

[Shri T. N. Singh]

this august House, has set up very noble traditions, has done an excellent job in a very difficult time, one of the most difficult periods of this nation's critical history, and we should be proud of it. I do not mind what somebody from outside says about us. After all, it is democracy. There is freedom of speech. We give freedom of speech to our own nationals. Let us extend that as a matter of courtesy to somebody who has come from outside, though he is not our national. Let him have the privilege, and probably the right, to criticise the most august body of this land. I felt it, no doubt, as a citizen of this country who is proud of the position in which our country today is, the way we have established for ourselves a national and international position, and all the great things that we are doing today. I do not want to take praise; it is no good to praise our own people.

But at times one feels — when so much criticism is made against us — that it is good to have a change and to say something about our own selves. All the same, I am sorry I raised this hornet's nest when we were discussing the excess grants. I did say then that it was rather very bad on the part of somebody who came from outside to have made certain remarks against this august House. I felt it certainly because we were not heard. Our side of the case was not heard; what we felt about it was not heard. Why the Parliament or Members of Parliament were behaving in a particular manner, nobody knew about. An *ex-parte* judgment was given. Not only that. As the Prime Minister rightly said, it was meant for private circulation, but it so happened that it was circulated to everybody and it became a public document. And there it is.

That was why I felt it. I am glad that this discussion has taken place. Probably, we cannot do justice in the short time that we have got. I wish you will give more time. I want to have the Report considered objectively, dispassionately and without

importing any unnecessary subjective matter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as I indicated at the beginning of this discussion, it is not my intention to go into this matter of the recommendations, suggestions and criticisms made in the Appleby Report at this stage, chiefly because we want to consider them very carefully in Government and then come up to Parliament for information or for guidance.

May I say right at the beginning that we should welcome very much discussions among MPs on this subject? Shri Matthen suggested some kind of Committee of Secretaries and the like. I do not quite know what he meant. The Secretaries are, of course, considering it. They are always considering these things that are referred to them, and they will, no doubt, send up their recommendations. But what seems to be a better procedure is that, if there is time, we might have those informal meetings with a number of Members of Parliament which we had for the Planning Commission. We may have that type of meeting, subject to one thing, if I may submit,—not having the necessity of every word being placed or recorded for future use. That, I think, is a little waste of time and energy. But to meet and discuss these various matters informally would be undoubtedly helpful from the point of view of the Government. I cannot guarantee this—I do not quite know what work we may have in the next session — but we hope to do that.

Now, I find that the way this Report has been looked at is as if it was an attack on this or that privilege of ours or rule of ours, and we are on the defensive. The House will notice that Government in various departments of Government, the Ministry of Finance and others, are criticised in very strong language, though we do

not object, my colleague does not object. We want as stout a criticism is possible. Not that we agree with it. if we agree, well and good; if we do not agree, we do not agree. But we welcome criticism, and we have, therefore, welcomed this criticism, this time and the last occasion that Dr. Appleby came here.

Dr. Appleby, there can be no doubt, is a person of very considerable experience in administrative procedures, structures etc. not only in the United States, but certainly in nearly all the countries of Europe and many elsewhere. He has been for long considered one of the major experts in administrative matters. That does not mean what he says about India must be right or good—it is neither here nor there. But he is a person who is entitled to express his opinion, and his opinion has to be considered carefully.

It so happened that he came here about three or four years ago on the first occasion, and the report he issued then was placed before the House much later, and sent to State Governments. And as a matter of fact, we profited greatly by that report, and some improvements were made in our internal procedures here in the Finance Ministry and in other Ministries because of the consideration that we gave to that report. I think that the O. and M. Division — the Organisation and Methods Division — was, more or less, started because of those discussions on the Appleby report, and that is doing really good work. As a matter of fact, changes have been introduced from time to time, because it is not a question of one major 'yes' or 'no' about it. This whole thing runs through the whole gamut of administration, and these changes have been introduced, and are being introduced from day to day, and I believe, to our advantage.

Then he came for a second time about two years back, and he made certain comments — I forget if he presented a major report or not; I have no recollection.

On this occasion he came again, for the third time, although he is a fairly busy man; he has been for some time what might be called the Finance Minister of the New York State. We do not call him Finance Minister there, but that is his function in the New York State. He deals with the finances, which are pretty big, of the New York State. All that does not qualify him to be a final judge in regard to our matters. But it does show a degree of competence and experience. He is a person on the eve of retirement; he has finished, more or less, his life's work, and he gave a good deal about administrative procedure, financial procedure and other procedures, and we have welcomed his visit here and profited greatly by it.

The whole trend of his criticism has been how we can meet the needs of today in India; that is, a new State dealing with not only social and other matters, but trying to deal with them at a rapid pace, a State which is industrialising itself, which is trying to grow, and in all sectors of our economy. How to do it? He has pointed out throughout that we cannot do this satisfactorily in the framework of the then existing administration, the one which we inherited from the British. He has paid tribute to the persons and the House will remember that he said that the level of administration in India, the quality of the administration was as high as he found almost in any country in the world. Even from the administrative point of view and the point of view of the purity of administration—in spite of the fact that there was corruption here and there—even so, he said that India came in the top dozen or so of the countries of the world. Having said that he said that the system that we have—it was a good enough system for the previous type of State—is not fast moving; it is slow and there are too many checks and counter-checks with the result that delays occur. That was his first criticism.

When he came a second time he expressed his surprise and satisfaction

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

that things had moved must faster than he thought they could have moved under the system partly because of certain minor changes that had been made and partly, according to him, because people had worked very hard, that is, the administrative apparatus. On this occasion again, the House will see that he began by saying that while they have proceeded as well because they have overworked themselves—and one cannot expect them always to be overworking themselves—in order to have a stable and fast progressive system you must change it in this way and that way. Anyhow, the whole criticism of Dr. Appleby is that this machine should move faster. It is obvious that he has a background. Although he has a world background, it is chiefly an American background and now he is partial to the American background. I remember I showed Dr. Appleby's Report to a very eminent Englishman, an English Professor, who obviously had an English background. He came, perhaps, from Shri Hiren Mukerjee's University, the Oxford University and he did not like Dr. Appleby's American background at all.

Well it does not matter, as a matter of fact, what Dr. Appleby says of what the other man from Oxford said. They are both very interesting and very helpful because they are looking at the question from various points of view. What are we interested in? We are not interested in retaining a particular framework, administrative framework or throwing it away; but, we are interested in getting the job done as quickly and rapidly and as well as possible. We are interested in getting our Five Year Plans go ahead and accomplish them both efficiently and speedily with purity in our administration. These we are interested in. Therefore, we welcome all suggestions, from any quarter they might come, and examine them with our own experience, the experience of Parliament and others and try to improve on that system.

Nobody can say that our administrative apparatus is just as perfect. Nothing is perfect. At the same time, it is admitted, and I think it should be admitted that our administrative apparatus, framed as it was originally for different purposes, has adapted itself to the change in India much more than might be expected. I might say everybody has adapted himself satisfactorily and the machinery has adapted itself—a good part of it has adapted itself—very well today. But, it is not merely a question of adaptation but something much more.

This House sometimes criticises and maybe rightly criticises the growth in all government offices, of people employed by Government or of Ministers or Deputy Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries and the like. But the fact is that the work we have to deal with has grown in geometric proportion—not in arithmetic. It is astonishing how work has grown. We may deal with it adequately or not; it is not for me to judge. But there is no doubt about the growth of work. It has to be recognised and it is not a sort of doubling or trebling. The only way to judge of it is 50 times or 100 times than it was previously. It goes into that region. Now, this puts a tremendous burden on everybody. Work grows; people are lacking; trained people are lacking. Obviously, the type of work we have to do more and more requires trained personnel. We want trained technicians; trained scientists, trained engineers, trained administrative officers and so on and so forth. We are constantly facing this difficulty.

One of our big problems today is this question of man-power. How to train our man-power adequately and utilise it immediately, not in the present haphazard way people go through colleges and universities and then knock about having no work to do because they do not fit in with the kind of work required. We have to train for a great deal of work and

nobody should knock about—no trained person. There is no doubt that we shall be training these men in much larger quantities than now. Not only that; we have to compete with others.

I am told that in the Soviet Union they are producing 75,000 engineers a year. We may not produce 75,000, but we may be able to 5,000 or 10,000. I do not know. We should have to. I think the figure will go up. In the Soviet Union, to give another figure, I was just reading today that there are 250,000 science teachers there; just science teachers—250,000. That shows the importance of science and technology and other things. The whole trend of administration is changing; the whole trend of modern life is changing and our administrative system will have to adapt itself to it. It cannot go on much as it has done in the past.

Two countries which are hardly alike but in some way are very much opposed to each other, the United States of America and the Soviet Union have one thing or many things in common. And, among them is this thing that they have a certain vitality and a certain adaptability, a certain knowledge of the changing world today and they are adapting themselves, they are trying to adapt themselves, scientifically, industrially and technologically and the rest. All other countries are behind them, if I may say so. Therefore, You will find that the average man from America and the average man from the Soviet Union offers the same criticisms on India. It is interesting to remember that the American comes and dislikes all these checks and balances. He wants to go ahead. He says, 'what is this'. We should have checks and balances. Every Government must. But what he says is, 'You have too many'. The average man in the Soviet Union—we do not have the average man from the Soviet Union, we usually have the special man from the Soviet Union,—but he offers exactly the same criticism to us. 'We cannot get work done. Your checks and balances and references and this

and that, why don't you give them to a General Manager to go ahead, as we have done in the Soviet Union'. It is no good working in theory. Theoretically, Parliament is supreme. Of course, Parliament must remain supreme. We must have the democratic structure. We must follow the fundamental basis of our Constitution. Nobody challenges that. We must have our checks; we must have the Auditor-General; we must fix this and that. All right. But we have to deal with the practical problem and not the theoretical problem of dealing with the Constitution, so that it may lead to results. In that way we welcome criticisms. We have received many criticisms.

My friend here is dealing with the building of the Steel plants and he is constantly being pushed by the Soviet people that this thing should be done quickly; delegate responsibility, this and that; we have to go ahead, we cannot wait for others. It is odd that the same type of criticism comes from the Soviet Union and from the United States, although they have entirely different structures.

6 P.M.

May I, in this connection, say and also draw the particular attention of my friend and colleague, Shri Mukerjee to a certain thing? He has been constantly talking about bureaucrate—that this sort of bureaucratic machinery crushes the spirit of man and all that. Well, I do not know what he would call the men governing the Soviet Union at the present moment. I say it is the essence of bureaucracy. And, I say the more socialists we get in this country, the more will bureaucracy grow. That is the inevitable result of socialism. It is obvious. Maybe, it should be a better type of bureaucracy; that is a different matter. It is bureaucracy and you must have bureaucracy in this complicated state of affairs whether it is India or America or the Soviet Union.

In America, they have a little less than they used to have—they used to

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

have a good deal of—what is called “The Spoils System”. That is, when a new administration comes, they push out almost up to the post-master in a local village. I do not know whether they do so still, but they used to. Everybody changes and in comes the new party man. In the Soviet system, I do not know the exact details of it, but sometimes, lots of people change suddenly.

But, the point is that you cannot escape bureaucracy. Improve it, if you like and we must. But, it is bureaucracy and in the old days we thought of bureaucracy in terms of the Indian Civil Service and some other Service. That idea has of course changed. The Indian Civil Service, as it was, is gradually fading out; a few people are left. Other people are coming and the Indian Administrative Service is bred up and conditioned in a somewhat new atmosphere. But, apart from that, naturally, a new invasion is taking place in this so-called bureaucracy and that is the invasion of the technical man—engineer, technologist, etc. He is coming in large numbers and he will come in ever-growing numbers in our whole apparatus. You have to rely on these people; you have to train them more and more. The time may come when you will be using them, not in thousands but in—if I may use the word—millions, not even in hundreds of thousands. And your Government will be progressively more and more bureaucratic in that sense. Then of course there will be hundred ways and many more ways of controls and others.

Now, again, our work becomes so complicated and so various. The work of Parliament becomes very very difficult and it becomes difficult for the Parliament to keep pace with it. If it cannot keep pace with it and yet has to control it, it has to pick and choose the strategic points; it has to see: what are the important points which you must hold and check and not waste our time in relatively

smaller and more trivial matters. Otherwise, important matters slip away and attention is drawn to the trivial matters.

If the hon. Members recollect the history of the growth of parliamentary system in England, they will see that the Parliament of the 19th century in the UK was something completely different from what it is today. Apart from the fact that it was not a very democratic Parliament—I mean to say that franchise was very limited and all that, but apart from that—that Parliament had leisure...The private member had plenty of time. It was a private Member's Parliament. Government hardly brought in anything, any important social measure. Sometimes it did of course, but they were a few and far between. And the Private Member had full charge.

Gradually, the work of Parliament and of the Government in Parliament has grown so much that the poor private Member in the British Parliament, as in other Parliaments, gets pushed out, simply through lack of time. And the most vital and important things are decided by Parliament by a real decision on the principle and then it refers it to some other body. Take an instance: It was divided absolutely. There were two main parties in the 19th century and the early 20th century Parliaments. There were two parties, for and against, free trade. The old Liberal and the Conservative Parties were divided on vital matters. Yet later, when protection came in, somewhat upsetting the hundred year old policy of the British, it is astonishing: the principle being accepted and the Board of Trade being told to draw up lists, duties, etc. Parliament hardly found time to consider; they had no time. They just decided: we have protection. Having decided that, the Board of Trade officials did the rest.

So, by the compulsion of events, Parliament cannot deal with these matters because there is so much. When you have not two corporations

but hundred State corporations in India, it is competent for Parliament but it will never have the time to look into each one of them, even if it wanted to. It has the power and if it chooses, at any time, to do anything, it will do it. But, you have to evolve other methods, therefore, whereby there should be adequate checks and at the same time, full initiative given for progress to go ahead.

These are really problems, not created by the Appleby Report. These are problems which are created by the facts of today, by the facts of life and we have to face them; we have to consider them carefully and discuss them and, step by step, change our administrative system or whatever it is, financial system, as we gain experience and as we see changes are necessary.

Shri Gadgil said that he wanted Government proposals. Certainly, I hope, in the next session, to put forward Government's ideas on the subject. But, all these are not one consolidated proposals. They are so many things and they are continuously, gradually changing; change after change comes.

For instance, during the last year or two, we have been progressively delegating authority; we have accepted that broad principle. We are going perhaps a little more slowly than we ought to. The Finance Ministry, which has been complained against greatly, not only by Dr. Appleby, but very often by the other Ministries of the Government of India too, is delegating its authority and introducing what is called, internal financial advisers. That is, instead of referring every matter to the Finance Ministry, one of its advisers sits with the Ministry in question and we pass on things; it avoids delay. Only in very important matters, need it go to the Ministry. We are going along these lines. Maybe, we are not going fast enough.

In regard to the delegation of authority to our autonomous corporations and others also, we feel it should be done, always keeping checks and

controls as far as possible. So that it is not a question of yes or no to anything; it is a question of examining it and making gradually such changes which appear to us desirable and which do not involve any risk, any grave financial risks and the rest. That is how we are proceeding in this matter and we shall proceed. I shall, from time to time, place before the House the steps that we are taking. In fact, in answer to many questions, we have been telling them about these various matters and, as I said, in the course of the next session. I hope that we shall be able to arrange an informal discussion among as many Members of Parliament as they wish. It is not a question of selecting them. As many as are interested and wish shall discuss this matter. We shall discuss the various points that the Appleby Report raises and, in fact, other points too, in regard to the administrative system and the other like points.

But, if I may again mention it, one should not feel irritated because of the strong language that Dr. Appleby has used. If I were quite sure that we were going to put it before Parliament, he would have used different language. But, we wanted our Government people—senior officials—to be shaken up. He told me that. In fact, he even offered to change his language, if it is going to be published, but I said: leave it as it is. That is good enough. So it is not that. But let us think rather of the great problem that we and every country has to face. It is a problem which, I have no doubt,—I know it is a fact—the United Kingdom has to face today; not the same type of problem as we have, but not so different either. After all, in a sense our civil services were somewhat modelled after the United Kingdom pattern. They had the same difficulties as we have had. It may be that they have greater experience and their country is small whatever it is, but they have their problems. I know it is a fact that the Soviet Union is constantly struggling with this problem of how much authority to delegate and how much not to delegate. I know they impressed upon me, when I was in the Soviet

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Union—they also impressed upon us when they came here—that we made a great mistake in not delegating authority, and they are delegating much more authority now simply because they found that the rapidly moving machine of their's was checked and stopped repeatedly because they did not delegate. Of course, they have a close supervision. Every Government has. But you cannot help the complicated and big administration not to delegate authority. And I would remind this House, when it talks about the Government by Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, that that is exactly the type of Government that both the United States and the Soviet Union have got today.

RELEASE OF A MEMBER

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received intimation from the District Superintendent of Police, Ahmedabad City today that Shri A. K. Gopalan, Member, Lok Sabha, was acquitted on the 6th September, 1956 of the charges under section 143, 145 and 188 I.P.C. by the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, II Court, Ahmedabad.

6.13 p.m.

The Lok Sabha adjourned till Half past Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 11th September, 1956.