

"That Dr. Paul H. Appleby's Report on the re-examination of India's Administrative System be taken into consideration."

We have fixed two hours for this discussion. About 25 minutes have already been taken by the hon. Mover. We have one hour and 35 minutes still. May I know the approximate number of hon. Members?

Shri Gadgil: Sir, may I say something? This is a very important question and a very important report. It is not possible for the House to do full justice in a short period of two hours. I know that this can, very relevantly, be raised during the discussion on the Plan. If I may make a suggestion for the acceptance of the House, I suggest that the discussion may proceed for two hours but need not conclude but may be taken up again when we re-gather.

Apart from the personal aspect and the fact that it may interest a few people, some of us who look more to the consequences that flow from this report and a certain administrative set-up that is functioning today and also certain administrative improvements suggested here want to submit certain things for your consideration and also the consideration of the Leader of the House. So, let this discussion go on for two hours, now and time may be found after we re-gather again here.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

It was not the intention of the Government to have this matter debated during this session. It is not because it does not consider it very important—it does—but, before the discussion, we wanted a full examination of the various aspects, by the various Ministries and other departments of the Government and the Cabinet, of the various suggestions made. Frankly, we are in the middle of the examination and if I am asked to state anything about it, I will be very brief and I will say that I have

come here to listen to hon. Members and learn from them rather than to say anything myself. I would be very glad if these questions are discussed, but, obviously, I cannot guarantee what will happen in the next session. But, I would like it.

Unfortunately, listening to the hon. Mover's speech on this motion, I was hardly conscious about Dr. Appleby's report; I was more conscious of the Auditor-General. I refer to that part of Dr. Appleby's report in which he deals with certain important things. It was an important part, no doubt, but one small part, which he dealt with. I wish he dealt with the other parts of the report, which, I think, are more important and vital, the parts which Parliament should be interested in, where he discusses Parliamentary control and he criticises Parliamentary interference. These are the points which Parliament, no doubt, should consider and discuss. The other matters are, relatively, of small importance. We can consider them certainly, but the main things are those and, if I may say so, any person introducing this subject should have, I submit, said something about the context of things in which this report was made. I would refer the hon. Members to the first page—I am too modest to quote it here, modest on the part of the Government, Administration—where he speaks in highly eulogistic terms of the Government's activities and the brilliant conception of the First and the Second Five Year Plans and so on and so forth. Then, he goes on to criticise.

If I may draw the attention of the hon. Members, I think in the second page, top, he mentions this. This was, this part, was not a document to be published at all. It was entirely a private document which he gave me and the then Finance Minister for our consideration. He told us that it was not for publication but he also told that if we wanted to publish it he had no objection but it had not been written from the point of view of publication. He has used the language

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

age deliberately because it is a private document and the language used is strong to shake things up. I think we should welcome it from that point of view, and not whether we agree or disagree. We always require taking it up so that we may build our minds and thought about various matters. We look upon it from that point of view and I am examining it fully. I should welcome as much discussion in these various aspects as possible, in this session or the next session, but I cannot just guarantee, Sir, the time for it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us proceed with the discussion. We will see afterwards if we need any time subsequently or not.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): **Mr. Deputy-Speaker,** Sir, it is perhaps....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is one thing more. We shall have to place some restriction on the speeches. Shall we fix 10 minutes to 15 minutes for each hon. Member?

Shri Jaipal Singh: That is too little.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is only an hour, perhaps, left for hon. Members. The Government spokesman also will have to be given time.

Shri Jaipal Singh: We go on, Sir.

Shri Gadgil: It would have helped us quite a lot, in the interest of the discussion itself, if the House had in its possession the views of the Government on the recommendations of the Report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Members desire, we can increase it to 20 minutes, but only three Members would be able to speak, that is all.

Shri Gadgil: That is the reason why I suggested that it should be carried over.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, may I have 15 minutes?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, it is perhaps a somewhat pleasant irony that we interrupt discussion on how to achieve targets set out in the Plan to consider Dr. Appleby's Report, where Parliament has been stigmatized as "one of the important negative influences on achievement," and this is a firm formulation arrived at, the Doctor tell us, after three visits to our country. For myself, I am rather intrigued by his generally forthright and hard-hitting observations and I do not at all mind, but on the contrary laugh over his superior assumption that his "American idiom" might be difficult for us to understand, or that we have a predilection for "a hotch-potch of references largely foreign and not well understood." However, we are all interested to find out how best we can utilise this report which the country has purchased, no doubt, at a fat price.

Sir, there is no question that the present system of departmental administration is largely cumbersome, vexatious and time-consuming. Particularly in a period of planning, this requires change. We cannot afford what Dr. Appleby says in picturesque language is "a tempo in which the calendar is more relevant than the clock." The central problem, therefore, is: how can parliamentary control be reconciled with efficient management of enterprises which calls for initiative, speed and flexibility of operations, qualities that can hardly develop under the present system?

The pity, however, is that Dr. Appleby does not help to solve the problem but, on the contrary, proceeds to aggravate it. Shorn of its trappings, the remedy he suggests for our administrative ills is: "Trust the civil service; do not be afraid of Government by Joint Secretaries". It is not only "Government by Joint Secretaries" he recommends; he says, "what India needs, more than anything else, is more Government by Joint Secretaries, more Government by Deputy Secretaries, more Government by