used to function in the old days. Possibly it might be desirable for us to think in terms of a District Council either elected directly or indirectly representing the various sections of the people and the District Officer would, in that event, be the Executive Officer of this District Council. These are just tentative suggestions. Anyway, the District Officer need not be the head of the Magistracy. I think it is undesirable that he should continue to combine the executive with the judicial function but more urgent than all these problems is that of enlisting popular enthusiasm and support for the Second Five Year Plan. The success of the Second Plan depends upon the enthusiasm that we are able to generate in the common man for that Plan. I was rather glad for that reason that our specific attention has been drawn to this very important problem by Mr. Anup Singh and some other Members in a separate resolution which I am glad to see, has not been barred by this resolution.

Take this question of decentralisation of administration. We should like to see that our administration is decentralised to as much an extent as possible but it is essential for us to remember one important thing. Planning on a nation-wide scale inevitably leads to centralisation. So far as the plan itself is concerned, it cannot be a decentralised plan. The plan will have to be thought out, will have to be framed by some central directing

planning authority. So far as the execution of that plan is concerned, it may be left to local agencies or State agencies but there again power will have to be reserved to see that the objects of the Plan are carried out and we cannot allow decentralisation to go to the extent of imperilling the execution of the plan.

Then you do need good services in any democratic country. How those services should be recruited, on what basis they should be recruited, what the requirements for recruitment should be—those are matters which may need further consideration but it would be a sad day for this country if we ceased to have regular civil services. The civil services have a very important, a very useful purpose to discharge in a democracy. Democracy is Government by the expert and by the amateur. We supply the amateur element in a democracy and the services supply the expert element in a democracy and it is co-operation between the amateur and the expert that is needed in order to make a democratic Government successful. A civil servant has to carry out orders. He may have his own political convictions.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): Order from the amateur has to be carried on by the experts—is it?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Yes. That may not be so in the Utopia of the Soviet land but that is so in every democratic country. My friend may turn to any elementary book on democracy and he will find that one of the best definitions of democracy is that it is a Government of amateur plus expert. That is how Sydney Low, in a famous classic on the Governance of England describes the Government of England. I think that you do need your experts and you do need your amateurs. I say this because we know that this House has got a lot of talent, it has got a lot of wisdom and the other House has got a lot of talent and wisdom and we represent a

cross-section of the community and we can bring to bear upon our task of formulation of policies a more comprehensive mind Lord Morley on one occasion said that he had never heard of any reform emanating from the Civil Services That is perfectly true but it is equally true that no reform has been carried out without the aid or assistance of the Civil Service Therefore, Mr Deputy Chairman, in the form in which this resolution has been worded, it is not possible for me to support it But underlying this resolution is the desire that the whole question should be viewed from new angle and I have no doubt that the Home Ministry and the other Ministries are alive to the urgency of this problem In fact, I know that in addition to our existing civil services, our Ministries are thinking in terms of a new industrial pool which will provide a body of economic civil servants to our country Therefore it is not possible for me for these reasons to give support to this resolution

SHRI H D RAJAH Sir, I am in general sympathy with the resolution sponsored by Mr Bhupesh Gupta The resolution is of such fundamental importance that it requires very serious consideration at the hands of this House and 15 minutes and one day are not enough to tackle this problem The problem is such a serious one that if the whip is removed and Congressmen are allowed to vote as they liked, I am certain this resolution would be passed

We have to go into the history of the whole governmental structure

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA But then we have got the press button democracy

SHRI H D RAJAH I am coming to that press button democracy

If we give serious thought to this problem I have no doubt in my mind that many of our friends on the Congress side, those on the Government side, will agree with me But

our difficulty is something like this I sympathise with the Government and their attitude in life, because the Congress Party never fought the British to get the freedom They got it as a gift If the British fellows had been thrown into the sea and those fellows who supported their regime in this country had also been equally thrown into the sea, then the concept and the structure of the Government would have been fundamentally different But we did not win freedom by a revolution We won freedom by a gift and that too in a shameful way, by partitioning this country Some civil servants went over to the other side and they created a hell of a problem to us, and the remaining civil servants are in charge of our Government But these civil servants, the people were afraid of They were never near the people The civil servant was a hobgoblin and the people and the civilians had no contact with each other at any time in the history of our evolution in this country Now, what shall we do? Congressmen who have got into this Government are in a dilemma They want to run with the hare and hunt with the hound They want to please the people and get their votes At the same time they have to keep up their guarantees to the British that the steel frame in this country will be protected They are today in this dilemma It is very difficult for them to adjust themselves to the requirements of the people And in this hellfare, I mean, this welfare State, we have to consider various aspects that are introduced by the bureaucratic system which is developing and which is increasing like an octopus Sir, you know there are some women and some men in our country who grow beyond their capacity to reach certain portions of their body by their hands, and I do not call that a healthy development It is in the same way that our bureaucracy is expanding Last time when I spoke in this House I said that Rs 83 crores were added to the establishment of the bureaucracy in one year Nevertheless my hon friend Shri Chandu-

1401 Committee of Experts [RAJYA SABHA] present Administrative Machinery of Government 1402
to examine the

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

lal Parikh said that that was inclusive of the salaries and other things payable under the Five Year Plan structure. Whatever the plan and whatever may be the structure the amount is Rs. 83 crores and brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, husband's brothers and so many other "in-laws" of these bureaucrats get themselves entangled and get into the governmental body. People like to be government servants. Why? Because they need not work and yet they can earn their salary on the 1st of every month. In a private institution you can never expect such things to happen. In a private institution, they will be made to work and they will earn their salaries. But so far as the bureaucrat is concerned, he need not work and he can earn his salary. It is very difficult even if my hon. friend Mr. Pant wants, to recast the structure and bring about a different system of administration. He will find it very difficult. Then what is the solution?

The solution is certainly decentralisation of power. How can we decentralise? You cannot do it merely by patching up here and there. We have to go into the fundamental structure of our society and thus have a Government which will meet the requirements of that society. How can we have real servants to serve the people? For that, you must build up democracy from the bottom and not build it from the top; not by a unitary system of governmental with government officials administering their commands, officials who are spread all over the country. To get an answer from the Government a man has to wait six months and that is not a democratic set up in the country. You cannot do service to the people in that way. At the village level, then the taluka level and then the district level and then at the State level, at all these levels, the administrators must be set up and then they can be easily approached by the public. Then the people will not have to wait for them.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Does my hon. friend agree with the Lohia ideology or scheme?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I will come to my hon. friend later.

Sir, there is a magazine published by our Government, called "Kurukshetra" which deals with community projects and all that. In it they had put in a beautiful cartoon which I saw and which I liked immensely. The collector of a district wants to know why others had not come to see him. He has taken charge only about four days back and yet he stands in front of his table and asks, "How is it that the people have not come and seen me yet and paid their obeisance?" That means that in the district the collector is the monarch, that when the collector comes and takes charge, the others must go to him and pay their obeisance to him. He does not invite the people for a conference. He does not ask them, "What are your grievances?" He does not understand, unless a petition comes to him. But how can a petition get to the collector unless through hundred channels?

Under the old British structure, the collector was the monarch of the district. There was no cohesion between the people and the administrator. If you want to develop the administration in the way it has to be done, then you must scrap these guarantees that you have given to these officers. There is the fundamental issue of corruption charge being proved against an officer and yet the Minister in charge cannot dismiss him. It will take time for them. And if he is dismissed he has various avenues by which that dismissal can be reversed. For example, if a civil servant misbehaves, under the rules and guarantees that this Government have given them that civil servant cannot be dismissed unless some other important steps are taken to get him out of it.

Secondly the people who serve under the civilians, their mentality is

one mentality of the British boss. It is inconceivable in this generation to change that feeling among the officers. They are trained up in that way. If I want to take tea I sit in a particular place and take my tea. It is very difficult for me to get rid of that habit and sit anywhere else and take my tea. In the same way, these bureaucratic rulers whom we have continued are still giving directions to such officers and so long as those directions are continued, they cannot think freely or independently themselves and dispose of even a single petition on its merits.

I will tell you about the officers and their work. When I send a petition to an officer, that man
3 P.M. probably signs it and then sends it down. It goes to the Under Secretary. From the Under Secretary it goes to the Superintendent of the branch who sends it on to the clerk. The clerk then puts up a note on that and that note goes up to the top and then I get a reply after six months. The idea of work is totally inconceivable so far as our officers are concerned. I had occasion to visit a few countries, really democratic countries. There, the officer does not require the Under Secretary to come and guide him. He deals with me immediately; he types out a letter by his own hand, seals it and gives it to me so that I can go to the man concerned and get my requirements attended to immediately. That is one thing. The public and the bureaucracy is one there; there is no difference but that difference is still maintained here by my erstwhile colleagues, the present Congressmen in service. This difficulty has to be removed but the point is, how is it to be removed? If you want to remove it, you have to take into account aspects of a political nature. They should not have too much power in their hands. The Central Government must be confined to main subjects like Defence, Foreign Affairs, Communications and currency. To that extent, they can have their officers and with the help of these officers, who are responsible to each

other and responsible to the public, their work can be done smoothly and honestly. There should be devolution of power. You must have zones in which will be three or four States together. In these zones, the economic needs of the States, their political needs, industrial needs and other needs of a far-reaching type, should be attended to by the Zonal Parliaments. Then we come to the State level. The State is concerned, in the true sense of the term, with the welfare of the people, and the primary responsibility of the States is to attend to the requirements of the people through the Legislative Assembly Members. These Assembly Members must be given work in such a way that they will be in day to day touch with the people. The officers must attend to their needs and comforts in a proper way. Of course, there will be abuse of power to some extent but that abuse is far-outweighed by the benefits the people will get and the employees of the Government who will attend to their requirements. We talk so much in the House but may I know who has constructively produced something, of course except children, positively adding to the wealth of this country? Have we spent even one hour in our garden so that some brinjals may grow or something else may grow? In the same way, our talk in Parliament of the work of an administrative office full of red-tape, is not producing any wealth for this country. If each man is employed in a constructive channel of that type, if each of us does an hour's manual labour, we will really produce something, some wealth. Otherwise, it will be mere administration on paper. Administration should be in line with the wishes of the people, in line with their fundamental wishes. They should get to know the difficulties of the people. If that kind of a concept is put in the minds of the officers, even the present set of officers can be transformed. Gandhiji believed in the transformation of the mind and change of heart in an individual. However great the opponent may

[Shri H D Rajah]
he tried to persuade him and convert him I am not in favour of dismissing the present officers and having a new set of officers. It is not possible but we should try and convert them in the proper way so that from the police state you can become a really welfare state and your officers will be of service to the people who need your services.

My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, talked about the salaries which are high. Of course, the salaries of the civil servants and those next to them are high but how can you consider them high when its value is only one-fifth of what it was in the British days? The four thousand rupees of today is worth only Rs 800 of those days. I have heard what Mr. Nehru said in regard to that matter. In the Congress meeting once he said that he Rs 2500 which they were drawing today was equivalent to only Rs. 500 of the Karachi Resolution but do you apply the same principle in the case of your subordinates? A man who was getting Rs. 50 should be given Rs 250. If you do that, then the Government servants will be satisfied and will not be hungry. If you apply that principle uniformly to the entire body of servants, then the man who was getting Rs. 30 in 1939 or 1940 should get Rs. 150 but are you paying him Rs 150 today? It should be five times the unit of a single rupee and it should be uniformly applied from the lowest to the highest strata. If you do that then it would be sensible and then people would say that Government is really democratic. You cannot have disparity in wages in such a way that the lower strata of the Government servants are always cheated and are in a position to put the entire nation at ransom while you people get away drawing immense salaries. That is morally wrong. We have to find out a method by which a contented staff will always be at your disposal for the service of the people and not bosses of them.

Then, Sir, finally, the question is how to implement this resolution, of course if the Government and the Congress Party accept it. I have no doubt that their minds are with us but their physical bodies are with another institution. They will not be able to speak the truth; they will not be able to help us and they will not be accepting good ideas given to them because of their inherent weakness and their difficulties in life. I sympathise with them but then the people should not suffer. They should be given a chance to feel that the Government and the people are not two different structures; they should feel that the structure is sound, that their voices will be heard and that there will not be any difficulty in the way of an officer helping them in a proper way. This is the way in which this resolution must be put. I wish, Sir, that this resolution had also said, "That with a view to implementing these points that are put in there, the Committee is also empowered to go into the structure of Government and try to reform it." It would have been better if it had been put that way but in the absence of any such clause in the resolution, this resolution must be accepted by my hon. friends on the other side. They will not lose anything but, on the other hand, they will gain much more and by gaining much more, they will gain the confidence and the support of the entire mass of humanity of our sub-continent.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH (RAJASTHAN) :
Mr Deputy Chairman, I do not agree with what my learned friend opposite said just now. He said that the minds of the Congress people are with him; true it is but we exercise our power a bit more rationally and want to know what will be the effect of the resolution that we are going to adopt in this House. The resolution, as the hon Mr. Sapru, pointed out, is of a very momentous character and of a very comprehensive nature and it is hardly possible that we can do justice to such a resolution in fifteen minutes or in one day that is

at the disposal of the House Therefore Sir, when we are discussing this very important problem, a problem which is of a very fundamental character, we must look before and after and we must also weigh all the pros and cons of the problem Mr Bhupesh Gupta quoted extensively from the Autobiography of Pandit Nehru and the writings of Mahatma Gandhi I think he was needlessly labouring on that because, so far as the subject, that we want to effect some change in the administrative machinery of our country, is concerned, I think the Government of India is already seized of the problem If we look to the history of the last seven or eight years, we will come to the conclusion that in these years, the Government have invited expert opinion from several people about the reform of the administrative machinery This fact goes to show that the Government is alive to the problem and that it is going to put in action what it feels The only thing that I want to point out in this connection is that we must tackle this problem not in a piecemeal way but that we should take an overall view of the situation and try to do justice to the problem At the same time we should see how this administrative system which we inherited from the Britishers was evolved, what are its chief characteristics and how it needs to be modified in the present circumstances Sir, the present administration that we have in this country is the gift of Akbar and the East India Company It was Akbar who evolved this sort of administrative system for this country and Akbar, as you know, lived in the Middle Ages Now what were the special characteristics of the Middle Ages? We must bear that in mind and I seek the indulgence of the House to read a portion from what Dr Tara Chand writes He says, "For example, the State was the person of the ruler, and the person was the leader in war, the final arbiter in justice, the maker of law Naturally there were limitations, largely provided by religion, yet it remains

true that the person was the centre round whom revolved the will of the State and society The history of the Middle Ages is therefore the story of the many colourful personalities which dominated its periods" This was the chief characteristic of the Middle Ages and the administrative system which was evolved by Akbar naturally carried these traits The East India Company when it came, the Britishers, in a pragmatic way adopted this system to the changing conditions of the country, but the main concern, mind you, was the maintenance of law and order We of course now have adopted the democratic system and we must certainly make fundamental changes in the administrative system to suit the democratic needs of the time Sir, as I just told you, this is a very vast subject and it should not be expected that I can give a detailed analysis of the problem or the solutions that I have in my mind Moreover I think that many learned speakers in this House are going to partake in this debate and they will throw more light on the subject than I can possibly do But in the short time at my disposal I would like to bring two or three facts to the notice of this House and then I shall take my seat

Now, Sir, we are talking of the community projects and we say that India has started a unique experiment in the work of community development and we are just proud of that But have we cared to know that this Community Projects Administration at the village level has yet three completely different agencies? There is the Vikas Mandal, there is the panchayat and there is the old Nambardar or Choudhury system or whatever you call it So there are the three agencies in the village panchayat, the Vikas Mandal and the Nambardar, and the fourth agency is that of the police Now how can you have effective village administration when there are three conflicting agencies working in the same village? It is in the interests of the development of the country that we have one unified

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

agency working in the village, the same village panchayat responsible for the Vikas Mandal, the same village panchayat responsible also for the collection of revenue and I think, Sir, there is much force in the argument when we say that the collection of revenue at the village level should be given over to the panchayat, and they should be allowed to retain a certain portion of that revenue with them.

Now, reference has been made by some speakers on that side that so far as the functioning of the panchayats in U.P., etc., are concerned, there is too much of interference by the appointed secretaries. Well, I don't come from U.P. and I do not have much knowledge of that, but one word of caution that I want to give is that many panchayats are as yet not so efficient as to understand the full significance of the tasks that are assigned to them, and in that case they certainly require the services of the secretary to guide them. My observations should not of course lead you to believe that I say that the secretaries should be allowed to interfere in the free exercise of the rights of the elected representatives. That should be there but, for some time to come, to guide these panchayats we certainly require the services of these secretaries.

Then, Sir, we should have district boards at the district level, and we should give them more power. In fact it has been suggested somewhere in U.P.—I think it was by Dr. Sampurnanand—that we should have district councils also. I have not gone deep into that matter; neither have I full literature with me here. But I think that this is a move in the right direction. Ultimately we should move towards decentralisation. This is a right move which I commend for the consideration of the Government and this House.

There was then, Sir, a suggestion that there was too much interference of police and police should also be

under local bodies. The example of Europe was put before us. Well, so far as the ideal is concerned, it is very good but, Sir, one thing we must remember and we cannot be oblivious of the fact and the extent to which violence and rowdyism has entered into our public life now-a-days. We say that we want to control the police. We hear of satyagrahas, we hear of rowdyism and we hear of agitations of various types. I do not want to name any State or States but there are agitations everyday going on and lakhs and lakhs rupees worth of public property is destroyed by the goonda elements. But I am quite sure, Sir, that all this is not the action of goondas, on their own. But the hand of political parties is clearly visible behind all these rowdy elements. Now political parties do not want to adjure violence; they are not wedded to the theory of non-violence. As such if we want to do away with police it will be suicidal for the country. They want that the police should be under local bodies and we should have the ideal of Europe before us. If so, Sir, a corresponding responsibility lies on everyone of us, whether one belongs to any political party or not, or is an ordinary citizen, that we also adjure violence in our everyday life and we follow constitutional methods for the redress of our grievances or for the attainment of our objectives. First we deserve, then we desire. The unfortunate fact of the Indian political conditions to-day is that many of us, though we say that we follow non-violence, are not actually observing that creed as an article of faith with us, and the so called satyagrahas are simply *duragrahas*. It is leading the country to disruption and when such are the conditions to-day you certainly cannot make over the police to the local bodies. If you do that you will wrought havoc on the Indian community and the future historian will never forgive you.

Now, Sir, there are two aspects of our administration. One is district and one is central. The time at my disposal is short and so I would just

say a few words about the Central Secretariat. I clearly do not like and I am not glad at the multiplication of the posts of secretaries and the enlargement of the army of clerks. It is not a sign of efficient or good work and if I may be permitted I will give you a story of some Indian State, coming as I do from Rajasthan, which will throw a flood of light on this administration aspect. The story I am telling you is that of an Indian Prince. The name of the State does not matter. He was very fond of horses, and because he was fond of horses he used to give milk to the colts. Then some of the persons went and reported to the Maharajah that such and such officer who 'is' in charge of the stable 'takes' away a bucketful of milk from the cauldron. The Maharajah appointed another officer. He also did the same thing. On hearing this yet another officer was appointed and this went on, and each one of the officers who was appointed began to take one bucketful of milk. The result was that corruption increased. One day the Maharajah himself went to inspect the stable. The officers came to know of this and they began to think what they should do to meet the situation, to make good the quantity of milk since a bucketful of milk had been appropriated by the officers from out of the total quantity. They decided on the plan and they poured an equal quantity of water into the cauldron. When so doing in went a frog along with the water. When the Maharajah during his inspection noticed the frog he asked, "What is this?" The reply was, "This is your administrative reform, Sir." Likewise in our administrative reform by the multiplication of officers we are not going to add to our efficiency in the same ratio. What I am saying is not only a simple story. I can point out to the House the case of irrigation works in one division. Lots and lots of irrigation schemes were completed year before last and they all got breached during the rains in the following rainy season. They were repaired last year and again this year they have breached. What is this? It is sheer scandal. We appoint officers but we do not look

into this simple thing, which we must take note of.

Some days before I went to Calcutta and I visited the firm of a business friend of mine. I saw that the officers there were drawing about Rs. 2,000 or so. But they were all sitting in the hall, not in separate rooms. There was no chaprasi at the time. I saw each of the officers getting up from his seat and bringing water and drinking. If anyone wanted to consult an official he himself went to that official for the purpose, and they were all nearby. Now this is the sort of efficiency in the private sector. We may decry the private sector and we may not like the private sector. But so far as the efficiency of the private sector is concerned, I think, Sir, we should certainly value it.

These are some of the observations, Sir, which I place for the consideration of the House. As far as the resolution is concerned I again repeat that the resolution is of a comprehensive character and we are not going to do justice either to the resolution or to the country by accepting the resolution in the form in which it is. Therefore I think that we should not accept the resolution that has been tabled by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for the reasons that I have adumbrated, not because I am against the spirit of the resolution, neither because I have pledged my physical body to the Congress. There is no question of that pledge. The question is whether we rightly exercise our minds, and in the due exercise of our minds we feel that the resolution in the present form will not do justice either to the country or to the subject which it deals with. Therefore in the interest of the subject itself, in the interest of the country and in the interest of the administration, I think Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should withdraw the resolution.

With these words, I take my seat.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, this resolution

[Shri Govindan Nair.]

though moved by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I expected would be very welcome at the hands of my friends on the other side. Our Prime Minister time and again had lamented about the red tapism in our administrative machinery. So also our Home Minister has admitted that there is lack of democracy and social culture in our administration. Also the Planning Commission has expressed their fear as to whether the administrative machinery would be able to rise to the occasion to fulfil the responsibilities that are left to them. So, I could not find any reason why my friends on the other side should object to such a resolution. The reasons put forward by my hon. friends on the other side, I do not think are tenable. They said that this resolution is comprehensive. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, while he was speaking quoted so many reports which showed that this question has to be tackled in a more comprehensive manner. I will only quote one example. We have the Appleby Report. He had tried to find out certain solutions for the problems confronting the public sector; but we know that that alone cannot find a solution to the problems that are confronting our administration. Now, whatever be our criticism of the administration, it would be wrong on our part if we forget the steady and stabilising influence the Civil Service had in our administration especially at the time of transition. At the same time it would be a mistake on our part, if we forget the traditions in which the entire administrative machinery was built up. This resolution, according to me is rather late. As soon as we got independence, it should have been one of our main responsibilities to have looked into the question in an all-comprehensive manner. Now, as has been pointed out here by many of my friends, we have inherited this administrative machinery from the British imperialists. I need not say that they had built up this machinery with the special purpose of ruling over this country against the interests

of the people here. Now, in a democratic set up we have to re-educate the Civil Service and put them in their proper place. Unfortunately we have not yet attempted that. I will take only one example. Here some of my friends pointed out the role of the police in a democratic set up. Is there any change after we have become independent in the attitude of the police to the people? Now, they are behaving in the same way as they used to do during the time of the Britishers. If there is a popular movement, if there is a popular struggle, in the name of law and order they are sent there. We have trade union laws. There is the Labour Ministry; there is a conciliatory machinery, all at our disposal. Yet if the police are not sent to shoot down the workers we feel that there is loss of law and order. This is a very wrong concept. I do not want to dilate on it because it has been pointed out here that in a democratic country the police are not used to suppress the workers or popular movements. In the same way, what is the relationship of the Civil Service with the ordinary public? I have had reports from very respectable people that if they go for something to an office, the behaviour of the Civil Service is rather very rude. Somehow a feeling has developed among the members of the Civil Service that every man should be taken to be a rogue and every law should be interpreted in order not to help him but to hamper things being got done. This attitude must change. I had a very interesting experience which really shocked me once. Once I went to see a football tournament. On one side were the Services and on the other side some team from some town. The Services were playing excellently, but the entire people who had gathered there were applauding the players on the other side and were shouting down the Services. Though it may appear a very simple thing, to my mind it appears it is very serious, because the relationship that existed between the Civil Services and the people during the time of the imperialists still continues. Neither from

the point of view of the Civil Service nor from the point of view of the people is it a good thing and it has to be mended. How can we do that? Of course, we often hear speeches from our Ministers that the Civil Service should behave decently to people. They should remember that they are the servants of the people. All these things we hear, but all these sermons are not going to improve the situation unless you subordinate the Civil Service to the elected Members. Now, no less a person than Shri Dhebar has said that he wants genuine and real power to be handed to the village panchayats. I start from there. What is the position of the village panchayats and district boards today? In every village panchayat it is the executive officer who is the boss. That should change. Decentralisation at every level is the only solution for either speeding up activities or for democratisation. This matter should deserve the serious consideration of the officers. Much has been said here about the district collector. Why not have an elected district board controlling the collector? The policy making body should be the District Board and the District Collector should act as the Executive Officer. In this way, if people's representatives and the Civil Service are linked together we will be able to get things done in a better way. In the same way, many things which can be entrusted to the panchayats without any difficulty are now taken over either at the State level or at the District level. One thing you should remember is that the most needy are the people at the bottom either in the matter of developmental activities or in the matter of administrative affairs. If the impact of popular opinion is there on the administrative machinery, I think things will improve.

So much has been said about red-tapism. There are so many levels at which power is distributed. They say it is to avoid corruption. But the fact is that it has only contributed to add to corruption. The law of Newton works in the secretariat better than

anywhere else. A thing at rest or in motion cannot either move or rise without an external force. That Law of Motion is applicable in the case of files. When there are so many tables from where these files have to move, the result is that at every table, there should be some external force applied either by way of bribery or any other way of seeking favour. Then only the paper will move on. This can be done away with provided there is a proper division and decentralisation of responsibilities. Things have been said here about Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Under Secretaries, etc. Nobody wants to take the responsibility for taking the final decision. So, the Secretary pushes the paper to the Joint Secretary. He pushes it to the Assistant Secretary. Finally, it is the clerk who decides as to what decision should be taken. It is on his note that every other note is put up. This thing must end. The work should be so divided that some Secretary should be made responsible.

(Time bell rings)

Another aspect is the conflict between the Department and the Secretariat. After the papers go round the Department, again the entire process is repeated at the Secretariat level. All this is causing unnecessary delay in the matter of getting things executed.

Another point which I want to stress is about the new responsibilities that have come up. It has been pointed out by my hon. friends how the administrative reform has ended in a very ridiculous position. Now we are taking up more and more responsibilities in the public sector. But if you examine the working of the public sector, you will find that it is not commendable. Why is it so? In every Government concern, it is the Financial Secretary or the Industrial Secretary who is made the Director. After all, what does he know about the concern? He attends meetings, if I may say, simply for the sitting allowance and the travelling allowance. The moment he leaves the room, he entire-

[Shri Govindan Nair.]

ly forgets the whole thing. So, unless something is done by which this state of affairs is improved, it would be very difficult to run the public sector properly.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it has been pointed out that this resolution is wide and comprehensive in its scope and therefore it cannot be accepted. I agree with this remark. We have discussed similar resolutions and we have discussed in whole the Report of Dr. Appleby. The Mover of the Resolution has, instead of making suggestions for improving the administration, has made some suggestions to undermine the present administration. He has made a virulent attack on the I.C.S. and the I.A.S. people. There are legislative bodies, there are judiciary bodies in the country to control the administration. But the administration can be run only by Civil Service personnel which is appointed on merits. The I.C.S. examination was being conducted in England and many people aspired to become I.C.S. officers because it was the highest post. Many did not get through the examination and the persons who have acquired this distinction. I must say with all due respect to them, deserve our admiration because they had to pass the university examination, pass so many tests and also stand at the top. That is not easy. What is the other way?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are some other brilliant persons.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Yes, Sir. But they are employed on some other activities and some of them are drawing much higher salaries than these people. You must consider this point. That is the main thing. What I am pointing out is that recruitment should be made on merit. That should be the criterion. That test should be observed. But if Shri Bhupesh Gupta wants any other test, he must suggest it. If persons are drawn from any other sphere of life, there will be favouritism. There will be greater corruption

if we have any other method of selection than on merit. He challenged the pay of Rs. 4,000. being given to officers. That is a pay which was covenanted at the time of their appointment. It is not for the Congress Party to break any covenant. The moment we break any covenant, the agreement and the promise that we make at present will also be broken. The present democracy lives on covenant, lives on agreement and the present Party—or any party will enjoy power as long as it observes the covenant. The moment the Communist Party thinks of breaking the covenant, they will lose the sympathy of the whole country. They must understand this. Covenants should be considered and treated as sacred. The pay of Rs. 4,000 of I.C.S. people does not compare with what is now paid to the I.A.S. people. Their pay has been reduced because, looking to our requirements, we proceed in the matter.

Shri Kishen Chand pointed out that we have to manage our own industrial and economic services and all that. Our work has increased ten, twenty or a hundred-fold, and our administration is at a breaking point. We have not sufficient man-power in the country. We have to conduct the present administration with a plan or spending Rs. 1,200 crores a year. That is not an easy thing. We may fail for want of man-power but not by finances. We must remember that Mr. Kishen Chand spoke about administrative personnel, economic personnel and industrial personnel. But can we create industrial and economic personnel in a short time? Have we got institutions to do that? Economic and industrial personnel can be only trained by theoretical training for five years and by practical training for another five years. We shall have to wait for ten years if we want economic and industrial equipment and personnel of the nature that we require and that is needed for our industrial expansion. Such institutions are not existing in our country. There is the Kharagpur Institute and others

also. I have seen and known them and I think they are far below the standard that we require. But we have to do what best we can. We cannot create miracles in our country by desiring to train man-power quickly. We have to import technicians from foreign countries. So, let us not forget this factor. Let us realise that we are unable to extend the public sector on account of want of administrative, economic and technical personnel.

Then, Sir, the other thing is this. It has been pointed out by the Members opposite and by the Communist Members also that the public sector is not running as efficiently as it should be. I submit, Sir, that even for ten years more it will not run efficiently because we have not got the manpower that we require. He himself has said that we cannot appoint a Finance Secretary to work in any factory where economic and administrative skill is required. Of course, he will be able to do that job after learning it for about five years or so. So, if we want to develop our industrial field, I think, Sir, we shall have to leave it to the private sector to play its own part, whatever may be the defects in it.

Now, Sir, another thing is about decentralisation. Complaints have been made with regard to decentralising the administration, that is very important. But decentralisation is not taking place on account of the virulent criticism that is made in Parliament, in the State Assemblies, in the press and elsewhere. The officers are not prepared to take decisions on their own because even if they take certain decisions, they are always challenged. I think, Sir, they are not trusted. If you cannot trust your own officers, you will never be able to do anything great. Is there any organisation, public or private where there is a cent percent efficiency? Certainly not. So, we have to improve whatever things are already existing, and we have to see in what ways we are going to improve those things. The whole permanent service is there. We have

people, social and political workers, who are posted as Ministers. I may say, Sir, that for the last five years the mistakes which our Ministers, either at the Centre or in the States, had made were very great, and we are now suffering on account of those mistakes. But there was no other way out. We could not entrust those things to other people. In the context of our political ideas according to which we wanted to develop our country we wanted only those people. So we must try to improve the situation that we are now faced with.

Now, Sir, with regard to corruption and delay in administration, I agree that in the whole country there is a hue and cry that there is so much delay and corruption. But Sir, we are not taking the measures in the way in which we should. The whole Government is getting unpopular from day to day on that account. Let that fact not be lost sight of by the party in power, because we have undertaken a huge task which is little beyond our capacity. And the trouble now is that every man in these days thinks that he is the most intelligent man in the country. The Indian nature is not to delegate power to others, whether he may be a Minister, a Member or anybody. He thinks that he can do everything himself. There is not that desire or the will to trust others. Therefore I am making one suggestion to the hon. Minister here and that is this.

I suggest, Sir, that each Ministry should be associated with seven Members from the public—five Members of Parliament and two from the public outside. Each Minister must choose seven Members, five from Parliament and two from outside. Similarly in the States also each Minister should choose five Members from the Assembly and two from outside. In that way I think there will be a cadre of about 500 people to work with them.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND (Madhya Pradesh): There should be eight Members on par with Shivaji's Ashta Pradhan.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: May be eight. I am not quarrelling with the number. But the Ministers, I think, do not want to part with power. I do not think that these Members want to enjoy power. . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not even to their Deputy Ministers!

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Let me tell you, Mr. Gupta, that even the Deputy Ministers have to grumble. They are not entrusted with the work which they should be entrusted with. There is no delegation of power. We have less and less decentralisation because each one has a feeling that he is able to do everything in as best a manner as possible. That egoism is there, and when that egoism is there, we cannot succeed in our aims, because we have great problems ahead of us.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Then why appoint Deputy Ministers at all when they grumble?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: We have, to find out the best talent in the country and we have got the best talent and we have appointed them. Sir, it is easy to talk but difficult to replace them.

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: With regard to these 7 members, they should all be in an advisory capacity because they are the members from the public. And then one Secretary should be associated with them for full time to look into the complaints which are brought forward by that body every week, and these seven persons should meet every week along with the Secretary to hear the public complaint or the grievances about corruption and delay. Now that Secretary can go to all the Sections of the Department to find out for himself how things stand and he can then place his report before that body of seven. In this way, Sir, the public will be satisfied and

corruption will be rooted out, because Ministers cannot do all this work themselves. I know that they are handling enormous complaints, oral as well as written. But they are only trusting their own officers. They are trusting them more than the complaints or even their colleagues, the Members of Parliament, because those officers are with them for all the time. That is the unhappy position in which we find ourselves. Therefore if we want to achieve anything really great, this suggestion of mine should be accepted and put into practice.

Then, Sir, with regard to the complaints about many other things, the masses or the public have got so many complaints that letters are not replied to even after two months or three months and in some cases even after six months. And even if a letter is receiving consideration, there is no reply. So, this advisory committee must set a time-limit for the disposal of such complaints. In this way, Sir, corruption and delay will disappear, because when somebody learns that this matter is going to be investigated later on, there will be no corruption and no delay. It is human nature that when a man does not get anything by right methods, he resorts to methods of corruption. Therefore, Sir, if we adopt this measure, it will in the first instance create some difficulty, but once the system is set in motion, we will have absolutely no difficulty, and we can achieve so many things.

Lastly, Sir, about mass enthusiasm for the Plan, which is very important. That is of greater importance because we cannot achieve anything great unless we create mass enthusiasm and mass co-operation in the public. But, Sir, that we are not moving in the right direction of creating mass enthusiasm and mass co-operation. I mean, Sir, that our political party, the Congress, is now occupied in the administration of the States and the Centre. The best talent in the Congress is working at the ministerial level either in the Centre or in the States, and if there is no touch with the masses and the public, what will

happen? When their grievances are not redressed and when nobody can deliver the goods, and when contact is not established, then naturally they will get into the hands of the opposite political parties who will make capital out of these things. Therefore, Sir, I have one suggestion to make that the top-ranking leaders should not continue in offices for long—in the ministerial offices, I mean—in the way in which they are continuing at present. I think one-third of the Members who are enjoying these powers must retire from the ministerial ranks and go to the masses and work with them and thus create public enthusiasm and public co-operation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Like us

SHRI C P PARIKH Sir, it is easy to discharge the work of a Minister, but it is difficult to invoke mass enthusiasm and mass co-operation. No plan of this magnitude or nature can succeed unless there is mass co-operation. And we must practise before we preach. Unless we practise what we preach, we shall not be successful in our aims.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR So, you are supporting this resolution?

SHRI C P PARIKH I entirely oppose it, if you have properly understood me.

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND Sir, I rise to oppose the demand for a committee contained in this resolution, though at the outset I would like to say that I am fully in agreement with the objectives that are stated there and which make it necessary for Government to apply its mind to this question. But I am opposed to this demand for a Committee because I feel this is wholly unimaginative, superfluous and impracticable, and also because the mover of the resolution belongs to a party which has got now the opportunity of showing what they can do in Kerala. We will soon find what they do there, we will be

able to have a taste of it, and then he will have a right to advise as to what should be done.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA But we are in the New Delhi kitchen.

SHRI H D RAJAH But you smother them. What can they do?

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND They have full autonomy they can do what they like.

I oppose this because I feel that the Government is not unaware of the objectives that are mentioned in the five clauses. The fact that the Government has been seized of this problem can be seen by the opposite party only if they care to remember that right from the time this Government came to power, they set themselves to seeing what could be done to create a new set-up. They appointed Mr Gorwala who went into the entire question of the administration, toured the whole country and submitted a report. After that, even though it meant some stigma to call for an expert from another country, they invited Mr Appleby. Certainly we had enough administrators in our own country, enough experienced people both in business and in the official set-up, who could, if they had been required to examine this question, could have done it, but in order to have perhaps the experience of the most forward country in the world today—America, the Government of India asked Mr Appleby to examine the administrative set-up in India, and again after two years they invited him to re-examine the whole position and submit a report.

SHRI H D RAJAH You want foreign experts to be brought here. Shameful.

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND Whatever the Honourable Member was saying, I have no time for answering interruptions like this. I think Mr Rajah has had his say, and that can be replied to. Government, therefore, is fully aware of what the defects are and they are trying to do

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] what they can. If the results are not what they should be, it is not the Government which can be blamed. The people are the Government too, and we the representatives of the people have also to co-operate in seeing that Government's policies are executed and pointing out where the Government is not right in doing what it does. But the real thing is what is mentioned in the last clause of this resolution—promoting popular enthusiasm; that is lacking, and also their conscious participation in nation-building activities, not only among the officials of the Government but also among the people. The causes for this are so complicated that it would be difficult, even after the appointment of ten committees every year to expect any real improvement. The disease is so deeprooted and no magic cure can be found.

The resolution says—decreasing the incidence of corruption.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the remedy?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Everything cannot be said in one sentence. A little patience is required.

Corruption is found even in such places where it would be difficult to imagine, even in the wholesale copying and publishing of books written originally by authors and prescribed for universities. No sooner a book is prescribed by a university, than you find a second or third unauthorised edition published even before the first authorised edition is exhausted, and these people are not caught. We know of corruption in drugs; we know of corruption in grains, exports and imports, where you find things adulterated, or what is put on the surface in a package not being found or what is put on the surface in a package not being found at the bottom. When you find the import of certain parts prohibited, you find that they are being imported in bigger components and then broken up and sold here. You find it in the income-tax department,

in the income-tax evasion. Perhaps it is easier to point out a few sectors where there is no corruption than to point out where there is corruption as the latter list is formidable. It has become more or less such a disease that a little enquiry here or a little enquiry there is not going to remedy the situation. We have set up so many committees, we have had so many reports, but we do not know how to set about implementing those reports. Here I am coming to the remedy.

The remedy, as has been pointed out several times, is to see that the national character of the people changes and that cannot be changed overnight. That has got to be brought about by training, but that training cannot be given to adult men or officers, who are above 30—I should say even above 25. Everyone of us has to see that in every possible place, in the school, in the home, in the clubs, in the playgrounds, we take the opportunity of coming into contact with the youth of the country and putting before them certain ideals, putting before them the ideals of our nationhood and of our being called the best nation in the world, the ideal of their doing their duty by their brothers and sisters, the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society. If this is done, not only by talks but also by practice, I am positive that it would not take more than 8 or 10 years to bring about a complete change in our country's outlook. We will find a complete change. It is said that the son is the father of man, and it will be correct to say that Hitler proved it so and by taking the education of the youth in hand, within a short period of seven years he succeeded in changing the outlook of the country, because it is the children from 7 to 10 and from 7 to 14 who are imbued with certain ideas, are enthusiastic about national aims. They come home and see that their parents also are doing the things which they are taught, and the parents also out of sheer fondness for their children very often fall in line. Then, Sir, it is said—

यद्यदाव त श्रष्टस्तत्तश्चेत ते जन ।
स यत्प्रमाणं कुरुत लोकस्तदनु वर्तते ॥

Not only the big people in a community but the elder people in the house covertly and openly practise some mean or distasteful methods, and the children are not ashamed of copying them. I will give one example. The teachers are not ashamed of avoiding their duty in the class room, they ask the students to learn something by heart and go out to do some private jobs, set questions in examinations on subjects of which they give indication beforehand, or setting questions only on subjects on which written answers have been learnt by heart. Then the students are not afraid of copying in examinations, they go still further, and if in an examination the paper is difficult, they intimidate and even threaten to murder the examiner or do some such ridiculous thing, or 4 P.M. boycott the examination. So what is required today though every Ministry takes a limited view of matters that pertain to it—is for all the Ministries to sit together and find these problems of corruption, and what the delays due to lack of a sense of duty are—that is a kind of corruption, not doing in time the legitimate work that one should do—and they should decide in what way they would help in setting up a new system of education to supplement the present system and provide even the funds that are required through what you might call, provision for youth leagues, clubs and similar things. As far as we, members of the public are concerned, it should be our duty to go sometimes to local schools and encourage the poorly and badly paid teachers, see what they are doing and take interest in what they do, that itself will be a greater incentive than giving one or two chips extra because after all people live not only by bread alone but there are certain things that make up for it. For that, I would suggest that more stress is to be immediately laid on reviewing the educational system of our youth and see-

ing that every young child from the age of 7 to 18 is enthused with the national spirit as we see in countries like China and Russia. I have seen that. It is not only at the point of compulsion or punishment, it may be indoctrination but for the good of the country I don't see that there is anything wrong in indoctrinating the younger generation. We simply carry our ideas of free thinking and education too far by calling disciplinary measure because if that were so, we should not even teach any geometrical axioms for example to our students but leave them to find out or evolve those theories in mathematics and other things. Certain things have to be taken for granted and for that reason, if we do indoctrinate the younger generation with regard to their duties to the country, with regard to doing certain things in a certain way in the present circumstances of the country, there is nothing to be ashamed of that we are trying to force our personality or our thought on the younger generation. So, if for a change the usual stereo-typed budget were to be diverted a little in each Ministry, say, for instance, in the Railways or in Post Offices they spend on different items and probably they give some money for, I think, social education and that social education usually is supposed to be for the adult, but similarly if, for youth education in their own Department some incentive like prizes are there, I am sure that within a short period of 2 or 3 years, we will see the fruits. Similarly the Labour Ministry—the Minister is sitting here—has its fund. I shall mention the Coal-mines Welfare Fund and so many other welfare activities. Similarly there is the I and B Ministry and it is their duty to devote more money by setting up loud-speakers etc in rural areas where people remain in leisure hours. The loud-speakers in the Railways, for instance, are now used only for announcing delays of trains etc but you find in other countries that in the leisure hours, even in trains, opportunity is taken to educate people about such things like 'Don't use the Platforms badly,

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] don't dirty the place etc.' Similarly so many things can be done in our country. If those loud speakers were used in railway waiting halls, so much of education could be given.

Finally the most fundamental thing is this and the State of Kerala can take up this as a tip from the Opposite side, to implement this type of plan in a quicker and a more sure way than the superficial impression that could be created by the appointment of a Committee and report where the suggestions would not go deep enough and the results also would not be enduring.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Thomas.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): When is the hon. Minister going to reply?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is still a large number of speakers. Unless closure is applied, I cannot close the debate.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: We may give some . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You know the rules of procedure.

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Sir, it is quite clear that most of us in this House are in agreement with the Mover of the resolution that there is need for decentralisation, a good deal of it, and for carrying out democracy into actual practice. There is no doubt about that. As for me, I feel very strongly that decentralisation is necessary at several levels. In fact, in the last few years, centralisation has certainly increased, probably more than in pre-Swaraj times, perhaps this is because of the adoption of centralised planning. Planning necessarily involves centralisation and we cannot help it. That is to say, when we carry out the Five Year Plan, its details have to be worked out at the Centre, and its working involves some central control. But it must be said

that centralisation has gone too far and must be reduced; we must somehow make an effort to give the power more into the hands of the people, as we have been promising in the past. We have long been speaking of decentralisation. We often say that we have already achieved political democracy and that only economic democracy remains to be achieved. But this is not true. We must give more power to the people. What happens in democratic countries of the West? The common people play a large part in public administration. In England they have the County Councils, and through them and their committees the whole administration is carried on by the people. Parliament only makes laws. Those are carried out by local bodies. This should be our aim in India, also.

So we all agree that decentralisation is necessary and only by such developments we can control corruption and other evils. But after all, there are many difficulties in achieving this decentralisation immediately. One of these is that in this country we are not a single community unlike in the Western countries or America. Even in America, where there are coloured people also, in most areas we find one people, one community. But here unfortunately in most parts of India, there are several communities, religious divisions, caste divisions and so on, and these are very important factors because these are impediments to democracy, whether in election time or at other times.

This can be seen by looking into the working of co-operative institutions. Why are our co-operative institutions working so badly? We have been working these since 1904 and we have been hoping for the rise of a Co-operative Commonwealth in this country. We hoped much, but except in certain areas, in certain States, we have not made much success. Why? It is because our people in most areas, are not unified, are not working together as a team. This has been enquired into by a Committee—the

Rural Credit Survey Committee—and it has brought out some of the reasons why these have not succeeded. It is chiefly because of these communal difficulties. There is not one community in any place, but there are several communities. The office-bearers from one community have been found to favour their own community too much. Again our sense of responsibility or sense of duty, to the neighbour is not very real.

These defects cannot be rectified in a day. Like the hon. Lady Member who spoke earlier. I am a believer in special training being given to the youths we older men cannot be improved much. We should all welcome the work of the Bharat Sewak Samaj which has been doing useful work in many parts of the country particularly in conducting labour camps, labour weeks and so on, to bring young people together. Just now, an experiment is going on in Kerala—work and orientation camps—probably also in Bengal. That is, young people are brought together, people of different communities, for work and some training. I have been watching them for several months and I find that these people have greatly improved socially. People of the lower classes, must be given encouragement, they must be enabled to come up as leaders. We want more and more leaders. For this, opportunities arise when young people of different communities come together and rub shoulders. When you find out that a fellow being of a lower caste is a good fellow, you give him support and encouragement. In labour camps, I find even Brahmins and other upper class people agreeing to serve under a non-Brahmin or even schedule caste men because they have been eating together, playing together, and working together. We had not been doing this in the past. We have been living separately, each community in its own groove. This change will take some time. But the youth can and should be improved.

In China the youths have been brought together, in a semi-military

way to work the Plan. They form into brigades and they work together and get training also. Millions of them are thus being trained. In fact, they are playing a large part in carrying out the National Plan. Here, in India, we have got the community projects and Extension Blocks, but in these the local youths are not much utilised. The whole thing must be considerably re-oriented. Unless the youths are brought together and given special training in an environment of social mixing leading to some moral improvement, any quick advance will be difficult. I do not want to go into this matter at this juncture. But I may say that merely by abolishing the collector and putting in his place the district board and the local board, things cannot be improved.

The question before us has to be dealt with largely at the State level. In the State of Kerala, a competent committee has been appointed to go into the whole question of the administrative set-up, and to suggest how the administration should be improved, how the panchayats could be strengthened and how the district boards should function. Not much can be done by the Centre tackling this question at this stage. The best thing is to give opportunities to certain States to make these experiments. I may say that States that are educationally advanced should take up this matter first. After all, lack of education is the chief cause for people not being able to take active part in government. Kerala has the highest level of literacy and so in that State may start the first experiment. Bengal, Bombay and Madras must also take this up. The first step should be, for the States to set up committees. Then probably in two or three years, it will be possible to have a Central committee or commission, to go into the whole question and suggest which part of India can advance in a particular way and what steps could be taken. After all, India is not one single country in the real sense. Though we call it one country, it is

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.]

composed of areas with different economic conditions, some parts being very different from the rest. Therefore, it is best to make experiments in the States first, and then pool together the results of those experiments and make some general plans for the whole country.

I am in general agreement with Shri Bhupesh Gupta's Resolution, but I should like the matter to be considered from a wider point of view. Let the experiment now being done in Kerala be watched. Action will soon be necessary at the Centre also; at a later stage the Central Government will have to draw up a comprehensive scheme. But the time for that will be after one or two of the States had taken action. Then we will require an all-India Commission to make a comprehensive survey throughout the country.

Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Sir, while I was very intently following not the resolution but the speech of my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I was wondering whether he was aware of the gradual changes that have been taking place during the last ten years. I was happy to find that at least for once, my friend has quoted from the Prime Minister and surprisingly enough from Mahatma Gandhi also. I wish he follows the great principles that Gandhiji has laid down and that the Prime Minister has also noted in his autobiography.

So far as this question is concerned, as I have stated, the point for consideration is whether after the 15th of August 1947, the present Government or rather the governments in the country have or have not brought the administration up-to-date or whether during the last ten years they had maintained and preserved the same

irresponsible administration that we had formerly during the British regime. I may point out to my hon. friend that Government took action so far as this question of reviewing the administrative machinery is concerned, immediately after the transfer of power and from 1947 and onwards, the Government has taken various steps. Reference was rightly made to the report or rather to the action taken on the recommendations of Shri N. Gopalaswamy Ayyangar which was, more or less, the first organised or concerted attempt to find out what the defects were. Naturally, when the new Government on behalf of the people took over, they had to consider to what extent the governmental machinery, the administrative machinery was useful and what were the special changes that were required. Naturally, you would agree, certain fundamental changes were necessary. Oftentimes, hon. Members make references to the I.C.S. officers to the bureaucracy and to such choice expressions. Naturally, objection was raised on this point. Now, so far as these expressions are concerned, let us see what is bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is a class of officers who are irresponsible to public opinion. That is point number one. Secondly they should be irresponsible to the elected representatives or the Ministers of the people. Are these two criteria present now so far as the old officers are concerned? Mr. Rajah, I think, rightly pointed out that it was not possible, neither was it desirable to remove all the classes of the old officers of the I.C.S. or the I.A.S. cadre. He also rightly stressed the need to have that particular outlook changed. That was exactly what the popular government at Delhi and in the States did when there was this transfer of power. So far as the officers were concerned, they were given very clearly to understand that a democratic set-up had been started in India, that the Ministers who were in charge, the elected Ministries and the Legislatures were responsible to the people, that our officers, however high they might be, the I.C.S. or other

officers, they had to work under the control and guidance of the elected representatives of the people. Formerly, during the British regime, so far as these high officers were concerned, it was in their hands, to a large extent, to define policies as well as to implement those policies in any manner they chose. They need not take into account the reactions of the public to what they did. But that no longer is the case. On the whole, I may point out to my hon friends that so far as these officers are concerned about their efficiency naturally no question has been raised from any quarter. Of course some persons stated that it was so easy for any person to occupy such offices and carry on the great work that they have to do. So far as that aspect is concerned, I shall deal with it a little later.

Let us not think of the ICS officers with the same old ideas that we had about them. They may be ICS officers but now they are officers who are responsible to the Ministries and they have to carry on the work of the Ministries. It is their duty to advise the Ministers but ultimately it is the Ministers who take the decision and when that is done, then that has to be followed loyally by the officers. When the same old criticisms are levelled against them again and again—we seem to have an obsession about these ICS officers—I would point out in all humility that the old times have changed and these officers also have had to adjust themselves in a democratic manner to the new set up in the country.

So far as the question of pay is concerned, that is a question which has always been raised but the number of such persons drawing Rs 4,000 is very small. In fact, the number of ICS officers itself is very small. So far as the IAS cadre is concerned, we are trying to bring the IAS to the modern scale, to the new set up that we have. You are aware, Sir,

that when the IAS course was started for the first time, naturally all the present conditions were taken into account and Government have been trying all along to get the best students, the best youngsters, from the country, highly qualified and brilliant students and to train them in some social service as well. Let the hon Members understand that. Therefore, attempts are made to make the IAS officers real servants of the people. They have to mix amongst the people and they have to work in as responsible a manner and in as responsive a manner as possible. Therefore, all those outmoded notions which some hon Members bring in are perhaps not in consonance with the present conditions at all.

I would now pass on to the nature of the resolution that the hon Member has brought forward. All that the hon Member has stated in the resolution is that there ought to be a committee appointed consisting of experts to examine the present administrative machinery of Government. He has purposely used the word "Government" in as wide a way as possible to embrace not only the Central Government but the Governments in the various States as well. May I point out in all humility to my hon friend, that we are now under a Federal Constitution in which there has been a division of functions between Centre and the States and, therefore, so far as the functions of the States are concerned, it would not be proper for us to deal with such questions and it may not be proper, it may perhaps not be right and constitutional for us, to have a committee appointed by Parliament in respect of matters which, to a large extent, belong to the State field? That question has to be taken into account and a number of hon Members have dealt with the question of what they called "Centralisation". I would point out to the hon Members that there has been already a considerable amount of decentralisation of power. The Government of India is

[Shri B N Datar]
no longer the unitary Government that it was about 1920 when diarchy was first introduced and some powers were transferred to the State Governments. We have more or less a three tier system according to which certain rights and subjects are reserved for the Central Government. An hon Member made reference to these subjects, possibly he had in mind a desire to restrict those subjects. Now all those subjects with which the Government of India have to deal with have an all-India approach, an all-India aspect and, therefore, the Central Government have, within their purview, certain subjects and questions which naturally have to be approached from an all-India point of view. We have a large number of subjects, especially dealing with welfare activities, which are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State Governments. There are certain subjects which are in the Concurrent List wherein the State Governments and the Central Government can operate but here also, we have developed a convention according to which even in respect of concurrent subjects we at the Centre, neither the Parliament nor the Ministry, take no action except after consulting the State Governments. This is a position that has to be taken into account. Apart from the technical objection, I would mention to my hon friend that we have even now got a very large measure of decentralisation starting from the lowest rung. In addition to the State Governments, we have also decentralised so far as what are known as local self-Government areas are concerned.

SHRI H D RAJAH Where does the residuary power lie?

SHRI B N DATAR The residuary power is hardly used. We had a section on the residuary power but as the hon Member is aware, in the last ten years, we have had no recourse to it except using the normal and ordinary powers that have been given to the Centre by the Constitution.

DR R B GOUR May I point out to the hon Minister that decentralisation has gone to such an extent that the tenders for national highways, after they are called for, have to be sent to Delhi and they can be rejected here.

SHRI B N DATAR Let the hon Member please himself by his own views.

We have got the panchayats, we have got the municipalities and we have got the district boards. Does it not mean, Sir, that all these are indications or instances of decentralisation?

SHRI H D RAJAH They are of British creation.

SHRI B N DATAR Something was said about the conditions of the panchayats. Just out of curiosity, I looked into the conditions obtaining in one of the States, namely, Bihar. We have got a very large number of panchayats in India. At present there are about five lakhs of villages in India. Out of them, at the end of the First Five Year Plan, there had been established in India, as many as 1,17,593 panchayats. Let the House understand that there had been in existence more than one lakh panchayats. At the end of the Second Five Year Plan, it is the desire of the Government to have as many as 2,44,564 panchayats.

DR R B GOUR With what powers?

SHRI B N DATAR Let the hon Member wait. I shall give him all the figures. Even though we are not concerned with it here and even though the hon Member's criticism is absolutely irrelevant, I am trying to satisfy him. At the end of the Second Five Year Plan, almost half the number of villages in India will have panchayats. Some hon Members raised questions about what they stated to be the bad financial conditions of the panchayats. May I point out to this House, Sir, that one finds, going through the Bihar Gram Pan-

chayats Report for 1954-55, that was supplied to this House, that the financial position is fairly satisfactory So far as these Gram Panchayats in Bihar are concerned, you would find very interesting ways in which the co-operation of the people has been sought I am happy to note that the panchayats as a class is prospering not only in Bihar but in certain other States too, for example, in UP In UP, the judicial panchayats, what are called the Adalat Panchayats, are on the whole, doing very well and that is a step in the right direction So far as Bihar is concerned, they have stated that every adult man in the village will have to contribute six days labour in a year From a statement which has been appended to the Report, the financial position looks fairly satisfactory In respect of 6,474 villages, the property tax that was collected was Rs 1,09,000 In addition to this, the six days or forty-eight hours free labour that they render in a year is computed in terms of money to be of the order of Rs 52,61,000 Let the hon Members understand how the panchayats are succeeding It is entirely wrong and unfair to criticise the panchayats with certain preconceived or old notions which are completely exploratory

Then, Sir, the total value of the labour—*shram dan* if you would like to call it—is Rs 52,61,000 In addition to this some persons, who were not in a position to work, actually gave money in lieu of labour That was Rs 1,54,000 and it might be noted that so far as the work of the panchayat is concerned, the people are satisfied to such an extent that they are making private donations and the amount of private donations in respect of the 6,000 and odd villages is Rs 18 lakhs Let hon Members understand that This is so far as their actual financial resources were concerned

Now, an hon Member suggested that the Government has been absolutely niggardly The House may kindly note that the Government of Bihar has given by way of donations, grants-

in-aid, grant for rural water supply, grant for works programme, etc, and the total amount that has been given to these 6,000 villages is Rs 25,47,000. These figures may be taken note of I have merely taken an instance from one State That would show that the panchayats have been doing fairly well

Lastly, in so far as the question of this panchayat is concerned, the members of the panchayats are elected on adult franchise basis That might be taken into account It would therefore be entirely wrong to state that the panchayats have failed It is one of the objectives of the Constitution that the panchayats have to be resuscitated, have to be revived, and an attempt is being made It is quite likely that here and there panchayats may not be working well but the considered opinion of the Bihar Government, after looking into what they did during one year, is that on the whole panchayats have done very well I would read only one sentence "Unlike other local bodies where the task of a citizen is over after he elects his representatives for a fixed term, direct democracy functions in a gram panchayat" Let the hon Members understand, perhaps we have to unlearn something Every male adult is required to take active interest in the affairs of the gram panchayats and gram panchayats are the nurseries for political training of the masses The local bodies beginning from the panchayats contain the germs of self-government The panchayat provides opportunity for training in leadership in villages and enables them to lead a disciplined life as members of a democratic society Thus you will find that the panchayats have been given very wide powers

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala) What does the Evaluation Report on the Community Projects Administration say about panchayats?

SHRI B N DATAR Then, Sir, may I point out that there are also other institutions where we have got the

[Shri B. N. Datar.]
largest elective element, municipalities and district boards.

Something was said about the District Collector. So far as the Collector is concerned, though he is the head of the District, he is always assisted by a body or bodies of public men, by advisory bodies, and therefore it would be entirely wrong to criticise the head of the District, the Collector or the District Magistrate in terms of what he formerly did. He is now more the head of a Developmental Department than merely a law and order officer. Therefore we have got advisory bodies at various stages where the whole question is considered.

Then I would come to the Centre. So far as the Centre is concerned, as I said, when they took up this question in hand they had before them the recommendations of that great administrative officer who became a Minister here, namely, Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar. His recommendations were given full effect to. A copy of his recommendations along with the action that the Government had taken on them was placed on the Table of the House long ago. That was one thing, but the Government did not stop there. So far as the administrative machinery is concerned, it has always to be kept up to date because the task of the Government has been gradually increasing. Formerly, you are aware, Sir, we were often times called a Police State. Even then certain welfare activities were being carried on. Now, Sir, that the Government took a decision round about 1953 or 1952 that the Government would not be merely an administrative machinery but that the Government would try to establish a welfare State as well, and that is the reason why the Government had to assume a number of responsibilities. The Government had to take over certain concerns. They had to start certain other activities also. That is the reason why the number of Government officers at the top and

elsewhere has naturally increased; the number of secretaries, joint secretaries and others have to be increased. Let hon. Members understand that India is a vast country. One hon. friend quoted the case of a country—a small country possibly—where he went to an officer, had a particular order immediately passed in his favour which order he took advantage of immediately. That is quite all right but here we have to deal with a vast country and therefore here naturally to a certain extent the machinery has to move slow though attempts are being made, and very successful attempts are being made to see to it, that the machinery does not remain slow but answers the requirements that are to be met so far as a welfare State is concerned. Then, Sir, we had advice from experts also. There was a report by Dr. Appleby and I remember here in this very House about a year or so ago there was a long discussion and the Prime Minister explained the whole position, and how a number of valuable suggestions that had been made had already been given effect to. Thus you will find that even from that time onwards the Government have been aware that the machinery has to be geared up, the machinery has to be made as useful, as up-to-date and as alive to the needs of the people as possible. Now oftentimes it is stated that an officer is not having a democratic outlook. What is exactly the meaning of a democratic outlook? An officer, you are aware, has to act according to the orders of his elected Ministers and to that extent he has to carry on his work and wherever he comes in direct contact with the people naturally he has to give them a patient hearing; he has to treat the people with the greatest respect and do whatever is necessary in the highest interest of the State. We have co-ordination committees; we have liaison committees with which people are associated and when the Government found that the machinery required further changes, a number of reforms was also instituted. May I point out, Sir, that the Organisation

and Methods Division was one of such organisations which was started in 1953. The machinery was growing and the Government work was not coming up to expectations, there was no sufficient speed as was necessary because it was more or less grounded on the model of the former British regime. It was found that it was absolutely essential that certain changes were to be made and for that purpose it was considered necessary to have a better and speedier disposal of the points raised in the files, and therefore during the last three or four years the Organisation and Methods Division, directly under the Cabinet, has been doing extremely good work and a number of Reports have been placed before this hon House. I need not go into the various details but I am pointing out to this House that very good and substantial results have been achieved. As one hon Member has stated we have tried to eliminate duplication of work, we have tried to eliminate all the causes that work for delay. So that is how the Organisation and Methods Division has been keeping a constant watch. Now, what would be the object of such a Committee that has been suggested when these various measures are being taken?

Now, so far as the Vigilance Division is concerned, hon Members are either under a misconception or have not cared to see what the functions of an administrative vigilance organisation are. Now, the expression itself ought to make it clear to hon Members that the vigilance that the Government desire to have would be in respect of the administration as a whole. The administration has got to be vigilant. And secondly this organisation will be so vigilant as to prevent all sources or avenues for going wrong for temptation. That is the reason why the work of a vigilance division is greater than the work of what you call an anti-corruption department. Though the question of corruption control or elimination of corruption is one of the objects of this particular body, still may I point out

that there are certain circumstances, there are certain environments where it is easy for an officer to go wrong unless he is very astute? Now, the object of this department is to cut this evil at the root, to remove all chances of maintaining environments which are entirely wrong, which are conducive to corruption, which are conducive to irregularities. That is the reason why the purpose of a vigilance division is far more wider than the purpose of even an anti-corruption department.

Then, Sir, this anti-corruption work is also being carried on. My hon. friend, Shri Bhupe h Gupta, referred to certain figures about complaints and a small number about prosecutions. The hon Member is not aware that there are various stages or various types of action that the Government can take. Just today in the other House I answered questions about complaints against officers of the All India Services. There we found that in 17 cases complaints had been made against IAS and IPS officers. In all these cases Government immediately instituted an enquiry, even where these complaints to a large extent were anonymous. Let the hon Member understand that the Government is absolutely careful of looking into every complaint from whichever quarter it comes. And Government found that in most of these cases the complaints were absolutely unjustified. Therefore, what happens now is this. Complaints are made. In some cases they are anonymous and in some cases they are pseudonymous. In all these cases, when the Government makes enquiries if the complaints are in respect of certain irregularities then a certain action is taken by way of what is known as the departmental enquiry. Departmental proceedings are started and then certain action by way of dismissal, removal from service or stopping of increment and a number of other punishments are there. They are to be taken into account and let it be understood that the Government naturally goes to a court of law when

[Shri B N Datar]

Government has sufficient material to obtain a conviction from a magistrate or from a sessions judge. It is very difficult to get evidence because even though people make complaints they are oftentimes not ready to substantiate the complaints. That is our experience. All the same when there is sufficient evidence to obtain conviction, Government does approach the court. As you are aware, there are cases where the highest officers like the Secretaries of Central Government departments were proceeded against. Some of them were convicted also and certain other persons were dismissed from service, very high officers. Therefore, it would not be proper to say that the number of complaints is very large. The speaker put it in a funny way. He said the complaints were too many, the actions were too few. Now, the actions have got to be too few because if for example the complaints are not justified, then is it necessary, it is proper to take action against an officer merely because a complaint has been made? Let the hon. Member take care to note. (Time bell rings) I will finish, Sir. Let the hon. Member take care to note that in all these cases Government have to take action if there is sufficient evidence before them. I am pointing out to this House that in all these cases, as I have stated, we are taking into account whenever it is found that there is any defect, whenever it is found that Government must get over certain defects or infirmities, Government immediately take action and we have got always the advantage of the UPSC in this respect. We are acting in such a way as to keep ourselves abreast of the times and to keep the administrative machinery as alive, as democratic and as responsive as possible. Therefore, I would submit that all that has been stated in this long Resolution is already being achieved. The process of improvement is a constant process. It has to be gone into and there is no point in having a commission, because if you appoint a commission then we will have to ask

for the views of the State Governments. And then suppose you appoint a commission, the whole thing might remain at a standstill. The object that the hon. Member has in view is already being achieved and I would point out to him that we are taking every step to see to it that the administrative machinery is as up-to-date as he wants us to have it.

Then, lastly I would point out to him that even the Central Government is not carrying on its work only with the aid of its officers. Now, I have before me a long list of advisory . . .

DR R B GOUR His time is over

SHRI B N DATAR But, Sir, I have to point. I shall finish in another two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Yes, go on

SHRI B N DATAR I am glad that he is not in the Chair. Now, I would point out that so far as the various Ministries are concerned there are advisory bodies. So far as Parliamentary Consultative Committees are concerned there are consultative committees in respect of the various Ministries. Then we have—I am finishing—two advisory bodies so far as the Harijan welfare and tribal welfare are concerned. They are in connection with my own Ministry. We have got an advisory body in the Finance Ministry. We have four or five advisory bodies in the Railways, we have an advisory body so far as the Posts and Telegraphs employees are concerned, another for telephones. So far as the Information and Broadcasting Ministry is concerned, there are a number of advisory bodies. Thus you will find that the Government is not responsible to you, but it is highly responsive to public opinion. All the criticisms that you make, to the extent that they are absolutely constructive, Government will always carry them out. And therefore, I would submit in all humility that there is absolutely no need

and all that the hon. Member has stated is entirely out of gear so far as the present conditions are concerned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ram Sahai.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) उप सभा-
पति महोदय

DR. R. B. GOUR: Under rule 206 (1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business for this House, I move "that the Question be now put", and under the provision to sub-rule (2) of this rule, you call upon the Mover of the Resolution to give the reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. After Mr. Ram Sahai speaks.
(Interruptions)

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): But the motion is put.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have already called him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, I make a submission that there should be at least this much co-operation. Otherwise, we are prepared to sit late. We thought that we should give the other Resolution a chance to be moved, so that it will be taken up in the next session. We will not extend the discussion. We would like to know from you. . . . (Interruptions.) Now, you are calling another Member to speak instead of putting this motion, which means that the Mover, if he were to make it possible for the other Resolution to be moved, will have practically no time to reply. Either I reply or I do not have it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After him I will put the motion to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to know the position. In that case we will insist on the guillotine. Let it be applied. Let it be known. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After him I will take the vote.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are prepared to sit longer. I would like to know the decision.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I have called him before the motion for closure was applied.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Before he has started. Now you have called. That is all right. We have seen it, but there must be some time at least.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, if he yields, I will put the closure.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I make a submission, Sir. When you allowed the hon. Minister to speak exceeding his time-limit, we kept quiet. We could have interrupted there because he was exceeding the time-limit. We thought that there would be some mutual accommodation. He sat and immediately he got up. Meanwhile, you have called him. If this is the technical rigidity, then I want to know what will happen.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After I have called him, he got up. Do not misrepresent facts (To Shri Ram Sahai) Are you yielding?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then I would insist, let the discussion go on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the House wants to sit.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): I may submit that this is such an important matter which one of the Opposition Parties said that even ten days surely would not be enough for discussion? Why is he in a hurry and want to finish today itself?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will put the closure motion after he finishes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We cannot have it.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, Order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are withdrawing it.

श्री राम सहाय : उप सभापति महोदय, मैं यह निवेदन करने जा रहा था कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा है, इसमें शुबहा नहीं कि बहुत विद्वत्तापूर्ण तरीके पर उसमें उन तमाम चीजों का विश्लेषण किया गया है जो कि आजकल आम तौर पर जनता के सामने एक क्विड-सिज़्म का विषय बन रहे हैं। लेकिन हर एक चीज की उपयोगिता के ऊपर हमें दृष्टि करनी होती है। हमें यह देखने की आवश्यकता है कि क्या इस प्रकार का प्रस्ताव इस सदन में आने की आवश्यकता है अथवा नहीं, और अगर आ गया है तो उसको स्वीकार करने की जरूरत है या नहीं।

अभी अभी मिस्टर राजा ने कांग्रेस पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में यह बात कही थी कि अगर उनको आजादी दी जाये तो वे यकीनन इस प्रस्ताव को पास कर देंगे। लेकिन मैं उनसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सन् १९४७ से, कांस्टिट्यूट एसेम्बली के जमाने से आज तक, निरन्तर हम ऐसे चैलेजों को देख रहे हैं, लेकिन वे कभी भी कामयाब साबित नहीं हुये। बाज़ बाज़ मौकों पर कभी कभी ऐसा हुआ कि लोगों ने यह बात उठा कर कि यह प्रश्न क्विश्शन का है, यह कहा कि सबको राय देने की आजादी होनी चाहिये। उसमें उनको आजादी दी गई और आजादी देने पर भी नतीजा वही निकला जो कि हमारा शासन या हमारी कैबिनेट या हमारे नेता चाहते थे। इसलिये इस प्रकार की व्यर्थ की बातों को सदन के सामने रखने से कोई लाभ नहीं होता। थोड़ा बहुत वे अपने मन को सन्तुष्ट कर ले। यह बात भले ही हो सकती है लेकिन उससे कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलता :

इस प्रस्ताव में जिन बातों की चर्चा की गई है मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे संविधान से लेकर हमारे जितने कानून अब तक बने हैं और जो अब तक हमारे शासन की प्रैक्टिस रही है, उसके मुताबिक वे सारी चीजें आज भी सुचारू रूप से चल रही हैं। शासन के ज्यादा लोकतन्त्रात्मक बनाने के लिये जो बात इसमें कही गई है उसके बारे में मैं यह निवेदन करूँ कि हमारे यहाँ म्युनिसिपैलिटियाँ तो हैं ही, पंचायतें भी गांवों में जगह जगह कायम की गई हैं, और उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा अधिकार देने की सहुलियत विधान में रखी गई है। लेकिन सवाल यह होता है कि किस प्रकार का उपयोग इन पंचायतों से हो सकता है। हमारे यहाँ जैसी भी हमारी जनता है, उसी प्रकार की हमारी पंचायतें हैं और हमारे सारे संगठन होंगे। लेकिन उन सबमें चाहे म्युनिसिपैलिटी हो, चाहे पंचायत हो, चाहे कोई और हो, हमको इस बात को देखने की आवश्यकता होती है कि वे किस योग्यता के साथ उस कार्य को कर सकते हैं और उतने ही अधिकार उनको दिये जाते हैं। इसलिये इसमें कोई तथ्य नहीं रहता कि इस प्रकार की बात कही जाय कि यह जो शासन इस वक्त चल रहा है वह कोई लोकतन्त्रात्मक तरीके पर नहीं चल रहा है।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें और जो बातें कही गई हैं भ्रष्टाचार इत्यादि के बारे में, उनके विषय में भी मैं सदन के सामने यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा शासन उनके बारे में बहुत सतर्क है। सन् १९५५-५६ की होम मिनिस्ट्री की रिपोर्ट को अगर हमारे मित्र देखते तो उसमें वह पाते कि सिर्फ होम मिनिस्ट्री ही इस ओर लक्ष्य नहीं रखती है बल्कि हमारा प्लानिंग कमीशन भी इस ओर ध्यान दिये हुये है कि हमारे यहाँ भ्रष्टाचार, इत्यादि बढ़ने न पाये और इसी कारण से आप देखेंगे कि होम मिनिस्ट्री की रिपोर्ट में यह दिया

है कि प्लानिंग कमीशन की मिफारिश पर एक विजिलेस आफिसर मुकर्रर किया गया है। उसने जो कुछ कार्यवाही की, वे सब बातें १९५६-५७ की संक्षिप्त रिपोर्ट में बताई गई हैं। सन् १९५५-५६ की रिपोर्ट में "Recommendations of the Planning Commission on administrative reforms" के नाम से जो हैडिंग है इसमें प्लानिंग कमीशन ने जो इस बारे में सजेस्ट किया था उसके आधार पर गवर्नमेंट ने खास बात यह की है कि होम मिनिस्ट्री से ये आदेश जारी किये गये कि :

"(a) Government servants should at all times maintain a high standard of integrity and impartiality; and

(b) No officer who does not have a reputation for honesty should be placed in a position in which there is considerable scope for discretion."

मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इसमें और भी बहुत सी बातें हैं जिनके आधार पर हम यह कह सकते हैं कि होम मिनिस्ट्री ही नहीं बल्कि मैं तो कहता हूं कि प्लानिंग कमीशन भी इस ओर पूरा पूरा ध्यान दिये हुये हैं कि हमारे यहाँ जितनी भी कार्यवाही चले वह सुचारू रूप से और सुव्यवस्थित रूप से चले और इस तरह से हमारे अधिकारियों में जहाँ कहीं भी करप्शन हो उसे दूर किया जाये। इतना ही नहीं इसमें यहाँ तक बताया गया है कि हर एक आफिसर को उसकी अपनी प्रापर्टी का, अपनी जायदाद का जो उसके पास है उसका एक लेखा जोखा देना पड़ता है और केवल इतना ही नहीं कि वह कभी एक दफा दे दिया जाय बल्कि उसे साल भर में एक बार अपनी प्रापर्टी का लेखा देना पड़ता है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर हम इन सारी कार्यवाहियों को देखें तो हम निश्चय ही इस नतीजे पर पहुँचेंगे कि जिस प्रकार से हमारे यहाँ एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चल रहा है, उसमें हमारे प्रधान मंत्री, होम मिनिस्टर महोदय और हमारे जितने भी मिनिस्टर हैं वे सब इस बात का बिल्कुल

ध्यान रखे हुए हैं कि किसी प्रकार की इसमें शिथिलता न आने पाये। यह बात जरूर है कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन कितना ही अच्छा क्यों न हो उसमें सुधार की गुंजायश हमेशा बनी रहनी है और यह निश्चय ही देखा जा रहा है कि ऐसे सुधारों की गुंजायश की तर्फ हमारी गवर्नमेंट का लक्ष्य हमेशा रहता है। हमारी जितनी भी इस सबब में कार्यवाही चल रही है उससे हम सभी स नतीजे पर पहुँचते हैं कि बहुत माकूल तरीके पर इस बात पर लक्ष्य दिया जा रहा है कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में किसी प्रकार की खराबी पैदा न हो।

अभी एक साहब ने यह बात कही थी कि "हम किसी एक बुराई को दूर करने के लिये एक और आफिसर की नियुक्ति करते हैं तो हम देखते हैं कि उसमें भी वही चीज़ आ जाती है" और उन्होंने एक मिसाल अभी अभी सदन के सामने भी रखी थी। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब हमारे सामने कोई समस्या आती है तब उसका हल किसी न किसी प्रकार से निकालना पड़ता है और उसका वही रास्ता होता है जो कि हमारे शासन चलाने वाले लोग उपयुक्त समझते हैं। उन्होंने निश्चय ही तमाम तरीकों पर ध्यान देकर एक तरीका अस्तित्वार किया है। उसमें हम कुछ बुराइयाँ जरूर पा सकते हैं लेकिन उनका जो इंटेनशन है, इरादा है, वे जिस तरीके से शासन चलाते हैं, उसमें कोई बात हम ऐसी नहीं पाते हैं जिससे हमको मालूम हो कि उसमें करप्शन इत्यादि की वे गुजाइश दे रहे हैं।

अभी हमारे कई मित्रों ने इस विषय पर बहुत कुछ कहा है, लेकिन मैं उस सबके बारे में पूरी तफसील से नहीं जाऊंगा और सिर्फ यही निवेदन करूंगा कि हमको, शासन के जो उसूल हैं, उन पर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। अभी हमारे सामने आज जितनी शासन की मैशीनरी है, उसमें हमारे

[श्री राम सहाय]

मित्रों को इस बात की सराहना करनी चाहिये कि उसने मौजूदा शासन को, जो कांग्रेस पार्टी का शासन कहा जाता है, उसको बड़ी खूबी के साथ चलाया। ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के जमाने में जो अधिकारी जिस तरीके से कार्य कर रहे थे, करीब करीब मैं समझता हूँ कि वे ही अधिकारी आज भी काम कर रहे हैं। तो फिर यह कहना कि आज वे उस जमाने से ज्यादा बेईमान बन गये हैं, यह बात हमें कभी खयाल नहीं करनी चाहिये। हमें अपने अधिकारियों की ईमानदारी पर भरोसा करना चाहिये और अकारण ही हम उनकी हर वक्त बुराई न करें क्योंकि जब हम हर वक्त बुरा, बुरा कहते हैं तो जो लोग ईमानदार होते हैं उनको भी यह बात नागवार मासूम होती है और बाज़ अधिकारी महज़ इसी कारण अपने पथ से भ्रष्ट हो सकते हैं। इसलिये मैं दूसरी पार्टी के सदस्यगण से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस बात को अच्छी तरह से समझें और देखें कि दरअसल जब सचवाई के साथ हम इस बात का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं कि हमारा शासन प्रबन्ध अच्छी तरह से चले तो बिना वजह टीका टिप्पणी उन अधिकारियों के बारे में न करें जो अच्छी तरह काम कर रहे हैं क्योंकि यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। हमें यह ध्यान में रखना चाहिये कि हमारी प्रजातंत्र व्यवस्था है, डिमोक्रेसी है, यह डिक्टेटरशिप नहीं है। तो इस डिमोक्रेसी में शासन कार्य चलाना हमारे अधिकारियों के लिये भी कोई साधारण सी बात नहीं है। पहले जहां हुकूमत में एक शख्स के सुपुर्दे सारा कंट्रोल होता था वह कोई भी काम जिस तरह से भी हो अपनी इच्छानुसार करता था, लेकिन आज जब हम प्रजातांत्रिक ढंग से कार्यवाही चला रहे हैं इस वक्त में हम कोई वैसा मेयार मुकर्रर नहीं कर सकते। इसलिये शासन के लोगों को भी हर एक बात पर प्रजातांत्रिक तरीके से ही विचार करना होता है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I move that the House sit for another fifteen minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will leave it to the House. There is a motion that the House should sit for 15 minutes if the House is agreeable.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want me to take a vote?

AN HON. MEMBER: Then we are prepared.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I submit to the House . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the House is agreeable, I have no objection.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I would appeal to the other Members to pass the motion for extension of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is moving that the House should sit beyond 5 o'clock for 15 minutes. Those in favour will please stand up.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Majority in our favour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (After a count) 30.

Those against will please stand up.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It is obvious.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let it be counted. Why are you in such a hurry?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (After a count) 20.

We are sitting for 15 minutes more. (To Shri Ram Sahai) Have you finished your speech? You have got 5 minutes more: Mr. Ram Sahai.

5 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I move:

"That the question be now put."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has got five minutes more.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA (Bombay): Sir, if the sitting is extended by 15 minutes, it does not mean that the discussion should be curtailed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not going to be curtailed. Please leave it to me. I know the procedure.

श्री राम सहाय : अगर श्री भूपेश गुप्त का कुछ ऐसा ही ख्याल है कि वह अपनी बात का उत्तर नहीं सुनना चाहते तो मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त कर देता हूँ ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the question be now put."
(After taking a count) Ayes 10; Noes 26.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That means, Sir,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I am submitting that it only means that because there is no more non-official day in this session . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): There seems to be some mistake in counting. We all voted for closure not to be applied. We want to give the right of reply to the mover of the resolution. I suppose it is clear that the majority of the Members of this House desire that the mover of the resolution should be given the right of reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena, that can be done only as long as there are no other Members to speak. That is the intention of the closure.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, the intention of extending the period by 15 minutes is that the mover will reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have a submission to make. After 15 minutes are over, I would go away and the House can sit till 12 o'clock in the night.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I cannot accept that suggestion.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I have got to make a submission, Sir. Knowing fully well that there is no more non-official day in this session and knowing also fully well that this resolution cannot be carried over to the next non-official day, I feel that it is unfair on the part of the Congress Party not to allow the right of reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. It is a reflection on the House. You should not make such remarks. Yes, Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal.

श्री कै० बि० लाल : उप सभापति जी, मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस अन्तिम चरण में बोलने का अवसर प्रदान किया है । मुझे अपने दोस्तों के ऊपर ताज्जुब होता है कि जो अभी इससे पहले कहते थे कि इतने ग्रहण विषय के ऊपर १० रोज भी बहस कम होगी, वही अब इतनी जल्दी में, हड़बड़ में, गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर स्ट्रिक्चर पास करके, जल्दी से वोटिंग कराके इसको पास करवाना चाहते हैं । श्री भूपेश गुप्त के लिये कोई ईमानदारी की बात नहीं है कि वे इस तरह से जल्दी में बगैर पूरी बहस किये प्रस्ताव को पास करा ले जायें । मैं श्रीमान् जी, आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने इस प्रस्ताव पर आगे बहस करने के लिये इजाजत दी जिससे कि लोग अपनी राय इस मामले में दे सकें ।

इस विषय के ऊपर हमें सबसे पहिले यह कहना है कि हम इस प्रस्ताव के विरोध में हैं । विरोध का कारण यह नहीं है कि हमारे कुछ मित्र जो उस तरफ बैठे हैं, वे इस प्रस्ताव को लाये हैं, इसलिये हम विरोध करते हैं । बल्कि इसलिये विरोध करते हैं कि

उनके प्रस्ताव में ऐसी बातें हैं, जिसका मतलब यह होगा कि जो हमारे कर्मचारी इस समय शासन प्रबन्ध का काम कर रहे हैं, जो एक्सपर्ट काम पर लगे हुये हैं, उन्हें निकाल दिया जाय। तो मैं अपने मित्र से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर ये लोग निकाल दिये जायेंगे तो हम दूसरे एक्सपर्ट कहाँ से लायेंगे ? क्या चन्द्रलोक से लायेंगे, क्या सूर्यलोक से लायेंगे ? अगर हम इस समय जो हमारे एक्सपर्ट हैं उनको और दूसरे अधिकारियों को निकाल भी देते हैं, फिर भी हम जिस ढाँचे में अब तक चले आये हैं उसी ढाँचे के एक्सपर्ट हमको मिलेंगे। फिर हमारे सामने वही पुरानी बात हो जायेगी। इसलिये हमें एक्सपर्ट कमेटी एपॉइन्ट करने के सम्बन्ध में विचार न करके इस बात पर विचार करना चाहिये कि हमारी शासन प्रणाली में अगर किसी किस्म की गलती है तो उसको कैसे सुधारा जाय। लेकिन हमारे मित्रगण इस काम में रिवोल्यूशनरी तरीके से काम करना चाहते हैं। मगर उन्हें इस बात पर आगे सोचना पड़ेगा कि किस तरह से वे इस कार्य को रिवोल्यूशनरी तरीके से सुधार सकते हैं।

इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि देश भर में, इस सदन के अन्दर और बाहर भी यह विचार है कि हम लोग उसी एक लीक पर चले जा रहे हैं जो कि अंग्रेजों के जमाने से चली आ रही है और यह जो रास्ता है वह ब्यूरोक्रेसी का रास्ता है, जिस पर हम चल रहे हैं। लेकिन उसमें अच्छाईया भी हैं और खराबियाँ भी हैं। विरोधी दल की ओर से जो प्रस्ताव आया है, कुछ उसी तरह की भावना हमारी तरफ के लोगों के दिलों में भी है। यह कोई नई बात नहीं है, यह तो दिल साफ करने से पता लगेगा।

अंग्रेजों के जमाने से जो शासन प्रणाली चली आ रही है उसमें अवश्य बुराईयाँ हैं लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि उसमें

कोई अच्छाई है ही नहीं। अच्छाईयाँ भी हैं और जब अच्छाईयाँ हैं तब बुराईयों को दूर करने के लिये क्या हमें उस शासन प्रणाली को ही खत्म कर देना चाहिये ? मैं समझता हूँ कि उसे हमें खत्म नहीं करना चाहिये। अगर हमारे विरोधी, दल के लोग यही चाहते हैं तो उन्हें इस चीज को दिखलाने का केरला में मौका मिला हुआ है और वे वहाँ पर इस बात की कोशिश कर सकते हैं। अगर वे केरला में शासन प्रणाली की व्यवस्था में सुधार करके दिखला दें, साल दो साल में दिखला दें, तो फिर उनको यह प्रस्ताव लाने का मौका ही नहीं मिलेगा। आप से आप सारे देश भर में इस तरह की हवा बहनी और उसकी नकल बाकी जगहों में चलने लगेगी। इसलिये उन्हें पहले इस काम को केरला में शुरू करना चाहिये फिर उन्हें इस तरह का प्रस्ताव यहाँ पर लाना चाहिये। एक चीज जो जमाने से चली आ रही है उसमें जो खराबी है, गलतियाँ हैं, वह तो मौजूद हैं और सब जानते हैं। लेकिन हम इस समय इस बहस को इस नीयत से आगे नहीं चला रहे हैं कि हम उसमें कोई एकदम तबदीली का सुझाव बतलायें या कोई सुधार कर दें। इस बहस को आगे चलाने से हमारा यह मतलब जरूर था कि हम अपनी राय को, अपने खयाल को, जो हम लोगों के दिलों में है, इस सदन के सामने रखें। हमारे सामने बैठे दोस्त तो चाहते हैं कि उनकी बातों का प्रचार हो क्योंकि उससे उनका काम बनेगा। ताकि हिन्दुस्तान के जिस कोने से भी कोई शिकायत आये तो उसको दूर करने में शासक तत्पर रहे। उनको यह तो नजर में रखना चाहिये था, लेकिन बजाये इसके वह उतावले हैं कि प्रस्ताव जल्दी पास हो जाय। पता नहीं इसमें क्या ज्यादा फायदा हो जाता। मेरा तो खयाल यह है कि जितना ज्यादा से ज्यादा टाइम इस विषय के ऊपर बोला जाय, और अपने इलाके की हर्कत के ऊपर रोशनी डाली जाये उतना ही हमारे शासकों के खयाल में आयेगा कि कैसे सुधार किया जा सकता है

और देश में भी कुछ जागृति होगी। इस खयाल से हमने मत दिया कि इसके ऊपर बहस चले बल्कि दो चार रोज बहस चले तो अच्छा है क्योंकि अपनी अपनी जगह की हालत को लोग इजहार करेंगे कि कैसी है।

अभी पारिख साहब ने आई० सी० एस० की तारीफ करनी शुरू की तो पराकाष्ठा पर पहुंचा दी। अगर उधर से कोई शिकायत जितना पराकाष्ठा पर आई तो इधर से तारीफ भी उतनी पराकाष्ठा पर आ गई। लेकिन कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है, जैसा उन्होंने कहा, कि काम बहुत बढ़ गया हो। मेरा खयाल है कि काम नहीं बढ़ा है। काम करने वाले बहुत ज्यादा बढ़े हैं। यह मेरा निजी खयाल है। उन्होंने कहा कि वर्क बहुत बढ़ा है। मेरा खयाल है कि वर्कस बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ गये हैं। सेक्रेटेरियट में हमने वह जमाना देखा है जब सेक्रेटेरियट में बहुत जगह खाली पड़ी हुई थी। अब सेक्रेटेरियट के जो रास्ते हैं उनमें भी दीवाल डाल डाल करके जगह बना दी गई है, हटमेंट्स बनाये गये हैं और आफिसर्स बढ़ते जा रहे हैं, आदमी बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। दलील क्या होती है कि साहब कुछ अनएम्प्लायमेंट साल्व होता है और अनएम्प्लायमेंट साल्व होने का तरीका जो है इतने आदमी बढ़ा देने का, उसका फल यह है कि जो काम पांच आदमी कर सकते थे, आज बीस आदमी उस काम को करते हैं। यह कटु वचन है। लेकिन इसके लिये क्या हमारे मिनिस्टर दोषी हैं? एक ऐसा वातावरण ही हमारे देश में उत्पन्न हो गया है, हमारी एजुकेशन में इस तरह की एक बात ही आ गई है। आज देहातों में धान के खेत में जहां रोप होती थी पांच मजदूरों से, वहां आज १५ आदमी लगते हैं।

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Less work and more pay.

श्री कं० बी० लाल : जब मैंने यह पूछा कि आज यह क्यों होता है, तो कहा गया

कि स्वराज्य हो गया है। आप देखिये कि स्वराज्य होने से लोगों में ज्यादा ईमानदारी, तेजी और उतावलापन होना चाहिये। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि लोग अपनी देह चुरावे। देह चुराने और पैसे का ज्यादा लालच करने के सिलसिले में अभी आपके सामने स्ट्राइक का मामला गुजरा है। इस तरह से जो पांच आदमी काम कर सकते थे, आज १५ या २० आदमी उनी काम को करते हैं। फिर भी आप कहते हैं “मोर वर्क।” “मोर वर्कस हैं” मोर वर्क नहीं है। वर्कस बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ गये हैं और इसलिये बढ़ गये हैं क्योंकि आप जो एजुकेशन देते हैं वह सिर्फ नौकरी की एजुकेशन देते हैं। आज जितने भी कालेज स्कूल हैं, सब सर्विस के ट्रेनिंग सेंटर हैं। जितने बी० ए० या मैट्रीकुलेशन पास करके आते हैं, सबको नौकरी चाहिये। आप बताइये कि क्या ऐसा भी कोई देश हो सकता है जो खाली नौकरों का देश हो, और कोई किसी काम में मन ही न लगाये। हम इस सदन में कह चुके हैं कि हमारे देश में इंडस्ट्री को स्टाव किया गया है, लोगों को उससे निकाल बाहर किया गया है। एग्रीकल्चर जो सब से बड़ी इंडस्ट्री है उसकी दशा कंट्रोल करके इस तरह की कर दी गई है कि कोई उसमें जाता ही नहीं है। जिसके पास ४०० बीघा जमीन है और एक ही लड़का है, वह भी चाहता है कि अब मेरा लड़का बी० ए० पास कर गया है, उसको नौकरी दी जाय। मैंने पूछा कि आपके पास कितनी जमीन है, तो उन्होंने कहा कि ४०० बीघा। उस पर मैंने कहा कि तुम्हारा बेटा दस आदमियों को नौकर रख सकता है, लेकिन उन्होंने कहा कि खेती में कुछ नहीं होता है, मजदूरी तक नहीं मिलती है, खेत में जितना इवेस्ट करते हैं उतना उससे नहीं आता है यह एग्रीकल्चर की हालत है। आज हमारी गवर्नमेंट है और हम इसलिये सजेशन देते हैं ताकि सुधार हो और रास्ता सुधार का तभी हो सकता है जब इन बातों को आप देखें।

[श्री कै० बि० लाल]

पहले यह देखा जाय कि एग्रिकल्चर किस तरह से तरक्की पायेगा । एग्रिकल्चर की तरक्की के लिये हम क्या कर सकते हैं ।

(समय की घंटी)

१५ मिनट हो गये ? पहले जब एक के ऊपर बड़ी सुई थी, तब घंटी बोलना शुरू हुई थी और अब तीन के ऊपर बज रही है । यह मेरे भाग्य की बात है कि घंटी आप से आप बज जाती है ।

श्री उपसभापति : आपके १५ मिनट नहीं हुये हैं । ५ के बाद के १५ मिनट हो रहे हैं ।

श्री कै० बि० लाल : पांच के बाद के १५ मिनट खत्म होने वाले हैं, तो नैक्स्ट सेशन में यह जायेगा या खत्म हो जायगा ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at fifteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday the 26th August 1957.

Editor of Debates,
Rajya Sabha Secretariat