

*Security of Service to
Government Employees*

[M.L. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

**RESOLUTION RE: SECURITY OF
SERVICE TO GOVERNMENT
EMPLOYEES**

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take immediate steps to guarantee security of service to Government employees by abolishing the different categories of temporary and quasi-permanent Government servants and by classifying all such employees as permanent after a certain number of years of service and also by repealing the Railway Services (Safeguarding of National Security) Rules, 1954, and similar other Rules and provisions applicable to the Government employees."

My object is two-fold, namely, to give government employees the sense that their service is secure and also to give them an assurance that they are to be safeguarded against victimisation. These two aspects are interlinked and I do not have to argue that if Government is going to be effective and efficient, it is very necessary that those who serve under Government have a sense that their services are appreciated, at least, to the extent that the security of their tenure of service is not in jeopardy. They have also to have a feeling that they would not be victimised for reasons that do not appertain to the real conduct of government business.

The fact of the matter is that today large numbers of people in government service do not know where they are. They lead, what might be called, a *trisanaku* existence, dangling between two worlds, and even while they are in employment the Damocles's sword of sudden termination of service hangs over their heads.

On this point, I find from the Report of the Railway Board for 1952-53, that

the total number of temporary staff who remained unconfirmed in that period was 95,565, the number of temporary staff which was under training or was on probation was 21,883, the number of railway staff whose posts were not likely to be required permanently came to about 96,602, and the number of workshop staff with less than three years' service was 15,767. The position in our railways, which are the largest employers in this country is, therefore, such that there is always a very large number of staff who do not know how long they shall be permitted to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair]

In regard to the Defence Services also, we find that defence employees, especially those who are in the industrial sector of the Defence Ministry are employed very largely on daily wages, monthly wages and casual and/or temporary basis. There have been many cases when they have continued working for years, even decades and some have worked for what might be described for a whole generation and they have remained temporary or casual. They have neither security of service nor any of the retirement and other benefits. So, a vast number of people in the Defence Services have to remain temporary and some of them remain temporary all their lives.

We find also that the Railway Establishment Code, quite apart from many other administrative provisions, which are employed from time to time today, lays down certain rules regarding the removal of employees from service, which are very drastic. In section 1708, it is laid down, for example, that a railway servant shall be liable to be removed from service in the following instances, namely, (i) inefficiency, (ii) repeated minor offences and so on and there are four sub-clauses to this section. Under this section of the Code a large number of employees have been removed from time to time. This section provides that nothing in these

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Rules shall abrogate the right of the General Manager, in exceptional cases, to remove a non-pensionable, non-gazetted railway servant from service in terms of his agreement, without the application of the procedure prescribed in the rules in this connection and without assigning any reasons if he considers it desirable to do so. This kind of omnibus allocation of power has been made in order that those who are lower down in the scale of employment do not have a real guarantee for security of service.

Recently, many instances have come to my notice regarding the description of certain people as superfluous and their termination of service. There happened a case of several employees in the Office of the Comptroller of Coal Accounts, Government of India, in Calcutta. There, the services of a certain number of temporary Upper Division clerks with two to over three years of service, without a blackmark against them, were terminated. This kind of thing has happened in many cases to such an extent that sometimes the matter has been taken to courts of law. The Supreme Court has pronounced a judgment in one particular case, under which it appears that by the employment of the expression 'termination of services' and by invoking certain rules which are still valid on account of our present set-up, if people are discharged, they would have no safeguard of the sort contemplated in the articles of the Constitution. If we read articles 309, 311 and 313 of the Constitution, we find that it was certainly the intention of the makers of the Constitution that our government employees should have a definite sense of protection regarding their employment. Government employees were given a definite assurance that nothing would be done against their interests in employment. Article 311, clause (2) says:

"That no such person as aforesaid....."

that is to say, any person who is a member of the Civil Service of the

Union or All India services or the civil service of the State—

No such person "shall be dismissed or reduced in rank until he has been given a reasonable opportunity of showing cause against the action proposed to be taken in regard to him."

This is a very definite provision, but, by utilising certain rules which are valid, unfortunately, and by using the expression 'termination of service', which does not, according to some kind of legal pedantry, come to be covered by the expressions used in the article of the Constitution, the Supreme Court chose to decide that Government could exercise its rights regarding the termination of service of these people without giving them any opportunity of showing cause against such termination of service.

Similar instances have happened in so many other cases. I have not got the time to refer to all the instances that have come to my notice, but, I think, I may refer to one or two. Very recently, in April 1954, the Rehabilitation Finance Administration gave notice to about 80 out of a total of 116 Assistant Inspectors and their services were terminated. Sir, most of these Assistant Inspectors were people who had come as refugees from Pakistan. Most of these people also held fairly good jobs. I know one instance where the person concerned was the Manager of a small bank in East Bengal. He had to come to this country after partition and he got a job as Assistant Inspector in the Rehabilitation Finance Administration. He worked there for more than two or three years and after that he was told, one fine morning that he had to go. This kind of thing was done in regard to, I understand, 80 out of 116 Assistant Inspectors.

Of course, there are the well-known instances of the employees of the Civil Supplies Department in the different States. These people have sometimes

put in long years of service. We have had all kinds of controls and large numbers of people had to be appointed. They put in years of faithful and fairly efficient service but, they are, today, "in the soup," as it is said in common parlance. At any moment large numbers of government employees are liable to be thrown on to the scrap heap and most of the Civil Supplies employees can get no consolation from the very equivocal assurance given by Government from time to time that large numbers of them would be absorbed in the railways and in the Post and Telegraphs services. I know, Sir, some thing of the lie of the land. I do not think our Railways or our Communications Ministry can come forward and absorb a substantial proportion of those who are going to lose their jobs in the Civil Supplies Department. This is the kind of thing which has gone on. I will give you one instance how this kind of termination of services happens. In the case of one individual who was working under the Income-tax Department in Calcutta this happened. He had joined the Army during the war and after the war, on release from the Army, he joined the Income-tax Department, West Bengal, as a Lower Division clerk on the 20th February, 1947. He was promoted to the post of Upper Division clerk with effect from the 1st September, 1949. On the 1st May, 1952 he suddenly got a notice signed by the then Commissioner of Income-tax in West Bengal purporting to terminate his services immediately with one month's notice. Here is a person who joined in 1947; he was promoted to be an Upper Division clerk in 1949 and suddenly in 1952 he was told that he must quit. In this case, of course, there was perhaps one reason, which, at least to the Home Minister, appears to be a justified reason, and that is, that he was an Assistant Secretary of the Bengal Income-tax Association which is an organisation of the employees. This organisation had, in 1952—just after the elections to Parliament were over—organised a meeting where they invited all the West Bengal

Members of Parliament—mostly Congress Members because they are in a majority from West Bengal—gave them some tea and wanted them to say that they would look after the interests of the income-tax employees and all that sort of thing. For this enormity, the Income-tax Association has been punished to the extent that today its recognition has been withdrawn. This person was the Assistant Secretary of that Association which, possibly, was the reason why his services were terminated. This is the way in which things are done from time to time.

Now, it might be said that, particularly in regard to the large numbers of government employees who serve in such Departments as the Civil Supplies Department, the Government cannot give a guarantee in regard to their continued employment; because the continuation of this Department is itself a matter which is very doubtful. It may be the Government's point of view that these jobs are necessarily of a temporary nature. But, on this point I would like to submit very seriously a point, which I hope Government will consider very carefully and seriously. Sir, it is this: there is no doubt.....

I am sorry, I find the hon. Home Minister speaking to the Chair. I wish the Home Minister would give—at least as long as he chooses so, condescendingly to be here—his undivided attention as far as that is possible; because, as I have said.....

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I find that the House is not very largely attended. I think this is a very important matter and we can discuss it in the next session. I was suggesting to the Chairman whether it would not be desirable to adjourn the House when we are not even having the quorum. This important debate will continue when the session re-opens and then we will have a full debate upon the subject. I was saying that Shri Mukerjee may consider this. I want people to take particular interest and listen to the hon. Member's speech. I am listening to it.

[Dr. Katju]

If the hon. Member agrees then we may adjourn the House.

Mr. Chairman: My difficulty is, once it has been brought to the notice of the Chair that there is no quorum, I cannot possibly ignore it. I should think, that since this resolution has been moved.....

Dr. Katju: If Shri Mukerjee agrees, then the House agrees. I do not want that he should not carry on with his resolution.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no quorum, there is no question of any agreement by Shri Mukerjee or otherwise.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If it is suggested that I formally have the resolution moved and the speech may be continued later; if that is the sense of the House and if that is your desire also, I personally do not object.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Adjournment motion has to be moved; it cannot be done like that.

Mr. Chairman: The resolution has been taken up. The hon. Member has spoken for 15 minutes. At the same time, I do not find that the House is very largely attended. Under the circumstances, if there is a motion for the adjournment of the House, the motion may be accepted or voted by the House. But, the Secretary tells me that the rules are there in case there is adjournment, the resolution shall have to be balloted again when the hon. Mover of the Resolution may or may not be favoured with the ballot.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Actually I have formally moved it. I began by saying that I move the resolution. At that time there was no question of quorum.

Mr. Chairman: I am not disposed to adjourn the House. There is quorum in the House now and the hon. Member can continue.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am entirely at your disposal. If there is quorum in the House and it is agreed that I

may continue I shall finish my speech; otherwise I formally move my resolution and continue later.

Mr. Chairman: There is quorum in the House. I do not want to stand in the way of the hon. Member continuing his speech. He has only spoken for 15 minutes and if he likes he may speak for some more time.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In that case I shall continue.

Sir, I was saying that there are certain Departments like the Civil Supplies Department where Government can say that, necessarily they are of a temporary nature, but the bias of society today, and specially in our country, is such that the ambit of Government action has been extended and ought to be extended. Therefore, society has a right to expect that Government should give something like a guarantee regarding employment. That is really the only choice of a welfare State and I think if we are not going to leave the directives of State policy as a sort of dead letter we should try to do so. I do not see why, when we are having more than one Plan—a series of them—we cannot give a guarantee of employment to all our people especially those who have already been in government employment and have no black-mark against them, they should be continued to enable them to earn their bread.

Sometimes termination of services has happened on grounds that could not stand the test of law. For example, in Calcutta there was a recent case of an employee in the Posts and Telegraphs Department, by name Shri Chatterjee, who was victimised, who took recourse to courts of law and ultimately got his relief. But, everybody cannot go to courts of law. Besides, it is frowned upon. I can quote from an issue of the *Eastern Railway Gazette* dated 2nd January, 1953 where it was said that even in cases where a legal remedy is admissible, a government servant who tries to seek a decision on such issues before a court of

law should not do so and that would be looked upon as antidiscipline. That being so, people are afraid to go to a court of law. Besides, it is an expensive proposition.

Now, Sir, this victimisation is done in a variety of ways. I have already referred to the case of an Assistant Secretary of the Bengal Income-tax Association. I find also that quite a large number of railway employees are in a very difficult position. In some cases for six long years they have been in suspension. There is one case which I have been told about from the D.A.O.'s office in Eastern Railway, Asansol. I was told, there were some people who were arrested in 1948-49 under the Security Act. They were released in 1950-51. They were served with charge-sheets by the Railway Department and interviewed by the departmental heads. Then the Railway Department maintained one year's silence. After one year, some were interviewed by a committee of advisers. Then, there was another period of silence for two years. After this, 'show-cause' notices were served intimating provisional dismissal. These were served in August or September 1953. Another year has passed and they do not know what exactly is going to happen to them. I find the railways have divided all these persons into three categories—class I, class II and class III. Those belonging to class III are sent back to duty. People put in class I have a very black-mark against them 'not to be considered under any circumstances' written on their files and they do not know where to turn.

It is exactly here that we are very perturbed by the latest announcement of the Railway Services (Safeguarding of National Security) Rules, 1954. This was notified by Government on the 19th April, 1954. These rules have been issued by the President in replacement of the old Railway Services Rules of 1949. According to the new rules the position is that these rules give no reasonable opportunity whatsoever to an employee to show cause against any

removal or dismissal, where the President is of the opinion that the employees engaged or reasonably suspected to be engaged in subversive activities. The terms are so wide that in effect it allows Government authorities arbitrarily to single out any employee and deprive him of any opportunity of showing cause against any action proposed against him. In 1949 certain rules were promulgated against which there had been a great deal of feeling. Last year, in 1953, we had a discussion of a resolution regarding the safeguarding of national security rules and on that occasion we tried to show how those rules go against the spirit of the Constitution. We tried to show how Government had ample safeguards in the Government Servants Conduct Rules. We tried to show also how in the actual operation of those rules injustice had happened in many flagrant cases. The 1949 rules at least gave the employee a chance of representing his case personally before a committee consisting of four officers of the level of Joint Secretary. The committee could scrutinise the cases and it only had recommendatory powers. Under the new 1954 rules, even the facade of justice has been taken away. This is very important and that is why I draw the attention of the Government to this matter.

I find in one case of a railway employee of the Southern Railway, Shri Ananthanarayanan, Assistant Permanent Way Inspector at Pakala, that he has recently been served with a charge sheet under the new 1954 rules and the charges are very familiar, just on the same lines as used to be done under the 1949 rules. It says "You are a member of the Communist Party of India and of the communist controlled South Indian Railway Labour Union, Golden Rock. You are in touch with the Politbureau Secretariat of the Communist Party, Bombay". As far as I know—and, Sir, I ought to know—the Politbureau of the Communist Party is not in Bombay, but for some time has been in Delhi, but at any rate, this is the charge. The third charge is "You spread the doctrine of communism

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

among the public and the railway staff." The next charge is "You actively canvassed for Communist Party candidates in the last elections to the Legislative Assembly." We know that there are people, particularly in the Government, who just cannot tolerate the existence of the Communist Party. During the discussion on the ban on the sale of Soviet literature in railway bookstalls, the Home Minister gave us a piece of his mind. We are quite familiar with that sort of thing, but I do not see why this sort of thing should be allowed without that kind of protest which ought to be made in this House for all who stand for the most elementary principle of justice and democracy. I do not see how the President, having made the 1954 rules under article 309, can take away the employee's right under article 311. I submit that articles 309, 311 and 313 should be read together. Because the 1954 rules gave no opportunity of showing cause against the action proposed to be taken, it is against the principle of national justice and, therefore, this should be stopped. Quite apart from the basic principle of violation of the freedom of rights, the freedom of speech and the freedom of association, this is a matter to which we must draw the attention of the House. I know that the Government has from time to time shown its attitude towards the Communist Party and also towards certain organisations and associations. I have got here a document which is a memorandum of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Dr. Katju: I am rising on a point of order. Are we discussing the question of dismissal or absorption of railway servants? My hon. friend is dwelling at great length on the merits of the Communist Party and singing their praise.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I will lay on the table a copy of this and anyhow I need not go into the details of it. Government's attitude is quite clear regarding the association of its employees with the movement represented by my

Party. Government have even gone to the extent of saying—the questions in this House have elicited information unequivocally—that such organisations as the Indian Peoples' Theatre Association which has performed repeatedly before the Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet, organisations like the All India Progressive Writers' Association, the Friends of the Soviet Union, or such organisations as Indo-Soviet Cultural Society, India-China Friendship Association, which today are sometimes supported by the august presence of my friend, Dr. Katju.....

Dr. Katju: Why all this? What has this got to do with the resolution before the House. Of course, you are singing your own praise and I am very glad to hear it, but what has it to do with the resolution before the House?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Government have said that Government servants should not belong to or even participate in the activities of these associations as it amounts to subversive activity and that they should be punished if they disobeyed these orders. I do not see how this can be tolerated in a free country. Dr. Katju is fond of English examples. The Masterman Committee, appointed by the House of Commons in England, made recommendations under which restrictions on civil servants regarding participation in political activities, have decreased to a considerable extent—I am quoting from an article in the *Statesman* of the 22nd March 1953 under the heading "Civil Servants and Politics":

"In Britain 62 per cent. of the civil servants will be freed, as well as a further 22 per cent. (subject to certain conditions). The remaining 16 per cent. (that is, those connected with policy and those whose work deal directly with the citizen in relations to his personal circumstances) are still barred from national political activities, but can, with permission, take part in local government."

We do not expect in India this kind of thing. We do not want government servants here to take part in political activities. I have got this document which says that if you are present in a political meeting, that is in itself *prima facie* evidence that you are of sympathiser of the political party which is organising that meeting. Here we are supposed to have freedom of views and yet this kind of blanket ban is put upon the freedom of our citizens. Last time when the safeguarding of national security rules was under discussion, some Members on the other side said that there are two kinds of trade unionism—one is respectable, decent trade unionism and the other is unrespectable, indecent trade unionism. The people might choose and decide which kind of trade unionism they are going to take up. I say that that kind of trade unionism really appeals to the People which helps the worker not only to get a paltry, beggarly improvement in the wage of Rs. 5 or Rs. 10, and even Rs. 50 or Rs. 100, but that kind of trade unionism will really appeal to the people which will enable the people to bring about the end of the wage system, the exploitation system and the introduction of the real Welfare State. That is the kind of trade unionism that our people want, and in spite of all these efforts on the part of the Government, that is the kind of trade unionism which our people will continue to conduct.

I am sorry, I have not got the time to refer to so many instances which I have here with me. I can see, with his usual predilection for frivolity, the Home Minister is proposing to treat this discussion in the same way as he has done several other previous discussions. I have said enough, I think, to place before the House the serious discontent which is today simmering among government employees of all sections. You cannot keep them hanging fire in the way you do. You cannot keep thousands of people in a temporary capacity. You cannot ask them suddenly to get out of their jobs. You cannot throw them

to the scrap heap after they have put in a good deal of their life, after they have put in years of service, without any kind of black-mark against their record. That is the kind of thing that you are doing. You are doing it with a definitely partisan motive. You are saying openly that you are going to define 'subversive activity' in a manner which is definitely directed against a particular political movement. Therefore, I say, let the Government be straight. If the Government thinks today that the Communist Party is such an undesirable organisation that it should be banned altogether, let it say so. I can understand that sort of thing. If the Communist Party of India today is conducting a movement which you cannot wish away however much you may like to wish it away, you cannot treat those sections of our citizens who are growing more sympathetic towards the ideas of communism and socialism and the construction of a new society, with the contempt which is represented by these rules, particularly the Railway Services (Safeguarding of National Security) Rules, 1954 and similar rules which are current. Against these rules I wish to raise my voice and I commend my resolution for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Chairman: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take immediate steps to guarantee security of service to Government employees by abolishing the different categories of temporary and quasi-permanent Government servants and by classifying all such employees as permanent after a certain number of years of service and also by repealing the Railway Services (Safeguarding of National Security) Rules, 1954 and similar other Rules and provisions applicable to the Government employees."

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): I want one clarification, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: From whom?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: From the Chair. The resolution refers to government employees. Is it not necessary at least for the chief employing Ministries to be represented here? The Communications Ministry is not represented here. It employs 220,000 men. The Defence Minister is not here. At least they ought to be present here. This is a very important Resolution.

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): The Home Ministry represents all the Ministries.

Mr. Chairman: There are three Ministers here. The Home Ministry represents all the Ministries. There is the Deputy Minister of Railways. Hon. Shri Datar is there. I do not see how any objection can possibly be raised.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: No Ministry has a uniform labour policy.

Mr. Chairman: Every Ministry of the Government of India has got a number of employees. Should they all be present here? That is asking too much. The Home Minister and the Railway Minister are there. The resolution refers to government servants and railway services. I think they are sufficiently represented.

पीडित मुजीराबर वत्त उपाध्याय (जिला प्रतापगढ़ पूर्व) : सभापति जी, श्री मुकजी जिस विषय पर अभी बोलें और जो विषय उन्होंने उठाया है उसमें मुझे विशेष रुचि है। मैं समझता था कि वह हमारे दश में जितने कर्मचारी हैं, सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, उनकी कुछ दिक्कतें हैं, परेशानियां हैं, उनके विषय में मैं समझता था कि सहानुभूति रखते हुए वे कुछ ऐसी बातें बतायेंगे जिसके जरिये कि हम उनकी दशा को सुधार सकें और उनकी कुछ सहायता कर सकें। यह विषय जब आज हाउस में आया तो मुझे एक बड़ा उत्साह सा जान पड़ा और इसी से मैं बैठ गया कि मैं भी इसमें कुछ हिस्सा लूंगा और इस प्रस्ताव पर जो कि अब सदन के सामने हैं, उसमें जो मुझे रुचि है जो मेरे मन में उत्साह है, मैं भी उसको प्रकट करूंगा।

लीकिन उन्होंने बोलना जब शुरू किया तो थोड़ी देर के बाद ही मैं क्या देखता हूँ कि आते आते वह तो उत्तर गये कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की तरफ और कम्युनिस्ट वर्कर्स की तरफ और कहने लगे कि कम्युनिस्ट लोगों के खिलाफ यह नोटिस निकला, वह नोटिस निकला, यहां से निकाला गया, यहां से निकाला गया, या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को बैंक क्यों नहीं कर दिया जाता और इसको आप चलने क्यों दे रहे हैं, और मैं उनकी इन सब बातों को सुन कर सोचने लगा कि आखिर यह आज का विषय तो है नहीं। खैर मैं अब अपने विषय पर आता हूँ। यह समस्या जो उन्होंने आपके सामने पेश की है, दरअसल ऐसी है कि जिसके साथ मुझे बड़ी सहानुभूति है। दश में बहुत से कर्मचारी ऐसे हैं जो कि टम्पररी हैं, वर्षों तक वह स्थायी नहीं हो पाते और अस्थायी रहते हैं। और स्थायी न होने की वजह से उन पर हमेशा एक इन्सिक्यूरिटी की चिन्ता छाये रहती है, उनको परेशानी रहती है। जब चाहे उन्हें नौकरी से हटाया जासकता है। हमारे नियम ऐसे हैं कि उन्हें हटाया जा सकता है। परन्तु मैं उनसे निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर उनका दृष्टिकोण केवल यह होता कि जितने दश में हमारे सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं उनकी सहायता करनी है तब तो इस विषय में हमारी उनकी कुछ बात साथ चल सकती थी और यह ऐसा विषय था जिसमें मैं बहुत दूर तक उनके साथ चल सकता लीकिन उन्होंने मुझे अपने साथ चलने का मौका ही नहीं दिया और शुरू ही से मैंने देखा कि वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की बात करने लगे कि कम्युनिस्ट वर्कर्स को नोटिस दिया जा रहा है और उनको सर्विस में से निकाला जा रहा है और अगर यह बात है तो कांग्रेस पार्टी और उसकी गवर्नमेंट उसको मानती क्यों है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को बैंक कर दे और उन्होंने बताया कि दूसरी पोलिटिकल पार्टीज के लोगों को तरह तरह से सत्ताया जा रहा है लीकिन मैं मुकजी साहब को बतलाना चाहता हूँ यहां पोलिटिकल पार्टीज का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। जो सरकारी कर्मचारी होते हैं उनका पोलिटिकल पार्टीज से कोई सम्बन्ध होता ही नहीं है और मेरी समझ में अगर कोई ऐसा

सम्बन्ध रहता है कि वह पॉलिटिकल पार्टीज में भी जाकर काम करें, उसके कार्यकर्ता भी बने रहें और सरकारी काम भी करते रहें, तो मेरी समझ में ऐसे काम करने वालों को सरकारी नौकरी में रखना उचित नहीं होगा, यह जानते हुए कि उनका सम्बन्ध एसी पॉलिटिकल पार्टीज से है और जिनमें वह एक्टिवली पार्टीसिपेट कर रहे हैं, हिस्सा ले रहे हैं, मेरी समझ में यह बहुत अनुचित होगा और उसके सम्बन्ध में तो कुछ कहा ही नहीं जा सकता। आज वैसे इस वक्त कांग्रेस की सरकार है, लेकिन कांग्रेस की सरकार होते हुए भी कांग्रेस का जो आदमी है, कांग्रेस पार्टी का जो एक्टिव वर्कर है वह किसी सरकारी नौकरी में रह कर वहां ठीक से काम अंजाम नहीं दे सकता, उसको भी दिक्कत पड़ सकती है, इस तरह के आदमी का सरकारी नौकरी में होना हमारे काम के हित में नहीं होता है। तो मुर्जी की उन बातों को सुन कर जो आधार में बात करने का था वह तो कुछ बदल सा गया और मैं अपनी जगह पर सोचने लगा कि यह तो विषय ही कुछ दूसरा है, लेकिन चीक वह विषय उठ पड़ा है, जो उनके प्रस्ताव का विषय है उससे हमारे मुर्जी साहब बहुत दूर एक दूसरा रास्ता अपना निकाल कर चलने लगे और जिसके साथ मैं एक कदम भी चलना मुनासिब नहीं समझता। किसी पॉलिटिकल पार्टी के आदमी, किसी पॉलिटिकल वर्कर को रखना, सरकारी कर्मचारी बना कर रखना और यह समझना कि वहां ठीक काम होता जायगा निष्पक्ष रूप से, यह बड़ा कठिन होता है। उस वर्कर के लिये भी कठिनाई पड़ती है। इसके अलावा मैं यह भी निवेदन करूंगा कि हमारे देश में सरकारी कर्मचारी अस्थायी बहुत बड़ी संख्या में हैं और इसका एक विशेष कारण है। कारण यह है कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त होने के बाद हमें तरह तरह के सुधार के और विकास के विभागों को खोल करके उनमें हमको तरह तरह के अपने पढ़-लिखे आदमी,

टेकनिकल आदमी विशेष काम करने वाले आदमी उनको सब को काम करने के लिये रखना पड़ा और वह सार विभाग जिनमें वे रखे गये टैम्पेरी हैं तो जब विभाग ही अस्थायी हैं तो उसमें काम करने वाले कर्मचारी कैसे स्थायी हो सकते हैं, यह तो सोचने की बात है और इस बात के लिये शिकायत करना मेरी समझ में कुछ मुनासिब नहीं मालूम होता। हमारी सरकार को तो यह फिक्र है कि हम कितने आदमियों को जल्दी से जल्दी जहां कहीं भी मौका मिले उनको इम्प्लायमेंट दे उनके लिये रोजी का साधन मुहैया करें। पहला उद्देश्य तो हमारा यह है। दूसरा उद्देश्य सिक्वोरिटी वाला है जिस पर हमारे मुर्जी साहब बहुत जोर दे रहे हैं लेकिन मेरी राय में वह पहले उद्देश्य को बिल्कुल भूल जाते हैं जब वह दूसरे उद्देश्य को अपने सामने रखते हैं। जब वह सिक्वोरिटी की बात करने लगते हैं कि नौकरी में जो हैं उनको स्थायी किया जाये और उनकी नौकरी ठीक से जमी रहे तो यह सिक्वोरिटी की बात हुई लेकिन मैं उनसे बतलाऊं कि स्थायित्व की बात तो पीछे है, पहले तो सब लोगों को काम पर लगाने के लिये और सब को इम्प्लायमेंट देने के लिये साधन जुटाना है और जिन साधनों को जुटाने का अभी हमारी सरकार प्रबन्ध कर रही है और वह सभी लोगों के जीवन यापन का प्रबन्ध करने का प्रयास कर रही है और...

Mr. Chairman: May I enquire whether the hon. Member wants to continue?

पंडित मुनीश्वर वत्त उपाध्याय : थोड़ा समय और लूंगा।

Mr. Chairman: The House will now stand adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 25th September, 1954.