

शहर की सफाई करने वाले लोग हैं उन हजारों
 आयुक्तों के साथ आप ब्रेल रहे हैं, अगर आप
 उनको पहले बसा दें, उनको एम्प्लायमेंट
 प्रोव्हीनियंस दे दें, उन के रहने का इन्तजाम
 कर दें, उनके लिये कोई घन्टा तलाश कर दें,
 तब मेरी हमदर्दी आपके साथ होगी। मैं
 आपकी कठिनाईयों को समझता हूँ। लेकिन
 जिस बात से मुझको विरोध है वह यह है कि
 गवर्नमेंट ने एक कालिब के बजाय छः कालिब
 पैदा कर दिये।

दूसरी बात जो ख़ास तौर पर इस बिल में
 दी गई है वह क्लाज 10 (ई) है, यानी पावर
 आफ़ जूरिडिक्शन। इससे कहीं ज्यादा यह
 ख़तरनाक है। एक आदमी मारे और फिर कहे
 कि रोओ मत, पीटो भी, मारो भी, कत्ल भी करे
 लेकिन उसे उफ़ नहीं होनी चाहिये। इससे
 ज्यादा जुल्म और क्या हो सकता है ?

15 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is he finishing
 or would he like to have some more
 time in which case he can continue
 on the next occasion. Now it is 3
 O'clock. We have to take up Private
 Members' business.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: I would
 like to have some more time. I will
 continue on the next occasion.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEM- BERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT

SHRI BHALJIBHAI PARMAR
 (Dohad): I move:

"That this House agrees with the
 Thirty-third Report of the Commit-
 tee on Private Members' Bills and
 Resolutions presented to the House
 on the 31st July, 1968."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House agrees with
 the Thirty-third Report of the
 Committee on Private Members'
 Bills and Resolutions presented to

the House on the 31st July, 1968."

The motion was adopted.

15.01 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE POSTS IN CIVIL AND MILITARY DEPARTMENTS— contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up
 further discussion of the following
 Resolution moved by Shrimati Tar-
 keshwari Sinha on the 3rd May,
 1968:—

"This House is of opinion that with
 a view to ensure efficiency and eco-
 nomy, a high-powered committee be
 appointed to examine the question
 of creation of highly paid posts and
 selection of personnel in the Civil
 and Military Departments, including
 the existing procedure obtaining in
 regard thereto."

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA
 (Barh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I
 moved this Resolution during the last
 session of the Lok Sabha, I was going
 to say that many people in the country
 have been feeling greatly concerned
 about the growing favouritism and
 nepotism in our administrative set-up.
 The tentacles of these are not only
 confined to the civil service, but these
 have gone very deeply to our commer-
 cial undertakings, the public sector
 projects; the defence of this country
 has also not been left immune from
 that.

We in this country have been follow-
 ing a system of administration which
 was given to us by the British Gov-
 ernment. The Britishers at that time
 had instituted certain fundamental
 rules and also had created certain con-
 ventions primarily to suit their
 purpose and the purpose was to
 reward the loyalties of their subjects.
 They wanted to create a class of people
 in this country who could assure them
 who could provide for them, a com-
 plete loyalty to their structure. When
 we became independent, we hardly
 did anything to change those things.
 We did not realise, that it was an ad-

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.]
 ministration, which was meant to take responsibilities for civil administration only without any other obligation, it was administration which was never geared for administering the country to provide welfare to the people, it was an administration which was mostly suitable for providing a convenient administration and peaceful administration for the Britishers. We inherited a particularly administrative apparatus and we did not do anything to change it. All the gift that we received from the Britishers—there might have been very good civilian personnel in our administrative set-up but it was an administrative set-up, just with a purpose to run the administration. That is all. But since we became independent, the responsibility of administration has grown very much. Today the administration has to gear itself in tune with the spirit of the people. Today the administration has to get the sentiments and also the welfare of the people. But we have done nothing. Even the fundamental rules which we see as a structure of the administrative apparatus have become very out-of-date. The only context in which they have changed is this. In the olden days these fundamental rules were made applicable for providing coveted appointments to loyal subjects, but as now these things have gone the loyalty is determined on the basis of caste, on the basis of favouritism, on the basis of creed and so on and so forth.

Therefore, every day in the House as well as in the country we hear about growing nepotism and favouritism in Government. Probably they would not have assumed such a dimension if they had been confined only to the civil administration. But we are very greatly concerned at the way things are happening in the public sector.

As at the end of March, 1968, the investment in the public sector was Rs. 3068 crores, and if we really see the appointments of the persons who are in the public sector and also their performance over

the years, we would find that in any other country such people would have been shunted and dismissed and replaced and the entire system would have been overhauled. But, here unfortunately, the controversy between the public and the private sector comes in from two angles. The private sector condemns the public sector because it does not suit them. The public sector is all the time feeling suspicious about the private sector, and whatever good personnel we could have located in the private sector are not able to come to the public sector because a definite prejudice has grown up against them, and, therefore, the talented people who are few in number—of course, we have many young talented people, but I am referring to the talented people who are at the present moment in a position to man these things—are divided into two compartments,—in the private as well as the public sector. There are no meeting grounds between them. The East and the West can meet but there cannot be any exchange between the private and the public sector personnel in this country. We have invested thousands of crores in the public sector, but it is not showing any results. And yet nothing happens. It seems water flows above the heads of the Government and that is why every year we had arguments to justify why losses have been occurring in the public sector, but nobody has come to justify and suggest what could have been done in that situation by any body else, placed in charge of the public sector.

Talking about civil appointments, I might mention that there are a few very out-of-date systems. I can certainly quote certain instances to prove why I say that nepotism and favouritism have been playing the roost in this matter. The fundamental rules have got to be changed. I am glad that the Administrative Reforms Commission was asked to go into that, but the terms of reference of the commission were made so big that the commission has surrounded itself in its own network, and we have hardly any hope from the Administrative Reforms com-

mission in this regard. The reports are coming but they are only filling the archives of the commission's big office and probably tomorrow or the day after they will go to the historical archives of India that such and such commission came into existence, such and such person was its chairman and their report was such and such. Those reports will never be implemented because they have not confined themselves to the root of the problem. The Administrative Reforms Commission should have stuck to the problem how really to improve the civil administration. I wish that this body had gone into the question of what exactly had to be done about the rules. There have been a set of superlative officers; they have the chosen men, the ICS men and they have been named as the steel frame of India. Nobody can touch them. They can touch every body. They touch heaven and earth and they also surround all the areas between heaven and earth. They can go to any place and can man any job in the public sector. A person may be the chairman of an electricity board today, and tomorrow he may be made the chairman of the FCI and the day after he may be made the chairman of the export corporation, on the fourth day he may become the chairman of an oil company and on the fifth day he may be chosen to man the steel plants. I have never seen this kind of thing happening in any other country.

According to Galbraith's new book entitled *The New Industrial Society*, today in this world, the difference between the capitalistic and socialist economy has hardly been visible, because the entire industrial apparatus has become so complex that it has gone into the hands of technocrats. Even in USA and the Soviet Union technocrats are manning these giant complexes of industrial societies. That is why he has very rightly argued that the capitalist system and the socialist system have gone completely into the background because of the complexity and the technicality of the industrial set-up; today in the light of the advanced technology and

the advance of science; the entire thing is managed by technocrats.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has said that the line is becoming thinner, not that it is evaporating.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: It is becoming thinner and it is in the process of evaporating. I am glad that you have supported me. When I say that it hardly exists it actually means that the process has got blurred. I shall be very glad if the Chair corrects me.

The first and foremost need is to change the service rules. There is a very peculiar system which is prevailing. We are the nationals of this country and yet we are supposed to sign a bond that we shall serve the Government for a certain number of years. Why should this system of bonds at all remain in this Government? I could understand the existence of this system when the British were ruling this country.

I also think that so-called confidential reports have been abused to such an extent that it is high time that they should be abolished. The confidential reports have lost all their meaning. I know that whenever I wrote confidential reports, the next day a copy of that report was made known to the person about whom I had written those reports. There are vested interests which have grown in the matter of confidential reports, in the light of the association of the person with the person next to him. A person may be very talented, a subordinate may be very intelligent and hard-working; and yet because the subordinate cannot act as a courtier he will never be able to get a good confidential report. So much abuse has come into this system of confidential reports that I feel that the entire system of confidential reports should be abolished. On the other hand, there should be a job-evaluation done with a detailed complex, and it should start operating in each Ministry so that just one person would not do it. And further the persons who are put in charge of the job evaluation should

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

be kept under constant rotation so that they may not develop vested interest.

Then, the system of forwarding of applications and also the question of probation require changes. In many cases I have found that applications are forwarded not on the merits of the application but on other considerations. In many cases, applications are forwarded not on the basis of merit but in the light of whether it suits the superior officer to forward the application. Some applications are not forwarded because it does not suit the officer and the person concerned does not act as the courtier to the superior officer. However some are forwarded with proper noting.

In the USA also this kind of system had come in as we, in our country, are seeing today. Under the rule of Andrew Jackson who had used the system of personal files for giving jobs to his own favourites, during 1865—1883, there was a constant agitation, and public conscience was created and roused against that kind of nepotism, and it is only after a continuous struggle that in 1935 the USA has been able to develop a positive personnel administration. We have no personnel administration in our civil service. I have no time to go into the names of the individuals which would show how much nepotism has been there. But I would like to give you just one instance. There is one gentleman who is the DGTD or the Director-General of Technical Development. That wing itself is a very big wing. As head of that wing he is dealing with various responsibilities, and yet he is represented in 20 public sector concerns. It means that either he is a supergod who can look after 20 things simultaneously along with his job here as DGTD or he does none of the jobs very well. Again, take the instance of the Railway Board chairmen. The chairmen of the Railway Board were so coveted people that retirement did not send them to wilderness even for a day.

After retirement, I do not think they even went to a picnic because the job was waiting for them; they were not waiting for the job. So the moment they retire they get berthed somewhere else.

Take the case of Shri Pande. After retirement, he became Chairman of Heavy Electricals. Then Shri Mathur Shri D. C. Baijal became Chairman of NIDC. We find that all this paraphernalia of Heavy Electricals is going from bad to worse. I understand that the Heavy Electricals has done something surprising. Now of course the Chairman is not Shri Pande or Shri Mathur but Shri Swayambhu. But is it not really surprising that out of Rs. 80 crores of total investment, as much as Rs. 8 crores have gone for consultancy charges? Which company can run honestly with Rs. 8 crores being paid as consultancy charges out of an investment of Rs. 80 crores?

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI (Howrah): Astounding.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: It is. No accounts regarding payment to AEI have ever been kept. On the purchase of the plant from AEI, a commission was paid. I do not understand why it was paid. The member to my left, Shri Tiwary, knows everything about these things. He knows how these things are done.

AN HON. MEMBER: What has he done about it?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I would mention one case, namely, of the Heavy Engineering Corporation. There was one great, influential gentleman by name Dr. Nagaraja Rao. Many times questions have been asked in this House about him. I do not know whether it creates any impact in Government's mind. All these things were talked about widely and something should have been done about them. Otherwise, it reduces the credence of Government in the eyes of people to administer this country.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi): On a point of order. Before names are mentioned of any individual in such matters, according to the book of rules, 10 days' notice ought to be given by the member. So it is not fair to make such references without notice.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I am not complaining about anybody. I am only stating facts which are noted in published documents.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: He is spoiling a good speech.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: The person concerned is not here to defend himself.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: The hon. Member is a very brilliant member, but he is new to Parliament. He must know that when you make an allegation against anybody, then notice should be given. All these things I am mentioning are available in the report of the public enterprises. He can go through them and find that they are a matter of record. This is no allegation I am making.

Dr. Nagaraja Rao was Industrial Adviser to the Development Wing. He was not pulling on well with the then Industries Minister. I am only repeating what has come out in Parliament before. The Minister was interested in someone else for the post. So Dr. Rao was sent on to this job in the Heavy Engineering Corporation. When the trouble became too prominent, Shri T. R. Gupta was brought in. He started working with great pace. But he was also removed. All kinds of rumours are afloat. What are the reasons for his removal? I do not want to go into the details; that I will do on some other occasion.

Then take the Export Guarantee Corporation Ltd. A gentleman who was not promoted in the Ministry of Finance somehow managed for himself this job and went there on depu-

tation. A person who was not promoted had this kind of resourcefulness to manage that job in the Corporation.

Now I would refer to *Lok Udyog*, a book which has been brought out by the Bureau of Public Enterprises. There 79 public sector projects have been listed. Of these 95-96 per cent personnel have been from the Government of India. I know, that one previous the Bihar Chief Secretary who has now gone on as adviser to the Governor of Bihar did not pull on well with the then Chief Minister and he wanted to come to the Central Government. He was a senior officer. Because he would have affected the chances of some of the blue eyed boys here, he was sent as the Chairman of the steel plant. Neither his heat, nor the Government of India's heart was there. He was shunted there as he would have affected the chances of the other people. We have Mr. Chandi who was removed from the Food Corporation of India, I do not know why the Food Minister could not adjust with him. He asked him to resign and he resigned. As a reward he becomes the chairman of the steel plants in which we have invested over Rs. 2,000 crores of our money.

I should also like the hon. Minister to explain some of these military appointments. Why have so many promotions been given in our military all of a sudden. I understand that six lieut. generals have been upgraded. I also understand that five major generals, 55 colonels and 20 brigadiers have been upgraded. Take the salary of the officers and the jawans. Has the salary of the jawans gone up comparably or proportionately to the rise in the salary of the officers? We had three times the present number of jawans during the Second World War but the number of officers was much less. If they were able to fight a war with a larger number of jawans and with a lower number of officers, why are so many posts upgraded now when the number of jawans has gone down? The expenses in regard to the amenities to be

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

provided to the officers is going up; but the expenditure in regard to the jawans is not going up proportionately.

I thank you for giving me this opportunity. Though you rang the Bell a number of times, you must appreciate that this is my resolution and I had a lot of things to say and therefore, I have taken this liberty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that with a view to ensure efficiency and economy, a high-powered committee be appointed to examine the question of creation of highly paid posts and selection of personnel in the Civil and Military Departments, including the existing procedure obtaining in regard thereto."

There are two amendments. Mr. Yashpal Singh is not here; so his amendment is not moved. Shri Nayanar.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat): I move:

That in the resolution,—

after "highly paid posts"

insert "and posts of ordinary jawans and lower officers" (2)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Both the Resolution and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha explained the nepotism and corruption in the administration. She said that a high powered commission should be constituted to go into these allegations. Previously also in this Parliament a resolution was discussed on constituting a high powered committee to go into the military affairs. The Members supported the proposal but the Defence Minister rejected it,

though he said he accepted the spirit behind the resolution.

I am placing some important points about the ordinary jawans and officers. After the revocation of the defence of India Rules the position of the jawans has worsened. After the Indo-Pak war of 1965, his service conditions, his food, and other facilities had diminished. A jawan who joined four years ago in the military or the Air Force has 19 years of regular service and 6 years reserve duty. They signed that agreement in 1965. After the Indo-Pak war it was altered to 15 years regular service and 6 years reserve duty. The war is over but even now the system of service in the military has not changed; the conditions which existed during the war period are even now continuing.

Those who have served for nine years in the military—the Air Force—or eight years in the infantry have been unable to get discharge certificates from the military authorities. This is one side of the picture. The other side of the picture is, those who have served the military for at least 12 to 13 years, in the Air Force and in the infantry, are being discharged from the military because if an ordinary jawan serves for 15 years in the military the Government is bound to pay him pension, and so, before he completes fifteen years, he is being retrenched after 12 to 13 years.

Then there is the question of medical treatment. They cannot complain to the superior officers. But at the same time, they are not getting good medical treatment. Their leave system is just a mockery at present. If a Jawans mother is seriously ill, and on the death-bed, when he receives a telegram to that effect and if he applies to the superior officers, he will never get leave at that time. An enquiry will be made after getting the telegram, but during the enquiry period, his mother will die. So, after the enquiry, he has to go to his place

to see his mother! Therefore, the Government must look into the conditions of leave for jawans.

Generally, every soldier will get two months' leave in a year. Now, that period is reduced to 45 days and then from 45 to 30 days. The leave period is reduced. A soldier who is serving in the Himalayan border, far away from the plains, 3,000 miles away, if he gets 20 days, leave, he has to use at least 10 to 15 days in travelling to his native place. Then, at least for a few days he has to stay in his native place; for 10 to 12 days. In view of the reduction of the leave period, the period of his stay in his native place is further reduced. Previously the jawans used to get two months' leave annually; it has now been reduced to 45 and then to 30 days.

Take next the food position. In the Himalayan border area, the soldiers who are accustomed to take rice—usually there are thousands of soldiers from the South who serve in the Himalayan borders—used to get one rice-meal a day. Previously, during the Indo-Pakistan conflict, they used to get more. Now, it has been reduced and that too is not good enough, as I got the information from the soldiers also.

About the regular, monthly payment, a jawan gets Rs. 55 a month plus earnings allowance. The argument is that the jawans are getting free food. For that matter, those in the jails, the prisoners, also get free food. So, we cannot argue in that light. Whether the food served to the jawans is sufficient and is of good quality and whether it is sufficient for his family for his livelihood at present is the main point. Let us compare it with the civilians. A civilian constable gets Rs. 75.95 as pay plus full D.A.

At the same time, the Government wastes money; there is corruption

and favouritism in the military departments also. There is wastage in the defence budget. Big business and business monopolists are connected with the Defence Department; Tatas get orders for military trucks; Mahindra gets order for jeeps for the military; Mafatlal gets huge orders for tents for the military. Birla gets other things like this. So the monopoly interests, through the defence expenditure, get huge profits. At the same time, the jawan's position is day by day worsening. Along with this, his conditions of service, his leave period, his food and his pension affairs have all deteriorated. So, I am moving this amendment which says that "after 'highly paid posts' insert 'and posts of ordinary jawans and lower officers'" I support the resolution that the high power committee should be appointed.

Previously also we discussed this point; though the spirit of it was accepted, nothing was seen in action.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI (Magaur): Sir, to my mind the present resolution seeks to do two things. One is to examine closely the existing personnel administration and matters of policy regarding recruitment, promotions, etc. and secondly to attempt to cleanse the atmosphere that has been vitiated and which has been amply elucidated by some of the names and events quoted by the mover. At the outset, I am surprised why she forget to mention certain other more dangerous appointments that have been made during the last one year. She has quoted the names of bureaucrats, and retired officials, but there are an army of defeated ministers and politicians who are today occupying very important positions of power and prestige. Whether by design or otherwise, she has forgotten to mention them. As many as 9 or 10 names occur instantly to my mind like Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri Raj Bahadur, Shri Alagesan, Shri Naskar, Shri G. Subramaniam, Shri Manubhai Shah and Shri Malaviya. She of course

[Shri N. K. Somani.]

mentioned Mr. Malaviya's name. Then there are Mr. Morarka, Shri Mahavir Tyagi and a host of others. These appointments hit at the very basis of a very sound personnel administration and which have been made for reasons which are entirely political, because they have been removed from their seats of power and appointed to such posts. This is an important aspect of this resolution which I have in mind to talk about.

This resolution basically talks about personnel and man-power administration of the Government of India. I would not venture to comment on the defence administration, because I do not know enough about it. Apparently on the defence side, we will have to consider appointments, promotions, transfers, job evaluation, etc. on a different basis than what we do in the civil side. Therefore I would like to restrict my comments to the civil side.

One of the important organs of recruitment of new people is the UPSC. As she rightly said, this commission as well as the other recruiting bodies which go in to questions of man-power are today confronted with rules and regulations which are completely antiquated and out of date, which have absolutely no reference to the changing patterns of management in this country and abroad. They have no reference to the present day circumstances. If the average age of the members of the UPSC is placed at 65 years, I would not be surprised. You do not expect people at that age to be able to recruit young officers who are dynamic and who have a fresh approach. They cannot find out what are the ambitions and what are the requirements of a job. This is such an unfortunate country that important posts whether in the railways or in other public sector or private sector enterprises or banks are monopolised by the same set of people who have been there for 30 or 40 years. This is a country which has a large young population. I would therefore submit that whiling fram-

ing new rules for recruitment to top posts, seniority and experience are consideration to be taken into account. Youth and daring approach to any problem should not be forgotten. If you are sitting upon in judgment upon a person whom you are going to appoint on the basis of the interview rating card or study the psychological capabilities and potential of a person, you should be able to understand the complete structure of the job. Therefore, such policies will have to be changed before long, if we have to improve matters in personnel administration, it is an entirely professional management issue, be it Government or public sector or private sector.

Therefore we will have to employ those techniques which are very well known as to how to run our personnel administration department.

As far as her suggestion of another high powered committee is concerned—she has not spelt out as to what she means by a high powered committee, how high powered, how is it to be structured, how is it to be composed and what the terms of reference are going to be—I would not like to support a suggestion like that without knowing more fully about it. As it is, we have had the unfortunate experience of an important and infructuous Administrative Reforms Commission which has been trying to do a job which for a variety of reasons it cannot do. One of the reasons she has herself mentioned. Report after report on the various aspects of the administrative structure, performance and set-up of the Union Government are either being coldstored or are not being brought up for consideration.

I think, this country suffers from too many bodies, committees, reports and other things and there is to my mind no necessity for appointing another high powered body. But if the Parliament sets the procedures and policies for the type of people that are required for the various impor-

tant positions in this country and if all the professional and personnel requirements are drawn out. I think we will be doing a signal service.

Therefore there is not only a necessity to cleanse the atmosphere in respect of the various appointments that she has mentioned, more so in the public sector enterprises and various bureaucratic appointments that we see from day to day—not only that, they also suffer from such a frequency of transfers that a man who has only got a chance to work in a particular department or a position for three to six months is abruptly transferred from one place to another and he is, therefore, not expected to grow up a loyalty to and understanding of the job and he loses his sense of security also—but all these policy guidelines must be firmly established and only that should dictate as to what should be done in the case of man-power.

The second problem that is vitiating the atmosphere about cleansing the whole atmosphere, about seeing that such appointments are not being made, I hope what she has said—and I must commend her for her courage—is at least reflected by the progressive parts of her party and through this Resolution. Therefore this change in the attitude in the party will bring in better people, younger people who will be achievement-oriented and who will be motivated enough to be able to be equal to the challenge.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA (Godda): Mr. Chairman, I support the general spirit behind the Resolution moved by Shrimati Sinha. It is high time that Government takes care to appoint various personnel at least in the public undertakings that are growing so rapidly. Very large investments have been made, so much so that if these undertakings begin to function properly and give proper return, our difficulties that are being

experienced at the present moment regarding finance or deficit financing should not be there. Therefore it is very important that the proper personnel be selected for the different public undertakings which are being run by the Government and in which such heavy investments have been made.

As was pointed out by the previous speaker, not much time is given to the person who is appointed to be efficient and effective at the place where he is placed. There are frequent transfers from one place to another and a person who gets familiar with a particular line of action or business and a particular job is transferred to another place where perhaps he is not fit. Simply because a person is in the civil service, he cannot be expected to do a job which he never knew about. If you place a doctor in a place where a lawyer is required, the result will be disastrous. Similarly, if a lawyer is placed in charge of a hospital and to treat patients, you can imagine what the result is going to be. That is the fate of some of the industries that are being manned by Government.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: Why does the private sector take up the administrators? If they are not good enough for the public sector, why is there such a demand for them in the private sector?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Because of the patronage they can provide.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA: A person may be very efficient but if the efficiency is not utilised properly by the persons in charge of management, he becomes ineffective. An administrator may be very efficient but if he is placed under a person who does not know the business he will not be effective at all. ICS officers can be very good when they are properly guided by persons who run the

[Shri Himatsingka.]

industry. They cannot be efficient at all if the persons who give them directions or who supervise their work are not efficient themselves. An administrator may be efficient in his own line, but unless he is properly guided by the persons in charge of the management he cannot be effective at all. It is not the fault of the person concerned but it is the fault of the person who is to guide him, give him instructions, give him advice. That person must be competent. That is the difficulty with the present Government. Because the directors in the Board of a company are part-time, they are Secretaries of different departments, they meet hurriedly and they do not have the time to go into the merits of a thing or examine a thing properly. They are supposed to carry on the management of a corporation or a concern where they are appointed. Therefore, it is very necessary that proper persons who are experts, who know the subjects, who can get proper guidance from the persons in charge are appointed. Then and then only it will be possible to make profits.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha gave certain examples. You know the fate of Ashoka Hotel. The Ashoka Hotel had been running properly and efficiently. It was also giving profits. But there have been some changes introduced. Certain favourites have been brought in. Persons who have no experience of the job and who perhaps are more interested in claiming travelling allowances, rightly or wrongly, have been brought in. The result is that they do not have sufficient customers to occupy the rooms. Their custom is decreasing while other hotels are making profits. The earnings of Ashoka Hotel are going down every day because persons who were doing well have been removed and certain persons who are the favourites of some person who has a say in the matter have been brought in. Such a person has been put in as Chairman. He does not know his job. He is in-

terested in making some money himself.

Similar is the case with certain other institutions. What I say, in short, is that proper persons should be placed in charge of industries where so much money has been invested and they should have proper guidance so that those institutions may begin to give us profits and they may be run properly.

With these words, Sir, I support the spirit of the resolution and commend it for the acceptance of the House.

श्री श्रीचन्द्र गेयः (चण्डीगढ़) :
श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा ने इस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा एक अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण विषय की ओर इस सदन का ध्यान आकषिप्त किया है। इस प्रस्ताव के पीछे जो भावना है, जो सिद्धान्त है, और जो आज समय की आवश्यकता है मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ आज हमारी सेवाओं का ढांचा बहुत विकृत हो गया है, उस के अन्दर भाई-भतीजावाद बहुत प्रवेश कर गया है जिस के कारण सेवाओं में कार्य-क्षमता बहुत कम हो गई है। इस सदन के सामने जो प्रस्ताव लाया गया है उस का उद्देश्य है, टु एन्शोर एकीशिएन्सी एन्ड एकोनामी, ताकि सेवाओं की कार्य-क्षमता बढ़े और मितव्ययिता भी लाई जा सके। यद्यपि प्रस्तावक महोदय ने इन विषयों पर कोई प्रकाश नहीं डाला है और न अपने विचार ही रखे हैं, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ आज सेवा विभाग की कार्या-कल्प करने की आवश्यकता है। आज सेवा विभाग के किसी अधिकारी या या कर्मचारी से बात करने पर पता चलता है कि सेवा विभाग में बहुत असंतोष है। वे समझते हैं कि सेवाओं में ऊँचे पदों पर योग्यता के आधार पर तरक्की नहीं दी जाती है, कार्य-क्षमता के आधार पर तरक्की नहीं दी जाती है बल्कि अन्य विचारों के अधीन ही तरक्कियाँ दी जाती हैं। इस बात का इत्तारा

मेरे पूर्व बक्ता ने भी किया है। आज हमारे सामने नवयुवक मंत्री बैठे हुए हैं, मैं समझता हूँ उन नवयुवक मंत्रियों ने अपने अपने विभागों में एक जगह डाली होगी, एक नयी प्रेरणा दी होगी। इसी दृष्टिकोण से आज हमें विचार करना है कि सेवाओं के अन्दर जो नवयुवक आगे बढ़ कर उत्तरदायित्व को सम्भालना चाहते हैं, उनके लिए एकस्ता खला हुआ है या नहीं। इस दृष्टि से मैं समझता हूँ हमें सेवाओं के सारे ढाँचे में काय-कल्प करने की आवश्यकता है।

जहां तक मित्रों का प्रश्न है, हमारे सामने एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमिशन के अध्यक्ष बैठे हुए हैं वे इतने वर्षों से इस कार्य को कर रहे हैं और लाखों रुपया इस कार्य पर व्यय हुआ है। इनके उपरान्त भी यदि हमें अब-समय समय पर नयी समितियों का निर्माण करने की आवश्यकता पड़े तो फिर भी नहीं मंजूरता कि उन्होंने अपनी जिम्मेदारी को पूरी तरह से निभाया है। मैं नहीं जानता उन्होंने अपने विचार इस सम्बन्ध में इतने वर्षों के समाप्त रिपोर्ट के द्वारा दिए या नहीं लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमिशन के कार्य का यह एक आवश्यक अंग था कि वे इस बात पर विचार करते कि बड़े पदों पर जिनको प्रबोत दिया जाता है वह योग्यता के आधार पर किया जाता है या किंसा दूसरे आधारों पर किया जाता है। इस के अतिरिक्त कानूनों और नियमों में किस प्रकार से परिवर्तन करके आई भ्रष्टाचार की मनोवृत्ति को रोका जा सकता है। यह आज का महत्वपूर्ण विषय है।

इसका महत्वपूर्ण विषय यह है कि मितव्ययिता कैसे लाई जाये? इस विषय में सेवा विभागों की पूरी जाँच पड़ताल करके ही हम एक नतीजे पर पहुँच सकेंगे। आज तो मैं यह समझता हूँ कि एक कर्मचारी का कार्य

एक दिन में दो तीन घंटे एवरेज से ज्यादा देखने को नहीं मिलेगा। इसलिए मेरी राय में जिस प्रकार से एकाउन्ट्स का आडिट होता है उसी प्रकार से सेवा विभागों में एक व्यक्ति कितना काम करता है उसका पूरी तरह से जाँच पड़ताल होनी चाहिए। आज एक मोहकमे का बर्ष 60 कर्मचारियों से चल सकता है लेकिन वहाँ पर दो सौ कर्मचारी लगे हुए हैं, जिनके पास पूरा काम नहीं है तो मैं समझता हूँ उन फालतू आदमियों को, किसी दूसरे यूजफुल एम्प्लायमेंट में लगाना चाहिए, बजाय इस के कि हम उनको वहीं पर रख कर उन के समय, उन की शक्ति और उन की योग्यता का पूरा उपयोग न करें। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज इस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा यह सदन इस बात पर विचार करे और अगर कोई समिति निर्माण करनी हो तो जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमिशन की रिपोर्ट्स हैं या समय-समय पर केन्द्रीय सरकार अथवा प्रान्तीय सरकारों द्वारा जो कमिश्नर्स मुकर्रर किए गए हैं उन के मूल्यवान सुझावों पर भी वह समिति विचार करे और उस के बावद सरकारी ढाँचे के अन्दर काया-कल्प लाई जाए ताकि वास्तव में इस के अन्दर मितव्ययिता पैदा हो, और साथ-साथ कार्य-दक्षता पैदा हो तथा भाई-भतीजेवाद की प्रवृत्ति को समाप्त किया जा सके। धन्यवाद।

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bengal-
lore):** Mr. Chairman, Sir. I came to the House with no intention of participating in this debate. When the hon. lady-Member made reference to the Administrative Reforms Commission, I thought, with your permission, with the goodwill of the House, I should clarify the position. At any rate, I am very happy that the hon. lady-Member made the speech from my seat. Therefore, I am sure that she will support whatever position I take.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I only want that some of their useful recommendations be accepted by the Government.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: Sir, I was carefully following the arguments which the hon. lady Member advanced. If she had read the report of the Administrative Commission on Public Undertakings, already submitted to the Government, she would not have said many things which she did. These are the very problems that have been tackled by the Study Teams and subsequently by the Commission—how ICS officers should be made use of if at all and how they should not be allowed to birds of passage from administration to public undertakings and *vice versa*. All these recommendations are there. Happily yesterday it was announced in the papers that the very recommendation regarding ICS officers being posted to public undertakings has been accepted by the Cabinet. Therefore, it is a matter of gratification that the Government has taken the decision on the very lines my hon. lady-Member wants the Government to act. The recommendations of the Commission have covered many of the points that hon. lady-Member so brilliantly made.

A point was raised regarding confidential reports. That is now being examined by the Commission. The Government has given in its terms of reference to the Commission, personnel administration, namely, recruitment, promotion, transfer and allied problems with regard to government servants. We are examining that very problem. If she had cared to look into the reports of the Study Teams on the subject, she would have found that her mind has already been read and digested and recommendations made. There are three reports by the three Study Teams. One Study Team was headed by a former ICS—later he resigned from ICS for patriotic reasons and became a Member of the Planning Commission and he was a Minister

in Madhya Pradesh—Mr. R. K. Patel. Another Study Team was headed by a gentleman of the eminence of Gen. Thorat. The third Team was headed by Mr. Nagarkatti, a former ICS. All the three reports are full of information. They have covered every possible point of view so far as personnel administration is concerned. Currently I came from a Commission meeting; we were discussing this very problem—job evaluation, recruitment, promotion and so on. All these things are being done. Therefore, if the hon. Member has made some remarks, it only highlights the work of the Commission and I am very grateful for that. I make a request to her and the other members of Parliament to go through these reports, and I am sure they will find much useful information which they can make use of.

The next thing is that they have to pursue implementation of these recommendations.

As Chairman of the Commission I have no fear at all that the allegations made against the Government will be kept as a historical record, will ever become true. That merely shows that we do not take cognizance of the day-to-day events, we do not read, and nevertheless we criticise either the Commission or the Government. In fact, this is the only Commission which has received a considerable attention at the hands of the Government and almost every one of its recommendations is being accepted; yet, there may be a few recommendations which Government cannot, for some reason or other, accept . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may try to conclude.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: So, this personnel administration is even now under discussion. The Study Teams' reports are already laid on the Table of the House.

The hon. lady-Member made another very important point. She said, the Commission has been given

so wide terms of reference that they cannot concentrate on any particular problem. This was the very thing that prompted the Government to appoint a Commission; in those days, late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and others were prompted to appoint a Commission with such comprehensive terms of reference for this very reason that if you examine the Government department by department and make recommendations, you will not be able to give a complete picture. I will give an example. Suppose a coat has to be stitched; if you stitch one arm one day and some other tailor stitches the other arm on another day, then the body of the coat by some other tailor and then the buttons by some other tailor, the coat thus stitched will not be of good appearance and also to size. Therefore, the Government wanted a comprehensive view of the defects and weaknesses of the whole governmental edifice from the village panchayat level to the Union administration level, and with this view in mind they wanted the Commission to make recommendations for rationalisation and streamlining of the entire administrative structure. Therefore, they made these terms of reference so wide. The Resolution moved regarding personnel administration is one item in the terms of reference. The Commission took such great pains on that that they appointed three study teams to study the problem. The Commission are now examining their report in order to make a final report on the subject.

I have great admiration for the brilliant lady-Member. But ladies have got a special bent of mind. If they are beautiful, they will accept no one else to be beautiful. So if they are doing a particular work of effort, they will not accept that any other person will do that work equally well. But the hon. lady-Member is much more of a statesman than a lady. Therefore, I want her to kindly take a comprehensive view of the matter.

श्री शिवशंकर झा (मधुबनी) : सभापति महोदय, श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा ने अपने प्रस्ताव में एफिशिएंसी और एकोनामी लाने के हेतु जो एच.आई.ए.ए. कमेटी बनाने की मांग की है जो कि सिविल और सैनिक विभागों में उच्च वेतन वाले पदों के निर्माण और परामर्शकारियों के चयन सम्बन्धी प्रश्न को जांच करे। इस के बारे में मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो उन का हाई-प.वर्ड कमेटी बनाने का प्रस्ताव है यह सुपरफ्लुएस है। इस बारे में पहले बहुत सी कमेटियाँ बन चुकी हैं और बहुत सी कमेटियों की रिपोर्टें हैं। बहुत सी कमेटियाँ तफ़्तील में गयी हैं। प्रथम जी 1 कि श्री हनुमन्तय्या ने कहा है कि बहुत सी कमेटियाँ इस क्षेत्र में बड़े डिग्रेड में गई हैं और इसलिए इन कमेटी को बनाना जरूरी नहीं है। एफिशिएंसी और एकोनामी लाने की बात बहुत हद तक सामने आ गयी है। अब सवाल इंटरप्रीट करने का नहीं है बल्कि समाज को कैसे चेंज किया जाय यह चीज हमारे सामने होनी चाहिये। समाज को कैसे चेंज किया जाय यह बुनियादी बात सामने आनी चाहिए लेकिन अभाव्यवस्था वह बुनियादी बात सामने नहीं आ रही है।

जहाँ तक हाइली पेड पोस्ट्स प्रश्न ऊंची-ऊंची तनख्वाह पाने वाले अफसरान का ताल्लुक है यह बात साफ हो गयी है और यह किसी कमेटी में रख ले जाने की जरूरत नहीं रह गयी है कि समाज में हाइली पेड अफसरों की जरूरत नहीं है। हम जिस नये समाज का गठन करने जा रहे हैं। वह बराबरी का समाज होने जा रहा है। जो एक कौज का सिपाही है और एक ऊंचा सिपाह-स.नार. है, उन दोनों की तनख्वाहों में अंतर जितनी असमानता नहीं होनी चाहिए। उन दोनों की तनख्वाहों में 1 और 10 से अधिक असमानता नहीं होनी चाहिए। यह चीज सिविल सर्विस में काम करने वाले ऊंचे अफसरान और निचले दरजे के मसजिदों के बारे में भी लागू होनी

[श्री शिवचन्द्र शर्मा]

चाहिये। आज के दिन बड़े अफसरों और निचले कर्मचारियों के बेतनों के बीच अत्यधिक असमानता है वह दूर होनी चाहिये। हम देश में आगे जिस समाज का गठन करने वाले हैं उसमें इस तरह की भारी असमानता नहीं होनी चाहिये। इससे उनमें जहां एफिसिंसी बढ़ेगी वहां इकानोमी भी आयेगी।

अभी तक सिविल सर्विस की जो व्यवस्था हमारे देश में है वह वही पुराने अंग्रेजी जमाने की सी है। वही पुराना व्यरोकेटिक दिमाग उन अफसरान का कायम है, वे अपने को एक समाज से सबसे ऊपर और अलग अलग सा समझते हैं और बाकी दूसरे लोगों को वह एक नीची निगह से देखते हैं। अंग्रेजी जमाने की पुरानी अफसरियत की वृद्धि भी उनमें मौजूद है और सह अपने को सबसे ऊंचा समझते हैं और बाकी समाज के दूसरे लोगों को नीची निगह से देखते हैं। यह चीज कि सभी इंसान बराबर हैं यह सामाजिक समानता की भावना हमारे उन सिविल और मिलिटरी के ऊंचे अफसरान में अभी तक नहीं आ पायी है। जाहिर है कि यह चीज हमारे जनतंत्र के विकास और प्रगति के लिये बाधक है। जो हमारा मकसद है और जो हमारा आने वाला नया समाज है उसके यह खिाफ है। इसलिये यदि आप हकीकत में चाहते हैं कि यहां पर कार्य-कुशलता और मितव्ययिता आये तो यह साजिमी हो जाता है कि आज सिविल और सैनिक विभागों में अफसरों और नीचे के कर्मचारियों के बेतन में जो भारी असमानता है उसे खत्म किया जाये। यह एक बुनियादी बात है जो कि जानी चाहिये।

दूसरी जंझरी चीज यह है कि अभी जैसा मैंने कहा कि जो ऊंचे अफसरान हैं वह अपने को सामाज से एक अलग ऊंचा क्लास समझते हैं और बाकी समाज को एक नीची निगह से देखते हैं, दूसरों को वह इनफोरियर सा समझते हैं, यह भावना हमारे बीच में से खत्म होनी चाहिये। इस बारे में मैं निवेदन करूँ कि मुझे थोड़ा बहुत अमरीका में रहने

का भोका मिला है। मैं जानता हूँ कि वहां पूंजीवादी जनतंत्र है वहां फर्क है, ऊंच-नीच की भावनायें हैं, सब कुछ है, लेकिन बाहर से देखने में मालूम होगा कि एक जबदस्त इन्फार्मिलिटी की भावना है, सब एक दूसरे के बराबर हैं। मैं वकाले में पढ़ता था।

आप वहां पर किसी भी दफ्तर में चले जाइये कोई भी बड़ा अफसर नहीं मालूम होता है। वह बड़े आदमी हैं लेकिन व्यवहार में ऐसा नहीं मालूम होता है। ऐसी भावना हम लोगों को यहां पर कायम करनी पड़ेगी। एक कम्प्यूटीशन की बात आपको रखनी होगी। यह ठीक है कि वहां पर उतना कम्प्यूटेशन नहीं है जितना कि यहां के अफसरों में है लेकिन तब भी आपको ए इन्फार्मिलिटी लानी होगी। जब आप जन-तान्त्रिक और समाजवादी सामाज की बात करते हैं तो आपको ग्रामदनी में जो इतना फर्क है उसको हटाना होगा चाहे फीज में हो या सिविल सर्विस में हो। यह एक बुनियादी बात है कि जनसेवा की एफि-सिंसी को बढ़ाने के लिये हमें यह बात लानी होगी। एक रहनुमा नहीं दो रहनुमा और बहुत से रहनुमा हमारे सामने इस बात को किताबों में लिख कर रख गये हैं लेकिन इसको व्यवहार में लाना आवश्यक है।

आपने जो कमेटियां बनाई हैं वह कमेटियां तो तफसील में जाकर बहुत सी बातें साफने रखनी हैं। जैसे ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्मस कमिशन के स्टडी ग्रुप हैं जो कि प्लैनिंग कमिशन के लिये रिसर्च करते हैं, तेक्नल कॉंसिल आफ एप्साइड ऐंड इकानामिक रिसर्च हैं इनसे मुझे असन्तोष नहीं है लेकिन उनमें सब तफसील की बातें हैं। सवाल यह है कि सिद्धान्त को कार्यान्वित करने की शक्ति सरकार में नहीं है। उसमें काबू करने की इच्छा का अभाव है। यह प्रस्ताव आता, कमेटी बनाई जाती, हम इसका फैसला करते लेकिन सरकार में बिल टूटने होकर

को हीना चाहिये जिस में कि हमारी शर्तें व्यवस्था ठीक से चल सके और हमारे सिविल और मिलिटरी अधिकारियों में जन सेवा का भाव आ सके ।

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव सुपरफ्लुअस है अनप्रोडक्टिव समाज में फुलबर्डी को स्थापित करना प्रस्ताव है यह बेकार का प्रस्ताव है । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ और कहता हूँ कि ऐसा प्रस्ताव हीना चाहिये जो कि कार्यान्वित किया जा सके ।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I admire the substance of the resolution and the manner in which Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha has put her case. It is true, if you consider how our administration has been functioning even after the assurance of Mr. Hanumanthaiya. It needs streamlining. In the matter of promotion, or recruitment or giving re-employment to the retired personnel it is necessary for us to go into the whole affair and a commission is necessary, if not of that magnitude, at least a commission of this House. Mr. Hanumanthaiya argued: cannot you rely on my wisdom and the wisdom of the Administrative Reforms Commission? We do. But wisdom is not after all the monopoly of someone and this House can appoint a committee of this type to go into the entire question. I know what is agitating the minds of the government servants. If you consider the various reports of the departmental promotion committee, whether it is class I or II or III, you will find favouritism and nepotism is the order of the day. Nobody recognises merit. If somebody knows a Member of Parliament or if he knows a Minister a five starred or four starred Cabinet minister or even an unstarred Minister like the Deputy Minister, he is sure to get the job or promotion. People have stopped

thinking in terms of strong competition and nobody is concerned with merit. He is more concerned with recommendations from a person in Government. Will he agree with Mrs. Sinha when she says that the big shots of the Railway Board, when they retired, need not wait for even a day since the posts were made available for them?

What happens in the public undertakings? Take the HEC, Bhopal. Why can not production take place, and why was there no production for years together? You will be surprised to know that the first transformer which was inaugurated by the late lamented Pandit Jawarhal Nehru ultimately was found to have been not produced there at all. Some strike took place, and those people who were asked to say before everybody that it was assembled there, when they became angry, subsequently said that it was never manufactured there and that all the parts were imported and the unit was only assembled there. So, the transformer was not produced in Bhopal at that time.

In the same manner, take the public undertakings and the Chairman of the Railway Board or any member of the Railway Board. Every day we see that no decision is taken. They have no initiative. There is nobody who takes a decision. In fact they are afraid to take any decision, because this Government is itself a prisoner of indecision according to the retired or resigned Member, Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit. So, nobody takes a decision.

If you really go to office, you will find one thing. I was serving a government department for 20 years. I know that during those days nobody used to write anything on the files unless he was convinced and the superior officers were convinced that they were right. But today, what is it that is done on the files? "Mr.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

such and such, please speak" You do not know what you want him to speak, and when he has spoken, the officer notes, "Spoken." You do not know what has happened between "Please speak" and "Spoken." It is only that man who speaks knows, and only that man who is spoken to knows what the matter is, Noone-else knows. On the second day, another officer who comes in is unable to know what has happened. That is why I think it is necessary that we should streamline the administration and if a Committee of Parliament is appointed to go into the entire question, it will be good.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: There is a committee of Members of Parliament.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I said earlier that wisdom is not the monopoly of somebody. That is why a committee should be appointed to consider whether retired government officials should be given such posts. They may be very efficient, and thanks to the voters, two or three ICS officers have been returned to this House, Shri Lobo Prabhu, Shri Dandekar and Shri Nayar. Otherwise, they would have created some posts of Chairmen for some public corporations. At least they are here with us; otherwise, they are bound to get some posts, because the ICS men are supposed to be very intelligent and very independent also. There is no doubt about it.

In the same way, there are appointments as Chairman, made on political considerations, for defeated Ministers or any minister. After all, if there is no place for them, the proper place probably for them would be the Rajya Sabha, where you have not to produce anything or do any work. That is why, I am opposed to jobs being given on political consideration. Take the British India Corporation at Kanpur. It is in turmoil only because Mr. Satish Chandra was sent there as Chairman. Mr. Satish Chandra was found to be efficient after be-

ing defeated at the polls that he was first Chairman of the IAC and then Chairman of the BIC and for every chairmanship he was the only man found to be fit, as a versatile genius for any chairmanship. So, that should not happen.

I request that a committee should be appointed to go into this question. We may or may not accept this resolution but the substance of this resolution is, Hands Off retired personnel; raise their pension. Let them remain contented with their pension. The Government should do these things in a perfect way. After all, the Departmental Promotion Committee should be perfect. Nobody should be able to point out a finger on the decision of the Departmental Promotion Committee. Otherwise, there is dissatisfaction. There is dissatisfaction among the army personnel also. People might have been promoted from Major-General to Lt.-General, but those who have been left behind are still having some minister or ministers who can possibly recommend. Even in the army, this favouritism and nepotism continues. I do not know what is going to be the fate of the army if such things continue.

With these words, I admire the courage with which Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha has brought forward this resolution. She is a very courageous lady and I support the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj): The time may be extended. Just five minutes may be left over for the next resolution to be moved. Till then this can go on.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Sir, the hon. member to my left was the Chairman of the Public Undertakings Committee. The House would like to hear him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He will be given a chance. Now, the minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): Sir, I think the hon. mover has done a great service to the country and to Parliament by bringing this resolution before the House and focussing the attention of the country and Parliament on a very important subject. The need for administrative reforms in our country has been felt almost right after independence. Not only the procedures and rules had to be improved upon, but the concept of administration had to be changed. There is lot of truth in saying that while this need was felt, not much in this direction was done. Therefore, it was a very welcome step that this high-powered Administrative Reforms Commission was constituted with able persons manning it. The terms of reference were deliberately kept so wide that they would not find any impediment in taking up any subject they thought was related to public administration, right from district administration to any other administration and give the benefit of their wisdom to the country and to Government, so that with the help of their recommendations, we could attempt to improve public administration in this country.

Mrs Sinha was pleased to make certain remarks about the public sector concerns. There is no doubt that the public sector in our country has not worked as well as we would wish it to do. But it has definitely done a great service to the country and public sector has found one of the most important places in our economy. I am sure Mrs. Sinha is not against the concept of public enterprises. We all share her worry and anxiety that our public enterprises should work better and because the future of our economy to a large extent depends on how well our public enterprises work. The suggestions she gave today and she would give from time to time, I am sure, would help us to improve the performance of the public sector concerns.

Mr. Himatsingka referred to the profit-making capacities of the public sector concerns. With all respect, I submit that profit making is not the motive of public enterprises. I would agree that they must give a fair return on the investments made but that is not the be all and end all of our public enterprises. They have to be production-oriented. They are not profit-oriented. If they were to be profit-oriented, there was no need for public enterprises in our country. They have to be production-oriented and fulfil the basic needs of our economy in the heavy sector. Profits would be all right in their own places, but the main thing is they must be production-oriented and our dependence on foreign sources must not continue. We should become self-sufficient in all essential items.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA: If they produce properly, they will make more profits.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA. I would not look at public enterprises from the profit point of view. But I agree they should not run at a loss but should give some return on loss but should give some return on the investment. When we started public enterprises we had to depend on civil servants and others who agreed to co-operate with us in this respect. I remember the days when I first entered Parliament in 1957. That was the time when public enterprises were getting into stride. At that time I know what amount of hostility was there from the private sector towards the public enterprises. That kind of hostility one does not see today. Because of that hostility and because of that lack of co-operation from the side of private enterprise we could not get proper talents from various sources and we had to depend on public services.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI: What co-operation were you seeking?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I do not think we can enter into an argument about this matter, but it is a patent fact that there were attempts to see that the public sector did not succeed in this country. Very serious attempts were made to stop it from coming up. I am very glad that those attempts did not succeed. I am only trying to explain why Government had to fall back upon certain individuals in the civil services. I do not myself think that it was very right because civil servants were not trained to do this job. But there was no other alternative and therefore this particular procedure had to be adopted.

I agree with what Shrimati Sinha has said, that for manning of public sector enterprises we must have trained personnel. It is not necessary that they should necessarily be from civil service. If a person or a group of persons belong to the civil service and they are properly trained to run public sector enterprises they should certainly be given an opportunity to do this work. Whether they do it well or not will have to be seen. A person who is trained to do this job would be in a better position to do it.

At present in the Home Ministry we have a Manpower Directorate. The Bureau of Public Enterprises is managed by the Ministry of Finance. The two of us look after this matter and see that proper kind of service and expertise is developed in this country so that our public enterprises are run better than they have been run before.

There is a lot of truth in the criticism that we have heard here about inherited administration. The administration we inherited from the British has by and large been kept intact. I personally think it is very unfortunate. In the beginning of the era of independence we should have made attempts and changed the concept of administration and the structure of administration drastically.

Today if we are not able to deliver the goods, if we fail in a particular sector and if we fail to make the impact felt in a particular sector, the greatest single reason is that the machinery through which we have to work is not geared to that kind of attitude and work.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai). Sir, I would like to ask one point of information. We want the views of the Government of India. Shri Shukla said that he personally thinks this is a bad thing. I want to know what the opinion of the Government is. We are not interested in knowing what view he personally has in this matter. He is speaking on behalf of the Government.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I deliberately made that distinction because the Government would commit itself to a view one way or the other after getting the wisdom of Shri Hanumanthaiya's Commission. I am not giving any conclusions on behalf of the Government when I say "I personally feel".

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: So the Government is now in blissful ignorance.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA. The Government is only waiting for the various reports of the Administrative Reforms Commission which have been found useful. We would be able to do the reforms in administration in a much better way after we have their reports in our hands. It is not necessary, as the Chairman himself said, that the Government may accept everything. The Government may not accept everything. The Government may even go beyond what they recommend.

What I am stating here is that if our structure and concept of administration were changed, the difficulty that we have had for the last 20 years might have been less. Since this particular deficiency was felt very strongly, this high powered Administrative Reforms Commission has been appointed.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI: Let us have another high powered committee.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: About the system of administration, everybody knows that we have a democracy functioning at the national and the State level, but it is an unfortunate fact of our national life that after the State level there is no democracy. It is a bureaucracy that functions in the districts and elsewhere, where most of the problems of the people are. That is the place where most of the administrative reforms need to be done.

This again is a view that I am stating on behalf of myself, because Government will have to come to a studied conclusion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have heard him not once but twice say that this is his personal view. Whatever he is speaking is all Shri Vidya Charan Shukla's speech. Should a non-official Resolution be taken in a non-official manner? After all, he is a minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

14.22 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My point of order is whether it is open to the Minister to reply only in a personal capacity. It will be a very bad precedent. After all, we are not meeting in the Central Hall; we are meeting in this House.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I am not replying to the debate.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: He is looking only to labour, nothing else.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Shri Randhir Singh is like my elder brother; only he talks too much.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: The Minister is talking something very seriously about district administration and I do not know why he is not appreciating this. I appreciate his viewpoint.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My conception of wisdom is different from his

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: That is quite possible.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My point of order is—the Chairman has heard me only half; so you kindly hear me—that we are discussing a non-official Resolution; after all Members have spoken, the hon. Minister is speaking on behalf of the Home Minister as the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs. He said once, "This is my personal view." We tolerated it. Then, the second time again he said, "This is my personal view." So no official view is available on this Resolution. Is it open to the Minister to reply to the debate in a purely personal capacity? In that case we can go to the Central Hall and hear him. Why should we be deprived of our coffee and cigarettes and be sitting here? It is a very important Resolution and he should make official comment, not non-official comment. Will you kindly give a ruling on that?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I am only intervening in the debate. The right of reply is reserved for the hon. lady Member. I do not think that Shri Banerjee means to say that I have no right to have any personal opinion. Whenever I speak, I can say everything on behalf of Government and whichever I want to specify as not the views of Government I can say that they are my own views. I am not saying that these are not the views of Government. Ultimately they may become the views of Government, but until we get the reports of the Administrative Reforms Commission and Government considers them, Gov-

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

ernment's considered views cannot be made known here. I am not making those views known here. Whenever I have comments to make like that, I can say that these are my personal views. About other things I am stating officially.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: What are the views of Government?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has made one thing very clear. So long as the Administrative Reforms Commission's report is not given full consideration and thought and views are formed by Government, he cannot say what the view of Government is. On this occasion before the hon. lady Member replies to the debate, in general he has replied and shown his reaction. But I must make it very clear that anyone occupying the Treasury Benches can express his view but with this reservation on some aspects as you have said, "These are my views". But if this is the view of Government, you can say so.

So far as this Resolution is concerned, you can say that Government at the present time is giving serious consideration to the report submitted by the Administrative Reforms Commission. Till that time, whatever he wants to say can say.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI: We are not discussing the reports of the Administrative Reforms Commission here. Therefore, he need not wait for all the reports and their acceptance. We are discussing the administrative structure, the economy, the efficiency and the overall position.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: The Commission is considering that matter.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI: We must have Government views on these matters.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Sir, in view of your ruling, I withdraw my point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I presume, the Resolution is brought forward to bring to the notice of the Government the urgency of some administrative reforms and certain steps to be taken as far as possible and as early as possible. That is the purpose of the Resolution and, I think, the Minister, more or less, shares the point of view expressed. But when the Administrative Reforms Commission is entrusted with the task of going through all the gamut of administrative reforms and procedure, though urgency need be urged, to bypass the Commission, because there is a Resolution, would not be proper. It would be difficult for the Home Minister to make such a commitment. Therefore, I would allow the hon. Minister to continue.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, I was speaking about the district administration and this I will state officially that we hope the Administrative Reforms Commission will give its serious thought towards re-orientation and improvement in the district administration with a view to bring the maximum amount of democracy in the district administration. This is what we are looking forward to and we hope that we shall have the benefit of their views soon enough so that this burning problem that we are facing in our country today could be solved in an expeditious manner.

The hon. lady Member, Shrimati Tarkeshwarj Sinha, has made a good study of the deficiencies of administration and she has made several useful remarks about confidential reports, fundamental rules and about job evaluation and things like that I would refrain from making comments on them because, again, the Administrative Reforms Commission is going through these matters and looking into them. I am quite sure they will give useful recommendations regarding these matters so that we could take proper decisions in these matters.

Before I close, I would like to refer to what Shri Somani said.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: On a point of information. Has the Government considered the possibility of recruitment to the public sector through a separate Public Service Commission because that will eliminate many of the complaints made here?

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: The view is that the public undertakings personnel are of a special kind. That has to be done by a special procedure. The usual Public Service Commissions are not cut out for this kind of work.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: You may have a separate Public Service Commission which may be qualified for this work.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: We shall consider that point also.

The hon. Member, Shri Somani, while he was speaking on the Resolution, mentioned about the jobs that are being given to defeated Ministers and defeated politicians. This is a subject on which there is a lot of confusion in the country. First of all, nobody is given a job just because he is defeated. If a job is given, it is given on the evaluation of his capacity or his experience. I do not think that anybody should be condemned just because he has been defeated at the polls. We have had the experience of the hon. Chairman of the Swatantra Party being defeated in the General elections. But we do not condemn him because of that. He somehow comes back to the House again. But his capacity or his public understanding is not reduced just because he is defeated in the General Elections. I do not think Prof. Ranga, an eminent person, could be condemned just because he is defeated. I do not think he would be condemned as being useless for any other thing.

If he could be used for such purposes and in such capacities where we could have the benefit of his talents, of his experience, we should by all means have it. Here if certain Members of Parliament . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI TENNETI VISHWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam): No public man becomes great unless he is defeated at the polls at least once.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I have won the elections four times and I have yet to become great.

Here what I am saying is that nobody in this country or no democrat in this country should be condemned just because he has been defeated at the polls. This is rather an uncharitable criticism . . . (Interruption). We tend to make public criticisms about those people who are otherwise regarded as honest, intelligent and experienced people . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): Mr. Malaviya had to leave the Government. Would you call it 'honest'?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: You should not quote individual cases. We are talking about the concept. We should take full advantage of their experience and their ability. Now I would give an example. Let us take the question of ambassadorial posts abroad. If you count out the public men who are at present serving in any particular position here, then there are people who have retired from public life or those who have been defeated or those who are doing nothing at this time. If you do not take any of these people who are otherwise very capable, experienced, and men of great integrity and public standing, then you have to fill all diplomatic posts by civil servants. What are the other ways? You have to take from professional fields, from public life and other such fields. That is why I am saying that this kind of criticism should not be made in a light-hearted manner. We should remember this. Whenever selections are made, only 10 or 15 per cent or may be, 25 per cent of the defeated politicians may be given jobs here and there, but that is not because they were defeated but because they are available, they have got experience, they have got capacity and they have public standing, which are required for these jobs. I would very much wish that criticism

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

of this kind is not heard again in this House. (Interruptions). This is all that I want to say.

The Administrative Reforms Commission has recommended appointment of a Parliamentary Committee. I would, therefore, request Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha to consider this. Government is also giving consideration to this recommendation. In view of this, I would request her to withdraw her Resolution.

श्री रणचर सिंह (रोहतक) स्पीकर महोदय, एक व्यू प्वाइंट है जो सवाल की शकल में मैं मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने पेश करना चाहता हूँ। हमारे देश में ठेकेदारी है दौलत की, जायदाद की, कारखानों की, सब की और नौकरियों की भी ठेकेदारी है यह रेजोल्यूशन जिसकी बात आया है। सिविल की नौकरियाँ हों चाहे मिलीटरी वह भी एक इजारेदारी बन गया है। आई० सी० एस० का लड़का जरूर आई० ए० एस० बनेगा। जनरल का लड़का जरूर कमीशन लेगा। बड़े बड़े जो आफिसर हैं उनके एक एक कुनबे में से बीस बीस गजेटेड आफसर हैं। इस इजारेदारी को तोड़ने के लिए मैं एक तजवीज पेश करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ आप या गवर्नमेंट उसके ऊपर गौर फरमायेगी। यूनिन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन में और स्टेट्स में जो पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन हैं उनमें और मैं तो यहाँ तक कहता हूँ जैसे प्लानिंग कमीशन है उसमें भी रूरल बायस के आदमी, मजदूर और किसान के हित के ख्यालात रखने वाले आदमों एग्रीकल्चर बायस के आदमी होने चाहिए। आप यूनिन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन में और स्टेट्स के पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन में क्या इसका कुछ ख्याल रखेंगे और साथ साथ जो मिलीटरी में भी आते हैं आप यह कहते कि इनमें इतनी काबलियत नहीं है मैं नहीं मानता इस बात को और मैं हनुमानिया जी से भी कहूँगा... (व्यवधान)... यह एक व्यू प्वाइंट है, मैं बड़ी बिल्कुल के साथ महसूस करता हूँ इस बात को और मुझे कह दिया

करें, यह बात 80 फीसदी आदमियों की है, हर बात में मैं यह समझता हूँ कि कोई आदमी देहात का है, गरीब का बेटा है, किसान का बेटा है, यह सबसे बड़ा मेरिट है। तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह एजेंसी जो बड़ी बड़ी नौकरियों में भर्ती करती है उस एजेंसी में उन लोगों को भर्ती करने के लिए सााा जाय, उन लोगों को पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन का मेम्बर बनाया जाय जो देहात से, किसान से, मजदूर से हमदर्दी रखते हैं और जो उस तबके से आदमी आते हैं उनको वह लें ताकि हमारी बड़ी बड़ी सर्विसेज में पब्लिक ग्रंडर-टेकिंग में और फौज में भी वह आदमी जाय इसके लिए आप व्यवस्था करेंगे ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is outside the scope of this debate. But if the Minister wants to say anything in reply, he might do so.

श्री रणचर सिंह : मैं कहता हूँ कि बड़ी बड़ी नौकरियों में इन्होंने कहा है एफिसरों के लिए भी और एकोनामी के लिए भी, उस शर्त से यह व्यू प्वाइंट है, बिना डा क्लिअर रिज?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When the Mover of the Resolution made a plea here, it was altogether on a different level. The hon. Member wanted a clarification. I now leave it to the Minister to reply or not reply. If he is not replying to it, I would call upon the Mover to reply.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: He has made a suggestion which will be on record and that would be considered.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I am very grateful to the hon. Members who have really appreciated the spirit of the Resolution. I do not understand why Shri S. C. Jha has opposed even the spirit of it. The wording of the Resolution put on the agenda is conditioned by the rules of procedure; it could have been put only in this way and that is why it

has been so put. I could not have brought a Resolution on the basis of a presumption, because the Administrative Reforms Commission's recommendation might have been accepted here and there in one or two cases; it is not the entire report of the Commission before us. It is in the process of being examined. Some of the reports are still with the Chairman of the Commission. Therefore, any reference to the ARC in the Resolution would not have been according to the rules. That is why I have worded my Resolution as it appears on the agenda.

As you rightly pointed out, Sir, my intention was to highlight some of the deficiencies and facts. Shri Hanumanthaya, a senior member of this House and Chairman of the Administrative Reforms Commission, mentioned that a number of subjects are under examination and a number of recommendations have been made. What I was concerned with is not the value of the recommendations. I do appreciate that our best brains in the country have been associated in those sub-committees appointed by the Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: He included the hon. Member also in it.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I am a very humble person doing my work in my own small way. I do not come in that category.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: He appreciates her humility.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I am grateful.

My fear was this that if all the recommendations of the Commission come simultaneously, being as they are, of far-reaching consequences, it will be impossible for Government to take cognisance of all them and implement them as Government would like to. They have very serious implications and therefore, it would be better if Government started implementing them keeping in view the suggestions that are coming forward starting from the day the first sub-

committee's report was handed over to Government for their consideration. Since the last one year, reports have been submitted to Government, but the way in which some of the things have been done in regard to appointments which have been made in the public sector does not show that these things have been taken note of. The hon. Member said that we have provided guidelines for manning the public sector projects. Even within the last two months, the appointments which have been made cannot be considered as confirming the view that Government have really taken cognisance of the recommendations of the ARC.

That is why our worry, that in spite of the fact that the ARC has given recommendations, they are being put in cold storage thereby reducing the effectiveness of the recommendations. My fear is that these recommendations will go into the archives. Except for the lonely Member Mr. Jha, I had the privilege of getting the spirit of the resolution commended by the entire House including the hon. Minister. Mr. Jha is always an exception to the rule. I do not mind it. Later on we shall discuss this and he will come round to the point of view which I have placed before the House. The House was a little disturbed in having some cross talks, when the hon. Minister made a significant remark. I think he has not made that significant remark as hon. Member Mr. Shukla but in his capacity as a member of the Government. He said there is a particular recommendation. A hint about it was also given by the hon. Member Shri Hanumanthaya. In their report on the machinery for planning, there is a recommendation that a special parliamentary committee of about 25 Members may be constituted to go into the annual progress reports of the Plan. That concerns the Plan. There is another suggestion that Parliament may consider whether the parliamentary committee mentioned above should not also perform the functioning of an informal consultative committee. That brings us to

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

a significant point. My resolution gets added significance because of this fact. There are two aspects to the recommendation of the ARC or any function of the Government. The hon. Minister has promised that he will take into consideration the recommendations in all seriousness. An effective machinery is required to act as a watch dog and see whether these recommendations are implemented as they should be, and in time too. Otherwise, the effect of recommendations will be lost. Therefore, I was wondering if he could agree to these two points. One point was made by the hon. Members of the Opposition and I agree with that: there is a lot of sense in the appointment of a standing committee or Parliament which will function in an informal manner. It would act as watch dog over the business of the Government. There is a lot of sense in that suggestion. This is a federal Parliament. We have seen the way it functions. In a budget discussion of five days, what can we do? Members get 5 or 10 minutes. In that short time we cannot put our points of view. What is the most effective way in a federal system? In America they have established these committees primarily for the reason that they could act as the watchdogs of the country. Every matter cannot be taken up in the House and discussed in great detail. The hon. Minister must consider the sentiments expressed by almost the entire Opposition Members. Standing committees should be constituted. I also strongly support that suggestion.

Secondly, I refer to the ARC recommendations in many reports. I had occasion to see some of the reports and Mr. Hanumanthaiya had also provided us with some guidance and suggestions. In every report they have said that something should be taken up by the PAC or the Public Undertakings Committee or the Bureau of Public Enterprises or by a parliamentary committee. Therefore, I submit that a watch-dog committee of Parliament should be constituted and it should be a permanent committee just

like the PAC or the PUC. There are many significant recommendations which are coming from the ARC. We are watching how they are implemented. The hon. Minister referred to this report and said one sentence: we shall examine it sympathetically. I hope that he has not given this assurance as Mr. Shukla but as a Minister of the Government. In view of this assurance and in the hope that he will appreciate the views of the House and give due consideration to the two points which had been raised and that a Committee will be appointed in the near future, I withdraw my resolution.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: If she is withdrawing the resolution, where is the question of amendment?

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: I beg to leave to withdraw my amendment.

*Amendment No. 2 was by leave,
withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Has the hon Member got the leave of the House to withdraw her resolution?

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

16.46 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. RURAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I move:

"This House calls upon the Government to give priority for rural housing development in the Plans."

About 20 years back, there was this cry:

"छोटा ना घर होगा बच्चों की छवि में।"

Young boys and girls spread over the five and a half lakhs of villages in our country went about humming this tune. After all, the call was given to the country by the late Prime Minis-