

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

SIXTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE
ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg
to move:

"That this House agrees with
the Sixth Report of the Committee
on Private Members' Bills and
Resolutions presented to the House
on the 14th April, 1954."

As a contingent mover, I move for
a certain contingency that may arise.
As a matter of fact, Shri S. N. Das,
who moved his resolution on the 2nd
April, 1954, has taken about 17 minutes
already, and the whole of the day
today could be spent on that resolu-
tion. But, if the hon. Minister accepts
the resolution in between, other resolu-
tions will have to be taken up for consi-
deration. Therefore, the time allotted
for the next resolution is 2½ hours—
Shri Gopalan's resolution relating to
the appointment of a parliamentary
commission to enquire into the ques-
tion of curtailment of civil liberties;
then, 2 hours for the resolution re-
garding the steps to be taken to
separate the finances of the Posts and
Telegraphs Department from the
general finance—this is Shri Samanta's
resolution; then 2½ hours for Shri
H. L. Agarawal's resolution regarding
steps to be taken by Government to
make the First Five Year Plan a com-
plete success.

I recommend that the House do
accept this.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the
Sixth Report of the Committee on

Private Members' Bills and Reso-
lutions presented to the House on
the 14th April, 1954."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE. WORKING OF
ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY
AND METHODS AT CENTRE—Contd.

श्री एल० एन० दास (दरमंगा भन्ध): अध्यापक
महोदय, पिछले दिन जब मैंने इस प्रस्ताव को
इस सदन में पेश किया था उस समय मैं ने
बिना कहा था कि इस बात की बड़ी आवश्य-
कता है कि हम अपने देश के प्रशासन तंत्र
और उसकी पद्धति के बारे में जांच करने के
लिये एक एंसे आयोग की स्थापना करें कि जो
इसके बारे में पूरी जांच पड़ताल करने के बाद
प्रशासन के सम्बन्ध में और प्रशासन पद्धति के
सम्बन्ध में सरकार के सामने अपने सुझाव और
सिफारिशों को रखें। मैं ने यह कहा था कि
आज जो हमारा देश में प्रशासन तंत्र है उसकी
कल्पना उस समय में हुई थी जिस समय हम
गुलाम भं. और उस संगठन को भी उन्हीं लोगों ने
लागू किया था जिन को इस देश में अपने
शासन को बहुत दिनों के लिये कायम रखना
था।

जैसे हम ने स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद अपने
शासन को चलाने के लिये बहुत परिश्रम और
महनत करके, बहुत समय लगा कर, विधान
का निर्माण किया था, उसी प्रकार से आवश्य-
कता इस बात की है कि हम अपने प्रशासन
तंत्र के सम्बन्ध में बहुत ही व्यापक रूप से,
पूरी जानकारी हासिल करें और जानकारी
हासिल करने के बाद उस में जरूरी सुधार
करें। इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि आज की
अवस्था में हमारे राज्य के जो भी मुख्य अंग
हैं, कानून बनाने वाला अंग, कानून को देश में
लागू करने वाला अंग और न्याय विभाग, इन
तीनों भागों में सब से महत्वपूर्ण भाग ऊपर से
देखने में, कानून बनाने वाले भाग को कहा
जाता है। लेकिन मेरा खयाल है कि प्रजातंत्र
में यह कानून बनाने वाला विभाग, जैसा कि
हम वर्तमान पद्धति को देखते हैं, सिवा बहस

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

और सुझाव के ज्यादा आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता। इस लोक कल्याणकारी राज्य की जो कि हम ने कायम किया है और हम ने जो ऊंचे ऊंचे आदर्श रक्खे हैं, उन की सफलता विशेषकर उन्हीं लोगों पर है जो हमारे दश में प्रशासन तंत्र में काम करने वाले कार्यकर्ता लोग हैं। चीक समय कम है इस लिये इस की ज्यादा व्याख्या न कर के में एक श्री रैम्बे म्योर नाम के जो अंग्रेज लेखक हैं, जिन्होंने अपनी किताब 'हाउ बिर्टन इज गवर्नर्स' में अपने प्रशासन तंत्र के महत्व के सम्बन्ध में जो कहा है उसे ही सदन के सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने जो लिखा है वह इस प्रकार है :

"Bureaucracy has become during the last century, and especially during the last generation, a far more potent and vital element in our system of government than the textbooks realise. It has indeed become effective and operative part of our system. The power of the bureaucracy, the permanent civil service, is to be found not only in administration but also in legislation and finance. It not only administers the laws, but it largely shapes them. It not only spends the proceeds of taxation, it largely decides how much is to be raised and how it is to be raised."

[SHRIMATI KHONGMEN in the Chair]

यह अंग्रेजी शासन पद्धति की बात है, हम ने तो अंग्रेजी शासन का जो ढांचा है, सिद्धान्त है, उस से भी बहुत बड़े बड़े व्यापक कार्य तथा बड़ी बड़ी जिम्मेदारियां अपने ऊपर ली हैं। ऐसी हालत में हमारे इस राज्य का जो प्रशासन तंत्र है उस का महत्व और भी बढ़ जाता है। इसीलिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम इस बात को देखें कि अभी तक हमारे दश में जो कार्यकर्ता लोग बहाल किये जाते हैं, उन के बहाल करने का क्या तरीका है और हम ने बहाली का जो तरीका रक्खा है, उनकी शिक्षा की जो आवश्यकता रक्खी है, जांच का

जो तरीका लागू है, परीक्षा का जो विधान कायम है, साथ ही साथ मौखिक प्रश्नोत्तर (वाइवा वासी) का जो कायदा हमने रक्खा है, वह कारगर और उपयुक्त है या नहीं। मेरे खयाल से और दश के जो दूसरे सोचने वाले और विचारने वाले लोग हैं, सभी ने पूरी जांच पड़ताल के बाद यह निश्चय किया है कि हमारी—कार्यकर्ताओं के चुनने की, सेवकों के चुनने की, चाहे वह आल इंडिया सर्विस के लिये हो, चाहे प्राविशल सर्विस के लिये हो,—वर्तमान पद्धति कारगर नहीं है। यद्यपि यह बात सही है कि हम ने विधान के जरिये से एक एंसा संगठन, 'यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन' के नाम से कायम किया है जो एक स्वतंत्र संस्था है, और जिस में इस बात की पूरी गुंजाइश है कि किसी भी राजनीतिक या अन्य प्रकार का पक्षपात न होने पावे। मैं इस संस्था के प्रति ऐसी बात नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ जो इस संस्था के मान के खिलाफ हो, लेकिन गवर्नमेन्ट आफ इन्डिया की तरफ से हमारे प्रशासन के सम्बन्ध में जानकारी हासिल करने के लिये जो एक एंप्लोयी साहब बुलाये गये थे, उन्होंने पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के बारे में, या उसकी जो पद्धति है उस के बारे में, जो कहा है उसे संसद् के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने अंग्रेजी में जो कहा है वह इस प्रकार है :

"Personnel administration here has too much feudalistic heritage, too much academic and 'intellectual' orientation, too little administrative action and human-relations orientation, and is too defensive of the 'rights' of existing personnel."

इस के बाद वह दूसरे प्रोग्राम में कहते हैं।

"The criteria by which personnel are selected by the Public Service Commissions are not up to date, and examining and appraising techniques are far from modern. Selection tends to be by one type of person, which naturally perpetuates its own type. Selection is too much in terms of academic records and appraisals by experienced academic examiners, too

little in terms of many other considerations highly important in public administration. The fixed limits on cadres predetermine too many matters of great significance, and too little attention in selection is given to any but the most subjective and incidental attention to capacity for growth. Recruitment is not imaginative or aggressive enough, is too much limited by concern for persons already employed, and governed too easily by an underestimate of personnel potentialities in the society".

एक विद्वांस के परीक्षक, जो दूसरी जगह से हमारे प्रशासन तंत्र के ढांचे के बारे में जांच करने आये, और उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा, और जिससे मैंने अभी आप के सामने पढ़ कर सुनाया, उससे स्पष्ट मालूम होता है कि हमने एक स्वतंत्र संस्था का निर्माण तो किया, लेकिन वह स्वतंत्र संस्था ठीक उसी ढंग से काम करती आ रही है जैसा कि औपनिवेशिक शासन के समय में होता था। बदली हुई अवस्था में जब कि हम ने अपने ऊपर बही बही जिम्मेदारियाँ ली हैं, अगर हम आल इंडिया सर्विसेज और प्रान्तीय सर्विसेज के लिये अपने समाज में से अच्छे से अच्छे और ऊंची से ऊंची योग्यता के लोगों को चुनने का प्रयत्न नहीं करेंगे तो हमारा यह सारा प्रजातंत्र को सफल करने का प्रयत्न निष्फल जायेगा। इसी लिये, सभानेत्री जी, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि यद्यपि हमने एक स्वतंत्र संस्था का निर्माण किया है, लेकिन स्वतंत्र संस्था का निर्माण कर देने से ही कुछ नहीं होता। हम को देखना होगा कि हम ने अपने सामने जो आदर्श रक्खा है उसे पूरा करने वाले लोग किस मात्रा में और कैसे इस संगठन द्वारा हमारे शासन तंत्र में आते हैं।

इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि जितनी भी जांच पड़ताल हम ने अभी तक की है, और जितनी भी हमारे सामने समालोचनाएँ आती हैं, उन में कहा जाता है कि हमारे दृष्ट में स्वराज्य तो हुआ, लेकिन सुराज्य नहीं हुआ।

कहा जाता है कि स्वराज्य लाने में कीठनाई कहाँ है? मैं नहीं कहता कि सारी कीठनाई और सारी बुराई प्रशासन तंत्र में ही है। बुराई तो हमारे समाज के अन्दर है। जिस समाज में हम रहते हैं, उसी का प्रतीक शासन होता है। लेकिन सभानेत्री जी, इस बात को हमें मानना होगा कि जैसे हमने अपने दृष्ट के लिये एक संविधान बनाया, उसी तरह संविधान बनाने के साथ प्रशासन के कार्यकर्ताओं का कैसे चुनाव होना चाहिये, इस की जांच पड़ताल का हम ने कोई प्रबन्ध नहीं किया। हमारे विद्यालयों में और यूनिवर्सिटीयों में जो शिक्षा अब तक दी जाती है वह शिक्षा सिर्फ इस लिये प्राप्त की जाती है कि किसी तरह से इन संस्थाओं से निकल कर वह अपना जीवन-निर्वाह नौकरी के द्वारा कर सकेंगे। इन यूनिवर्सिटीयों और स्कूलों में इस बात की तरफ कम ध्यान दिया जाता है कि हमारे प्रशासन को चलाने वाले लोग कैसे हों। सौभाग्य से हमारे दृष्ट में हमारे पुत्र नेता माहत्मा गांधी ने बताया कि प्रशासन के लोगों को अपने सामने क्या आदर्श रखना चाहिये। मुझे इस बात के कबूल करने में कोई हिचकिचाहट नहीं है कि जो आशा उन्होंने दृष्ट के सामाजिक और राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ताओं से और विशेषकर कांग्रेस के कार्यकर्ताओं से की थी उसे हम पूरे तौर से चरितार्थ नहीं कर सके हैं। लेकिन साथ ही साथ यह बात भी हम को माननी पड़ेगी कि प्रशासन का जो ढांचा हम ने अपने दृष्ट में रखा वह जैसा का तैसा पुराना ढांचा ला कर रख दिया। जैसे आज टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री के सामने सवाल आता है कि उस में रेशनलाइजेशन की जरूरत है क्योंकि उसकी मशीनरी पुरानी हो गई है और उस के द्वारा बना माल दूसरे देशों के माल के कम्पटीशन में नहीं खप सकता है, अगर उसी उपमा को हम अपने प्रशासन पर लगावें तो कहा जा सकता है कि जो तरीका हमने अपनाया है वह पुराने जमाने के गुलामी के शासन को चलाने के लिये भले ही पर्याप्त रहा हो लेकिन वह आज हमारे बैलफेचर स्टेट (कल्याणकारी राज्य) के लिये उपयुक्त नहीं हो सकता।

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहूंगा कि हमारा प्रशासन यंत्र के जो तीनों भाग हैं अर्थात् लीजिस्लेचर (विधान-मण्डल) जूडीशियरी (न्यायपालिका) और एग्जिक्यूटिव (कार्य-पालिका) इन तीनों की जड़ जनता में होनी चाहिये। हम जानते हैं कि कानून बनाने वाले यद्यपि सब के सब अच्छे नहीं हैं लेकिन उनको निश्चित समय पर जनता के सामने उपस्थित होना पड़ता है। हर पांच साल बाद जनता उनको अपने तरीके से परखती है कि इनका काम अच्छा हुआ है या नहीं और तब उनका चुनाव होता है। जूडीशियरी को जनता के सामने जाने की कोई खास आवश्यकता ही नहीं है। लेकिन जो लासों की तादाद में प्रशासन तंत्र में काम करने वाले हैं उनको कभी जनता के बीच में जाकर परखे जाने का कोई मौका ही नहीं होता। इस लिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि उनके चुनाव में इस बात का ख्याल रखा जाय कि सचमुच में वे लोग प्रशासन यंत्र में आवें जो कि जनता की अभिलाषाओं की पूर्ति कर सकते हैं। जब तक जो रवैया रहा है उससे हम जानते हैं कि प्रशासन तंत्र में बड़े दिमाग वाले जाते हैं। लेकिन देखना यह है कि उन में सेवा भाव से कितने जाते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि इस में जो लोग जाते हैं उनमें से किसी में सेवा भाव या दृश भक्ति नहीं है। लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि ज्यादातर लोग जीवन निर्वाह के लिये ही जाते हैं। क्योंकि जो तरक्की वहां मिलती है, जो सुविधायें वहां मिलती हैं और वहां पर जो तरक्की की गुंजाइश है वैसे सुविधा अभी किसी दूसरे कामों में नहीं है। इस लिये ज्यादातर अच्छे मीस्त्रिक वाले लोग इस में जाते हैं। हमारा ख्याल है कि इस दृश में मीस्त्रिक के विकास की बहुत आवश्यकता है लेकिन उससे भी अधिक इस दृश में उन लोगों की जरूरत है कि जो जनता के आदर्श के अनुसार सेवा भाव से कार्य करना चाहते हों और इस तरह के आदीमियों को इन सर्विसज (सेवाओं) में लिया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन हमारी पीब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन की जो परीक्षा विधि है उसके

द्वारा मीस्त्रिक वाले भले ही आ जायें लेकिन सेवा भाव वाले, दृश भक्ति रखने वाले किस हद तक नियुक्त किये जाते हैं इस बात की जांच वहां नहीं होती। इस लिये मैं कहूंगा कि यह जो पीब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के इम्प्लोयमेंट का तरीका है उस में अदल बदल करने की जरूरत है।

मैं ने अपने प्रस्ताव में जितनी बातों का जिक्र किया है उन सब पर प्रकाश डालना मेरे लिये सम्भव नहीं है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि पीब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने बहुत दिन पहले कहा था कि जब हमारा सरकारी अफसरान कोई ऐसा काम करते हैं जिस में उनको सजा मिलनी चाहिये तो उस सजा के मिलने में इतना समय लग जाता है कि सजा का कोई महत्व ही नहीं रह जाता और दण्ड देने वक्त इस बात का कोई ख्याल नहीं किया जाता कि दण्ड देने का क्या मतलब है। पीब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने इस पर अपनी राय दी है। उस में उन रूल्स का जिक्र है जो कि सन् १९३० में बनाये गये थे लेकिन वह पुराने कानून अब भी कायम हैं। यद्यपि समय समय पर छोटे मोटे संशोधन किये गये हैं, पर वही पुराना पीब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने अपनी सन् १९५१-५२ की रिपोर्ट के पेज ३०, पेरा ४८ में यह कहा था :

“Revision of the Classification, Control and Appeal Rules:—

The Committee discussed at some length with the Home Secretary the desirability of amending as early as possible the existing Classification, Control and Appeal Rules in order to ensure that prompt disciplinary action was taken against Government servants responsible for committing breaches of discipline, irregularities, etc. There is ample evidence that the present elaborate procedure is very procrastinating and it results in affording more protection to a bad Government servant!”

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जो रूल्स

(नियम) हमारे दश में हैं वह इतने पुराने हैं कि उनका फिर से निर्माण और सुधार करने की जरूरत है और बदली हुई स्थिति में उनको किस तरह से लागू किया जाय यह देखने की आवश्यकता है। मैंने सुना है और अखबार में देखा भी है कि सारे देश के जो विभिन्न राज्यों के सीचवगण हैं वे लोग यहां आये हुए हैं और वह आल इंडिया सरीवसंज के नियमों के सम्बन्ध में विचार कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इतना ही काफी नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में जो जांच पड़ताल हो उसमें कुछ बाहर के लोगों का रहना भी जरूरी है। यह ठीक है कि जो लोग इसमें रखे गये हैं उनको प्रशासन का अधिक अनुभव है लेकिन साथ ही साथ यह भी ठीक है कि बाहर के लोग बाहर रह कर जितना और जिस दृष्टि से सोच सकते हैं, उतना डिपार्टमेंट वाले नहीं सोच सकते। इस लिये मेरा प्रस्ताव है कि इस काम को भी एक आयोग के सुपुर्द किया जाय और आयोग जो सिफारिश करे और सुझाव दे उसके अनुसार काम किया जाय। सभानेत्री जी, स्वर्गीय गोपालस्वामी अय्यंगर के सुपुर्द यह काम किया गया था कि जो केन्द्र में संगठन है उसके रिआर्गनाइजेशन के सम्बन्ध में वह अपने सुझाव दें। उन्होंने भी यह कहा था :

"There is need for carrying out organisational changes in the existing set-up of the machinery of government. This is so because there is insufficient co-ordination in the framing of policies and plans and inadequate speed and efficiency in their execution and these are relatable to faults in the set-up."

हमारे प्रशासन यंत्र में जो कुछ अभी तक परिवर्तन हुए हैं वह इतने धोड़े हैं कि उनका असर हमको अपने यंत्र पर कुछ दिखलाई नहीं पड़ता है। आम जनता इसकी शिकायत करती है पर मैं इस समय उसमें जाना नहीं चाहता। हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी को वह अच्छी तरह से मालूम है। मैं यह मान सकता हूँ कि इन शिकायतों में अतिरंजन भी होता है और इनमें बहुत सी ऐसी बातें भी हो सकती हैं कि

जिनका आधार नहीं होता है। लेकिन जिनके लिये हम अच्छी तरह से राज्य चलाते हैं वही यह कहें कि राज्य अच्छी तरह से नहीं चलता है तो यह हमारे लिये अफसोस की बात है। आप जहां कहीं जाइये जनता शासन की शिकायत करती है। हर जगह से यह शिकायत आती है कि जो सरकारी अफसर हैं वह जनता से दूर हैं, उनकी बड़े जनता में जितनी होनी चाहिये वह नहीं है। जनता के मनोभाव इनमें प्रतिबिम्बित नहीं होते हैं। जनता का उनसे सम्पर्क होता है तो जनता यह नहीं समझती कि यह हमारे सेवक हैं और जो अफसर जनता के सम्पर्क में आते हैं वहां वे यह नहीं समझते कि वह जनता के सेवक हैं बल्कि वह अपने को जनता का मालिक समझते हैं। उनके मनोभाव अभी तक नहीं बदले हैं। हम स्वतंत्र हुए, और हमने अपने विधान का निर्माण किया और जनता की आकांक्षाओं को उसमें हमने संकल्प के तौर पर रखा। इस विधान के बनने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के हर व्यवस्थापक को, न्याय विभाग में काम करने वाले को, और हिन्दुस्तान में एग्जीक्यूटिव विभाग विशेषकर प्रशासन में काम करने वाले को इस बात को महसूस करना चाहिये था कि वे इस देश की 26 करोड़ जनता के सेवक हैं। बदनसीबी यह है जो डांचा हमने अपने देश में बनाया है उसके कारण जितने आदमी उसमें काम करने वाले हैं उनको जनता अपने अज्ञान के कारण अपना हाकिम समझती है, अपना मालिक समझती है। लेकिन हम कानून बनाने वालों का और शासन चलाने वालों का यह फर्ज है कि हम जनता को अपने व्यवहार से दिखा दें कि हम उनके सेवक हैं। लेकिन अभी जो हमारा डांचा है और उसके जो काम का तरीका है उससे जनता को मालूम होता है कि सरकारी कार्यकर्ता हमारे सेवक नहीं हैं बल्कि हम पर हुकूमत करने वाले या हमारे मालिक हैं।

एक बात मैं और कहूंगा कि इस डांचे में हिन्दुस्तान की वर्ष व्यवस्था की सी कुछ चीज आ गई है। मैं नहीं कह सकता कि हमारे देश

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

में इस वर्ष व्यवस्था का किन्तु परिस्थितियों में निर्माण हुआ : कहा जाता है कि कर्म के आधार पर हुआ था। लेकिन जो हमारे दृष्ट में जातिपात का और ऊंच नीच का झगड़ा चला जाता है कुछ उसी तरह की चीज प्रशासन में सरविसेज में भी आ गई हैं। ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि यह सब हिन्दुस्तान के सरकारी कर्मचारी एक संस्था के कार्यकर्ता नहीं हैं। इस लिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि इस संगठन का हम इस तरह से निर्माण करें कि इसमें छोटे से छोटे कार्यकर्ता को यह महसूस हो कि वह भी इस सेवा मंडल का एक आवश्यक अंग है। हमने तन-स्वाहां की असमानता से और दूसरी सुविधाओं के जरिये से ऐसे भेदभाव कर दिये हैं कि उसका असर इस प्रकार का पड़ता है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि एक दिन में सब बराबर कर दिये जायें। लेकिन जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम ऐसा परिवर्तन करें और ऐसे कदम उठावें कि जिससे अफसरों को और दूसरे कार्यकर्ताओं को यह मालूम पड़े कि वे सब एक तंत्र के बराबर के पुर्जे हैं और सब के काम का महत्व है और सब को अपना काम चाहे वह छोटा हो या बड़ा हो, अपनी अपनी जगह पर ठीक से करना चाहिये। सभानेत्री जी, प्रशासन तंत्र में ऐसा ख्याल अभी तक नहीं आ पाया है। मैं अब और अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक ऐसा प्रस्ताव है जिस पर न सरकार को और न संसद् के किसी दूसरे सदस्य को मतभेद है। जरूरत इस बात की है कि इसकी छान बीन हो, बांच पड़ताल हो और अनुभव के आधार पर और बांच पड़ताल के आधार पर हम अपने शासन तंत्र में और काम करने की पद्धति में और इस सम्बन्ध में जो कानून और नियमादि हैं उनमें अधिक से अधिक और अच्छा से अच्छा परिवर्तन कर सकें। इस लिये मैं अपने इस प्रस्ताव को इस संसद् के समक्ष रखता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री इसको स्वीकार करेंगे।

Mr. Chairman: Let me now place the Resolution before the House.

Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that a Commission be soon appointed to inquire into the working of the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre, covering particularly the following aspects with a view to suggesting comprehensive measures for reforming and reorganising the administrative set-up, namely:—

- (a) adequacy or otherwise of the existing enactments, rules and regulations regarding recruitment, training and conditions of services;
- (b) adequacy or otherwise of the existing All India Services including the necessity and desirability of establishing an All India Economic Service and Social Service;
- (c) adequacy or otherwise of the existing rules, regulations and procedure regarding disciplinary action against Government employees;
- (d) the existing trends of deterioration in the administration, the causes underlying them and possible short term remedies to arrest further deterioration and long term and urgent measures to stop the rot; and
- (e) necessity and desirability of suitably changing the existing constitutional provisions with regard to the various safe-guards provided for the existing services."

There are as many as nine amendments to this Resolution. Of these I find that No. 5 and No. 9 are out of order. No. 5 appears to be beyond the scope of the original Resolution. So I rule it out of order. And so is No. 9 which also I rule out of order.

*Machinery and Methods
at Centre*

I will take the other amendments as moved, provided the hon. Members who have tabled the amendments are present in the House.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House is of opinion that Government should take immediate steps to reorganise the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre keeping in view the recommendations made in the report on Public Administration by A. D. Gorwala and also the report by Paul H. Appleby and pass anew or amend, enactments, rules and regulations in accordance with the democratic set-up adopted by the Constitution of India.”

Shri G. L. Chaudhary (Shahjahanpur Dist.—North cum Kheri—East—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House is of opinion that Government should take immediate steps to reorganize the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre and, if necessary, constitute a permanent statutory Commission to advise the Government in the matter of reorganisation and reforms from time to time.”

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Dist.—South): I beg to move:

That in the Resolution—

- (i) for the words “a Commission be soon appointed to inquire into the working of the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre” the words “a Commission be appointed to inquire into the working of the existing administrative machinery at the Centre” be substituted; and

- (ii) after part (e) the following part (f) be added:—

“(f) the desirability of having one Service Cadre, both for the Centre and States, avoiding the present distinction of All India and State Services.”

Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha (Hazaribagh East): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely:—

“In view of the fact that a number of Reports on the Reforms of Public Administration have already been submitted, from time to time, by different authorities appointed by the Government of India in the past, this House urges upon the Government to submit a scheme for gradual implementation of the appropriate recommendations contained in those Reports and suggest ways for an early re-orientation of the whole administrative structure, best suited to a Welfare State.”

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Etah Dist.—North East cum Budaun Dist.—East): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:—

“This House is of opinion that having regard to the existing trend of deterioration in the administration it is high time when the Government should review the entire administrative set-up in the country either by appointing a Commission or setting up a Committee consisting of officials and non-officials with a view to suggest:—

- (i) what changes, if any, are called for in the method of recruitment to services;
- (ii) what minimum qualifications, if any, are to be insisted upon;
- (iii) how discipline and control can be effectively enforced; and

[Shri Raghbir Sahai]

- (iv) how the effective carrying out of the policies of Government by the services can be ensured."

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

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

"This House is of opinion that a Commission be appointed to make a thorough enquiry into the working of the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre with a view to recommending measures including revision and replacement of rules, regulations, enactments, and constitutional provisions for the fulfilment of the following objectives, namely:—

- (a) that the administrative set-up may in every respect be suitable to meet the requirements of an independent, democratic and welfare State;
- (b) that proper personnel may be recruited, trained and organised for the purpose of making the administration trustworthy, efficient and responsive to the present-day needs;
- (c) that the development programmes may be expeditiously executed without being delayed or hindered by complicated rules of procedure or methods;
- (d) that corruption may be effectively checked and adequately dealt with; and
- (e) that public association and co-operation may be ensured in all welfare activities of the State."

Mr. Chairman: Amendments moved:

(1) That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that Government should take immediate steps to reorganise the exist-

ing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre keeping in view the recommendations made in the report on Public Administration by A. D. Gorwala and also the report by Paul H. Appleby and pass anew or amend, enactments, rules and regulations in accordance with the democratic set-up adopted by the Constitution of India."

(2) That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that Government should take immediate steps to reorganize the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre and, if necessary, constitute a permanent statutory Commission to advise the Government in the matter of reorganisation and reforms from time to time."

(3) That in the Resolution—

- (i) for the words "a Commission be soon appointed to inquire into the working of the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre" the words "a Commission be appointed to inquire into the working of the existing administrative machinery at the Centre" be substituted; and

(ii) after part (e) the following part (f) be added:—

"(f) the desirability of having one Service Cadre, both for the Centre and States, avoiding the present distinction of All India and State Services."

(4) That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely:—

"In view of the fact that a number of Reports on the Reforms of Public Administration have already been submitted, from time to time, by different authorities appointed by the Government of India in the past, this House urges upon the Government to submit a scheme for gradual implementation of the appropriate recommenda-

tions contained in those Reports and suggest ways for an early re-orientation of the whole administrative structure, best suited to a welfare State."

(5) That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:—

"This House is of opinion that having regard to the existing trend of deterioration in the administration it is high time when the Government should review the entire administrative set-up in the country either by appointing a Commission or setting up a Committee consisting of officials and non-officials with a view to suggest:—

- (i) what changes, if any, are called for in the method of recruitment to services;
- (ii) what minimum qualifications, if any, are to be insisted upon;
- (iii) how discipline and control can be effectively enforced; and
- (iv) how the effective carrying out of the policies of Government by the service can be ensured."

(6) "That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that a Commission be appointed to make a thorough enquiry into the working of the existing administrative machinery and methods at the Centre with a view to recommending measures including revision and replacement of rules, regulations, enactments, and constitutional provisions for the fulfilment of the following objectives, namely:—

- (a) that the administrative set-up may be every respect be suitable to meet the requirements of an independent, democratic and welfare State;
- (b) that proper personnel may be recruited, trained and organis-

ed for the purpose of making the administration trust-worthy, efficient and responsive to the present day needs;

- (c) that the development programmes may be expeditiously executed without being delayed or hindered by complicated rules of procedure or methods;
- (d) that corruption may be effectively checked and adequately dealt with; and
- (e) that public association and co-operation may be ensured in all welfare activities of the State."

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I have listened to the speech of the Mover, and I am in general agreement with the objective with which he has brought this Resolution. But I am not sure whether that purpose will be best discharged by the appointment of a commission or it can be done by some other alternative way.

As far as I am able to see, in the course of the last fifteen years so many attempts have been made, before independence and after independence, by the Government of India to review from time to time the machinery of government and to effect such changes as they thought were absolutely appropriate and necessary in view of the new objectives for which the State stood and stands. Before independence there were the two reports of Tottenham and Bajpai. After Independence there was the Gopalaswami Ayyangar Report. Apart from these, there was the Central Pay Commission, appointed by the previous Government before independence, although the recommendations of that Commission were more or less accepted by the Government that came after the achievement of independence. The point is that as soon as there is a necessity clearly established that the existing machinery is not appropriate to implement the policy of the Government, it becomes the duty of the Gov-

[Shri Gadgil]

ernment to review the situation as often as it is necessary. I think in a democratic country, examination of the machinery of government to see that it is of the best type is very necessary. It does not mean that the existing machinery should be changed from the top to the bottom, but there is no doubt that for the fulfilment of the objectives and the purposes for which the State stands it is necessary that the instrument must be appropriate.

Now, what are the purposes for which our State stands? Those purposes and objectives are more or less defined in the Preamble of the Constitution and certain other directive principles that are embodied in certain other clauses. The main thing is that our State has become a democratic State in which the individual is not to be neglected and his significance and importance has been duly acknowledged. In economic terms, our State has become a 'Welfare State'. We have to see whether the old machinery that is working is quite adequate or appropriate for the purposes of making the State a Welfare State not only on paper but in actual experience. Therefore, we have to look to other countries where such problems have appeared and it is necessary to borrow from their experience. We need, so to say, to develop the new arts of social and economic engineering into a coherent pattern which will be quite consistent with the new mass democracy which we are developing in this country. From this point of view, not only the few subjects that are enumerated in the Resolution, but the entire conception of public administration, the entire field of public administration has to be reviewed. I am not suggesting that this task is not possible to be done by an officer here and there. We have very lately an example where one officer tried to review the thing with the result that there was a storm in the Cabinet tea-cup and the situation which was considered to be very harmonious and homogenous was disturbed. I am glad

that, that storm is over, but the point remains that there are fundamental problems now facing this country which are related to public administration. The great objective must be that the will of the people must be well expressed in the Parliament, and whatever policies are formulated by the Parliament must be properly executed by the instrument of the Government, namely, public administration. For that purpose it is absolutely necessary that people who have got the requisite ability, the requisite knowledge, must be recruited. In a modern State, the public administration has become a matter of professional achievement. Just as we have the profession of law, the profession of medicine, the profession of engineering, similarly, public administration is today a profession. Therefore, what my friend suggested was that those who have suffered and have rendered service, this that and the other, should be recruited in the public administration, I am sorry I do not go with him to that extent.

An Hon. Member: He has not suggested that.

Shri Gadgil: If he has not suggested, so much the better; but the impression that I got—it might be due to my inadequate knowledge of Hindi—was that he did mention that they must be patriotic-minded, this that and the other. The point is, if it is a profession, then we must have the best men recruited to this profession. Therefore, the problem is—as he himself has stated—a difficult one in which we have to take into consideration not only the policy but the personnel; not only the personnel but the propaganda and in a way the entire field, namely, that of the machinery of co-ordination, principles of de-limiting departments, accountability, expert knowledge, and last but not the least the recruitment of personnel.

I will begin with the last one. In this case, when we have accepted a form of Parliamentary Government it obviously means that Ministers may

come and Ministers may go. There must be some permanent machinery which will maintain, to the extent possible, continuity of policy, not continuity of policy followed ignorantly but with knowledge and consciousness. I do not think that the importance of Civil Service has diminished even in the least because we have accepted the democratic form of government. On the contrary, the Indian Civil Service, or for the matter of that speaking in a general way, the Civil Service still remains, partially though, responsible for the formulation of policy. The Ministers, after all, base their policy on such data and on such background as are presented by the permanent section of the Civil Service. If there is wrong data or the data is arranged in such a way as not to give the right indication, then the work is not satisfactorily done. Therefore, let us realise the importance of permanent Civil Service in the sense that Civil Servants are as much responsible for the formulation of policy, though not to the same extent, but, to a considerable extent as the Minister himself is, and the Civil Servant is hundred per cent. responsible for the execution thereof. From that point of view we must make certain things clear which are already embodied in our Constitution, namely, that we have discarded what is known as "spoils system" which is available in America though gradually it is being given up. We have decided that we will recruit servants in our Civil Service on the principle of merit that means by open competition; we will not take into consideration his private opinions—he may be an R.S.S. man, he may be a Praja Socialist man, or at the worst he may be a Communist man. But, the point is, whether he is a good engineer, a good civil servant and whether he knows his job. We have nothing to do with his private opinions. If we were to introduce this question, namely, of taking into consideration what his private opinions are, I think we will be destroying not only something which we have inherited,

but we will not be able to build in the manner in which we desire for achieving such of those objectives which we have embodied in the Preamble of the Constitution. Therefore, so far as recruitment is concerned, it must be by open competition. It does not mean that I entirely agree with what is being done today. This is no occasion to criticise the vagaries of the Union Public Service Commission. I have received a number of complaints where boys coming very high in the written examination are thrown out in the *viva voce* examination; but these are things which will be referred to by me, if necessary, at some other occasion. The main principle on which the Union Public Service Commission has been framed is acceptable and our service must be recruited on the principle of merit and nothing else. To some extent we have to bow to the inevitable, to the extent it is necessary, to have certain representation of the backward and Scheduled Caste Communities; but I want to express that even this little weakness ought not to go beyond a certain limit because it will certainly affect the general efficiency of the administration.

Then, Sir, the question often has been argued in several reports on administration, whether experts should be in charge of administration, or the administrators should be a class by themselves and occasional advice of experts may be taken. My own personal view, both as a student of public administration and as an administrator having very varied experience for nearly five years in the Central Government and otherwise in local bodies, is that the expert should not be in the charge of administration. That is the conclusion which was arrived at by a committee which was appointed by the Government of Bombay a few years ago to recommend some changes in the machinery of Government. The same conclusion was arrived at by another committee appointed by the undivided Bengal some time ago to suggest certain changes in the administration of Bengal.

[Shri Gadgil]

Then, the other question is of accountability, discipline and other things. They need some change, no doubt. I will give an example without mentioning the name. A certain president of a trade union complained that there were cases of corruption and mismanagement in a certain department of the Government.

The matter was taken up by me as a Minister, and was pursued by me as an ordinary private Member. The result was that everything that the gentleman alleged was proved, but the gentleman was dismissed. So, it required a great amount of work on my part, and thanks to the late Mr. N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, who saw the injustice, the man was reinstated.

There is another case pending now. A certain non-commissioned officer at a certain Depot, time and again, asked his higher officers, to give him a few minutes' interview, so that he could explain cases of corruption, mishandling, and how a foreign man in charge of the Depot was sabotaging and causing harm to the best interests of the country. On all the occasions, his written requests were turned down, and when he made direct representations, the result was that those accusations were inquired into and found correct; but the man, instead of being given any credit, has been discharged from the service.

After independence, most of us, even including my humble self, have been appealing to the people to bring to the notice of Government any cases of corruption. And when in great enthusiasm, officials and non-officials made such representations, the result has always been only this. And it is not only this, but something more. If there is a case of individual injustice, I can understand the acceptance of the principle that the individual should not approach a Member of Parliament every now and then. But if a case of

individual injustice involves some big principle, I think, discretion ought to be used, and the man should not be taken to task and either demoted or discharged from the service.

So far as the organisation of government is concerned, I think we must organise it either on unit principle or on purpose. I shall illustrate what I am saying. For instance, here is the Ministry of Communications, and it wants to build certain quarters for its staff. Can it have its own engineer? No, that would be wrong. Can it have its own fire-fighting equipment? No, because that would be wrong. If that is done, then it would be wrong organisation of Government. So, it must be organised on the principle of function. There must be one department to discharge one function for the entire government. That is the principle that has been accepted in all modern administrations. The extent to which this has not been accepted in the Government of India or in the various Governments of the constituent States of the Union, it is a matter for consideration by the Central Government.

Now, that we have become a welfare State, and more and more spheres of activities are being taken into governmental hands, I think, men with the requisite ability, knowledge and honesty, must be recruited to the services.

We are now entering into a new field of activity, namely the field of industry. I do not say that a man after four or five years of experience will not become quite competent to discharge the duty of a manager. But there is one thing that Government must do, if they are keen on nationalisation. I am very much keen on that, and I have been abused for that, but today or tomorrow, we must proceed with nationalisation with speed, and more and more industries must be coming under the control of Government, as time passes. The usual question is asked, where are the people? That is a very simple accusa-

tion to make, and in fact, I answered one of my millowner friends here thus, "look here, when I nationalise the concern, I conscript those who are working there, I will transfer the man who is working as a manager in an Ahmedabad mill to a mill in Kanpur. That way, not only will I nationalise the commodities or the industrial products manufactured, but I will conscript the personnel also, so that my programme of nationalisation may not come to grief.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Just as in Nazi Germany.

Shri Gadgil: Not Nazi Germany, but something else.

Even if you do not want to go to that extent, I would suggest that there should be a managerial service or an economic service. That is something which I suggested when I was in Government, and I do not know to what extent the matter has been pursued. I also suggested one central engineering service. Although the persons may be engaged anywhere in any of the States in India, yet at a given time, their services should be made available to a big project, whether it be in a Part A or a Part B State or at the Centre. The point is that the organisation of government should be such that the best talent in the country, and the best equipment in the country could be made available easily.

Lastly, I come to the machinery of co-ordination. The other day, I asked a question whether it was not the policy of Government to derequisition land not required, and the reply was given, yes. Then, what happened to a particular piece of land? It was simply transferred from one Ministry to another. I think there ought to be better co-ordination, so that at a given time, we may know exactly where we stand. If you go to an electric powerhouse, you know exactly what is happening at the different centres, in a minute's time. In the same way, if we are not able to know what is hap-

pening here, there and everywhere, I doubt very much whether efficiency will result.

In conclusion, I would submit that these are points which are very important, especially when the direction, purpose and objective of the Union as a whole are materially different from those that were invariably maintained by the government which was there before independence. Now that we have become a welfare State, it has become very necessary that we should bring about some change in the instrument of policy, namely the administration, so that the poor people, who through their representatives here decide and formulate a particular policy, may be sure that it will not be sabotaged, while being implemented. A doctor may have diagnosed correctly, and given a good prescription, but if the compounder is inefficient, we know what the result is. Let the compounder be as able, as honest and as capable as is possible under the circumstances. As to how we should achieve this is a small matter. You can have a commission, you can have an officer or anybody else for that. But so far as we, the tax-payers, are concerned, we want that the administration should be efficient and honest.

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Etah Distt.—North East *cum* Budaun Distt.—East): I welcome this Resolution, because it has given us an opportunity to discuss our administrative set-up, and the position of the services in the country. Everybody knows that there is a variety of criticisms on this matter, not only from the educated classes, but from the uneducated, not only in the cities, but also in the rural areas. These criticisms can be placed under three or four categories.

There are criticisms to the effect that there is corruption in almost every department of the Government. There is another criticism that there is inefficiency in every department. There is also the criticism that there are unconscionable delays in the decisions of cases in every kind of court. We have also the criticism that the services are

[Shri Raghur Sahai.]

unresponsive, and that they do not care for public opinion. I am not prepared to say how much truth there is in everyone of these criticisms, but there they are, and we as public men have to face these criticisms off and on.

There is another point that we have to consider in this connection. Since we have obtained independence,—as many as six or seven years have elapsed, and the Central Government is run by our trusted leaders. There are also the various State Governments run by our trusted leaders, and so many beneficent measures are being adopted by the Central as well as the State Governments, and every possible attempt is being made to see that the lot of the poor is made a bit more happy. But we find that there is no recognition of this fact by the public. Everywhere either the State Governments are being blamed or the Central Government is being blamed, and all kinds of motives are being attributed to those who are running the State Governments and to those who are running the Central Government. Now, there may be a thousand and one reasons for all this state of affairs. But I am quite certain that one of the reasons for this state of affairs is that our services from top to bottom have not inspired confidence in the public. They do come in contact with the public at every stage. The man-in-the-street comes into contact with the services—high officers, medium officers, low officers. In every walk of life, people come into contact with these officers, with these government servants, and my own estimate is that people do not repose confidence in them because by their attitude, by their conduct, they have not been able to inspire confidence in the ordinary public. Fortunately or unfortunately, we are the majority party, and ours is the Government, both in the Centre as well as in the many States. My own estimate is that wherever we have lost in elections, it has been due mostly to the bungling and to the inefficiency of the

services in those States. (*Interruptions*). We do feel that the Government have not been able to act to their convictions. Who knows what are these schemes of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru? Who knows what are the schemes of the Central Government?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Nobody knows.
6 P.M.

Shri Raghur Sahai: Everybody judges Government by the conduct of a petty official, a high official in day today administration. They do not feel, in fact, that the Central Government and the State Governments are doing good for the ordinary people. My own estimate is that if the services were to change their methods, if the services were to adapt themselves to the exigencies of the situation, things would have been better, and our regret is that the services have not acquired that requisite frame of mind. They think in terms of their emoluments; they think in terms of their privileges; and the amenities to be enjoyed by them. There the matter ends. With regard to their obligations, they feel as if they have none. In the present state of affairs, everybody in the entire country wants to have the greatest benefits of *swaraj* and independence, and my own estimate is that the services want to reap the benefits of *swaraj* with a vengeance, because they feel that they have got no obligations. From my own experience, I can say that. When I am making these remarks, it does not mean that I am opposed to every government servant or that I say that everyone of them is inefficient or everyone of them is corrupt or everyone of them is not up to the mark. But my humble submission is that most of them are not—many of them are not. I have had occasion to talk to a very senior officer, the Chief Secretary of a Part A State, two or three years back. I was talking to him about the gradual deterioration in the administrative set-up in the country. He is a very good man; he was talking to me very frankly, in all sincerity, and when I asked him:

'Do you ever think about the deteriorating state in the administration? Do you ever point out this state of affairs to the Chief Minister or to the Minister with whom you come in contact, in private, in confidence because you get several opportunities to talk to them?' He very candidly told me 'No, I do not'. I asked: 'Why? Why don't you put your own point of view?' He said: 'Well, we follow the policy of the line of least resistance'. Now, look at these people who once belonged to the 'steel frame', who have got vast experience of administration during the British regime as well as during this regime....

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): May I take it that according to my hon. friend, the services were far more efficient, far more responsive, far more competent in the olden days and now they are deteriorating?

Shri Raghubir Sahai: I think so.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): Please try to correct that.

Shri Raghubir Sahai: So, Madam, I was simply surprised at the answer given by that high-placed gentleman in the services. He said: 'We are following the line of least resistance, that is, not putting their honest viewpoint before our Ministers.

Dr. Katju: That has nothing to do with public services; that has to do with Ministers.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): Address the Chair. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Raghubir Sahai: It is my misfortune that I am not able to carry conviction to the learned Home Minister. I am sorry that I have also got my confirmed views about the services. My own impression is that when he gave that answer, he wanted to shift the entire responsibility. Perhaps during the British regime he could not say that he was following the line of least resistance. In support of what I

say, I shall quote a line from Appleby's report. When Appleby came here at the instance of the Prime Minister and our learned Finance Minister to just have a review of the administration set up in this country. He just had a hurried view of the things. In course of this enquiry he asked one of the eminent and intelligent officials in the Government of India as to what he thought about the graft and corruption prevailing in the administration, and that intelligent and eminent official told him. 'All the graft and the corruption that is to be found in the country in the administration is at the level of Ministers'.

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): Then why does he blame the officers alone?

Shri Raghubir Sahai: This is an example of their sense of loyalty to a Government.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): Can you prove any of these?

Shri Raghubir Sahai: After the attainment of *Swaraj* government servants have begun to feel that they are greater politicians; they can criticise the policies of the Government with impurity. They can do anything that they like! That is a regrettable state of affairs. I do not know whether the hon. Home Minister would agree with the view that was given to Mr. Appleby the other day by that eminent and intelligent official that all the graft and corruption are at the level of the Ministers and not at the level of the Government servants.

Dr. Katju: Is that what Mr. Appleby was told?

Shri Raghubir Sahai: Yes; he was told so by a very eminent and intelligent official in the Government of India. I am not imputing motives to every government servant, but I do say that most of them have not come up to the mark.

Lastly, we should consider our services from the point of view—whether they are fitted to implement the de-

[Shri Raghbir Sahai.]

velopment programme. The entire country is watching our development programmes. The fate of the country depends upon the success or failure of those development programmes. My own doubt is the services have not risen to the occasion. They have no faith in the Five Year Plan. They have no faith in the community projects, and they have no faith in any of our development programmes. It is time for us when we should see whether our development programmes, within the short time at our disposal, can be successfully implemented by this machinery. I only want to submit to the hon. Minister that the time has come when we should review the whole situation. I do not advocate that every government servant should be turned out, lock, stock and barrel. They may be retained, but we should make sure that our policies are successfully carried out and if there is any hitch from any quarter, that hitch should be removed. From that point of view I would submit that my amendment may be accepted.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I am specially thankful to the previous speaker for his forthrightness in expressing his views regarding the present day administration though he belongs to the party which is ruling the country today. He made one particular remark which attracted my attention. He said that after the attainment of independence the morale has been deteriorating and the permanent service is becoming progressively unresponsive to the needs of the public. When the Britishers were ruling us, when foreigners were our masters, there was confusion and ambiguity with regard to the purpose and mode of service that had to be rendered by the permanent service. They had to please the alien masters and, at the same time, they had to serve the Indian community. So, there was ambiguity and confusion when the alien masters were ruling us, but after independence, this ambiguity and confusion came to a close.

Now, the public servants must really play the role of public servants. They

must be really servants of the public. The position of the general administrator since freedom has changed, in so far as the source from which he derives power. Prior to independence he was deriving his authority from above. His power originated from an outside power. Now he derives his authority from below, from the masses. That is the implication of democratic rule. Today, people exercise their power through elected ministers, and the masters are also public servants; they are the servants of the state and servants of the people. The civil servants execute the policies that are made by these public servants, that is, the ministers. The ministers act through these civil servants. But today, what has happened? As my hon. friend said just now, in addition to the politician playing the role of a politician, the people who adorn the civil service, instead of expressing their views and opinions on merits of each case, are playing the role of politicians. I may quote an instance in this context. I come from the State of Mysore. There, the permanent service itself has been divided into two groups, because there are two rival groups in the congress party itself.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Only two groups?

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): How many in P.S.P.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I am not talking of the P.S.P. I am talking of the ruling party now. There are two groups functioning in the Mysore State Congress. One group has got the support from one particular class of civil servants. The other group has got the support from another class of civil servants. So, the division of the Congress, the rift in the Congress, is carried even to the administration. Today, there are two different groups of civil servants: the one group is hostile to the present ruling group and the other group is hostile to the previous group. So, the administrative unity is completely destroyed, and, so I said, these administrators are becoming politicians. It is very unfortunate: it is a tragedy. Nowhere in the world do we

see such a situation existing. Unfortunately, in this country, the administrators, the people who belong to the permanent service, dabble in politics and always align themselves with some Minister or other or some politician or other, and they pass on administrative secrets and thus try to sabotage the policies or try to bring down the prestige of the Government. This is how our administrators are conducting themselves in this new set-up.

There is one important aspect which has to be touched when we talk of the permanent services. That is, they should think that they have got a fundamental obligation to the people. They are not only servants of the Ministers but they must also think that they are servants of the nation. Ministers are also servants of the people as are the permanent services. Unless and until there is a realisation on the part of the Ministers as well as the civil servants of this aspect of the matter, we cannot have a democratic administration. Whether a democracy functions or not can only be judged if there is responsive and responsible administration. And the administration will become responsive and responsible and serve the real interests of the people only when the emphasis on exercise of power is changed to the rendering of service. Today, the permanent services think that they belong to a separate class altogether and feel that they possess angelic wisdom and intelligence. They may possess intelligence and wisdom (*Interruption*). It may be that because they possess intelligence and merit they have been recruited to the services; but they must remember their intelligence and wisdom are dedicated to the service of the nation. Unfortunately, that kind of approach is not there. The present megalomaniac tendency of officers has been encouraged by some of the Ministers themselves. I do not want to name them, but some of the Ministers were telling me, "After all, we come and go, we will be there in the saddle for three, four or five years and we are not expected to know everything. Moreover,

even if we are expected to know everything, it is not possible to know everything during these few years and we have to depend upon our Secretaries and the permanent staff. Suppose, we take a strong attitude in a particular case, then the intelligent Secretaries may involve us in something else. So, we are afraid of the Secretaries." Many Ministers have spoken like this.

I must also say that the Ministers have also their own interests to serve. For that they have to depend upon the Secretaries, they want the good will of the Secretaries.—This has made them to think that they are omnipotent. This is not democracy; you may call it neocracy. I mean by 'neocracy' a government of upstarts and this is nothing but a neocracy. I, therefore, say that every step should be taken to reorientate our administrative machinery so that it may fulfil the new tasks that are ahead.

Before I close, I want to say that the administrator is expected now to perform new duties and obligations because the activities of our State are expanding. The civil servant has to be a manager of an industrial concern and he has to do so many other duties regarding production, distribution and exchange. It is very necessary that he should be properly trained, and proper men are recruited.

First of all, there should be reformation in the mind of the Ministry itself. That is very necessary (*Interruption*). Unless the Ministers make a bold move in the matter, it is not possible to bring about any change in the administrative system. The present system is outmoded and rotten and it cannot fulfil the new duties and obligations of a democratic nation. I therefore, say that the hon. Home Minister should give up his lethargy and become more active, give up his indifference and treat this matter very seriously and not brush it aside as a simple problem. He should realise that unless there is administrative reform, democracy cannot function well in this country.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Madam-Chairman, I entirely agree with most of the

[Shri S. C. Samanta.]

objects put forward in the resolution moved by my friend Shri S. N. Das. I have put forward an amendment to the effect that I find no necessity for further investigation into the subjects mentioned by my hon. friend. Already two committees, one the Gorewala Committee and the other, the Appleby Committee, have submitted their reports of government administration. They have mostly dealt with the subjects mentioned by my hon. friend. We the legislators and the officers are both impatient to see that the old rules and regulations should be changed at once to facilitate the administrator in which the National Government has proposed. We are all well-wishers of the State running on democratic lines. But the administration is not being run as it should be. I say, time should not be spent on investigation. There are Ministers who know the difficulties. There are good officers who know the difficulties. My friend, Shri Sahaji, remarked that most of the men in the services are not doing well. I cannot accept it. An administration cannot be run unless there are good men in it. There are good persons and there are also black-sheep; but, not most of them are bad. Had it been so, the administration would have been impossible.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: On a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Chairman: The House is very thin—I see there is no-quorum. Let the bell be rung.

The hon. Member may now continue as there is quorum.

Shri S. C. Samanta: My friend, Shri Sahai, was referring to his conversation with some officer. I may also refer to my conversation with another officer who told me to find out the means whereby administration may be efficiently run. The officers are feeling difficulties. For example, the Ministers, who are long sufferers, want to run the Government in their way, but when they express their views to their Secretaries in the Department, they point

out the difficulties created by the rules, regulations and the customs that are prevalent. The efficient officers, who, really feel for the country, are helpless because of the rules, regulations and enactments coming in the way. My friend, Shri Das, has done immense good to the country by bringing such a resolution as this before the House.

Shri Velayudhan: Will the Government accept the resolution?

Shri S. C. Samanta: In this country, we had different administrations in different periods. We, Indian nationals at present, would like to run our government in the way we like best. I may cite here as an example that Mahatmaji advocated non-violence, and our Government also advocated it (*Interruption*). What do we find today? I may draw the attention of the House to the fact that before independence, what we saw of the soldier was quite different from what we see of him today. What do we find now? Whenever there is any havoc, any accident, any flood, any famine etc., the Army is deputed to attend to help the situation and the soldiers do immense service. They feel, as we feel, that they should defend the country, and that they should not attack others unless they are attacked. This is the gist of non-violence, which the Army and the soldiers have instilled amongst themselves, because our Government wants to run its administration in our own way. In the same way, if it wants to be really a welfare State and to run efficiently, then the difficulties that stand in our way should be removed, that is, the rules that were framed during the British regime have somewhat to be altered—they are found to be efficient for our purpose even now in certain respects. Government is alert on the subject. The Planning Commission did not wait long. It appointed Mr. Gorewala to go into the matter and suggest how the administration can be made to run efficiently, and his report is before us. Under the Ford Foundation Scheme, Dr. Appleby was also invited to go into the administrative set-up of our country, and he

has also submitted his report. These two reports may be considered by Government with the help of their efficient officers, so that without waiting for a long time, we may bring in some changes at least, in the administrative set-up. In the legislatures, we legislate enactments and the efficiency of those enactments depend upon their working, which again depends upon the administration. So, the people who are recruited by the Public Service Commission should be properly selected. Even the Public Service Commission rules require some changes. We should not entirely depend upon the talents or education of the people for administrative purpose; we should also see the heart of the people whom we are going to place in important positions, and who will form the future administration of our country. Our future destiny depends on them.

My friend has brought forward all the points and my only request is that these points should be considered by Government, and that the Government should come to an early decision in the matter.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : सभानेत्री जी, जो प्रस्ताव इस भवन के सामने मेरे मित्र श्री एस० एन० दास ने पेश किया है वह समय के अनुकूल है और बहुत ही उचित प्रस्ताव है और मुझ उम्मीद है और साथ ही प्रार्थना भी है कि सरकार इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करेगी और उसके अनुसार एक कमिशन बिताने का निश्चय करेगी। प्रस्ताव जिस उद्देश्य से इस भवन के सामने आया है, उसका खास उद्देश्य यह है कि देश में हमारे एक प्रगतिशील शासक वर्ग कायम किया जाय। जो शासक वर्ग आज हमारे देश में है वह उस मशीनरी का बनाया हुआ है जो मशीनरी हमारे देश को गुलामी की जंजीर में बांधने के लिये कायम की गई थी। सन् १९४७ के पहले इन सिविल सर्विस सरबैंड्स को ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट अपना स्टील फ्रेम कहा करती थी, वह स्टील फ्रेम आज देश के लिये उपयुक्त है या नहीं, इस पर हमको और आपको विचार करना है। उस वक्त जो

मशीनरी बनी थी उसका खास अभिप्राय था कि देश में जैसे भी हो आजादी की लहर न फैलने पावे और वह सर्वदा के लिये जंजीरों की गुलामी की जंजीर में बंधा रहे, उस तरह के काम के लिये वह मशीनरी बहुत उपयुक्त थी। अभी हमारे माननीय गृहमंत्री ने एक सवाल किया कि क्या तब यह मशीनरी अधिक उपयुक्त थी या अपने कार्य में अधिक कुशल थी, और तब की बनिस्वत आज यह अकुशल है, इसका जवाब सच्चे हृदय से होगा, हां। उस वक्त वह मशीनरी उपयुक्त थी क्योंकि वह एक खास उद्देश्य से बनायी गयी थी और वह उस कार्य के लिये सर्वथा उपयुक्त थी और उपयुक्त सिद्ध हुई, लेकिन आज हमारे सामने कार्य दूसरा है। उस वक्त मशीनरी बनी थी देश को दबाने के लिये और आजादी की भावना को खत्म करने के लिये, लेकिन आज तो हम इस बिगड़े हुए देश को एक सुन्दर उद्यान बनाना चाहते हैं और इस लिये हमें आज चतुर माली की जरूरत है जो इस देश को सुन्दर बना सके। सवाल इतना सा है और हमें इस पर गम्भीरता से गौर करना है। अभी हाल ही में बोझा सा वायुमंडल गर्म होगया था और यह वह समय था जिस वक्त कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने त्यागपत्र देने की सूचना दी थी। किन्हीं अर्थ सम्बन्धी मामलों में उनका मतभेद होगया था, किन्हीं एक महोदय की नियुक्ति होगयी थी और उन्होंने अपनी एक रिपोर्ट बगैरे उनसे पूछे दी, क्या रिपोर्ट दी, वह सब ठीक नहीं मालूम, लेकिन वह एक मसला प्रणाली का (प्रोसीदियर का) चला जिस पर कि यह मतभेद उठ खड़ा होगया और त्यागपत्र तक दे देने की नौबत आगयी थी। एक प्रणाली है जिस पर यह सब भुगड़ा उठ खड़ा हुआ और उस सम्बन्ध में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जब वक्तव्य दिया तो उन्होंने कहा था कि हमें एक नई प्रणाली कायम करनी है, एक ऐसी प्रणाली जो देश के अनुकूल हो और देश को आगे बढ़ा सके। इन पहलुओं पर हम गौर करें और देखें कि क्या आज का जो शासक वर्ग है वह सही ढंग से चल रहा है या नहीं। अभी

[श्री सिद्दासन सिंह]

परसाँ डाक्टर राधाकृष्णन साहब ने कर्नाटक के एक सम्मेलन का उद्घाटन करते हुए कहा था कि किसी दंश की प्रगति के लिये तीन चीजें परमावश्यक हैं। दंश में एकता हो, दंश में प्रगतिशीलता हो और दंश का शासक वर्ग बहुत ही पवित्र हो। जिस शासक वर्ग की पवित्रता में थोड़ा भी सन्देह हो तो वह शासन दीर्घकाल तक नहीं चल सकता और उसका पतन किसी न किसी दिन अवश्य हो जाता है। अभी चीन में जो पतन हुआ, उसका मुख्य कारण यही था कि वहाँ का शासक वर्ग ठीक नहीं था और उसमें करप्शन विद्यमान था। हमारे यहाँ के तत्कालीन चीनी राजदूत महोदय कहा करते थे कि चीन के उस शासन में करप्शन और खराबी बहुत ज्यादा फैली हुई थी और हालत यह थी कि वहाँ का जो प्रधान मंत्री था वह मिलों का मालिक भी था और सरकार को अगर माल लेने की जरूरत पड़ती थी तो वह एक तरफ से तो चीन के प्रधान मंत्री की हँसियत से और साब ही मिल के डाइरेक्टर की जगह पर भी वही कन्ट्रैक्ट (contract) पर दस्तखत कर दिया करते थे। तो इस तरह का घपला और गड़बड़ वहाँ चलती थी और प्रधान मंत्री तक वहाँ का उस में पार्टी था। वह सूरत तो हमारे यहाँ अभी नहीं आई है, हाँ, जलबत्ता यह सुनने में जरूर आता है कि फलां का लड़का होने के कारण या रिश्तेदार होने के कारण उसका अमुक पद मिल गया या कोई खास लाभ पहुँचाया गया। आज आप देखें कि हमारे शासन तंत्र और जनता में कितना सहयोग है, एक के प्रति दूसरे में कितने प्रेम, सहानुभूति और सहयोग की भावना विद्यमान है। आज हमने जो बड़ी २ योजनाएँ बनायी हैं, कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स जो खास तौर पर आबकल देहातों में फैलाये गये हैं। इस की प्रगति और इस के काम को देखें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि उन के कार्यकर्ताओं में और हम में बड़ा अन्तर है। अभी वहाँ साहबी ठाठ ही लगा हुआ है। जो वहाँ के कार्यकर्ता हैं वह जनता में घुल मिलकर काम करने की व्यवस्था कम करते हैं। वह

अभी भी जनता को आदेश देने का काम करते हैं कि तुम को ऐसा करना है। मैं अपने यहाँ गोरखपुर में एक कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट का काम देखने के लिये गया। हमारे गाँवों में एक देहाती कहावत है कि हमारी पुरानी चीज आप की नई चीज से अच्छी। आप का नाजुक तरीका है, हमारा मोटा तरीका है, उसी से हम काम कराते चले आ रहे हैं। एक भाई ने कहा कि आप दोनों धान तोल लीजिये कि किस का ज्यादा है। हमारे सामने उसे तोला। संयोगवश उन का धान ज्यादा निकला और नये तरीके से पैसा किया हुआ धान कम निकला। गाँव वाले कहते हैं कि आप हमें काम तो बता कर चले जाते हैं, लेकिन काम कैसे हो यह नहीं बताते हैं। अभी लोगों का दृष्टिकोण नहीं बदला, उन के अन्दर दंश के प्रति प्रेम नहीं उपबा।

सवाल यह है कि जो लोग सरकार में काम करने आये हैं वे नौकरी की गरज से आये हैं, नौकरी इस लिये नहीं करते कि दंश में सेवा की भावना उत्पन्न हो। हमारा जो शासक वर्ग था वह ब्रिटिश सत्ता के नीचे काम करता था नौकरी के लिये, इस दंश के उत्थान की ओर उस का ध्यान नहीं था। उस के हृदय में तुरन्त परिवर्तन हो जाय यह असम्भव बात है। आप इसे देखिये किसी होटल या क्लब में जा कर। अभी हाल में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने काक्टल पार्टियों का जिक्र किया था। काक्टल पार्टियों से वह घबरा उठे हैं, तंग आ गये हैं। अभी हमारी कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से एक सर्कुलर निकला है कि किसी काक्टल पार्टी में कोई कांग्रेसी न जाय। इसी के परिणाम-स्वरूप एक पेंपर में निकला था कि अमरीका के जो एम्बेसेडर हैं उन्होंने पार्टी दी है, उस में उन्होंने कह दिया है कि शराब नहीं चलेगी। काक्टल पार्टी में न कभी देखी नहीं, लेकिन सुना करता हूँ कि उन में ज्यादातर शराब चलती है। हम लोग जहाँ कहीं जाते हैं, वहाँ पर बहुत से आदमी मिलने को आते हैं। वह कहते हैं कि, आप जा कर वीखिये गेलाड में

या क्लबों में कि वहां क्या क्या चलता है । यह इस लिये चलता है कि हम अभी उन्हें दृश भिक्त की भावना नहीं दे सकें । जिस प्रणाली को वह अंगरजों के जमाने में चलाते थे, उसी प्रणाली और पार्लिसी को वह चालू रखना चाहते हैं हम दूसरी तरफ काम करना चाहते हैं वह दूसरी तरह काम करना चाहते हैं । इसी लिये संघर्ष हो जाता है, और संघर्ष में काम आगे नहीं बढ़ता ।

अभी हमारा एक प्लैनिंग कमिशन बना, प्लैनिंग कमिशन की बात कहते हुए मुझे अफ-सांस होता है और लज्जा भी जाती है, प्लैनिंग कमिशन ने जितनी भी रिक्मेंडेशन की, उन में खास यह भी कि ग्रामोद्योग की व्यवस्था की जाय और जल्दी से जल्दी यह काम किया जाय । उस प्लैनिंग कमिशन में आदमी कौन से थे ? प्लैनिंग कमिशन में थे हमारे प्रधान मंत्री साहब, हमारे अर्थ मंत्री साहब, हमारे प्लैनिंग मंत्री साहब, श्री मती दुर्गा बाई जी, लेकिन अब वह एक संचालिका हो गई हैं, इस के अलावा हमारे कृषामाधारी साहब, जो कि उस के वाइस प्रीसिडेंट हैं । इन लोगों ने हर एक राज्यों से राय लेने के बाद अपनी योजना बनाई । किन्तु आज एक सवाल का जवाब देते हुए हमारे मंत्री महादय ने कहा कि राइस हलर्स को बदलने के बारे में बहुत सी स्ट्रट्स एटराज करती हैं । राज्यों ने इस का विरोध किया है । किन किन राज्यों ने विरोध किया, यह तो बताया नहीं, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जब प्लैनिंग कमिशन की रिक्मेंडेशन आई तो सब राज्यों की राय से आई । सभी मंत्री इस की कॉन्सिल में थे जिन्होंने उस को एप्रू किया था और पास किया था । लेकिन पास हो जाने के बाद भी वह चीजें अभी तक लागू नहीं हुईं । इस का कारण क्या हो सकता है ? हम तो यही अनुमान कर सकते हैं कि हमारे दृशका शासक वर्ग शायद इसे पसन्द नहीं करता । वह इसी विचार में है कि यदि इस को लागू कर दिया जायगा तो मिलें बंद हो जायेंगी और उन को बंद नहीं होना चाहिये । इस लिये ग्रामोद्योग की जो सिफारिश है वह कोर कागज में ही है ।

कांग्रेस कमटी ने शिकायत की कि गवर्नमेंट इस को इम्प्लेमेंट नहीं करती । मुझे तो हैरत होती है कि कौन सिफारिश करता है, कौन इम्प्लेमेंट नहीं करता है और कौन-शिकायत करता है । जो गोलमाल हो रहा है उस का उत्तत्सयी कौन है, इस पर हम बंद जायें तो हमें मालूम होगा हमारी शासन व्यवस्था इस में उपयोगी नहीं हो रही है । अभी हमारे गाडीगल साहब ने कहा कि वही लांग वास्तविक पार्लिसी का निर्णय करते हैं । मैं तो कहता हूं कि पार्लिसी का निर्णय तो गवर्नमेंट करती है । पार्लिसी का निश्चय मंत्री करते हैं कि हमारी पार्लिसी वह होगी । उस पार्लिसी को चालू करने के लिये शासक वर्ग है । लेकिन आज सामन्त साहब ने भी कहा कि पार्लिसी को चालू करने में पुराने तरीके ही बाधक बने हुए हैं । आज सन् १९२० के रूस्स आफ प्रोसीबर और कन्वेंट रूस्स बने हुए हैं । आज १९५४ हो गया है । आज स्वराज्य के बाद लोफहित का ध्यान रखना चाहिये । इस लिये दोनों मिल नहीं पाते । आज दोनों का मेल कराने की जरूरत है । आज हम एसी व्यवस्था बनायें जो कि हमारे दृश की प्रगति के साथ साथ चल सके ।

अभी गवर्नमेंट ने कहीं कहीं पर थोड़े थोड़े परिवर्तन किये । हमें बड़े खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जिस सरकार के बड़े बड़े सचिव (Secretaries) अदालत में खड़े हों, उन पर घूसखोरी के मुकदमे चल रहे हों, किसी राज्य के सचिव घूसखोरी के मुकदमे में अदालत के सामने जायें, वह सच हों या न हों, इस का फैसला तो अदालत करेगी, लेकिन मुकदमे चलें, यह इस बात का सबूत है कि कहीं न कहीं बड़ी गड़बड़ी है । जहां के बड़े बड़े सचिवों पर इस प्रकार के आरोप हों, मुकदमे चलें, तो बिचारी जनता की क्या हालत होगी ?

दूसरी तरफ यदि किसी शासक वर्ग से खुद मिलिये तो वह कहते हैं कि साहब, चलती तो उस की है जिस की एप्रोच है, जिस की पहुँच है । मैं समझता हूं कि सब से कलंक की

[श्री सिद्दासन सिंह]

बात यह है। प्रत्येक अफसर समझता है कि जिस की पहुँच होगी, उसकी सुरक्षा होगी, जिस की पहुँच नहीं होगी उस की सुरक्षा नहीं होगी, चाहे वह कितना ही ईमानदार क्यों न हो। इसलिये आज कल ईमानदार लोग ही घाट में रहते हैं। लोग कहते हैं कि आज कल के समय में ईमानदार रहना भी बुरा है। हमारी गलती से, वह भावना फैली या उन की गलती से वह भावना फैली है। यह भावना दोनों ही के खिलाफ फैली है। जहाँ तक मैं जानता हूँ इस का कारण यह है कि जनता के सामने आज वही कलेक्टर, वही सुपरिन्टेंडेंट आफ पुलिस, वही सबइन्स्पेक्टर पुलिस, वही पटवारी सब जगह जाते हैं। उन में कोई परिवर्तन जनता नहीं देखती। हम कहते हैं कि स्वराज्य हो गया, हम आजाद हो गये हैं, जनता के लोग कहते हैं कि स्वराज्य हो गया होगा दिल्ली में, स्वराज्य हो गया होगा लखनऊ में, लेकिन हमारे घर में तो वही पटवारी साहब आते हैं, नाम लिखाया जाता है गिडवानी साहब का और लिखा जाता है दूसरे साहब का। तो हम तो उसी दिक्कत में हैं। कचहरी में जब हम जाते हैं तो पहले ही की तरह क्लर्क को घूस देनी पड़ती है। वह लोग कहते हैं कि आज अमल में वही पुराना तरीका है। एक नकल लेने के लिये बीस रुपये अब भी देने पड़ते हैं। जाखिर स्वराज्य आने से हमारे लिये क्या फर्क हुआ। आप वहाँ हाइड्राबन बम की बात करते हैं। हमारे देश के लोगों के लिये पुरानी बातें ही हाइड्राबन बम का काम कर रही हैं। इस लिये हम सब को ठंडे दिल से गौर करना है कि हम कौन सा उपाय करें कौन सा तरीका अपनायें कि हमारे राज्य निर्माण में सहायता मिले। आज चारों तरफ शिकायत है कि यह सिस्टम ठीक नहीं है, देश के कार्यों के लिये अच्छा इन्तजाम आज लागू नहीं है। इस में जिस प्रकार परिवर्तन हो वह कार्य हम करें।

जहाँ तक मुझे याद है, एक चुनाव के जमाने में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने एक व्याख्यान देते हुए

कहा था कि हम इस प्रणाली को परिवर्तित करेंगे, इन नियमों को परिवर्तित करेंगे। परिवर्तन इस प्रकार करेंगे कि सन्देश पर भी अफसर अलग किया जा सके। लेकिन आज तक वह परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ। परिवर्तन के लिये कई कमीटियाँ बनीं, गोरवाला साहब की रिपोर्ट आई, टंकचन्द साहब की रिपोर्ट है, बहुत सी रिपोर्टें आईं और कमीटियाँ बनीं लेकिन बनने के बाद कुछ काल तक वह काम करती हैं, फिर आगे खिसकती ही नहीं। इसी लिये कुछ परिवर्तन नहीं हो सका। इसी लिये, इन चीजों को देखते हुए हम सब लोगों की राय है, मंत्र ख्याल में इस भवन में शायद ही कोई व्यक्ति हो जो इस राय से इत्फाक न करता हो, कि एक स्वतंत्र राज्य के मुताबिक हमारी गाड़ी चलनी चाहिये, और उसी के मुताबिक हमारा सारा कार्य होना चाहिये और हमारे शासन में परिवर्तन होना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे संविधान में दफा ५० है जिस के अन्तर लिखा हुआ है कि हम शासक वर्ग और न्याय वर्ग को अलग करेंगे। लेकिन आज तक नहीं किया। ऐसा प्रस्ताव हो गया कि एग्जिक्यूटिव को जुडीशरी से अलग करेंगे। ऊपर तो अलग हैं, लेकिन नीचे की श्रेणी में जहाँ पर कि जनता को रोज काम पड़ता है वहाँ पर अलग नहीं है। एक ही आदमी सिविल आफिसर है और क्रिमिनल आफिसर भी है। वह ला भी मॅन्टन करता है और सजा भी देता है। हमारी ५० पी० में कुछ परिवर्तन इस सम्बन्ध में किया गया है, जुडीशियल आफिसर और एग्जिक्यूटिव आफिसर अलग अलग बना दिये गये, लेकिन दोनों आगे चल कर कलेक्टर के ही मातहत हैं। लेकिन जब वे दोनों कलेक्टर या डिस्ट्रिक्ट मॅजिस्ट्रेट के मातहत हैं और अपनी तरक्की के लिए उसका मुँह देखते हैं तो वह बँसा ही काम करते हैं बँसा कि वह चाहता है। इसीलिए हमने जो विधान बनाया है उसके मुताबिक भी इस बात की जरूरत है कि हम व्यवस्था करें कि न्याय और शासन विभाग दोनों

अलग अलग हो जाय क्योंकि जब तक ये विभाग अलग अलग नहीं होते तबतक जनता में जो कुहराम मचा हुआ है वह बन्द नहीं हो सकता। इसीलिये मैं अपील करूंगा कि इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार किया जाय। मैं जानता हूँ कि अगर सरकार इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं करेगी तो यह स्वीकार नहीं होगा। हालाँकि इस समय हर मेम्बर इसके समर्थन में बोल रहा है लेकिन जब वोट देने का समय आवेगा तो इसके खिलाफ वोट करना होगा। इसलिए जब चीफ और भाई भी बोलना चाहते हैं मैं विशेष समय नहीं लूंगा और अपना संशोधन पेश करूंगा। एक बात कहकर मैं समाप्त करूंगा कि आज जो सेंट्रल और स्टेट सचिवालय में अन्तर है उसको दूर किया जाय और एक तरह की सचीवस बनायी जाय जो कि स्टेट में भी काम करे और सेंटर में भी रहे। आज मैं ने पेंपर में पढ़ा कि एक सचिवा (Secretaries) की कमेटी बनी है उसने सुझाव दिया है कि राज्य से जो अफसर सेंटर में आते हैं उनके लिये सन् १९४९ से पहले का नियम लागू किया जाय अर्थात् वे कुछ समय के लिये यहां आवें और फिर वापस चले जाय करें। आप जानते हैं कि आज जो अफसर केंद्र में आ जाता है वह चाहता है कि किसी न किसी प्रकार यहां बना रहे और मुस्ताकिल हो जाय क्योंकि यहां आने के बाद उसे यूरोप जान के मौके मिलते हैं इसीलिए यहां जाने की होड़ है। हम देखते हैं कि आई० ए० एस० वाले पी० सी० एस० से घृणा करते हैं। इस अवस्था को दूर करना चाहिये। इसीलिए मैं ने अपना संशोधन पेश किया है और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि प्रस्तावक महोदय इसको स्वीकार करेंगे और इस संशोधित प्रस्ताव को गवर्नमेंट स्वीकार करेगी।

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): A very heavy yoke of responsibility rests on the shoulders of those who are called upon to run the services of this country. It is for them to serve the country properly; and it is for them to sabotage all the efforts made by the Government. Our Constitution, how-

soever sacred a document, remains a paper Constitution if it is not paid the homage and respect in action by the services. The ship of state can founder on the rocks of corrupt and inefficient services. The ship of state can sail beautifully everywhere and to its goal if the services are efficient, honest and prompt about the discharge of their duties.

It is to my mind a little disappointing that a Resolution of this great significance and importance should have come as a private Resolution. It should have been a matter which should have promptly engaged the attention of the Government. It is for the Government to devise ways and means whereby it should become possible that the policies laid down by the Cabinet should be promptly, efficiently and honestly pursued by those who are called upon to carry them out. We make certain decisions which are well-conceived. But because of the services, they are ill-executed. It is therefore very desirable that we should find ways and means whereby there should be some test, some thermometer, in order to see whether the services are discharging their duties efficiently, promptly and honestly.

There is a feeling in the country, a feeling, unfortunately, shared by all classes of society, by every cross-section of society, a feeling of acute disappointment bordering on indignation, bordering on indifference, bordering on distress that the services are not playing their role by the nation, that they are conducting themselves in a manner that is officious, that is haughty, that is high-handed and dilatory. It is a matter of deep regret that the services who are called upon to discharge a very onerous duty, who are called upon to participate in a very great part should be conducting themselves in a manner so as to be the targets of all fingers of scorn which are pointed towards them. We have produced a lot of things, I mean the planners. It was never in the imagination of the planners even that another article would be produced in tremendous quantity,—the 'red tape'.

[Shri Tek Chand]

The 'red tape' has increased to a strangulating point. The Government makes a decision and that decision is fettered and manacled by 'red tape'. Why is it that the decisions of the Government in order to be executed have to pass through the gauntlet of so many hurdles, so many little moats and obstacles? It is up to the Government, and in the interest of the Government, that they should have such checks, such a vigil on their officers, that they should see that they are not only not corrupt but they do not steal; they do not commit theft not only of the money of the State, but also of the time of the State. There is an impression—how far it is correct it is difficult for me to say—but almost a universal impression that our services are over-staffed. Where one competent and careful man can do the work, we have got four or five indolent drones doing absolutely nothing but just fanning themselves and killing their time. It is said, and it is a matter of which everybody is aware, that there is corruption. Corruption is corroding to the soul of the country; but is there any difficulty, if you had the will, to stamp out corruption? In my humble way of thinking, it is not very difficult thing. Let an officer who is recruited be called upon to declare his assets; and then you know that he has got Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 20,000 and, this much of movable property and that much of immovable property. Then, have a complete check after five years, a periodic check. If there is a windfall because he has made lots of money in solving successfully a crossword puzzle, or in a horse race, or some rich relation of his has left a legacy, let him say that he has inherited Rs. 10,000 or made Rs. 20,000 in a horse race. But, when you see officers drawing a salary of Rs. 800 or more going in gorgeous limousines, regaling themselves in expensive clubs, boozing like fish, throwing cocktail parties, indulging in gambling and Bridge parties in clubs, is the deduction very difficult to draw that all this extravagant expenditure must be at the cost of some body who managed to grease

his palm? Therefore, all that I say is, it will not hurt me in the least if you have a special department whose exclusive and sole duty should be to keep a watch, to keep a real check as to the manner in which work is being done. I am equally anxious that not only you should see that you do not keep corrupt officers, but our officers should be like Caesar's wife; they should not even be thought of as engaged in receiving improper money. But, be that as it may, I am anxious to see that there should be some governmental agency which should ensure that every employee of the Government is doing honest work, does real work and is not idling away his time.

Dr. Katju: And I suppose there must be another agency to see that this agency is working all right.

Shri Tek Chand: Sir, once it is driven home to the minds of your Services that they are going to be accountable to somebody, whether to you or to another functionary; so long as they are aware that if they deviate from the path of rectitude they will be answerable to someone, they will do their work honestly. You have to impregnate them; you have to imbue them with the idea; you should make an example of a good few and will be earning the gratitude of the people, serving the nation, and ensuring that your policies are being carried out efficiently, diligently properly and obediently. These officers of yours are a standing menace not only to the common man who is being victimised. . . .

Dr. Katju: But to the common Member of Parliament.

7 P.M.

Shri Tek Chand:but they also stand in the way of carrying out your policies. Then again, so far as your services are concerned, they are conducting themselves in a manner as if they were the sole and exclusive beneficiaries of the *swaraj*. If there is anybody who is comfortable; who is thriving under *swaraj*, these are your incompetent, irresponsible officers. I wish that those who are discharging

their duties honestly should receive recognition and those who are not should be made to realise that they have earned the scorn of their bosses, their officers. 'Dialatoriness' and 'procrastination' I place at par with corruption and they can strangulate your reforms or plans if they are not checked. Reports of the Public Accounts Committee are eloquent about the rotten conditions that are prevailing in some of the department. I wish they should open the eyes of those who do not appear to be fully alive to the distress and menace confronting the country.

Lastly, I would say this much only, that the State is engaged in a progressive expansion of its activities and a welfare State ought to be. Therefore, if the State machinery which is getting more and more complicated every day because of the exigencies of the nation, is to function properly, it should see that all the wheels, nuts and bolts of the machinery are working in complete harmony, in cohesion and in co-ordination. If there is a conflict, if there is a tension; if there is a dead-locking anywhere; if there is a bottle-neck anywhere, it is the nation that suffers. Therefore, the potentialities of an incompetent servant, the potentialities of a corrupt servant to sabotage the nation's work are tremendous and should not be taken lightly and it should be the keen anxiety on the part of those who are holding the reins of the governmental machinery to-day to see that their commands are carried out; their mandates are obeyed.

Then again, there is one aspect of the matter to which I wish to invite the attention of the Hon. Minister and that is, that there is a feeling shared by even the people who are high up in society, people who are educated and people who belong to the professions, that your officers are officious, they are discourteous, they are contemptuous and their demeanour and deportment is extremely forbidding. It is difficult to enter their portals without running the risk of jeopardising one's self-respect. A man in civilian clothes is afraid of even pointing out defects

of a person having a badge of authority, whether the badge is humble or very high. Leave apart the case of the rural people; or of the ordinary townpeople; but even people with education, if they are called upon to knock at the portals of some officers, some departmental head, the treatment that is likely to be meted out to them is something that will make a person quail in his feet before he musters courage to do so. It is very necessary that a feeling of real service is inculcated in the minds of the services. They should not be like the servants of the Indian Civil Service, neither Indian in outlook, nor civil in their approach, nor service-minded. That legacy, unfortunately, is still being carried, despite the fact that they no longer owe allegiance to a foreign government.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Madam Chairman: The scope of discussion on this Resolution and the amendments there to is so wide that I dare not attempt to go into general questions. I shall therefore confine myself to certain specific points which the hon. Mover of the Resolution has sought to raise. I wish, particularly, to refer to the inadequacy of the existing rules and regulations, regarding the matter of recruitment of officials.

You know Madam, that last year, when we had a discussion on the despicable manner in which the Rehabilitation Finance Administration was carried on, the hon. Minister in answer to certain very specific charges which I levelled against that department, had the gumption to tell this House that he did not know, and that he did not care to have the family histories of officers concerned. I had alleged that certain officers who had appointed their own kith and kin, overriding the claims of other officers. But the hon. Minister told us, "yes, it has happened, there are some relations, but I am not expected to work out the family trees." When I see my hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma he inspires me to invoke the words which he used

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

on that occasion. He said, and I also agree with him, that in departmental services, there is a specific law of gravitation by which relatives gravitate to certain offices.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Distt.—East): That law is everywhere the same.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It has not changed. On the other hand, it has gone from bad to worse. This is not peculiar to the Rehabilitation Finance Administration only; it is true of other government departments as well. I have put several questions on this matter time and again, and the hon. Ministers have got up and said, yes, it is true. I remember Shri L. B. Shastri, whom I find has now retired to the back benches, answered a specific question the other day and said that the allegation which I made about the security Adviser of his Ministry was correct in all material particulars.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

There is no rule by which you can recruit an officer. The top officials are very often recruited by the Ministers concerned, or by the highest authorities, irrespective of any rules of procedure laid down for that purpose. I can cite instances after instances from every Ministry to show that it is not only the officers, but some of the Ministers even at the Centre have done something and seen to it that some of their very close relatives have been appointed. I do not want to name the officers or the Ministers, but I can say that in one of the factories under the Production Ministry—and that question was also put here the other day—a very close relative of one of the Cabinet Ministers has found his place. I do not complain about Ministers' relatives being appointed, but certainly I do complain when such relations happen to have no other qualifications at all. You could find from the various examples which I can give, that it is not a matter to be laughed at,

as my hon. friend Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is trying to do now. I shall be thankful to any hon. Member on the other side, who points out a single Ministry against which the charge of nepotism, corruption and favouritism cannot be legitimately levelled. Every Ministry has had it, and day by day, the administration is getting increasingly corroded by corruption, nepotism, favouritism, and even venality and graft, and by every other despicable practice which you do not expect in the services.

Dr. Katju: I protest against all these generalities. They are absolutely unfounded.

Shri V. P. Nayar: You may protest. They may be unfounded for you, but I will prove them to the hilt.

Dr. Katju: You may say what you like.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: General charges that every Minister is doing that, and so on, which try to reduce the dignity of Government, should not be made here. Generalisations do not serve any purpose. When this point was raised the other day, the Hon. Speaker said that if any particular charges are there against any particular persons, by way of illustration, one or two officers of high importance may be referred to, but with respect to the other, previous intimation should be given, so that the other side may also be prepared to give its reply. But generally throwing mud on Government creates a very wrong impression. After all, the hon. Minister has also to justify the action of Government, and if attacks are made nebulously and in a general manner, using all the epithets that could be found in any dictionary, as has been done by the hon. Member, I do not think it is right at all.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is not a question of giving specific instances, but I do not want to embarrass the hon. Ministers, because most of them are not present in the House, and

this is the interest which they take in matters like this. As you have given the ruling, I do not propose to generalise, and if necessary, I shall illustrate my points by examples of specific instances only.

Shri Punnoose: Previously, when the Members on the other side were speaking, and they made very general statements, the hon. Minister did not react against them. But when something is said on this side, he is making it difficult for hon. Members to speak.

Dr. Katju: May I say a word? I propose to deal in my speech with these things, which I shall show, are absolutely indefensible. The hon. Member is throwing mud in heat on the whole of the public services, from the patwari onwards to the highest officer. He has just now said that there is no single Minister in the Government of India, who is not appointing his relations, friends and all that. It is all very lamentable. My hon. friend is taking advantage of his position and saying all this. But I propose to deal with them in my speech.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I never for a moment said that all the Ministers are corrupt. I was only saying that in every Ministry, at least one instance can be pointed out. If you would allow me time, I am prepared to prove it in Ministry after Ministry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that I can say is that it is a very difficult matter. In the administration, of course, however much a Minister may be anxious to avoid it, here and there, there will be some cases. It is the business of hon. Members to bring it to the notice of Government, and see that the administration is absolutely perfect. General statements like this, whether they come from the one side or the other, are embarrassing to the hon. Minister, and he may not be able to answer them. If earlier hon. Members who had made such general statements had not been pulled up, I do not know how one wrong will make

another wrong right. Therefore, hon. Members will confine themselves to illustrations consistent with the dignity of the House, and see that they try to remove these ills.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad (Purnea cum Santal Parganas): If some allegations are made against particular officers, that is out of order, because those officers are not in this House to defend themselves. If general remarks are made, then also they are considered out of order. So, some model instances might be given, so that it may be brought to the notice of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would not be taking up the time of the House, if I refer to rule 320 of our Rules of Business, which says:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person, unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned, so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of reply.

Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House or that no public interest is served by making such allegation."

I would request hon. Members to bear this in mind. In view of this rule, I hope hon. Members will not leave it to me.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Precisely so. This very rule justifies what I said. I do not propose.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, the rules must be interpreted in this way. If any such reference is made, previous notice has to be given. The rule cannot be avoided by making a generalisation, and making it worse. (*Interruptions*).

Shri V. P. Nayar: I take your ruling and I do not propose to go into generalities, hereafter.

There is another aspect, which the hon. Mover has sought to discuss here, namely the conditions of service which prevail. I ask the hon. Home Minister through you, whether the service conditions lay down the conditions of work of the subordinate services. In many departments, they are not laid down. I know, for instance, in the Civil Aviation Department, thousands of people—at least one thousand people—have to work for seventy-two hours a week.

I would very much like the hon. Minister to contradict me. I have been for years a quill-driver who served and sucked sustenance through the quill. I know the difficulties of clerks. I know the difficulties of chaprasis. I know the difficulties of the underdog in Government Service. For them no conditions have been laid down. Sir, the Government use in all the rules, in all the regulations a sort of inverted vocabulary by which dishonesty means honesty, inefficiency means efficiency, in the matter of promotions. Even here—the hon. Minister is getting more impatient—if the hon. Minister wants illustrations, I shall send him some.

An Hon. Member: Name them.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I do not propose to name them.

This is the way in which the subordinate has to serve with no security of service. His promotion depends upon the whims of the superior officers and if he refuses to fulfil one of the private errands, he does not get the due promotion. Any number of instances can be pointed out. At the time a clerk is appointed he is not asked to do such and such duty. I have been sitting in office late, till 2 o'clock in the night when I was a clerk. I have seen several other people doing that. I find in many of the

offices here in Delhi clerks have to do that. As for the chaprasis, Sir, the less said about them, the better. They are not even treated as human beings. The service conditions which have been laid down are not applicable to them. Many of them have put in service for eight years or nine years without confirmation. They have to do their office work and have also to attend, not only to their officers, but also their families. This is the condition in which you find the services. Probably some of the top officials have changed and in the place of Englishmen, you have Indians. But that has not changed the character or pattern of the administration. It is only a continuation of that which we had as a curse.

Now, Sir, I want also to bring to the notice of the Home Minister certain other aspects regarding service problems. There is not that freedom of association for the subordinates in government service in various departments. If they come and approach a Member of Parliament and if it is known, then they are sacked. There are many instances like that. I very vividly remember that once, last year, the hon. Minister got up to answer a supplementary question and said that the government servants have complete freedom to approach Members of Parliament. But if they do that and if the Government comes to know of it, then they have no other alternative but to quit service. They cannot have their representations made before Government. If they send a petition to the Minister, it will be put in the waste-paper basket by an Under Secretary. Very often it happens. If the Under Secretary somehow sends it up, the Deputy Secretary will put it in cold storage. It will never reach the Minister. What is the guarantee which you have given to the services? How are they to represent their claims? How are they to represent grievances? How are they to fight for their rights? You have not given them that freedom;

you have not given them the freedom of organisation. Everything which you give to the services.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly address the Chair. It will avoid much of heat.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I shall address you Sir.

Sir, everything which Government say they are giving to the subordinates is given only on paper. Suppose some violation is brought to the notice of Government, they seek to justify it by a very well known technique, the technique of technical justification. They write—'Under this rule, it is not necessary that a government servant's relative should not be appointed.... Under this rule it is obligatory on the Government servant to do such and such and also to obey instructions'. This is the manner in which you have kept tens of thousands of our subordinates.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: 'They' have kept.

Shri V. P. Nayar: When I say 'You', I mean 'they'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Otherwise, on the floor of the House hot words are exchanged. Hon. Members will look at other Members and then say 'you'. 'you' directly and they get excited and agitated about it. In a Resolution of this kind—of course, it is not for me to suggest to hon. Members—side by side, whenever any grievances or set of facts are placed before the House, the remedy also may be suggested. If hon. Members have thought about it, they may place the suggestions also.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I am thankful for your suggestion. But supposing we give a suggestion, we know the fate of that, and Government seems to think that they are having a monopoly of wisdom. So they do not very much care about our suggestions.

Dr. Katju: All freedom will come when you come to power.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That is coming in spite of you. Don't you worry about that

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I thought it was otherwise—he had got the monopoly.

Shri V. P. Nayar: If we look to the services—I again want to emphasise this point—except a few people at the top, every man in the subordinate service has his grievance not merely in one respect but in ever so many respects. If only the hon. Minister will go and see some of the quarters provided for class IV servants, e.g. in the Civil Aviation Department, quarters measuring only 12'×10', then he will understand that service does not entitle them even to the habitation which a human being is supposed to get. This is the condition in which they exist. There is no use saying that the services are deteriorating. The services undoubtedly have deteriorated. It is because of this attitude, this reckless attitude of the Government against the vast majority of servicemen. They do not have the enthusiasm to work. Not that they are not clever; many of our subordinate people are as clever as anybody in their position in any other part of the world. But they do not have the enthusiasm; they do not feel that their position is secure; they do not feel that their grievances will be remedied; they do not feel that they will be looked upon as people who do this service for a country which styles itself as a free country.

Sir, I do not want to embarrass the hon. Minister by giving more instances. I will resume my seat after one observation. Much is talked about providing jobs for those unfortunate brethren who belong to the backward classes. I have come across an instance when the employment exchange sent a candidate for selection to the post of teleprinter operator in one of the departments in Delhi. That boy unfortunately did not get the place or even an interview.

[SHRI V. P. Nayar.]

Instead, that place was filled by a first degree relation of the person who appointed, against which the staff complained, and then another test was conducted and the officer wrote that 'she is found to be eligible for the post'. This is the way things are done. I can give offhand at least a dozen cases to the hon. Home Minister. But I am sure, although you may say that I can give some suggestions, if I give my suggestions, he will not accept them. Even before giving a suggestion, we have seen how provoked he has been.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shrimati Uma Nehru.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): There are only ten minutes left now. May I know whether the second Resolution that has come up in the ballot will be taken up today or whether it will have to go into the next day or another ballot will have to be taken.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member wants to know through me, if the next Resolution standing in his name, should go once again into the ballot. Formerly, for a non-official day we had 4 hours exclusive of the Question Hour, and there was a ballot for all the 4 hours. Now, it has been split into two days—2½ hours on alternative Fridays. No doubt, it appears to cause some inconvenience. I think the Committee has made a recommendation that there may be a ballot for the two days together. But that has not yet been adopted as a rule. That, I understand, is the difficulty. So far as the present Resolution is concerned, it has got to go into ballot again. But I think in view of the recommendation of the Committee, the rules will be suitably modified and there may not be that inconvenience in future. But for the present, the present rule will apply.

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू (जिला सीतापुर व जिला खेरी-पश्चिम): बनाव डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब,

यहां पर जो व्याख्यान हो रहे हैं उनमें बराबर सरीबसेब की चर्चा हो रही है। सब के सामने सरीबसेब का सवाल है। मेरा इरादा यह है कि मैं सरीबसेब का मुकद्दमा लेकर इस हाउस के सामने आऊं। मैं समझती हूँ कि सरीबसेब की जो हालत है वह दुःखदायी है और तकलीफदेह है लेकिन साथ ही साथ जब मैं इन सरीबसेब को देखती हूँ तो मैं अपने आप कां भी देखने लगती हूँ। मैं देखती हूँ कि क्या मुझ में वह सब खूबियां हैं, वह सब बारी हैं, वह सब सच्चाई हैं, रूपये पैसे का या बातचीत में कहीं जरा भी करपान नहीं है कि जो मैं वह उम्मीद करूँ कि हमारी जो सरीबसेब है वह बहुत ऊंचे पांव की हो। प्रश्न यह सामने आता है कि हममें वह खराबियां हैं या नहीं। जब यह प्रस्ताव आया तो मुझ खुरी हुई और मैं यह समझती थी कि मेरे भाई सरीबसेब की चर्चा नहीं करेंगे बल्कि उस पार्लिसी की और उस प्रिंसिपल की चर्चा करेंगे कि जिसकी वजह से हमारी यह गाड़ी बल्की आगे बढ़ सके। लेकिन हम वह मकसद तो भूल गये और हर एक की निगाह सरीबसेब के ऊपर हो गयी। कुछ को सुन कर तो ऐसा मालूम होता था कि किसी के सत्कार हुए हैं। जलग जलग मंत्रों के भाषण का मेरे ऊपर अलग अलग असर पड़ा। लेकिन मेरा कहना तो यह है कि सबसे पहले हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि हमारा आदर्श क्या है, हमारा प्रिंसिपल क्या है, हमारी पार्लिसी क्या है? यह सवाल हमारे सामने सबसे पहले आता है और अगर हम इस पर विचार कर लें कि हमारी पार्लिसी क्या होनी चाहिये तो हमारा मॅथड आफ वर्क क्या होना चाहिये वह पार्लिसी के बाद का सवाल है। जो हमारी पार्लिसी होगी वही हमारे देश को आगे बढ़ाने वाली होगी और उस पार्लिसी को किस तरह से काम में लाया जाय वह नम्बर 2 सवाल है।

इसके बाद जो हमारे कमिटीरिटिव इन्स्टिट्यूट हांते हैं उनके बारे में कहा गया कि लड़कों में इस बात का विचार नहीं किया जाता कि उनके राजनीतिक विचार क्या हैं और देश के

बार् में उनके विचार क्या हैं। लेकिन मैं वह कहूँ कि इतना न करके वह देखना चाहिये कि इन्तहानों में क्या सबजेक्ट हैं। ऐसे सबजेक्ट हैं जो कि मुल्क को आगे ले जाने वाले हैं। बच्चों को ऐसी शिक्षा देनी चाहिये कि वे अपनी खुदी को भूल कर देश को आगे बढ़ाने वाले हों। तब हम देखेंगे कि हमारे बच्चे इन परीक्षाओं में पूरे उत्तरेंगे। साथ ही साथ जब हम मिनिस्टर या डिप्टी मिनिस्टर हों तो हमारा यह फर्ज होना चाहिये कि हम अपने देश को आगे बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करें। हमारे सामने पांच साला योजना है। इस योजना को आगे ले जाने के लिये हमारी सरकार के हर मुहकमे में कोऑर्डिनेशन होना चाहिये और इस योजना को आगे ले जाने के लिये हमारे सब अफसरों को चाहे वे आई० सी० एस० के हों या आई० ए० एस० के हो सब को यह कौशिल्य करनी चाहिये कि इस गाड़ी को एक तरफ ले जावें। लेकिन जब हम अपने आपको देखते हैं तो हमको क्या मालूम होता है? मैं तो साफ कहना चाहती हूँ कि हम कांग्रेस वालों ने, जिनकी कि आज गवर्नमेंट है, आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी है और हम यहाँ आये हैं, लेकिन अपने बतन को आजाद करने के बाद हम चाहते हैं कि हम इसको आगे बढ़ा ले जायें। लेकिन हमको देखना चाहिये कि यह आजादी के दीवाने जिन्होंने कि इस हुकूमत को लिया है और जो इस गाड़ी को आगे ले जाना चाहते हैं उनकी इस गाड़ी में एक ही रंग रूप के घोड़े लगें हैं या नहीं। लेकिन अगर हम देखते हैं कि इन घोड़ों में अदल बदल है, उनके एक आदर्श नहीं है, गृह उद्योग वर्गरेह के बार् में उनके एक ख्यालात नहीं है, और अगर वह यह समझते हैं कि जिन ख्यालात को जाहिर करना चाहते हैं, नहीं कर सकते, तो मैं समझती हूँ कि वह गाड़ी आगे नहीं बढ़ने वाली है। यह सरविसेज बंचारी क्या चीज है। यह गाड़ी तो अभी आगे बढ़ेगी जब हममें एकता होगी और यह नहीं होगा कि एक, एक तरफ जाता है और दूसरा दूसरी तरफ घसीटता है। सरविसेज वालों इस चीज को देखते हैं। इसलिये जब तक कि आप

सब एक विचार के, एक ख्यालात के नहीं होंगे कि हमको इस देश को आगे बढ़ाना है, तब तक हमारा देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता है। अगर हमारे ऐसे ख्यालात होंगे जो मैं नहीं समझ सकती कि हमारे सरविसेज वाले क्यों नहीं हमारे म्यूजाफिक चलेंगे। मैं एक बात कह दूँ कि सरविसेज बहुत बुरी चीज है। मैं तो जगह किसी लड़के से मिलती हूँ तो बड़ी कहती हूँ कि भाई कुछ भी काम कर लो, लेकिन सरविसेज बहुत बुरी चीज है यह मत करना। जब मैं इन सरविसेज की तरफ ख्याल करती हूँ तो मैं देखती हूँ कि जब अंग्रेज थे तो इन्होंने स्व उनका बंशी बजाई और बड़ी किया जो कि वह चाहते थे। अब कांग्रेस की गवर्नमेंट है लेकिन अभी उनके दिल और दिमाग नहीं बदले हैं। लेकिन उनके दिल और दिमाग के तो आप मालिक हैं, आप उसको संभाल सकते हैं। अगर हम अपने दिल और दिमाग को संभालें तो उनको संभाल सकते हैं।

श्री गिडवानी (बाना): लेकिन अगर दिमाग बिगड़ गया हो तो क्या हो?

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू : अगर मंत्रा दिल व दिमाग बिगड़ गया है तो मैं उम्मीद करती हूँ कि मंत्रा भाई श्री गिडवानी मेरी सहायता करेंगे और मुझे सही रास्ता बतलायेंगे, वह यह कौशिल्य कभी नहीं करेंगे कि अगर मंत्रा दिमाग बिगड़ गया है तो मुझे पीछे से धक्का देंगे। मैं उनसे यह उम्मीद नहीं कर सकती हूँ। इसलिये मंत्रा कहना यह है कि सरविसेज का सवाल तो पीछे है, जो सबसे पहले विचार करने का सवाल है वह है अपने को संभालना। जब हम अपने आप को संभाल लेंगे तो मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाती हूँ कि सरविसेज अपने आप संभल जायेंगी। जो अपने आप को संभाल लेंगे हैं उनके लिये सारी दुनियां संभल जाती है। तो अगर हमारी यह गाड़ी संभलेंगी तो हमारी सरविसेज ऊंची से ऊंची हो जायेंगी। मैं समझती हूँ कि मैंने काफी समय ले लिया। साढ़े सात बजे गबे हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member has got much more to speak,

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

she may continue on another day. Or, if she can wind up in a minute or two. I hope the House will continue to sit for those few minutes.

Some hon. Members: No, on. Next day.

श्रीमती जग्नू मेहता : मैं समझती हूँ कि अगर आप मुझे अगली दफा अपनी स्पीच को

जारी रखने को इजाजत देंगे, तो ज्यादा बेहतर होगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now stand adjourned and meet again at 2 P.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Monday, the 19th April, 1954.