

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The Government have to take certain precautionary steps because one or two days before certain things were being planned and therefore the Government had to forearm themselves.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Has the Government received any information from the authorities of the Girls' School that the girls were being prevented forcibly from entering the school?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The information is just the opposite of what my hon. friend is suggesting.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, he has not answered my question. Has the Government received.....

SHRI B. N. DATAR: We have not received any such information; on the other hand we have received information which is entirely contrary to what the hon. Member is suggesting.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, he does not understand my question. My question is this. Has the Government received any representation before they sent their police force there, from the authorities of the Girls' School that some trouble was going on there and did they ask the help of the Government?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: They did not ask for it. The police and the Magistrate on their own initiative took precautionary steps.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Is it not a fact that Mr. Nanjappa does these things on his own?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: That is an entirely incorrect insinuation.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is a correct insinuation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Is my hon. friend aware that letters and telegrams to Members of Parliament giving information about this incident have been withheld?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: So far as I am aware, I am not aware of any such telegrams having been withheld.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: May I know, Sir, how is it that the hon. Minister who is in possession of a number of representations from the people there has not thought it fit to go into those representations and to institute an inquiry?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I have gone through the whole file and made full enquiries.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, just now he replied that.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. That will do.

RESOLUTION RE. A COMMISSION
 TO EXAMINE THE ADMINISTRATIVE
 SET-UP AND PROCEDURE
 OF WORK OF THE GOVERNMENT
 OF INDIA—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up Mr. Mathur's Resolution. Mr. Sundarayya.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): Mr. Chairman, the object of this Resolution is welcome in that it wants some mechanism or some early steps to be taken so that the delay in the governmental administration can be put an end to. But we do not support the appointment of a Commission to go into this matter, for in fact it is one of the reasons for the delay in administration even in connection with many beneficial things. Of course, the Government is very prompt, even without information, when it is a question of beating down the people but when it is a question of any reforms in the interests of the people, the Government does not get information and the Government does not know the facts. That is exactly the reason why when we want to tone up the administration, the appointment of a Commission to go into this matter will only result in delay. Therefore

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

we are not in favour of this Commission. The Government can certainly take immediate steps on the basis of so many reports which they have already got with them.

There had been the Gorwala Committee's Report; there was the Appleby Report; there were so many other reports in the Secretariat files. The best way to see that administration is carried on efficiently is to do away with the present centralization. Now, everything is being centralized; even the smallest affairs are being centralized. Even when you want to get the meagrest statistics, you have to go from one room to another and after all this you are directed to some other Ministry with the result that ultimately you do not get anything at all. The only way to tone up the administration, to quicken the pace of administration, is to decentralise the whole authority. For this, more powers and more finance have to be made available. We should begin first with the State Governments. Even there, in the State Governments, they must decentralise their powers, they must delegate their administrative authority to the local bodies, the district boards and the village panchayats. But, what we are seeing is not this kind of decentralisation but more and more centralisation, taking away even the minimum powers that are vested in the village panchayat and district board.

There have been proposals by certain State Governments to do away even with these local bodies and even where the local bodies exist, to have more and more Commissioners and see that the elected representatives of the people do not have any voice in carrying on their day to day affairs. The best way that the administrators can do their job is by decentralising authority.

The second thing is this. It is to take full responsibility to take decisions after defining well the spheres of authority of each officer. We have first of all to define the scope and place of each officer and to what extent the village panchayat, the district board

and the State Government can go on independently. This is the one way of decentralisation so that too many matters need not be referred to Delhi, where the files, the dusty files, are passed on from one dusty room to another, and where one Minister does not know anything of the representation coming to his own superior Minister.

Similarly, look at the number of officers we have got. There are a whole lot of them—Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries—Additional and Special Secretaries apart—(laughter); then, the Chief Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Upper Division Clerks, Lower Division Clerks, and the whole thing goes on. If you only place these things in a line, it will be more than enough to encircle the whole of Delhi at least a dozen times. All this, with what result? A small representation comes, then nobody is prepared to take responsibility. It goes from one file to another file and so on *ad infinitum* and then is referred back to us. If these suggestions are carried out, I do not think any separate Commission is necessary.

Government can certainly make rules about all matters, say, those connected with sanctioning of certain projects involving a certain amount of expenditure, or carrying out of certain matters other than these, and define the rights and responsibilities of an Under Secretary or even the Chief Superintendent and say: "You are at perfect liberty to take decision; but if anything goes wrong, you will be responsible and answerable to the Minister". This, you are not prepared to do. I ask: Why should there be a Secretary, a Joint Secretary, a Deputy Secretary and an Under Secretary? After all, they are all recruited after their educational qualifications, their administrative capacities and other things are taken into account. Why all this hierarchy of officials? The Under Secretaries can certainly take responsibility for all things. I do not know how a Secretary is more efficient

than a Deputy Secretary or an Under Secretary.

The same thing is seen at the district level. We have District Collectors and the Revenue Divisional Officers, whom we call Deputy Collectors. They take all decisions. So, why this hierarchy here? Instead of doing things efficiently, they are keeping a hierarchy. The net result of all this is enormous delay in the matter of administration. The Government, of course, will come out and say 'If we decentralise first by giving the authority to Under Secretaries, even within well-defined areas, then, these Under Secretaries or the lower officials will try to expand their powers and try to rope in other things, and take decisions, who is to check them?' I say, to check them, there are the Members of Parliament in the Centre, the members of the State Assemblies in the States, the members of the district boards in the districts and the members of the village panchayats in the villages. If the officials in these respective spheres do not do their job efficiently, it is the duty of the respective members to check them. It is not the function of a higher official to check the work of a lower official. What is the Ministry doing? Our Central Government has got about 33 Ministers of all kinds—Ministers with cabinet rank, Ministers without cabinet rank, Ministers of State, Deputy Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and what not. And, it is all a question of confusing and muddling the common man. I fail to note where the difference is between Ministers with cabinet rank and Ministers without cabinet rank. Even such a small State as Bengal has got about forty Ministers.

AN HON MEMBER. Out of how many legislators?

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA. Out of about 230 members, Congress Party having about 170 members.

SHRI B GUPTA (West Bengal): Ali Baba had forty! (Laughter)

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA. So many ministers,—as if this whole hierarchy of officials was not enough to check the decisions taken. Therefore, the argument of Government that they are required to check the decisions taken at lower levels is no good.

Another argument is that "if you are going to rationalise this administration what is going to happen to all these officers and employees?" That is really our big problem. They think that if the work is done efficiently and quickly, then, half the employees are to go, are to be retrenched. That is why the officials are not working hard and efficiently. The reason is, the harder they work, the quicker they will be taking the bread away from others. Therefore, the officers are justified, of course, in their own way, in not taking any prompt action. But, this evil could be done away with only if the Government had in mind a plan and could assure us that everybody will have a full job and a decent salary also. Without that, whatever number of committees the Government may appoint, whatever number of rules and regulations they may make, they will not go a long way to tone up the administration.

In this connection, I would also like to mention one thing. The Government has got a very bad habit of giving high salaries in order that the officials become more efficient or the official will be able to carry on their jobs better. My view is that the higher you pay them, the less efficient they become. It is only when they are in touch with the people, only when they live in conformity with the people, that the efficiency of the administrative structure will be improved. In this connection, of course, the Government may say that unless they guarantee them quite high salaries, the likelihood of corruption may be there. Unless you want to tackle the main problem of huge profits that the millionaires go on amassing day after day and leave no scope and facilities for them to bribe not only a few officials, but to bribe the whole Government, it is no use

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

appointing commissions, and it is no use passing resolutions for toning up the Administration. Sir, if you want that there should be an efficient Administration in the country, you must do the following things. Decentralise the power; decentralise the finances; give more to the States, and the States in their turn have to give more to the district boards and local boards; do not have too many rungs of officialdom; define the functions of officials and give them every responsibility to take decisions. (*Time bell rings.*)

Those people who do their job very well can be rewarded, and those people who fail to do their job well, can be fined very heavily. Take every step to guarantee full employment; take every step to see that bribery is put down. It is only by adopting these methods that the Administration can be toned up and made efficient.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is nothing very radical, nor does it seek to achieve something which is very revolutionary. It merely reflects the modicum of popular aspiration in the country that this Administration should improve. It therefore suggests the setting up of a Commission to examine the whole question of public administration today. Sir, what is the genesis of such a demand? I might invite the attention of this House to the fact that on the eve of the implementation of the first Five Year Plan the Planning Commission was of the opinion that inasmuch as the present administrative system was inadequate, it could not fulfil all the targets which had been set in the Five Year Plan. Therefore, they set up the Gorwala Commission to go into this whole question of public administration. Sir, Mr. A. D. Gorwala submitted his report in July 1951. The late Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar was also entrusted with a similar task, and his report must be lying in the archives of the Home Ministry. After that, the Government of India, in their infinite wisdom, thought it fit to bring Mr. Paul H. Appleby from the U.S.A. as a Ford

Foundation consultant. Sir, I might, at the very outset, say something about the very remarkable career of Mr. Appleby.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is necessary.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, I am paying my compliments to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No compliment, no criticism.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, I am a great admirer of Mr. Appleby.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May be.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: He is a great man, a great administrator, who raised himself from the status of a fruit vendor to that of one of the most important officials of the Ministry of Interior. Sir, I would invite the attention of this House to a book of Harold Laski, on American democracy. In the Chapter on "Public Administration" you will find many things said about this gentleman. This report, Sir, was also submitted one year ago, on May 23, 1953. Therefore, Sir, in the post-independence period, within a brief span of 7 years three reports have been submitted on public administration, and they are serving no other purpose than providing some interest to scholars on public administration. After all these reports, the Government of India is not satisfied. They are now setting up an institute of public administration, as if this is the culmination or the climax of the grand efforts to change the tenor and tempo of this administration. Sir, you are a genius in reducing every baffling phenomenon to a very simple proposition. Sir, I ask you: What is this? Is it not a purposeful or—I should not say 'purposeful', but I cannot prevent myself from using very hard words—a callous approach to a very burning problem? Therefore, Sir, this Resolution aims at setting up a Commission which might go into all these reports and might submit a fresh report and press the Government for its implementation.

There is no gainsaying the fact that even though every Congressman, every public administrator, feels and gives expression to his feelings in matters relating to public administration the Government still remains unresponsive, inefficient, inadequate, imperfect, insipid, callous and a soulless machine.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Exhausted the adjectives?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Therefore, this Resolution only seeks to remedy that position.

Now, Sir, let us try to approach this subject without importing any passion in it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you do it?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: It is a justified passion. Sir, I mean to say without any unjustified passion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go on, go on.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: The question is about the I.C.S. or I.A.S. I have every respect for them and due regard for them, but they were.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): You have done that all your life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, I want to spare him because he is too old. Sir, the question is that this iron frame was designed for a very different purpose than satisfying the interests of a Welfare State. Sir, what is this I.C.S.? It was planned by the British Civil Service. And as you know, Sir, the British Civil Service is quite different from the American Civil Service, or to a very great extent, from the French Civil Service. In the British Civil Service all the blue-blooded young men from high aristocratic families were recruited because only those who could afford their education in Oxford or Cambridge could join the I.C.S. Therefore, Sir, if you simply analyse the sociological pattern of British Civil

Service, you will find that the set of persons who were being trained up in public administration were quite remote from, and had nothing to do with, the feelings or the aspirations of the lower rungs of life. The British Civil Service supplied us the matrix for our foreign service. Sir, I am very much pained to say that the Indian foreign service also continues to be very much the outdoor relief department of Indian aristocracy. Sir, I wanted that these things should change. It was a very famous statement. The man who made this statement—I do not know if he himself or his compeers still remember it—but it was a very famous statement which was made in this House on the midnight of August 14, 1947. It was an inspiring voice which said that the hour of our tryst with destiny has reached and thereafter we would realise our dreams in substantial measures, though not in full measures. It was a very inspiring voice. We set ourselves that goal. Now, what have we achieved? We have failed and failed miserably, because the soulless machine of the Government would not work, because they lack the social vision, they lack that philosophical attitude which alone would enable them to take up all the programmes of a Welfare State. Now, so much has been said about the Five Year Plan. I invite the attention of the House to Mr. Appleby's report on the Community Projects. There he has said that the Community Projects are not working simply because this red-tapism, this cross-referencing, all this esoteric paper work going on behind the Secretariat walls would not allow the quick implementation of the programmes of the Five Year Plan. So, in a nutshell, we have come to the conclusion that this Government will not be able to improve its tenor, its tempo, and will not enable India to achieve its targets. By merely setting up an Institute of Public Administration, you are not going to tone up the administration. Therefore we suggest that a Commission should be set up.

Another most important aspect to which I would like to invite the

[Shri S Mahanty]

attention of the House is this question of graft and corruption. Corruption has been more or less synonymous with the Congress. We have had a very good crop of scandals, if not of food, after the present Government came to power. Therefore I have ventured to suggest that Congress and corruption are synonymous terms. Some time ago in a journal which is being published by the Congress Parliamentary Party one article was written by an eminent Congressman, viz, Shri S N Agarwal, wherein he attacked the public services for all the acts of omission and commission.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA. Was it also considered as part of the Communist Party crusade against this Government?

SHRI S MAHANTY. Mr A. D. Gorwala replied to that article in the *Statesman* by saying that the Ministers themselves who ought to have set up a higher standard of public administration were guilty. If we turn to Mr Appleby's report, we will also find a startling and amazing observation made by him.

"The extent to which there is graft and corruption is wholly within the responsibility of Ministers, as one eminent independent official said to me here."

So, what I mean to say is that this chit system should be immediately stopped. I would not go into details, because time would not permit me to do so. On the question of a permanent civil service also—whether a permanent civil service would lead to the realisation of the democratic aspirations of the country or not, is a different matter, time will not permit me to analyse it. But so long as you have got a permanent civil service, when once you have arrived at a policy, you should leave it to the permanent civil servants to work out that policy. This chit system and trying to accommodate nephews, cousins or brothers-in-law distant or near, should be completely stopped.

With these words, Sir, I conclude, but before I do so, I would once again urge on the hon. Minister not to consider this merely from party-prestige point of view. I would appeal to him to accept this Resolution and try to see his way to set up a Commission which would really be very useful to the Government.

SHRI H P SAKSENA. Mr Chairman, I rise to express my views with regard to this Resolution. I need not oppose it, because it has already been supported as well as opposed by the Members of the mover's own group. Mr Sundarayya very rightly said that it was no use appointing this Commission, because it would be or no avail. So, in a sense he opposed the Resolution. Mr Mahanty, in his usual eloquent manner and also in his short-tempered frame of mind this morning, has supported it. So, my opposition or support would not be of any special value or importance.

Sir, my whole grievance is this. Unfortunately for our country, we have not yet developed the high sense of nationalism, especially those of us coming from the deserts of Rajasthan or from the distant and almost obscure place, Orissa.

SHRI S MAHANTY. India is not Uttar Pradesh only.

SHRI H P SAKSENA. I would not mind the hon. Member's interruption, because it is beneath my notice. I would recall to the memory of the House the instances of Zaglul Pasha of Egypt or Ataturk of Turkey, when they introduced national Governments. In the first instance Ataturk tried to introduce a national government and in the second place, when he succeeded in bringing about a national government in Turkey, not a sparrow was disturbed out of its nest. The commands and orders of Ataturk were observed and followed by all the inhabitants of Turkey like gospel truth, but here from the first day of our independence in 1947 as soon as the momentary glow of that great event was over, even without waiting for the

results of that to follow in order that a correct assessment may be made, people began to get impatient and began to find out the mistakes, shortcomings and failings of the Government.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Are you aware of what the Chief Minister of U.P. said the other day?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh is a great personal friend of mine. I got many opportunities of talking to him when I do not see the shadow of Mr. Mathur present there.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: You are callous.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I was very much pleased when my friend, Mr. Sundarayya, said that the Commission would cut no ice, that it would be a useless thing, because there have been so many commissions, committees, and things of that sort and this would be only a useless addition.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: What about my suggestions?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I was very much amused to hear Mr. Mahanty saying that corruption and the Congress were synonymous, that they were one and the same. I wish it were a triumvirate, in which Mr. Mahanty would be one of the three—Congress, corruption and Mr. Mahanty. I tell you frankly that I cannot see any corruption in this great country of ours, for the very simple reason that I am myself not corrupt; I do not see any corruption anywhere. Whenever I come across any person who is corrupt, I snub him; I send him away scornfully saying that I did not want to have anything to do with him, because of my fear of being corrupted by him.

Now, this is the way in which corruption can be uprooted. I do not deny that some individuals are corrupt. It has always been so, it shall always be so and it is so even today. True, there is corruption but the manner in which this corruption can be uprooted is not the way to point out that there

is corruption and then to keep quiet as if one's duty was over. This is not the way in which corruption can be uprooted or removed, nor can any number of commissions uproot it. Of course there are ways and means of doing it. I at once declare that I do not believe that day after day rise in wages and salaries will be able to uproot corruption. It has never succeeded anywhere nor shall it succeed here. The only thing which can prevent people from practising corruption is to give them some sort of practical teaching by which their morals may be uplifted. That is the only way. When they begin to shun, to detest and to hate all corrupt practices, then and then alone will corruption be uprooted. I was just on the point of suggesting to the hon. Railway Minister the other day while we were debating the Railway Budget that since the Railways are the biggest employers here in India, there should be a rule that every new entrant to the Railway service should be required to sign a pledge that he shall never have recourse to any corrupt dealing nor, so far as it lay in his power, allow anybody else to have any corrupt dealing. This is one of the ways in which this corruption can be stopped.

Now, while criticising the number of officers and deputy officers, Secretaries and Under Secretaries and Additional Secretaries, Joint Secretaries and Additional Joint Secretaries and all that, we should also bear in mind the volume of work that has increased. After all India today of the year 1954 is not the India of 1904. We should also bear this fact in mind that the volume of work has tremendously increased and we require a larger number of men to cope with it and if there is an increase in the number of clerks and other higher grades of officers, then certainly there will be a proportionate increase among the Secretaries and Under Secretaries also. So there is nothing to be alarmed at, provided the evils of multiplicity of work and duplicity are removed. For instance I may point out that even for the daily bulletins and daily lists of business that we receive from our

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

Secretariat, there is always attached to them an errata; even for the questions there is an errata. Now this sort of thing in my whole public life of 50 years, I never noticed. Our men of the press cannot even print one single question paper correctly and there is an errata to that question paper. This sort of thing brings dishonour to our Government—for unfortunately an individual fish spoils the entire tank.

Now in winding up, I would earnestly request my hon. friends headed by the mover of the Resolution not to be wasting their time in these fissiparous tendencies but devote themselves wholly and entirely to the advancement of their country, the glow of the freedom of which is still radiant before my eyes. I don't know how they look upon the effort but then we have got to do all that lies in our power to make it completely successful within the shortest period of time and with these words I find it my painful duty to oppose the Resolution.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Chairman, I support this Resolution. I think it is very essential to have a Commission which will go into this problem at an early date and as carefully as possible.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Sir, I beg to disagree with some of the remarks made by Members on this side in supporting the Resolution because I believe in a steel-frame. I do believe that in a democracy when Ministers come and Ministers go, when party feelings are high, we have got to have an administration which is absolutely not influenced by party labels. We want an administration which may not be influenced by the party in power. The hon. Member has been just remarking that this is wrong. I may point out to him that in the last elections in Travancore-Cochin, the complaint was that the Government servants were taking sides. What I meant was that the Government servant should not take

sides, should not really be influenced by the party in power. He should be a servant. The very name signifies that he is a public servant and he should carry out the duties of a public servant. The Ministers should lay down policies, should lay down principles, but the execution of those should be done by the civil servants. The civil servant has got the difficult and delicate task of carrying out the policies of the Ministers without any favour. This Resolution does not say that we do not want to have a civil service or a permanent civil or a steel-frame. This Resolution only says that in the present administrative set-up the number of officers and the number of staff is so large that it is leading to red-tape, that it is causing delay, that by the very increase of numbers the files go on moving. On another occasion I took the opportunity of pointing out that the number of notings on files has gone up very much. The hon. Member who preceded me has pointed out that the number of officers with all the prefixes and suffixes that are available in the English dictionary, are added on to Secretary and Director, that where there used to be 2 or 3 persons with the basic name of Secretary and prefixes and suffixes are now being replaced by at least 18 or 20 persons in the same category, that the number of officers included in the group of Secretaries has increased nearly six-fold. You know that in the External Affairs Office alone the number of Secretaries and Joint Secretaries, etc., is about 25.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): There is a Secretary-General.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Likewise in other Departments also, the number of Secretaries and Joint Secretaries and other officers of the same category with prefixes and suffixes has increased so much that they have got to create some work for themselves.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Have they no work?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The result is that in order to create work, they have

to draw up elaborate programmes of how the noting from one officer has got to go to another officer, of how he has got to shirk the responsibility of taking the final decision. You see it is all an artificial creation of work and once you create such work, you can certainly say that everybody is already overworked. I do not say that Secretaries at present have not got enough work. They have got enough work on the basis of the arrangement of transfer of papers from one to the other that they have adopted. But really speaking, there is not enough work in the true sense. If you make some changes then you can reduce the amount of work.

Sir, this Resolution asks for a Commission to consider the procedure of work, not only the administrative set-up but also the procedure of work. The procedure should be simplified in such a manner and the powers to decide should be so well distributed among the staff that decisions are taken quickly, without simply transferring the file from one to the other. I suppose every hon. Member has had experience of the delay that is caused in our offices and in the Secretariat of the Government of India, and they would have often found how a simple reply is received after six months, when the event for which the enquiry was made had already passed by and elapsed. This is all due to the artificial creation of work by the departments.

Then again, Sir, let us consider it from the point of view of the employees in the Government Departments. If you consider it from their point of view, they say that the opportunities for promotion are dependent on the number of persons employed. So naturally, if they want larger number of promotions, they must increase the number of persons. If there are only one or two Secretaries or Joint Secretaries, then naturally people lower down on the ladder feel that they will get an opportunity only if one of those persons retires. But if the number of Joint Secretaries and Secretaries is ten, naturally the

possibility of getting one of those posts is much greater. And therefore, the whole Secretariat is busy trying to find out some sort of new loop-holes and new names and new requirements and to somehow or the other impress the Minister, by creating a sort of unhealthy rivalry between them that a particular Department is getting ten Secretaries, why should not this "your Department have a like number, or if that is not possible, at least one or two more?" And so the competition goes on. Every Minister wants a little more, a greater number of Secretaries than the Minister in some other Department, and in this unhealthy competition, the number of Secretaries goes on mounting up. The hon. Home Minister some time back gave us the figures that while before the War there were 3,000 officers in the Secretariat, there are now as many as 19,000 of them. I submit, Sir, that in a free country, their number is bound to increase; but the increase is out of all proportion to the amount of work, to the increase in the amount of work.

Sir, when we come to the clerical staff, there also the same competition goes on. You have got two or three grades of clerks and there is a proportion fixed that if you have so many clerks of Grade III, you should have so many of Grade II and if you have so many of Grade II you should have so many of Grade I. Therefore, naturally the clerks also want to have a larger number in each category so that they may have greater possibilities of promotion.

And, of course, when there are more clerks and more officers, each clerk and officer must have a chaprasi and so the number of chaprasis also increases in proportion. The net result is that the whole Secretariat has created an amount of artificial work. One officer considers it below his dignity or the clerk feels it beneath his dignity to go to another room where the file has to be considered and examined. He must have a chaprasi who must take it with a noting to the other room. The other man in that room does not understand

[Shri Kishen Chand]

this noting and so he puts down his noting on it and sends the file back to the first room and so it goes on from one room to the other

Sir, what is the solution? Hon Members have pointed out that we have had several commissions. Each person who is appointed, examines it from one particular view-point. But unless and until there is a Commission which is appointed to deal with the whole work, it cannot be tackled properly. You have got to see how much work each Department has got. They must say "This Department is to have so many people and somehow or other you have to manage the work within that number". That is the only way of doing it. No Commission can really go into every detail and prescribe the complete rules and regulations and simplify the matter. They will have to fix the optimum for each Department generally, considering the amount of work that is coming under that Department, and it should be the duty of the Secretary of the Department in full consultation with the Minister in charge, to so regulate the work that the work is accomplished in the shortest possible time. That is the only way. If you expect the Commission to go into all these details and to say how it is to be carried out, then the Commission will only submit a report and it will be shelved as previous reports have been shelved so far.

Sir, hon Members have said that if the number is found to be much in excess of the requirements, then it may lead to retrenchment and unemployment. The problem of unemployment is already very acute and I do not think the hon Member the mover of this Resolution, wants the immediate retrenchment of all the additional or superfluous staff. It is very easy to manage. Every year there is at least 4 to 5 per cent of the total strength in the shape of vacancies, and new recruitments are being made. When the occasion for new recruitment comes up you should not fill up all the vacancies. You should fill up only one-fourth of the

vacancies by new recruits or new entrants and for the rest three-fourths, you should absorb the people who have become superfluous in these Departments. I assure you there is no danger of retrenchment if there is a reorganisation of the Central Secretariat. I do not agree that we have too much of decentralisation, because in a federal structure, the States have got full autonomous powers and so that question does not arise at all. We are only concerned with the Central Secretariat and this Commission will deal only with the Central Secretariat and the set-up involved there. Therefore, if we have a proper policy of recruitment so that every year we do not fill up all the vacancies but only a part by new entrants, then we can in a period of ten years, absorb the superfluous staff and yet not adopt any policy of retrenchment.

Sir, the hon Members have on various occasions spoken about corruption. This is a well-known fact and there is no need to rub it in. But this is due entirely to the fact that the numbers in the offices are too many. They have to have some sort of work and they therefore keep on transferring one paper from one room to the other and naturally the man who is keen to have his work done quickly offers them some bribe. Therefore, I think if you reduce the number of clerks and officers in the Secretariat, we will, to some extent, remove corruption also.

Lastly, Sir, I want to point out that in the Congress Government it has been somehow adopted that the persons who have gone to jail have got to be given some sort of a reward and when some sort of reward has to be given, some undue influence is brought in by public men on Government servants. Therefore, I think it is very essential that the Government should insist that public men do not interfere in the matter of Secretariat work.

For these reasons, Sir, I support this Resolution.

MAJOR-GENERAL S S SOKHEY
(Nominated) Mr Deputy-Chairman,

whether a Commission is necessary or not, it is a fact that the present administrative set-up requires to be changed. We must look at the fact that the present administrative set-up that we are having is one borrowed wholesale from the previous British Administration. They had something very specific in their mind for which they built up this machinery and that was to have an administrative set-up which they could rely upon to see that orders received from England were carried out. Their main interest was to see that law and order was maintained and nothing allowed to disturb the easy collection of taxes and to generally carry on the other activities of the country but they had no intention to use their machinery to develop the country. So long as law and order was maintained, their business concerns had a free field to do what they wanted. For that purpose the whole of the power was concentrated in the hands of a few officers in the Secretariat. They had a very large number of officers outside the Secretariat but they were given routine powers and written books of rules and regulations. They were given no power; they could work inside the rules and regulations and if anything else was to be done which was not covered by the regulations, they had to come to the Secretariat. In the Secretariat they put in a man whom they could trust to see that the British interests were safeguarded.

If we look at it, we will see that the present administrative machinery and the rules and regulations are the same as of the British and they will not help us to develop our own resources. I personally have had great experience of the working of the machinery. I served for 37 years as a member of one of the services. For twenty years I was the Director of one of the biggest research institutes of the country. I developed it from a small beginning. I found the rules entirely unsuitable. I am a scientist of some standing, but I could not do anything; I had to write to my next officer, who would be a Surgeon-

General, either a physician or a surgeon, who would know a little of what I was talking but then even he, under the regulations, was not entitled to take any decision and he had to write to a man higher up in the Secretariat, a member of the Civil Service. This officer knew certainly nothing about what I was talking and the result was that when I sent up some suggestion, it first went into the hands of a man who knew little about the subject and finally was decided by some one who knew certainly nothing whatsoever. I soon discovered what the trouble was and I had to point out that the Institute could not be developed under the set regulations and the present hierarchy. I must say to my good fortune, that I was listened to and was allowed to develop the Institute without taking much note of the rules and regulations. I acquired freedom to act with the result that I was able to develop it. When I took over the Institute, there were about twelve scientists and, in a period of twenty years, I could increase the number of scientists to ninety and raise the income from Rs. 3 lakhs to Rs. 30 lakhs simply because the rules and regulations which hampered the work were not applied. Three other similar research institutes which continued to work in the routine way, received very much the same during this period. I am just explaining that the rules and regulations under which routine work could be done are not designed to enable officers to undertake developmental work. Therefore, the most important thing that we have got to realise is that in order to be able to get developmental work done we should give responsibility to the officers at different stages of the hierarchy. When we employ a person to do a particular job see that he is competent and that he knows the job, then give him full responsibilities.

At present, there is still another difficulty. It is perfectly true that we want a permanent Civil Service but what happens to a Civil Service is that people are employed at a very young age and possibly after they had just taken an academic degree in classics

[Major-General S. S. Sokhey.]

or some equally futile subject. Then they serve in different departments, one day they are in charge of Commerce and Industry, then perhaps in charge of Broadcasting, after that perhaps in charge of Finance and so on. Civil Servants should be selected on a different basis. Then again it is true that they do not give even the Civil Servants the responsibility to see what they can do. We must look into the question in a proper manner and devise an administrative set-up that meets our needs. The present administrative set-up, as I said, was just to keep things going in their own tracks smoothly and not to allow them to jump tracks.

The services were so unused to taking initiative that in World War II when England—which devised this Civil Service—was faced with a life and death struggle, the House of Lords had a debate for three days in which they demanded that the British Civil Service be done away with, thrown out lock stock and barrel, because under their method of work nothing could be done rapidly enough for the defence of the country. I am not saying that this is the fault of the Civil Servants; I am merely saying that the way they are enlisted and the way they are used makes them routine workers.

Similarly, in the present set-up, as far as I know, if a particular question comes to the Secretariat, it is handled by a clerk, an Under Secretary, a Deputy Secretary and then by the Secretary. Even then the matter does not come to an end. I am told it goes to the Minister. That is not the way. Each officer should be properly selected for the job and given responsibility and given defined sphere of work. The thing would be for the Ministers to devote themselves to broad problems of policy and lay down very clearly what they expect their Secretariat to do. Having decided that, they should then divide the work among the various officers, the Secretary, the Joint Secretary, the Deputy Secretary,

the Under Secretary and so on and give them the responsibility to do what is expected of them. When a matter comes up they should take a decision and expedite the work.

The present administrative machinery is holding up development in this country. It is a matter of extreme importance that without further delay we should look into this and devise a machinery which will enable us to undertake the great work of development.

SHRI A. S. KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I heard the speech of the mover with great attention. I will first of all say a few words on the merit of the proposal. I may remind the House that the late Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar went through the whole system of the Secretariat here and made certain recommendations, which were accepted by the Government then. Again the Five Year Plan Committee went into the whole thing and they made certain recommendations, and retrenchment and economies were effected by the Government on the recommendations of the Planning Committee. If we see the Budget carefully, we will find that some two years ago there was some retrenchment made. Then, with the development of the Five Year Plan the work increased and they had to increase the staff also to cope with the work. Well, this is the position as far as the question of the Secretariat is concerned.

Now some of the hon. Members, in their speeches, while supporting the Resolution, I think, have gone a little bit beyond the scope of the Resolution and have condemned the services. I am sorry, Sir, I do not agree with them there. I had to do something with the services. I had occasions to work with them and I know that the services in India are really quite a good lot. The real difficulty is that during the British regime, the services had to make the policy and that is the reason why there is a bias generally against the services, but now that position has changed. To-day they have to carry

out the policy made by the Government and to the best of their ability they are doing so. Therefore I see no reason why we should feel any bias against them, or in any way suspect their loyalty or their sincerity.

As to the question of corruption, well, I do not say that the members of the services are all very honest. Some of them are corrupt; some of them are straightforward, but there are black sheep in every fold, and I am sure the Government will take every care that such black sheep are kicked out from the fold of the services, but, at the same time, if we look at the thing rather dispassionately, we will find that after all recruitment to the services is made from our young men through the Public Service Commission or through competitive examinations. Well, I should say that the same standard which prevails outside the services about honesty and integrity must be reflected in the services also. After all they are one of us, they are our kith and kin, and I see no reason why they should be more corrupt than we ourselves. I am saying all these things for this reason that there is nobody here from among the members of the services to defend them and somebody should take it on himself to defend the position of the services.

One of my friends who just spoke was pleased to say that notes made by scientific people are dealt with by clerks. Well, that is a very difficult question because this complaint has always been there. Military people always say, "Our schemes should not be dealt with by laymen." Engineers always say, "Why are these laymen poking their nose in our proposals?" And we have just heard a doctor saying the same thing. But there are two sides—there is the administrative side and there is the technical side of administration of every department. So far as the technical side is concerned, generally the Ministers, the Secretaries and the Deputy Secretaries abide by the advice and suggestions of the technical advisers. Where they interfere is generally on the administrative

side of it. Apart from this, Sir, if we carry this theory to the extreme, that expert opinion by technical men should never be challenged, then it will cut at the very root of a democratic government, and it will then come to this that the Minister of Health should not be necessarily a Member of Parliament but an eminent doctor, that the Minister of Defence should be a very eminent General, etc. But this is not democracy. Democracy really means that there is a Government of laymen presided over by laymen but advised by experts. This, I think, is democracy because we are men in the street. We do not represent here the experts, the technicians and the specialists, but we represent the man in the street and we want to bring the feeling of the man in the street to bear on the subject when it comes to us. I do not want to say anything more. I think it is premature and there is hardly any need for such a Commission at this stage. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Resolution that we are discussing is a very important one. Whatever the proper method of dealing with it may be, there is no doubt that the present administrative set-up, which has been in existence for a long time, has repeatedly come in for criticism. It was set up at a time when the object of the Government was not so much to get things done as to prevent any radical change from being effected quickly. The Government in the old days was concerned with administrative problems, but not, generally speaking, with such large questions of policy as have to be dealt with now. The British administrators themselves recognised that the administrative machine prevented the taking of action on any subject within any reasonable time. We all know that important questions, particularly those connected with constitutional and administrative reform, had been repeatedly discussed in the old Secretariat and yet no decision was arrived at. The papers passed through the hands of various persons every time the question came

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

under examination from a Superintendent right up to the Secretary of the Department concerned, and yet no substantial change in policy was effected. Now surely, the character of the Government having changed and the character of the problems to be dealt with having also changed, the tempo of administration should be quickened. It is necessary that while every important question that has to be decided should be carefully thought over, it is equally important that no unnecessary delay should take place in the decision of the question. I understand that there are frequently cases in which every officer in the Secretariat from the Under Secretary, or rather from the Assistant Secretary, to the departmental head notes on the file. I do not know whether this takes place frequently but I suppose this takes place in connection with important matters. There is certainly a division of authority between the various grades of officers in the Secretariat. The Secretary, the Joint Secretary, and the Deputy Secretary each has an allotted sphere of work and yet those who have had occasion to see the files of the Government of India have complained from time to time that there is too much noting and that it is unnecessary. Now, I do not know what the result of the examination of the problem by Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar was. I do not know what his main recommendations were and to what extent they have been given effect to. But from all that I hear, I gather that the administrative set-up remains either totally unchanged or substantially unchanged. The Ministries now are concerned not merely with keeping the administrative machine going but with the approval of important schemes and the necessity for their early execution. I think therefore that it is high time that the working of the machine was carefully examined from this point of view and all unnecessary noting was done away with. But, Sir, it should not be supposed that if decisions were arrived at quickly, if unnecessary noting was done away with, the administrative

machine would work as we wish it to work. Recently, because of the change in the character of the Government new problems have arisen which have created new difficulties. The Report of Shri A. D. Gorwala on Public Administration forcibly draws attention to these questions. Giving examples of organisational defects, he first points out that there is not that clear demarcation of functions between the Minister and his departmental head, that should exist in a well-organised Administration. Perhaps owing to the pressure of the representatives of the people in the Legislatures on the Ministers, they are anxious to go into details and to concern themselves, with things which really lie within the sphere of the departmental head and his colleagues. He rightly points out that this encroachment of the Ministers on the functions of the department should be brought to an end as early as possible. This can only be done when the Minister is in a position to trust his Secretary. Normally, the relations between the Minister and his Secretary ought to be inspired by goodwill and confidence but if in any particular case the Secretary does not win the confidence of his Minister then it is better that the Secretary should be changed than that the Minister should encroach on the functions of the Secretary. A change in personnel is any day better than acting in such a way as to bring in serious organisational defects which blur the sense of responsibility of the permanent officials and destroy their power of initiative and their sense of confidence in themselves.

Another defect pointed out by Mr. Gorwala is that when a question concerns more than one Ministry, the Minister principally concerned instead of settling the matter in consultation with the other Ministers whose opinion has to be taken, asks the head of his department to go to the other Ministries. Now, this again is demoralising and leads to delay. The Secretary should be left to perform his own duty. The Ministers should take upon themselves the task of

settling their differences amongst themselves. If something has to be explained by one Ministry to another, well, the heads of the two Ministries should meet and after understanding the problem come to an agreement. If no agreement can be arrived at between them, the Prime Minister should settle the matter or when it is an important question, the entire Cabinet, but in no case should the Secretary be asked to wander about from Ministry to Ministry. His work suffers and, if I may say so, his sense of self-respect also suffers. He chafes under the feeling that he is asked to do work that is not really his.

There is one more example of defects in organisation pointed out by Mr. Gorwala that I should like particularly to refer to on this occasion. He has referred to the relations that prevail at present between the Ministry of Finance and the other Ministries. I think every one of us has some experience of this. A Department may consider some expenditure to be necessary. This view is arrived at either on administrative grounds or on grounds of policy. But the Finance Ministry may turn down the scheme, and this may happen even though the Financial Adviser of the Ministry concerned might have approved of the scheme. Now, Sir, is it necessary to have two financial officers to deal with the proposals of a Ministry or group of Ministries—a Financial Adviser and the Joint Secretary of Finance concerned with the particular problem? I see no reason why this should happen. The appropriate relations between the Finance Ministry and the administrative ministry, as Mr. Gorwala says, should be of a different kind. The Finance Ministry should exercise general financial control and not interfere with the efficient working of a Ministry.

Other matters may also be referred to; but I think the examples I have given from the Gorwala Report are sufficient to show that the defects in the present administrative machine are neither few nor small.

There is only one other point that I should like to refer to before I conclude. All officers of Government are not equally efficient; nor, unfortunately, men of equal integrity. But, I think it may be said of our higher civil services in general—mind you, Sir, I am not speaking now of the technical services, but of the administrative services—that their members have a high sense of duty and set a good example to their subordinates. Where the Minister does not agree with his departmental head, he should quickly come to an understanding with him and not run him down in public. We have had to criticise the Administrative Services; they are undoubtedly sometimes open to criticism and it would be a pity if anybody tried to shield them from criticism. It will be then for the Minister concerned to defend them, but the Ministers themselves should take such measures as they can to improve the working of their departments, and not make the differences between them and their subordinates public and criticise the civil servants on the ground that they still have the old angle of view and until the administrative personnel was completely changed, no large programme of reform could be quickly carried through. This is the worst way, Sir,—the worst way imaginable of dealing with this problem. If the Government really feel that the present services are not capable of discharging the tasks that the recent changes—political and constitutional changes—have thrown on them, then, it should take effective steps to change the personnel as quickly as they can. Whatever the financial burden that this matter may entail, it is far better that the Ministers should have to deal with new men in whom they have enough confidence. Then, they should not unnecessarily and sometimes unjustly, depreciate the capacity and the power of adjustment to new situations and circumstances that the higher civil servants possess. I hope that they can well look into these problems.

Sir, the last problem is of very recent origin; the other problems

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

however are old. I think, therefore, that they should be quickly looked into so that the Administration might be equal to the new responsibilities that have devolved on it. According to the Gorwala Report, there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the Administration, but only certain changes have to be made in order to enable it to handle its work more efficiently and more satisfactorily.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the importance of such a Resolution, I suppose, lies not in its proposals, but in the fact that it gives us an opportunity to discuss some of the very important administrative problems of our country. I wonder, Sir, whether it is at all possible to radically change the present administrative organisation or set-up without having a corresponding change in the public policy, in the attitude of the Government, in the behaviour of the Ministers and the officers. Since, Sir, I do not see any possibility of such a radical and much-desirable change, I do not have many illusions about the future changes here and there in the administrative set-up. There may be a kind of re-assortment of the old furniture but the room will be the same, the furniture will be the same. That may please some, but that will not please us. So, I would like to touch on some of the basic problems of public administration as we see them. References have been made to two reports. One is the Report on Public Administration by Mr. Gorwala, and the other is a Survey of Public Administration by Mr. Paul Appleby, Consultant in Public Administration, who came to this country under the Ford Foundation, but being invited, of course, by our Government. Sir, the less said about these two reports, the better. I have not read such a worthless report as the report of Mr. Appleby. It is full of platitudes, and it makes certain suggestions which would only go to make the administration much more bureaucratic than it is. Mr. Appleby came to see India and he wanted to

give us a harangue and he has done it; I do not know how much it has cost our exchequer. Then, there is the Gorwala Report. He is, again, a retired I.C.S. gentleman, and looks somewhat frustrated in his own line; and this frustration finds its echo in his report. He has approached this problem of public administration with the air of a high-brow bureaucrat.

Sir, what does one get between these two reports? If you read these reports you are puzzled. One comes from the American school of bureaucracy and the other from the Anglo-Saxon school, and in between them they have produced a sort of a report, and we get a cross between American and English bureaucracy. Yet, Sir, these reports are important inasmuch as certain very popular grievances which are brushed aside by some of the Ministers, have found some reflections there. Therefore, they have to be read. That is why we read even such bad books.

Sir, I would like now to touch on one aspect of the administration, i.e., the Secretariat and the Cabinet. We are supposed to be a parliamentary form of Government, and the Administration is supposed to be responsible to Parliament. We are trying to imitate the British, and we are not unmindful of the American State Department either. Now, Sir, first of all you have here the Cabinet which has undoubtedly certain administrative functions, and it is through the Cabinet that the public administration of the country is supposed to be responsible to the people through Parliament. Now, we have, I suppose, 14 full-blood Ministers and 6 half-blood State Ministers. And then we have got another 14 Deputy Ministers. We have got a total of 34. I am not counting here those little Parliamentary Secretaries who are just having their first lessons so that at some day they might appear in the role of Deputy Ministers or State Ministers, or may be, Cabinet Ministers. But let us take the Council of Ministers. What is it? How does it function? If the public

administration was really responsible, we would have found the reflection of that responsibility in the functioning of the Council of Ministers. But what do we see? Sir, they come here, and as you have been experiencing, they do not bother about the people at all. The Opposition of course is brushed aside and dismissed out of court, although the fact is that this side of the House, whatever may be the various divisions here, represents the majority of the voters in the country. Not that side. Nearly 44 per cent. of the people are represented by that side, and the rest 56 per cent. are represented by this side. Yet we find an indifferent attitude adopted towards us. That is perhaps because of the incorrigible habits of those people. Then, Sir, what do we find in the Congress Party itself? The hon. Members of the Congress Party, who are sitting on the back benches and who do not have any opportunity to come forward and to occupy this position in the front, will bear me out when I say that they are hardly consulted and they have hardly any place in the discussions on policy matters. They attend the Congress Parliamentary Party meetings to ditto the Congress policies or rather the Government policies as presented to them. Now, it is an unfortunate thing that even those representatives of the 44 per cent. of the people of our country are not taken into proper confidence as far as matters of public administration are concerned. I am sure, Sir, if they had been properly consulted, the Administration would have been much better than what it is today. I am not talking about our side. We are of course untouchables as far as the Government is concerned. Sir, what happens then? How do they function? The Cabinet functions somewhat on the pattern of the British Cabinet, relying on the bureaucratic set-up. There was a time when one gentleman, called Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, wrote a book—his autobiography. In it he described the civil services as kept services. And he said very bold and brave

things against the services and he gave an impression to the country that if he were to be put in power those services would be disbanded. Now, Sir, we know nothing of that sort is happening. The very same gentleman today is the greatest worshipper at this shrine of civil services, and my hon. friend, Pandit Kunzru, need have no fear, because they are not at all going to abolish the Civil Service which is holding the baby for them, and sometimes that baby is passed on here to us to be demonstrated in Parliament. Sir, the point is this. Here we have got the Civil Service in India which has not at all been disbanded. It has been strengthened and much more hardened and toughened by bringing in fresh reinforcements. We have got the latest figures. The number of Secretaries in the Government of India is 26 and each of them gets of course Rs. 4,000, if he is fortunate enough to belong to the I.C.S.; but if he belongs to the I.A.S., he gets Rs. 3,000. Then there are 42 Joint Secretaries. Their salary has been fixed at Rs. 3,000 in the case of I.C.S. and Rs. 2,250 in the case of I.A.S. Then of course we have got a whole array of Deputy Secretaries. Their number is 142. Then we have *ex-officio* Secretaries and *ex-officio* Joint Secretaries and *ex-officio* Deputy Secretaries. Then, Sir, there is a whole regiment of Under Secretaries. Now here is an army of bureaucrats kept ready in the Secretariat to deal with the administrative problems. Now, Sir, how are they recruited? They are recruited in the same way as it is done in England, by some Civil Service fellows. I had a very queer experience of those fellows. In England, Sir, one man went for a *viva voce* examination. The question that was put to him was "Who is the greatest man in India?" The candidate thought that the best way to get into service would be to say that Lord Irwin was the greatest man in India. So he replied "Lord Irwin". But some of the examiners did not like that crass reply and the man was rejected. Now, Sir, we know how they had

[Shri B. Gupta.]

been taught. We have lived with those people, and we know the types of books they were given to read and the kind of lesson they were given. We know all these things. There is no doubt that some of them are very good students; some of them would have been very good professors, very good demonstrators and very good lecturers, scientists and so on. But they are all pitchforked into such administrative positions and made over to a ready-made bureaucracy which grinds them and makes mince-meat of them. The result is that they get de-educated. An I.C.S. officer told me that they had become fairly illiterate now because they had forgotten whatever they read about Shakespeare or Tagore, and all the rest of it. Now, that way, we get an army of people who rule the show. Now, it is they who prepare Bills; it is they who look into all these matters; it is they who handle all such things. And some of the Ministers simply eat out of their hands, and that is what we feel, Sir, when we find how helpless they look when the supplementaries go off the rails. These people having dealt with such Ministers and Deputy Ministers, and all the rest of it, have become very artful. They know what kind of supplementaries would be coming, because they have been sitting in the official galleries for long long years. But, in case, the supplementaries go off the track, our Ministers are very very helpless. They look like orphan boys when we ask difficult supplementaries. And, Sir, when you are in the Chair, you also sympathise with them. So, Sir, this is the position with regard to the I.C.S. and the I.A.S.

Sir, as far as the parliamentary form of government is concerned, it is a very wonderful thing. We can hardly change even a comma in the Bills prepared by bureaucracy. Dr. Katju is now putting up a very gallant fight, but we find that the Bill has been drafted on the advice of the intelligence service. And what a gallant fight?

(Time bell rings.)

I will finish. When, Sir, it comes to that sort of Bill, we find that the parliamentary machine is put in full gear and that Bill gets passed. And the 700 Members of Parliament in these two Houses will not be able perhaps to change even a comma or whatever has been written at the Secretariat by a handful of bureaucrats on the advice of the intelligence service. Sir, they may try to hide the bureaucratic regime from the country, but after all people are becoming intelligent, and it would be very difficult to deceive them for any length of time.

Now, a word about the lower grade officers—the small men—in the Administration. They are neglected. They have become beasts of burden. Initiative is not encouraged in them. Sir, even in this Gorwala Report you will find that he has made certain observations that the arrangements are such as would not enable these smaller people to come up. On the contrary, they are retrenched; they are often penalised. They are not even paid a proper dearness allowance. This is what Mr. Gorwala has written, a man from among the big people. What we feel is that there should be enough room for initiative with the smaller people. After all, the real administrator should come from the common man, and it is the people who are in the lower rungs of the ladder who are most connected with the common man. They should not be victimised. They should not be retrenched. They should be encouraged. But the Government is using them—at least most of them—as temporary hands and throwing them out like squeezed lemons whenever they like, after the job has been done. This is another blot on the public administration of the country. Now, I do not know how to overhaul this elaborate bureaucratic machine with all its strings spread over the entire country. Therefore, we say that there is no point in appointing this Commission. It would not take us any far, and we know that many Commissions have come and gone, but nothing really good has been done. I

see the people sitting on the other side smiling, when we talk of such things, because they have their answer ready. Sir, the problem of the public administration of this country is essentially the problem of democratisation of the administration, decentralization of the administration and of the disbanding of that hide-bound bureaucratic core which has entrenched itself in very high positions. The Ministers should develop a proper attitude towards the people and towards the Parliament, and not bring forward Press Bills and other measures like that to curb all criticism. I know that all this must have fallen on deaf ears because there, again is this soulless bureaucracy behind them.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Andhra): Mr Deputy Chairman, I trust I have followed Dr Kunzru carefully and intelligently. He appeared to be a consummate Gorwala fan. I do admire that civilian, especially when he does not write articles on international politics, which must be left to men like me. His report I have read with great care and attention, all the care and attention it deserves but the leopard cannot change its spots, neither can a civilian shake himself out of his own body. His report suffers from certain limitations which make it less valuable than it might have been. It is not free from those conditioned complexes to which the mind of a member of the Indian Civil Service is heir. Sir, we should not forget that in a democracy it is the Minister responsible to Parliament that gives orders, and there is no question of a Secretary "differing" from him, he advises but obeys he must. Democratisation of the services is required in consonance with the ideals of this country, I agree, and I find myself in a very good company of Mr Bhupesh Gupta, but that must not impair ministerial responsibility to Parliament. Sir, what is the set-up in this country? We have a Public Service Commission to recruit the personnel of the services. We have treasury control as much as possible, and it has been tightened up in recent months. We have a Cabinet Secre-

tariat which co-ordinates policies, but then the personnel, the training and the working are not satisfactory. I shall explain why. An obvious defect is the lack of a sense of urgency and of tempo. You may do anything with the bureaucracy as it has descended down to us from the Anglo-Indian days, but you cannot cure it of inertia. You will remember, Mr Deputy Chairman, the story of a correspondence on a subject that had been going on for sixty years till Lord Curzon put an end to it. Sixty years cover two generations, but there are still children of that bureaucracy living with us. The bureaucracy has also the vice of self-proliferation. It continuously adds to its corporation—Secretary, Joint Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary—goodness knows how many. You can ascertain it from the Telephone Directory or the Civil List. I am not against bureaucracy as such, for the simple reason that in a Welfare State you have got to have a huge bureaucracy. But to what extent it will be susceptible to the influences of a democratic life and the Welfare State is a doubtful proposition. I am not sure our bureaucracy does not deserve the compliments, the exuberant compliments, paid to it by Mr Edwin Samuel Montagu in 1917 after the Mesopotamia debacle—too wooden, too antediluvian. It is much more so comparatively now. It has now risen to the expectations and requirements of the new State. It suffers from a chronic institutional defect. Expeditious disposal of business is never its strong point. A conspicuous weakness is the lack of initiative at the lower levels. What about freedom from corruption? We have yet to reach the ideal. In passing let me say that I do not agree that the Secretaries of the Government must be paid according to the "Congress standard." By doing that you will only make them corrupt. Being a journalist fighting for better standards of living and payment I would say, "Let the civilians stand up for their rights." Do not starve them, because that will only make them less efficient. But do not at the same time allow them to set a high standard of

[Shri Rama Rao.]

life. The story goes that, when Sir James Grigg came to India as Minister of Finance and was shown the place where he was to live, he was startled to see the palatial premises and asked, "Am I a Duke?" Only Dukes live in such houses in England. I used to live in only a small flat in London. What is all this? How can I maintain this?" Our Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and Under Secretaries are still keeping up those old standards. We cannot afford it in this country. What are the essential conflicts in the Governmental machine today. In a federal polity, there is ever present conflict between the Centre and the States. At one time, British India in real practice was 250 districts governed from the Centre. Today, that is not possible. In regard to financial control, in an era where the provinces depend upon doles from the Centre, the Centre cannot abdicate its responsibility for the proper spending of the amounts.

The Five Year Plan has reinforced the demand for Central control. We want linguistic provinces. That has a direct bearing on recruitment to the services. I have already discussed the question of democratic government, the Welfare State and parliamentary institutions. These bear strongly on the administrative machine which must not creak under their weight. There are two points to consider here. One is the personnel, the policy, the administration. The other is the laying down of policies and the execution of them with graduated levels of responsibility or initiative. Fitting the general administrative set-up in the ambit of political policies, is the problem of the day.

Sir, I support the Resolution for the demand for the appointment of a Commission. Why? The administration must be modernised. You will remember that the Civil Service of today had its origin in the clerks of the East India Company—not a very adorable species if Robert Clive was one of them. Then slowly a Police State developed under a foreign government. It was the cry of the Indian National Congress in the

early days that if only the services were Indianised, it would be a wonderful world to live in but the forefathers, that begat us forgot that the Civil Service of those days represented the ruling race and therefore the moment Indians became fifty-fifty with the Europeans in the services, certain awkward things began to happen. Indian civilians were still being denied effective opportunities on grounds of race. A man like Sir Malcolm Hailey, it seems, once remarked that Indians made good administrators but they lacked the qualities of the ruling race. It might as well have been said that they lacked the tiger qualities of the Imperialist race. Having been slaves for centuries, they could not have developed the qualities of a ruling race overnight. I suppose anybody who has read Scott's "Ivanhoe" would find that the Normans used to say the same thing of the Anglo-Saxons of their day. So the battle has not been won even after the Indianisation of the services.

Why not periodical Commissions? We have had them pretty frequently. There were the Welby Commission, the Islington Commission, the Lee Commission—there were ever so many Commissions and personal investigations after, down to the day of Mr. Gopalaswamy Ayyangar. The time has come when you have got to examine this question afresh in all its amplitude and comprehension, in order to make our democracy successful. Mr. Appleby has given a good certificate to our machine and we are grateful to him. Mr. M. R. Jayaker, laughing at it said that this Government seemed to be depending too much on certificates from Americans, but it does mean something when the certificate in this instance comes from an expert on administration, and that too from an American. We are setting up institutes of administration in this country. I believe one is coming up in Patna, another in U.P. and in the Centre also we are going to have an institute. Let us study administration scientifically before we get down to practice.

No Indian, if he is honest to himself, can forget the great work of our services after 1947. There was a tremendous debacle in 1947. The senior men—the Europeans—ran away. Onerous responsibilities devolved upon younger shoulders. They accepted them cheerfully and rose to the height of the great argument. We are grateful to them but it would not be enough that our services are up to the mark. The urgent questions are these: How will they fit themselves into the mental apparatus of the new State? How will they create the needed machine? How will they raise the tempo? What is the system of administration best suited to us? If you go to France, you will find that the civil service set-up there is different from that of England. In the United States even judges are elected. I would therefore suggest that, instead of importing experts, we should send abroad say half a dozen Gorwalas and half a dozen men from public life to gain knowledge of other systems.

I must pause to pay my tribute to the youngmen of the I.A.S. who have been coming up very well. I know they are being called upon to accept responsibilities of a high order and they are not disappointing us. I am particularly proud of our young men in the Indian Foreign Service. I had occasion to go out of this country and I was discussing problems of foreign policy with some of the ablest men in Europe to whom I was introduced by our embassies and legations. They admired the capacity of these young Indians to conduct so well affairs of diplomacy of the highest order with only the short experience available to them.

Sir, I am hopeful of the future. I hope it will be said of us at a future day that having inherited the institutions of Asoka and the Moghul Empire, having had the benefit of British contracts and the British methods of administration, we have built up Civil Services of the highest order, services working so well as to

deserve to be called the greatest architects of the Welfare State.

Sir, for this reason I would welcome the appointment of the Commission, provided it is a Commission that will do its work along the lines I have suggested.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): I had no intention of taking part in this debate but one or two speeches that have been made compel me to say a word or two. The problem that is before the Government is a serious problem and there is not the slightest doubt that the Government is fully aware of the seriousness of the problem. The Government has taken steps to have this particular problem examined by experts. After the two reports which my friend on my right considered to be worthless, perhaps because he had not read them.....

SHRI B. GUPTA: Oh, yes, I have read them.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: If my friend had read them, he would have known that every bit of the criticism he dealt with is referred to in these reports and answers are given. After these two reports, I understand that the Auditor-General has been examining this problem and has already submitted an interim report. Whatever the aspect of that report may be we don't know. But the fact is that from this evidence it is clear that the Government is taking certain steps in regard to this very important matter. Now, why is the Government taking these steps? A lot of criticism has been levelled at various stages in regard to the working of the Administration. What has happened is this that the whole Administration was almost completely concerned with the preservation of law and order in this country. Therefore, the type of official who had to be appointed to these important posts was an official who was capable of controlling the situation, if I may use that expression, and so his entire aspect and outlook were governed by the necessity of preserving law and order in the country, but since 1947 a tremendous

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

change has come over the aspect of administration in India. Not only are we under the compulsion of preserving law and order, but we are under the compulsion of running a business concern as far as this Government is concerned. We are launching out into tremendously great projects of development probably unknown in any country. No country that I know of has indulged in such tremendously great projects in such a short time and brought them near fruition. Therefore, a compulsion arises in regard to the character of the Administration which has to deal with these problems. Today a man may be dealing with Home Affairs, let us say, and tomorrow he may be compelled to go over to Sindri and take charge of the management of that great factory. Therefore, the aspect of work and of the education of the individual who is called upon to undertake that task have got to change in the concept of the new state of affairs in India.

We have done another thing. We have got the finest democracy that the world has ever seen, an example that the world does not know of, except in India where millions of people, as I said, marched to the polls and exercised their vote and chose their rulers. Along with this democratic march, it has become necessary also that the Administration should change its aspect and not merely be the servant of a small selected bureaucracy, of the bureaucratic foreign rulers. They have under the compulsion of the new and revolutionary changes that have come about in India, to adjust themselves to the new concept of government in this country. Hence the policy on the part of the Government is to see that these necessary changes are incorporated in the Administration, that ways and means are found to make the necessary adjustments of existing personnel and ways and means are found for the future, for the purpose of choosing the future personnel which would be suitable in the circumstances of the case and in these revolutionary times.

Therefore, may I say this, that I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind that the Government is deeply concerned over this particular matter? Now, what is exactly happening today? Some of the criticisms that have been made are entirely justified, justified not because of the deficiencies in the administrators. I am very glad that Mr. Rama Rao and my hon. friend Dr. Hirdaynath Kunzru paid well-deserved compliments to the personnel which is now in charge of the Government of India. After all, Sir, remember that in 1947 half the cadre represented by the Europeans disappeared. They took their pensions and they departed. That was their sense of service as far as India was concerned. We did not want them to depart. We offered them alternative terms, but they took, practically everyone of them the terms of pension and left the country. Then another portion departed for Pakistan so that the entire administrative machinery was pretty nearly damaged, almost fatally, almost destroyed. And yet the hard core of officials who remained—they must be paid this compliment—carried on under these most difficult circumstances and did not allow chaos to supervene. Now, my hon. friend will agree with me in this, and if he does not agree with me, he probably would prefer chaos; I do not know.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am not playing into your logic.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He may not play to my logic, but he will probably agree with me in paying the necessary compliments to this hard core of officers.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I only listen to you.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Now, with regard to the complaints that have been made, I said that many of them were justified, because of the nature of the changes that have come about. Take for instance this example. In West Bengal, when Mr. Appleby went there, to discover what exactly

was happening there, he came across most astonishing examples, things which were suitable in the olden days but were not suitable today. He found that a letter sent to one of the Ministries there was handled between 30 to 42 times before the Ministry reached a particular decision. And the Appleby Committee found that this was too slow a process. You can imagine what would happen if a letter had to be dealt with, not by one Ministry but by several Ministries.

SHRI B. GUPTA: But do you know why it happened?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: The result is what we are now witnessing. The machine has to be stiffened and accelerated and quick decisions have to be taken because the decisions are of a very vital nature, involving large sums of money, tremendous finance and, if there is slowness in the process of decision, it is bound to be reflected, as Mr. Appleby has reported, upon the financial position of the country. Hence, something has to be done to find out how the bureaucratic machine can be democratised and brought into line with the democracy that we have installed in this country. When I went to Yugoslavia last summer, I visited the offices of many Ministers there and I was astonished, as you probably will be when I tell you, that I found not a single file on the table of any Minister. I asked them how that came about and they said, "We do not deal with files. It is not our job. We deal with policies and we have decentralised administration to this extent. For instance, now we are trying to import the same sort of democracy into the industrial sphere which is controlled by the public, that is to say, by the Government. We will have to find ways and means of changing the aspect of that particular type of administration."

Again, when I went to the factories there, I saw one of the biggest factories near Belgrade and there I asked them, "Where are the directors and where is the managing agent?" They said, "Please take your seat.

We will bring the people to you who are running this factory." And, remember, it was a factory in which there were 3,600 workers and what was their administrative machinery? Presently three men walked into the room, each in his dirty overall, their hands grimy with oil and they shook me by the hand. One was introduced to me as the managing director of the factory. The other was introduced to me as the Chairman of the People's Workers' Council and the third one was introduced to me as the director nominated by the Central Government but who was also a worker in the factory. Each one of them had been working at his lathe and not getting a single penny extra, and they were in complete charge of and control of the management, of the production side and the import side and the export side of this factory. They were workers in the factory itself. When I asked them what profit they made, they told me that they made 54 million dinars. I laughingly said, "You distributed it among yourselves?" "No," they said, we held a meeting, a mass meeting and by secret ballot we decided what to do with this money. Fourteen million dinars of this profit was to be distributed as bonus to the workers and the rest of the money was to be utilised for a new factory to be set up and for a new cinema for the workers, for a new water supply, a new road and so on and so forth. The result was, wherever we went throughout the length and breadth of the country, every few miles I saw a new factory coming up. They had no unemployment problem in that country.

Now, we have also to keep such examples in our view when we are attempting to change the aspect of our Administration. After all, for what purpose do we do it? It must be agreed, and I think we are all agreed, that this country is ours and whatever happens to this country affects each one of us, whether we are inside the Government or whether we are outside the Government. Therefore, it is necessary for the instrument of Administration to work

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

in such a perfect manner that it will be suitable to the new changed times and allow this country to function properly in the democratic spirit. This cannot happen if a letter takes thirty to forty-two handlings before a decision is arrived at. It cannot function that way. It cannot function in the proper way if it takes 17 months to come to a decision upon even a small matter. It cannot happen if decisions are bandied about from one Ministry to the other or from one official to another, until the very objective is lost sight of. Therefore, I am very glad to find that the Government has been concerned about this matter and has been taking steps in order to find out ways and means of accelerating the process of democracy in the system of administration. And for this purpose instead of having a commission—we have had plenty of commissions—I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should take a few Members who are interested in this matter into his confidence. Let them do their own task, set up their own little committees, make their own suggestions on the basis of what they themselves desire to do in order to improve the administration of this country and become co-partners in this noble task of putting an end to the old methods and creating new ones.

SHRI M. S. RANAWAT (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, so far as this Resolution is concerned, I cannot think there could be a more innocent request to this Government. Diwan Chaman Lall has already spoken probably more in favour of this Resolution than against it. He said everything to agree with it excepting that he thought that a Commission will not do. I believe something more drastic than a Commission—which is the proposal in this Resolution—is necessary if Government could accept it and agree to do it. Placed as we are, experienced as we are, knowing the way in which this country and our Government's mind works, the minimum thing that we thought that

Government would accept was that they would set up a Commission to examine the present administrative set-up and the procedure of the working of the Government and propose suitable changes, for what? For ensuring speedy disposal of work. Now, Diwan Chaman Lall feels that it is being done; it seems that he is quite satisfied. I do not think he is honest to himself when he says that he is satisfied with the way that the Government is going on.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I, on a point of personal explanation, say that I never said I was satisfied with what is happening? On the contrary, I pointed out ways and means to adopt in order to put matters right.

SHRI M. S. RANAWAT: Quite. Therefore, he strongly supports this Resolution. But the trouble with him is that the Government is not going perhaps to oblige him or me or anybody else because their mental make-up is different. I know that great things have been done; in a short space of time big schemes have been taken up and I certainly say that it is amazingly rapid work that our Government has done. But I tell you, Sir, that the whole of these put together, the Government cannot take the credit for themselves. Credit is one fact because we have one man at the top. There you have a wise man who can switch off and on and it is our Prime Minister who, in spite of all his other duties, has taken a direct interest in these big schemes. Because of his personal push these things have come up. If these things had been left as normal Governmental functions, they would have taken certainly another twenty years to complete them. So, Sir, the first thing is that there is no denying that we are not doing our best. But the trouble is, at the rate at which we are going, and the way the Administration is behaving, the people are getting dissatisfied and the rank and file in the country feel, even as regards the district administration all over the country, that the Government is very luke-warm; there is not that enthusiasm

and there is not that push. If we delay things this way and if we go on for another good number of years having one commission after another, the result will be that the people will be disappointed. People are already getting restless; the country is getting very very restless over the way that the Government is handling the administration. The administration has almost broken down, for very strong reasons, I do not deny. We had our Civil Service difficulties as various speakers have pointed out; we had all these difficulties, but the point is, have we taken a bold step to remedy this evil now and here?

Then, there are the State Governments. How many State Governments have put in an efficiency drive? There is no doubt that we are doing a lot of good things, a lot of nice things are being done but everywhere the basic trouble is that things do not move quickly because that driving power, that strong urge which is the essential thing is lacking in us. There are a few people in the Ministry or a few people in the country who possess necessary driving power but they are very much handicapped and the general set-up of the bureaucratic machinery is a real handicap. During the last seven years things have not completely broken down and great credit to the people who helped Government in this work but also great credit to the people of this country that they are so law-abiding, that they are so—I should say—timid about the Government. We have a saying in Hindi:

“कोई नृप होई हमें का हानी”

In this country people have inherited that. They live by themselves and live in spite of bad governments. That is the mass mind and that has helped it in not breaking down; otherwise perhaps by the merits which we have shown, this Government has shown, it should have broken down. Credit goes to the masses; credit goes to the rank and file in this country that they say, “All right, let it go. Probably something may come later

on.” There is that belief. They had great expectations at that time and they hoped that the great leaders would certainly change things to the better conditions in our Government. I do not say that their expectations have remained completely unfulfilled—lot of things have been done, big things have been done at least generally—but the trouble is, every man wants the Government at the village level to be efficient; he wants it to be efficient at the Tehsil level, at the District level. If a man wants a *taccavi* he wants to know whether you are going to give it or not; if a man wants to pay his revenue, he wants somebody to take it and give him a receipt; if the canal is broken he wants somebody to repair it and set it right. That sort of thing is not being done in this country. I could say that nothing moves at that level. We have agreed that at the Secretariat level things do not move. I do not mind if big decisions are held up or perhaps delayed. Some big cases may be held up. There is not much harm. But I find in the village things do not move at all. I wish we had agreed with Gandhiji's request that now that Swaraj had been achieved we should disband our Congress. You should disband all that machinery which is a parallel Government, remove *Karyakartas* who are going and telling the Ministers that things are going on well. This sort of thing dislocates the mind of the officer there and that is a thing which you have not been able to appreciate.

Again, Sir, I have repeatedly said that we had a lot of good senior Military Officers. We have inherited, probably in our political background, a suspicion about those and, therefore, these Military Officers or even retired Military Officers are not being used to help the Administration. You are appointing Governors? Whom? Sometimes a man who was defeated in an election; sometimes a man because he was the ex-President of the Congress. But that is not exactly the idea which the Constitution makers had. If you put a man in the

Governor's post who has some knowledge of the administration, who can understand the difficulties of the democratic machinery and, at the same time, the Civil Servants' difficulties, he would be able to appreciate them and guide them. It is not that you want a Governor to be there to write beautiful weekly letters or to write beautiful books or literary things. I know of a very good Brigadier-General, a retired officer. What is he doing? He has bought a camel because he cannot run a car in hills and he said, "I am going round the area of the Rajasthan hills myself". The trouble is that with your political mind and ideas you do not want to trust anybody unless he had been previously of your way of thinking. But then, unfortunately, your way of thinking was full of agitation; there was really no action which would produce results. My friend the Nawab Saheb has said that everything is well and he has explained the lines on which the Secretaries and Ministers are given help. Quite all right, but our handicap is this. In other countries it may be that a man who is not trained in administration comes to be the head, but that man at least is trained in some kind of a profession with which he has earned his livelihood. He may be a good engineer. He may be a good *Vakil* or a doctor or a man who has some such attainments to his credit and not that he has achieved only one thing, namely, that he cried hoarse against the British rule and talked against it and was experienced in that kind of agitation. So that should not be the only criterion. Now things have changed. Even if a man had not been in the rank and file of the Congress, if you feel that he is an able man, then try to take him in, try to give him some help and try to learn from him. You go to the railway, you go everywhere and you will find that the people are dissatisfied. You may have your reasons for this and there may be strong reasons also, but at the same time the man who criticises you has also reasons, perhaps stronger

reasons, but he cannot make his voice felt.

Now you are having the Community Projects. You are having the Bharat Sevak Samaj. The Prime Minister and everybody is crying, "We are not able to have the people's enthusiasm", and therefore they say, "What can we alone do? Things won't work because the people do not work." Why are not the people coming forward to work? Have you ever tried to understand the reasons for it? The people don't work because you do not want them to work and you do not allow them to work and because you want them to work according to your own set ways. You tell them, "If you want to come into Congress you will have to spin 200 yards of yarn." If you cannot do that, you are no good. If you want to be a good Congressman you must be having some sort of that qualification", and that way you are not trying to take the people, who are in the masses, the agriculturist, the trader and everyone, into your confidence. And if you appoint this Commission, they should probably be able to help you out of this difficulty. We do not say that you appoint Mr. Mathur or Mr. Ranawat or any particular person. We want the people to be appointed, people who will have the courage to point out to you your mistakes and would not depend upon your certificates. Don't appoint a Commission just like the one we had which certified, "Our machinery in Government is one of the best, if not the best in the world." This sort of certificate we are not in need of. You have to take the certificate of the 35 crores of people, and they at the present moment are not satisfied with your administration. They are utterly dissatisfied and they feel that things are absolutely going wrong. Because the Indian character is *Ahimsa* you think that you can neglect the common man and give him a blow on his nose. You took charge seven years ago. What have you done? In Rajasthan you have destroyed every institution of good administration that existed there and because your own

Administrative set-up

party gentlemen are quarrelling with one another you have not been able to replace them. You have done away with all our experienced officers and you have sent there men who have just passed the Indian Administrative Service on a pay of Rs. 800 and it will take another five years for them to study that State. You create all the trouble for Rajasthan and then you say that the Rajasthan Government machinery is not efficient. All right I agree. But why then do you hand over all those roads which the Central P.W.D. were building there, to that machinery with the result that whatever little good that that manpower at Rajasthan Government's disposal could do is not able to do and we are not going to have new roads built in the absence of engineers who are all taken up in Central P.W.D.'s work. There is growing unemployment and so many engineers are available. But are you able to use them? The fact is that you are not able to use them. I know that I am using a little strong language and Diwan Chaman Lall may not like it but the trouble with me is that I intensely feel that in all the good things you do you must have a basic administration in which the courts must be efficient, the *Tehsils* must be efficient, the P.W.D. must be efficient and so on.

I can give you an instance of Delhi, of Delhi hospitals, to show how corruption is prevalent here. A friend of mine was sick here and was admitted in the hospital. When I went to see him there he told me, "I am lying alone and I cannot get anything done, cannot even have the proper medicines unless I can pay something to the man there." A sick man, a dying man has to bribe and that happens in Delhi. And if you want to see this thing happening, you come with me and I will take you and show you and you will be satisfied that this thing is happening and should be removed. Here you may say, "You are giving a bad name like that. How can you? There may be stray cases and probably this is one such." But the point

is that the troubles have gone too deep. You should accept this Resolution and then accept this Commission and then try to find out if you can remedy this miserable failure of the administration.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh):

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव हमारे मित्र श्री माथुर साहब ने रखा है, उस का मैं समर्थन तो नहीं करता परन्तु मैं उन को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव को ला कर उन्होंने हमारे केन्द्रीय सरकार के शासनसूत्र की चर्चा इस सदन के सम्मुख छोड़ी। मैं यह कहूँ कि भारतवर्ष में प्रत्येक नागरिक, प्रत्येक जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति और स्वयं केन्द्रीय शासन यह चाहता है कि हमारा शासनसूत्र इतना अच्छा बने, जिस से हम अपने देश में एक आदर्श शासन पद्धति की स्थापना कर सकें। वह यह भी चाहते हैं कि इस शासनसूत्र में जो कार्रवाई होती है वह भी इतनी सुन्दर और अच्छे तरीके से हो, जिस से काम भी हो और लोगों को कष्ट भी न हो। सब से बड़ी बात जोकि शासन में प्रत्येक नागरिक और प्रत्येक व्यक्ति चाहता है, वह यह है कि शासन के जितने भी निर्णय हों, उन निर्णयों को कार्यान्वित करने में देरी नहीं होनी चाहिये।

मुझे यह बात कहने में दुःख होता है और हमें यह बात माननी ही होगी कि हमारे शासन का कार्य जितनी तेजी और तीव्र गति से होना चाहिये, उस तीव्र गति से नहीं हो रहा है, उस में शिथिलता है, इस शिथिल्य को नष्ट करने के लिये, उसे दूर करने के लिये, हमें कुछ न कुछ करना ही चाहिये। परन्तु यह शिथिलता आई क्यों, यह शिथिलता हुई क्यों और यदि हुई तो वह ऐसे कारणों से हुई, जो दूर नहीं

किये जा सकते। अगर वह दूर करी जा सकती है तो हमारा शासनसूत्र और भी अच्छे ढंग से चल सकता है।

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar):

डा० पी० सी० मित्रा (बिहार) : कारण बतलाइये।

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ:

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज : साधारणतः हमारे शासनसूत्र में कोई कमी और खराबी नहीं है। हम ने अपना शासनसूत्र अंग्रेजी राज्य से ग्रहण किया है, उस में कोई संकोच की बात नहीं है, उस में कोई लज्जा की बात नहीं है। मैं आप से यह कहूँ कि ३५ करोड़ आबादी वाले देश में, थोड़े से भारतीयों की मदद से अपना राज्य स्थापित कर के उस शासन ने इस देश में इतना कड़ा और कठिन कब्जा बनाये रखा कि हमें उस के पंजे से निकलने में लगभग १०० साल लग गये। शासन का जो सैट-अप (set-up) है, शासनसूत्र है उस शासनसूत्र में कोई खराबी नहीं है। अंग्रेजी शासन पद्धति, अंग्रेजी शासनतंत्र और अंग्रेजी शासनसूत्र, हमारे देश के लिये बहुत ही हितकर है, इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं।

अब सवाल यह आता है कि जब इस शासनतंत्र में कोई खराबी नहीं है तो फिर खराबी कहाँ है? वह क्या दूर नहीं की जा सकती है? मैं एक बात यह कहूँगा कि शासनतंत्र में जितने भी सरकारी कार्य करने वाले हैं, उन को इस तरह की पूरी निश्चितता होनी चाहिये जिस से वे अपने को पूर्ण रूप से सुरक्षित समझें। जब तक शासन में कार्य करने वाले लोगों को अपने स्थान का पता नहीं है, अपने भविष्य का पता नहीं, अपनी रोटी का पता नहीं, ऐसी अवस्था में कोई भी सरकारी कर्मचारी साहस के साथ अपना

कार्य नहीं कर सकता है। जब तक उन की इस तरह की स्थिति रहेगी उन में निर्भयता नहीं आयेगी और न निष्पक्षता ही आयेगी। मैं आप से यह कहूँ कि प्रान्तों में क्या और केन्द्रीय सरकार में क्या, हमारे शासन में सब से बड़ी खराबी यह है कि हमारे यहाँ लगभग ५० प्रतिशत सरकारी कर्मचारी टैम्पेरेरी (temporary) होते हैं। जो आदमी टैम्पेरेरी होगा, मुस्तकिल नहीं होगा, कच्ची नौकरी पर होगा, उस के मन और दिमाग में हमेशा यह भय बना रहेगा कि न जाने मैं कब नौकरी से निकाला जाता हूँ। यही कारण है कि इस तरह के कर्मचारी निश्चित हो कर सरकारी नौकरी नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस तरह की कमजोरी आ जाती है कि भाई आज नौकरी है, कल नहीं रहेगी, इसी कारण उस में करप्शन (corruption) की भावना भी आ जाती है। अगर आप टैम्पेरेरी कर्मचारियों को निकाल दें, तो शासन से ५० प्रतिशत करप्शन खत्म हो जायेगा। अगर आप उन को नहीं निकालते तो यह होता है कि वे करप्ट प्रैक्टिस (corrupt practice) करेंगे और अपने जीवन को सुरक्षित रखने के लिये फाइलों में देरी करते रहेंगे। यदि किसी के फाइल में किसी के भाग्य निर्णय करने की बात होगी तो उस आदमी को परेशान किया जायेगा और जब तक कुछ पैसा नहीं दिया जायेगा तब तक फाइल आगे नहीं बढ़ेगी।

इसलिये मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से आग्रह करता हूँ और यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि इस तरह के टैम्पेरेरी कर्मचारियों की नौकरी खत्म कर के लोगों को परमनेंट (permanent) और क्वैसी परमनेंट (quasi-permanent) करिये। हमारे देश के लोगों में शासन चलाने के लिये चरित्र है, बल है, ताकत है और सा बलें हैं। हमारे भारतीय शासन में नौकरी करने वाले कर्मचारियों को बुरा क्यों कहा जाता है। इन बेचारों ने,

इन गरीबों ने शताब्दियों तक अंग्रेजी शासन की नौकरी की, शासन चलाने के लिये हम लोगों पर लाठिया भी चलाई, जेलखाना भेजा, तो ये कर्तव्यनिष्ठ लोग स्वतंत्र भारत में, विशेष कर जवाहरलाल जी के शासन में बेईमानी करने वाले नहीं हैं, यह बात सत्य है। परन्तु यह भी सत्य है कि सभी देवता नहीं हैं। जिस तरह से मिनिस्ट्रो के ऊपर और हमारे नेताओं के ऊपर भारतीय जनता का निरीक्षण रहता है, उसी तरह से सरकारी नौकरी पर भी मिनिस्ट्रो का निरीक्षण होना चाहिये। जिस तरह से कि अगर मिनिस्टर इम्पारशियल (impartial) हो जाय तो वह पक्षपात नहीं कर सकता है, इसी तरह से आप यह क्यों नहीं मान लेते कि सरकारी नौकरो और अफसरों में भी पक्षपात की भावना आ सकती है। वह भावना तभी निकल सकती है जबकि जो हमारे शासन के चलाने वाले मंत्रिमंडल के लोग हैं वे अपने एक-एक आदमी को खुद अपने अनुभव से समझें। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाँच, छ. साल हुए मुझे भी शासन को चलाने का अवसर मिला और उस का मुझे कुछ अनुभव हुआ। मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि कुछ ऐसे सेक्रेटरी हैं जोकि अपने किसी मित्र को लाभ पहुंचाने के लिये फाइल को बहुत इधर उधर घुमा कर पेश कर देते हैं। मैं अपना एक अनुभव आप को बताता हूँ। मैं ने एक आर्डर (order) पास किया परन्तु हमारे विद्वान् सेक्रेटरी उस को गवर्नर के पास ले गये और उल्टा ही आर्डर गवर्नर से लिखवा लाये। यह सन् १९४६ की बात है। मैं ने गवर्नर साहब से कहा कि साहब आप का यह आर्डर गलत है। आप के सेक्रेटरी ने और मेरे सेक्रेटरी ने आप को गलतफहमी में डाल दिया है। उन्हो ने कहा कि नहीं यह सेक्रेटरी ठीक कहता है। उस पर मैं ने कहा कि मैं मिनिस्टर हूँ,

आप हमारा कहना मानिये सेक्रेटरी का नहीं।

Either keep the Secretary in the Secretariat or keep me in the Cabinet. I will throw the Secretary out of the Secretariat.

उस का परिणाम यह हुआ कि दूसरे दिन ही सेक्रेटरी महोदय छुट्टी ले कर चले गये परन्तु दुर्भाग्य की बात है या मौभाग्य की बात है कि वहा के ठुकराये हुए सेक्रेटरी यहां केन्द्रीय सरकार में बड़े बड़े डिपार्टमेंट्स (departments) के सेक्रेटरी हैं। तो मैं यह आप से कहूँगा कि सभी सेक्रेटरी देवता नहीं होते। कुछ पक्ष वाले हैं और कुछ निष्पक्ष हैं, कुछ ईमानदार हैं और कुछ नहीं हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि शासन में पक्षपात नहीं होना चाहिये। यदि आप शासन में शुद्धता चाहते हैं और अधिक काम करने की शक्ति चाहते हैं तो आप को पक्षपात की भावना को मिटा देना चाहिये। आज हाज़त यह है कि जो बेहाम के और अयोग्य आदमी हैं वे समझते हैं कि अमुक व्यक्ति तो मेरा परिचित है इसलिये चाहे मैं काम करूँ या न करूँ, मुझे तो तरक्की मिल ही जाने वाली है और जो बेचारे परिश्रमी आदमी हैं वे कहते हैं कि चाहे काम कर कर के मैं मर जाऊँ मुझे तो वही रहना है जहाँ हूँ, तरक्की तो दूसरे को मिलने वाली है, इसलिये मैं क्यों काम करूँ। तो पक्षपात के कारण अयोग्य आदमियों की रक्षा हो जाती है और जो योग्य आदमी हैं उन का गला घोंटा जाता है, जो बेचारे गरीब रात दिन काम करते हैं उन की कोई खबर लेने का श नही है तो फिर वे क्यों काम करने लगें। मेरा कहना है कि इस तरह से पक्षपात शासन को नष्ट कर देता है। यदि आप एक एक व्यक्ति के जीवन में जाये तो आप को पता लगेगा कि सच्ची बात क्या है। इसीलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि मेन और मैटीरियल (men and material) को

[Shri R. U. Agnibhoj.]

देखने के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार को बहुत ध्यान रखना चाहिये। मैं किसी व्यक्ति के बारे में नहीं कहता हूँ। मैं एक साधारण बात कहता हूँ।

अब मैं एक और बुराई की ओर आप का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। मेरा कहना है कि जो केन्द्र के लोग हैं वे कम से कम अपने प्रान्त का, अपनी जाति का या अपनी भाषा का सेक्रेटरी कभी न रखें। उस का कारण यह है कि जब अपने प्रान्त, अपनी जाति या अपनी भाषा का सेक्रेटरी लोग रखते हैं तो फिर वहाँ पैरोकियलिज्म (parochialism) और कम्युनलिज्म (communalism) की बात आ जाती है। यदि स्वतंत्र भारत में केन्द्रीय सरकार में इस तरह का हो जाय तो फिर केन्द्रीय सरकार टुकड़े-टुकड़े में बट जायेगी और हर एक मिनिस्ट्री एक विशेष प्रान्त की मिनिस्ट्री बन जायेगी। इस को रचना चाहिये। मैं बड़े दावे के साथ और विश्वास के साथ कहता हूँ और केन्द्रीय सरकार की होम मिनिस्ट्री से बड़ी प्रार्थना के साथ कहता हूँ कि उसे इस तरह की भावना को बदलना चाहिये कि जान पहचान वाले, या किसी विशेष प्रान्त के, या किसी विशेष जाति के या किसी विशेष भाषा को बोलने वाले सेक्रेटरी न रखे जायें। इस भावना को रोकना आवश्यक है नहीं तो बड़ी हानि होने वाली है।

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:

श्री एच० पी० सक्सेना : तो क्या इटैलियन रखे जायें ?

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ:

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज : मेरा मतलब आप समझे नहीं। मैं यह कह रहा था कि यदि आप को राष्ट्रीय सरकार चलानी है तो कार्यकर्ताओं का जो सेट-अप है वह एक दोस्ती का जुट नहीं होना चाहिये, एक प्रान्त का गुट नहीं होना चाहिये, एक ही भाषा को बोलने वाला

गुट नहीं होना चाहिये। एक एक मिनिस्ट्री में इस तरह का गुट नहीं बनना चाहिये। केवल भारतीय दृष्टि से हर मिनिस्ट्री में काम होना चाहिये। मैं यह कह रहा था। मैं यह नहीं कह रहा था कि हमारा देश का शासन चलाने के लिये लोग विदेश से आयें। मैं ऐसा कभी नहीं कहूंगा, मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि एक भी विदेशी आदमी भारतीय सर्विस (service) में न हो। जो एक दो विदेशी आदमी सर्विस में हों भी उन को भी आज ही निकाल दिया जाय। यदि उन की जोड़ का कोई आदमी भारतवर्ष में है तो फिर उन की कतई जरूरत नहीं है। मैं तो इस बात को कहता हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि हमें शासन सुधार के लिये ऐसे काम करने चाहियें जिस से कि हमारे देश में निष्पक्षता आये और ईमानदारी की भावना फैले।

(Time bell rings.)

इतना कहते हुए मैं यह कहूंगा कि यदि हमारे शासन में अच्छे कार्य करने वाले और ईमानदारी से रहने वाले तथा निष्पक्ष रहने वाले लोग लिये गये तो हमारी उन्नति होनी जरूरी है। मैं तो मानता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल में बहुत अच्छे-अच्छे लोग हैं और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू सरीखे हिन्द के नेता के नेतृत्व में जो मंत्रिमंडल कार्य कर रहा है उस से अच्छा मंत्रिमंडल और क्या हो सकता है। फिर भी बहुत सी ऐसी चीजें हैं जोकि हमारे ध्यान से गुजर जाती हैं, दूर हो जाती हैं, उन चीजों का ध्यान में रखना जरूरी है। मैं तो कहूंगा कि इस कार्य के लिये कमीशन की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि यह तो मंत्रिमंडल का काम है कि वह इस को ठीक से देखे और करे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 145.]

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh) Mr Deputy Chairman, I would not have liked to take the time of the House by speaking on this subject but I thought I would be failing in my duty if I did not contribute to the debate by citing certain facts I have come by, certain inside information about the administration

Well, Sir, listening to the debate, I was really puzzled to know whether we were speaking in a Parliament of the pre-Independence days or in a Parliament of our own country, and under our own Government. Sir, we all should understand that nobody is perfect, and even the Government does not think they are either perfect. The very fact that they have instituted several commissions and committees and have invited even foreigners shows that they are conscious of the shortcomings. Even if we are conscious of these drawbacks—I am referring in particular to the charge of corruption—if we go on in season and out of season, hammering these drawbacks, exaggerating small ones and again repeating them in open debate and demanding an enquiry or a commission to go into the working of this or that shortcoming, I feel that instead of the Administrators trying to improve, they would be disheartened, and I may tell you that this constant prodding amounts to nagging. After all, with the enquiries already held, if the Government will not be able to do anything, it will not set the administration right even after such a commission has held an enquiry.

Shri Diwan Chaman Lall referred to the difficulties that Government had in 1947, when we started after partition. It is to the credit of our country that without keeping a single foreign civil servant, particularly the British civilians, we carried on. Every Britisher then, particularly the British civilian, was wanting to see what type of confusion would follow when they withdrew and when we took over. We gave really a good account of ourselves, and the credit certainly goes to the civil services.

Before I pass on to another subject, I would suggest to the Government one thing. These senior officers have been brought up in British discipline. Before they are allowed to go into retirement, they should be made to train their successors in the same traditions. They are themselves conscious of their duties irrespective of criticism.

Sir, the criticism in this House has mostly revolved round four points as put down by the hon. Shri Sundarayya, delay, high salaries, corruption and number of Secretaries. About delays, I was not a little surprised when he remarked that the Government was quick only in beating down the people with the aid of the police and not in any other sphere of administration. I do not know what they would have done if they, i.e., the other Party, were in power if there was no quelling of disturbance. They would turn round and say, 'Why was the police not used when matters were worsening?' The Opposition criticism should not therefore be of an exaggerated nature, then only would Government be encouraged to take notice of that criticism.

With regard to the number of Secretaries, Sir, this is the only point I would like to expand because on this particular point only a few days ago I happened to have discussion with some Secretaries and tried to have an intimate knowledge of the inside working of the Secretariat. Until a few months back, I did not know in what way the External Affairs Ministry was working. The work in the Secretariat has multiplied many times of late years. I am giving some examples. There is now the Eastern Section, the Pacific Relations Section, the Africa Section, the European Section and so on. Every one naturally cannot be expected to have an expert knowledge of every section. And, moreover, there is likely to be a casualty here and there. Somebody may fall ill and so on. So, all these people have to be there. You say that you should leave the question in the hands of a single officer and

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] then you raise the question of check. So, in these things, there is a contradiction, some sort of confusion being made. We blame the Government of inefficiency; and if they try to put a double or treble check, we at once ask why there is this superfluous check! In a democratic form of Government, this check has to be put through the medium of a number of graded officers. Our Ministers are like us; they are new to their job. I do not say all; I don't mean that every Minister is new. I do not mean all the Cabinet Ministers are new to their work. There is nothing to laugh at the statement. After all, even if the Opposition were to take charge, they will not have everyone for all the posts with administrative experience. They may be good lawyers, advocates, doctors, but it is difficult to have men of administrative experience. I maintain, it is not so easy as you think. I would like any Opposition Member to take charge of a Ministry, especially the Defence Ministry, and let me see how they conduct the affairs without the help of their Secretary. It is easy to laugh at people.

When our reports are bound to be published, everybody will be reading them. We would like our Ministries to smarten up no doubt but I don't think it is right to hold the Ministers to public ridicule like so many school boys or school girls as was done by an Opposition Member. They are not school children. Members here have been demanding in one breath to increase the types of services; for instance, to start an 'economic service' and in another retrenchment. Would not the former add to the persons employed? I would not like to be misunderstood that I am making a case for no retrenchment of the present staff at all. I feel there is scope for that, but I do not think that there is scope to the extent made out.

Then, Sir, I would like to state something about the high salaries that are being drawn, particularly accord-

ing to Shri Sundarayya's point of view. I did not understand him when he said that "high salaries lead to inefficiency". I rather think that if all creature comforts of employees are catered to, it would lead to efficiency and will act as a deterrent to corruption. Take the example of these merchants, because, I feel after all a good State is nothing more or less than a big well-run firm. We find that our own indigenous merchants get loyal service from their staff because they look after their creature comforts, not necessarily in rupees, annas and pies. It is a small welfare state, so to say, run on a small scale. I had a talk with some of the top-ranking Secretaries on this question of salaries. Nobody is enamoured of high salaries because nearly half of it had to be paid back to Government by way of income-tax or some other due like rent, etc., if Government were to give them big houses, they find it difficult to maintain them. They would be quite satisfied if their children are given education, if they are given conveyance to go about and if their sickness care and old-age pensions—to which they are entitled in any case—are assured. In short, if all the requirements in which a human being is interested, are assured to them, they are even prepared to forego a substantial portion of their salaries. They say they do not want these high salaries to be doled out on so many things back to Government. High salaries are no more a glamour in India to anybody and particularly when the salaries are a constant source of criticism. (*Interruption.*)

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Then, what do you suggest?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: There are constitutional guarantees provided with regard to these salaries to civil servants. Sir, I would suggest that if the Government were only prepared to provide certain of the necessary demands of these officers, they could be asked to accept a cut in their salaries. That

is the impression I have gathered from my talk with some of the Secretaries.

Much has been said about 'corruption'. I am of the opinion that the corruption we speak of is only a reflection of our own national character. Corruption is so rampant these days that it is difficult—on the standards of Christ—to point our finger at others. It is rather easy to point out this person or that, but often those who talk about others being corrupt are themselves corrupt. Many people know that; it is easy to point out to others.

Some Members talked about Foreign Service and Home Service. In England, there is recruitment both to the Foreign Service and to the Home Service. People are not recruited to these on account of their birth; that is an old day thing. In the end, I would like to say one word about Dr. Kunzru's point, namely, that there should be co-ordination between the Ministries. By this much of labour could be saved and more efficiency could be secured.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE) in the Chair.]

Take, for instance, the Health Ministry, the Education Ministry and perhaps the Food Ministry. The Food Ministry could perhaps co-operate with the Education Ministry and the Health Ministry with regard to children's health and mid-day meals in schools and medical examination. I have made this point once before, and there is certainly scope for doing a lot in this respect.

Then, Sir, we have to rectify one little drawback, and I will refer to it before I finish, Sir, although there are so many points. We have to realise the fact that the civil servants of old days used to lay down policies. They were mostly Britishers. But the tradition is there. They became the Members of the Viceroy's Cabinet. So in the old days a civil servant used to

lay down policies. But today he has to carry out policies. On account of the natural handicaps of being new to administrative work the Ministers are not so well informed in their subjects. I would only say this in the end because of the promise that I have made to Prof. Malkani that I would not speak long that it is no use asking again and again to set up commissions like giving pin-pricks because sometimes we are not satisfied with a certain state of affairs. I agree with Pandit Kunzru that there should be no shielding of mistakes because that would lead to a deterioration in the Administration. But I do think that this type of a Resolution, instead of encouraging the services to do their bit in the national interest, would make them disgruntled. That should be borne in mind. And only on that account, Sir, I would oppose this Resolution.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, evidently you are anxious to close this discussion very soon.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): The Deputy Chairman was under the impression that there were no other speakers and therefore he had asked me to call on the Minister. But since you have caught my eye, I cannot do so.

PROF. G. RANGA: The Deputy Chairman was wrong, and the House is not expected to know what the Deputy Chairman has said. I do not also like the way in which these things seem to have been arranged. This is the third time I have got up, or perhaps the fourth or fifth time that I have indicated my wish to speak. And if this is the way this debate is going to be regulated by the Chair, then the best thing a man in my seat can do is not to speak, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): I believe there was no speaker.

PROF. G. RANGA: Long before you took the Chair this thing was happening. I am sorry I noticed it. But when my sister got up, I wanted to give her a chance because she was the second speaker in succession from that time. And four times I indicated my wish to speak and it was only reasonable that when a Member gave an indication, he should have been given the earliest possible opportunity. The opportunity has not been given till now. Well, you were advised otherwise. Therefore, I do not wish to embarrass.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): It is not a question of embarrassment. Since you have risen, you can speak.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Mr. Ranga is right and he should be given an opportunity.

PROF. G. RANGA: I am sorry I won't.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): Prof. Ranga, do you want to speak?

PROF. G. RANGA: Well, Sir, I do not wish to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): Then I would call upon the Minister to reply.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we had a very interesting debate. It was also instructive; it was interesting because we heard the usual epithets, the usual slogans and the usual condemnations, so far as the whole Government machinery was concerned, without any consideration to the fact as to whether a particular item of criticism was relevant or otherwise. It was also instructive because some Members on this side, and also some on the other side, contributed very usefully and constructively to place before this House a picture of the administration as it formerly was, as it now is trying to be, and as it is going to be.

Sir, so far as this Resolution is concerned, it says that there ought to be an appointment of a Commission to examine the present administrative set-up and procedure of work, and the object is that suitable changes should be embodied for ensuring expeditious disposal of work. In other words, according to the author of this Resolution, the disposal of work is not as it ought to be. In other words, it is not as speedy as it ought to be. And the only object for which this Resolution appears to have been brought is to introduce speed in the administration so far as the Government of India is concerned. In the course of the arguments a number of other alleged facts have been pointed out and it is not necessary for me to minimise the great task that we have before us.

Now, Sir, so far as the present administration is concerned, we are in the seventh year of freedom. The seventh year has not yet run out, and we must see also the circumstances under which there was a transfer of power, the kind of administration that was handed over, and we have also to see whether during the seven years any conscious and deliberate attempts have been made by the Government of India to improve the administration. Sir, you will agree that when there was this transfer of power, we had the transfer also of the service personnel, and so far as that service is concerned, some of the hon. Members of this House have paid a tribute to certain aspects of the qualities that the servants then had. So far as the servants under the British administration were concerned, we have to admit, Sir, that they were highly efficient, and to a large extent also, they carried on the administration with a great sense of integrity. But they naturally had been brought up in an atmosphere of autocracy. And as it was pointed out very correctly by a number of hon. Members, in addition to carrying out the executive

side of Government, or in addition to carrying out orders of Government, the civilians were also responsible, to a very large extent, for laying down policies. And then, in that Administration, it was open to them to be also policy-makers in the sense that they could be Members of the Executive Council of the Viceroy. So, when in 1947 the whole service personnel was transferred to the popular Government, naturally we took the services as they were, with the advantages that they had and also with certain limitations on their part, which had got to be improved. Now, I am happy to point out here that, so far as the higher services are concerned, we have got a staff of persons who are also patriots. Now, often times most ill-informed criticism is levelled against public servants in general. At least, so far as the higher personnel are concerned, I am prepared to say here on behalf of the Government of India that our public servants have continued their tradition of efficiency, they have also continued their tradition of integrity, and to a very large extent they have also democratised their outlook. Now, this democratisation of outlook is absolutely essential, if not inevitable. There has been a complete change, and from policy-makers or effective advisers, they have now become only public servants who have to carry out policies, in addition to advising the Ministry whenever their advice is called upon. So, that is the function which these officers have to carry on, and it was quite right on the part of some Members to have said very plainly that we have got a service here which is one of the best in the world. They have certain defects, there is no doubt about it; also the process of democratisation might be slow in certain cases. After all, if the whole administration at the top is democratic, then the services or the services section of the Government has also got to be democratic. Therefore, as I said just now, our civilians are gradually, though surely, attuning themselves or adjusting themselves to the new democratic at-

mosphere. They can no longer afford to consider themselves either as the sole advisers or as policy-makers. Their limitations have got to be understood but as was rightly pointed out by the hon. lady Member, they have also to advise so far as the administrative set-up is concerned. It is no longer merely the administrative side of a government which is dealing with law and order only. As was very rightly pointed out by Diwan Chaman Lall, our Government is no longer a police State. It is no longer a Government which is responsible only for the maintenance of law and order. When the old administrative machinery was taken up, we immediately started the work of improving the whole tone of the administration and improving the personnel also, and for that purpose, various steps that are now contemplated by the hon. the mover of this Resolution, had already been taken, and I am happy to say that the Government of India have implemented most of the recommendations that had been made. Immediately after the transfer of power, we had a very exhaustive, instructive and useful report from the late Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar. He was then the Minister for Transport. He expended great labour and recommended that the administrative machinery required certain changes. He gave his report and most of the recommendations he made have been fully accepted, as I shall point out readily just now. He gave us advice so far as the division and allocation of work between Ministry and Ministry was concerned; he also pointed out how the work should be co-ordinated between the various Ministries; he also pointed out how many portfolios there ought to be. He went into minute details, and almost all his recommendations have already been given effect to. That is a point which has to be understood very clearly. I would also point out that thereafter when the larger question of planning was taken up by the Government of India, the question of the improvement of the administration,

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

the democratisation of the administration and also of its expansion so far as the new activities were concerned, was taken up by Government as part of the Planning Commission's work. We have the report referred to by hon. Members, viz., the Gorwala Report.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: May I know what were the suggestions made by Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar to bring about co-ordination and what was the decision of the Government of India on those suggestions?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: It would be difficult to read out all the suggestions. If the hon. Member wants, I shall show him this report. The suggestions are too many and some of them are of a technical nature. If the hon. Member so desires, I shall certainly give him a copy of this report.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Can it be laid on the Table of the House?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I shall consider it and if possible, I shall lay a copy on the Table. The first item is:

"It will be necessary to take the following steps:

(i) detailed schemes of the organisation of the services, as distinct from establishment, will be necessary."

Now, that is the first point with which he dealt. Immediately the Government gave effect to all the recommendations made by him. Formerly, the various services were in a liquid condition. As we all know, during the war, there had been large expansions so far as appointments in the various Ministries were concerned. It was therefore considered necessary that all the services should be duly organised and for that purpose, immediately after this recommendation was made, Government accepted the recommendation and now

we have got three classes of services—so far as the Central Services are concerned—the Central Secretariat Service with classes I, II, III and IV; the Central Secretariat Stenographers' Service; and then the Clerical Service. Now, in connection with these services, one hon. Member from this side contended that we should confirm all those who have been in service on a temporary basis. That is a point which has been worrying us all along, and it is our desire to confirm as many as we can, consistent with its financial implications. Now, so far as this question is concerned, there are two points which have to be noted. One is that there is a claim for retrenchment on the one side. On the other hand, there is a claim for expansion also, because Government activities are being expanded, but there are also certain expansions which are more or less of a temporary character, e.g., the rehabilitation work which has been going on. This was a tremendous problem which the Government had to undertake. As the House is well aware, this is an eloquent example to show how our Administration can rise to any occasion and do what is necessary. So far as the unfortunate displaced persons were concerned, there were numerous problems, and during the last six or seven years over Rs. 200 crores have been spent. Effective attempts have been made to rehabilitate these people. This itself is a testimony to the way in which our administration can deal not only with normal problems but also with abnormal problems. Take this question of rehabilitation. Now, rehabilitation cannot be a permanent task of Government so far as the displaced persons are concerned. There are other Departments also which have to be closed down, which will have to be wound up, one day or the other. Therefore it is that the number of temporary employees is so large. It is not a matter for congratulation to us. We are trying our best to confirm as many of the temporary people as possible and the process of retrenchment, as you would

agree, has to be very slow, because if people are in Government service for 6, 7, 8 or 10 years, even though under the rules it is open to us to terminate their services, still out of humanitarian considerations, out of human considerations, we have to see if we can absorb them or reabsorb them. Therefore, this is just a measure of the magnitude of the problems that we have to deal with.

Then, secondly, after dealing with these Central Services—the new services have already been brought into existence—rules also have been made. In connection with this you have also to take into account that some years ago even before the transfer of power the I.C.S. was abrogated and in its place we had the Indian Administrative Service. Now we have two All-India Services—the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service. So far as these two Services are concerned, they have been purposely instituted with a view to have a common and uniform structure of administration so far as the various districts are concerned. Now some Members talked of decentralisation but after all there are certain powers which the Centre has to exercise in the interest of the unity of the nation as a whole and therefore it was that the all-India character of these two Services were maintained. So far as the various districts are concerned, the districts are a unit by themselves and we require the best type of officers and therefore it is that the Public Service Commission at the instance or on the advice of the Government of India are holding examinations and the best talent is always available. I am very happy to tell some hon. Members of this House who made light of the new young recruits that so far as the new candidates that we are getting are concerned, they are some of the most promising candidates that we are having and therefore we are trying to maintain and also to increase the progressive character of the services and therefore the kind of examination that

is necessary is also taken into account. Sometimes it does happen that only written examinations will not do at all. Sometimes a man can cram, a boy or a student can cram and he would get the highest number of marks; but for our districts, we require not those who cram and get the largest number of marks but those who have a personality, those who can handle very important situations, in other words, those who can carry on the work of administration over a very large area having on an average a population between 10 to 15 lakhs. Therefore we require persons who have got personality, persons who have got potentialities; and that is the reason why the Public Service Commission have introduced extremely effective methods by which they can find out whether in the particular candidate there are promises of his becoming a competent officer, a very efficient officer knowing how to deal with even awkward situations.

SHRI RAMA RAO: All this in half-an-hour's interview.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Have you made proper arrangements for training these good recruits?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I am coming to that. I am dealing with that. Now what happens after they pass this examination? My hon. friend here contended that within half-an-hour it was not possible to know the particular potentialities of the man. I would invite the hon. Member to attend one of these meetings and the interviews and then he will be satisfied that the personality test, or the oral test as it is called, is carried out in certainly a very effective way. After all, all Government institutions are not perfect, all human institutions cannot be perfect, but we can devise measures for finding out whether a particular candidate is or is not a man of promise, is or is not one who can be a very good officer and a district officer. That is what we have done. Then immediately after the candidate has

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

been provisionally selected, we have got a training course extending over one year so far as the Indian Administrative Services are concerned and we have also a training course for about 15 months so far as the Police Services are concerned and I have visited and seen the Police training there. I have myself seen the training and I might tell the House that in spite of the prejudices that formerly we had against the Police or against services in the Police, we are getting.....

MAJOR-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY:
Against the British Government altogether.

SHRI B. N. DATAR:.....we are getting very promising boys from high families, from very good families and cultured families and the candidates that are getting trained there are bound to make very good Police Officers—not of the old type but of the modern type—and therefore we are having this training so far as the All-India Services are concerned. Then Shri N. Gopalaswamy Ayyangar suggested that we should have an All-India Services Act and under that Act certain rules should be made. Now the Act was passed by Parliament in 1951; thereby we derived authority to make these rules. Draft rules were made and they had to be circulated to the various States because we have to understand it very clearly that so far as these Services are concerned, they are, in the first instance, of use to the States and then only from them we can take some of them for the administration here. Therefore the draft rules were made, they were circulated to the State Governments for their objections, suggestion or comments. Their comments have been received. Naturally you will agree that India is almost the second greatest country in the world—barring China it is perhaps the greatest country in the world—and the administration has to extend over such a great country so far as both area and population are concerned. Therefore

the vastness of the area over which we have to rule has also to be taken into account. Lastly in this connection we have also to understand that we are now attempting to establish a Welfare State and if it is going to be a Welfare State, then naturally the work of administration, the purpose of administration and the functions of administration have to grow hundred-fold. As was pointed out by the hon. Member Diwan Chaman Lall, it is no longer merely a government for keeping law and order but we want to establish a Welfare State in the interests of the very masses on whose behalf the other party claimed to speak. Therefore we have made these rules and these rules will ultimately be placed before Parliament and this House also will have the opportunity of scrutinising these rules. Now, so far as these rules are concerned, Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar made a number of suggestions about recruitment, about training and also about the conditions of service and also about the limitations that have to be laid upon the incumbents of these offices. For example, in this connection I have answered a number of questions and that point also may be noted in this connection. Oftentimes we are told that some of our Government servants acquire or accumulate property beyond their legitimate resources and therefore the question was whether it was possible to make certain rules by which the exact extent of the property for the time being of the officers could be known to the Government in order to have some check over these persons. So far as the original rules were concerned, they stated that in respect of the higher services it would not be open to them to purchase immovable property without the consent of Government. That was the rule that was laid down by the British administrators and that rule is still in vogue. We are also considering now.....

SHRI B. GUPTA: Property in whose name?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: We are also considering to what extent this rule itself requires any amendments. Yes, it may be either in his name or in the name of his dependents or *benami* in the name of others. It is perfectly open for Government to ascertain this also and take necessary action. We are going to establish certain rules in consultation with the State Governments as to whether we can call upon them to make returns, either annual returns or periodical returns, or take the permission of the Government whenever they have or are going to have either by way of sale or gift certain immovable property of over, say Rs 200 or whatever amount may be mentioned against them. So that would show the House that we are introducing certain original methods with a view to seeing that our Government officers are not lured by any undesirable temptations, that they are always above temptations and that the reputation that they have is kept as high as possible. Ultimately reputation is a great factor. It is extremely bad to always go on criticising our own Government servants, because after all, so far as the success of the Government is concerned, so far as the success of the Government machinery is concerned, it depends upon the loyal and efficient service of these people. They have to be a contented class. If there are stray instances then every person is entitled to complain and the complaint will be looked into by Government. I may tell you that whenever any Member of Parliament or others have complained to me that a particular officer or some other person is guilty of corruption or is guilty of illegal gratification, then I have called for reports and I have made enquiries and it is my misfortune to point out that in a very large number of cases, either the complaint is not true at all or the complaint has been grossly exaggerated. In all cases, I pointed out.. ..

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May I ask a question, Sir?

SHRI B. GUPTA: Was it found on enquiry by a competent body?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The enquiry was through independent means, not through officers at all.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: But why does the hon. Deputy Minister say that it was his misfortune that these charges were proved to be untrue? Would he have been happy if they had been proved true?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: My misfortune is that people make complaint without foundation. Let the hon. Member understand it very correctly. I am very glad indeed that these allegations of corruption were not found true at all.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I wish to ask one question. May I know in how many cases the hon. Minister has not permitted the Special Police Establishment to start cases against persons against whom the Special Police Establishment had found unimpeachable evidence?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: So far as the Special Police Establishment is concerned, that body was purposely started by Government under a special Act.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: But that is not my question.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I will explain the position. The Special Police Establishment deals with cases of corruption of Government servants and also deals with cases of misappropriation of Government property and in all the cases, wherever we had got some legitimate ground for complaint, immediately we have proceeded against the persons concerned and we have proceeded against the guilty person and proper action has always been taken. In this connection, I may say that so far as prosecutions or disciplinary proceedings are concerned, we have always to proceed slowly. After all, under the very principle of

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

criminal jurisprudence, you are aware that there is the presumption that a man cannot be considered guilty until the guilt has been proved. In other words, there is in his favour the presumption that he is innocent. That has also to be accepted. After all, there is the presumption that every man is good and every officer is also good unless the contrary is proved.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: All platitudes.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: And the process or the procedure for proving the guilt has to go on. You have to establish it and.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Cannot that procedure be expedited?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): Order, order.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Yes, the procedure is being expedited to the fullest possible extent. So far as the various Ministries are concerned, we want to see that the procedure is as swift as possible, consistent with justice and fair play. That is a point which has to be understood.

Another point that was made is that there is red-tapism. On this question of red-tape, I would like to read to the House what Mr. Appleby—he was so much quoted here—has to say. This is what he says on page 7 of his report:

“Government more than any private organisation must work in ways preventive of whimsicality and irresponsibility, in ways accountable and reviewable, and in matters larger and more complicated of content than those involved in the largest of private organisations. Red-tape in government is therefore fundamentally much more a good than an evil.”

This brings me also to the next question—the extent of delay in Gov-

ernment work. I admit that Government work is not so swift.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Please read page 44 also of the same report.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: You can read it. I have read what is necessary for me and that is quite correct so far as this particular point is concerned.

I was saying that there has been delay and there has been considerable dilatoriness. But the question is whether we have taken steps or have not taken steps to remedy matters in this respect. Government have been trying their best to deal with the question of dilatoriness and also with the question of the elimination of red tape to the extent that it is necessary.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: It is all white tape.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: For this purpose recommendations were made both by the late Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar and Mr. Appleby and it was suggested that a special department should be opened. Now that department has already started working and it is known as the Organisation and Methods Division of the Cabinet Secretariat. It has been specially appointed to deal with the way in which the administration is being carried on, to deal with the ways in which delays are caused and this new department will see to what extent delays can be avoided or eliminated. So this is a matter in respect of which action has already been taken. A director has already been put in charge of it from the beginning of this month. But after all, though that director or this department has started work, it all takes some time. In such a case as this you cannot proceed very swiftly, nor can you expect results absolutely immediately. The whole process has to go on, the process of Government has to go on, the administration has to be improved and the process of improvement may be slow, may not perhaps be percep-

tible at all. Then, as I have already stated, this new department or organisation would also see to what extent there is need for removing dilatoriness, whether the files should go through various offices or whether they need not go through various offices. So far as that point is concerned, perhaps some hon. Members of this House may not be aware of the way in which the Secretariat work is being carried on.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

After the Ministry or the particular Minister has laid down a particular policy, or before he comes to a conclusion, he has to find out the pros and cons of the particular proposal. For that purpose, the file has to come back. He makes enquiries and so far as these enquiries are concerned, both the sides have to be placed before the Minister or before the Ministry, and then he or the Ministry comes to a particular conclusion. There are also a number of matters which have to be considered not only by one Ministry but by a number of Ministries together. There are problems which deal with commerce, and there are problems which deal with the services. There are problems which deal with supplies or with defence or there are problems which particularly belong to a particular Ministry. Therefore, for this purpose, in addition to finding out the full material on a particular point, the various Ministries have also to be consulted.

Sometimes, what happens is that when a particular point goes to a particular Ministry, new points are raised, new difficulties are raised or new aspects are placed before us and then for that purpose again the matter has to take the round. Sometimes it has to go twice or thrice to various Ministries. Lastly, Sir, inasmuch as we propose to go by and follow a planned economy and a planned administration we have also to consider and consult the Planning Commission. After the Planning Commission is consulted and after the propo-

sals are formulated, they have to be sent to various Ministries, and their opinions obtained, after which the Government, the Minister or the Cabinet, as the case may be, takes the decisions.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: On a point of information, Sir. Could there not be one conference of all the representatives of departments for consultation and for expediting the work?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Sometimes that is resorted to also; but then it is found that calling a conference means taking away the officers from their regular work. Sometimes, as the hon. Member has rightly pointed out, inter-Ministerial or inter-Departmental conferences are called. That was one of the suggestions made by Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar and that suggestion has been given effect to.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: One point of information I would like to ask. This inter-Ministerial difficulty of certain problems relating to more than one Ministry is not a new thing only in India. There are other countries also where there are Ministries and problems connected not with one alone but with several others. Have you ever cared to make an enquiry from the other countries as to how they tackle this particular type of difficulty in their countries?

SHRI M. S. RANAWAT: This is new to our Ministers.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: We have sent out to other countries officers and their reports are also received. Their recommendations are being given effect to, to the extent that it is possible.

Now, I cannot believe that in the other countries all these processes which are necessary are not observed. After all, we cannot take a hasty decision; we cannot take a decision unless the whole matter is before us.

SHRI H P SAKSENA: Nor can they.

SHRI B N DATAR Now it is like this In the foreign countries they either are more experienced or more of an expert than we are—it is quite likely, we are a new democracy and we have also to contend against certain difficulties but the question is whether we are trying our best to surmount these difficulties and whether we are progressing That is the point that has to be understood and my submission is that we are trying our best to know what the problems are and to find out the difficulties in the administration and we are taking steps We have already taken steps and we are going to implement most of the recommendations that have been made by the various authorities

I was glad that a number of points were placed before us constructively by a number of Members including Dr Kunzru We are trying our best to surmount the difficulties and to place the whole of the administration on a very proper basis under which swiftness or speed could be one of the objectives to be taken in view consistent with efficiency and consistent with fair-play There are a number of cases where we have to deal directly either with the officer or with the public at large and the opinion of the public has also to be taken into account Take for example the various Bills or the proposals for legislation Now I know that oftentimes complaints are made that our Bills are not properly drafted or that they are hastily drafted Now, that is the complaint made against some of the State Governments even after they have tried their best If, for example, instead of going through this necessary process, we immediately take into account the needs and immediately have a draft of the Bill placed and passed in Parliament what will happen is this Under the new Constitution we are subject to the jurisdiction of our Courts and it is likely that the Courts may declare a piece of legislation as *ultra vires* or as a piece of legislation which is beyond our powers It is quite likely

also that hasty legislation might even be found to be an unwise decision Therefore it is not that I am pleading for dilatoriness, but I am pointing out the circumstances that the Government have to take into account Government have to progress, but the pace of progress is bound to be slow That is a point which has to be understood very clearly Government have also taken into account other factors and they are implementing them For example, administration itself has now become almost a science The art of administration has almost become a science

SHRI S MAHANTY How would art be science?

SHRI B N DATAR Art itself is the best science I am not going to make a distinction between art and science

SHRI H C MATHUR What a confused mind?

SHRI B N DATAR Thank you, thank you

Now so far as this is concerned, it has been decided and very soon we shall have what is known as the Institute of Public Administration

SHRI H C MATHUR I am also a member of that body

SHRI B N DATAR I am glad that my friend is a member of that institute

SHRI M S RANAWAT Will the Ministers also be admitted?

SHRI B N DATAR Yes, they will be

So, the short questions that arise are first whether Government are aware of the difficulties, secondly, whether Government are taking steps to eliminate or to eradicate these difficulties These are the only two important questions

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA The third question is whether they are satisfied with it

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Whether they are satisfied with the pace of progress or not? I have no objection to posing a third question also.

So far as the first question is concerned, I have fairly admitted that the Government machinery requires changes and that it has got certain difficulties which have to be got over or removed.

Then, the next question is whether we are doing anything to remove them. As I told you, we have already taken steps to have the difficulties duly scrutinised and we have before us all that can be had by the appointment of a Commission. Now, what will this particular Commission do? It will merely go over the same ground and make almost the same recommendations. Therefore, there is no need to have any such fresh Commission at all and Government have sufficient material before them to make them cognizant of the various difficulties. The next point is whether we are trying our best to improve the administration. From what I have stated the House will be satisfied that all attempts are being made, that Government are not in a mood of self-complacency at all, that Government are fully aware that the administration has to be extremely efficient because it has got other more important and extended duties to perform—it is not merely an administration in the popular sense of the term; as was pointed out, we are having a number of commercial undertakings, we are having a number of welfare undertakings—and it would be risky if the administration does not rise to the occasion and is not so efficient as it ought to be. Therefore, taking into account all these circumstances, Government are fully satisfied that reforms are necessary, that improvements are necessary and we are taking steps to train and also to develop a body of public servants who could deal efficiently not only with normal aspects of administration but also with the new

avenues that have opened themselves for Government. We have started a number of enterprises and we require for our services a new class of persons who know that particular science well in addition to ordinary duties and who would make of it a success not only in the commercial sense of the term but also in the welfare sense of the term. As I stated, Government are cognizant of the magnitude of the problem. They have applied their mind to it and they have already started the process of improving it, of avoiding delays as much as possible and, therefore, the appointment of any such Commission will not serve any purpose at all. Therefore, Sir, I oppose this Resolution.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I cannot but express my deep gratitude to all the Members who participated in this debate and who gave almost, with some solitary exceptions, unanimous support to the intent and purpose of this Resolution. Sir, I have also no complaint even against Mr. Saksena for he has the privilege to be irrelevant and start with abuses because in the absence of any argument he can do nothing better. I would only refer him to how this voice from Rajasthan was supported in every word and to all intents and purposes by the Chief Minister of his own State only last week. Mr. Deputy Chairman, if the hon. the Deputy Home Minister had the same courage and the same honesty as the hon. Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh had, the tone of his speech would have been entirely different. The hon. the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh was dealing with this same subject of the administrative set-up and the administrative machinery and he had no hesitation in accepting that the real adjustments had yet to be made and they must be made. What he said was that the Government was actively thinking of measures for simplifying the administrative structure. One proposal was to scale down the number of grades.

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

and to reduce the gap between the seniormost and lowest posts in the Secretariat. This would have the effect not only of liquidating what he called casteism in the services but also of fostering initiative among junior and intermediate ranks and functionaries who would be accorded greater opportunities for promotion through periodic examinations. But, Sir, it is our misfortune that we talk here to deaf ears.

The hon. the lady Member from Orissa the other day gave a piece of good advice to her own party, the Treasury Benches, when she uttered a home truth, when she asked the Treasury Benches to understand the position and when she stated that it would have been much better if they had accepted some of the suggestions coming from the Opposition side.

Sir, my complaint—and not my complaint alone, but the complaint of everybody on this side—is that this Government is not attaching and is not giving that due consideration and is not attaching due weight to what comes from the Opposition. Government's failure to attach due weight to the Opposition is its greatest weakness and its greatest drawback. In the present democratic set-up, Sir, I wish the hon. the Home Minister to be a bit more considerate and to be a bit more open-minded, because what happens here, this closed mind and lack of consideration to the Opposition, this percolates down to the administrative machinery and it makes the administrative machinery more wooden and less responsible. If the hon. the Home Minister wants that the administrative machinery should be trained and should be tuned to the democratic set up and the democratic way of life and if it is to serve a Welfare State, he should start learning the first lesson from here and that lesson is to understand the Opposition's viewpoint. Sir, today I feel reinforced in my views—

which I have had occasion to place before—because my views have been supported and my views have found a great measure of support from the quarters that count. When I talk of the administrative machinery, it must be clearly understood that I don't talk about individual officers. If the hon. the Home Minister would remember, I made it perfectly clear that there are officers not only in the higher hierarchy of the Government but even among the lower cadres, officers for whom we have nothing but respect. They are as patriotic as anybody could be and I did mention this fact while moving my Resolution, but we must distinguish. It would be uncharitable of anybody to impute or even indirectly suggest that I mean to condemn the whole administration and all the officers that go to make up the administration. My chief complaint, Sir, is against the administrative set-up as it is working, the ways and the procedure that are being adopted. I think facts and figures would not be so effective to the hon. the Home Minister. I can quote one case after another to prove that there has been no improvement whatsoever, that we have progressed only towards deterioration. But I think the hon. the Home Minister will understand only foreign experts. He quoted from the report of Mr. Appleby and wanted the House to believe that Mr. Appleby had supported the present state of affairs. I think, Sir, the situation is entirely different. I would like to quote the same Mr. Appleby and quote him for the benefit of the Home Minister. There can be no worse condemnation than Mr. Appleby's of the administrative procedure which is being followed at present by the Government. He was very hesitant. He felt that he should not express an opinion condemning the Government in such terms, but he felt that he would be dishonest if he did not do so. What he said was: "When I express the opinion that the system in vogue here is unnecessarily slow, burdensome and lacking in utility, it is an opinion shared by

some of the most eminent of Indian Civil Servants, notably those who have had experience with very different systems." This, Sir, is the opinion of Mr. Appleby. This is what is happening.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of clarification. You are taking one sentence out of the context. Would you also read out the portion where he says that the Government of India is one of the twelve best administered governments in the world?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: If the hon. gentleman would not interfere it would be much better. If I were to comment on this it would take much time. I am rather ashamed as a matter of fact to hear that we are making much of this foolish certificate that we are one of the twelve best administered States. Are you taking pride on the services, on the hierarchy which you have inherited from the British Government? Are you proud of it?

SHRI RAMA RAO: But what is wrong about that?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: It is his privilege to contradict himself.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: But what are those twelve countries? That is the best thing that my friend can do. He has not got the guts and the courage to face criticism and the best thing is to report. Sir, which are those countries we are comparing?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Nigeria.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: What are those countries?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Saudi Arabia.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: And when I submit, Sir, that the present administrative set-up has completely outlived its utility, it is not at all due to the democratic way of life and to the democratic set-up. It is not at all competent and it does not meet

the requirements of a Welfare State. Against this view not one argument by any Member has been advanced. As a matter of fact, everybody who spoke, whether it was from this side or from the other side, did maintain that our present administrative machinery is not at all suited for this purpose. Now, Sir, because the time is short.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: You can go on.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Now the next question comes—What should be done about it? It is an acknowledged fact that the administrative set-up has got to be tuned to the Welfare State, to the democratic way of life. The entire system of our recruitment, the basis of our recruitment has got to be changed. There is no dispute that the training of our officers should change. There is no dispute that the outlook of the present officers must undergo a radical change, but only a doubt has been expressed as to what should be done, whether this Commission is the proper thing or not. Quite correctly. I have not asked for this Commission in any haste. We have waited patiently for full seven years. We have waited and we have permitted the Government to go its own way. We have given the amplest chances to the Government, and the Government, as I submitted, made sporadic efforts, but to what effect? This is the latest report and this is what Mr. Appleby says of the state of affairs which exist today. What changes have been made? What have you been able to achieve so far, during these seven years, in spite of all these reports before you? Nobody has told me, the Home Minister included, what are the reasons for this. How does he satisfy us that things would be better from tomorrow and what steps he is going to take? Let him give some other alternative. Therefore, I think there was no other better way than to ask for a Commission. This Commission will be entirely different, it must be understood, from

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

individual officers being appointed and submitting their report. This Commission appointed by the authority of this Parliament will have a very great weight attached to it and to ignore the recommendations of this Commission which is suggested in this Resolution will mean hell for the Government. All these reports are there it is true. But who have been appointed? A particular set of officers who have got their own mental outlook. If a Commission is appointed as has been suggested, it will bring a fresh outlook absolutely. It will be the most competent authority to suggest how the administration should be adjusted to the democratic way of life. You are appointing officers for whom we have all respect, but they have their own training, they have their own association and they have their own past. They cannot tear themselves away from that past and from that association. How can you expect those officers to give you suggestions which would be absolutely alien to them? Can anybody deny today that it is absolutely wrong to call a public servant a public servant? He continues to be the boss; the relationship of the ruler and the ruled continues even today. The very idea is alien to him; he cannot conceive that his first duty is to the people. What is his relationship with the people? It is very necessary that the relationship of the officer with the people is adjusted. The relationship of the officer with the legislators has got to be adjusted and lastly, I must submit, Sir, that the relationship of the officer with the Ministers has got to be adjusted. There is too much of interference by the Ministers today. They do not allow the public servants to work. The public servants cannot take the responsibility. Let there be a clear understanding; let there be a clear demarcation as to what are the duties and responsibilities of public servants. You just go and abuse the public servants for their failings and the Ministers most unfortunately have developed a tendency of want-

ing to be surrounded by yes-men, by sycophants and flatterers, their own partymen. That is the most unfortunate state of affairs today and this is a great blow to the efficient running of the administration. I definitely demand—I am not talking of corruption and all these things; we are sick of talking about that and that I am sure makes absolutely no effect on these deaf ears—but I definitely demand a standing tribunal..... (Time bell rings.)which would be competent to take action even against the Ministers. They should not be above punishment. It is most unfortunate. We know many of the Ministers; the hon. Home Minister knows them both in the States and at the Centre. What have you been doing and how have you been fighting corruption? Just wait for an opportunity and drop the Minister out of the Cabinet. Is that the way to deal with it? If it does not start with the head, how is it going to have any effect in the lower levels? If Ministers could rise above all these things and if they knew where to interfere and if they knew how to control—control is entirely different from interference—things would be different. Today no public servant however honest, however capable, is prepared to take the responsibility. He fears; he does not know whether he has the support of the Minister. Until and unless the man has got the confidence of the Minister, until and unless he knows definitely what he can do, he will always shirk the responsibility. This is what is happening here and almost everywhere and this is one of the main causes of our deterioration. So it is very necessary that we calmly and coolly examine the whole set-up and the relationship between the Minister and the public servant. We must give a new orientation to our public service and tell the public servant what his duties and responsibilities are. The administration must be attuned to the new and changed circumstances and I think there is no other way but to appoint a Commission by the authority of Parliament and that only can be effective in this matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this Council is of opinion that a Commission be appointed to examine the present administrative set up and procedure of work in the Government of India and to suggest suitable changes for ensuring expeditious disposal of the work."

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE PROGRESSIVE USE OF HINDI FOR THE OFFICIAL PURPOSES OF THE UNION

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated):

प्रोफेसर एन० आर० मलकानी (नामनिर्देशित) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निम्न प्रस्ताव सदन के सम्मुख प्रस्तुत करता हूँ :

"This Council is of opinion that with a view to implementing the provisions of article 343 of the Constitution Government should take adequate steps to authorise the progressive use of the Hindi language in addition to English language for official purposes of the Union."

इस प्रस्ताव को परिषद् के सामने पेश करने में मुझे खुशी भी हो रही है क्योंकि मैं सिन्धी हूँ, मेरी मातृभाषा सिन्धी है, न कि हिन्दी। मैं इस प्रस्ताव द्वारा यह चाहता हूँ कि इस देश के अन्दर हिन्दी की प्रगति जोरों के साथ हो। यह प्रस्ताव जो मैंने पेश किया है, कुछ समझाने के वास्ते है, जैसा कि आप जानते हैं कि हमारे विधान का १७वें भाग में राजभाषा हिन्दी के बारे में जो दिया है, उसका जो पहला खण्ड है उसमें यह दिया हुआ है "The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script."

1 C.S.D.

इस के पीछे दिया गया है कि १५ साल के अन्दर नियमानुसार पांच, पांच साल के बाद एक कमीशन होगा। उसमें यह दिया हुआ है "It shall be the duty of the Commission to make recommendations to the President as to the progressive use of the Hindi Language for the official purposes of the Union."

अब हमें यह देखना होगा कि यह "प्रोग्रेसिव यूस" हो रहा है या नहीं। विधान को लागू हुए चार साल व्यतीत हो गये हैं, पांचवां साल होने वाला है। अब हमें यह सोचना होगा कि इन पांच सालों के अन्दर हिन्दी की कितनी प्रगति हुई है। इसके साथ ही साथ यह भी सोचना होगा कि आयन्दा पांच सालों में कितनी प्रगति होगी। इसी अनुच्छेद के अन्त में एक महत्व की बात यह भी लिखी हुई है "In making their recommendations under clause (2), the Commission shall have due regard to the industrial, cultural and scientific advancement of India and the just claims and the interests of persons belonging to the non-Hindi speaking areas in regard to the public services."

अगर आप लोग इन तीन बातों पर ध्यान रखेंगे, तो मेरे प्रस्ताव के महत्व को और भी अच्छी तरह समझ सकेंगे। अंग्रेजी जो पहले हमारे देश की राजभाषा थी उस के तीन गुण थे। एक गुण यह था कि वह राजभाषा थी, मगर अब हम उसके बदले में यह चाहते हैं कि हिन्दी राजभाषा हो। इसके साथ ही साथ अंग्रेजी का व्यवहार