

[Shri H. V. Koujalgi]

of the labourer have not gone high as compared to the rise in the prices. The wages which the labourer gets is not even sufficient for his maintenance since the prices of the essential commodities have gone very high. So, one can safely say that the criticism that has been made by some Members that the rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer seems to be true.

The country is facing so many difficult problems. Especially the food problem has become a chronic one. Recently, we have seen agitations in many States, and still these agitations are threatening in many States. Government must see that we secure self-sufficiency in food at least within the next five years. We are expected to be self-sufficient as early as possible, and we are not expected to go from country to country asking for food every year. The hon. Food Minister has told us on more than one occasion that incentive prices should be given to the growers. Accordingly, each State has fixed prices in the respective areas, but in practice we find that the foodgrain which is sold at the rate of Rs. 50 to 60 per quintal in some parts like the Punjab or Rajasthan is sold in other States like Maharashtra or Gujarat at the rate of Rs. 100 to 150 per quintal. The pity of it is that the grower does not get the price fixed, but on the other hand, the profit goes to the middleman. Sometimes we see that even the States which are dealing in these foodgrains are purchasing at a lower rate and selling at a higher rate, thereby making a profit. That is highly objectionable, and there should be no such thing. It has been stated on more than one occasion that . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may resume his seat and conclude his speech on Monday next. Now, we have to take up the Private Members' Business.

15.29½ hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTIETH REPORT

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eightieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th March, 1966."

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eightieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th March, 1966."

The motion was adopted.

15:30 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS—contd.

Mr. Chairman: Further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Bibhuti Mishra on the 25th February 1966:—

"This House is of opinion that with a view to bring socialism in the country forthwith and to execute the Five Year Plan successfully, Government should bring about radical changes in its administrative set-up without the least delay".

Shri Bibhuti Mishra might resume his speech.

श्री बिभूति मिश्र (मोतिहारी): सभापति महोदय, पिछली बार मैं कह रहा था कि प्रशासन में काफी सुधार होना चाहिये और उस सिलसिले में मैंने कहा था कि प्रशासन सम्बन्धी कार्यों में सुधार लाने के लिए जो कमेटी बने उस कमेटी के जिम्मे वैदेशिक कार्य

सभापति महोदय : आपके रेजोल्यूशन के लिए दो घंटे हैं। आप 29 मिनट ले चुके हैं। इसका आप ख्याल रखें।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : पांच मिनट में मैं खत्म कर दूंगा।

श्री कपूर सिंह (लुधियाना) : फिर हमारे लिए क्या बचेगा ?

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो सुधार सरकार लाने जा रही है, उस में वह एपलबी की जो रिपोर्ट है, उसका भी ध्यान रखे। वह अमरीका के रहने वाले हैं। अमरीका एक डैमोक्रेटिक कंट्री है। जिस तरह से हमने अमरीकी विरोध की राय ली है उसी तरह से हमें रूसी विरोध की राय भी लेनी चाहिये और रूसी को भी रखना चाहिये। हमें देखना चाहिये कि वहाँ किस तरह से कामकाज चलता है। हर तरह के एक्सपर्ट्स को बुला कर उनकी राय ले कर सरकार को प्रशासन में सुधार लाना चाहिये।

आज हमारे यहाँ सेंटर है और स्टेट्स भी हैं। इसके साथ साथ लोकलबाडीज भी हैं, ग्राम पंचायत भी हैं। ये सभी सोचते हैं कि हम एक दूसरे से इंडिपेंडेंट हैं। इसके बारे में एपलबी, ने भी लिखा है कि जो डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन है वह इंडिपेंडेंट होने की भावना को भी जन्म दे रहा है। इस वारते और ज्यादा डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन को आगे बढ़ाते समय सरकार को इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि यह डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन ऐसा न हो कि हर स्टेट इंडिपेंडेंट हो जाए जैसे कि मुगल राज में हुआ था। इस वास्ते एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स करते समय इस पर भी आपका पूरा पूरा ध्यान जाना चाहिये।

एपलबी रिपोर्ट में लिखा है :

"The constitutional effort to specify scopes of national and state powers so precisely would appear to raise the most serious

barriers before national needs to develop and execute national programs in the interest of the national economy and the national public".

ऐसा मालूम होना चाहिये कि सेंटर और स्टेट में कोई फर्क नहीं है, एक चीज है। आपको यह भी देखना चाहिये कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि एक स्टेट तो डिवेलप हो जाए और दूसरी स्टेट डिवेलप न हो, वह पिछड़ जाए। अगर ऐसा हुआ तो लापसाइडिड हमारी इकोनोमी हो जाएगी और लापसाइडिड एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन हो जाएगा। इस पर सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये और कार्रवाई करनी चाहिये।

आगे वह कहते हैं :

"Language usage and sentiment seem to support minimizing Central powers. 'Autonomous states' is a phrase in wide use and as used of tremendous influence on modes of action. Yet the constitution does not provide for autonomous states and their creation would destroy India as a nation".

यह जो भावनायें पैदा हो रही हैं कि स्टेट्स फ्राटोनीमस हो जायें और कुछ नेताओं द्वारा भी इसी तरह की बातें की जाती हैं, हमारी पार्टी के नेताओं द्वारा तो नहीं लेकिन दूसरी कुछ पार्टियों के नेताओं द्वारा, उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन तो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में क्या हो पाएगा, डिसेंट्रेशन हो जायेगा हमारा। इसलिए सरकार को एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सुधारों को इसको दृष्टि में रखते हुए लागू करना चाहिये।

इसी के मुतालिक वह आगे कहते हैं :

The power that is exercised organically in New Delhi is the uncertain and discontinuous power of prestige. It is influence rather than power its method is making plans, issuing pronouncements.

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

holding conferences. In reference to two different programme fields I have been authoritatively informed at both the Centre and in the states that the Centre's administrative function is performed by annual or semi-annual conferences. Any real power in most of the development field is the personal power of particular leaders and the informal, extra-constitutional, extra-administrative power of a dominant party coherent and strongly led by the same leaders.

सभापति बहोबय : एक मिनट में आपको जो कहना हो कह लीजिये। आप चार मिनट ल चुके हैं।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सुधार इस ढंग से हमें करने चाहिये। जिससे हमारा देश मजबूत हो और आगे बढ़ सके।

हैंसन ने अपनी किताब में लिखा है :

Public Enterprise and Economic Development, p. 53:

"The State has no alternative but to provide the initial impetus, to control almost every aspect of economic life, and to set itself up, in many branches of industrial, agricultural and commercial activity, as owner and manager. To do this, it needs a body of servants who are not only honest, educated and adequately remunerated but possessed of a variety of administrative talents. Those in the higher reaches of the hierarchy must have an unusually marked ability to plan, to execute, to co-ordinate, to adjust. They must know where to seek the best advice, be able to distinguish between good advice and bad and possess a flair for detecting what is and what is not possible from the political and social point of view".

मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन बातों को भी ध्यान में रखा जाए।

Mr. Chairman: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that with a view to bring socialism in the country forthwith and to execute the Five Year Plan successfully, Government should bring about radical changes in its administrative set-up without the least delay".

There are three amendments by way of substitute resolutions. I shall take them all as moved.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Kindly remember to give me a chance to speak on my point of order regarding this.

Mr. Chairman: Very well.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): If the movers of amendments are not present in the House, would it be proper to take them as moved?

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry.

Amendment No. 1 by Shri Yashpal Singh—he is not present.

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): I beg to move:

"That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that with a view to bring about the socialist pattern of society based on a democratic structure and to achieve this objective through the successful working of the Five Year Plans and the democratic institutions in the country the administrative machinery should be so reformed and geared as to make it fully efficient, purposeful and responsive to the social need' . . . (2).

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 3 by Shri Limaye. He is not present. The original resolution and the amendment moved are before the House.

श्री काशीराम गुप्त (अलवर): सभापति महोदय विभूति मिश्र जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसकी भावना का तो मैं समर्थन करता हूँ किन्तु जो तरीका उन्होंने बताया है उससे मैं सहमत नहीं। जो कार्य वह करने जा रहे हैं उसके आधार पर यह बनता है कि वह गाड़ी को आगे करते हैं और घोड़े को पीछे। आखिर यह जो प्रशासन है इसमें क्यों इस प्रकार की कठिनाइयाँ हो रही हैं? इसके बारे में अगर वह गहराई से विचार करेंगे तो उनको मालूम होगा कि सबसे पहले खराबी उनके अपने दल की कार्य प्रणाली और अपने दल के सिद्धान्तों के प्रचार में है। वह नारा लगाते हैं प्रजातन्त्रीय सभाजवाद का लेकिन उनको देखना चाहिये कि जो समाजवाद आया बाहर के देशों में उसमें व्यक्तिगत सम्पत्ति को आय के साधन के रूप में स्वामित्व देना जो था उसको वज्रित कर दिया गया था। किन्तु हमारे देश में उसको वज्रित नहीं किया गया है साथ ही यह भी घोषणा की गई है कि स्वामित्व को यथासम्भव कम किया जाय। किन्तु जो प्रणाली अपनाई जाती है वह ठीक इसके विपरीत है और उसका नतीजा यह होता है कि सरकार की मशीनरी जो है वह केवल पूँजी पतियों के लाभ के लिए ही काम कर सकती है। उनका उसमें दोष मानसिक है या नहीं यह अलग बात है।

वह प्रणाली वैसी है यह मैं उदाहरण देकर बताता हूँ। सब से पहले शहरी जायदाद को मैं लेता हूँ। अगर आपको समाजवाद लाना है तो आपको यह फँसला करना होगा कि मकानों की मिलकियत के रूप में किसी को मकानों को किराये पर देकर रुपया कमाने का अधिकार होगा या नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि अब तक आप यह अधिकार देंगे तब तक शहरों के मकानों के बारे में समाजवाद नहीं आ सकता है। जो भी शहरी जमीन है उस पर सरकार का कब्जा होना चाहिये और उसे सरकार मकानों के लिये दे। उसके जो कीमत का आधार है वह बाजार भाव नहीं हो सकता है। यही कारण है कि आज

गरीबों को मकान वहाँ नहीं मिलते हैं जब तक एक निश्चित नीति इसके बारे में हम नहीं अपनायेंगे, शहरी मकानों से किराये के रूप में आमदनी करने की बात को समाप्त नहीं करेंगे और इसके बारे में घोषणा नहीं करेंगे तब तक जो लाभ आप चाहते हैं नहीं उठाया जा सकता है।

इसी प्रकार प्राइवेट सैक्टर में किसी आमदनी को अधिक से अधिक कितनी सम्पत्ति रखने का अधिकार होगा उत्पादन के साधन के रूप में, श्रैयों के रूप में या किसी और रूप में कितना रखने का अधिकार होगा इसका जब तक आप निश्चय नहीं कर लेते हैं तब तक प्रशासन की प्रणाली को सुधारने या क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन लाने की बात करना बिलकुल बमाने है। कैसे वह क्रान्ति करेंगे जब उनके सामने कोई तस्वीर ही नहीं है।

वैसे ही आप गांवों में एक झगड़ा उठा रहे हैं। गांवों में आपने जमीन की सीलिंग की और 300 रु० मासिक आमदनी की सीलिंग उस पर लगा दी। लेकिन शहरों में लोग लाखों की आमदनी करते रहें, लाखों का व्यापार करते रहे, उस पर आप कोई सीलिंग नहीं कर सकते हैं क्योंकि जो शहरी सम्पत्ति है उस पर कोई भी सीलिंग करने का आपने विचार नहीं बनाया है। इस के नतीजे क्या हो रहे यह आप देखिये। संयुक्त समाजवादी पार्टी जो नारा लगाती है 1,000 रु० की आमदनी का वह भी गांव वालों को नसीब नहीं होता। गांव वालों के लिये जितने समाजवादी पक्ष हैं उन्होंने तय कर लिया है कि 250 या 300 से ज्यादा आमदनी नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर इस तरह से होता है तो देश से डिस्पैरिटी कैसे दूर हो सकती है। इसलिये जो इमारत ही नहीं बन पाई है उस को पहले बनाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

आज भुवनेश्वर प्रस्ताव की बड़ी आशा उठाई जाती है। लेकिन उस का नतीजा

[श्री काशीराम गुप्त]

क्या हुआ। आप ने नारा लगाया कि चावल मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करेंगे लेकिन दशा उसके विपरीत हो गई। इसका कारण यह है कि आप अपना निश्चित विचार ही नहीं बनाते। आज कांग्रेस दल में संघर्ष चल रहे हैं। वह क्या है। मान लीजिये कि इस दल के चार माननीय सदस्य यहां बोलते हैं तो एक दक्षिण पन्थ की बात कहता है दूसरा बाम पक्ष की बात कहता है, तीसरा बीच के तरीके से बोलता है और चौथा गोल मोल तरीके से कहता है। जब आप अपने फंसलों को ठीक प्रकार से लागू करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं तब आप किस आधार पर प्रशासन प्रणाली में क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन करने की बात करते हैं।

मेरा निवेदन है कि जब तक आप उसकी मूल भूत बातों को तय नहीं कर लेते अगले तीस चालीस सालों के लिये कम से कम तब तक अगर आप कोई सुधार करेंगे तो वह गड़डे में पड़ जायेगा।

मैं पूछता हूँ कि आज क्यों भ्रष्टाचार चलता है। आप जब कोई आधार देते हैं कि इम्पॉर्ट और एक्सपोर्ट लाइसेंस के बारे में हमारी यह नीति हांगी तो वह स्थिर नहीं होती और लोगों को भौका मिल जाता है भ्रष्टाचार को बढ़ाने का। जब आप अधिकार देते हैं शहर में जायदाद बनाने का तब आप यह नहीं सोचते कि किस को वह अधिकार मिले, जो किराये की आमदनी खायेंगे उन को मिले या जो खुद घर में रहेंगे उनको मिले। नतीजा यह होता है कि भ्रष्टाचार फैलता है। कौन नहीं जानता है कि आज दिल्ली नगर निगम में कितना भ्रष्टाचार होता है और वह किसी के काबू में नहीं है। वहां पर सारे सदस्य कहा करते हैं कि नगर निगम में भ्रष्टाचार क्यों होता है। लेकिन आप कितना ही प्रशासन को ठीक कीजिये जब तक आप उस की जड़ को नहीं पकड़ेंगे तब तक कुछ नहीं होगा।

इसी प्रकार से आप को आपरेटिव सेक्टर का जिक्र करते हैं। कहते हैं कि को आपरेटिव उन लोगों के हाथ में आ गया है जो शोषक हैं। वह क्यों जाता है शोषकों के हाथ में। राजनीति के लोग जब स्वयम् शोषक बन जायें, जब वे स्वयम् उससे अपना फायदा करने लग जायें तो उस से जनता का फायदा कभी नहीं हो सकता। आज जितने भी हमारे मजदूर संघ बनते हैं उन सब पर राजनीति के लोग छाये रहते हैं। अभी एक सदस्य कह रहे थे विरोधी पक्ष के मजदूर संघ के सदस्य उनके संघ वालों को पत्थर मारते हैं। वह कहते थे कि हमें पत्थर क्यों मारते हो पत्थर अफसरों, को मारो। आज देश में जो कुछ हो रहा है उस के रहते हुए प्रशासन में सुधार करने की बात कहना गलत होगा। आप कोई भी सुधार करने की बात करें तो उस से पहले आप मूलभूत सिद्धान्तों को ठीक करें। उन में परिवर्तन करने के लिये जो ठोस उपाय करने हों उन को क्या क्या प्राथमिकता देनी है उन्हें देखना चाहिये। अन्यथा आप इस को वेलफेअर स्टेट कहिये। वेलफेअर स्टेट ज्यादा अच्छा शब्द है। इस के कहने से कहीं कुछ विगड़ नहीं जायेगा। आप ने व्यक्तिगत स्वतन्त्रता सम्बन्धी अधिकार दे रखे हैं। आप को डर क्यों लगता है ऐसा कहने में। लेकिन अगर आप प्रजातान्त्रिक समाजवाद कहना चाहते हैं एक अखिल भारतीय ट्रेड यूनियन की तरह का तब उनका क्रिटिसिज्म क्यों न किया जाये।

अभी प्रशासन को ठीक करने के लिये आप न एक कमेटी बनाई है जिस के सभापति शायद हमारे श्री मोरारजी देसाई हैं। उन को आप क्या आधार देंगे। आप उन को अपनी तरफ से क्या डाइरेक्टिव दे रहे हैं, प्रशासन में करने के लिये। क्या यही उन का काम होगा कि किसी का ग्रेड कम कर दें या यह कहें कि यह कम यह ज्यादा लेवें। अगर ऐसा हुआ तो श्री बैनर्जी की बात बन जायेगी। उन्होंने

1,000 रु० से ऊपर 100 रु० देने की बात उठाई थी। अब शायद 1,000 से 2,000 रु० वालों तक 100 रु० दिये जा रहे हैं। क्या यही उन का ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म है।

श्री मधु लिमये ने एक आवाज उठाई। वह कहते हैं कि चुनाव से होना चाहिये। चुनाव प्रणाली लेनी है तो अमरीका की प्रणाली लो, शियन और अमरीकन दोनों प्रणालियों को मिला कर उस का घोल मेल कर के कोई प्रणाली अपनाते नहीं हैं इसका यह नतीजा हो रहा है। इसलिये इन सब दृष्टियों से इस पर विचार होना चाहिये।

Mr. Chairman: There are a number of speakers, and the time at our disposal is little. Five minutes each.

Shri Khadiikar: Minimum ten minutes, it is not possible.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let us increase it by another hour.

Shri P. Venkatasubbalah (Adoni): At the outset, I would like to congratulate Shri Bibhuti Mishra, our veteran Congressman and also Secretary of the Congress Party in Parliament, who has moved this resolution for the consideration of the House.

Shri Mishra is wedded to socialism, as is the case with every member of the Congress Party which has accepted socialism as its principle. It is time and again being reiterated and reaffirmed by our election manifesto and also by the resolutions passed at the plenary sessions of the Congress.

From the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society, we have come to a firm decision that unless socialism is adopted and executed and implemented successfully and expeditiously, we will not be able to bring prosperity to this country and also remove the inequalities that exist in this society. For these radical reforms to be imple-

mented and executed to bring prosperity to the country, it is entirely necessary that the machinery that is to implement and execute it should be reformed, reoriented to the changing pattern, and it must be able to deliver the goods as intended.

We are suffering from a hangover of British bureaucracy since we got independence. The British left our country for good, leaving us an administration which is considered to be very efficient and also foolproof. We were given a band of administrators with administrative capacity, but lacking in human touch, who were also trained in the steel frame of the bureaucratic setup of government. Our planners and administrators did not think a while, nor thought seriously, first to give a new look, new touch, new orientation to the administrative machinery, and they have gone on all these years in spite of planning. They did not give much care or thought to this vital link of our national economy, for reforming our administration so as to cater to the aspirations and needs of the country. In all the five year plans that we have drawn up, this aspect of the matter has not received the attention that it deserves.

So, from the village panchayat administration right up to the Central Government's level, we see an administration which is not alive to the human problems, which is not receptive to the various schemes that we have undertaken, but having the same old type of thinking and also the old type of redtapism and inordinate delays in administration. Where there is delay, where there is redtapism, it is the breeding ground for corruption. Corruption emanates from these administrative delays and also from bureaucratic management.

We were very honest in our intentions, we were very honest in implementing our schemes for which we worked, for which we have planned

[Shri P. Venkatasubbiah]

all these years, for which we sought the help of other countries also. We made our five year plans so as to reach the common man, but we have completely failed in getting them implemented and reaching the common man. That was our weakest link in our pattern of things.

So, Sir, whether you take the administration at the State level, or the district level or the administration here at the Centre, we see that the officers move in the old groove. I do not find fault with them, because they have become a prey and have become the victims to the type of administration that has been handed down to us. When one gets into it, it is just like a spider's web. However well intentioned a man might be, if he is inducted into this steel frame of thinking, he will only identify himself with that type of thinking, and he may not be receptive to the aspirations of the people. So, our planners or administrators should have thought that even before we implement all those schemes they must have revolutionised this administrative machinery, this type of machinery, these checks and counter-checks also, the long line of administrative officers, starting from the despatching clerk to the Secretary to the Government,—all trying to put a halt to the problem that was asked to be tackled by them. They do not see that here is a human problem behind them, behind every paper they got, because their training and upbringing and the set-up have been like that. Unless all these matters are tackled in a very radical manner, we will not be able to achieve good results.

Colossal expenditure is being incurred in so many of our projects and schemes, and the expenditure that is being incurred on administration alone is much more disproportionate than what it should really be. We must realise the urgency and the importance of administrative reforms in this country. I am happy that the Central Government has thought it fit to form

an Administrative Reforms Commission. I do not know what the terms of reference are. But I am happy that it is being headed by a man like Shri Morarji Desai who has been in the public life of this country for the last 30 to 40 years, who knows well both the administration and the organisations, and who has had an intimate touch with the people. I hope this Administrative Reforms Commission will be able to get into touch with the problems, will be able to grapple with the problems and come to right conclusions. On the same pattern, there are other administrative reform committees being set up at the State level. I do not know what are the terms of reference of these State administrative reform committees. But one thing is sure. Unless the cobwebs are removed from our administrative machinery, whatever be the political ideology—whether it is a welfare State or socialism of the type that Shri Kashi Ram Gupta referred to, it will not succeed. Whatever ism it is, that should be suitable to the common man; that ism must go to the welfare of the common man, and you must see that all these inequalities in our social pattern as well as our economic ills are done away with.

We have been noticing a sad spectacle of the amenities or the benefits that are sought to be provided by the democratic government being misused by a few influential people who have got the wherewithal of having a convenient power as well as political wirepulling to make use of, to the best advantage of a few people. So, the entire benefits are denied to the common man. In this context, therefore, I heartily commend the motion that has been moved by my hon. friend Shri Bibhuti Mishra.

Mr. Chairman: Before I call upon Shri Banerjee, I would refer to the point of order he raised last time. I must dispose of that now. He asked, since the Government has already set up an Administrative Reforms Commission, whether this resolution could

be taken up for discussion here. Since this Parliament has not set up a committee like that, nor has it said anything with regard to that, I rule the point out of order. There is no point of order. Shri Banerjee may now start his speech.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I support the resolution of Shri Bibhuti Mishra, but I do not know whether he really feels that socialism is going to be established by such a resolution. All social reform is necessary in this country and I am one with him when he feels that the goal of socialism has not yet been achieved, despite all the assurances given by this Government.

Let us go back to 1947, when we became independent. Since after Independence, we have been hearing speeches from the various leaders who are in power today that we are moving towards a socialistic society and than towards a socialist society. I do not know what we will achieve. Shri Kashi Ram Gupta suggested that at least let us have a welfare State. Now, the country is coming to a pass where the welfare State is going to be a farewell State. That is exactly what I feel, with the present happenings in the country.

Now, an Administrative Reforms Commission has been appointed with a very eminent person like Shri Morarji Desai as its Chairman.

15.56 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I have no doubt that Shri Desai will consider all aspects of the problem, but the tragedy here is that when this Commission has been appointed, with Shri Morarji Desai as Chairman and some eminent Members of Parliament as its members, nearly 6,000 to 10,000 man working in the Central Secretariat and some subordinate and attached offices are likely to face retrenchment or they are going to be declared surplus. I am surprised at this, because

an assurance was given outside this House by no less a person than Shri Hathi or Shri Nanda to the deputationists of the Central Government employees working in the Central Secretariat, when they met and presented a memorandum to the Minister that no retrenchment would be resorted to because of certain administrative reforms or because of the so-called officer-oriented policy accepted by the Government. We thought that since the Commission has already been appointed with Shri Desai as its Chairman, the whole question of this officer-oriented policy and other things will be referred to that Commission.

Now, Sir, I have in my possession a letter of the Government of India, issued by the Home Ministry, and it is dated 25th February, 1966. The subject is, "Redeployment of the staff rendered surplus as a result of introduction of administrative reforms or studies by a Staff Inspection Unit, Ministry of Finance—Imposition of ban on direct recruitment to Government Organisations." When we put a question in this House whether it is a fact that 6,000 to 10,000 Assistants, Lower Division Clerks and Upper Division Clerks would be declared surplus or be retrenched because of this newly introduced officer-oriented policy in the Government, we were told that nobody would be declared surplus and nobody would be retrenched. But here I have in my possession this letter: it is not issued by the Opposition Members but by the Ministry of Home Affairs, dated 25th February, 1966. Let me read the relevant paragraph from it.

"The new scheme also provides that surplus staff transferred to the central pool would have the option to retire voluntarily on terms which would be generous and attractive enough to induce them to opt for retirement at their own initiative. The voluntary retiring terms are expected to be notified shortly. Those who do not opt to retire and cannot be placed and are also un-

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

willing to undergo training in fresh skills would be retrenched under existing rules."

I am surprised really that when the Administrative Reforms Commission has not even started functioning, what is the basis for this mass retrenchment of nearly 10,000 employees including Assistants, Upper Division Clerks and Lower Division Clerks. I am told a scheme has been evolved by the Government of India that there will be only one officer and one stenographer, and that will eliminate red-tapism from top to bottom. If the work can be done by one officer and one stenographer and if they can run the Home Ministry, the Defence Ministry, and the Railway Ministry, then I am sure that one Prime Minister with eight stenographers can run the entire administration of this country without the use of any more Cabinet Ministers, Ministers of State or Deputy Ministers! In that case, I want a definite reply from the hon. Deputy Minister whether this letter dated 25th February, 1966, envisaging retrenchment, or declaration of surplus employees in Delhi, in the Secretariat and subordinate and attached offices, will be operative, even when this Commission has not started its work or when this entire work is going to be entrusted to this Commission. I request the hon. Minister to kindly throw some light on this: when this Commission is going to start the work, what will be the terms of reference, and whether this particular aspect of the whole matter will be considered.

16 hrs.

With these words, I wish all success to Mr. Bibhuti Mishra. Let us dream of socialism for some time more. We dreamt of Ramraj; it has resulted in Kamraj. We do not know whether it will lead to Jamraj!

Shri Khadilkar: Sir, we are having an opportunity to give some thought to the problem of administrative reforms, because my friend has brought forward this resolution. I heard a

story recently from a friend of mine who had some experience of administration. A well-known academician from the western world, who had devoted a good deal of his time to the study of administrative problems, who was a sort of an atheist, came to India to have a look at our administrative system. He stayed here for three months, went from department to department, followed all the procedures and he left this country completely converted to theism. A friend asked what led to his conversion. He said, "When I studied the Indian administrative system and the various procedures, I was puzzled as to how all this machinery is running. I came to the conclusion that there must be some unseen hand of God that keeps the administrative fabric in this country going all right." He could not point out to any definitive system which is supposed to translate our objectives of social policy into day-to-day executive action. If this conclusion is correct, then there is very little hope.

But this gentleman failed to appreciate another aspect of our social life. This morning we had a rather distressing debate on the Bengal situation. The thought occurred to my mind that it is not the hand of God or some unseen power, but in this society there is such a thing as moral authority, coming down from tradition. If that is weakened, as it is being weakened in Bengal and other places, whatever the administrative, political or judicial system, we will not be able to sustain the democratic set-up that we are trying to strengthen in this country.

A serious attempt is likely to be made to improve our administrative system by the commission set up under the chairmanship of Mr. Morarji Desai. But considering its terms of reference, with due deference to the Chairman and other members, I feel it would not be able to tackle the whole problem. I would suggest like the Planning Commission, it should have some

independent panels. They should devote themselves to special problems. There was a suggestion in the Consultative Committee once. For instance, there are these tribunals. There are about thousand and more tribunals in the various ministries and departments. The procedures are different. There was a suggestion that an independent committee be set up to study the problems of tribunals, their procedures and allied matters. If the Administrative Reforms Commission is supported by such panels, various panels to study different problems, I think that a comprehensive review and suggestion for administrative reforms ultimately would emerge out of it.

Recently an attempt was made in the Punjab. There is a Committee. In Maharashtra also there is a Committee, if I remember correctly. Other States also have at various State level administrative reforms committees established and problems are being studied from various angles.

Some hon. Members referred to socialism and what is happening to socialism. Some said about a welfare State and all that. Ultimately, administration is supposed to translate the policy of the Government in day-to-day running of the government or the policies that we lay down. We all talk of socialism. Some say it is a welfare State. I do not see anywhere any attempt being made, really speaking, to show what steps towards the implementation of socialist programmes we have made. Therefore, instead of talking vaguely about our social objectives, we should concentrate on this. The main question is the administrative apparatus. The question is whether it is in a position to translate these ideas and the policies of the Government so that the benefits would reach to the common people. Today the administration is a sort of paper-logged thing. Just as there is the water-logging problem in the Punjab, there is paper-logging problem in the administration.

2760 (Ai) LSD—9.

Secondly, unfortunately, there is a lot of meddling with the result that an administrator is not free. That is what we find at the district level and at the lower level. There is a lot of meddling and interference by the so-called political bosses or somebody—I do not know how to describe him—at the local level and higher level. Unless the administrator is immune from these things, unless a certain amount of insulation takes place and he is left free to execute the policies, we cannot expect good results. Only when this is done we can have results. After all, we have inherited our administrative system from our former British rulers. We inherited a certain system that was suited for foreign colonial rule.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Khadilkar: Sir, in the beginning I wanted to suggest ten minutes for each Member. This is a very important debate. This will help the Commission also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time allotted is two hours. There are other hon. Members belonging to other parties also who want to participate in this.

Shri Khadilkar: I will conclude in three or four minutes. I was saying, Sir, that we inherited a certain system that was suited for foreign colonial rule. We have got to re-orientate it. That re-orientation must be done with a good deal of thought. This cannot be done in a haphazard manner. The former system was a well tried thing for the colonial rule by the foreigners and it survived. Even now certain legacies continue.

Shri Warior (Trichur): Only certain legacies? All the legacies continue.

Shri Khadilkar: Only certain of them continue. Certain innovations have taken place. You must admit that. You are a sort of Marxist. You should have an objective approach and assessment of the situation. Do not exaggerate. Certain innovations have been made, no doubt, and certain

[Shri Khadilkar]

reforms have reached the people at the village level, at the district level and so on. At the same time, they are not enough and they do not meet the requirements of the situation. Therefore, what I would suggest is, when a Commission is appointed, this kind of all-comprehensive view is called for. What is this administrative system meant for? I would like to utter a word of warning. As you know, in France almost the third day the Government was changing and still because of the sound administrative system the State apparatus continued its proper functioning throughout that period of short lived governments. De Gaulle now has changed the whole pattern, but that is a different matter.

The administrative system is one of the important parts of State apparatus. Therefore, while applying one's mind to this problem in a comprehensive manner, thought should be given to whether the apparatus that we evolve ultimately, the personnel that we enlist for execution of that as executive in that apparatus, are capable to translate the policies, if they are oriented in that day. Then alone can we say that that apparatus will be able to meet the situation. Otherwise, we in this House will always chant *mantras* of socialism and what not and really people will not experience in their lives the translation of these policies and the benefits that we desire should reach the people. It should not be a machine of unnecessary harassment or interference; it should be insulated from that point of view. Then alone will administrative reforms yield some good results.

Shri Kapur Singh: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Resolution before the House is couched in general terms and is more or less of an academic nature. I will, therefore, confine myself to the terms of the Resolution without touching on contingent or particular points of current administration, as has been

done by some hon. Members who have preceded me.

I have the highest respect for the mover of this Resolution because he is a peasant, and peasants throughout the ages have been honest simple-minded people. I myself am a peasant and I know it. But, on that very ground, they are liable to be beguiled by slogans, confused by shibboleths and thus they become the victims of socialism-makers.

The Resolution before the House is misconceived and is based upon confusion of thought. This Resolution, if it is to be properly understood and analysed, would pose three questions. Unless these three questions are answered, this Resolution cannot be properly debated upon. These three questions are (1) What is Socialism? (2) In what manner the administrative set up is related to the State objectives? (3) What does "radical changes" connote?

Socialism is more a slogan than a precise theory. Its content is constantly in flux. But it has one permanent element in it, as the history of Socialism during the last 25 or 60 years shows.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuruzha): Have you read some books on Socialism?

Shri Kapur Singh: I have read some books and I am prepared to read many more.

There is one permanent element, as far as I have been able to discover by reading books on Socialism and also by studying the practices of Socialism in various countries of the world, and that one element is introduction and induction of more and more of State control into the affairs of men and into the lives of citizens. Only this element remains constant; every other element of so-called Socialism keeps on changing. Thus, the essence of Socialism, in the context of this Re-

solution, is a State run on these principles. From this there is no escape. Once we have understood this, we can come to the second question.

In this Resolution, Socialism has also been yoked with the question of Five Year Plans. What are these Five Year Plans? The Plans are mere grandiose industrial and productive activities which are run by the State on more or less monopoly basis. This is the essence of the Five Year Plans in the context of the administrative set-up. Now, the machinery to run it requires regimented managerial talent; anything more than that is not required. These are the tasks which the mover of the Resolution wants to tackle by our administrative set up.

Now, how is the administrative set up related to the tasks which the State has set before itself? That is the fundamental and the central question. That is the core of the Resolution which we are considering. The administrative set-up is related to the State in the relationship of apparatus and its executor. This is the essence of all public service systems. This was the essence of all public services in ancient times; this has been the essence of public services in the days when the foreigners were rulling us and this is the essence of public service now that we have our country run by our own men and this shall be the essence of public service, no matter what theory of Government's objectives the State sets up before itself. It is for the executive to select and train its apparatus to the tasks which they embark upon. In all public services, in all times, as I have said—and I repeat it—in all times and in all circumstances the States set up the public services on this principle.

Socialism and five-year plans cannot change or modify this principle. No question, therefore, of a radical change in this principle can arise. Therefore, I say that this whole Resolution has been misconceived and this whole Resolution, when it is properly analysed, does not come to any signi-

ficant meaning; it does not proliferate into any thought content which can bear any relationship to the problems which we now have before us.

For these reasons, I repeat that this Resolution has been misconceived and has been misconceived by an honest and simple peasant who has become a victim of socialism-makers. I, therefore, not only oppose it but I request him to withdraw it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What time will the hon. Minister require?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): About 15 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have to close it by 5 O' Clock. I will call him at 4.40

Shri Warior: Sir, I support this Resolution, that is, the core of the Resolution, as my friend, Shri Kapur Singh, put it. The other words, "radical" and all other things, may be eliminated; instead, there are certain other words which must be put in, as "bold", "courageous" and other things.

The administrative set-up at present, as Shri Khadilkar rightly noted, is a set-up that we rather inherited from the British rulers. What is this set-up? As we see it, there are three separate stages in this whole apparatus. The first stage is the ministerial set-up. The ministers are there, naturally, as the link between the popular side and the executive side; but here what are the ministers doing? Actually, what is the power in their hands and what actually they are doing are two things.

The other day, Shri Nanda—I am quoting an instance, that is all; it is not any allegation—read a statement and when there was some objections raised, he said that it was made in a haste. By whom? The minister is reading a statement which is made in haste, by whom? The "whom" is the hidden thing, the actual real administration and he who comes here is only for name's sake, the figurehead.

[Shri Warior]

I take another instance. Ministers change their portfolios so often and so suddenly just like the comic figure in the circus. Any minister can handle a portfolio without sufficient background training and sufficient experience in life. Any day, all of a sudden, the Home Minister becomes the fisheries minister and the fisheries minister becomes the defence minister. Anyone can become anything here, because there is a hidden apparatus behind and they can rely upon it. I ask the Ministry whether they have gone anywhere at any time in any basic question against the wishes of that hidden power. Never. That is the first brake in our set-up.

Shri Kapur Singh: That is a sensible thing too.

Shri Warior: It is sensible according to our retired administrator but not sensible according to us.

Now, the second thing is the steel-frame. What is the set-up in it? There are two divisions. There is a secretariat, all powerful, omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent. Will you just believe that a district engineer must wait upon the will and pleasure of a chaprassi in a secretariat to get an interview with his own department secretary? Any man in this set-up will rather prefer to be a chaprassi in the secretariat than be a high official in the field.

Shri Kapur Singh: You want us to believe it!

Shri Warior: Shri Kapur Singh is not believing it. I do not mind because he believes in nothing, even in himself.

Dr. Ranen Sen: (Calcutta East): That is a good one.

Shri Warior: So, this secretariat is, as I will name it, the "Establishment". I wish, a courageous step is taken by

the Central and State ministries to smash this "Establishment" which is the omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent thing in Indian administration. Then, take the I.C.S. corps. How many times, even in our living memory within these 18 years they were changed and placed under our popular Ministers resulting in their discomfiture? How many times they had to swallow all those things which are placed in their hands? That is the second thing. I have a lot to say about this. But I have no time to do so. Still there are some I.C.S. officers... (*Interruptions*) I am glad that some of them have come to this side also but they must prove better in their relationship on this side. Whenever this reform is thought of, always there is a sting in the tail, as Mr. Banerjee was now referring to. What is meant by reforms is not to touch the core of the problem, the central basic problem in it, that is, the secretariat. Whenever a hue and cry is made, either in the public or in Parliament, for administrative reforms, at once the thought goes only to this as to how to retrench as many *chaprassis*, as many Class III and Class IV employees as possible and the reforms end there. Even here, in order to have the reforms, according to the Home Ministry's letter which was quoted by Mr. Banerjee, they are creating a new cell—new officers, new salaries, new telephones, etc. to so many officers from each Ministry. So, the higher the reforms go, the more the higher officers come and the more the lower employees go out. This is what is meant by reforms in a nutshell.

Why should it be so? I ask a very simple question. After the preparation of the Union Budget, why should there be such a huge factory of a secretariat to supervise and administer all the day-to-day details that are going on in the States? Why not the States be given the authority and the autonomy for implementing all those things? That is never done. Even for sanctioning a small project in a State, the people from the States come

here and wait in attendance on the secretariat people who have no responsibility at all in this world. The core of the problem is this. There is authority vested in some people who have no responsibility at all. So, authority and responsibility will not go hand in hand. The entire responsibility is placed on the field officers or the officers who are expected to implement these things. But the entire authority is centralised in the most iron-fisted manner in the secretariat. So, unless the Government takes courage in its own hands, before thinking of all the other details, to smash the authority of the secretariat, nothing can be achieved. Let it be disbanded. If the authority and the responsibility is given to people in the field, in the implementing organisations of administration, that, I think, will be a good starting point from where the reforms could begin.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : (कोटा) :

श्रीमान अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जॉ रेजोल्यूशन आया है, वह एक बहुत ही कर्मठ कार्यकर्ता यानी पुराने सदस्य महोदय मिश्रा साहब ने पेश किया है, क्योंकि इनको समाजवाद के ऊपर इतना विश्वास है और ये चाहते हैं कि दुनिया इनके साथ चले और शासन में सुधार करते जायें। लेकिन यह होना जरा मुश्किल है। मैं नहीं मानता कि ये रेजोल्यूशन को वापस नहीं लेंगे, इस को इन्हें वापस लेना होगा क्योंकि प्रशासन में सुधार होना बहुत मुश्किल है और यह निश्चित बात है कि प्रशासन में सुधार जब तक नहीं हो सकता, जब तक आपसी लिहाज नहीं मिटती। आज मैं देखता हूँ और कई सालों से इस लोक मभा में देखता रहा हूँ कि जितने भी मंत्रियों के भ्रष्टाचार के मामले आये, वे सारे के मारे जांच नहीं हुए। सुखाड़िया की जांच नहीं होगी तो कुम्भाराम की जांच नहीं होगी, विरेन मित्रा की जांच नहीं होगी तो टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी की जांच नहीं होगी, चौधरी ब्रह्मप्रकाश की जांच नहीं होगी, जो भी है, इनकी जांच नहीं होगी, तो आखिरकार

मतलब क्या है, क्यों जांच नहीं होगी और यदि जांच होती है तो उसके ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार साबित नहीं होता है, तो फिर कौन खा जाता है, क्या चपरासी खा जाता है। पुलिस-मैन की जांच हो सकती है, वे निर्दोष नहीं हो सकते तो इतने बड़े बड़े करोड़ों रुपये खाने वाले निर्दोष निकल सकते हैं ? यह हमारे प्रशासन की स्थिति है। जब एक मंत्री करोड़ रुपया खाता है, तो सेक्रेटरी लाख खायेगा, बाबू हजार खायेगा तो चपरासी पांच सौ खायेगा।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) : ये एलीगेशन लगा रहे हैं कि मंत्री करोड़ रुपया खाता है।

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : आपको दर्द नहीं होना चाहिये, आपको दर्द होता है तो बैठ जाइये, सुनते जाइये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कुछ नहीं है।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : ये एक मंत्री के खिलाफ करोड़ रुपये खाने का रिश्तत का इल्खाम लगा रहे हैं, आप बहते हैं कुछ नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has not referred to any one by name.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : आपको सुनना नहीं है तो वान बन्द कर के बैठ जाइये। जांच होती है निष्पक्ष रूप से निर्दोष बता दिये जाते हैं। यह पार्लियामेंट का रिवाज है। अगर वास्तव में निष्पक्ष शासन की प्रशासन में सुधार आ सकता है। जितनी भी हमारी लाइसेंसिंग प्रणाली है, वह बड़ी दोषपूर्ण है। मैं आपको राजस्थान की बतलाऊं कोटा मिला और वह ऊपर की ऊपर बिक जाता है। तो उनको क्यों दिया जाता है, कांटे की जांच की जाय, तो प्रशासन सुधर सकता है।

इसलिये मैं प्रस्तावक महोदय को वन्द्यवाद देता हूँ। अगर ऐसी नमति बनाई जाय,

[श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा]

प्रान्तों के अन्दर बनाई जाय, केन्द्र के अन्दर बनाई जाय, तो चार सदस्य इस के अन्दर अपोजीशन के होने चाहिये, और दो सदस्य सत्तारूढ़ दल के हों, तब हम बतायें कि किस तरह में सुधार नहीं हो सकता, अगर एक एक को लाल-किले पर टांक दिया जाय तो प्रशासन सुधार सकता है। लेकिन हम भ्रष्टाचार को प्रोत्साहन देते हैं, उसका पक्ष करते हैं, इसलिये प्रशासन में सुधार होना बहुत ही मुश्किल है। इसलिये मैं नम्र निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर प्रशासन में सुधार करना है तो विरोधी दलों की एक ऐसी समिति बनाइये जो इसकी जांच करे और न्यायिक जांच करके उनको उचित दण्ड दिया जाय, तब प्रशासन में सुधार हो सकता है।

एक महाशय कह रहे थे कि अंग्रेजों के राज्य की प्रणाली चल रही है। मैं उनको बतलाना चाहता हूं कि अंग्रेजों के राज्य में दो पैसे भी खाना हराम था। जब अंग्रेज आफिस में आता था सारे चपरासी सतर्क हो जाते थे.....

श्री बाल्मीकी (खुर्जा) : डालियां चलती थी।

श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा : कुछ भी चलता था, लेकिन आज तो हम और आपके हाथ में डालियां जा रही हैं। तो आज प्रशासन में अगर सुधार करना है तो स्ट्रांग मजबूत हो कर काम करना पड़ेगा। मैं मिश्रा साहब से कहता हूं कि वह इस बिल को वापस न लें।

Shri M. R. Krishna (Peddapalli): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am very thankful to you for giving me a chance to participate in this discussion. This Resolution has come before this House after a very long time

Shri S. Kandappan (Tiruchengode): I move that the time be extended by half an hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have already allotted two hours.

Some hon. Members: It can be extended by half more hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can extend it by half an hour.

All right. It is extended by half an hour. The Minister will be called at 5 O'Clock.

Shri M. R. Krishna: The term 'socialism' is not quite new to this House. Even before the Third Plan was discussed, the House discussed about socialistic pattern of society and the House has given its approval to this policy. Ever since the Congress came into existence, the Congress Party has not been speaking anything except socialistic pattern of society or socialism. Even after the formation of the Government, both in the Centre and in the States, the party in power and the Government did not have any programme excepting socialism. Today it is very surprising that we have come to know that we do not have the necessary machinery to implement the socialist principles and programmes. The Government of every country in the world had always taken care to create first the machinery which they wanted in order to implement their programmes, whether it was the British Government which was aiming to create a welfare State or the Government of Soviet Russia who wanted to bring in communism.

So far as our country is concerned, illiteracy is at the highest level; ignorance is there, and we have a lot of poor people in this country. So, this country needs socialism very badly. The people who are in the administration, the leaders of the nation—and everyone in fact—are really interested in socialism. But unfortunately for the last eighteen years we have not tried to create the machinery which would effectively implement the programme of socialism. To expect the Administrative Reforms Commission

which has come into being now to clear all the ills and evils and to provide the machinery effective enough to implement the programme is too much to expect. The educational system that we are still pursuing in this country is not directed towards socialism. Public school education is available only for those people who can afford to spend more. Technical education and specialised education is available only to the richer classes. Government institutions, Basic education, and agricultural and Art Colleges are the only things available for the poor and the landless. The same thing is true in the case of the medical facilities also. The same Government doctor who allows his compounder to give the watery colourful medicine to the poor people while the doctor takes special interest in the well-to-do classes in their houses. These are the evils which Government will have to remove. I think the Administrative Reforms Commission is not the body which would be able to bring about changes in these spheres.

We have been speaking about the removal of disparities in wealth, equal distribution, equal rights and equal opportunities. We have been speaking about all these things very effectively off and on. Almost every speech of any big man in this country has contained a phrase of this kind, but very little attention has been given to the implementation of it.

The conditions on which industrial licences are given and the industrial policies are based are on the rules framed by the Britishers who had framed such things to suit their 'own' people. Those very sets of rules are still being followed. Whether it be a small private bank or the Reserve Bank or a Finance Corporation or any institution which has come into existence to help the people of this country, their rules have been framed in such a fashion that they cannot help anybody else excepting the class which is controlling the entire wealth of the nation. Unless the rules governing these institutions are changed, it is too much

for any one in this House to expect that by introducing a resolution of this kind or by having a resolution of this kind passed, socialism will come into force.

Every country which has tried to introduce this kind of reforms has given more care to the institutions, their character, their preference and their interest. They have been very careful to see that whatever institutions are created, are created in such a way as would enable them to help in the real honest objective of implementation of the programmes in view.

The agricultural sector about which almost everybody speaks—much more than anybody, the Mover is very much devoted to its development—even in that sector which is perhaps the biggest industry in the whole country, the due that has to be given to the poor, small landholders is not being given. Even for developing agriculture, the maximum benefit is given to or being enjoyed by big landlords. Our leaders who are interested in agricultural development have not taken the trouble to see how for these rules are impairing or harming the very development of agriculture. If this Resolution was aimed only to create a machinery at least to help that sector, the agricultural sector which consists of a very big portion of the labour class in the country, something good would have come. I would plead with Government to try to create a machinery to change the rules for granting finances to the various institutions so that at least deserving us that sector gets the maximum encouragement possible. The rules will have to be quickly modified to ensure that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is about administrative reforms.

Shri M. R. Krishna: The First, Second and Third Plans have only enriched the rich Businessmen who can float too many medium and big industries have been allowed even to indulge in small scale industries. Similarly, the big and rich business

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

community has even entered the agricultural field, not to increase production of food but to conceal their unaccounted money—by growing huge grape gardens and so on.

So, I humbly make this appeal to Government. If they are really sincere in seeing that the socialist pattern of society and its programmes are to be implemented, they must create a body to change the existing rules.

Shri S. Kandappan: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the administrative set up that we have got at present was created by and large, by the British. However much we may disagree with the policies the British pursued in our country, it must be said to their credit that they had formulated a good administrative set-up, and when they left the country, it was intact and capable of tackling the administrative problems of this country.

They had an administrative set-up which was regulated by codes to which strict adherence was called for from all officers. They had the honesty not to interfere with the administrative codes or in the day to day administrative affairs. But today, the major affliction of the administrative machinery is to my mind the unfortunate, undue, unwanted and uncalled for interference of the political executive. For each and every thing, from the lowest rung of the administration to the top level, we find people belonging to the ruling party who have got local influence or influence at the State or Central level tampering with things and even at times setting aside the regular rules. And if the official is an honest man, and if he does not agree with the tampering of his administration, either he will be transferred to some other place or even discharged. We know many cases which have come to the Supreme Court and High Courts were squashed, and the Government was forced to take back so many officials who had been discharged from service.

Another malady of this administration, to my mind, is the wide discrimination shown in the pay scales of the Central administration and State administrations. If my brother works in the post office and I am employed in some office belonging to some State administration, if we are on the same cadre, doing almost the same kind of work, the pay scales are so different that really it creates an unhealthy symptom in the mind of the man who is working in the State administration. I do not find any excuse for this kind of disparity between the two. A man who is working in the Central administration in Madras goes to the shop and gets everything at the rate prevailing in the city. The same thing happens to the man who is working in the State administration. This kind of anomaly should be done away with. To my mind, it definitely though indirectly afflicts and creates anomalies in the administration.

The third thing, to which I think an hon. Member who preceded me referred, is the duplication of work at the Central Secretariat. There are so many departments here which are doing almost the same work or even less work than is being done in the States. The only excuse for such kind of duplication would be that during the Question Hour or at other times the members of the treasury benches can give the excuse that it does not come under their purview, that it belongs to the State. They can evade questions like that, or the Ministers in the State may evade questions saying that it belongs to the Centre and that it does not come under them. No other justification is there for this kind of duplication, and it should be done away with.

I do not know whether the House will agree with me, but I find that there is an undue importance being paid in the Central administrative department to learning of languages, or rather one particular language. What the Government should do is to

see that people selected for a particular job are qualified for the job and suitable for that Job. It does not matter much that they should carry on the administration in a particular language. There is a language already in this country for administration, and I am not entering into arguments whether that will continue or some other language should replace it. But as far as administration is concerned, in the present juncture what we need is an efficient and effective administration. For that we need personnel who are fully qualified, but unfortunately there is a wrong emphasis being placed in the selection of persons, in the promotion of persons, in giving emoluments and increments to persons, on whether they know Hindi or not. It is high time Government did away with such kind of predilections and set right at least these things before thinking of any programmes for giving a tonic for making this administration stronger.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने आया है वह देखने में बड़ा सुन्दर है और इस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा प्रशासन में परिवर्तन की मांग की गई है। पर प्रस्तावक महोदय से मेरा अनुरोध होगा कि वह विचार करें कि प्रशासन की कमजोरी से हमारे यहां समाजवाद नहीं चल रहा है या कि समाजवाद को चलाने वाले जो पालिसी होल्डर हैं वह सही तरीके से उसे इम्प्लिमेंट नहीं करना चाहते। मैं कोई इस प्रशासन का समर्थक नहीं हूँ बल्कि उन का विरोध करता हूँ। अगर हम जो पालिसी बनाने वाले हैं उस पालिसी को सही तरीके से लागू करना चाहें तो यह प्रशासक वर्ग उस को लागू करेगा। अभी मेरे पूर्ववक्ता श्री कृष्ण ने शिक्षा के बारे में कहा। हमारे संविधान में है कि प्राइमरी शिक्षा लागू की जाये और दस वर्षों के अन्दर उसे कम्पल्सरी कर दिया जाये। आज 19 वर्ष हो गये लेकिन हम कम्पल्सरी प्राइमरी शिक्षा लागू नहीं कर पाये। आखिर इस में प्रशासन का

दोष है या जो हमारे पालिसी मेकर्स हैं उन का दोष है। उन्होंने उस को लागू नहीं किया, इस के लिये धन नहीं दिया। वैसे ही हमारे गृह-मंत्री जी हैं। वह सोशलिज्म के हमी हैं और जब कभी कांग्रेस की सभा होती है तो उनका एक अलग सोशलिस्ट फोरम बनता है। आज सोशलिज्म का कार्यावित्त करना प्रशासन के ऊपर है। लेकिन वह यहां पर मौजूद नहीं हैं। इस प्रस्ताव को मान कर लागू करने के लिये वही उपयुक्त भादमी हैं मगर यहां हमारे डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब ही बैठे हुए हैं। उन को कुछ हिदायत होगी कि वह इस प्रस्ताव को मानें या न मानें और वह उन की हिदायत पर चलेंगे। यह पालिसी के रूप में कोई डिजीन गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से नहीं ले सकते। आज इस प्रस्ताव पर विचार के समय खुद नन्दा साहब को होना चहिये या। वह खुद सुनते और अपना निर्णय लेते।

मेरा यह कहना है कि कांग्रेस ने सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न का प्रस्ताव भावडी में पास किया। नागपुर में वह सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न रूप में रखा गया और भुवनेश्वर में वह समाजवादी रूप में रह गया। एक प्रस्ताव किया गया कि चावल की मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाये और अन्न का व्यापार सरकार होल-सेल अपने हाथ में ले ले। लेकिन सरकार ने नहीं किया। मंत्री वर्ग वहां पर थे। सब ने पास किया लेकिन वहां से आने के बाद चावल की एक मिल का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं हुआ। जब कि प्रस्तावक तैयार है तो गवर्नमेंट तैयार नहीं है। प्रस्तावक कहां है, उस के इम्प्लिमेंट करने वाले कहां है? प्रशासक कहां है? प्रशासक इम्प्लिमेंट कर देते हैं लेकिन हमने उस को इम्प्लिमेंट नहीं करने दिया। हम ने अपनी चीजों में समाजवादी ढांचे को ठीक तरह से लागू करने के लिये कभी सही कदम नहीं उठाया। अगर सही कदम उठाया होता तो इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ हुआ होता।

[श्री सिहासन सिंह]

अब प्रशासन में परिवर्तन की बात कही गई। तो हमारे प्रशासन में परिवर्तन करने के लिये 19 वर्षों में कितनी कमेटियां बंठीं। कई कमेटियों की रिपोर्टें आईं। अप्पेलबी रिपोर्ट आई और रिपोर्टें आईं कि यह परिवर्तन हो वह परिवर्तन हो। अब एक नई कमेटी और बनाई गई है हमारे देसाई साहब के नेतृत्व में। यह भी अपनी रिपोर्ट देगी। लेकिन रिपोर्टों के बाद इस सरकार ने कभी भी उस पर सही कदम नहीं उठाया।

डा० भा० श्री० अग्ने (नागपुर) : उन को पढ़ने वाला कोई नहीं है।

श्री सिहासन सिंह : पढ़ने वाले तो दरकिनारा उस को ताक में रख दिया जायेगा। यह कहा जा सकता है कि प्रशासक वर्ग इतना प्रबल है कि उन रिपोर्टों के आने के बाद वह देखता है कि उस के खिलाफ तो कोई चीज उस में नहीं है। अगर होती है तो वह उस की फाइल को ही दबा देता है और हमारे मंत्री महोदय कुछ कर नहीं पाते हैं। एच० जी० वेल्स ने कहा है कि पालिसी बनाने वाले, कार्य प्रणाली बनाने वाले तो हमारे मंत्री होते हैं लेकिन उस को चलाने वाले व्यूरोक्रसी के लोग होते हैं। अगर मंत्री मजबूत हो अपनी पालिसी पर पर दृढ़ हो तो नौकरशाही सही काम करती है। अगर मंत्री कमजोर हो तो नौकरशाही खुल खेलती है। हमारे यहां आज नौकरशाही मजबूत है पालिसी बनाने वाले कमजोर हैं। मैं ने कई दफे इस सदन में देखा कि कोई अबडमेंट आये अप्पेन्डमेंट पर सदन के लोगों की राय एक है। मंत्री उठ कर जाने हैं गैलरी में पूछने के लिए कि इसको स्वीकार करें या न करें। अगर गैलरी से हां हो गया तो स्वीकार कर लिया। अगर ना हो गया तो स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे चाहे कुछ भी राय किसी की हो। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . इम्प्लीकेशन यह है कि

पालिसी वाला कमजोर है और वह प्रशासक मजबूत पड़ गया है। तो हम कुछ भी प्रस्ताव रखा करें, उससे क्या होता है? बैठे हुए हैं माथुर साहब। यह प्रशासन के बड़े जानकार हैं और उस कमेटी के मेम्बर भी हैं और शायद आज भविष्यवाणी करना तो ठीक नहीं होगा लेकिन इनकी रिपोर्ट आयेगी, साल भर के बाद या चुनाव के बाद आयेगी या पहले भी आ जाय, अभी तो झगड़ा है कि क्या इन लोगों को कैडर मिले . . .

एक सवस्य : वह तय हो गया।

श्री सिहासन सिंह : तो वह रिपोर्ट भी आयेगी। आने के बाद अलमारी में रख दी जायेगी। कितनी कमेटियों की रिपोर्टें आयी हैं? . . . (व्यवधान) . . . हम तो ला दिये थे सी० बी० आई० की उड़ीसा वाली रिपोर्ट। कुछ भाई नागज भी हुए। तो रिपोर्ट यह भी आ जायेगी। मगर उस पर क्या होगा। धन कहां गया देश का। उस पर बड़ा रिपोर्ट आयी महालोनबीस की। लेकिन आज वह रिपोर्ट कहां है? अशोक मेहता साहब हमारे प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि चाहे कुछ करो या न करो, धनी धनी होता जायगा, उसको रोक नहीं सकते। क्योंकि उन्हीं के पास नो-टाउ है, उन्हीं के पास रुपया है, इसलिए परमिशन उन्हीं को मिलेगी। यह हमारे प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर का कहना है। कैसे उसको रोक सकोगे?

इसलिए यह प्रस्ताव कार्यान्वित हो तो बड़ी खुशी की बात है लेकिन होगा कैसे जब तक कि मंत्रिवर्ग अपने को सही तरीके से जो कांग्रेस में प्रस्ताव पास होता है उसको यहां इम्प्लीमेंट करने के लिए तैयार न हो। लेकिन वह प्रस्ताव वहां पास होने के बाद यहां भूल जाता है या क्या होता है पता नहीं। इसलिए विभूति मिश्रा जी का प्रस्ताव हमारे ख्याल में वह स्वीकार तो करेंगे नहीं, चाहे कितना ही इन्फोर्मेट हो और वह कांग्रेस के सेक्रेटरी हैं,

पता नहीं विदज्ञा करेंगे या क्या करेंगे, यह वह जाने ।

Dr. Ranen Sen: Sir, this is a timely resolution. But I must say that by merely having administrative reforms, socialism cannot be established in any country. This is the main lag in this resolution. Today in spite of the fact that we have said in our Constitution that socialism is our goal, we are building capitalism, pure and simple. I agree with those non-members who have said that socialism alone can bring prosperity to India. While admitting that, most of our friends here have concentrated on the point of administrative reforms. Administrative reforms are no doubt very important, but there are other things which are necessary for bringing in socialism.

In spite of the differences in form, the main principles of socialism admitted throughout the world today are abolition of exploitation of man by man and exploitation of a nation by a nation. But in India we are not seeing abolition of exploitation of man by man, but more and more exploitation of the majority of people by a handful of people, may be in the name of socialism. This is what is happening, as is quite evident if we go through the Mahalanobis Committee's report and the Monopolies Commission report.

While congratulating Mr. Bibhuti Mishra on bringing this resolution, I wish to say he should have brought a resolution including many other factors which are necessary for bringing socialism in India. I admit immediately a country like ours cannot and should not jump into socialism. But what are the minimum steps which should be taken? Let us look at some African countries like UAR, which are our friends, which are also underdeveloped. They are adopting certain minimum things which are bound to lead them to socialism, namely, radical land reforms. In spite of the fact that the recommendations of the land reforms panel were submitted in 1955,

uptill now they have not been implemented. Then comes nationalisation of big industries—not small or medium industries.

You speak of corruption. Where does corruption come from? What is the source of corruption. An ordinary fellow might try to corrupt another man with four annas, eight annas, or one rupee. Then the man is not corrupted so easily. But if he is given Rs. 1000, Rs. 20,000 or a lakh of rupees, he is easily corrupted. So an ordinary man may not have the means to give Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 20,000. It is the people who have these means, they corrupt the administration, influence the administration and even influence the Cabinet.

My third point is, in every country you will find, as for example UAR, that they are more and more restricting and ultimately trying to eliminate exploitation by foreign capital. Unfortunately in our country we find that the grip of foreign capital is growing every day. I say this is an affront to all Members of this House. This will not allow development of the people's initiative. When the Indo-Pakistan war went on we saw that there was a real people's upsurge and there was a self-reliance movement. What do we find today after three, four months? That spirit, that movement, that initiative has been watered down from the highest authority down to the lowest.

Sir, these are things which are essential for building up socialism in India. For that, bloodshed is not necessary at all. What do we find today all over the world? Groping through socialist ideas today has become so popular all over the world that more and more the exploiters of the people the imperialist powers, those handful of people are getting isolated. Therefore, these things can be developed in such a country like India where the ruling party has accepted socialism as their goal, though they have not defined what that socialism is. People

[Dr. Ranen Sen]

inside the Congress Party who are really serious about socialism, who really want to end exploitation of man by man, they should seriously think how to develop socialism and not move inside the rut and simply go on mouthing slogans of socialism, and use all sorts of phrases and ultimately go on building capitalism and helping monopoly.

Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma (Khammam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we have promised the people under our Constitution social, economic and political justice, equality of status and liberty. Our Constitution has proved a great success and our democracy too. So far as opportunities for equality of status are concerned, we have today, for the largest democracy in the world, a woman as the Prime Minister. Nowhere in other parts of the world, even in a great and big country like America, they have been able to give this much of opportunity to all their citizens on an equal footing.

16.59 hrs.

[SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF in the Chair]

I am glad that Shri Bibhuti Mishra has brought this resolution. I support his resolution. He has connected socialism with administrative reforms. In fact, they are connected. Some friends have tried to define socialism. It is not so easy. I am reminded of the blind men and the elephant. There are several paths to reach God. There is the *bhakti marg*, there is the *karma marg* and so on. Same is the case with socialism. For reaching the same goal, call it human welfare, equality of opportunity, or economic equality, we have chosen a particular path. I am sure, we have been to some extent, trying our best to attain that goal. But still, in spite of our three Five Year Plans the fruits of these Plans have not reached the common man.

At this stage, I would like to say that indecision and half-hearted effort should come to an end if the country's development is to go on. Socialism in India is not a mere fad or Utopian idea it is something more. In spite of all the criticism by its detractors, I am convinced that socialism is the only way open to us in the context of our country and society. Of course, it is true that there have been some shortcomings. Much is made of those shortcomings. The shortcomings are not because there is something wrong with the socialist plans. It is because the content of socialism in these plans is less. If we are to get more concrete results, we should have more socialist content in our plans.

17 hrs.

I am sure this missing link will be supplied by the present dynamic Prime Minister and Planning Minister.

It is regrettable that in spite of the three Five Year Plans we have not made much headway, as far as administrative reforms are concerned. A high-power committee has been appointed and I think it has started doing its work. But the progress is slow. The Committee has to speed up its work and promptly come to certain decisions. If the progress of the work of this Committee is slow, it will also delay the development of this country.

It is high time that we realised the importance of an administrative officer. He is not merely a cog in the wheel or a tool in the hands of the Government. He is also a human being. He has as much potentiality as the planners themselves, in fact even more potentiality in either furthering or defeating the plans. People with field experience will agree with me when I say that the official contribution in the execution of a programme has been second to none. Several instances can be quoted where some young enthusiastic officers have been

pulled up for showing initiative and ignoring some of the rigid and senseless rules in all good faith. The situation has deteriorated so much that officers have come to believe that doing nothing and passing the buck is the safest and surest way for promotion and recognition. In this atmosphere, it is imperative that we try to create a sense of urgency in the officials. Programmes based on socialism or egalitarian society require some conviction for speedy implementation. Unless the administration is instilled with that conviction, the schemes will not succeed. We have seen funny situations where the plans or programmes drawn up by the Secretary or Minister has been wrecked by the people at the lower level in implementation. No Plan can succeed unless the people who implement it have conviction. Therefore, the only way to ensure success of the Plan is to entrust it to an agency which is earnest and sincere in implementing the programmes of the Governments. Then alone will the plans succeed.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Chairman, one English poet wrote two books of poems; one was called *The Songs of Innocence* and the other was called *The Songs of Experience*. When I read this Resolution moved by my very lovable friend, Shri Bibhuti Mishra, I think it is a song of Innocence. If he had read the book which is entitled *The Songs of Experience* he would have asked himself why he proposed this Resolution. Of course, we all believe in socialism.

Shri Kapur Singh: Not all.

Shri D. C. Sharma: If socialism is a temple, the high priests of that temple are the ministers at the Union level and at the State level. I ask you, Sir, how many of these ministers believe in socialism. Most of them are careerists; most of them are climbers and they have no faith in it.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. Member aware that none of them is here excepting one hon. Minister?

Shri D. C. Sharma: He is my lovable young brother; I do not refer to him. Most of them are careerists and they will be as glad to serve a socialist pattern of society as any other pattern of society. Therefore the rot starts at the very head and unless you have those ministers who are wedded to this theory, how can you expect anybody else to practise socialism? The first thing is that all those ministers who do not believe in socialism should be weeded out of the Council of Ministers.

Shri Kapur Singh: It is very drastic.

Shri D. C. Sharma: They should be asked to do something else. Of course there are plenty of jobs available in this country and they can be asked to serve the nation in some other way; but I request them in the name of the country, in the name of all those things which we hold dear that they should not adore the Treasury Benches of any State or any other place and mouth the slogan of socialism without meaning it, without understanding it, without knowing what it is. Therefore I would say, first of all, that we should have those persons constituting the Council of Ministers who believe in socialism.

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): Why not open a lecture class?

Shri D. C. Sharma: You have got something; do not bother.

My second point is: Who said that socialism can be brought about by the administration? I have never come across a country where socialism can be brought about by administrators except in the totalitarian countries or in those countries where you have, what are called, the people's democracies, where they handpick, those persons who believe in the theory and practice of the ruling ideology of

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

the nation. But here you cannot do so.

Sir, do you know that the late Mr. Churchill, when he went to a conference in West Germany in connection with the Second World War, took with him some members of the British Civil Service and in the mean time the general elections were held in England and Mr. Churchill had to go out of office. He said, "I have been given the boot by the electorate". Then, Lord Attlee went to represent UK and he took the same set of officers with him. They asked him, "What does it mean? Mr. Churchill was a Tory, a leader of the Conservative Party, and you are a leader of the Socialist Party. You have brought the same set of civil servants with you. How does it happen?" Lord Attlee said, "These civil servants are not wedded to any ideology; they are neuter gender persons; they do not believe either in socialism or in conservatism; they only carry out the policy of the leader of the nation, of the Prime Minister, of the Council of Ministers". Therefore, what is the good of blaming these administrators for the gaps which we find here? They are not to blame for that. I think, it is wrong to hold them up for any kind of cross-examination. Therefore, I think, the best thing is that we should put an end to this unending process of administrative reforms. Sometimes an administrative reforms commission is appointed in one State; sometimes in another State. Now it has been set up here also. Though, some of my very good friends are members of it, I tell you, that not much will come of it. I do not want to be a dismal prophet, but I can assure you that the Government will take an endless time in pondering over its recommendations and by the time it has taken a decision those recommendations would have become utterly futile.

Therefore, I would submit that the only way for spreading socialism in this country is that you should give

the broad principle of socialism to our students in schools, colleges and universities, tell them that we believe in equality of opportunity, in economic equality, in abolishing social disparities, in abolishing landlordism, in abolishing monopolies. You tell them these things and when you have a generation which has grown up in that atmosphere, you will see that administrator or no administrator, minister or no minister, this country will be ripe for socialism of the right kind in ten years' time.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the need for administrative reforms was felt as soon as we gained our independence, particularly after our Constitution came into force. As hon. Members know, the British system was colonial in nature and it was mostly based on checks and balances. The fundamental thesis in the British system was disbelief; that is why, before a decision could be taken it had to be referred to so many departments, ministries or persons. That was quite natural and normal for them because when a foreign power was ruling over a country like ours that kind of system was justified as far as they were concerned. But after independence was gained, new Constitution came into force, the need was immediately felt that some sort of administrative reforms would be necessary. As you know, Sir, several committees were appointed that same to advise us and some eminent Indians gave thought to this problem and this system which we inherited from the British was amended from time to time. *Ad hoc* changes were made and they did prove of some utility. We derived some benefit out of those changes. But the main system was never tackled; the main system was never changed. There was no attempt made to change the underlying system as such. With the advent of the Five Year Plans, the developmental and welfare activities of the Government

became larger and larger and they have been increased several-fold. At the same time, the economic development, the public sector industries, all these things coming up, have entirely changed the concept of administration as we knew it in the pre-Independence days.

The question of administering a dynamic society, a growing nation like ours, has to be tackled with a great deal of imagination. All these years, while we have been trying to improve the system, the basic concepts, the fundamental concepts, as I said earlier, were not disturbed. But now, after we have tackled various other problems which were very urgent and which could not be postponed, we are embarking upon the exercise, the task, of looking at this very system that has been prevailing in our country. When the system has to be examined some fundamental, some basic, changes have to be made, it cannot be done in a haphazard or an *ad hoc* manner. It requires a very high-powered and a competent commission to go into this matter. As the House knows, this Commission was appointed, headed by an experienced administrator, Mr. Morarji Desai. It has also eminent persons like Shri Harish Chandra Mathur. All the members of this Commission have wide experience in administrative matters and we are quite sure that this Commission will tackle the basic defects all the basic faults that we have come across in the existing machinery, and they will suggest practical and suitable remedies so that the execution of our policy becomes easier. Some of the members.....

Dr. M. S. Aney: Is it included in the terms of reference that the whole question has to be gone into, keeping in view the principles of socialism?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: If the hon. Member cares to go through the terms of reference, which have been laid down in the Gazette of India, which was issued on the 5th January,

he will find that the various subjects that have been mentioned for the Commission's attention are actually meant to bring about the same thing as the hon. member is saying. Socialism has not been named as such but the measures or the things that the Commission is supposed to examine will fulfil the same task.

I was saying that we have constituted this Commission. Some members have raised questions on the terms of reference. I would request them, rather than taking the time of the House, to go through the Gazette of India dated the 5th January where all these things are laid out.

I was saying that, in the meantime, we have done something in the field of administrative reforms. I want to mention particularly the development of Panchayati Raj in our country. This is one of the basic things. If we have full faith in the capacity of our people to look after their interests properly, we have to decentralise our administrative machinery in such a manner that the local people, at their own level, have the full initiative as far as their own problems are concerned. That is why, this Panchayati Raj was encouraged by the Central Government as well as by the various State administrations. Right from the village to sub-division and to district, various kinds of measures have been adopted to give more and more power to the locally elected assemblies of our people, so that they can tackle their own affairs according to their own decision and discretion and they do not have to waste time in referring those matters to the capitals of the State Governments and waiting until a decision is made by the State Governments.

Some members made certain observations and I would like to refer to one or two of them before I come to the end of my speech.

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

I would first refer to what Mr. S. M. Banerjee has said about retrenchment of certain Central Government servants as a sequel to the appointment of this Commission. I must say that his fears are absolutely unfounded. The letter of Home Minister that he read out clearly shows that no retrenchment, as such, is envisaged. There is the new scheme of transferring some surplus staff to the Central Pool where they will be adjusted as against the new vacancies; but for that, certain rules have been laid down which give a wide option to the employees—they can take this or that option. The retrenchment will come only when the employee is willing to do nothing, only if he is not willing to go to the new job, if he is not willing to undergo the new training. He is given option.

Mr. Chairman: On similar jobs?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: If he is not given similar job, he may be given training for another kind of job where he will be absorbed provided he is willing to undergo the training; there is no question of retrenching that particular member of staff; that will come only if he is not willing to do anything.

Mr. Chairman: In spite of age?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: It has nothing to do with age. The question of retrenchment will arise only if the person is not willing to accept any of these various alternatives which have been put before him.

Shri S. M. Banerjee mentioned the number of employees that would be retrenched as being about 10,000. I must say that that is absolutely wrong. There is no such proposal and nothing of that kind is going to be done. As a matter of fact, we expect that the number of surplus people that would be available on the basis of the present calculation would be a little less than the number of

vacancies that are expected to be created because of the new defence jobs and things that have to be done with regard to national defence. So, as usual, Shri S. M. Banerjee was quite inaccurate in saying all these things, but I thought that I should put the record straight and a statement like that should not be allowed to go unchallenged.

I was quite disappointed at the speech made by my very honoured and dear friend Shri Warrior. He spoke here as if he would do in a public speech. I was expecting something better from him. But he was saying things such as the Ministers did not know how to act and they depended only on the bureaucracy and they were guided by whatever was done by the civil servant. I must say that my hon. friend might have known one or two instances of that type, but by and large what he has stated is absolutely untrue. We do fulfil our public duties here. We represent the people of India, and we do represent their aspirations, and all important decisions, and in fact, even ordinary decisions, are ultimately taken by the representatives from this House and from this Parliament, and the civil machinery only executes them. It may be an exception that one or two Ministers may not have that kind of initiative, but that is only an exception rather than the rule.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Every Minister has been getting the statements written by the civil servants except Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I would say that even the hon Member would get the statement or speech or anything else drafted by the Secretary and then he would go through it himself and correct it. There is nothing wrong in getting a draft, reading it and then correcting it. Whatever we speak here is absolutely our own hundred per cent, and nobody else has any responsibility in that.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: At least the Ministers should read the speech before they deliver it here.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: As I have said, we are very happy that this resolution has been brought forward by my hon. friend Shri Bibhuti Mishra, and we are convinced that in order to expedite the ushering in of socialism in our country and to make our Five Year Plans succeed better, we do require radical administrative reforms. I would, therefore, commend the resolution of my hon. friend Shri Bibhuti Mishra for the acceptance of the House and I am sure the House will accept it.

Dr. Ranen Sen: What about the points raised by Shri Kapur Singh?

An hon. Member: And also by Shri D. C. Sharma.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Bibhuti Mishra.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: It is for the hon. Mover.

Shri Kapur Singh: A question has been put by an hon. Member "What about the points raised by Shri Kapur Singh?" That should be answered.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: The hon. Mover has to reply to the hon. Member's points and not myself. Shri Bibhuti Mishra is the Mover of the resolution.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं शुक्ल जी को हार्दिक बधाई और धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने एक बहुत बड़ा कदम सरकार की तरफ से उठा कर मेरे प्रस्ताव को कबूल किया है। मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अब वह इस प्रस्ताव को काम में लाये और देश के अन्दर समाजवाद लाने का यत्न करे और प्रशासन में सुधार लायें ताकि लोगों का जीवन सुखी बने और लोग समझें कि हिन्दुस्तान में सचमुच राम राज्य की स्थापना हो गई है।

2760(Ai) LSD—10.

जिन मेरे साथियों ने मेरे प्रस्ताव का समर्थन किया है, उनका भी मैं आभारी हूँ। मेरे भाई कुछ ऐसे भी हैं जो मेरे बहुत ज़बर्दस्त दोस्त हैं और उन्होंने इसका विरोध किया है। हमारे वनजी साहब इस वक्त यहाँ नहीं हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि कामराज योजना सफलीभूत हो गई है और वह यमराज हो गये हैं। वह जानते ही हैं कि हिन्दू धर्म के मुताबिक भगवान जो होता है वह अपने यहाँ यमराज को भी रखता है। इसलिए यमराज को रखता है कि जो गलत काम करने वाले हैं उनको पकड़ कर वह लाये और उनको वह सजा दे सके। कामराज जी ने अपने पास यमराज बनजी साहब जैसे आदमियों के लिए ही रखा है। उनको इस वास्ते घबराने की ज़रूरत नहीं है।

हमारे सरदार कपूर सिंह जी ने कहा है कि इस प्रस्ताव में कोई सैस नहीं है। हमारे बहुत से भाई ० सी० एस० दोस्त हैं। उन में काबिल भी हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान की भावनाओं के साथ भावनायें रखते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की जो भावनायें हैं उस जैसी उनकी भावनायें हैं। सुरेन्द्रनाथ वनजी भी भाई ० सी० एस० थे। उन्होंने इस्तीफा दिया और कांग्रेस की स्थापना की। आज उसी कांग्रेस की छत्रछाया में हम काम करते हैं। हमारे कपूर सिंह जी को भी जब अंग्रेजों ने ठोकर मारी तो उन्हें सुबुद्धि आई। आपका नाम कपूर है। आप जानते ही हैं कि कपूर को हम लोग कस कर डिब्बों में बन्द करके रखते हैं। ज़रा सा अंगर डिब्बे का मुँह खुला रह जाए तो आप जानते ही हैं कि कपूर की सारी गंध निकल जाती है। अब मेरा प्रस्ताव कहां से समझ में आए। यह तो समझ में आ ही नहीं सकता है। गांधी जी जैसे आदमी नान-वायोलेंस के पुजारी थे। उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान के लिए स्वाधीनता प्राप्त की। जिस तबके से सरदार कपूर सिंह जी ताल्लुक रखते हैं उस में भी कुछ अच्छे आदमी हैं। लेकिन वह उस तबके में पड़ गए जिन की गंध निकल गई थी। मैं अब क्या करूँ और कहाँ से उनको सैस ला कर दूँ, कहां से

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

अकल दू । जितनी देनी थी हमारी सरकार ने दे दी है और उसी की वजह से वह आज इस सदन के सदस्य हैं । वना अगर हमारी सरकार . . .

सभपति महोदय : आप ने दूसरों को अकल दी है . . .

श्री विभूति मिश्र : इसलिए तो बैठे हुए हैं, नहीं तो अंग्रेजों की नौकरों में होते ।

तीसरे हमारे शर्मा जी हैं । वह बड़े लर्निड प्रोफेसर हैं । एपलबी रिपोर्ट को मैंने पढ़ कर सुनाया है । अगर कोई आदमी बहुत ज्यादा पढ़ा लिखा होता है तो वह भी फीवल मार्टिडड हो जाता है उसका दिमाग कमजोर हो जाता है कोई फैसला वह आसानी से कर नहीं सकता है । मैंने अपनी स्पीच में कहा था कि सरदार पटेल बहुत ज्यादा किताबों के कोड़े नहीं थे लेकिन उन्होंने ठोस फसले किये । ये जो हमारे प्रोफेसर साहब हैं पढ़ते पढ़ते इनका जो दिमाग था वह भी खाया जा चुका है वह भी चट हो चुका है । आगे बुद्धि कहां से आये । इसलिए इनको सोशलिज्म सूझता ही नहीं है । ये हमारे मिनिस्टर्स की बात करते हैं । मैं इनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि किसी जमाने में आप बाइसराय से या एग्जैक्टिव कार्डिनलजं से मिल तक नहीं सकते थे इस तरह से बात नहीं कर सकते थे जिस तरह से आज यहां कर सकते हैं । आप यहां इस सदन में बैठते हैं और इसी सदन में प्राइम मिनिस्टर बैठते हैं होम मिनिस्टर बैठते हैं सभी मिनिस्टर बैठते हैं । सब को आप चैलेंज करते हैं सब से आप बातें करते हैं । इससे बड़ा सोशलिज्म आपके लिए और क्या हो सकता है । अब जो सोशलिज्म एक दिन में आप चाहें कि आ जाए तो वह तो असम्भव है । सोशलिज्म धीरे धीरे ही तो आयेगा ।

हमारे काशीराम गुप्त जी नहीं हैं । उन्होंने मेरे प्रस्ताव की भावना का तो समर्थन

किया है लेकिन कहा है कि वैलफेयर स्टेट में बहुत अच्छे आदमी चाहियें । वैलफेयर स्टेट क्या कोई भी स्टेट हो उसमें अच्छे आदमियों की जरूरत होती है । किसी भी राज्य को चलाने के लिए सज्जन आदमी चाहियें बुद्धिमान आदमी चाहियें तत्पर आदमी चाहियें ताकि जो पालिसी है उसको वे कार्यान्वित कर सकें ।

अन्त में मैं सरकार को प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करने के लिए घन्यवाद देता हूँ ।

Mr. Chairman: First I have to dispose of the amendment moved by Shri B. K. Das.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं किसी भी सबस्टीट्यूट मोशन को कबूल नहीं करता हूँ ।

Shri D. D. Puri (Kaithal): This looks like a substitute resolution.

Mr. Chairman: This is an amendment by way of a substitute resolution. I shall now put this amendment to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put the main resolution to the vote of the House. It is acceptable to Government.

The question is:

"This House is of opinion that with a view to bring Socialism in the country forthwith and to execute the Five Year Plan successfully, Government should bring about radical changes in its administrative set-up without the least delay."

The motion was adopted.