

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

we have five or ten hours to discuss it. Now even if we extend it, we can do it only by half an hour or one hour; not more. I agree with him that this is a very important subject. But, then, if the Government agrees, they might come forward with a resolution and then we can discuss it for a very long time—one day, two days or even three days.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Government is not likely to bring forward such a resolution.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): It is so static.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 2nd December, 1959."

The motion was adopted.

14.34 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: RE-ORGANISATION OF COUNTRY'S ADMINISTRATION—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Diwan Chand Sharma on the 20th November, 1959:—

"This House calls upon the Government to appoint a high powered Commission, consisting of public men, administrators and two judges of a High Court to suggest ways and means for the re-organisation of the country's administration so that it could be helpful in achieving the goal of a Welfare State."

Shri D. C. Sharma may continue his speech. He would have another fifteen minutes.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I require more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right, twenty minutes.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I was submitting last time that our administrative apparatus requires overhauling in view of the fact that we do not have a police State, or a law and order State. We now have, by and large, a welfare State. Now, what are the objectives of the welfare State? In the first place, every citizen of the welfare State should have sense of security, which is not easily disturbed. The dacoit menace in Rajasthan, the lack of security for those persons who travel on the railways, and all kinds of things happening in Delhi,—to give only a few instances—show that the sense of security is not there in as pronounced a degree as it should be. Again, we should have a sense of fairplay.

Now, unfortunately, in India we have come to acquire a kind of superstitious belief, a kind of mystical faith, in the value of recommendation. Now everybody thinks that anything can be got done if you get the proper sort of persons to recommend your case. I do not think that this holds good in all cases, but, unfortunately, this impression has gained more currency than it should. The result is that people speak always very uncharitably of even those bodies which should be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion, institutions like the Public Service Commission, our judiciary, our universities and our administrative organs. I do not subscribe to that view. But I think that this is what is being said, and this goes very much against the objectives of the kind of State that we are building up.

Then, the welfare State should promote a sense of unity. I think the

States Re-organisation Commission had given a good lead in this direction. So far as this was concerned, they had said that in appointments as judges and in I.A.S. and I.P.S. we should have non-local people also. But recently I have seen some articles in the Indian press which show that the proportion of non-local officers in the Indian services, and also the proportion of non-local judges in the various High Courts, has been diminishing gradually. So, instead of promoting a sense of oneness in our administrative apparatus, we are trying to develop regional and sectional tendencies. These tendencies, I need not say, are not always conducive to the good of our country.

Then, the welfare State should make the people believe that they are getting a fair deal. It should promote a sense of fair deal in the public, and also in the relations between the public and the administration. But I am sorry to say that this feeling of fair deal is not promoted.

14.39 hrs.

[SHERIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY in the Chair]

For instance, if you look at the Unstarred Questions today, you will find that there are six questions—Q. Nos. 966, 975, 976, 997, 980 and 1001—and all of them deal with some grievance which some section of our administration has against the Ministry or somebody else.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): Not somebody.

Shri D. C. Sharma: So, what it means is this: there is a state of uneasiness at all levels of our administration, and the lower we go the greater is the sense of uneasiness. I think this is something which should be looked into.

Then, the goal of a welfare State requires that we must practise economy. The other day I put a question about the economy effected in the High Commissioner's office in U.K. I must say that the Prime Minister is more vigilant about economy than many other Ministers and I was amazed to see how much economy had been effected in the expenditure of the U.K. Mission of ours, economy amounting to lakhs of rupees. So many posts have been abolished, because they were superfluous, so much of expenditure had been levelled down because it was unnecessary. All that had been done. I may tell you, when I visited London recently, I met one of the officers of the Indian Mission. He said to me, this Mission of ours in London is a great mission for unnecessary expenditure. Of course, he used a much stronger word than this; I do not want to use it. There is need for economy all along the line.

Even today, I found that there was a question put about economy measures which are being undertaken by the Finance Ministry and by other Ministries so far as their functioning is concerned. There is, therefore need for very rigid control over public expenditure of our country, and over tax-payers' money, for maximisation of results and minimisation of financial outlay.

A Welfare State requires that our administration should be speedy. It should not be synonymous with delay. I would request hon. Members to look through the Report of the Organisation and Methods Division. They will find how slowly the change over or, I would say, take over is effected from one place to another. I do not want to burden the House with facts and figures. Any report will show that. Arrears, thy name is modern administration. It is because there are vertical references,—I am now using technical words used by them—horizontal references. Recently, a seminar was held on Planning in the capital city of India.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

One of the hon. Members there said that it took about ten months to finalise a licence. He may have exaggerated it. There is no doubt about it that so far as speed is concerned, our administration will be found wanting judged by any standard. These are the objectives of a welfare state which cannot be overlooked.

Again, I would say, that a welfare state should give to every citizen a sense of well being. Are we promoting this sense of well being through our administration? I do not want to mention the name of a Ministry here, because I am not prone to accusing other persons of anything. If the hon. Home Minister were to go to one of the office of the Ministry here, he will find a large queue of applicants coming day after day with applications in their hands and finding that very little redress is given so far as their grievances are concerned. He should visit any District court, or any court of a Sub-divisional officer or any other court. He will find that the sense of well being which we want to engender in the minds of the people by our Plans is being destroyed; if not destroyed, it is being very much mitigated by the shortsighted policy which our administrators resort to from the patwari up to the highest. Our administration has so many things to its credit. It has also a few things to its discredit.

For instance, I would submit very respectfully that the organisational set up of the Government of India was studied by a committee headed by Shri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar. It was again scrutinised by another Member of the I.C.S., whose name I do not want to mention. Then, this was studied by Mr. Appleby. Of course, as a result of Mr. Appleby's report, we have the Indian School of Public Administration and the Organisation and Methods Division. All these persons have studied the problem. The difficulty is that all this has been piecemeal. Nobody has taken an overall view of the needs of

our administration. Nobody has taken an omnibus view of the deficiencies of our administration. Nobody has taken a comprehensive view of the needs of our administration. Nobody has done that. We have been tinkering with the problem. We have been trying to deal with this problem in a half-hearted and hesitant manner. We have not tried to catch the bull by the horns. The result is, while we make a change here or a change there, the basic things remain absolutely un-changed. That is what is happening.

For instance, there was a time when we had the colonial type of Government. We used to call our administrators civil servants. Why should you call them civil servants? At that time, the State had only two functions: to preserve order and to defend us. Now, this nomenclature, civil servant, is an outmoded nomenclature. I do not see why we should not call our administrators now social servants. Because, they are the servants of a State which has a socialist pattern of society. They are not working under a capitalist regime. They are not working in a colonial type of Government. But, we sometimes give wrong names to right things and sometimes we give right names to wrong things. Here, we have given a wrong name to a wrong thing. Therefore, I would say that the nomenclature of this should be changed.

I would say that what our administration needs today is re-thinking. Look at our Plans. Did we have any Plan when India was not free? Our Planning requires a new type of administrator. Look at the vast work of rural development. This rural development was just a drop in the ocean at that time. We are now spreading this gospel of community development all over India. Do we have the type of administrator that we need for this purpose? Again, we are having the autonomous corporations. The question of the autonomous corporations, I must submit,

was studied by a committee of the Congress Parliamentary party of which Shri Feroze Gandhi was the Secretary. I would say that we have new types of problems now. We have new types of ventures; now we have new kinds of duties. All these things require reorientation. But, still we are persisting in the old ruts and we are not doing anything.

Therefore, I submit, respectfully that we need two things. In the first place, we need democratic decentralisation. If you go to France, you will find that their administration is divided into two parts. There is general administration and there is social administration. The public is associated more and more with the latter, not in an advisory capacity. We also have advisory boards and all that kind of thing, but they do not mean much; they have no effect on the administration.

Therefore, I would say that in the first place we should have democratic decentralisation, and I think for that purpose we can find some material in the report which was submitted on community projects.

We also want functional representation, which means the association of the public with the administration from the lowest level to the highest level.

We do not want loyalty of the old type from our social servants, I do not call them civil servants. That loyalty is to laws, rules and regulations. That is also very good, but we also want loyalty from them to the socialist pattern of society, to the Indian way of life. I think that is what is needed in our country now.

Again, we have to draw up a kind of code. We talk about a code for the lawyers. We referred the Legal Practitioners Bill to the Joint Committee only yesterday. I am myself a party to a code for teachers. Similarly, there should be a code for our social servants also.

Again, if you look at the administrative structure of the Railway Ministry, God knows how many divisions of workers we have there. I think nobody can remember the number of divisions of the commercial clerks, the loco clerks, this and that clerk, and even in them there are so many divisions and subdivisions. This kind of stratification which we have in our country is not doing any good to the country.

We have to see how we can adjust the relationship all along the line. For example, there was a question today as to whether the Government had studied the relationship between the Minister and the Secretary. I do not know what the reply is, but I tell you the relationship between the Minister and the Secretary, the Secretary and the Joint Secretary, the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary and similarly the relationship all along the line has to be studied and has to be looked into.

You have rung the bell twice and I am a law-abiding citizen of India, and I do not want to encroach upon others' time. I would say this is a very big problem. The administration of the country is the basis for the welfare of the country, it is the key-stone of our official, social and administrative life and it should be looked into not in that half-hearted fashion to which we have been subjected all these days, but a commission should be appointed. We have appointed a Law Commission, a commission for education, the Pay Commission etc. This is the most important aspect of our work, and I think we should appoint a commission consisting of High Court Judges, public men and Members of this House so that they can give us a rationalised structure for our administration.

Mr. Chairman: Resolution moved:

"This House calls upon the Government to appoint a high-powered Commission, consisting of public men, administrators and two judges of a High Court, to

[Mr. Chairman]

suggest ways and means for the re-organisation of the country's administration so that it could be helpful in achieving the goal of a Welfare State."

There are two amendments. Both Shri M. L. Dwivedi and Shri Maiti are not here. So, they are not moved.

Now I call upon Shri S. M. Banerjee to speak, but before he proceeds, I would request hon. Members to take ten minutes each if possible because there are quite a large number of speakers who would like to participate, and I would like to call as many as possible. Therefore, if hon. Members confine their remarks to ten minutes, I think we may be able to accommodate more hon. Members. How long will the hon. Minister take?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I shall take about 20 to 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: So, it leaves us very little time, and there are about ten or twelve Members who want to speak. So, I would request that each Member may take about ten minutes. I will ring the bell after seven minutes, and by ten minutes they should conclude.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): It will be almost reducing the debate to a farce if such a subject is to be covered by any Member is seven to ten minutes. That is why I submitted even when the Speaker was here and again repeated it to the Deputy-Speaker, and he told us that it would be possible to accommodate the Members as there were not a large number of Members to speak. We do not want to block the other resolution, it can be moved, and still we can have more time for this, because it is of such importance.

Mr. Chairman: I agree that it is a very important resolution. It is

also correct that a very large number of Members desire to speak. Obviously in every debate we try to accommodate as many Members as possible. If an hon. Member makes a very striking contribution, surely we shall allow, but the point is that each person has a particular point of view, and I would request that as far as possible we should try and accommodate as many Members as possible.

Shri Datar: I have no objection if the Chair thinks it feasible to give some extension. I am prepared not to speak today but to reply the next time with a view to accommodate more speakers.

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid this House has already decided, and the Deputy-Speaker, before he left, told me that he had already made the position clear. Unless a new proposal is put here, we stick to that. Let us see how far we proceed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I rise to support the non-official resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma regarding the re-organisation of the country's administration.

I would like to read a few passages from the report on public administration by Shri Gorwala. He has started with this; this is what he has said in Chapter IV:

"In the circumstances of the present time the necessity of high moral standards for both the Government and the administration can hardly be exaggerated. The system of Government we have adopted postulates these standards. Parliamentary Government with a Cabinet system on the British mode cannot be effective unless the standard of morality of those who work is high and the general public believe it to be so. Without this, the parliamentary system may

limp along, but its existence will always be in danger, for there is no more potent weapon in the hands of the opponents of democracy than the ability to show that under the democratic system power passes into the hands of the corrupt and the self-seeker."

Today, those who are at the top of our administration, I would include the Ministers also, should become an ideal before us. But what is happening today? With a top-heavy administration, things are delayed more, and the representation of the common man to the highest man is not only delayed, but sometimes denied and denied very cruelly.

If we have to reorganise the administration, we have to consider all aspects of it—whether the administration of the country which is said to be wedded to socialism is trying its best to have a socialist society in the country, whether there is any need to change the present administration.

I have a bit of experience of this particular administration. I am not going to name any particular Ministry or Minister or officer, but I have seen that in cases of corruption where a representation is sent by an employee or a public man, the contents of that representation are sent to the very person against whom the complaint is made, asking his comments whether he was a good or a bad man. In that case, the man who reports against the particular officer who is said to be corrupt is punished and is dismissed from service. I can quote several instances of this kind both in the Defence Ministry and in the Railway Ministry, or, in fact, in any other Ministry. People have represented with full facts, but the net result was that those particular individuals were sacked from service. So, if this becomes the order of the day or this becomes the ruling of a particular administration that one cannot report against a particular officer on whom there is complete reliance by Gov-

ernment, then it becomes impossible for anyone to report against the present-day administration.

15 hrs.

I shall now quote from the same report as to what Shri A. D. Gorwala said about corruption. He said:

"Corruption, it is said, is often difficult to prove. All the more reason why there should not be the least hesitation in investigating every matter in which there is ground for complaint. Punishments too, for corruption, should be exemplary, the least being dismissal from service. There is in this matter of corruption one clear criterion which can be of great assistance in assessing the possibility or otherwise of its existence. Reputation can be taken as almost conclusive. It may be said of an officer who has no that particular fault, that he is harsh or rude or lazy, but it may be laid down almost as a rule that over a period it will not be said of an officer who is honest that he is dishonest."

So, he has clearly stated the position. Now, all representations are turned down or rejected on the ground that there is no proof. Corruption cases cannot be proved. It is known better to the hon. Minister than to me or to anybody in this House. Still, if there are cases of corruption, how are we to investigate them? Sometimes, it comes to the Intelligence Branch; I do not quite know. In this country, we have the Central Intelligence, the Military Intelligence, the State Intelligence, and the District Intelligence Branches, but I am afraid that there is no common Intelligence in them. That is the tragedy of this country. The case is reported to so many people, but nothing comes out, and the man who reports is sacked. I would respectfully submit to the hon. Minister that he should consider this matter.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

The entire administration will crack, if the men at the top are not men of integrity. I do not impute any motive or make any allegation against any officer who is at the top, but I say that they should set the example for others, in regard to integrity. The Minister and the administrator must safeguard the interests of the people. We have passed several pieces of legislation here in this House, and the Minister is responsible for their implementation; he is definitely responsible, because he himself was a party to the passing of those laws. But what about their implementation? The laws are not being implemented properly.

I might quote here an instance of a minor nature. Some of the pensioners in Rajasthan, some time ago, I believe, in 1952, or 1953 reported to the Defence Ministry that they were not getting their pensions. The matter was properly investigated, and it was found that orders were issued from the Defence Ministry and the money was also sanctioned, but the Naib Tahsildar of that particular place could not find a proper proforma on which this payment could be made. Ultimately, it was found that the tahsildar took two and a half years to find a proper proforma on which proper payments could be made; and when the payments were about to be made, it was unfortunately found that the claims had become time-barred. So, my submission is that let us consider all these reports. I have here in my possession another report from which I wanted to read some portions, and that is the report of the Administrative Reforms Committee appointed by the Government of Kerala. This particular report of 1958 is the latest one on the subject and it is a very good report, which has also safeguarded the interests of the secretaries and other officials, and also defined their relations with the Minister and how the Minister must react to it.

Another point which I want to mention is how in most of the cases that we have seen, economy is effected. Whenever we have asked any question in this House about effecting economies, the answer has been that certain persons have been discharged or that certain clerks have been demoted or reverted. In this country, what is happening is this. If you want to earn easy money, somebody will ask you to prepare a plan, and you submit an attractive plan and you will get the money. If you want to employ some relations of yours or somebody who is near to you, then you may do it in the name of reorganisation of a particular Ministry or Department. I submit that this should not be the case. There should be proper vigilance in regard to these matters.

I am quite confident that the volume of work in this country has increased abnormally. Nobody disputes that. But if we have a proper assessment, we shall still come to the conclusion that we can have efficient functioning, with the present staff or, in certain cases, with less under-secretaries, deputy secretaries or top-heavy people.

In the end, I would only submit that this is a matter which should be considered. Otherwise, the faith in parliamentary democracy or in the parliamentary form of government is shaken. There is a saying in Bengali which says that anybody who goes to Lanka becomes a Ravana.

Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri):
The hon. Member may say it in Bengali.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: *Je Jai Lankai
Shei Hoi Robon.*

I do not want that anybody who comes into power should become a Ravana; let us not convert this country into Lanka.

Shri Narasimhan: I shall be very brief, and I shall not take up much time. There is absolutely no doubt that the subject which has been

brought before us is a very important one. We are seeing day by day that many of our desires, ambitions and plans do not get fulfilled in the way we would like them to be, and we have also realised that this is partly due to the failure of the administrative machinery. In fact, not a day passes without our seeing some failure here or some failure there in the official side, and somehow, we have to get things done. This is the sad experience, I suppose, of most of the Members also, when they want to play their part in the fulfilment of the Plan.

There are certain tendencies and trends in the official machinery which we should take note of. Of course, there is the well-known ancient red tape. There is also the fact that it is very difficult to control corruption. There is also another aspect of the matter, namely over centralisation. Decentralisation will be to some extent a good remedy. I would like, for instance, that instead of emphasising on having a central management at the very centre of the country, we may have some part of it at least shifted to some other place at the Zonal Council level. That experiment may also be tried. We have created certain zonal organisations statutorily, they have certain functions. If the Government at the Centre are not very much willing to part with their powers to the State level, they can at least part with many of their powers at the Zonal Council level.

Then, there is the police administration. The laws that we pass have to be enforced only through the police. But we think whenever we see that any of the laws fail, that the only way is to make it a success is to make it more stringent and make the punishment more deterrent by increasing it. But that is not the remedy. That is not the difficulty either. The real difficulty is the failure of the machinery itself to cope with the situation in regard to detection of crimes etc. For the failure of our organisation in the

matter of equipment and forensic knowledge etc. to cope with detection of crimes, we in Parliament are advised to go on making the laws more and more stringent. But a close and forthright examination of the laws will make it clear that it is no use doing like this, it is no use meting out an extraordinary punishment for a small offence. Take, for instance, the Dowry Prohibition Bill which is under discussion here. We go on adding punishments, by saying 'imprisonment and fine' and so on. But for that kind of offences, the punishment prescribed is not the proper punishment. It may be a social evil; it may be a very great social evil and the need to remedy it may be urgent. But when parents want their daughters to be given in marriage, they just do something by way of giving dowry which may, legally speaking, be incorrect, but one has to remember that they are influenced by social pressure. So they do something for which they are sure to be punished.

This kind of approach to the question arises because of the failure of our official organisation, the governmental organisation, to cope with situations. People in the organisation are not geared properly to this requirement. Therefore, a considerable rearrangement, re-examination and re-education is necessary.

Take another instance—of statistics. There are various departments of statistics. Statistics are meant to be collected and utilised. But actually they come very late, sometimes too late. Even the weather report sometimes says that there will be rain—after the rain is over!

There is another tendency on the part of Government, as things stand today. When I say 'Government', I include the Secretariat also in it. I am referring to the practice of putting technical men in various departments under non-technical people, in the matter of scientific research and other matters. Ultimately, the Secretary functions. The technical men

[Shri Narasimhan]

are not allowed to hold their own. Something or other prevents them from functioning. Even where a technical man is put as the head of a department, he is overlooked. The whole thing is managed by ICS people. The scope for chemical engineers in scientific research and other things is also limited in the matter of selection and nomination to various research departments. Ultimately, the Secretary who has his pull with the Minister functions; his view alone prevails.

In the matter of selection of these technical persons also, such things happen. Technical men are selected by the selecting Commissions while non-technical men are there. The UPSC is there; when technical people are selected, the Secretary of the department is associated with the selecting Commission. But if he also happens to be a non-technical man, it does not do well. There have been cases of men not very first rate being selected simply because of the fact that the selecting personnel do not contain technical men.

These are many of the defects. Something must be done. Many people have written reports on this. Mr. Appleby has given a big report. Shri Gorwala had also submitted a report. Off and on we have been saying that something must be done. Something has to be done. Otherwise, in place of democracy, we will only have bureaucracy and there will not be any progress.

There are also other tendencies on the part of officials. Now the laws are there and penalties are also there. Crimes are committed; I am not speaking of crimes in the proper sense of the term, but legal crimes, legally created fictions. They are not really crimes but merely cases of forgetfulness or irregularity. Companies are asked to submit returns. Theatres are asked to file returns. A formal application has to be made to the prescribed authority. If an application is made to the prescribed autho-

ry regarding any change to be made, due to official delays it takes even two years for a reply to be received. Just on account of that, a businessman is supposed to have committed a crime. Then all of a sudden after two years of silence on the part of the official, the letter comes and says: 'Look here. You have not got permission for this. Two years have elapsed. Therefore, you have committed a crime. You do like this, you do like that'.

I can cite one instance. It is a matter not pertaining to the Centre but administered by the State. A cinema theatre owner wanted his rates to be changed according to the naya paisa system. He did change the rates and, as everyone else did, in the process he added a naya paisa or so in his favour. He had written to the authorities for written consent. But somehow or other, the theatre owner was careless about it. After two years comes a letter from the authorities: 'You did not take permission beforehand. You have been violating the law for two years. You have transgressed the law. You close the cinema for a month'. This was just at the time when that theatre owner had got a very good popular picture to show to his village.

This kind of thing happens. That is, the officials do not act quickly. They are allowed to delay matters. In the process, certain people appear to have committed offences and they are visited with punishment. There are ever so many weaknesses of the official machinery. There is a growing necessity for everything to be geared to our goal of a Welfare State and whatever is done to that end will be welcomed by the public who are groaning under the weight of bureaucratic deficiencies.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): This is a subject of perennial interest and it is good we come to it once and again for considering afresh the ways and means of how to tone up the administration. But having said that,

If I am not in agreement with the Resolution as it has been moved by my hon. friend, it is for the reason that it is going to yield no practical result, barring some waste of public money, time and energy.

I might recall that right from Shri Gorwala to Mr. Appleby of the Ford Foundation, many persons and bodies have gone into the question of public administration and we remain where we were. Therefore, I think no useful purpose will be served if another Commission consisting of public men, High Court Judges and the rest is appointed to go into this question once again. After all, it is a matter of common knowledge that High Court Judges are not as efficient as they are supposed to be, for we know the quantum of cases in arrears piling up every day in High Courts. It is not that a public man or a Judge or for the matter of that, a Member of Parliament is imbued with a special virtue which can really tone up the administration. It is a technical question and it is time enough that we paid some amount of technical attention to this problem.

For instance, we talk of a Welfare State. Well and good. This country is pledged to the goal of a Welfare State. But the Welfare State is not going to be ushered in by us through speeches on the floor of this House or outside. There should be an instrument which can bring about the objectives of the Welfare State, and that instrument is the public administrative apparatus. But what do we find? We find a peculiar phenomenon in this country that while we have pledged ourselves to the fulfilment of the objectives of a Welfare State, we still maintain the steel frame of public administration which we had inherited from the British. I am not allergic to anything that is British. The little point I want to make is that under the British system of administration, permanent civil service; grew up; whether you are efficient or not, whether you are capable of delivering the goods or not, it does not

200(Ai) L.S.D.—7.

matter; once you are a member of the permanent civil service, you are entitled to all the safeguards which are conferred on it under that service. In our Constitution, also, we find that the former ICS personnel have been guaranteed certain safeguards. I believe the Government have very little authority to tamper with those safeguards guaranteed under the Constitution to these civil servants. The time at my disposal being very short I cannot dilate on it. But the only thing that I wish to bring to the notice of this House is that the milieu in which the permanent civil servants were flourishing at the time of the British has been completely changed.

We brought to this country an administrative expert named Paul Appleby. The other day I was reading a book written by Harold Laski on the administration of U.S.A. where-in you might find a mention about Appleby. It will be interesting for this House to note that Mr. Appleby started his career as a fruit vendor in the streets of Washington. He had no university degree. He came almost from the ditches; he joined the Ministry of the Interior and with his efficiency he impressed the authorities so much that went up the ladder and occupied a very important post in the American administration. We invited him to this country to advise us as to how to tone up our administration.

The story has a moral. Here we go by birth; we go by degrees whether they have any practical significance or not. Irrespective of that we attach undue importance to birth. If I am fortunate enough to have been born in the family of a Minister or a Secretary no matter how capable or otherwise I am I am given a sort of weightage. If I come from a Harijan family I am given another weightage. If I come from the tribal areas, again, I am given a further weightage. If you go further south, if I come from the Brahmin family I incur some dis-

[Shri Mahanty]

qualification but if I come from the Harijan family I gain some weightage. Like that all kinds of currents and cross currents are going on in public service as a result of which you find a set of people who have been practically de-activated.

When we come to the administration what do we find? Nobody is prepared to take any responsibility at any stage. There will be all kinds of references, horizontal and vertical references. I do not know where these two cut. It will be for the persons dealing with these horizontal and vertical references to know where they cut and what results they yield and what it will be in terms of efficiency. Be that as it may, today we are confronted with a unique situation. It is being said day in and day out by our leaders and the Prime Minister that this country should become industrialised. I want to cite a concrete instance.

We are also connected with industry. As such we have to come in contact with this Government, at many levels. I tell you in all seriousness that the way in which this Government has been functioning, not a blade of grass will grow in this country, what to speak of industry. So many bottlenecks have been created in the Ministry. You go to the office of the Controller of Imports and Exports and you will find that so many bottlenecks have been built, that nothing moves on.

Here is the question of industrialising the country wherein each moment counts. The entrepreneurs have to wait indefinitely even for getting small things done. If they have to wait because of this shuttlecocking of files between one Ministry and the other or between different sections of one Ministry, it is time enough to see how we improve the job.

As far as I am concerned, though I believe it is time enough that we streamline our administration, that

objective is not going to be achieved by appointing any Commission because that Commission will only publish another bulky report which will be duly consigned to the archives of the Government of India. What we want to do is to change the very pattern of our administration. Let us be bold enough to say that in this country we will have no permanent civil service. What we will judge is efficiency. It is true that efficiency like paternity is uncertain while seniority like maternity is a fact. If somebody is senior he is senior, he has put in so many years of service. Efficiency is a little more uncertain and makes way for all kinds of favouritism. I do admit there is that danger. But with vigilant public opinion and Parliament, I believe, evils of that kind will be very greatly minimised. But the point is are we going to say that no matter what one is, since he has put in 25 years or more of service he is going to be in charge of things for which he is singularly incompetent.

You know the controversy we had in the Army about the three gentlemen next to Gen. Thimmayya. We were told that seniority would not count. What was to be counted was efficiency. In one of the wings of our administration we have already accepted the fact that seniority need not necessarily be the only criterion for promotion. Let us be bold enough and let us say that every public servant is going to be judged by the single standard of efficiency alone. Otherwise we do not know to what morass this country is being consigned. Whether it is the judiciary or the executive, whether you go to the High Court or the lower courts or whether you go to the Secretariat departments, you will find files and files of papers are piling up every day.

When we talk of a Welfare State, I believe, our objective is that the taxpayers and the citizens will be entitled to the courtesy and efficiency that is their due. Neither do we find courtesy. The same bureaucratic and

steel-frame approach is maintained. Nor do we find efficiency. That efficiency is lost, as I pointed out earlier, in the vertical and horizontal references.

With these words, even though I am in agreement with the spirit of the resolution I oppose it because I do not think that the appointment of another Commission is going to improve matters, as they are today.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Madam Chairman, though my hon. friend who just preceded me has, throughout his speech, underlined the necessity of a re-examination of our administrative machinery, he says that a Commission would not serve any useful purpose. I think a proper approach to the problem will convince him that the hon. Member who has moved this Resolution has rendered great service and has underlined the most immediate and urgent demand of the times by asking for the appointment of a Commission.

Of course, I do not agree with the constitution of the Commission as has been suggested by him in his Resolution. I will presently show, as I go from point to point, that we in this country have had absolutely no Commission of the type which my hon. friend contemplates for the last 40 years. As a matter of fact, it was more than 40 years ago that we had an Islington Commission of which Shri Gokhale of revered memory was a member. We had no such Commission at all. The sketchy reports which have come before us and which are diverting our attention from the real issues do not deserve any attention.

I have gone through the Gorwala Committee's Report; I have gone through the Appleby Report. They have a very limited purpose to which we might attach little importance. But they cannot take the place of a commission of the nature which is very necessary to look into the governmental as well as administrative structure.

We had one Commission in England, the Haldane Commission after the First World War which went into the most important aspects of governmental responsibility. It makes classic reading even today. In the United States of America we had the Hoover Commission. It is not like Shri Appleby coming and making a report. We all know the name of Hoover, the most distinguished President of the United States. He was the man who headed that Commission and it has produced the most valuable report. We want a Commission of that type. If we have that type of Commission it will yield concrete results in improving the complete structure of the administration and in revising our rules and procedure and the method of administration. The urgency for such a Commission can hardly be over-emphasised.

This Resolution raises an issue of very vital importance in the present context. The stability of democracy and the success of our Plans depend entirely on the administrative machinery which we will have to evolve to meet new situations. I would draw your attention to the observations made by the Home Minister himself while he was speaking at the Institute of Public Administration, when under the guidance of Shri C. D. Deshmukh, a distinguished son of this country, a seminar was held and the morale of public services was the subject considered. The Home Minister himself underlined the need and necessity of some sort of a thorough enquiry because he admitted that the present administrative machinery was designed for an entirely different purpose and to work under an absolutely different set of conditions. Now, you are wanting to stretch it and strain it to meet the present demands and then blame the administrative machinery. It is most uncharitable to them. I will not go into the details of the weaknesses of the administration. Anybody can speak for hours on the subject. I will only deal with the broad and important aspects of the question. Rahu,

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Kethu and Sani have seized the administrative machinery; they are the delays, corruption and wasteful expenditure. We have been all the time talking about them. Still I will say that I do not blame the services at all for this. What are the services constituted of? They are constituted of the best educated among us in this country who come through competitive examination. Many of the officers, old and young, are as patriotic as anybody sitting here. How do we say that we, who sit here, are more patriotic or honest than the services? I would go a step further and say that services are what the Government and this Parliament makes them to be. We are reflected in the conduct of the services. How does the Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee, the Estimates Committee or the Ministers conduct themselves? They are reflected in the services. If there is dishonesty at the top level, slackness at the top level it is reflected thousand fold right down below in the services. How can you blame the horse if it goes astray? If the rider does not hold the reins or does not know how to ride, the horse is bound to go astray. How can I blame the services? I have met many among them. They are working overtime; are as patriotic and as keen to push forward our schemes as we are. But they find themselves absolutely helpless in the machinery in which they find themselves.

I would just give a small instance. The Comptroller and Auditor-General who is an independent authority and who has got all the powers according to our calculations was addressing only the other day the Accountant-Generals of the various States and I shall read two or three lines out of his speech.

He says:

"I will now come to the most important point—simplification of financial rules and accounting procedures."

I asked a question this morning on this particular point. He says further:

"I am sure that if we simplify the rules and procedure we would be able to eliminate petty objections and irritating delays".

He had referred this matter quite a long time back to a sort of a high-powered Cabinet committee. The Cabinet Secretary was one of the members, the Finance Secretary was another member and a third member was his own representative. Nothing has come out. He wrote to the Prime Minister and he has stated his conclusions:

"I think it is resting on its laurels having secured a measure of financial devolution in favour of the Ministries".

It is a very minor point. What would the poor civilian servant do if he is riddled with those outmoded rules and regulations? He is there only to go according to them. I have touched only this very minor point. The entire structure has got to be changed.

My friend talked about the Commerce and Industry Ministry. It has made considerable improvements in its various branches of administration. But every businessman and every entrepreneur complains today that because of the administrative rules and regulations of this Ministry and its slow-moving machinery, bottle-necks are created in the way of development. Right from the small-scale industry man upto Shri G. D. Birla say this. We do not very much go by Shri Birla's speech. He has said that it takes about 8-9 months to get the green signal from the Ministry. Are we to blame the Commerce and Industry Ministry? This Ministry was constituted only for regulatory purposes at sometime. It had no developmental outlook. It did not know anything as to how to

conduct business. I think—I do not know—the Home Ministry has already appointed a Committee of Secretaries. But a Committee of the Secretaries is not even an apology for the type of commission we want. The poor Secretaries, whom I have defended at the present moment, are themselves the ailing patients. How can they look at these problems? Today new problems are arising, after Independence. We have now the Planning Commission. Nobody, no Commission examined what should be the relationship of the Planning Commission to the Ministries and again, the Central Government and the State Governments. These are the things which will have to be examined by this high-powered Commission, if you are to get through your Plans.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I have not even covered one third.

Mr. Chairman: I have given him more time than anybody else. He can go on for another 3-5 minutes but there is no unlimited time.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is an important subject. But I will sit down when you ask me even though my speech is half-finished.

Shri Goray (Poona): Will it be possible to extend the time? . . . (Interruptions.) The subject is very important and we should be allowed to express our views.

Mr. Chairman: I think the remarks of the hon. Member do not represent the correct position. Just before the hon. Members asked for this, I believe—I was not in the House—the question had already been put and the hon. Deputy-Speaker told me that the time had already been extended right up to 5 or 3 minutes to 5 P.M. It has already been extend-

ed. That is what he gave me to understand.

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): It was already extended by 27 minutes . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: I think Shri Mathur will have to find out if he wants a very long time to make his speech. Obviously it cannot be more than ten minutes, more than anybody else. He will have to confine his speech to that. If he says that he has not even touched a fraction of what he has to say, I am afraid he will have to leave out certain portions of his speech.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I will see. As I told you, I am absolutely in your hands; you can stop me whenever you like.

Mr. Chairman: Please continue . . .

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I made this request to the hon. Deputy-Speaker also. I was saying that we have to face very many new problems, problems which we had never imagined, problems to which the administration had never given any consideration. I just gave you the example of the Planning Commission. Take, again, the National Development Council. You will remember that our ex Food Minister, only the other day, wrote two articles which make one feel absolutely agitated. One does not know where the Minister stands, what is the relationship of the National Development Council so far as the Planning Commission is concerned, so as the Central Ministries are concerned, so far as the State Ministries are concerned. These are very important problems which have got to be looked into and examined so that the Minister does not find himself absolutely in the lurch, absolutely in difficulty, in the blind alley. He has raised this point. It comes out of this, that we have to examine this problem.

[Shri Harihar Chandra Mathur]

Take another thing. We are now, under this Plan, making huge contributions to non-official bodies, some grants-in-aid. Some comprehensive study has got to be made as to how these aids should be given, what should be the relationship, what should be the control etc. Somebody said, if you give any aid, if you set up any public enterprises you must do this and you must do that. No comprehensive study of the problem has been made, which is absolutely essential. It is absolutely essential, if the administration is to be run properly, that something is done about it.

Therefore, I submit, again, that it is not a few Secretaries who can look into the matter. It is not Mr. Gorwala, it is not Mr. Appleby who can examine it. It is only a high-powered commission which can look into it. What we are examining, as a matter of fact, is a very important issue. I have, as a matter of fact, four or five issues. They should be examined by that commission. We had a committee in the Congress Party, and the expenditure is frozen today. We must look into it in a thorough and proper manner. What I would like to examine is reduction of expenditure, elimination of duplication of services, consolidation of work and abolition of non-essential services. If we take the relationship between the Secretaries and Ministers, the autonomy of the States and the autonomy of the new enterprises, there is complete confusion. We do not know where we stand. If we are to do real justice—it does not matter if this report takes another two years to come; we shall be prepared—we will have to do this, and then we shall be prepared to deal with our Third Plan in a much better manner. Therefore, it is of prime importance that we appoint such a high-powered Commission today. It would be of great assistance and help, as a matter of fact, to the Ministry itself. If it gives a report

within two years time and we set our administrative machinery and other things in such a way that they will be able to meet the demand of the day, the situation of the day, the new problems which have crept up before us, I think we will be rendering a very great service to the country.

Having underlined very strongly the necessity for such a high-powered commission, I would like to draw the pointed attention of the House to two or three very important aspects which must be agitating the minds of everyone here today. What happens is, unfortunately, we cannot consider the administrative machinery in isolation. The administrative machinery has got to be considered in relation with the Parliament and in relation with the Ministers. Has there been a proper adjustment between the Ministers, the legislators and the services? This is a very crucial point. I have talked to many senior civil servants, people engaged on developmental works. They do not take decisions. Everybody shuns decision; he wants to throw responsibility on somebody else. They think that the Public Accounts Committee is a dread to them. This matter has to be examined. I do not blame the Public Accounts Committee or the Estimates Committee. But we must see that the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee do not have a paralysing effect, but they have a healthy and stimulating effect. We have got to define the relationship with the Minister. What is happening today? We are forming into a vicious circle. The politician is condemning the services, the services do not get an opportunity to condemn the politician in the open but they have got the least regard for the politician today and the politician is coming day by day into public contempt. As a matter of fact, for various reasons, he is to be blamed. We have not got any code of conduct for ourselves. He is coming into contempt in the public eyes. People say,

so far as students are concerned he should be kept out, so far as labourers are concerned he should be kept out so far as panchayats are concerned he should be kept out, so far as community development is concerned he should be kept out. This is a very serious and dangerous situation that is developing. Again, we say here that the Services are thoroughly corrupt, inefficient this, that and the other. If we develop this sort of contempt in the public mind, and I am afraid this contempt is developing every day in the mind of the people, contempt for politician, contempt for the services, what do we lead to? As a matter of fact, we are only moving farther and farther away from democracy. This is the end and the death-knell of democracy, if the politician and the services stand condemned in the eyes of the people.

Until and unless we create a great respect for the politician as well as the services so far as the public is concerned we are doomed. This is a very important matter. I think it would be necessary to redefine our responsibility, to understand the responsibility of the ruling party. The responsibility of the ruling party is very great. As a matter of fact, most of the responsibility lies with the ruling party. You cannot have efficient services until and unless the ruling party has a code of conduct for itself, a code of conduct which will create great respect for it in the country, a code of conduct which will create a great respect for the ruling party in the minds of the services in this country.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Madam, I close my speech without touching two or three other important points because there is no time.

Shri Nagi Reddy: Madam, let me begin my speech with a quotation from Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's book

The Discovery of India in which he aptly quoted:

"The Bengal Administrative Inquiry Committee, in their report, say:

'So widespread has corruption become, and so defeatist is the attitude taken towards it, that we think that the most drastic steps should be taken to stamp out the evil which has corrupted the public service and public morals'.

The Committee received, with surprise and regret, evidence that the attitude of some civil servants towards the public left much to be desired. It was stated that they adopt an attitude of aloof superiority, appear to pay greater regard to the mechanical operation of a soulless machine than to promoting the welfare of the people and look upon themselves rather as masters than as servants of the people."

That was two years before independence was achieved. My question to the Ministry is, what steps have we taken, after such pertinent remarks made about the administration, within these ten years to see that the administration is toned up, is brought nearer to the people, and to implement the new policy that the Government has taken into its hands, the policy of planned economy and our development towards a socialist society. Any administration which is set up serves a particular objective. The British Government when it was here, had as its objective the collection of land revenue or revenue in general and keeping law and order intact. These were the two major factors of administration so far as the British Government was in existence. Independence came, and then we began our grand economy eight years ago. Three years back, we declared that our objective was the socialist pattern of society. Yet, we are

[Shri Nagi Reddy]

continuing on the same super-structure which had been built by the British imperialism. Therefore it is that we are finding ourselves in the most difficult situation today.

If there is any change that has taken place at all in our administration, it is this. Here is a small comment made by Sir John Thorne, once a very distinguished member of the ICS. When he joined the Government of India in 1935, he says that in his department there were only six persons down to the Under Secretary including one Member of Council. He says that when he visited India in 1956, the staff in that department was "one Minister, one Deputy Minister, one Secretary, one Additional Secretary, four Joint Secretaries, fourteen Deputy Secretaries and twenty-three Under Secretaries". Add to all this, he remarks:

"Now everyone down to Deputy Secretaries (inclusive) has at least one Private Secretary or Personal Assistant, sitting in ante-rooms and protecting their masters from interruption by telephone or otherwise".

That is the fundamental change, I am afraid, we have made in our administrative set-up after we became independent. Therefore it is that even to this day, our administrative machine is as soulless, perhaps eight times more soulless than it was ten years ago. The result of this, nobody knows as to where things can be got done. It is so from the village peasant up to the Members of Parliament. There is no doubt about it. Even if Members of Parliament want certain things, they have to wait until the department gets it done. Of course, because he is a Member of Parliament he might come to know about a thing within three hours or in some cases within three or four days, but non outside can get anything.

Shri Narasimham: So they are very impartial, and soul-less in that sense.

Shri Nagi Reddy: The position has been described long, long ago, by one of the great novelists in the world, realistically, in his novel, *Little Dorrit*. That novel is by Charles Dickens. In that novel, one of the characters goes to a very important member of the administration, Mr. Barnacle, of whom it is said:

"This touch and go young Barnacle had "got up" the Department in a private secretaryship, that he might be ready for any little bit of fat that came to hand; and he fully understood the Department to be a politico-diplomatic hocus pocus piece of machinery for the assistance of the nobles in keeping off the snobs".

That was a most pertinent remark about the type of administration that was existing at that time in Britain which, probably very successfully, we have copied here in our country today. Mr. Barnacle goes on to point out what is to be done if anything has got to be done. He says:

"When the business is regularly before that Department, whatever it is...then you can watch it from time to time through that Department. When it comes regularly before this department, then you must watch it from time to time through this Department. We shall have to refer it right and left; and when we refer it anywhere, then you will have to look it up..."

I do not want to read the whole of it. But it is very interesting and I wish the hon. Minister takes a little time off from his very prosaic duty of administration and go through this novel. Then he will understand

what the Government departments are doing, and how they were working in Britain at that time.

Therefore, what is the result? The result has been very pertinently remarked by the panel of the Planning Commission which, I think, in 1956, has said as follows:

"Even the most carefully considered law will however fail to achieve its object unless it is supported by firm and thorough going administrative action. Problems relating to administrative organisation should therefore receive immediate attention".

Why did they say that? They said so after reviewing the major legislations that have been passed in the country in relation to land, as for example, the tenancy reform laws and the zamindari abolition laws. What was the result of these laws? Did the people get even the little benefit that was expected out of those laws? No. Why did the panel say that? They went into it very closely and came out with the most apt definition saying that the administration unfortunately was tilted to wards the landlords. Let me read out the relevant portions so that the point may be made very clear. They said that "the attitude of the revenue officers may at times be unconsciously against him". Against whom? Against the tenant. They further say:

"In the case of conflicting evidence, there is a greater tendency to believe the landlord than the tenant, the presumption being that a poor man is more likely to speak untruth with a view to obtain some land than the rich landlord who having already enough land, may not be under immediate pressure to do so".

This is what exactly I would like the Minister to realise. This tendency should be stopped. Unless we are

able to stop this tendency in the outlook of the administrative personnel, or, to put it bluntly, even in the outlook of the ministry that is ruling the country, whatever laws we may pass, whatever enactments we might get through day in and day out, I am sure that even one-tenth of the benefits that the peasant or the common man of the country should receive will not be received by him. It is with this idea in mind that I want a commission to be appointed to go into the whole question as to what our objective is, how our objective can be implemented, what type of administrative machinery is necessary to implement this objective and how from top to bottom we will be able to keep the people in constant contact with the administration, so that there will be closer co-operation between the people on the one hand and the administration on the other.

We have not even tried to change the patwari system and the duties of the patwari in our country. I myself come from a family of patwaris, and I know the mischief of the patwari, what mischief he can do. Our whole administration stands on that single pedestal of the patwari, in the village. The village is our backbone; the village is our foundation-stone. You have panchayats. In Andhra we are going to have an extension of the panchayat system up to Zila Parishad. Yet, these panchayats do not have that most important administrative duty of keeping the revenue records or continuing to keep the revenue records. It is the patwari who is most important, and no tenant, no agricultural labourer has ever got any justice done. The Congress agrarian reform movement gave the same slogan. The panel of the Planning Commission has given us the same slogan. Yet, with all this experience, we have not found it necessary to change the administrative pattern of society. I wish that a Commission is appointed to go into this matter.

[Shri Nagi Reddy]

I am thankful to Shri D. C. Sharma the experienced professor in this House, for having brought this resolution, and I am sure Government will accept it and try to see the reality as it is, through the Commission which should be appointed. I also plead that the recommendations of the Commission should be implemented.

श्री पद्म देव (अम्बा) : सभावेधी महोदया, अंग्रेजी ने लुई से नहीं बल्कि मजदूरियों के कारण इस देश के शासन की बागडोर कांधेस को जिस्तने कि भारत की स्वाधीनता के लिए अतत प्रयत्न किया था, सौरी । जिन विचार-धाराओं के लिए या जिस स्वयं का मूर्त रूप में अपने के लिए भारतीयों ने जग की भी और उसके अनुधार अपने देश को बनाना था उसके लिए उनके पास उस वक्त मशीनरी मौजूद नहीं थी । प्रशासन का जो ढांचा अंग्रेजी राज्य में था उसको ही भारतीयों ने अपनाया और काफी लोगों ने कहा कि यह नई बोटल में बुरानी शराब रखी गई है । मैं यह तो नहीं कहता कि इस १३ साल के समय में भारत में कोई उन्नति नहीं हुई, महान् उन्नति हुई है किन्तु देश में प्रशासन के सम्बन्ध में हम विचार करते हैं तो कुछ इसके अन्दर विवशता सी दिखती है । इसके खालू करने में निपोटिज्म मेरा मतलब है रैंड टैपिज्म इस समय सबसे अधिक बढ़ा हुआ नजर आता है । उसके लिए सरकार ने एमो एंड एम डिबीजन बनाया है जिसके कि सैकशन हर एक मिनिस्ट्री के साथ लग है किन्तु इसने कितनी उन्नति की है इसको प्रशासन अच्छी प्रकार से जान सकता है । ऐसा नजर आता है कि उन्नति जरूर कुछ हुई लेकिन आज के एटैमिक युग में वह उतनी नहीं हुई जितनी कि होनी चाहिए थी ।

मैं इस बात में पूर्ण विश्वास रखता हूँ कि बिचारे जो मेका मोप हैं वो पूरी तरह से खर्क हैं और वो देश को अपने के बनावा चाहते हैं । देश के अन्दर सन्धि लाना चाहते हैं लेकिन कुछ ऐसी

मददने बीच में चल रही हैं कि इतना अपना खर्च करने के बावजूद भी जो व देखना चाहते हैं व शायद उनको भी नहीं दिखती ।

दूसरी बाँव जैसे मैं ने कहा कि कप्तान बनाने के लिए हमेशा मकान निर्वाह की जरूरत रहती है । शासन चलाने के लिए शासकों की जरूरत रहती है । इस समय जितनी अपने देश के अन्दर खर्चसेज हैं, मेरे मतलब में केन्द्रीय सरकार के कोई ५५ लाख कार्यकर्ता होने जिन्होंने कि इस देश के भारी भार को अपने धिर पर उठा रखा है । इसके अन्दर कुछ

16 hrs.

स्टैंडिटी नजर नहीं आती । कारण उसका वे हैं कि एक तो हर प्रकार का इंटरफीरेंस होता है हस्तक्षेप होता है जिससे कि कर्मचारी स्वतन्त्रतापूर्वक अपने काम के मुताबिक देश के कार्य भार को वहन नहीं करते और व ही अपना दायित्व समझते हैं । फाइलें एक जगह से दूसरी जगह और दूसरी जगह से तीसरी जगह इस तरह से चलती रहती हैं और कई दफा तो ऐसा भी होता है कि कई केसेज का सालों तक निर्णय नहीं होता । यह इसलिए भी होता है क्योंकि नियुक्तियों में भी कुछ ठीक ढंग का कार्य नहीं चलता, कई बार पक्षपात इत्यादि भी होता है और बीच में दखल देते हैं और उसका नतीजा यह है कि जो हमारे कार्य की स्टेज होनी चाहिए थीं वह नहीं होतीं बल्कि हर काम को सेटलाइज करने की कोशिश की जाती है और डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन की तरफ पग नहीं उठाया जाता और जिसका कि नतीजा यह है कि हर कोई जिम्मेदारी को महसूस न करता हुआ काम को घाग से घाग टालता है । मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि कुछ डिसेंसन का अभाव नजर आता है । जल्दी से किसी बीच में निर्णय लेना चाहिए, ऐसा नहीं होने पाता । इसका मूल कारण मानूँ नहीं क्योंकि होता तो ऐसा ही चाहिए था जो जमाने में । जैसे कई काम हैं जो कि हमारे

देश में बाढ़ में किये वैसे ही जाते हैं हालांकि मुक्त में कुछ विलम्ब था। उनमें चलता है जैसे कि यह अब बन्दर्दी का केस है और ऐसे कई और भी हैं। आज दो साल के बाद हम बंसा ही आये हैं लेकिन मुक्त में ऐसा नहीं होता। इसी तरीके से बहुतेरे काम हमारे देश में हैं जिनके कि अन्दर जल्दी से जल्दी जो काम किया जा सकता है किया जाना चाहिए और लोगों का जब नेताओं के ऊपर पुरा विश्वास है तो उनके पर हममें कांपने नहीं चाहिए बल्कि पूरी लगन-लकड़ों और पूरे संकल्प के साथ कार्य कर ही डालना चाहिए। इसी में मुक्त आगे जा सकता है और दूसरे मुक्त भी इसी तरह बढ़े। इसका कारण यह है कि जिस काम को करने का उन्होंने निश्चय किया उसकी पूरी शक्ति के साथ, पूरे बल के साथ पूर्ण करने का प्रयत्न किया।

कारणों की बात अष्टाचार के सम्बन्ध में काफी बातचीत की जाती है। मेरे कहने का यह आशय नहीं है कि हमारी सरकार उसमें प्रति उपेक्षित है, उसके प्रति उपेक्षित नहीं है उसके लिए उन्होंने विजिलेंस डिपार्टमेंट्स भी खोले हैं और वे काम करते हैं लेकिन कहीं पर तो बहुत ज्यादा हां जाता है तो कहीं पर ओवर-दुक हो जाता है। ऐसे हालात के अन्दर जिनकी कि कुछ ऐसी बातें होती हैं उनके दिल के अन्दर कुछ करने के लिए श्रद्धा नहीं पैदा होती और अश्रद्धा पैदा होती है हालांकि सरकार बहुत कुछ कर रही है मुक्त के लिए लेकिन जब कोई ऐसी घटना उनके सामने घटती है तो मैंने निवेदन किया कि उनके दिल में जरा कुछ अविश्वास हो जाता है। एक बात यह कि इस वक्त आप देखेंगे कि मुक्त से चाहे वह सरकारी मशीनरी हो अथवा हमारे दूसरे इदार, उनके अन्दर इस वक्त अन्तःशासन का अभाव है। डिस्प्लन नहीं है बल्कि दफ्तरों में जाय अथवा स्कूलों में जाय अथवा कहीं भी चले जाय, एक ही देश दुनिया में आपकी इसी स्थिति जहाँ स्कूल में पढ़ने

वाले विद्यार्थी भी स्टूडी कर रहे हैं और इसके लिए कोई न कोई बहाना बूढ़ने का प्रयत्न करते हैं और जब देश के अन्दर अन्तःशासन न हो तो आप समझ सकते हैं कि कितनी अधिकल हो जायगी। इसका एक बड़ा कारण तो यह है कि ठीक बंग का पथ प्रदर्शन नहीं है। ठीक बंग का कार्य और पथ प्रदर्शन हो तो मेरे ख्याल में अपने देश के अन्दर इस किसम का एलिमेंट बहुत थोड़ा है भले ही हल्का गुल्ला चाहे कितना होता हो।

दूसरी बात यह है कि सेंस आफ रिसर्पी-सिम्बिलटी, जो अपने कर्मचारी हैं या लीडर हैं या जो भी हैं उनके दिल के अन्दर अपनी जिम्मेदारी का अहसास नहीं है। कितनी हमारी सरकारी आर्गेनाइजेशंस हैं और उनके अन्दर जो कर्मचारी काम कर रहे हैं उनके अन्दर कुछ ज्यादा श्रद्धा और एक काम करने की भावना नहीं है। उसका नतीजा है कि आपके सामने अशोक होटल, इंडियन एयर लाइन्स कारपोरेशन और सिदरी फिटिलाइजर्स वगैरह यह जितने भी सरकारी काम चले हुए हैं उनका काम अगर किसी एक व्यक्ति के पास होता तो जितना फायदा वह व्यक्ति इन कामों को चला कर दिखा सकता था उतना फायदा सरकारी प्रबन्ध में इन कामों के चलने से नहीं होता। आज हम प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं कि हर एक चीज नेशन-लाइज हो जाय लेकिन ऐसा नजर नहीं आता।

इसके साथ ही आज यह प्रयत्न किया जाता है कि जब काम कुछ ज्यादा बढ़ गया तो शट कोई न कोई एक ऐसा तरीका निकालते हैं, एक नया सुपरिन्टेंडेंट और उसके नीचे फिर कर्मचारियों की खूब भर्ती होती है। इस तरह कर्मचारियों की संख्या बढ़ती ही चली जा रही है। और कोई पता नहीं कि इसकी सीमा कहां खत्म होगी। काम इतना नहीं हो रहा है जितनी कि आज सरकारी कर्मचारियों की भर्ती हो रही है हर एक

[नी पञ्च देव]

इदारे के अन्दर। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके बारे में जरूर विचार करने की जरूरत है।

एक बात जो कि मैं बहुत ही अद्भुत समझता हूँ वह यह है कि पुलिस का एक बहुत बड़ा अफसर है वह एक केस को इनवेस्टिगेट करता है और उसकी जांच के फनस्वरूप वह चोर है डाकू है बदमाश है लेकिन उसके बाद जब वह तहसीलदार के पास आता है तो वह एक बहुत छोटी कटेगरी का अफसर होता है तो वहाँ पर उसके लिए फिर नई तरह से वह सारा का सारा केस इनवेस्टिगेट होता है, नई तरह से साक्षियाँ ली जाती हैं तो इस तरीके से यहाँ इस वक्त जितने हमारे सरकारी इदारे हैं उनके अन्दर आपस में किसी किस्म का कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है और न सरकारी कर्मचारी इस बात को महसूस करते हैं कि यह सारा का सारा मुल्क हमारा है, हम इसमें सब सौधीदार हैं और मिल कर इस मुल्क को हमने आगे ले जाना है। आज हालत यह हो रही है कि लोग अपनी जिम्मेदारी नहीं समझते और जैसे जैसे किसी तरह अपने ड्यूटी के घंटे काट देते हैं और उसके बाद दफ्तर को आँसू लग जाय, कुछ हो जाय, उनकी कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं होती। ऐसे हालात के अन्दर मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से यह प्रार्थना करूँगा कि यह ऐसी चीजें हैं जिनके कि ऊपर हमको निहायत संजीदगी के साथ, ईमानदारी के साथ सोच-विचार करना है। आखिरकार मुल्क ने इस पार्लियामेंट के सिपुर्द या पार्लियामेंट ने अपने मिनिस्टर्स के सिपुर्द यह जो देश के प्रशासन का भार किया है तो उनकी एक बहुत और महान् जिम्मेदारी है। खास तौर पर ऐसे समय में जब कि मुल्क के चारों तरफ शत्रु भी मंडला रहे हैं हम यहाँ सिर्फ पैसे गिनने में लगे हैं। पैसा और पद से दो ही चीजें जब हमारे सामने होती हैं तो हमारे देश के लिए बड़ी मुश्किल हो जाती है। वो मैं चाहता हूँ कि चाहे

कमीशन बने या कुछ और बने, लेकिन जरूरत यह है कि हमने जो पुरानी मैसिनरी इन्हीरिट की है उसमें न केवल छोटी रद्दोबदल की जाए बल्कि बहुत बड़ी क्रांति लायी जाये। यहाँ फिबीशियन से काम नहीं चलेगा, बल्कि हमारे मिनिस्टर सरजन भी बन जाएँ, ताकि मुल्क का काम ठीक ढंग से चले।

Shri Aurobindo Ghoshal (Uluberia):
Mr. Chairman, this motion covers a very wide field and touches the fundamental principle of administrative policy. The administrative set up is generally dependent on the character of a Government and the ultimate purpose which they want to achieve. This idea of reorganisation of the administration is agitating the minds of us all.

The British had a quite well-knit administration which was quite fitting with their policy. The real purpose or policy was to rule us, not for our interest, but for exploitation for enriching their nation at our cost. Naturally, the framework of their administration was laid down to suit their purpose. This framework alone cannot move unless the living part of the machinery which will work within the framework of that machinery is suitably made to fit with that framework. So, a set of persons with diehard attitude with some I.C.S. heads on those departments were fixed within that framework in a well-knit bureaucratic manner for their bureaucratic purposes. Their administration went on quite well on that line.

Now, about a decade ago, when the Britishers transferred their political power, the administrative framework was also inherited by us. We inherited the whole system even without a jolt. At that time, with the transfer of power, a change in the administrative set up was neither necessary nor possible. So, we got political power by transfer, not by forcible occupation. Of course, we had to pay a huge price for the last 100 years to attain our Independence. But, the transfer

was quite peaceful, peaceful in the sense that it was on understanding with the transferor.

After our Independence, the whole approach of the Government has changed. It has become national, democratic and in some respects, progressive too. Our Constitution guaranteed democracy and its goal has been declared as socialism. In pursuance of the same, the Government quite naturally wanted to bring reforms in our society and also in our national life. It has been trying to abolish feudalism and to industrialise the country through the Plans. Huge developmental projects and programmes have been initiated in order to raise the standard of living of the people. The public sector is gradually being widened. People are becoming gradually conscious of their fundamental rights and are becoming assertive. But, the old machinery cannot be responsive due to their inherent narrow and un-accommodative attitude and method of work. Naturally the clash is inevitable. So, the framework is neither wide and pliable enough to welcome the socialist approach, nor is the machinery which will work out the new objectives fit to implement the same properly.

So, in our experience we find that lofty plans, big projects and grandiloquent schemes are being floundered on the rock of this bureaucracy. Though speed is the essence of our present developmental progress, still too much officialdom and red-tapism have stood in our way. Not only that. This bureaucracy which was being previously controlled by the autocratic top, have got a long rope under the so-called liberalism of the present Government. Too much dilatoriness and negligence have created a hopeless condition in the sphere of administration. Favouritism, corruption and nepotism have now corroded the steel frame of the British administration. A callous attitude and colossal wastage are found everywhere, and the Government is losing the confidence of the people as days are passing by.

Somehow this rot has got to be stopped. Two important reports have

so far been made, one by Shri Gorwala and another by Mr. Appleby, but I agree with the opinion of Shri Mathur that these two reports are inadequate and cursory. Both of them have analysed the problems, but they have not been able to lay down robust principles for future administration.

The present Government has lost its link with the people and has been segregated from them. The authorities of the present Government are working from an emerald tower, far, far away from the din and bustle of the madding crowd. This smoke-screen which the bureaucracy has been able to create between the Government and the common people should be removed. In order to do that, a committee is necessary to go into the details and to suggest the reorganisation of the country's administration which will be helpful in achieving the goal of a socialist State.

I would like to refer to another point which has become very prominent and troublesome also, viz, the relation of the Centre with the States. We find that every year in the Budget huge amounts are being granted to the States for developmental projects, but they are not used; they lapse and are surrendered. Whenever we raise any question about such matters we are told that it is within the jurisdiction of the State, that the Centre has got no control over it. This should also be considered by this committee, to see that the grants which are being made to the States for development projects, for the total development of the country, are regularly and properly spent.

Public undertakings are now controlled by separate statutory bodies which are also beyond the scope of Parliament, because whenever a question is put whenever anything comes to light, we are told that this is not within our scope. Naturally, all these problems and many others are there. To make the administrative machinery coherent and organised, an enquiry is necessary and for that reason this commission is also required.

With these words, I support this motion.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Guha.

Before the hon. Member speaks, I would like to know the desire of the House. Some Members were very agitated and they wanted that the time should be extended. Is it the opinion of the House that I use my discretion to extend the time by an hour? Are the Members prepared to sit for another hour?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Of course, they can move a motion if it is beyond one hour.

There are only three or four speakers, and if we sit for one hour I think we can finish it and everybody can be given a chance.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): What is the time allotted?

Mr. Chairman: I have requested that each hon. Member may take ten minutes. One hon. Member has taken twenty minutes, and naturally, the subject being a very exhaustive one, he has not been able to finish; and obviously, he has not been anxious to remain in the House after that.

Shri A. C. Guha I shall try to be as brief as possible.

It is a very important subject that Shri D. C. Sharma has brought before this House for discussion and I am thankful to him, and I think the whole House should be thankful to him for bringing up this resolution before this House—although, actually, I do not like the idea of having another commission because a commission would mean the shelving of the whole matter for another four or five years more. We know the fate of so many commissions in the past; their reports have been published, but hardly any action has been taken or if any is taken, it is in slow partial doses with the result that the real purpose of appointing those commissions has more or less been neutralised. This is a subject in which Government should act expedi-

tiously and I think they have got enough guides already in the many reports on this subject.

It is rather strange that after the attainment of independence, Government have not thought fit to appoint any enquiry commission or committee to look into the question of reorganisation of the administration. The British gave us an administration that was intended for the law and order purpose. Although the whole character of the State has changed since then, yet the administration has remained the same in form, in outlook and in everything else.

Only recently, when I was touring one of the flood-affected areas of Bengal, I happened to come into contact with a district magistrate. He openly told me that with this machinery, one could not expect to have a welfare State. He said that it was within his discretion to spend even crores of rupees by way of gratuitous relief, but he did not have the authority to spend even Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 for any item of permanent utility to the public. On the one hand, Government have devolved enormous powers on the services for distribution of money and for distribution of patronages; thereby, the authority of the officers before the public has increased; their prestige and power have increased. But on the other hand, there are so many rules and formalities which are in vogue still, these were in vogue during the British days, there are so many rules, formalities, standing orders and other things in vogue still, which curb the initiative of the officers for doing any permanent good or to undertake any development schemes beneficial to the public. That is why I think the whole administrative set-up must be re-examined and reoriented on the basis of a welfare State. It is no longer a law and order State now, but a Welfare State. So, the services also should be so shaped physically and mentally, that the real purpose of the administration can be served.

We have a federal system of government in our country. The authorities between the States and the Centre

have not been clearly defined. The different States are endowed with autonomous powers, but they have not got the revenue with them to undertake any development work. Revenue is mostly in the hands of the Centre, and so, they have to depend on the Centre either as grants or as loans for their developmental works. It is quite natural and it is psychologically also true, that in respect of money received from other sources, they become somewhat lenient and loose while spending that money. That has been the case in regard to the expenditure of the money received by the different States from the Centre also. It depends upon the lobbying capacity of the different State Governments how much money a State will get from the Centre. It leads to administrative laxities. It has often been heard that a particular officer is retained in a State because he has got some influence here with some Secretaries and other important persons; so he can get more money from the Centre for that State. So that officer has to be retained and his services extended year after year, even though he has reached the age of superannuation.

This is a bad sort of thing. I think the revenue position between the States and the Centre should also be revised so that the States can stand on their feet for their finance. If any help is to be received from the Centre, that should not be for a very minor work, but only for any major development work.

As regards the money received by the State from the Centre for particular schemes, the Centre has no authority to look into the expenditure of that money after it is given. Every State is so very alert and keen on the maintenance of its prestige that it won't allow the Centre to interfere by enquiring how it has spent the money. That makes the position still worse.

Then I think crores of rupees have been spent even from the time before the attainment of independence on grow-more-food and many other

schemes with the States collaborating. It would be worthwhile for Government to hold an inquiry as to how many of these schemes are still being continued and maintained by State Governments. Certain amounts might have been spent and certain schemes put into operation. But as soon as the Central Government aid is withdrawn, those schemes have also gone out of operation and have ceased rendering any service to the public. I am afraid that this may happen to the whole community development scheme also. In the post-intensive period, most of the development areas in the Community Development areas are being neglected and are not kept in operation. This refers particularly to some of the social service schemes. They have not been working after the Central Government aid was withdrawn at the end of the intensive period. All these things require a certain reconsideration and revision of the entire scheme. This is also an important factor in the administration.

In April this year, during the budget discussions, in this House and outside there was a lot of talk about the multiplication of offices and officers and infructuous expenditure. A number of offices, autonomous bodies, subordinate offices and a lot of other offices are being created, big buildings are being set up. I think most of the money that has been received through the taxation proposals during the Second Plan has been spent on non-development expenditure, a fact which has been admitted even in the Government statement circulated to us along with the budget papers. This means a lack of proper outlook in the administration. This is also an aspect of the administration. If a particular sum is to be spent on a particular scheme, we have to see whether the full value for the money is received.

Recently, I received a copy of the report of a Corporation. Its total subscribed capital is Rs. 10 lakhs. The entire subscribed capital is from the Government. In one year's working, it has lost only Rs. 3,32,000 odd!

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):
Only?

Shri A. C. Guha: That means one-third of the total capital lost in one year's operation. And the Corporation is supposed to be a commercial body; it is not set up just for development or other probing purposes. So a commercial body has to be run on commercial lines. Out of Rs. 10 lakhs, one-third, about Rs. 3,33,000, has been lost in one year and Government have been good enough to reimburse it practically with the entire amount. The Central Government have reimbursed about Rs. 3,22,000, for enabling it to incur fresh losses during the next year. Why should so many Corporations be created? These are things that require to be looked into.

We are having a democratic set-up. We are proud of it. It has also to be examined whether we are having a democratic set-up or a bureaucratic set-up. Recently, about 2 years ago, a report was published. An eminent Member of this House was the Chairman of the committee. It recommended democratic decentralisation to start from the bottom. If democratic decentralisation were to start at the bottom and at the top we tighten up bureaucratic centralisation, in a few years' time we shall have a clash between the two sectors. If we start with decentralisation at the bottom, in the Centre also there should be some decentralisation of authority and not bureaucratic centralisation of authority as it is happening today.

You have rung the bell. So, lastly I should say the administration today has lost its reputation and its prestige before the public and it is gradually losing public confidence. It is no use for the Minister defending the administration in the House. We may take it from the Minister that the administration is quite all right. I may also say that all that is being talked about in public about the administration is not wholly correct. But still in a democracy, it is public opinion which counts and should carry some weight with Government. If Government have any eyes to see and any ears to

hear, they must realise that the administration today is not enjoying the same prestige and confidence for integrity and efficiency and for expeditious discharge of duty as it had before. That is the most important thing. For all these things there should be a proper reorientation of the whole administrative set-up on the basis of a Welfare State.

I am not sure whether a commission of the type suggested by Shri D. C. Sharma will be quite necessary for that. Government have already got so many reports. They must have their own ideas also. They can start taking some action even if a Commission is set up. They can start taking some action immediately. There should be no delay in this matter. Otherwise, as my hon. friend Shri Mathur has said the whole democratic set-up would be in danger.

We have got the Appleby Report; we have got other reports also and we have got the O. & M. Division and the Vigilance Organisation and all those things. They have not been able to remove the anachronism and anomalies in the administration as they exist today. So, I would suggest that a proper review should be made and Government should take appropriate and immediate steps to set the administration on a proper footing so that the objects of the Welfare State could be really fulfilled. The nation expects that for every pie of the money it is paying there should be sufficient return,—the officials paid from revenue, should be welfare service-minded. There should be that feeling that the ideal of a Welfare State is being realised but that is not the feeling in the country at present.

Shri Goray: Madam, the subject we are discussing today is very vital, in my opinion. It is as vital as the defence of the country. But I do not say we should be pessimistic in our approach. Had I been pessimistic I would have said like my friend, Shri Mahanty, that not a blade of grass is

likely to grow under this accursed Government, I do not want to be over-optimistic either because, if I may be allowed to anticipate the Minister, most probably in his reply he would say that everything is best in the best of all possible worlds. I do not want to take either of these two views. What has happened is that during the last decade we have been trying to move from the concept of the law and order State to the concept of the welfare State. Because we want to face this new challenge, we are coming across all these difficulties.

In the first chapter of Raghuvamsa, the ideal kingdom was described as one where the king was said to be:

प्रजानां विनयाधानात् रत्नगद्मरणादपि ।
स पिता पितरस्तेषां केवलं जन्म हेतवः ॥

I do not know whether the Raghus lived up to that standard but that is the objective that we have set for ourselves. If we want to reach that objective, we shall have to overhaul the whole system. I do not want to be pessimistic because I think this problem is not peculiar to India. In almost all the countries which are trying to build up a particular standard in the shortest period of time, these difficulties have been experienced. When the late Roosevelt launched his New Deal in America, he had to face some difficulties; how to create an apparatus which would be able to ensure quick and just results and to root out corruption, poverty and unemployment from the land. If we look to other totalitarian countries like Russia or China, we find that they have to pass through these difficult periods. What do the purges of the thirties suggest? Thousands of scientists and experts were mowed down because the plans they made went away and some scapegoat had to be found. They got hold of people in charge of these difficult projects and because they could not come up to the standard they were eliminated. Here in India the position becomes all the more difficult because we want to be a welfare State in the quickest possible time. At

the same time we want to keep intact the framework of democracy. These are the limitations that we have accepted for ourselves. Within those limitations we have to function. That is, I suppose, one of the challenges which we shall have to meet.

A Commission has been asked for in this Resolution. I do not think it will be able to achieve a miracle because there have been reports right from the Gopalaswamy Ayyangar Report to the recent report of the Kerala Government. In every report they have tried to analyse the malady and suggested a way out. Let a Commission be appointed but it is not going to discover something which is altogether unknown. We know there is a lot of corruption, inefficiency and nepotism. We know there are such delays. I can quote an instance or two.

Last year on the 1st of May, near Ahmednagar, a tank belonging to the Defence Forces over-ran and killed a man who was an employee of the local body. Since that day, 1st May 1958, his widow has been writing to the Defence Ministry. When she came to me only a month back, she produced before me about fifty receipts of registered letters and nothing was done. She was being told that the case is under consideration. When I took it up, perhaps it was because I was there, a Member of Parliament, they said: "All right, let the widow be given Rs. 900 and the whole claim settled". This is how things go on. A postal employee had made certain mistakes eleven years back. No action was taken. He thought that his defence was accepted. After eleven years they have said that because he committed some mistake he is to be punished. The supervisors who supervised the work at that time have retired and no punishment has been meted out to them. This is what happens. I do not want to flog the dead horse but it is there.

I would go a step further and ask, after all, who are these functionaries? They come out of the people. If the

[Shri Goray]

people as a whole are not above suspicion, the officers who are recruited from the people also will be not above suspicion. What I am saying is, when we are blaming the bureaucracy, we are blaming ourselves; that is the way I look at it. I have my friends who have just passed their IAS and other examinations. As soon as they enter the cadre I find deterioration starts. What happens? Young people who want to be patriotic, who want to build up their country, who think the challenge should be accepted—they are engineers, scientists, professors, administrators—as soon as they are recruited we see that they gradually begin to lose their enthusiasm. Why? It is because they find that the whole atmosphere of the country is like that. It is not the bureaucracy which is to blame, it is not the Parliament which is to blame, it is not the Ministers who are to blame, but it is the whole society which has created a particular type of atmosphere.

Therefore, I would say, after the commission is appointed let it go into the total problem, make an overall study of the whole milieu in which we are working and then let us try to find out where we should begin. Of course, I have noted, as they say that the fish begins to rot from the head, there is something wrong with the heads of the Government. There is no doubt about it and so many people have tried to highlight this factor. Only today it was mentioned in the House that the Punjab Government has interfered somewhere. Though, of course, the Home Minister said, he is looking into it, everybody knows that there is something rotten in the State of Denmark and that something must be weeded out but we do not make the necessary effort.

Then, I would say, when we are thinking of the expanding public sector let us try to understand how

fast we are trying to expand. In the First Five Year Plan the public sector and the private sector were on a par, 50 per cent of the investment was in the public sector and 50 per cent in the private sector. In the Second Five Year Plan 61 per cent of the investment was in the public sector and the remaining in the private sector. In the Third Plan most probably from 61 per cent we may move up to 65 or 75 per cent, because the Prime Minister has said that in view of the danger that is threatening our country the first thing must be heavy industries. If these heavy industries are going to be given the top priority, the investment in the public sector will go up.

The task we are faced with is, where do we find the people who will give or furnish the necessary functional leadership to the public sector which is growing at such a hectic pace. I think that if we really want to furnish the country with functional leadership then we will have to see to it that the young people who graduate or who pass the competitive examinations will have to be cared for and we will have to be more attentive in order to create the necessary morale in them. We should also see to it that they do not develop into a bureaucratic caste but that they remained linked up with the people. What I feel is the most essential thing, at this time to do, is to see that they do not lose contact with the grass-roots.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi (Ludhiana):
Mr. Chairman, there is a consensus of opinion in the country that the administrative set-up not only needs gearing up to meet the changed conditions but also needs a change to meet the changed objectives. It must also be admitted that we have not been able to achieve much during the last ten years to further our objectives to obtain a welfare State, at least not to the extent that we hoped for. Of course, we started with high hopes and higher

ambitions. Yet, the assessment of the last ten years is not as much as we expected in any walk of the administrative set-up.

If we take the public services which have come up for much criticism in this House, we must admit that the criterion for the utility of these services is not what we hoped for. Have the services endeared themselves to the man in the street or the man behind the plough? Have the services endeared themselves to the people in anyway after these ten to 12 years and can they be called the people's services? Is not the Deputy Commissioner in the district still looked upon with fear and awe? Is not the magistracy of a district still looked upon as some one unapproachable? If that is so, then we must concede that we have not been able to achieve even a part of the objective of a welfare State.

Let us see the judicial system. Everybody has got the highest regard for the judiciary, for its integrity and honesty at all levels, certainly. But how topheavy is the judicial set-up? That must also be considered. The accumulation of work is one of the points certainly, but that is not all. The accumulation of work and arrears of cases are not due to the fault of the judiciary as such, but due to the duties which the Constitution has laid on the judges to decide upon and carry out. The high courts and the Supreme Court have been given the power of superintendence over all breaches of the Constitution and breaches of the law. But the disease lies elsewhere. The judicial system which we have inherited was set up with a set objective, and with the changed conditions and changed objectives, it should also have been changed. That is to say, there should have been decentralisation in order to lessen the arrears of work and to entrust the people themselves to decide certain matters of dispute relating to offences relating to person or property.

Similarly, let us turn to the police force. It is equally looked upon with suspicion. I believe it is looked upon with greater suspicion now than it was being looked upon previously. It has been said in this House that this applies to Punjab. I am afraid it applies equally to all the States. What I would submit respectfully to the House is that whatever be the administration that is functioning, it is looked upon with suspicion and not endearment.

We have embarked upon a socialist pattern of society. That is very good. But are we not creating another bureaucracy even in the public sector which will certainly be enlarged in times to come?

Therefore, my respectful submission to the House is that the administrative set-up certainly needs a change. How can that change be brought about? Of course, one suggestion which has been made and which I welcome is the appointment of a high-powered committee, which is postulated in this resolution, which should be able to look into it and suggest how the administrative set-up can be changed to achieve the objective of a welfare State.

The only way in which the administrative set-up can be changed to fit in with the changed conditions and changed objectives is absolute decentralisation in all aspects of administration—judicial, social, economical and I would say even political. We have got a nucleus of community development blocks from which we can start. If we want to build a welfare State for the benefit of the man in the street or the man behind the plough, we must see that he also participates in those activities which are for his welfare.

Let us look at the laws. All the laws we inherited from the British masters were for a certain objective and not for utilitarian type or social welfare. For changing the administrative set-up, the community development blocks are the foundation on

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi]

which the edifice of a welfare State can be built. In those community blocks, you can have people's courts and panchayat courts, which should decide all minor disputes not only with regard to property, but also with regard to minor offences. There is no reason why the panchayats should not be empowered with powers to decide disputes. Also, our ambitions and aspirations should be that each community development block should perform all those functions which pertain to and which go to the extent of creating self-sufficiency in the matter of administration of justice and their economic needs. I would say that the functions of the community development blocks and the people living therein should be like those of the Greek city States, which at one time were really democratic institutions, in the right sense of the term, when peoples themselves participated in all the activities.

So, I submit for the consideration of the House, particularly the Home Minister, that they must look into this problem from a human and democratic point of view and should not stand on any prestige. If it is correct that the present administrative set-up does not fit in with the changed conditions, if the present assessment is that for the last ten years, we have not been able to endear the administration to the man in the street or the man behind the plough in the village, I submit it is very necessary that that change should be made. When we have got a certain basis on which we can start, why should we not do it earlier? The earlier we do it, the better. Therefore I am sure the resolution is of such a nature that the hon. Home Minister would not find any difficulty in accepting it.

Shrimati Na Palchoudhuri (Nabawdip): I am very happy to support this Resolution, because I had actually brought a resolution practically identical with this in the last session but Shri D. C. Sharma had more luck

in the ballot than I had. However, I certainly commend this resolution.

First I would like to quote a few words of the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha where he said:

"My earnest desire has been that we should speak less in world assemblies and confine our activities to our own internal affairs."

Really, the time has come when that should be done.

When we look at this question, when we look at this Resolution, I am entirely of the opinion, as expressed by my friend Shri Mathur, that it behoves on us to have such a commission as this, because in the shadow of the Third Five Year Plan unless we have this assessment, we cannot do justice to the next Five Year Plan. And the tax-payer has every right to see that some assessment has been made that the money that he pays in taxes is fully utilised. Because, it is not money alone that is wasted; there is wastage of effort and wastage of time which, if translated into terms of money, would mean crores of rupees. In India today we spend Rs. 190 crores in salaries alone, out of a revenue of Rs. 725 crores. This may not be the exact figure for every year, but this is more or less the average that we spend. That is a very high figure and so we must look into it.

16.75 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I have nothing against the administrative services. It has become a fashion to call them a bureaucratic set-up, and we have got the red-tapism for a number of years. I should say in the first place that the set-up is there to do a certain work. Let that work be done efficiently. It is not a question of a person here, or a person there, or the Secretary, or the Under Secretary that is responsible. It is

the procedure and the rules and everything surrounding them that need to be looked into. As far as red-tapism goes, it is there for a number of years, people write long notes, files travel from place to place and it results in red-tapism. Incidentally, Government has changed the red tape to white tape now. But it has not made any difference in the time taken for taking decision. It is the same as it was before when the red tape was there.

Now clerks are employed, hundreds and thousands of them. When letters are received, one man opens it; another clerk registers the letter; a third clerk files the letter. It is a long process, and if we want to find out anything, naturally we have to turn round, asking many people, and it has become impossible to find out anything from the morass of so many people. As a woman I certainly feel the worth of the proverb, "too many cooks spoil the broth". In the same way, too many people in an office, I think, spoil the efficiency of service.

We have had the reports of Appleby and Gorwala. Of course, those reports are piece-meal. It is a report of this kind which we need, which will go into the whole subject, and not really criticise anything but try to find out ways and means how the money of the country can be saved, and if saving can be achieved how it can be used for development purposes. Because, I think the first thing to be done is to have a contented administrative service, and that I think must be achieved by whatever means we have in our power. And contentment will come if the person has full scope for work, he has security of service and his work is appreciated.

Even the Gorwala report says that:

"Officers are unwilling to take responsibility because they feel that they are not likely to get support if things go wrong. Because of this feeling the inclination is to shirk work. If it is

the desire that more work should be done by the lower level officers, they should be made to feel that their superiors trust them and are prepared to leave the initiative to them."

That, I think, is the keynote of efficiency. They must be trusted; they must be secure. We must look after the rules and procedures so that they can be simplified and they do not take so long to implement them. Look at the co-operatives. Almost the main hurdle in the organisation of co-operatives is the Rules. We have not yet done anything to simplify the rules and the co-operatives do not get on. I could multiply instances. There is not much time. I do not want to burden the House with too many figures. Here, in India, we spend on collection 10 per cent of the taxes that we realise. This is a very high figure for any civilised country. I do not think it is so anywhere else.

17 hrs.

Secondly, I would also put this to you. We have this Audit. In Japan, there is the Auditor General and he is supported by eight experts. They not only do financial audit, but they also do efficiency audit. I think we should evolve some sort of a system like that. I think, if a Commission like this is set up and it goes into the question thoroughly, large savings can be made. The External Affairs Ministry which is the most live Ministry as far as I can see, has really made substantial savings by having a probe into the various Embassies. The High Commission in London has made a lot of savings. I think all the Ministries could do this and the whole set up can be looked into. There was the Hoover Commission in the U.S.A. The United States is a richer country than us. What was the result of this Commission? It had people, teams of experts, going into each department to find out ways and means of how to create more efficiency, how to get more value out of the money of the tax-payer.

[Shrimati Ilpalchoudhuri]

What did they find? As a result of the Commission's recommendations, a saving of 3 billion dollars was effected. On paper alone, there was a saving of 288 million dollars: I will say this about our Constitution; I noticed it from the time when it was drafted. Ours is the longest and the most extensive Constitution in any country in the world. It comprises 300 pages. The U.S. Constitution comprises 10 pages. I have no quarrel with that. Let us have a well written extensive Constitution that deals with every aspect of welfare as we want it to be done. Because, in these ten years, the whole concept of the State, as it is supposed to be, has undergone a change. Since 1947, there are four things that we have achieved. We have achieved Independence. We have declared ourselves a Republic. We have a Plan and lastly, we have declared ourselves to be going forward for a Socialistic Welfare State. If we have to achieve this, the whole set up has to be looked into. There should be a contented administrative service, whose grievances, whose wants or difficulties are enumerated and taken care of.

The Pay Commission has come in. Their recommendations must be adopted and implemented as soon as possible. I think we could really take a Chinese saying which is very good although we may be allergic to many Chinese things at the moment. There is a Chinese saying that if you are planning for a year, plant grain, if you are planning for ten years, plant trees and if you are planning for 100 years, plant men. I should say, plant men in the right places. Keep your administrative service in the right place. Nourish them with confidence. See that their jobs are secure. When the time for them to retire comes, the time will be very good and it will have the rich value of all their experience. The whole set up will be much more organised and much less expensive and really driving towards a Welfare State as we wish it to be.

I have no criticism to make of the Government. I commend this Resolution. This Commission, I think, would do infinite good if, before the Third Plan, within these two years, they submitted even some sort of a report.

Dr Melkote (Raichur): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Mover of this Resolution, the hon. Shri D. C. Sharma for bringing this Resolution at this juncture. He has done a service, because, I feel that it is not merely that a Commission should be set up, but commissions of this nature periodically to examine the question once in ten years would do a great deal of good to the country. I also congratulate Shri Goray for placing his views in such a moderate manner, because he has considered every aspect of the question without leaning to one side or the other.

The problem is this. As is said, we get the type of government we deserve. With a cross-section of the population in the civil service, whether they are good or bad, they reflect the society at large. Therefore, if that cross-section is considered bad, why are we bad, what is the reason, and what is the feeling of the common man?

Before independence we had a police raj, and today our ideal is a raj of the public, a welfare State. The people expect the Government to implement that ideal, and any shortfall in it would naturally be resented. But it is not merely the ideal, it is the working towards that ideal that is very necessary. If there is improvement, people will recognise it, but today there is a great deal of dissatisfaction among the people, because, when all is said and done, in a democracy the people, the common masses, ought to feel satisfied. The administration has got to convince the common man that everything is being done for him, and make him satisfied. What is the good of building huge

dams, railway stations and other amenities, if the common man who goes there does not get the benefit from them to the extent that he expects. It is there that the common man is disillusioned and is criticising the Government.

But that is not all the picture. There have been encomiums from the world over with regard to the methods we have adopted after independence. The problems that we have faced during these ten years have been colossal. There was the partition, there was the bloodshed after that, there was the integration of the different States, and then their realignment on a linguistic basis. These and other things have gone on and during this period the administration also has changed considerably for the better. The people the world over admire the way we have gone on and have given credit to the Indian nation. If that credit is due, we have got to give credit to the administrators also, the civil service which has rendered service and brought this applause from the world over.

Whereas this is a fact, the other aspect of the question is this. If the common man is dissatisfied, to what extent ought Government to modify its administration? From that point of view, public criticisms of this nature ought to be welcomed, and a review of the administration periodically should be welcomed. Then, people will not merely say these things; ultimately they will also come to know that all their criticism is not justified, many of their suggestions cannot be implemented even if they themselves are to administer these things.

The services have to look at it from a different angle altogether. They have got to see that the common man is satisfied. Today the common man is not satisfied. Applications may be received, letters may be acknowledged, but they are never followed up. Hundreds and thousands of applications pour into the rooms of

these services, and beyond acknowledgment nothing further takes place. The common man feels terribly dissatisfied.

On the one side there is public criticism which should be welcomed, on the other hand there is an influential section which controls the press. While the common man voices his views, these people voice altogether different views in the name of the common man. So, a balance has to be struck between these two. Therefore, while all criticism may not be incorrect, it is also necessary for the Government to look into the correct aspects of the criticism and rectify matters to the extent necessary. A good deal could be spoken with regard to these administrative aspects, but I do not want to say anything very much; I only hope that the Home Minister would accept the motion and set up a commission which will look into the whole affair and recommend whatever is necessary.

श्री राम कृष्ण गुप्त (महेन्द्रगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपने आनरेबिल मेम्बर प्रो० दी० चं० शर्मा का बड़ा शमकूर हूँ कि उन्होंने एक बहुत जरूरी रेजोल्यूशन हाउस के सामने पेश करके तमाम देश का ध्यान हमारे मौजूदा एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सिस्टम की तरफ खींचा है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि सरकार कमिशन मुकर्र किए जाने की मांग को स्वीकार कर लेगी और मौजूदा सिस्टम में जो डिफिक्ट्स हैं, उनको दूर करने की कोशिश की जाएगी। हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सिस्टम में डिफिक्ट्स आने के जो कारण हैं उनमें सब से बड़ा कारण यह है, जैसा कि बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है, कि हमारे सिस्टम की जो बुनियाद है वही कमजोर है। हिस्टोरिकली और पोलिटिकली अगर हम इस सिस्टम को स्टैब करे तो हमें पता लगेगा कि हमारे मौजूदा एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सिस्टम की बुनियाद उन दिनों में डाली गई थी जबकि अंग्रेजों ने हिन्दुस्तान पर कब्जा किया था। हमने इस सिस्टम

[श्री राम कृष्ण गुप्त]

को क्लिंटन गवर्नमेंट से इनहेरिट किया है। उन्होंने इसको किसी एक खास प्राबजक्टिव के लिए बनाया था और उनका क्या प्राबजक्टिव था, इसको आप भ्रच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि वैनफेयर स्टेट काम काम चलाने के लिए इसको रिआर्गनाइज करने की सब से ज्यादा जरूरत है। इसको तभी किया जा सकता है जबकि एक कमिशन मुकरर कर दिया जाए, जोकि सारे सिस्टम को थारोली स्टडी करे, देश के सभी प्रान्तों का दौरा करके पालियामेंट के सामने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश करे और जब ऐसा हो जाए तभी सही नतीजे पर पहुंचा जा सकता है।

जहां तक डिफैक्टस का ताल्लुक है, आप जानते ही हैं कि सब से बड़े डिफैक्टस इनएफिशसी, कोरप्शन और नेपोटिज्म का होना है और इन चीजों को दूर करने की सब से ज्यादा जरूरत है। जहां तक इनएफिशसी का ताल्लुक है इसके बारे में पिछले दिनों भी हाउस के अन्दर बहस हुई थी और आनरेबल होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने डिबेट का जवाब देते हुए खुद इस बात को तसलीम किया था कि दूसरे देशों के अन्दर किसी काम को करने के लिए जहां एक आदमी की जरूरत होती है वहां उतना ही काम करने के लिए यहां तीन और चार आदमियों की जरूरत पड़ती है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि इस इनएफिशसी को दूर करने की पूरी कोशिश की जाएगी और यह मालूम किया जाएगा कि इसके क्या कारण हैं। इसका जो सब से बड़ा कारण है, उसको मैं हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। आनरेबल प्राइम मिनिस्टर मिनिस्टर साहब ने ४-९-१९५९ को लोक सभा को टेबिल पर चौथी सालाना रिपोर्ट पेश की थी और उस रिपोर्ट में भी इस बात का जिक्र किया गया है और कहा गया है:—

One of the major causes for delays in the disposals of Government busi-

ness was the tendency on the part of officers to make avoidable references to authorities outside and within the same department, the report said.

“There, unnecessary horizontal and vertical references were mostly due to the “intellectual” dishonesty, i.e., reluctance on the part of individual officers to take full responsibility.”

मैंने इस बात का जिक्र इसलिए किया है ताकि इस और ध्यान दिया जा सके और इसको दूर करने की कोशिश की जा सके। यह तभी दूर हो सकती है जबकि रिसपांसिबिलिटी फिक्स की जाए। हाउस के अन्दर इस बात का कई बार जिक्र आया है। बहुत से ऐसे एकशन होते हैं जिन में कि आफिसर्स के खिलाफ एकशन लिया जाता जरूरी हो जाता है। लेकिन वह एकशन इसलिए नहीं लिया जा सकता है कि हम आसानी से किमी आफिसर के खिलाफ रिसपांसिबिलिटी फिक्स नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस तरह से मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे सिस्टम के अन्दर जो ये डिफैक्टस हैं, ये बुनियादी डिफैक्टस हैं और इनको दूर करने की सब से ज्यादा जरूरत है और जब तक आफिसर्स अपनी रिसपांसिबिलिटी को रीयलाइज नहीं करेंगे उनके अन्दर एशिरोली नहीं आ सकती है।

वैनफेयर स्टेट के अन्दर जिस दूसरी बात की सब से ज्यादा जरूरत होती है वह यह है कि हमारा सिस्टम ऐसा हो कि जो डिब्लेपमेंट के काम है, उनकी बढ़ावा मिले, उनके अन्दर कोई किसी किस्म की रुकावट पैदा न हो और हमें सोचना होगा कि किस तरह से यह सम्भव हो सकता है। डिब्लेपमेंट के कामों के लिए कितनी भी स्कीम को आप तैयार करें, उसके तीन हिस्से होते हैं। पहले तो स्कीम बनाई जाती है, फिर प्लानिंग किया जाता है और उसके बाद उसकी इम्प्लेमेंट करने की कोशिश की जाती है। आज हम देखते हैं कि डिब्लेपमेंट के कामों

में काफी से ज्यादा देरी हो जाती है और कभी कभी तो इतनी देरी हो जाती है और इस तरह के केस भी आपको मिलेंगे कि जो रकम उनके लिए बजट में एलाट की जाती है वह लैप्स हो जाती है जिस से बड़ा भारी नुकसान होता है। इस वास्ते इस और भी ध्यान देने की आज सख्त जरूरत है। इसके लिए मेरी तजवीज यह है कि खास तौर पर डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स के अन्दर डिवेलोपमेंट के कामों के लिए अलग आफिसर्स होने चाहिए। आज हम देखते हैं कि जिले की तमाम मशीनरी, जिले के तमाम एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सिस्टम का न्यूकलियस डी०सी० है और सारी मशीनरी उसके चारों तरफ घूमती है। हर काम में उसकी सलाह ली जाती है और सभी काम उसकी देख रेख में किए जाते हैं। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि कामों में देरी हो जाती है और काफी नुकसान होता है। मुझे भी इस बात का काफी तजुर्बा है। डिस्ट्रिक्ट डिवेलोपमेंट काउंसिल को जो मीटिंग होती है उनमें मैंने देखा है कि डी० सी० के ऊपर काफी बोझ पड़ता है और चूकि उसके पास समय कम होता है, वह उनकी तरफ पूरा ध्यान नहीं दे पाता है और इसका यह लाजिमी नतीजा मिलकलता है कि स्कीमों को काफी नुकसान पहुंचता है।

पिछले दिनों जब डिस्ट्रिक्टलाइजेशन के लिए रिपोर्ट पेश की गई उसमें भी इस बात का जिक्र किया गया और इस बात पर जोर दिया गया कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट डिवेलोपमेंट काउंसिल का जो चेयरमैन हो, वह नान-आफिशर होना चाहिए और इस काम को डिस्ट्रिक्टलाइज किया जाना चाहिए। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस और भी पूरा ध्यान दिया जाएगा और इसको अमल में लाने की कोशिश की जाएगी। यदि ऐसा किया गया तो हमारा एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सिस्टम बहुत ज्यादा सुधर सकता है।

एक आखिरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह है कि हमारी जो एग्जिक्टिव है, खास

तौर पर उसका जो पुलिस का महकमा है, वह हर काम के अन्दर दखल देता है और हमेशा कोशिश करता है कि ला को अपने हाथ में ले। इसका बहुत बुरा असर पड़ता है और इस चीज को रोकना बहुत आवश्यक है ताकि ला को कोई अपने हाथ में न ले सके। आनरेबल प्राइम निनिस्टर साहब में भी कल अपने प्रैस कान्फस में इस बात का जिक्र किया था और उन्होंने कहा था :—

"There were grave complaints against the Punjab Police taking the law into their own hands."

मैं चहता हूँ कि हमारा सिस्टम इस ढंग से रिआर्गनाइज किया जाए जिससे कि पुलिस ला को अपने हाथ में न ले सके।

इन तमाम चीजों को मद्दनजर रखते हुए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस किस्म के कमिशन का मुकरर किया जाया बहुत आवश्यक है और माननीय मंत्री महोदय इस मांग को स्वीकार कर लेंगे। मैं इससे आगे बढ़ कर यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस कमिशन को सिफ इसलिए ही मुकरर न किया जाए कि वह इनक्वायरी करे और रिपोर्ट पेश करे। बल्कि इसके अलावा एक ऐसे हार्ड पावर कमिशन की भी जरूरत है जोकि जिन लोगों को एग्जिक्टिव के हाथों या दूसरे लोगों से इन्साफ नहीं मिलता है, उनको इन्साफ दिलाये और उस तरह के मामलात की जांच करे। आज अक्सर देखने में आता है कि बहुत से महकमों के अन्दर बड़े बड़े आफिसर दखल देते हैं जिससे काफी नुकसान होता है और उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाई आसानी से नहीं हो सकती है और अगर कभी कोई इनक्वायरी होती भी है तो उसमें बहुत ज्यादा डिले होती है। इस वास्ते सब से बहतर तरीका यह है कि एक हार्ड पावर कमिशन, मुकरर किया जाए और यह उसकी पावर में हो कि वह यदि किसी

[श्री राम कुण्ड गुप्त]

को किसी के खिलाफ कोई शिकायत हो, तो वहां से उसे वह इन्साफ दिला सके।

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं इस रेजोल्यूशन की तार्किकता हूँ और मुझे पूरी आशा है कि मिनिस्टर साहब जरूर इसे स्वीकार करेंगे। आज इसकी सब से ज्यादा जरूरत है। आज हमें इस तरफ सब से ज्यादा ध्यान देना पड़ेगा और अपने इस सिस्टम को सुधारना पड़ेगा वर्ना, जैसा अभी कहा गया, अगर इस तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया गया तो जो हमारी डेमोक्रेसी है वह खतरे में पड़ सकती है। हमारा जो पुराना सिस्टम था वह किसी खास आबजैक्टिव के लिये बनाया गया था। वह सिस्टम डिमोक्रेसी गवर्नमेंट के लिये फिट नहीं है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि कमिशन मुक़रर करके इन डिफैक्टस को जरूर रिमूव किया जायेगा।

श्री बजरंग सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक कहावत है :

“यथा राजा तथा प्रजा”

लेकिन जो इस कहावत की भावना है उस के खिलाफ ही आज शासन की तरफ से बहुत सी बातें कही जाने लगी हैं। आज बार बार यह दलील दी जाती है कि चूंकि जनता का स्तर गिर गया है इस लिये वह शासन और प्रशासन में प्रतिबिम्बित होता है। जब जनता का स्तर ऊंचा उठ जायगा, चाहे वह उस की नीति सम्बन्धी हो चाहे आचार सम्बन्धी हो, तब प्रशासन का स्तर भी उठेगा। लेकिन बात बिल्कुल उल्टी है। हम आज देखते हैं, और सदन में भी इसकी काफी चर्चा होती है, कि हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के बाद अष्टाचार, पक्षपात और कुनबापरवरी का जितना बोलबाला आज है उतना पहले संभवतः कभी नहीं था। अष्टाचार की शिकायतें थीं, लेकिन कुनबापरवरी और पक्षपात की शिकायतें संभवतः उतनी नहीं

थीं जितनी आज बढ़ गई हैं। अगर हमारे यहां स्वराज्य होने के बाद इस तरह की शिकायतें हों तो यह प्रतीत होता है कि जो हमारे प्रशासन का ऊंचा हिस्सा है, खास तौर से जो कबिनेट और मंत्रालयों का हिस्सा है उसमें भी अष्टाचार, पक्षपात और कुनबापरवरी बहुत ऊंचाई की तरफ चली गई है। जब गंगोत्री में ही काफी कीचड़ इकट्ठा हो जाय तो हम आशा नहीं कर सकते कि प्रयाग और हावड़ा में जा कर कहीं भी गंगा का पानी साफ मिल सकता है। आज यह तर्क हो गई है कि गंगोत्री में ही कीचड़ इकट्ठा है। जब तक हम वहां से कीचड़ हटाने की कोशिश नहीं करते हैं, सर्वोच्च स्थान जो है वहां के कीचड़ को हटाने की कोशिश नहीं करने, अपवित्रता को हटाने की कोशिश नहीं करते तब तक हम प्रशासन को शुद्ध और स्वच्छ नहीं बना सकते।

तो प्रश्न यह है कि हम इस को करें कैसे? बहुत से सुझाव दिये गये हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो मूलभूत समस्या है जब तक उस के लिये कोई मूलभूत उपाय नहीं सोचा जायेगा, जब तक ऐसा कोई उपाय नहीं सोचा जायेगा जो क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन ले आये, तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि न इस अष्टाचार को खत्म किया जा सकता है और न प्रशासन का पुनर्गठन हो सकता है। मूलभूत यह समस्या है कि हम विकेन्द्रीकरण की बात तो बहुत करते हैं लेकिन केन्द्र में रहने वाले लोग ही ज्यादा से ज्यादा शक्ति अपने हाथ में लेना चाहते हैं। उदाहरण के लिये आज एक प्रश्न पूछा गया और उस के उत्तर में शिक्षा मंत्री जी ने कहा कि वैसे तो जो शिक्षा का विषय है वह राज्य के हाथ में है, उस की नीति पर प्रमल करना राज्यों की जिम्मेदारी है और राज्य उस पर प्रमल करते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक सपना देन का सवाल आयेगा, योजना के अनुसार कामों को करने का सवाल आयेगा,

स्कीमों को मंजूर करने का सवाल आयेगा, तो वह केन्द्र करेगा। नतीजा यह होता है कि सारी शक्तियाँ केन्द्र में ही केन्द्रित रहती हैं और राज्य सरकारों को कोई मौका नहीं मिलता कि वे अपनी इच्छा के मुताबिक काम करें। इसी तरह से हमारे युनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन की स्थापना हुई। युनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन का काम वही है जो राज्य सरकारों करती हैं। मगर युनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन की स्थापना कर के युनिवर्सिटियों और बड़े बड़े कॉलेजों को जो अनुदान दिया जाता है उसे शक्ति को एक स्थान पर केन्द्रित कर के एक व्यक्ति या आयोग के हाथ में दे दिया गया है। नतीजा यह होता है कि युनिवर्सिटियों और कॉलेजों ने जो अपने उसूल बना रखे हैं अच्छे अच्छे, उन के मुताबिक वह काम करने हैं तो उन को अनुदान नहीं मिलता। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमें प्रशासन का पुनर्गठन करना है तो हमें यह निश्चय करना पड़ेगा कि आज जो हमारी शक्ति केन्द्रित होती जा रही है एक स्थान पर, हम उस का विकेन्द्रीकरण करें। जनवादी विकेन्द्रीकरण के लिये एक रेजोल्यूशन पास किया गया। लेकिन उस के बाद आज क्या हो रहा है? राज्यों में जिला परिषदों की स्थापना हुई। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में जानता हूँ। वहाँ जिला परिषदों की स्थापना हुई। पर उस के अध्यक्ष बनाये गये क्लेक्टर या डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट। वहाँ पर कुछ चुने हुए आदमी होंगे, और उन का अध्यक्ष कौन होगा? वह होगा एक ऐसा आदमी जो सरकारी नौकर है। मैं सरकारी नौकरों की भत्सना इसलिये नहीं करना चाहता कि वह सरकारी नौकर हैं, बल्कि सवाल यह है कि परिषदों में चुने हुए आदमी होंगे लेकिन उन के ऊपर कौन होगा? एक ऐसा आदमी जो स्थायी सर्विस में होता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि विकेन्द्रीकरण के यह माने कभी नहीं ह कि जो चुने हुए लोग हैं उन के ऊपर हम ऐसे आदमी को रख दें जो स्थायी सर्विस का हो।

जनवादी विकेन्द्रीकरण की जो बात कही जाती है उसके बारे में हमें देखना पड़ेगा कि हम जनवादी विकेन्द्रीकरण को ऐसे स्थान तक ले जायें जो कि प्रशासन को चार हिस्सों में बाँटे। एक हिस्सा होगा केन्द्र। केन्द्र के विषय निर्धारित हों, उन विषयों में केन्द्र को अधिकार होगा। इसके अलावा राज्यों के विषय होंगे और राज्य के बहुत अधिक विषय हो सकते हैं। जो विषय आज केन्द्र के पास हैं उन से ज्यादा राज्यों को जा सकते हैं, राज्यों को जो अधिकार मिलेंगे उन से बहुत ज्यादा विषय ऐसे हो सकते हैं जो कि जिलों को जा सकते हैं और जो अधिकार जिलों में हैं उन से बहुत ज्यादा अधिकार ग्राम सभाओं को जा सकते हैं। जब तक उन को पूरे अधिकार न होंगे, जब तक हम इस तरह से अपने राज्यों की योजना नहीं बनायेंगे, तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि कभी प्रशासन में शुद्धता नहीं हो सकती है। इस चौखम्भा योजना के साथ साथ मैं यह भी निवेदन करूँगा कि इस को अमल में लाने के लिये जो राजस्व है, रेवन्यू है, उस का भी हम उसी हिसाब से विभाजन कर दें और वह चारों स्थानों पर बराबर बराबर जाय। आज यह टेन्डेंसी बढ़ती जा रही है कि सारे का सारा राजस्व केन्द्र में आये और केन्द्र अनुदान दे जिस के साथ उस की अपनी शर्तें लगी हों। जैसा कि मेरे मित्र ने कहा कुछ राज्यों को अपने यहाँ ऐसे अफसर रखने होते हैं जिन का केन्द्र में जो मिनिस्टर और आफिसर्स हैं उन से सम्पर्क रहता है। अनुदान पाने के लिये ऐसे अधिकारियों को राज्यों को अपने यहाँ बढ़ाना पड़ता है। इससे बड़ी दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण बात और नहीं हो सकती कि कोई राज्य अपने यहाँ केवल राजस्व प्राप्त करने के लिये अधिकारियों को रखे जो कि लाबींग कर सकें और केन्द्र में कोशिश कर सकें जिस में कि ज्यादा अनुदान मिल सके। ऐसी बात जानी चाहिये और इस तरह की बात जाने का मार्ग यही है कि हम राजस्व का विभाजन कर दें। सारा राजस्व एक

[श्री राजराज सिंह]

बगह पर इकट्ठा हो और उस में से हर स्थान का बांटा जाय। एक चौथाई केन्द्र का हो, एक चौथाई राज्य का हो, एक चौथाई जिला परिषद् को जाय और एक चौथाई ग्राम सभा को जाय। लेकिन इस के साथ साथ प्रश्न यह उठता है कि प्रशासन का पुराना ही ढांचा चला आ रहा है, उस में परिवर्तन कैसे हो। अगर प्रशासन के ढांचे में परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ तो हमारा काम कैसे चलेगा? जो पुराना प्रशासन चला आ रहा है उसे हम पुलिस राज्य का ढांचा कहें या शांति और व्यवस्था कायम करने का ढांचा कहें, उस से इस तरह की बात पूरी नहीं हो सकती। इस सरकार की जो सब से बड़ी गलती हुई वह यह कि उस ने सारे ढांचे को बदलने की कोशिश नहीं की, कहीं कहीं बदलने की कोशिश की। नतीजा यह हुआ है कि हम एक दूसरे जंजाल में फंस गये हैं, एक ऐसे जाल में फंस गये हैं जो बदलते हुए युग में अपनी जड़ों को नहीं बदल सकता है। उन की परम्पराओं को बदलना है, जड़ बदलनी है। अगर उन जड़ों में हम नई जड़ों का समावेश नहीं कर सकते तो हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता। हम यहां नये कानून बनाते हैं जिन से हम नये लक्ष्य पूरे करने की कोशिश करते हैं, लेकिन वह पूरे नहीं हो सकते।

आज बार बार कहा जाता है कि एफिशिएन्सी या योग्यता के आधार पर सारे प्रशासन हों या अप्वाइंटमेंट हों। लेकिन यह एक बड़ा भारी मिथ है, यह एक ऐसा झूठा जाल है जिस के अनुसार कभी भी देश का भला नहीं हो सकता। हम प्रशासन में, सर्विसेज में इतने आदमी देखते हैं, उन का एक अलग क्लास बन गया है। अगर कोई मन्डर सेक्रेटरी है तो उस का लड़का यही चाहता है कि वह सेक्रेटरी हो जाय, कलक्टर साहब का लड़का कमिश्नर बनना चाहता है, गवर्नर बनना चाहता है। लेकिन बेलवार का लड़का बेलवार ही रहेगा, किसान का लड़का

किसान ही रहेगा, मजदूर का लड़का मजदूर ही रहेगा। चपरासी की कभी हिम्मत नहीं हो सकती कि वह सोचे कि उस का लड़का या वह खुद सेक्रेटरी हो जाय। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक हम प्रशासन के इस ढांचे को नहीं बदलेंगे कि योग्यता के आधार पर प्रमोशन मिलेगा या वरीयता मिलेगी, या सर्विस मिलेगी, तब तक प्रशासन को प्राप अच्छा बना ही नहीं सकते। हमें इस का निश्चय करना पड़ेगा। आज इन सब बातों का नतीजा क्या होता है? मेरे मित्र श्री नागी रेड्डी ने कहा, और सही कहा, कि सरकारी अधिकारियों की यह आदत हो जाती है क्योंकि उन की पृष्ठभूमि ही ऐसी होती है कि अगर कभी कोई सवाल आता है किसान और जमींदार का तो हमेशा उन का मुकाब जमींदार की तरफ होता है, कभी कारखानों के मालिक और मजदूरों के सम्बन्ध का सवाल आता है तो वह कारखाने के मालिक की तरफ झुकेंगे क्योंकि वह उसी वर्ग से आते हैं। इसलिये हमें इस पृष्ठभूमि में देखना होगा कि जो नया ढांचा ही प्रशासन का उस में हमारे अधिकारी उन वर्गों से आये जो दबे रहे हैं, पददलित रहे हैं, जिन को सताया जाता रहा है। उन को प्रशासन की जिम्मेदारी सौंपी जानी चाहिये। जब उन में से लोग आयेंगे तो एक नई विचारधारा उत्पन्न होगी, एक नया तरीका आयेगा और वे लोग जो हमारा सोशललिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसायटी का लक्ष्य है उसे पूरा करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि यह एक ऐसा विषय है जिस पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करने की जरूरत है। यह कह देना काफी नहीं है कि तहकीकात हो रही है, जांच पड़ताल हो रही है। जांच पड़ताल से ऊपर का काम चल सकता है लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि यह समाज को सही तौर से समझना नहीं है। इसलिये जिस आयोग का सुझाव दिया गया है इस प्रस्ताव में वह स्वागत करने योग्य है।

इस प्रायोग के बिना पुनर्गठित हुए हम सारे देश का अध्ययन कर ही नहीं सकते, हम जान ही नहीं सकते कि क्या-क्या कार्य प्रशासन के लिये किया जाय जिस से खर्चा कम हो सके, किस तरह से कीचड़ में फंसा हुआ प्रशासन उस से बाहर आ सकता है, किस तरह नौकरशाही का जो ढांचा बन गया है उसे खत्म करने के लिये मदद दी जा सकती है चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों को। इस लिये जरूरी है कि इन सब दृष्टियों से इस पर विचार हो।

मैं जानता हूँ कि इस पर विचार होने में साल दो साल का समय लग सकता है। अब तक सरकार का जो एक काम करने का तरीका रहा है वह पुरानी लकीर और पुरानी नींव पर ही पुराने ढर्रे से काम करने का रहा है लेकिन यह जरूर है कि आयोग द्वारा इस साल दो साल का जो अध्ययन होगा उससे आगे आने वाली योजना के लिए हम बहुत ही मजबूत नींव रख सकते हैं। अब तक तो पुरानी लकीर पर ही चला गया है। इस लिए मैं गृह मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस आयोग के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करने में प्रेस्टिज का सवाल न लाये। ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है कि सरकार यदि यह प्रस्ताव स्वीकार कर लेती है तो सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा गिर जाती है। अगर इसी के स्वीकार करने से सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा के गिरने का सवाल आता है तो मैं कहूंगा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय स्वयं कह दिया करते हैं कि कलक्टर का काम दफ्तर में बैठना नहीं है उसे तो दूर करना चाहिए और इलाके में घूम घूम कर लोगों से मिलना जुलना चाहिए और सही हालात से अज्ञान को पोस्ट करना चाहिए। लेकिन क्या वाकई में ऐसा होता है? मैं तो माननीय गृह मंत्री से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस आयोग सम्बन्धी प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कर लें और यह चीज कतई अपने दिमाग से निकाल दें कि इसमें कोई प्रतिष्ठा गिरने का सवाल है जिस तरह की परिस्थितियों में यह

रहते हैं उन कमजोरियों को दूर करने के लिए अगर हमें कुछ एक कान्तिकारी कदम उठाने की जरूरत ही तो उन्हें उठाने के लिए हमें अपने हाथों में हिम्मत बटोरनी चाहिए और हिम्मत बटोर कर यह कहना चाहिए कि हम इस प्रायोग को बनाना चाहते हैं। अगर इस प्रायोग की स्थापना होती है तो सारे को सारे ढांचे को ओवरहाल करने के जो सुझाव दिये गये हैं, उन तमाम माननीय सदस्यों की तरफ से जो सुझाव दिये हैं उनको लेकर वह आयोग विचार करे और विचार करके इस तरह की एक रिपोर्ट पेश करे और जो कि बाद में पार्लियामेंट के सामने आये ताकि सारे के सारे ढांचे को हम बदल सकें, पूरे प्रशासन को ओवरहाल करना है। ऐसा करके हम देश में एक नई जान डाल सकते हैं और याद रखिये कि जब तक देश में यह नई जान और नवचेतना नहीं आयेगी तब तक यह जो हमारा सारा देश का जनतंत्रीय ढांचा है वह कभी भी गिर सकता है। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हमारे गृह मंत्री महोदय प्रतिष्ठा का सवाल न उठा कर इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करने की कृपा करें।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Brajeshwar Prasad. I would suggest that in all such matters as this, so that whoever sits in the Chair may have an idea about the allocation of time, hon. Members who want to participate in the debate must rise in their seats once or twice in the first instance. Thereafter the Chair will determine what time to allot to hon. Members. Now hon. Members are getting up one after the other, and when I made up my mind to call the hon. Minister I found it difficult to refuse to accommodate hon. Members.

Shri M. C. Jain (Kaithal): I gave my name two hours ago.

Mr. Speaker: Very well; others have been called.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the resolution. The establishment of a unitary State is the urgent need of the hour. Legislative centralisation coupled with administrative decentralisation will solve all our problems. My interim suggestions are two- in number. The unit of administration should be the parliamentary constituency. There should be a council in each parliamentary constituency of which the Chairman and the members should be the member of the Lok Sabha and the members of the State Assembly respectively. This council should be vested with all administrative, financial and judicial powers. In every Assembly constituency there should be a council consisting of the member of the Assembly and all the elected mukhtias. This council should be vested with all powers over irrigation, health, education and planning. The members of the Lok Sabha and the Provincial Assembly should be graduates of recognised universities. The Constitution needs to be amended. The goal is the liquidation of the evils of bureaucracy, capitalism and provincial autonomy.

श्री मू० चं० जैन : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव की तार्किक करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ गीक मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव जिस हद तक जाता है वह नाकाफी है। मैं नाकाफी इसलिए कहता हूँ कि मूवर ने सिर्फ इस बात के लिए तजवीज की है कि हम एक ऐसा ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचा अपने देश में बनायें और उसके लिए यह कमिशन बनाने की जो तजवीज उन्होंने की है और जो कि एक बेलफेयर स्टेट को हासिल करने में मदद देगी, मूनासिब है। लेकिन मैं कहूंगा कि एक बेलफेयर स्टेट के लिए जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचा चाहिए, वह काफी नहीं है। हमें तो सोशललिस्टिक बेलफेयर स्टेट के लिए एक ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचे की जरूरत है। मैं यह तमीज इसलिए करता हूँ क्योंकि सारे देश में बहुत से लोगों में इस बात की गलत-

फहमी है कि हमारा यह जो सोशललिस्टिक बेलफेयर स्टेट की स्थापना करने का व्यय है उसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है और सिर्फ बेलफेयर स्टेट ही काफी हीना चाहिए और बेलफेयर स्टेट होना ही काफी है। अब बेलफेयर स्टेट के लिए एक खास ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचे की जरूरत होती है गीक मैं तसलीम करता हूँ कि आज जो हमारी वर्तमान ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मशीनरी है वह एक बेलफेयर स्टेट के लिए भी काफी नहीं है और उसके लिए भी इनसफिशिएंट है तब सोशललिस्टिक बेलफेयर स्टेट के लिए तो वह और भी ना काफी होगी। लेकिन मैं स्वीकर साहब यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह जो हमारे सामने बेलफेयर स्टेट की आइडियल है तो उसके लिए जो हमें ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचा बनाना चाहिए, उसकी वर्तमान ढांचे के कायम रहते हम उसे नहीं बना पा सकते हैं तो फिर इस वर्तमान ढांचे के रहते तो हम सोशललिस्टिक बेलफेयर स्टेट कायम करने में तो और भी असफल होंगे। मैं इस पर इस वजह से जोर दे रहा हूँ कि वैसे तो पार्लियामेंट में और कई मौकों पर इस बारे में बहस हो चुकी है। सोशललिस्टिक बेलफेयर स्टेट का जो एक आदर्श हमने अपने सामने रखा है उसके एक खास मायने हैं और जब हमने उस आदर्श को अपने सामने रखा है तो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचे को उसके अनुरूप हमें बनाना पड़ेगा और आज के वर्तमान ढांचे में आमूल चूल परिवर्तन करना होगा। अगर हम उससे कम स्टेज पर कोई आदर्श अपने सामने रखेंगे और उस लिहाज से ही हम उस किस्म का कोई ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचा बनाना चाहए तो फिर मैं कहूंगा कि हम अपने आइडियल से नीचे आ गये हैं। मैं तो चाहूंगा कि जैसी हम बेलफेयर स्टेट बनाना चाहत हैं उसी के अनुरूप हमारा ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ढांचा भी होना चाहिए। मैं तो मूवर साहब से रिक्वस्ट करूंगा कि अपने इस रेजोलूशन में इतना और एड कर लें कि reorganisation of the country's administration so that it could be helpful

in achieving the goal of a Socialistic Welfare State तो मे इसको ज्यादा बेलकम करूंगा ।

मेरे क्याल में मेरे से भी ज्यादा तकसील में बहुत से आनरेबुल मेम्बरान ने इस प्रस्ताव की टाईव की है कि एक कमिशन होना चाहिए । जहां तक हमारे लीडरान का साल्लुक वे भी जब कभी एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव डांचे की बाबत बात करते हैं तो वे इस चीज को मानते हैं और तसलीम करते हैं कि आज एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव डांचे को बदलने और ओवरहाल करने की सल्लत जरूरत है । एपिलबी ने भी इसकी जरूरत महसूस की और उसने इसके बारे में बहुत शानदार रिपोर्ट रकखी । हमारे सेंकंड फाइव इयर प्लान में एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के बारे में एक खास चैप्टर है और फस्ट फाइव इयर प्लान में भी उसका जिक्र है । हर एक ने इस तरफ इशारा किया है कि हमारा जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव डांचा है वह नाकाफी है । अंग्रेजों के जमाने में एक खास किम्म की स्टेट के लिए वह बनाया गया और आज के बदले हालात में उसको कम्पलीटली ओवरहाल करना बहुत जरूरी हो गया है । मैं मानता हूं कि पिछले १२ सालों में हमारी सरकार ने देश और जनता की भलाई और उन्नति के लिए अनेकों प्लान बनाये और कुछ पर अमल भी हो रहा है और उनकामो के वास्ते लाखों और करोड़ों रुपये खर्च किये जा रहे हैं लेकिन एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव डांचा चूकि ठीक नहीं है इसलिए हम देखते हैं और जैसा कि दूसरे आनरेबुल मेम्बरान ने भी बताया कि हालत यह है कि बेसुमार रुपया पब्लिक बैलफेयर के नाम पर खर्च किया जा रहा है बेसुमार रुपया प्लानिंग कमिशन की मार्फत स्टेट्स को जाता है, वह तमाम रुपया आखिर कैसे खर्च होता है? देखने की चीज यह है कि आया जिन गरीबों के वास्ते वह रुपया दिया गया उनको वाकई में वह रुपया भयबा जमीन मिलती भी है कि नहीं और मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह अफसोस का विषय है कि ऐसा आमतौर पर नहीं हो पाता है और

डिजर्विंग हैंड्स तक वह रुपया और हमदाद नहीं पहुंच पातो है । इस सिलसिले में मैं चन्द एक वाक्यात होम मिनिस्टर के नोटिस में लाना चाहता हूं और एक दो चीज की तरफ हालां कि टाइम बहुत ही थोड़ा मेरे पास रह गया है उनका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं । मिसाल की तौर पर मैं अर्ज कलं कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की यह स्कीम है कि हर एक स्टेट में हरिजनों को जमीन दी जाये और जिसके कि मुताबिक आधा रुपया उनको बतौर ग्रांट के हो और आधा रुपया उन हरिजनों को कर्ज की शकल में मिले और जो कि बाद में उन से आसान किस्तों में वसूल कर लिया जाय लेकिन आप यह सुन कर हैरान होंगे कि वह रुपया जो गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया स्टेट्स को देती है और उस रुपये से जो जमीनें हरिजनों को देनी चाहिए तो मैं पंजाब की बाबत कह सकता हूं कि हरिजनों को वहां पर वस्त टाइप आफ लैंडस दिये गये हैं । जो वाटर लौग्ड ऐरियाज थे और जिनकी कि ५० रुपये और १०० रुपये फी एकड़ से ज्यादा कीमत नहीं थी वही जमीनें वहां पर बेचारे हरिजनों को ८०० और १००० रुपये के हिसाब से दी गई हैं और वे इस काबिल कतई नहीं थीं । और जिनका कि आधा रुपया भी मिलना चाहिए था । होम मिनिस्टर साहब कहेंगे कि आप कैसी मिसाल दे रहे हैं । यह एक मिसाल नहीं है । आप अठारहों जिलों की मिसालें ले लीजिए । शायद ही कोई ऐसा खुशकिस्मत जिला है और शायद ही कोई खुशकिस्मत हरिजन हो जिसे अच्छी जमीन मिल गयी हो । ऐसा क्यों हो रहा है? इस सिलसिले में मुझे एक मिसाल याद आती है । हमारी तरफ यह रिवाज था, और शायद हिन्दुस्तान के और हिस्सों में भी होगा, कि जब बारात चढ़ती थी और शादी के बाद दुलहन को डोली में बिठा लेते थे उसके बाब दुलहन के ऊपर कुछ पैसा कौड़ी की बखेर किया करते थे । आजकल भी कहीं कहीं यह रिवाज होगा । जब यह पैसों और रेजगारी की बखेर करते थे.

[जी यू. चं. वैन]

तो ग्राम तौर पर छोटे छोटे बच्चे डोली के आगे से उन पैसों को चुग लेते थे। लेकिन कहीं कहीं कुछ तगड़े मुश्किले आदमी चार साठियों में अदर बांध कर जो डोली पर से पैसे फेंके जाते थे उनको ऊपर से ऊपर उड़ा लेते थे और इस तरह वह सारा का सारा पैसा समेट लेते थे। इसी तरह से आजकल हमारे यहां हो रहा है। जो पैसा सरकार की तरफ से गरीब के लिए दिया जाता है वह उस गरीब तक पहुंचता नहीं और बीच में एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन और दूसरे मुश्किले उसको ले लेते हैं। कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीज के नाम से रुपया भिलता है। ये करनाल और रोहतक जिलों की मिसालें हैं और चौधरी रणवीर सिंह साहब भी मेरी ताईद करेंगे अगर उनको वक्त मिले। मैं अपने जिले में देखता हूँ कि चन्द मालदार और निकम्मे लोग को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बना कर दो दो चार चार हजार रुपया घांट ले लेते हैं लेकिन अगर कोई गरीब चमार चाहे कि उसको जूते बनाने के लिए हजार पांच सौ रुपया मिल जाए तो उससे कह दिया जाता है रुपया खत्म हो गया। जो चन्द पैसे वाले निकम्मे लोग हैं उनको रुपया मिल जाता है। मेरे पास ऐसी बहुत सी मिसालें हैं, अगर वक्त हो तो उनको पेश कर सकता हूँ। मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक बड़ा सख्त जरूरत है कि एक हार्ड पावर्ड कमिशन बने। उसके बगैर इस मशीनरी को ओवर हाल नहीं किया जा सकता।

अगली बात में जूडीशियरी और एग्जीक्यूटिव के सेपरेशन के मुतालिक कहना चाहता हूँ। एक सोशलिस्ट बैलफेयर स्टेट के लिए यह जरूरी है कि जूडीशियरी और एग्जीक्यूटिव को अलाहिदा किया जाए। हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन के डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स के अन्दर यह चीज रखी गयी है, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि एक भी स्टेट में इस बुनियादी चीजे को अभी तक कम्प्लीट नहीं किया गया। जहां तक

पंजाब का ताल्लुक है उसका तो बाबा आदम ही निराला है। मैं कहता हूँ कि कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाने वालों ने जो एक बुनियादी चीज डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स में रखी थी उस पर भी हम अमल नहीं कर सके हैं। हम अभी तक जूडीशियरी और एग्जीक्यूटिव को अमल नहीं कर सके हैं।

आज हाउस में ब्रेवाल केस का जिक्र आया। अगर पंजाब से बाहर के जज न आते तो उस केस में यह नतीजा न होता। ब्रेवाल आदि का सारे राज्य की जूडीशियरी से ऐतबार उठ गया था। बाहर के जज आये तो यह पता चला कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन कितना राटन हो सकता है। यह बात मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि जहां हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन पर जिम्मेवारी है वहां उसको चलाने वालों पर भी उसको ठीक चलाने की जिम्मेवारी है। हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के जो आई० ए० एस० या आई० पी० एस० या दूसरे अफसर हैं वे तो एक मजबूत घोड़े की तरह हैं। अगर घुड़सवार अच्छा होगा तो उनको जैसे च.हेगा चला सकेगा। लेकिन अगर सवार ही कमजोर हुआ तो वह घोड़ा अपनी मर्जी से कहीं से कहीं चला जाएगा। अफसरों को ठीक से चलाने के लिए स्ट्रांग, एफीशेंट और इनकर-टिबिल मिनिस्टर होने चाहिए। मौजूदा मशीनरी भी अच्छा काम दे सकती है अगर सवार लोग तगड़े हों और उनमें खुद में करणन वगैरह म हो।

एक बात में और कहना चाहता हूँ, आज अगर मजारे और मालिक में झगड़ा होता है या किसी अमीर और गरीब में झगड़ा है तो अमीर की ही जोत होती है क्योंकि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की मॅटेलिटी प्रो-रिच है। मेरा विश्वास है कि अगर वह घुड़सवार प्रो-रिच न हो, अगर मिनिस्टर खुद प्रो-पुअर हो और सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न की सोसाइटी के आदर्श पर यकीन करता हो तो वह अपने आदर्श से नीचे तक एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को परमिट कर देगा। इसलिए न सिर्फ

एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को ठीक करने की जरूरत है, लेकिन यह भी जरूरत है कि हम देखें कि हम बिनाको मिनिस्टर मुकर्रर करते हैं वे खुद सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न की सोसाइटी के आदर्श पर बनीन रखते हैं या नहीं। ऐसा तो नहीं है कि अन्दर तो खरी है और बाहर राम राम है। ऐसा तो नहीं है कि वह सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न की दुहाई देकर मिनिस्टर या चीफ मिनिस्टर बन जाते हैं और उस आदर्श में विश्वास नहीं करते। तो यह भी बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है। अगर हम इस पर अमल नहीं करेंगे तो हमारे अफसर ठीक तरह काम नहीं चला सकेंगे, वे डिमारेलाइज हो जायेंगे, उनका इनीशिएटिव कम हो जाएगा। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि यह बहुत गहरा मसला है और यह जरूरी है कि हमें मिनिस्टर साहब इस पर अपना ध्यान दें और मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि एक हाई पावर कमिशन मुकर्रर करने के प्रस्ताव को मंजूर करेंगे।

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): May I say a few words?

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I am unable to help him. Already, it has been extended by one hour.

Ch. Ranbir Singh: I will not take more than five minutes.

Shri Datar: I will take half an hour, because a number of points have been raised.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the hon. Member can have another opportunity.

Ch. Ranbir Singh: In any case the Minister will have to be given half an hour. So, I suppose it will be better if I am also given an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Now the hon. Minister.

Shri Datar: I heard very intently the numerous points that the hon. Members have made and I have also noted the desire expressed by a number of friends that such a high-power-

ed committee ought to be appointed. But I was very happy to find that there were a number of hon. Members, Sarvashri Goray, Melkote and Guha, who pointed out the difficulties in the way, and who rightly said that there was sufficient material before the country, or before the Government, and that that whatever changes were necessary, whatever improvements were called for, could surely be attended to by Government.

Now, may I also point out here that if we take into account the whole position, that is, the development during the last twelve years, and how this question has been very carefully attended to, examined a number of times and recommendations made by a number of bodies, including the bodies of Parliament, like the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee,—and all these efforts are duly appreciated by the hon. Members—then they would agree with me that there is no need for the appointment of such a commission at all.

Before I deal with the various points, may I assure the House that whatever new points have been made by hon. Members will surely be looked into and whatever necessary will be done? Because, we and the Parliament are one that the administration has to be absolutely efficient and, secondly, that the people, the common people, should believe that this is a welfare administration designed to advance the interests of the common man. So far as this objective is concerned, all of us, either the Government, or the hon. Members of Parliament, or the people at large, are fully agreed. I might as so assure the hon. Mover and others that we do not claim that there are no defects at all. But, all the same, whenever they are brought out, immediate action is taken by Government to see to it that they are completely eradicated. I might also point out here to my friend, Shri Braj Raj Singh, that in opposing this Resolution we are not actuated by any sense of

[Shri Datar]

prestige does not arise, and if the hon. Members see how the Government have been carrying on their work on their behalf, they will find that the question of prestige is the last to be taken into account. For these reasons, I should like to submit as briefly as possible what has been done in this respect during the last 12 years.

May I also, before dealing with this, point out that two hon. Members suggested improvement in the administration of justice. So far as that question is concerned, we had a Law Commission. Their recommendations have been received. They concern very largely administration of justice within the orbit of the States. A Law Ministers Conference is going to be held and naturally, at the Central level and also at the State level, the recommendations made by the Law Commission will be fully enquired into. My hon. friend brought in the question of the separation of the judiciary from the executive. To that question also, due attention is given and we have been requesting the State Governments to try to effect this measure as early as possible. Certain States have done so. I am confident that during the next few years, all the States will fall in line.

Then, I come to the main question of the administrative machinery to which this particular Resolution is confined. We have got the usual complaints and stock phrases are used. I would not like to use any strong words. But, I would like to point out in all humility that this is a question which has to be considered specifically. So far as the various charges are concerned, it is often said that there is inefficiency, corruption and nepotism. May I point out that whenever such charges are made and whenever they are specific, immediately they are enquired into and the persons who are responsible therefor are brought to book. I would therefore request in all humility hon. Members of Parliament to give us specific instances wherever

there are any, then, it will be duty not only of the Central Government, but also of the State Governments to see to it that all such cases are immediately looked into and proper, and wherever necessary, stern action is taken.

The question is like this: first, is there a need for a high-powered commission and secondly, will anything new be placed before the Government by the findings of such a Commission? As regards the first point, I would point out to the House that almost immediately after the popular ministry took over charge of the Central Government, and within a few months of popular ministries taking over in the States, attempts have been made, and in a number of cases, very effectively to meet charges of inefficiency, etc. that have been brought. It is also true that during the British administration, naturally, as Shri Goray rightly pointed out, it was more or less a law and order administration, though here and there they dealt with certain welfare schemes only to the minimum extent. After we took over, even before a Resolution was passed by Parliament that the objective of the Government administration was to establish first a welfare state and then a society on the socialistic pattern, the Government of India had already taken steps with a view to improve the administration and to change it wherever it was necessary. It might be called reorganisation of the administrative machinery. That is the reason why in 1949 the late Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, who was an hon. Minister of this Government was entrusted with the task of going through the whole of the Central Government administrative machinery. His report is very valuable. His report as also a statement of the action taken by the Government have been placed before Parliament, long long ago.

Thereafter, this question was again examined by an independent critic who was to a large extent interested in the problems of administration. It was Mr. Appleby who came to India

twice, whose reports make interesting reading. I would not like to go into those reports in detail, but I would point out that after naming certain defects, he rightly pointed out that on the whole the administration in India of the Central Government was perfectly sound and progressive. This is what he has said in his report:

"I should like to begin, however, by discounting some of the popular criticisms of governmental administration commonly heard among citizens. The four most prevalent are that Government has too many employees, that it is permeated with dishonesty, that it is inefficient, and that its work is unnecessarily hampered by red tape."

He made reference to such criticism on the floor of Parliament as also from the public platforms. So, he went into the whole question, and he admitted that the administration was, as I have said, on the whole efficient and progressive.

He refers to the achievements of the Government of India, and thereafter says:

"Yet in the face of these achievements, one finds in Parliament, in the press, in the universities, and in many conversations that citizens of pretension, cultivation and influence voice criticisms which tend to suggest a sense of failure and a lack of confidence. Criticisms that would be appropriate enough as counsels of improvement (which is ever to be had and always desirable) are made in such sweeping and extravagant terms, and in terms so little recognizing the nature and means to administrative improvement, as to be damaging and threatening of increasing damage to India's great march forward. One is moved to observe that India's greatest need is for a sense of certainty concerning her own success."

Thus, he has dealt with the various problems. He came to India twice, he

had the fullest opportunity of examining the governmental machinery at various levels. Thereafter, he made certain suggestions and those suggestions have been to a large extent accepted and implemented by Government, especially where they were of such a character that they required immediate enforcement.

Thus, we have before us not only Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar's report, but also the report of an independent person, a foreigner who came here with an open mind, and studied the conditions as they were.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That was in 1951.

Shri Datar: No. This report is subsequent. This report was also debated upon in both Houses of Parliament. The Prime Minister himself, if I remember aright, initiated this debate in both Houses and we had the advantage of the views of the hon. Members of this House also.

Then, I would point out that when the Planning Commission was appointed and when they were asked to prepare the First Five Year Plan, they devoted special attention to the administrative machinery, because, as you are aware, unless the administrative machinery was properly geared up and consisted of men who work not in an ordinary or casual manner but with a sense of devotion and dedication, the Five Year Plan could not have been successful at all. Therefore, they made certain suggestions. In fact, they have a particular division, so far as administrative matters are concerned. They deal not only with initiating new projects but also with finding out to what extent the administrative machinery has been working properly, with a view to implement the Five Year Plan.

18 hrs.

Thereafter, at the time of the formulation of the Second Five Year Plan also, the Planning Commission in particular, and the Government in general, had the advantage of finding out

[Shri Datar]

how the administrative machinery had been working. We found that there were certain defects here and there, and attempts were made to eliminate all these defects and to make the condition as proper and salutary as possible in respect of the Second Five Year Plan. Now, when the Third Five Year Plan is under consideration, all these defects in the administrative machinery will surely be taken into account and will be eliminated to the extent that it is possible to do so.

Now, I would point out some broad features of the improvements which Government have made. Though my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur stated that this was a resolution which ought to be accepted, yet towards the last portion of his speech, he struck a correct and salutary note. He stated that it was not proper always to entertain a sense of contempt either for the services or for the politicians. That is unfortunately what we do sometimes, because we believe that the services are entirely defective, and are absolutely inefficient; and, therefore, there has been a tendency everywhere to go on offering criticism. Some of this criticism is either exaggerated or is generally overpainted. For these reasons, another hon. Member pointed out rightly that the governmental machinery has to be improved, and the fullest efficiency has to be our aim. I accept this position. We are also trying our best to see to it, as another hon. Member has pointed out, that there is a sense of contentment so far as the large official machinery is concerned. That was the reason why the Central Pay Commission was appointed. That report is now before us. It is valuable not only because they have recommended various scales of pay, but also because they have taken what I might call an overall picture of the improvements, which, according to them, are required in the administrative machinery.

Without going very deep into the subject, I would, in this connection,

make a reference very briefly to certain chapters where they have dealt with this question. In chapter XLV, they have dealt with the question of promotion and character rolls. Then, the most important point has been raised in chapter LIII, and that deals with efficiency in public services. Then, there are other chapters where they have given their valuable views. They are all entitled to the greatest respect, and Government will consider and take such steps as are necessary, so far as their suggestions are concerned.

Then, a number of hon. Members stated, and my hon. friend Shri Goray also contended, that even the young people, the most brilliant people, who join the IAS or the other services, immediately after they enter service, become actuated by the same feelings, according to him, the other senior members of the services have. To some extent, it might be true, but we are trying our best to do two things; one is that in respect of the existing service personnel, we have always impressed upon them, we have almost warned them that in the new set-up which is a democratic one, they have to adjust themselves to democratic considerations. They cannot carry on their administration in the way they did during the British administration. We have stated that the sovereignty is in the people, and all of us have to work as servants of the people.

My hon. friend, Prof. Sharma, did not like the expression 'civil servant' and suggested the expression 'social servant'. May I point out that we are trying our best to reach that particular ideal and we have impressed upon our government servants at all levels that they should never consider themselves as masters, they ought not to be autocrats but they are to be the servants of the people and any separation, any difference, that formerly existed between a non-official social worker and a government servant ought to be reduced to the minimum? The government servants themselves have to be

the social servants of the people and they have to carry out their duties in this manner under this particular conception.

Secondly, we are also trying our best to see to it that they are properly trained. In this connection, I would invite the attention of hon. Members to the National Academy of Administration that we have established at Mussoorie. Now the object of that School as also the general policy of Government is that our new probationers in the All India services and the Central services ought to be imbued with a great sense of humanism. Formerly, as a number of hon. Members rightly pointed out, the human element was lacking. Therefore, we are trying our best to so train them and so imbue them with a new idea of service that they must always consider that they are administrators not in a rigid way, not in a technical way but administrators with a grace of humanism. Every question has to be approached in a human way, especially when we have a democratic form of government. For that purpose, a number of subjects have been introduced, subjects like social service, humanism etc. and we are trying to develop in them not only the idea of service but,—may I add?—the ethics of service. The service has to be as less patronising as possible, a service without reservations, because they are of the common people and the common people as their masters are entitled to expect full, dedicated service from all our officers.

Therefore, we are trying our best to see that the young entrants to those services are trained properly. Secondly, we have also what are called refresher courses! after six or eight years of experience, we bring them back and then they are trained in what is known as refresher courses, whereby they come into contact with other fellow-government servants. There whatever is done during that period is fully reviewed and proper instructions, and where necessary, guidance and advice, are given to them.

Thus you will find that these services, the IAS, IPS and the Central Services are not of the former type. At the district level, you will find that these officers have to be not merely the administrative heads of the district, but they have also to be the benefactors of the people at large in the fullest sense of the term. Everywhere, especially at the district level, we take care to see that these officers mix with the people, know their minds, know their difficulties and aspirations and try to attend to them as best as possible. Under these circumstances, I would point out to my hon. friend, the Mover that the conditions have changed very materially.

Going further, he made a mention of the Community Development schemes. These are schemes that concern the people directly at some of the lower levels and even at the lowest levels. Naturally Government had to appoint officers for carrying out these schemes. But at every stage, we took into account the fact that there was the need for advice and there was the need for contacts with the people. That was the reason why advisory committees were appointed at various stages.

Now, certain hon. Members have rightly pointed out that the lowest self-governing unit in India has to be the panchayat. Unfortunately, there was a break in the great tradition that we had so far as the panchayat administration is concerned. Some time must elapse. We are anxious to hand over as much work as possible to the panchayats. That is the reason why a new and very important experiment is being tried in the Andhra State as also in Rajasthan.

We are anxious that the panchayats should take over as much of administration especially of those matters which are in the interests of the community as a whole and that the panchayats should be competent and should be above factions and the members of the panchayats should also

[Shri Datar.]

work as servants of the people and for the interest and benefit of all the sections of the community. That is a very great experiment that is being tried.

Sir, you are aware of Shri Balwant-ray Mehta Committee's Report. That report has pointed out how there ought to be panchayats and panchayat samitis and panchayat parishads. All that is a matter of great moment. It is not that Government have been impervious to the calls of modern times and to the calls of progressive and democratic times. We have been examining every aspect of this question and I am anxious that the panchayats be developed as early as possible.

In the course of my tours I always visit the community development projects and have informal discussions both with the people at large and with the official machinery. And, I am happy to find that the common people have a sense of appreciation of what is being done. There is a lot of enthusiasm in their favour and some of the people have pointed out realistically that for some time at least they would require the help of the governmental machinery. Therefore, our officers have to be advisers. At present they have to carry out the execution of these schemes. I am looking forward to the time when the main brunt of the work and the responsibility will be taken over by these panchayats at various levels. Sometimes expert advice may be necessary and that will always be made available because, as I have stated already, our officers are social servants.

Thus you will find that from the panchayat which is the lowest unit of self-government up to Parliament we are having various bodies which deal with the various governmental problems. We have the invaluable advice of the hon. Members of Parliament not only during Sessions but whenever they are out they always oblige us by making suggestions, by

bringing complaints to our notice especially so far as the administrative machinery is concerned.

I would not, at this stage, give a long list of the committees that we have appointed for ascertaining the desires as also the aspirations and difficulties of the common people. I have got before me the list of a number of consultative committees attached to the various Ministries. Even here one charge was made that there was over-centralisation. May I point out that we are following the path of decentralisation not only as between Ministries or as between departments but we are trying to follow it up so far as the various schemes to be executed by the State Governments are concerned.

Some hon. Members suggested that sometimes the amounts have not been properly utilised. I would point out that sometimes there were such cases. But, on the whole our State Administrations are trying their best to improve their administration and to give us a good account of all the moneys that we are giving them. In these circumstances, we have to consider whether any new suggestions worth considering are coming or are likely to come from the appointment of what the hon. Member called a high-power commission. Government have full materials before them and are looking into all aspects of this question.

Reference was made to a retired civil servant who stated that during his time the staff was very small and it has become very large after Independence. But the activities of Government have increased generally about ten-fold. It was not a welfare State in those days. While considering the question of economy in expenditure, we have also to take into account the fact that the Government activities have been expanding in all directions. That is the reason why we have to take a decision after considering all these questions. We are always trying to see where there is

extravagance. We have got what is known as the 'Special Reorganisation Unit' which goes into all these questions, not only sporadically but every time. There is an organised attempt to see that no amount is wasted because it is the money of the public and the tax-payer and we have to act as trustees. We are responsible to Parliament for every pie of the expenditure. Therefore, I would point out how such considerations arise. All the same we are trying our best to keep the whole machinery as active and up-to-date as possible. It was found that the machinery was not yielding proper results or working expeditiously. Therefore, a special division has been appointed known as the Organisation and Methods Division. It goes into the whole thing and an hon. Member pointed out how they have developed a new machinery and coined new words to eliminate certain defects. It is constantly working and the defects pointed out are immediately removed.

A number of hon. Members spoke about corruption. I have said that four years ago we have set up a special division known as the Administrative Vigilance Division. This does not only deal with actual corruption cases because when corruption erupts we have to take action for detecting the crime and for punishing the wrong-doer. Corruption is twofold. There is on the one side the officer's readiness to receive illegal gratification. There is also the other side which should be noted. That is the common man's desire to get at the results as quickly as possible and not minding to pay some money in addition. This is a two-way house. Shri Goray also pointed out that the public also has to be extremely careful. A little inconvenience or harassment might be caused because things may not be done immediately. All the same, the public has to be trained to be above such temptations of getting work done easily. Corruption is one of the most important points to which the Government have been giving not only immediate attention

but stern attention. We have got the Special Police Establishment also which deals with larger cases of corruption. You will find that in a number of cases we have got convictions from the courts. Government are no respecter of persons. Action is taken if a wrong is committed or if corruption is found even at the highest level. I would not mention the instances, but Government takes action against even the delays of these people. In one case—I would not mention the name—where an officer was given a light sentence we moved the High Court and the sentence was enhanced from six months to two years. That is how Government had been acting about corruption. Whenever, as I have said, specific instances are brought forward, every instance is looked into. We know that corruption is a highly corroding evil and corruption has to disappear as early as possible, but we should not make large and general charges that all the people at all levels are corrupt. As we go up, though there might be some instances here and there, the extent of corruption also diminishes to a large extent. All the same, we are trying our best to see that all cases of corruption are fully and sternly attended to, and we either take strong departmental action or, where the case requires further action, we prosecute the officer.

So far as magistrates and others are concerned, we are maintaining the highest independence of the judiciary and therefore we are having results which are on the whole satisfactory.

I would not like to take any further time of the House, but I would only point out how we have been trying our best to take various steps for improving the whole machinery, for maintaining the highest efficiency, for eliminating corruption and for decentralising to the extent that is compatible with the progress of the country, with the advancement of the nation.

If, as I have briefly pointed out, we are taking action in respect of the

[Shri Datar.]

matters about which there was considerable complaint from many hon. Members, I am quite sure the narration of the various steps that the Government have been taking will satisfy even my professor friend that the Government are not idle, much less are they self-complacent. This is a matter which is of the greatest importance, and I would assure all hon. Members that Government would be remiss in their duty if they do not act strongly so far as this aspect of the matter is concerned.

In these circumstances, in the light of what I have pointed out, I would appeal to hon. Members to consider whether it is necessary to have, what my hon. friend calls, a high-powered commission. That is a question which is being tackled. It is our constant effort to remove all corruption, to make the administration as efficient as possible and to avoid delays at all steps. So far as these matters are concerned there are certain suggestions made by the Central Pay Commission. They will also be fully and thoroughly considered, and whatever action is necessary will be fully taken.

I would assure my hon. friend that Government are fully aware of their responsibility to the country in general and to the distinguished hon. Members of this House in particular. I have profited, Sir, by what a number of hon. Members have stated. I wish to assure them that whatever new points they have made will be fully enquired into and effective and appropriate action taken so far as these points are concerned. Under the circumstances, may I appeal to the hon. Member not to press this resolution?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sir, I once again thank you for extending the time for this resolution. You have been very generous as usual and you have allowed a large number of speakers to have their say. I have no word, Sir, to thank you for this kindness. My second duty, Sir, is

to thank all hon. Members who have taken part in this debate. I think every party has been represented so far as this debate is concerned. All the groups have been represented so far as this discussion is concerned. I think this question has been looked at from almost every point of view that is relevant, material and vital. But one of the results of this discussion has been that the hon. Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs has refused to be convinced. That is the failing in our ministers; that is one of the occupational diseases of our ministers. I think they do not try to be convinced by what we say.

Mr. Speaker, under your kind auspices and leadership and presidency, I have moved several resolutions on the floor of this House. The first reaction to those resolutions by the ministers has been a negative one. I spoke about the journalists. There was a negative reaction but afterwards they had to do something for the journalists. I spoke about the Pay Commission in this House. It had a negative reaction, but afterwards, the Government had to appoint a Pay Commission. I can assure you, without being a prophet, that the Government will be well-advised to appoint a Commission to go into the question of administration as a whole.

The hon. Minister has said that he has so many committees. I am reminded of a shop of a physician in my village who has all kinds of bottles in his shop with different medicines. One can go and see a whole array of bottles with him. Similarly, my hon. friend the Minister has a large number of committees. What are those committees? Those committees contain, like the phials of the physician in my village, medicine which does not produce the desired result; they contain old medicine, useless medicine. I would submit very respectfully that these committees have not produced the desired effect. They are giving homoeopathic doses to a person who requires

allopathic doses. They are giving a small dose to the patient who requires a big dose. The small doses are not going to help him.

श्री मू० ज० जैन : सर्व बढ़ता गया
ज्यों-ज्यों दवा की ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: I wonder what world our ministers live in. Wherever the minister goes, he gets sense of appreciation from the people! And wherever we, the Members of Parliament, go, you know what we get. I do not want to say it. I would like to go with the Minister one day and see where the sense of appreciation on the part of the people goes.

Shri M. C. Jain: Let him go in-cognito.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The difficulty is, our ministers live in a world which is different from the world of ordinary Members of Parliament. I want all the hon. Ministers who deserve my respect, who deserve my admiration and who deserve every kind of appreciation that I can give, to look at these things from the point of view of Members of Parliament who rub shoulders with the population, who mix with the *janta* and who obliterate the distance between themselves and the people. If the ministers were to look at these points from that point of view, I am sure the minister would agree with the humble suggestion that I have made.

Everybody has supported my resolution. The hon. Minister went on saying that Sarvashri so and so and so have not supported it. Everybody has supported it. I can produce the documents and the verbatim report which has been taken here to show that everybody has supported the resolution in substance excepting one person who always disagrees with whatever is said on the floor of this House.

An Hon. Member: Who is that person?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Everybody has said that there should be some Commission appointed. The hon. Minister said so and so—he was giving some names of hon. Members—have not joined me in this resolution. If three persons do not join me, are they going to turn down the suggestion of 16 persons? I do not know what democratic logic is this. The hon. Minister tells me that three persons do not want a Commission. But then 16 hon. Members demand the appointment of a Commission and they say that it would help the democratic functioning of the administration in this country. Otherwise, as I see, there is democratic inaction. 16 persons are for me and 3 persons are against me, but those 3 persons overrule the 16 persons.

Sir, I do not deny that our administration is improving day by day. But this administration will not improve at the speed at which we want it to improve and attain the efficiency which we want it to attain, unless the whole problem is examined on the basis which covers every aspect of administration. Our administration requires a whole medical check-up. It does not require check-up of one part of the body or the other, but it requires an over-all medical check-up. I would submit very respectfully that the hon. Home Minister should go home, read all the speeches that have been made today, understand all the intentions of the speakers today and come to the conclusion that the commission is needed.

I do not want to be egoistical, but I am not a man to yield. I will go on pressing this point till the commission is appointed. If I do not press this point, my hon. friend, Shri Banerjee, will do it or somebody else will do it, because this is one of the most desired things in the India of today. I would request the hon. Minister to see what the need of the hour is. He has talked about the administrative training school at Mussoorie and about refresher courses. Sir, I am a teacher and all

Re-organisation of
Country's Administration

[Shri D. C. Sharma.]

my life has been spent with students. I can give you a discourse for 45 minutes on what is happening in that administrative training school. But I do not want to tire the patience of the Members of this House and of the benevolent Speaker of the House. So, an overhauling is needed all along the line and committees here or there are not going to solve the problem. So, I would again request the hon. Minister to change his mind and accept my resolution.

Mr. Speaker: Is it necessary to put the resolution to the vote of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"This House calls upon the Government to appoint a high-powered Commission, consisting of public men, administrators and two judges of a High Court, to suggest ways and means for the re organisation of the country's administration so that it could be helpful in achieving the goal of a Welfare State."

The motion was negatived.

18-33 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: DEVELOPMENT
OF DRUG INDUSTRY AS STATE
CONCERN

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kesergod): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that the development of drug industry in the country be taken up as a State concern."

Mr. Speaker: He may continue on the next day.

18-33½ hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FORTY-SIXTH REPORT

Shri Rane (Buldana): Sir, I beg to present the Forty-sixth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

18-34 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, December 7, 1959|Agrahayana 16, 1881 (Saka)
