

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the member who moves and from the member who opposes the motion, may, without further debate, put the question:

Provided that where a motion is opposed on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the House, the Speaker may permit a full discussion thereon."

So, this procedure of not supplying us the Bill is effectively taking away my right under rule 72 to raise the question of legislative competence of the House in respect of each Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But copies were supplied when this Bill was introduced.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It is true, but it validates 37 other Bills. I am, therefore, asked blindly to validate 37 Bills, the contents of which are not furnished to me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does he contend that in validating the Bill, the Members would be authorised to accept some portions of it and throw out the others?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: In the first place, they cannot validate so many Bills by an omnibus clause in this Bill. They have got to put down the titles of the Bills and the clauses. However, since we are looking into the constitutional aspect of it, let it not be said outside that though there were 150 lawyers in the House, nobody took objection to a piece of legislation which, on the face of it, is thoroughly unconstitutional. That is the reason why we are opposing the Bill.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava
() , se—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have to take up the other discussion.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It means that when this Bill comes up next time, we will be entitled to speak on this?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes; I am not closing it.

14.33 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: REPORT OF ORGANISATION AND METHODS DIVISION

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I beg to move:

"That the Fourth Annual Report of the Organisation and Methods Division for the year 1957-58 laid on the Table of the House on the 4th September, 1958, be taken into consideration."

I am so grateful to you for allowing me to raise this discussion, which is of far-reaching consequence to the administrative machinery. It was sometime in January, 1953 that Dean Appleby had recommended to the Government, while submitting his first report, the establishment of some sort of an organisation which will look into the administrative structure of the present set-up and also advise the various Ministries regarding the administrative methods and manners. This division was created in March, 1954, about a year after that, as a part of the Cabinet Secretariat with this aim: I would like to draw attention to what has been stated in the first report as the aim of this particular division:

"(1) Initiating and sustaining a concerted effort to improve administrative efficiency in all branches of the Government of India".

I think this is wide enough scope, though it does not take within its purview what was also recommended by the originator of this idea, so far as we are concerned, and that is the

administrative structure of our Government.

The plan and programme which was envisaged by this division was to supply leadership and drive to the services and by a co-operative effort to build up a common fund of information, experience and competence in the O. & M. Division.

The importance of this division, even as it is, can hardly be over-emphasised, because it has to take care and advise the Cabinet in respect of efficiency, economy as well as integrity of the services, particularly in view of the growing responsibility and importance of the administrative machinery, to which the hon. Prime Minister referred today in his concluding remarks on the foreign affairs debate. As a matter of fact, it is inherent in the very nature of our policy and programme, even in the nature of our Plan, that this machinery must grow, because of the socialist State. If we are going to have a socialist State, there would be certain social controls and regulations. The Welfare State also envisages all kinds of welfare activities and as we know, a developing economy does envisage a great spurt of activities in all fields. Again, industrialisation and urbanisation also mean a lot of administrative activity. As a matter of fact, this administrative machinery is now coming into contact with us at almost all levels and at every step. It is almost becoming a part of our life. So, I submit it is extremely necessary that our administration is in good health.

Four years have elapsed since this division was set up with this purpose. I think four years is a good enough time when we can take stock of the situation. This division claims some achievements. I do not deny that this division, particularly at the initial stages, proceeded on correct lines and it has certain achievements to its credit. What it claims is a measure of improvement in the speed of disposal, development of organisation

and methods, consciousness, preparation of certain reference manuals, etc. and some elementary rationalisation. I will take them one by one and assess how far they have succeeded. I will not only offer barren criticism, but I will also be giving at the same time my suggestion in respect of each item I am discussing.

Let us take the first claim regarding a measure of improvement in the speed of disposal. If you were to look at this report, you will find that in at least 14 departments, even after these four years, the number of arrears has gone up as compared to the last year. The arrears are such that it should cause some concern to us.

The office of the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs leads the other offices with 53.1 per cent of arrears, followed by the External Affairs Department with 44.3 per cent., Education 38.5 per cent, C.P.W.D. 37.2 per cent and Finance and Revenue 36.1 per cent. 14 of the 42 departments had arrears ranging from 6 to 20 per cent and 28 departments from 20 to 35 per cent. I do not think we can draw any reasonable conclusion even from these statistics provided to us. They give a very superficial picture, but even accepting these statistics as they are, the position is unsatisfactory. But the fact that there is this chronic ailment of inordinate and vexatious delays cannot be denied by anyone.

I think I need not go out anywhere to search for evidence. Even the Prime Minister found it expedient only last September to issue a circular that something must be done about the irritating arrears. It was issued just before he went to Bhutan and he has said that something radical must be done. He pointed out that the various files—even the unimportant ones—passed through too many hands and there are so many references and cross-references.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Even this Report makes a particular reference to this tendency of delaying the decisions by making references to outside agencies. It also refers to the intellectual dishonesty to shirk responsibility and all that. So far as I could feel, the causes which are there for the delay are too many hands, unnecessary references and unnecessary objections. Just because you want a paper to be disposed of, you raise some unnecessary objection which, as a matter of fact, if the officer was to take a helpful attitude, would not be there—the desire to shirk responsibility. Then we have now devised a very new technique of appointing various committees. These various committees are, as a matter of fact, unfortunately utilized only in the first instance to delay matters and, in the second instance, just to shirk responsibility. It is nobody's responsibility, as it has been decided by a committee. It is quite handy and easy. So, it leads to enormous corruption. Because of the Prime Minister's circular they have given certain thought to this matter and I understand that certain steps are proposed to be taken, or possibly are being taken.

In this connection I would like to refer to what is officially called "level-jumping". The Section Superintendent will not take the paper to the Under Secretary. He will cut out that process and the paper will go direct to the Deputy Secretary. The Under Secretary's papers will not go to the Deputy Secretary but will go directly to the Joint Secretary. That is cutting out one authority. But I wish the hon. Minister gives second thought to this matter. This level jumping, as it is called, is bound to bring about a certain amount of discipline and lack of morality. If you want to be frank and if you want to be honest the best way out is to take a calculated devolution of authority. Authorise those persons to take decisions. Let the Deputy Secretaries dispose of the papers. You are paying them enormous salary. Let them be

disposed of at the Deputy Secretary or Joint Secretary level. We have an army of officers, and they are responsible officers. Why can't we delegate proper authority to them? I think the jumping level is no answer. The proper answer is the delegation of proper power to proper persons.

In this Report particular reference has been made to delays in pension cases, and some cheer has been held out that certain steps are being taken. Now after four years the step that has been taken is this: a certain proposal has now been formulated. That proposal has not been given effect to so far. I understand that proposal—I just gathered from an answer given to the other House yesterday or day before yesterday—will now be discussed between certain officers. It is really unfortunate that after four years we are just at this stage. As a matter of fact, they should have taken up this case or question during the first year and done something about it. But now it is the fourth year and what they are doing is just considering the proposal to be discussed.

As we all know, recently there was a case in Mysore where the retired forest officer had to go on hunger strike, because he was not getting the pension for a year. The case was reported in the press. Since I asked a question to the Railway Ministry only a week back, I have received half a dozen letters from persons asking me to get their pension cases settled. Those persons who have been in your service and who have given such faithful and loyal service to you, after retirement some of them die before their pension cases are disposed of, and we have not been able to do anything. They are now considering the proposal and they have appointed certain welfare officers to chase these pension cases. One is very much distressed at this approach. What I would suggest is that in the case of pensions it should be made incumbent on the administration to finalise the

documents regarding the retirement benefits and all that before the person retires. At the moment he retires, he relinquishes his charge, those papers should be handed over to the proper authorities. Why should those persons suffer? If the administration cannot finalise these papers in time let either the administration suffer by retaining this man for another six months or let those people who are responsible for these delays suffer. I cannot just understand it. If even in such a simple matter the delays have not been cut out it is really a matter for some concern to all of us.

In the Report reference has been made to certain other delays also. It has happened particularly in the case of assurances to Parliament. Reference has been made in the Report that these delays have occurred because proper answers were not given on the floor of the House, because fuller information was not given. They have advised that in future it would be much better if fuller information is given, because otherwise it multiplies work I hope some attention will be given to this matter.

Delays are not only due to these reasons. They are inter-related also with the structure of the administrative machinery on the one hand and the number of persons working in the administration on the other hand. I think you are aware of the famous Parkinson's Law which mentions that in spite of the fact work goes on decreasing, by a certain law, still the staff goes on increasing. I am not accusing this particular Government alone. He referred to this law in connection with the UK Government. There in the Admiralty though the number of ships were reduced and the number of workers was reduced, still the Secretariat went on expanding.

Not a single word has been said in this Report as to whether any attention has been paid to this particular issue or not. I do not know whether we have got any norms to judge the

expansion that is taking place in the Secretariat today. I particularly wish to draw the attention of the hon. Home Minister to the fact that this expansion in the Secretariat is not commensurate with the volume of work. It does not balance the expansion in the field, where the whole work is being done. The expansion in the Secretariat is much more than the expansion in the field where the actual work has got to be done. This law has been very lucidly mentioned here in the *Indian Journal of Public Administration* in a book review by Shri Siddhanta. He gives certain figures about expansion of our administrative machinery, of our Secretariat. He says that in 1937 we had about 37 Special Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, *ex-officio* Secretaries and persons equivalent to Secretaries, in all. Now we have 46; not much of a rise. We can understand it. I can very well understand that from 37 to 46 is not at all a rise. It is only 30 per cent. But now what I am going to tell the House is that this law comes into operation. When the officer at the top multiplies, he has habit of multiplying his subordinates, and the subordinates have the habit of creating work for each other. That is how the law works. Now see what happens at the lower level.

Take the case of Joint Secretaries. Here I owe an apology to the hon. Home Minister. The other day when he was answering a question I interjected and said that the number was 142, when he said it was about 82 or 88. Technically he was right. But substantially I was correct, because Joint Secretaries, *ex-officio* Secretaries and the officers working as Special Officers, they all put together, the number comes to 142.

Now, this number has gone up from 79 to 142, i.e., in the case of the Secretaries the percentage of increase is only 30 per cent. but here it is 90 per cent. Now, you go from 30 permanent and 49 temporary Joint Secretaries to 142. They were temporary hands because that was a legacy of the

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

War and those people, who were supposed to be retrenched, were absorbed in due course. So, these figures are also very misleading. The rise is much more as a matter of fact, but still the rise is 90 per cent.

If you come to the Deputy Secretaries, the number was 220. In 1956 it has gone to 572. The increase is 150 per cent. The same applies to the Under Secretaries. The number was 463 and now it is about 1,006. I think some attention should be paid and I at least expect that the Organisation and Methods Division will make certain reference to this particular problem and say as to what attention they have paid to it, whether they have examined this problem or not and what are their views about it. But I think it is very difficult for a poor Organisation and Methods Division to comment on the expansion of the Joint Secretaries and the Deputy Secretaries. It is very poorly constituted so far as its real work is concerned. I think absolutely no harm will come if there is a cut of 25 per cent straightaway.

I am not speaking just out of any vague ideas. I was just reading a report in which it is stated that in the United Kingdom the union of the clerical establishment, i.e., people parallel to our clerical establishment, came to the conclusion that at least 25 per cent of their staff could be reduced if there was a proper reassessment of duties.

Shri Goray (Poona): That sort of courage is rare.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Now, I am talking only of the Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and the Under Secretaries. We can definitely cut down their number by 25 per cent. I am not saying this only because of economy. This will increase the efficiency. I have no doubt about it. The delays will be cut out. Otherwise this will go on multiplying.

I have referred only to two points here. But while referring to the staff I must say that it is really callous that more than 300 per cent of the staff in these higher levels is temporary. What can you expect from the temporary staff? What is their feeling? How do they work? If we are convinced that we have an expanding economy, at least let us have some sense of proportion. I can understand 20, 25 or 30 per cent of the staff being temporary but I cannot understand 300 per cent of the staff being temporary. I cannot understand that. Are we running a temporary Government? It gives a temporary nature to the Government itself. You have got 45 permanent and 97 temporary Joint Secretaries. You have got 136 permanent Deputy Secretaries and 336 temporary Deputy Secretaries. You have about 299 permanent and 707 temporary Under Secretaries. Just think of what impact it can have on the efficiency of the administration.

I have got very little time and many a point to cover. So, I will very briefly state that this Division has done little or no work. It has not done any work which is far more important for this Division than these petty matters to which it has attended. About work simplification nothing has been done. Regarding organisational studies very little has been done. About effective utilisation of personnel very little has been done. Problems of co-ordination have not been tackled. Regarding reforms of hierarchical structure no attention whatsoever has been paid. About the elimination or the diffusion of responsibility nothing has been done.

Regarding review of administrative decisions at higher level nothing has been done. I want to refer particularly to this aspect because even Mr. Appleby in his Report has said—he has said in a very dignified manner—that it is the noting at the lowest

level which goes right through and which prevails. He said that this is the failure of many Governments and particularly in respect of this Government. He has said—he has mentioned it—that it requires special attention and special correction. This is what we in general language call a rule by the lower division clerks or Baburaj or whatever you may like to call it. Now, there is not a word about this Baburaj business in this Report and whether they have paid any attention to this matter or not.

Regarding improving Government procedures and forms for greater public convenience nothing has been done. And what is very regrettable is that even what is legitimately the duty of this Organisation has been wrested out of its hands now, i.e., the Re-organisation Division in the Finance Ministry or what you call the Economy Division. It is doing exactly what falls within the purview of the Organisation and Methods Division. It has been wrested out of its hands as a matter of fact. The unfortunate fact is that the Organisation and Methods Division has not only lost the momentum but has gone stale and sterile and, as it stands, is incapable of fulfilling the purpose for which it was set up. It has degenerated into one of the routine departments or one of the routine divisions of the Secretariat and instead of making studies of the problems, finding solutions, simplifying procedures and giving effect to them, it is doing the policing. It is doing the *jemadarang*. It is a very cheap type of job which it is doing. So many returns have to be prepared and in every Ministry, in every Section one week in a month is wasted over the preparation of these returns, which are not attended to by anybody. This is the state of affairs. This is what it has degenerated itself into.

Now, what should be done? I would suggest that it is expedient that a high level committee of direction consisting of the hon. Prime Minister, the hon.

Home Minister, the hon. Finance Minister and two non-officials—I emphasise the words 'two non-officials'—should be set up if this Organisation is to function properly. It must meet every quarter to give guidance and direction to the Division and to examine its progress report. I emphasise it again because there is a particular approach. Simply because of the virtue of their office, they are not in touch with what is happening. They are not in touch with the feeling of the Services. They are not in touch with the feeling of the people as a matter of fact and if those feelings are to be respected I think such a committee of direction is necessary if this has to serve any purpose and two non-officials are absolutely necessary to give them direction.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I am afraid they cannot find time to devote to it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Now, there are two other matters which I would like to refer to. This Division will never be able to function properly if there are certain matters in regard to which Government acts in a particular manner. If Government itself acts in such a manner that it demoralises the whole Services or it creates a sort of a feeling of discontent in the Services, what will this organisation do? How can it instil any feeling or any awareness of their duty towards the people? People all the time are thinking of their own personal problems.

Now, they tried to improve the emoluments of the lower division clerks and in trying to improve the emoluments of the lower division clerks they decided that increments are to be given to those people who have put in more than three year's service. It is very much welcome. But this is confined only to what they call "the participating Services". I do not know what these participating Services are except those that are under the patronage of the Home Ministry. Now, it creates a very great discontent and frustration.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]
in all other sections and all other departments. How is it that the lower division clerk who is in this particular Ministry is different from the lower division clerk in the Defence Ministry?

Shri Tyagi: It is not particularly for one Ministry.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is only for the Ministries that are participating. Defence Ministry is a class by itself. That is why I named Defence. How is it that a lower division clerk working in the Secretariat of the Parliament is different from them? But they do not get this concession. There is bound to be discontentment. The Defence Ministry was excluded because it has its own rules and regulations, but the Defence Minister was powerful enough to wrest this concession from the Home Ministry after the orders were passed and after all sorts of objections were raised. It was an exception in the case of the Defence Ministry, creating further discontentment among all other services.

15 hrs.

It is a very recent occurrence. Even those people who want to improve their lot through sheer examination and by their own merit are not permitted to do so. Certain Assistants wanted to appear for the I.A.S. but they were not permitted. I wrote to them about it in 1956. But who listens to these things? This required the intervention of the Prime Minister to see that these restrictions and these bars on those people who want to improve their lot are removed. This was done only after his intervention. That is why I have recommended a high-power committee; because this Organisation and Methods Division will certainly fail to be effective if the Government functions in this manner. And that is why I further emphasise the association of two non-officials who will bring a fresh outlook to bear and who will be able to tell

the Ministers at the highest level as to what is expected of them and where they are going wrong.

I know the Prime Minister referred this morning also to the morale of the services and all that. It is none of my purpose here to say anything about the state of affairs, which is as a matter of fact not a very happy one so far as the administrative machinery is concerned. We know there are many officers for whom we have great admiration, small and low, but their moral tone has got to be raised. There is the least doubt about it. No greater harm can come to any country than when people start losing faith in the administration and when they start losing faith in the politicians of the Government. All the troubles all over the world are due to this. I do not go to that length and say that people have no faith in our administration. But I do definitely want to warn this Government that their respect and faith in the administration is definitely on the decline, and we must take definite steps to see that there is respect for the administration and there is confidence about the administration in the public mind. Whether it is right or wrong there is this growing feeling among the people and this growing feeling must be checked. If you are in the right you must tell the people that here is the correct situation, and a greater respect and confidence must be created for the administrative machinery in the country.

I will only add a word. In dealing with these receipts and in preparing statistics we have got two types of categories: one is the primary receipts and the other is the secondary receipts. Primary is the one received from outside or arising out of the Ministry, and secondary is the one arising out of the primary receipt itself. What I wish is that there should be a third category. And that third category should have a different statistics. It should find a separate place by itself. And that third category should pertain to

those communications which are from the public to the Government and which want a reply; so that in this confusion we can at least sort out what is happening, what is the response of the administration to the communications from the people, whether they are properly attended to or not. Let there be a third category for this and let there be separate statistics for it. I would also give this advice to the hon. the Home Minister. Before he relies very much on these statistics, I would request him to ask this Organisation and Methods Division to set up a small team to study these statistical collections to see what their effect is, whether the story which they tell is to be relied upon or not.

We know how these statistics are prepared. We also know how the papers are disposed of. My hon. friend knows that even in the judicial courts what happens is that on the last day six or seven cases on the civil side are dismissed on default, so that we show that so many we have disposed of. And the next month they are again reinstated and they are taken back on the file. It also swells the number of the institutions as well as the disposals. I am fully aware that typically similar things happen when these statistics are prepared. They give no true picture of the state of affairs, and because you lay a greater emphasis on these statistics all sorts of things happen and it only increases the delay; because just for the sake of making the maximum number of disposals, the man makes a further reference to somebody and disposes of the paper or he raises an objection and sends it to audit.

Instead of collecting these statistics, the best thing is to study the problems and find solutions for them and see that they really give true relief to the people. At the governmental level as well as at this level I think it requires proper attention. I am afraid this Organisation and Methods Division has to be reorientated completely, given fresh vitality and assigned a certain task. Let it do something and let us

hope that there will not be this delay and this demoralisation in the services.

Sir, I have touched only two points. I have as a matter of fact touched only the aspect about efficiency and a little bit about economy, but I have not touched the third aspect, namely intellectual morality, to which reference has been made. If proper help is to be given to the services, adequate attention must be paid by Government to this matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Fourth Annual Report of the Organisation and Methods Division for the year 1957-58 laid on the Table of the House on the 4th September, 1958, be taken into consideration."

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvella): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is only proper and appropriate that the House sits up to discuss this report which is a very important report. We are generally in the habit of talking so much, and now we are trying to examine to what extent things are actually being done in this country. We are all anxious that the inordinate delay in the disposal of cases before every department should be reduced as far as possible, if not completely eliminated. But what do the figures give us as contained in the 1957-58 report?

At the outset I would like to make it very clear that I was not at all disappointed with this report; because I did not expect very much. I am quite sure that this Organisation and Methods Division, as it is set up today, cannot do much in this direction. They are expected to do two very important jobs: one is they are there to see that delay is reduced as far as possible and, secondly, they are expected to see that as much economy as is possible is effected in the expenditure.

As far as economy measures are concerned, we do not get very much from this report, except that there is a reference in one paragraph to certain

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

steps taken and certain advices given by this Division to certain Departments. There is not much about economy. For the last two years there has been a lot of talk about economy, and we are told that we also have contributed our lot in this direction. Some hon. Members effected certain cuts in their salaries, but the cuts were withdrawn after some time. Some such attempts were made, of course not very substantial. Previously we used to get two or three copies of our speeches. But that has now been reduced, we get only one copy. There are some such steps. Apart from such things, I do not know whether any serious steps are being taken in the direction of economy drive. On the other hand, things are being told in this very House of wastage of lakhs and crores of public money. I do not go into those questions just now. I will confine myself to the report as far as it relates to the attempt in reducing delay.

I have tried to tabulate certain facts and figures given in this report with regard to reduction in the delay of disposals. I do not want to repeat what the hon. Member Shri Harish Chandra Mathur has said. I would like to draw the attention of the House that it is really distressing to note that in almost all the departments and Ministries except the Food department the percentage, the proportion of arrears to the total receipts in 1957-58 is, in certain departments more than 10 per cent, in certain other departments 20 per cent and it goes up to 50 per cent in certain departments. Between 10 and 20 per cent, there are eight departments: Atomic Energy, Agriculture, Information and Broadcasting, Law, Ministry Public Service Commission, Development Wing, Directorate General of All India Radio, Chief Controller of Imports and Exports. With regard to Commerce and Industry, Defence, Scientific Research, Revenue, Home Affairs, Irrigation and Power, Steel, Mines, and Fuel, Transport and Communications, Works,

Housing and Supply, what is the position? The proportion of arrears to total receipts is 30 to 40 per cent. which is really a staggering figure. In External Affairs, Directorate General of Posts and Telegraphs and most important, the CPWD, it is more than 40 per cent. The Directorate General of Posts and Telegraphs gets the first prize, that is, more than 50 per cent. I do not want to go into more details. I have tabulated the entire thing. It is really a disappointing picture.

There is another Table given in this report comparing the achievements in 1955-56, 1956-57 and 1957-58. There is nothing very much to compare between 1955-56 and 1957-58. That is the position. I do not want to go into that also. So the position is this with the Organisation and Methods Division. I do not complain that they have not done their lot. They might have attempted to do something. But, they have signally failed in reducing the delay in the disposal of receipts that come before the various departments.

Apart from the figures that are before us, we have got our own experience. I am quite sure, you yourself will have your own experience. Members of this House will have their own experience. Why should we speak about the Members of this House? I will quote the Prime Minister himself. In Hyderabad when he was there for the Congress AICC session this time, he made a speech and he cited the instance of his own attempt in forming a co-operative society. He was very angry when he referred to his experience and he said that all these old rules and regulations—I will quote his own words:

“These laws appear to have been devised by some genius to prevent the co-operative movement from developing. I have been myself a sufferer, and therefore I speak with some feelings.”

Last year, I came across an experience. A doctor in our State—he is not an ordinary man; he is quite influential—happened to rent out one of his buildings for a Government office in 1951. It was in 1957 that he told me that the rent—not a substantial amount; it is only Rs. 150—had not been paid. The rent of a building that was rented out in 1951 had not been paid to him in 1957. It is a short period; only six years. There may be many other instances like this. I need not go into all these instances. In a way, this is a very serious problem that the people of this country are facing. Imagine the condition of an ordinary man, a man in the rural areas, a peasant, an ordinary human being in our country. What will be his plight? If Members of Parliament, Members of Legislative Assemblies, if even the Prime Minister of this country is not able to get things done, what will be the position of an ordinary citizen in this country, we can imagine.

Sometimes I feel that all this talk about a Congress Government or a Communist Government or a Socialist Government is meaningless if the people are given a good Government, an effective Government, an efficient Government, by any party. Let the party be any party. Let it be Socialist, Communist or Congress. The ordinary people will be very happy and they will vote for that party for all time to come if this inordinate delay is reduced, is completely abolished. If the Party that runs the Government succeeds in that, that party will be blessed by our people. That is the situation today.

The hon. Member Shri Harish Chandra Mathur referred to the cases of pension. I know actual cases where people, after retiring from service, have waited for years and years and have died without receiving their pension. It is not just an exaggeration. There are cases like that. I will refer to the occasion when there were a lot of questions fired on the Railway Minister last time during the Question-
276(Ai) L.S.D.—7.

hour. Every party in this country, every citizen in this country, irrespective of the creed of his party, is interested in seeing that things are being done as quickly as possible.

What is the difficulty? To me, the first and foremost difficulty is this. We have inherited a system of Government, a State machinery, a system of working of Government and officials also from the British. It was an alien Government. It had its own practices. It had its own aims and objectives. Its aims and objectives were quite narrow: collection of revenue, maintenance of law and order; nothing more than these things. We have inherited that State machinery. I beg to submit that we have failed till now to overhaul that machinery, to make a fundamental departure from the old ways of functioning and instil a new spirit in our services from top to bottom. Unless that is achieved, unless such a re-orientation is made, I am quite sure we are not going to succeed. You may create a thousand Divisions in the name of Organisation and Methods, Vigilance or Anti-corruption. There is close connection between corruption and this delay. If there is no delay, if we get things done quickly, there is no question of giving bribes to the officers. That question does not at all arise. These two questions are closely linked up. Unless a new spirit is instilled in our services and unless the relationship between the people and the services is re-orientated in a new way, we are not going to make much headway. I know the leaders of our Government will agree with this principle as a principle, but when the question of real implementation of this principle is taken up, there are practical differences of opinion. As far as the principle is concerned, I am glad that even our Home Minister, while replying to a debate on home affairs, has himself said that there should be a difference in outlook as far as our officers are concerned. I do not go into the quotation just now. It was in 1956, I read it today. It was in 1956 while

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

replying to the debate on home affairs, and he said that a new approach, a new outlook should be instilled among our services.

I was going through the report of the Administrative Reforms Committee appointed by the Government of Kerala, and they have produced a very substantial report, I should say. The recent debate in the State Assembly of this report was a very happy occasion, because, in spite of the differences between the various parties, they all agreed, and they all welcomed this report, and they all said it should be put into effect as soon as possible. In that report, on page 21, a very important statement is made. They refer to the momentous changes that have taken place in the country, viz., the achievement of freedom from foreign rule in August, 1947, the Constitution of the country into a sovereign republic in January, 1950, the coming into operation of the First Five Year Plan in 1951 and lastly the decision of the nation that its goal shall be the establishment of a socialistic Welfare State in the country, and then they say:

"These momentous changes fundamentally altered the objectives of Government, its method and the manner of functioning of its machinery. Shortly stated, the objectives were not merely to collect revenue and maintain the peace, but to promote the welfare of all classes of people, particularly the poorer sections; the method was to be democratic and the machinery, which until the attainment of independence owed allegiance ultimately to an alien Power, had henceforth to be responsible to the people's representatives. These changes have created new tasks and new responsibilities for the services, requiring a thorough re-orientation in their attitudes, outlook, skill and training. It was to be expected that in the wake of these important changes will fol-

low suitable changes in the administrative systems and procedures so as to enable the smooth and efficient functioning of the machinery and the early achievement of the objectives mentioned above."

Now, what have we done to instil this kind of a new outlook, to give a new orientation to our services? We have done very little.

In this report, there are certain references to the training schemes for the clerks and other personnel in the services. I would urge upon the Government to have a regular re-education scheme for the entire services of our country, from top to bottom. None can be exempted from this regular re-education scheme, and they should be made to know what the objectives are, to which this House, this Government and this country are pledged today.

What is the meaning of the socialistic pattern of society? I know, there may be difficulties, because even today it is just a mystery to many of us. It is not clearly defined. To me it may be one thing, but to another Member it may be a different thing. It may be just like the blind man trying to ascertain the form of the elephant. There are difficulties like that. All the same, let us have some general principles laid down and let us try to have a re-education scheme for the entire services as far as our objectives and new developments in our country are concerned. Unless we make such a change, we will not be able to make much headway.

I have got one or two more practical suggestions to be taken up seriously by the Government. I feel the Government should set up a time-limit for every petition or paper on file that comes before any department. It should be disposed of, say, within two months, at the utmost two months, and an explanation should be

asked for if a paper or file is not disposed of within that period.

Shri Tyagi: Two months is too long

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Two months is the maximum period. You can reduce to one month, I also agree. I do not stand by two months, but my point is that we should have a time-limit and we should stick to that, and strict action should be taken if there is delay even after that.

There is another very important point. There is so much of concentration of power in certain officers of the secretariat. There should be bold delegation of power. In this report, there is a suggestion that a large amount of power that is now concentrated in the secretariat should be delegated to heads of departments. Now a file goes up from the lower division clerk to the upper division clerk, then to the Superintendent, Joint Secretary etc. How many kinds of secretaries we have I do not know—Deputy, Joint, Additional, Assistant Under, all kinds of secretaries are there, and a file goes from one secretary to another, from the lower division clerk to the upper division clerk etc. We should think of some device to reduce all these various stages through which a file has to pass, and we should have bold delegation of powers.

Thirdly, I would recommend to the Government a scheme of incentive awards as far as our services are concerned. There also, I would read out a paragraph from the report of the Kerala Administrative Reforms Committee, where they make a concrete suggestion as far as incentive awards are concerned. On page 108, the committee says

“We have considered the suggestion recently made by Shri D G Karve recommending the institution of a system of incentive awards based on a similar practice obtaining in the United

States of America. It consists of making a cash or honorary award to a Government servant for any outstanding performance or useful suggestion made by him to reduce the cost of administration or to simplify its procedure or to improve its efficiency. Rules of promotion in Government service are generally rigid and would not enable immediate and suitable recognition of individual acts of merit. The hope for promotion will not, therefore, furnish sufficient incentive to encourage originality and initiative in the rank and file, which awards of the kind mentioned are likely to do. They will also influence promotions indirectly because the acquisition of a number of awards by a person will, by itself, constitute proof of continued efficiency justifying permanent promotion. We recommend that the suggestion of Shri D G Karve may be adopted here.”

The O & M Division has got cells in almost all departments and if in a particular department they show better performance they should be given some such incentive award. Let there be competition, let it be a socialist competition or a socialistic pattern of competition, let us have some kind of competition in the services also in disposing of the files that come before them.

I hope the Home Minister will pay attention to the various suggestions made in this House. If these suggestions are accepted and put into practice, I hope a day will come when we will be in a much better position than we are today.

Shri Jamal Khwaja (Aligarh): I listened with great attention to the opening speech by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, and I congratulate him for the very frank and outspoken manner in which he has spoken. Yet, I cannot also help feeling that he has been rather unkind to the O & M Division. If the O & M

[Shri Jamal Khwaja.]

Division had made great claims in their report and the state of affairs had not been so, the criticism would have been valid. But I find that the claims that have been made by the Division in the fourth report as well as in the first report—I could not get the second and third ones—are very modest claims. And they have pointed out all the features and given all the statistics. They have not tried to conceal anything. So, I think that that criticism has not been very fair. It might be very correct, but surely in evaluating the performance of any organisation, any individual or any country, the total situation should be taken into consideration. This, I think, is intellectual justice.

The previous speaker referred to the large number of Secretaries, Joint Secretaries and all that, and to a very large number of them being temporary. As far as the very high percentage of temporary personnel is concerned, I think there can be no two opinions. That is basically wrong. That has a very bad psychological effect on the people. But from his statement, I thought that he wanted that the temporary hands should be dismissed because he thought that they were too many.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: No, no. You should never dismiss them. Even one dismissal will mean so much of trouble. I know it.

Shri Jamal Khwaja: He emphasised that there were too many Secretaries, and too many officials at the top, and they tended to multiply their subordinate officials. I would say that instead of their number being reduced, it should be increased. I am not a protracted student of public administration or a very senior student of public administration as Shri Harish Chandra Mathur is. I have great respect for him, but from what I have been trying to find out for myself on the basis of personal experience, and from informal talks and chats with the officials at various levels and also

from a perusal of the Appleby report which, I think, is a masterly report and a brilliant survey, I think there can be no doubt that the officers are overworked. There might be a few officers here and there who may not have sufficient to do.

Take, for instance, our district officers, as, for example, the district collector, the superintendent of police, the Secretary and the Joint Secretary. I have had a few occasions to talk to them also. I have visited them in their offices, and I have found that they do a lot of work; constantly, files and papers and other things are coming, and other interruptions are also there.

So, I should think that in view of the limitations of personnel and the limitations of money, what the O. & M. Division has been doing is really creditable.

To my mind, as I view the matter, the dimensions of a sound administration are four or five, namely speed, equity, uniformity, accountability and democracy. They are all important. We should not over-emphasise one at the cost of the other.

Many things might happen with much greater speed in China or in the various other countries with a different administrative set-up. But that is only one value. Speed is only one value. It has a very great value. I grant that today in the context of the international situation, where there is terrific competition for achieving these material values, speed is of the essence for success. But we should not forget that there are other values. They might not be so readily ascertained; they may be more imponderable, but they are there.

Therefore, I think it is one of the great virtues of our effort and of our administrative philosophy that we have tried to bring about a synthesis of all these values. For example, accountability might suffer, if there

were undue emphasis on succeed. Similarly, democracy might suffer. I do not want to go into those details now. But I grant that in the context of today, speed is the most important dimension. And this report shows that Government are not averse to it. It is true that not much improvement has been made, as the figures and the statistics show. But the very fact that the Government of India invited Dr. Appleby, an expert of international fame, on whose advice this organisation was set up, the Institute of Public Administration has been set up, and the Administrative Staff College in Hyderabad has been set up, shows that attempts are being made. If, in spite of all this, administrative delay continues to rage in an epidemic form, as was pointed out very correctly—I agree—it shows the magnitude of the task we have to face, and the difficulties we have to overcome. I should say, after listening not only to this debate, but generally, to the other debates that I have had the privilege of listening, that we as a people are forgetting the art of admiration, or the art of admiring. We develop a craft of crudely criticising and condemning. I would submit that the assessment should be made in the light of the total situation and not in an isolated way.

It was very well said by Shri Vasudevan Nair that the problem of eliminating delay became all the more important because that is one of the chief causes of creating a temptation among the public to offer what he called as bribes; I do not call them bribes, but I would call them tips, because bribery implies that one pays in order to divert the course of justice. I do not think that is very often the case. Of course, that might be done, and that is done, but generally speaking those sums of money are not paid to divert the course of justice, but they are paid to expedite matters. And that is quite understandable. So, we cannot accuse the man who does it. Many of my constituents and others have related to me their experiences. Suppose a man

from outside Delhi comes to Delhi, and he has to wait for two or three days or a week, naturally, the cost would be prohibitive for him; he has to get a right thing done, not a wrong thing done, but because it becomes prohibitive for him to stay in Delhi or even in Lucknow or in any other State capital, for that matter, he is tempted to offer these tips, and not bribes. However, it has a very bad psychological effect.

In my speech last, I had occasion to point how great the damage is. The moral idealism disappears. The man from the public thinks that his work has been done because he has paid Rs. 5 or Rs. 10 or Rs. 20 or Rs. 50 as the case may be, and not because it ought to have been done, or the clerk has done his duty or the officer has done his duty. He feels that the officer has just done it, and he has done it out of consideration. Then, it is quite natural for him to feel disillusioned, and this moral idealism disappears. And that has disastrous consequences for everyone.

The diagnosis which has been made by Mr. Appleby is a correct one. Many suggestions have been made by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur and also by Shri Vasudevan Nair. I do not want to repeat them. They are correct. There can be no two opinions. The O. & M. Division also has said so.

As for the system of noting, I am inclined to call it the 'notistic' pattern of administration. We are hearing of the socialistic pattern of society; of course, we have not reached it. But the 'notistic' pattern of administration is already here.

Shri Tyagi: Call it notorious.

Shri Jamal Khwaja: That seems to be correct. Mr. Appleby has analysed why it is so. He has pointed out that it is because there is not enough delegation of power. The Under-secretary has to write a note, because he cannot

[Shri Jamal Khwaja]

take the decision himself. So, the file goes to the Deputy Secretary or the Joint Secretary as the case may be, and he has to write a further note, and so on. So, the 'notistic' pattern of administration is here. It must be done away with as far as is possible and compatible with sound administrative procedure.

The O & M Division's Report itself has referred to the vertical and lateral movement of files which, I think, is a very refined and subtle expression. Evasion of responsibility has already been touched upon by speakers who have preceded me. All these things are true. But the question is, why is there evasion of responsibility? I think this requires probing into in some greater detail. I was told a story about evasion of responsibility by a very eminent person of all India fame. He had a relative here, a young man, in some Ministry or department, and he being a new man made an order. A few days later, the Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary called him and gave him friendly advice and said 'Young man, I have been here for the 15 or 20 years and I would like to give you a piece of advice. Never make an order. Just write a note and pass it on. Otherwise, God knows what may happen. If you make an order, you become responsible. You can never know what is going to happen.'

So evasion of responsibility is there. But why is it so? There also Appleby's Report is highly relevant. I do not want to go into the various suggestions he has given because that Report was discussed in the Rajya Sabha in 1956 and probably also in the Lok Sabha—I was not here then. It is painful that such a brilliant Report as Dr Appleby's was severely criticised. There might have been some flaws here and there. But I found from the debate in the Rajya Sabha that it was severely criticised by a large number of Members, and the Prime Minister very aptly remarked in his reply that after all,

what the Members had discussed was Dr. Appleby rather than his Report. There were so many personal criticisms because he had something to say about the negative influence which is exercised by Parliament. Sir, I am myself a Member of Parliament, but we must face facts, we must see things, we must have objectivity of judgment. It is patent that very often negative influence is exercised. Of course, that does not mean that that influence is bad or anything like that. But it is there.

There is another factor connected with it. Not only is there the negative influence of Parliament, but the negative influence of superior officers is also present. I have been told stories—true stories, I must say—during my informal chats which I purposely held with various officers from the highest to the lowest rank, from ICS Secretaries to clerks and chaprasis. What happens is that a superior officer is very often afraid to take action against a subordinate officer, because the latter might start indulging in various machinations; he might approach somebody else and there might be some other intervention or something of that type. In the result, the subordinate officer might have the upper hand.

There is the fear of being overruled by the superior officer.

I have no idea of the time I have actually taken.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: I myself had no idea of the speakers. But now I find there are many fresh names being sent in.

Shri Jamal Khwaja: I would not go into details, but would confine myself to a general principle which, I think, is of crucial importance, the principle whether the rate of growth of our civil expenditure and our expansion of our administrative personnel is proper, or high or too high or too low. I have heard several speeches during the budget

session and at other times when criticism has been made that the civil expenditure is mounting. I do not have the figures here, but a perusal of the Appleby Report would show that this objection is completely unfounded. Economy does not mean that we just try to keep our staff at the minimum level. Economy means efficiency. If there is no efficiency, there can be no economy in the long run.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Might I inform my hon. friend that the Comptroller and Auditor General has condemned the scale of this expenditure?

Shri Jamal Khwaja: I have not read the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General, but I did go through the Appleby Report and I found this idea was very strongly opposed by that brilliant and wellknown expert.

But apart from this general principle that there must be a steady and corresponding growth in the administrative machinery—because that constitutes the very foundation; there can be no developmental progress; our developmental schemes are all there, but if there is administrative delay or if there is lack of law and order and other basic considerations which are very important our schemes cannot fructify—apart from that, here I think an analogy can be drawn between the relationship of heavy industry and consumer industry and that between civil expenditure and developmental expenditure. These days we have become so much production-minded that we think that any schemes which do not lead to direct production are useless or at least not so important.

Lastly, I would say that apart from this general and basic consideration, there is another basic thesis. I have no time to develop it now. That is my favourite thesis. I am a student of philosophy and ethics. I would have to have a full hour to develop

that thesis, but I would be content to finish it in just one minute. It is the thesis of the primacy or at least the equal, inherent necessity of the moral dimension, as compared with the economic or political or any other dimension. In this age where there is more technique rather than of vision, in this age where there is more emphasis on doing rather than on being, I think it needs to be reminded again and again that we can never over-exaggerate the importance of the moral dimension. It is not moralising, it is not sermonising. It is as scientific a statement or proposition as any other scientific proposition that can be verified by observation and experiment. Unfortunately, I do not have the time to dwell on this point. But I would say that this is the only way for a poor country like ours, to make up for the lack of funds by this moral capital, as somebody has very aptly said.

श्री यू० चं० जैन (कैथल) : मान्यवर डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, इस प्रारगेनाइजेशन एंड मैथड डिवीजन की चौथी सालाना रिपोर्ट पर जो बहस श्री माथुर साहब ने शुरू की है मैं उन को इस के लिये बधाई देता हूँ। साथ ही साथ मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने ने आज सबेरे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की स्पीच जरूर सुनी होगी जिस में उन्होंने ने यह कहा था कि आज हमारी मिनिस्ट्रीज बड़ी बड़ी एम्पायर्स हो गई हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह हालत है तो यह प्रारगेनाइजेशन एंड मैथड डिवीजन इन एम्पायर्स को कैसे कंट्रोल कर सकता है।

श्री हरिचन्द्र माथुर : यही तो मैं ने कहा था।

श्री यू० चं० जैन : तो जब यह मिनिस्ट्रीज बड़ी बड़ी एम्पायर्स बन गई हैं तो इन को कंट्रोल करने के लिये क्या तरीका प्रस्तुत कर जाना चाहिये यह एक बहुत गहरा सबजेक्ट है।

मैं इस सिलसिले में अपने तजुबों की बिना पर चन्द छोटी छोटी चीजें आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। अंग्रेजी में एक कहावत है कि

You can take a horse to a pond but you cannot make it drink.

बहुत सी अच्छी अच्छी तजवीजें और स्कीमें बनाई जा सकती हैं और आर्गनाइजेशन और मैथड डिवीजन कायम किये जा सकते हैं, लेकिन सवाल यह है कि उस परसोनल को जोकि मुस्तलिफ लेविल्स पर हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में काम करता है किस तरीके से उस स्पिरिट से आगाह किया जाये जिससे कि हम उन को आगाह करना चाहते हैं। मेरे से पहले यहां पर कहा गया कि यह जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चल रहा है यह तो पुराने जमाने की पुलिस और रेवेन्यू स्टेट के माडल पर चल रहा है। पिछले दस ग्यारह साल से हम चाहते हैं कि यह एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन वेल्फेयर स्टेट के पैटर्न का होना चाहिये। पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी इस पर जोर दिया गया और दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी इस पर जोर दिया गया है, यहां तक कि इस पर अलग से एक चेप्टर भी लिखा गया है। लेकिन उस पर किस हद तक अमल हो रहा है या कहां तक उस में कसर है, यह बात सोचने की है। इस पर भी कई रायों का इजहार किया जा सकता है। लेकिन एक बात की कसर में देखता हूँ, जितनी तरफ नायर साहब ने भी इशारा किया है और मेरे प्रिडेसेसर ने भी उसका जिक्र किया है। क्या यह आर्गनाइजेशन एंड मैथड डिवीजन या हमारा होम मिनिस्टर साहब यह बतलायेंगे कि पिछले दस वर्षों में डिफरेंट लेविल्स पर जो हमारे आफिसर्स काम कर रहे हैं उनको उस सोसलिस्ट पैटर्न के मुताबिक बनने के लिए जो कि हम कायम करना चाहते हैं क्या ट्रेनिंग दी गयी है, इस तरफ क्या कदम उठाये गये हैं? क्योंकि जब तक इन अफसरान में यह स्पिरिट पैदा नहीं होगी

जो कि हम चाहते हैं, तब तक महज इन टैकनिकल चीजों के करने से ज्यादा फायदा नहीं हो सकता। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि अफसरान में यह स्पिरिट पैदा करने के लिए कोई कदम नहीं उठाया गया है। मैं ने इस बारे में एक सवाल पूछा था। मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारे एजुकेशनल इंस्टीट्यूशंस का भी यही हाल है। वहां भी पढ़ने वालों में सही स्पिरिट पैदा करने के लिए कोई कदम नहीं उठाया जाता। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक इस सिलसिले में कदम नहीं उठाया जायेगा तब तक हम ठीक सुधार नहीं कर सकते। हम लैंड रिफार्म के बारे में रिपोर्ट पढ़ते हैं, ए० आई० सी० सी० की रिपोर्ट पढ़ते हैं, प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पढ़ते हैं। उन रिपोर्टों को पढ़ कर हैरानी होती है क्योंकि जिन लोगों के हाथ में इस देश के ३६ करोड़ लोगों की हुकूमत है उनकी तरफ से इन रिपोर्टों में कहा जाता है कि हम मुस्तलिफ स्टेट्स में कानून पास करते हैं लेकिन जब उन पर अमल का सवाल आता है तो मालूम होता है कि ५० फीसदी मुजारे ब्रेखल हो गये। ऐसा इसीलिए होता है कि जो हमारे अफसरान हैं उनको उस आबजैक्टिव से आगाह नहीं किया गया है और हम देखते हैं कि आजतक किसी अफसर को इस वजह से सजा नहीं दी गयी कि उसने उस स्पिरिट के खिलाफ काम किया है। हम सुनते हैं कि रिश्वत की वजह से, डिले की वजह से, इनफ्लैशेंसी की वजह से अफसरान को सजा दी जाती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम इस वजह से भी सजा दे कि किसी अफसर ने हमारी स्पिरिट के खिलाफ काम किया है।

आज से जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब करप्शन का जिक्र कर रहे थे तो उनको श्री महाबीर त्यागी जी ने इंटरजैक्ट किया था। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब कह रहे थे कि हम एक तरफ से सारे अफसरान को कर्बम नहीं कर सकते, उनमें कुछ काली भेड़ें हो सकती हैं, लेकिन उनके खिलाफ हम फर्म ऐक्शन लेते हैं।

इस पर त्यागी जी ने कहा था कि आपकी गवर्नमेंट फर्म ऐक्शन नहीं लेती। इस बारे में मैं त्यागी जी से इत्तिफाक करता हूँ। हमारे यहां ईश्वर के तीन रूप बताये गये हैं, एक ब्रह्मा है, एक विष्णु है और एक महेश है। ब्रह्मा का काम है पैदा करना, विष्णु का काम है परवरिश करना और महेश का काम है संहार करना। तो यही तीनों चीजें एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में होना चाहिए। हुकूमत भी जन्म देती है, पालन करती है और संहार भी करती है। लेकिन मुझे यह कहते हुए अफसोस होता है कि जब हम कभी अपने चोटी के नेताओं से मिलते हैं और इस बात का जिक्र करते हैं तो हमसे कहा जाता है कि साहब यह डिमाक्रेसी है, इसमें हम सलाह करते हैं और रिफार्म करते हैं? मैं कहता हूँ कि इस तरह हम कब तक रिफार्म कर पायेंगे। यह सही है कि हमारे यहां डिमाक्रेसी है लेकिन डिमाक्रेसी में भी फर्म ऐक्शन लिया जा सकता है और जब तक यह फर्म ऐक्शन नहीं लिया जाता तब तक आफिशियल या अनआफिशियल लेवल पर सुधार नहीं हो सकता।

तो पहली बात तो यह है कि डिफरेंट लेवल्ल पर हमको पब्लिक सर्विसेस को खास ट्रेनिंग देनी चाहिए ताकि उनमें जो हम चाहते हैं वह स्पिरिट पैदा हो सके, और दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब सजा दी जाये तो किसी किस्म का रहम या मेहरबानी न की जाये। अगर हमको अपने एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को और देश को आगे ले जाना है तो हमको यह जरूर करना चाहिए।

जैसा कि श्री माथुर साहब ने कहा था कि हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की बहुत बदनामी है। शायद यह मुबालगा हो। लेकिन यह कहने में कोई मुबालगा नहीं है कि हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की नैकनामी दिन पर दिन कम होती जा रही है। पिछली १०, ११ सालों में गवर्नमेंट ने पहली और दूसरी पंचवर्षीय

योजनाओं में करोड़ों अरबों रुपया खर्च किया। हम अपने जिलों में और कांस्टीट्यूएंसीज में जाते हैं तो देखते हैं कि जहां तक बेंनीफिट कामों का ताल्लुक है काफी काम हुआ है, जितने स्कूल अस्पताल सड़कें वगैरह अंग्रेजी हुकूमत के सौ डेढ़ सौ साल में नहीं खुले उतने या उनसे ज्यादा इन दस सालों में खुल चुके हैं। लेकिन फिर भी क्या वजह है कि पब्लिक इतनी क्रिटिकल है। इसका कारण यह है कि हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में गड़बड़ है। मिसाल के तौर पर आप को आपरेटिव सोसाइटीज के काम को लें। इसमें काम इस तरह से हो रहा है कि जो लोग अनडिजराविंग हैं, जिनके पास पहले से पैसा है, उनको ही रुपया दिया जाता है, उनको ही लोन और ग्रांटें मिलती हैं। कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट मुहकमे के मारफत बहुत सारा रुपया खर्च हो रहा है। लेकिन उसका देहात वालों पर क्या असर है। वहां यह हाल है कि जिन लोगों के पास पहले से है उनकी ही जेबें भरी जा रही हैं, और जो भूखे और रूखे हैं उनकी वही हालत बनी हुई है। एस सिलसिले में मुझे एक छोटी सी कहानी याद आती है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मेम्बर साहब इस बात का ख्याल रखें कि सब को दस दस मिन्ट का वक्त ही मिल रहा है, इसलिए वह ज्यादा कहानियां न कहें।

श्री मू० च० जैन : तो मैं इस कहानी को छोड़ता हूँ क्योंकि मुझे दो एक और बातों पर जोर देना है।

एक बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां यह सही है कि जिन अफसरों की गलती पायी जाये उनको सजा दी जाये, वहां यह भी बहुत जरूरी है कि जो अफसरान अच्छा काम करते हैं उनको reward बढ़ाई मिलनी चाहिए। आज हाल यह है कि जो लोग अच्छा काम करने वाले हैं, जो इनीशियेटिव दिखा सकते हैं उनको यह डर होता है कि पता नहीं कि क्या नतीजा हो। मैं चाहता हूँ

[श्री म० ब० ज०.]

कि इस बहस का जवाब देते हुए होम मिनिस्टर साहब यह बतलायें कि अच्छा काम करने वाले किन किन अफसरों को इनाम दिया गया। अगर ऐसी कोई चीज उन्होंने की होगी तो उन्हें उसके लिए म्बारकबाद मिलेगा और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मामले में सारा हाउस इस काम की तार्हद करेगा।

इसके बाद मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ। यों तो रिपोर्ट में बहुत सी बातों का जिक्र है लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हर मिनिस्ट्री में एक सेक्यन ऐसा होता है जिसमें बड़ा करप्शन होता है। वह सेक्यन है, जो सर्बाइनेट आफिसरों की ट्रांस्फर और एपायंटमेंट को कंट्रोल करता है। हर मिनिस्ट्री में—रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री, डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री में—यही हालत है, उस सेक्यन का पटिकुलर नाम कुछ भी हो। अगर हम किसी भी सर्बाइनेट आफिसर से बात करे, तो हमें मालूम होगा कि उन को सब पता होता है कि कैसे ट्रांस्फर कराना है और कैसे उस को कैसल कराना है और किस तरह से रिबर्तें दे दे कर काम कराया जाता है। इस की वजह से बड़ा हैजान फैला हुआ है। यह एक ऐसा सैल है, जिस की वजह से हर एक मिनिस्ट्री के सर्बाइनेट आफिसरों में बेचैनी पाई जाती है। इस की वजह से हर जगह करप्शन का शोर मचा रहता है हर एक आदमी कोसता है कि यह क्या हो रहा है और हुकमत बहकती है और वह करती है।

इस रिपोर्ट में यह जिक्र किया गया है कि जब कोई पब्लिक कम्प्लेंट्स आयें, पब्लिक एन्क्वायरीज आयें, तो उन का जवाब दिया जाय। मैं इस बात पर सख्त हैरान हूँ। मैं ने एक वक्ता पहले भी जिक्र किया था कि हमारे महकमे और मिनिस्ट्रीज पब्लिक एन्क्वायरीज का जवाब क्या देंगी, जब कि उन की तरफ से एम० पी०, को भी जवाब नहीं दिया जाता है। रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री पर बहस

के दौरान मैं ने कहा था कि मेरे पास मुस्ताबिक मिनिस्ट्रीज के साथ कारेसपांडेंस का रिकार्ड है कि वे जवाब नहीं देते हैं।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर की हैसियत से उन को कोई चीज भेजते हैं, तो फिर वे लम्बी बीड़ी रिपोर्ट दे देते हैं। पंजाब में एक छूटे से मिनिस्टर की हैसियत से मेरा तजुर्बा है कि जब हम किसी Minister के पास कई चीज भेजते हैं, तो कुदरतन वह अपने मातहतों से रिपोर्ट लेता है और मेरा तजुर्बा है कि आतहत आफिसर हमेशा अपने एक्शन को डिफेन्ड करता है। मिनिस्टर साहब के पास जब फाइल आती है और उन को नोट "पुट अप" होता है, तो वह उस पर मक्खी पर मक्खी धार देते हैं और बाजों-नादर ही एक फ्रीसदी केसिज में ही वे इन्टरफीयर (Interfer) करते हैं। अगर कोई मिनिस्टर दिलचस्पी लेता है, तो कुछ काम बन सकता है। एक केस का मुझे पता है, जो कि अस्पताल की नर्स के ट्रांस्फर के बारे में था। मैं ने हैल्थ मिनिस्टर साहब को लिखा। मेरे पास सारी की सारी कारेसपांडेंस है। मैं ये सब बातें इस लिए बत रहा हूँ कि कैसे सुधार हो सकता है, जब कि मिनिस्टर और सेक्रेटरी के लेबल पर इस तरह की बातें हों। मैं ने एक चिट्ठी लिखी, उस का जवाब आया। दूसरी चिट्ठी लिखी, उस का जवाब आया, लेकिन जहां तक अमल का ताल्लुक है, ठाक के वही तीन पात। कुछ नहीं किया गया। किसी डिप्टी मिनिस्टर ने मिनिस्टर को कहा कि यह बात करनी है। जो चीज मैं चाहता था, वह मेरे कहने पर नहीं की गई, लेकिन जब डिप्टी मिनिस्टर ने कहा, तो फौरन कर दी गई। अगर एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को ठीक करना है, तो मिनिस्टर साहबान को इस का अच्छी तरह से ध्यान रखना होगा, क्योंकि यही कसौटी है, जिस पर कि हमारी जनता, हमारी मन्वर्नमेंट और हमारी पार्टी को देख रही है।

16 hrs.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my hon friend, Shri Mathur, has very ably covered all relevant and pertinent points arising out of the Fourth Report of the Organisation and Methods Division. Sir, so far as details are concerned, I cannot do anything better than to emphasise some of the points that he has already made out. Therefore, I would like to confine myself to the basic issue pertaining to the Indian Administration.

The purpose and the objective behind the creation of the Organisation and Methods Division was to streamline and rationalise the administrative organisation of the government departments. It was designed to secure the increasing output of qualitative disposal of primary receipts and efficient performance of the tasks undertaken. I shall come to the review of the performance of the Division later on, meanwhile, Sir, if a little indulgence is permitted, I would like to engage myself with the basic issues, that is, the personality and the character of the Indian Administration.

The present-day Indian Administration as such was designed and created by a Government, a regime which is no longer here. The regime has passed, but the legacy of the regime still continues. What has astounded me most is that none of my hon friends who have spoken on the subject has given any indication of the fact whether they acquiesce in the present-day Administration, whether they approve of it or whether they reject it, if they approve of it, to what extent, and if they reject something of it, to what extent. That has not been made clear.

"Sir, with the emergence of independence and the change in conditions and situations all over the world, we had been faced with a new task, a new assignment unknown and never

experienced in history so far. We had a backward economy. We professed, announced, undertook to have a socialist society, and thereby we developed on ourselves a responsibility to create an administrative structure which will fit in with our requirements and would give an account of itself which will meet the situation squarely prevailing around us.

Take the instance of America, Britain or Russia. The administration in those countries was evolved, it was not taken or transplanted from elsewhere. As the experience warranted, as the situation desired, step by step, gradually, the administration was evolved to meet the situations, the needs and conditions arising from time to time. But in our country, Sir, the fundamental task which was to have been done with the emergence of independence has been relegated to the limbo of oblivion, and today we are acquiescing in the present-day administrative structure.

I think, if at all the House will remember, it was in Para 3 Chapter XVI of the Second Five Year Plan that this problem of administration was mooted out. Eight categories were listed. If, in the light of experience, I start to review one by one those categories, I am sure time will not permit me to do justice to the subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. He has ten minutes in all.

Shri Rajendra Singh. Eight categories are there.

Sir, it needed courage and determination to have gone ahead with the design and the fabrication of a new administrative organisation which could meet the demands of an underdeveloped economy through the door way of democracy. But our Prime Minister though so many times he has given expression to his views regarding the present-day administra-

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

tion, could not persuade himself that the reorientation, the reorganisation of our administrative system is of paramount necessity, and he has suffered the present administration as others have.

My hon. friend, Shri Jamai Khawaja, paid a tribute to the report of Mr. Appleby, and in that context he has reminded the House of the observation of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister sometime back observed that the Members of Parliament are more keen on discussing Appleby himself and not his report. I respectfully submit, Sir, that a man, however eminent a scholar he may be, however vast and extensive ideas, knowledge and experience of his own country he may have, when he comes to pass on lessons to others, those lessons could not be swallowed up without evident danger to oneself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has only two minutes more.

Shri Rajendra Singh: I have taken only five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken eight minutes.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Other Members were allowed 15 to 20 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That was my mistake; I realised it only late.

Shri Rajendra Singh: That mistake may kindly be extended to me also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now there is no time. I had warned him in the beginning that he would get only ten minutes.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Everything that was in my mind still remains unsaid.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then he can avail of some other time.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Be kind to me this time at least.

As there is no time, I will skip from one point to another as quickly as possible. The first problem is that of demarcating clearly the role which the administration has to play in our national efforts to achieve our objectives. The role can be briefly defined as that of implementing the policy decided upon through democratic processes. Policy-making has to be delegated to the policy-making machinery, but the implementation aspect of it is given to the executive.

But in our country, as is evident from many speeches, no matter who is the Minister and at what elevated place he is, it is the executive which wields the power from A to Z. The character of the executive is quite clear. Shri Mathur recited one sentence from that report. He said that there is a persuasive intellectual dishonesty all round our executive. They shirk their responsibility and they believe in a limited philosophy of their responsibility and obligations to the country and to the people with the result that we have vertical and horizontal passing of files from one place to another and things getting delayed, people feel a sense of frustration and will become, I am afraid, prone readily to the counsel of despair. I submit with a sense of restraint and responsibility that I have known the officers and with a few honourable exceptions, they are not simply intellectually immoral, but they are physically immoral inside their office and in their homes also. The whole climate is so vitiated, so full of frustrating and disappointing elements that unless we undertake to transform the whole system, I think our objective of having a society of prosperous and equal people can never be achieved.

Our administration can be really termed as caste hierarchy. Of course, it is a heritage from foreign rule. The principle of hierarchy is also responsible for the narrow view of responsibility accepted by the philosophy of

our administration. The only responsibility expected of our civil servants is that obeying the orders of the superior. If one is able to answer satisfactorily for his actions in the light of the orders from higher quarters, he is free from all further responsibility. Whereas this type of responsibility is very essential for the successful functioning of the administration, it is not enough. In a positive State, initiative is as important a qualification for the public servant as obedience. This entails delegation of authority with proper safeguards. But so far no safeguards have been provided.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member might conclude his remarks in a minute.

Shri Rajendra Singh: My whole contention is that, as Shri Mathur has said, a very poor organisation has been set up as a corrective to this gigantic and monolithic administrative organisation. It is just like a rabbit being sent out to correct a jackal. So, this Organisation and Methods Division is superfluous. I am one with him in demanding from the hon. Minister of Home Affairs a thorough-going enquiry into the pattern of administration that we have and let us analyse how far the present administration is suited to the needs and requirements of the country.

Our Prime Minister is very much averse these days to public scrutiny. The other day when Shri Bharucha just mooted a suggestion that our financial procedures in the military should be examined by the Members of this House of course with the co-operation of certain experts, our Prime Minister was prompted to say that such a roving enquiry cannot be made as because it will demoralise the administration. Similarly, if the Home Minister says: "No, no enquiry against our administration. It will demoralise them. It will create in them a sense of diffidence. They will never pick up any amount of initiative, which is so urgently required . . ."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude.

Shri Rajendra Singh: I want your indulgence for a minute. I think Shri Mool Chand Jain has rightly said that our administration should be like the Caesar's wife hundred per cent., even if it means making changes all the time. More than anything else, the essential requirement is to have a full public scrutiny, wherever there is suspicion. It is not enough that Caesar's wife is chaste. She must be above suspicion. He has rightly said that wherever you go in the country, everywhere the people feel that there is something wrong with this Government somewhere. He may not pinpoint it or spotlight it. But, nonetheless, this suspicion is there all over the country; even in this Parliament it is there, though not to that degree. Therefore, if you want this country to have full-fledged democracy, if you want to set an example to other defaulting countries like Pakistan, Sudan, Egypt and other countries, then the first and the primary task that the Home Minister should attend to is not merely to see that there is initiative and imagination in the administration but also the requisite honesty and integrity also to the satisfaction of Nation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now the hon. Member has trespassed his own limitation. His time is up.

Shri L. Achaw Singh (Inner Manipur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the Organisation and Methods Division has completed four years of its existence. It should be remembered that it was started on the recommendations of Dr. Appleby, who was invited by the Government of India and who submitted his report. He was asked to make administrative studies and to make recommendations about the improvement that is necessary. The purpose of establishing such a Division was that the Central office of the O. & M. Division should be invested with the responsibility of giving extensive as well as intensive leadership

[Shri L. Achaw Singh]

in respect of structure, management and procedures of public administration in India. We suggested that technical things like work measurement, work flow, office management, the filing system and accommodation should be dealt with at one level and at another level general procedural matters and proposals should be studied. When we study the Report we have to judge it in the light of all these recommendations.

The Report of the Organisation and Methods Division is quite complacent about the speed of disposal. The statement shown on page 2 clearly indicates the progress made by the application of the O. & M. measures. Except in the Department of Revenue, Railway Board and the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, no appreciable progress has been made. Furthermore, the Third Report, i.e., for 1956-57, is more faithful in emphasising that no progress has been made, that there is a great scope for improvement, and that unnecessary and repetitive notings and unnecessary reference to other branches, sections and ministries are defects which would still persist.

Our main programme is to adjust the democratic procedure to the economic and social changes brought about by the successive Five Year Plans as well as by the international situation. Dr. Appleby again said that there are two defects in our administrative system. One is the lateral defect, i.e., too many cross references are made and unnecessary notings are also made. References are made to other ministries, other departments and other branches. Another is the vertical defect, i.e., too many details are taken at the upper or the higher level and that prevents a speedier disposal of the work. In fact, the result is that disposal or clearance is rather very slow as well as laborious. Moreover, these cross references defer and delay the execution of work. So, from a close scrutiny of the Report,

it is found that little progress has been made to remedy the above defects.

The heavy load of old pending cases hinders the progress of the current work. The Directorate General of Posts and Telegraphs continued to have the highest carry-over in spite of efforts made to reduce the arrears. Para 12 of the Report says:

"In spite of repeated steps taken from time to time to eliminate the evil of repetitive and unnecessary noting, it was found that the evil had tended to persist."

It is very good that the O. & M. Division has realised that a good deal of the notings consisted of recapitulation of facts about a case every time it goes to the upper level and every time it goes to other departments for concurrence or for advice. In the Report they have suggested the method of 'running summary'. I hope it would help in speedier disposal of cases. But the malady lies deeper and a revolutionary reform should be demanded from the Cabinet Secretariat as well as the O. & M. Division.

The creation of the O. & M. Division has not achieved its purpose. Now we have a Central office and then we have its sections under an Under Secretary or a Deputy Secretary to function in the Division. The main duties of the Division are to prescribe monthly, fortnightly . . .

Dr. Krishnaswami (Chingleput): Is there any quorum?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the hon. Member's opinion?

Dr. Krishnaswami: I do not think there is any quorum.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That question should not be asked. If he wants to bring it to my notice, he should say so.

Dr. Krishnaswami: I say there is no quorum.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will have the bell rung.

Shri Narayankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): The quorum has come, Sir!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, there is now quorum. The hon. Member may continue.

Shri L. Achaw Singh: The main duties of the Division are to prescribe weekly, fortnightly and monthly reports from the different departments, to consolidate the statistics, and also to conduct quarterly inspections. All the labour and expenditure spent on the Organisation and Methods Division has not resulted in improving the day-to-day work, in removing the deficiency, in facilitating the disposal of the work or even in removing the secretariat red tape. The innovation of submitting reports has added to the burden of the lower staff. They are in constant fear that they would be warned by the Organisation and Methods Division, and they have to prepare new statistics, new returns at the cost of their legitimate and normal work. They always try to close a case on the slightest pretext, and those cases are again reopened. That is the danger. In many cases the attempt is to deal with the cases in a lighter fashion or in an easier way with the result that these cases are not done proper justice. They do this in order to bring down the number of pending cases.

The mere collection of statistics entails more work on the Assistants. The work has not been comparatively reduced or facilitated by the Home Ministry or the Finance Ministry. Within the four years of its existence it is regrettable that the Organisation and Methods Division has not published a single book for the guidance of the workers or for the improvement of the work in the different Ministries. The Organisation and Methods Division in other countries do not confine themselves to the theoretical side only; they always look to the practical side also.

There is great scope for improvement in its working. So far as provision of accommodation is concerned we find that the Assistants have to work in a very inconvenient way. They have to sit in a very crumpled-up way and it will be surprising for you to know that it takes about five minutes for them to go to their seats and to come back from their seats. They are supplied with very ordinary type of furniture and that does not facilitate easy working. As regards typists in these offices, they are not supplied with standardised chairs and tables, and this causes much inconvenience to them. As regards accommodation, you will find that the big officers are occupying spacious rooms which would accommodate fifteen or twenty of these workers.

Lunch is generally observed for one hour. Though it is only half an hour that is allowed, instead of half an hour we observe one hour. Any surprise visit to the secretariat between one and two will show this; you will find that many officials are standing outside and sometimes playing cards in the outskirts of the South Block or the North Block. You will find that lots of man-hours are lost. Half-an-hour for thousands of workers would amount to hundreds of working days. This is a great wastage. The O. & M. Division has not done anything to strictly enforce the working hours.

I have only one more point and that is about the psychological approach to be made by Ministers and Secretaries. It will be very good if Ministers and Secretaries have weekly interviews with the staff so that they may study the difficulties and grievances of the workers. If they have the co-operation and help of the workers, most of the work will be facilitated and the great expenditure on the O. & M. Division would be saved.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): Sir, I am thankful to Shri Harish Chandra Mathur for

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

the pains he has taken over this subject and also for initiating this debate. I wish matters relating to Administration could be discussed in a constructive way in this House from time to time.

Nobody can claim that the system of administration in any country, at any time, can be or is perfect. We have to continue the process to review the position from time to time and to see that the standards of efficiency, the demands of economy and the achievement of the targets and objectives which we have placed before ourselves are constantly borne in mind. I may, however, submit that the representation of the case seems to be somewhat one-sided. Of course, he was only interested in pointing out what he thought to be deficiencies. Not that I think he does not find any point which he does not appreciate. But, he had little time to refer to them and hardly much tendency to dilate on it. I can appreciate that but we have to bear certain facts in mind when we deal with the administrative problem.

The Central Government is charged with many onerous responsibilities. So far as the States go, their respective spheres are more or less circumscribed. Here, the Centre has to cater to the needs of the entire country and of an enormous population, a population which, since the achievement of Independence, is growing more and more self-conscious and also, I hope, developing a sense of civic responsibility. We have, whether we like it or not, inherited a system, a system which had many advantages but which was not free from drawbacks either. So, when we apply our mind to the complicated problems and assess the present position as judiciously as we can, we should also give thought to the various aspects which are intimately related to this problem.

We have an organisation of about 17 lakhs persons serving under the Centre. Ultimately, the responsi-

bility for every one of them rests on the Ministers, and they have to function through the secretaries. So, the Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Joint Secretaries have to be here in an adequate number so that the Ministers may be able to render an adequate and accurate account of what they do or what they fail to do to Parliament.

There is one other point which may also be perhaps borne in mind. The standard of efficiency in our country is not very high. I include in that myself as a Minister, and others too who do not possess that degree of efficiency which we find in other countries. Perhaps we require three men, sometimes four men, to do the work which is turned out by two in other places. So, with this growing consciousness, there is naturally a desire to be fully informed about every matter which has a bearing on public life, I will say not only on public but also on private life, to a large extent. Our activities are growing from day to day, from an undeveloped stage we are striving continuously to build up a new social order which will ultimately blossom into abundance for every one.

So, there are these factors also, and the activities in the field of commerce and industry and of other similar constructive spheres do call for constant scrutiny and attention. So there has been any increase in the number of Secretaries, perhaps he has not much to say against the Secretaries at least so far as their number is concerned. In the case of Joint Secretaries and special officers, I should say that the number has perhaps increased to the largest extent in the Ministries of Finance, Commerce and Industry, Iron and Steel, and Mines and Oil. Anyone who has been following the efforts that are being made to set up new plants to rebuild the country on a new economic basis will instantly see that it is much better to have all these things carefully looked after than to stint in matters which would only lead to the saving of a pie at the cost of a pound.

Shri Mathur referred to certain matters and said that the number of Secretaries and Joint Secretaries has gone up. That is no new discovery. Every one has been saying that for the last two years, but every effort is being made to reduce the number of existing hands in the Secretariat.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):
In consequence, the number goes up

Pandit G. B. Pant: Well, the number goes up in higher ranks, but we have stopped all recruitment to class III and also almost in class IV. New men are not being taken. I am of the opinion, I must say—I would like to make it clear—so far as my own attitude goes, the number of responsible officers should be increased.

If you want devolution, if you want decentralisation, if you want the work to be done speedily, then you will have to appoint a larger number of officers whom you can charge with the responsibilities which they can be reasonably expected to discharge efficiently and honestly. You cannot but have five or six or seven stages, unless you reorganise the thing on a rational basis.

So, if there has been an increase in the number of Joint Secretaries, it must be due to the exigencies of the situation. Before any new post is sanctioned, due care is taken.

As hon. Members are aware, we have adopted a number of measures for ensuring economy. There is an Economy Reorganisation Unit in the Finance Ministry. There is an economy unit in every Ministry, which works internally. Besides, we have the teams on plan projects which go about and study and then report, one of whose main functions is to tell us where economies can be effected, and we have been making economies like that. Then there are also other measures taken for ensuring this objective. I do not say that every man who is there is absolutely necessary. It may be possible to make 276(A1) LSD—8.

some reductions here, and perhaps, it may also be desirable to make some increases elsewhere.

When we talk of the increase in the numbers, we forget that our activities have multiplied hundredfold. The number of receipts in the Secretariat today, as compared with what it was five years ago,—I cannot say definitely—must be at least three hundred or four hundred or five hundred per cent more. So, you have to look at the thing in a national way.

The question that one should consider is to what extent a clerk or an officer can be expected to deal with the work that is to be allotted to him. The O and M Division has been making a close study of this problem. Work-studies have been made. Work-Groups have sat together. Forms of work have been determined. If anyone says that the work allotted to a particular person is less than what he should do, then we should revise that standard. But if for the performance of the work that is to be done, you need a man, then either the work should suffer or the man has to be provided. As I said just now, I do not claim that there is no room for any sort of scrutiny in this matter.

During the war-time and for some time thereafter, recruitment, especially in the lower ranks, was made in a somewhat indiscriminate way, with the result that we have to carry on our work with the aid of some of the persons who are not quite up to the mark. We cannot turn them out. We do not want to retrench them. We have to keep them on. The work has to be done. I think no one in this House stands for retrenchment. I think no one in this House would like a single hand to be turned out. If that is so, we have to work with the tools that we have. If those tools are such that instead of one, two are necessary, then you have to bear with us for working in accordance with your wishes. For that we alone cannot be held to be responsible.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

I would also like to mention here that when hon. Members examine the figures of the clerks who are serving in the Secretariat or in any other office, they should also take account of the vast increase that has taken place in our budget. Our activities here have to deal not only with the recurring day to day administrative work but also with the entire Plan; everything that comes within the ambit of it, whether of development or of administration or of reconstruction has to be guided, controlled, regulated and supervised from the Secretariat. So when you take that into account, our expenditure today per year—the public expenditure—inclusive of the current expenditure and the Plan expenditure and the capital expenditure, you will find that it has grown into enormous dimensions. So when you have got that, you should also have adequate machinery for carrying out all this work. Merely comparing figures would not yield a satisfactory, reliable and dependable sort of result. But if you take all these factors together, I hope it will be conceded that situated as we are, we have not been extravagant. We have taken every good care. We have set up a number of economy committees and efficiency committees. We have this O. and M. Besides these, we have the Manpower Directorate. We have set up an administrative pool of officers. We are going to have another pool for managerial and industrial men, another one for economic service and so on.

This is a continuous process which has to be followed relentlessly and ceaselessly so that the standard of efficiency may be raised and at the same time, work may not suffer. In fact, we have sometimes been taken to task for not preparing people in advance for the activities that will have to be carried out later. If this is also to be borne in mind, there will have to be still further increase.

In the circumstances, I should say that what we have today does deserve scrutiny, but what we have is but adequate for the needs. Look at the questions we have to answer in Parliament alone. All those questions are not reached every day. There are a number of written answers that we give. For answering one question, we have to consult a number of officers. The thing has to go down to the bottom and then it has to come up. All these things take time and we have to do them in the course of a few days, sometimes even three or four.

So this democratic system does involve expenditure in administration. We often think that we must re-organise our system. I have also often thought of it, and I do not say there is no room for improvement. We must give thought to the matter. But, it should be consistent with the basic fundamentals of a democratic system. And, when that fact is borne in mind, then, we have to make due concession for the obligation which such a system inevitably involves.

We have also been continuously examining the procedure that is in force in the offices. Shri Mathur did not quite like the idea of level jumping. Well, I do not know whether he would like to jump down. But, there is nothing like jumping down here; one has to jump up. We have eliminated some of the intermediate stages so that work may be done more quickly, and everyone may understand that he is responsible for his part.

Formerly a paper had to pass through 5 or 6 hands before it reached the Joint Secretary. Now, the man at the bottom has only to collect the papers; the section officer or the superintendent writes the note and it goes direct to the Deputy Secretary or the Joint Secretary so that a lot of superfluous noting is avoided and also time is saved.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: With respect, may I submit that my suggestion was also to eliminate. I was only wanting delegation of powers instead of level jumping and no jumping down.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I quite agree that power should be delegated and that is the reason why there are now more Joint Secretaries because if you have to delegate power to others, you must have men who are fit enough to exercise such power. So, you do not like the power to be delegated to class IV officers; power has to be given to a man who, in your opinion, is competent to discharge the functions which are entrusted to him.

Similarly, in other matters too we have improved the procedure and there is a continuous effort to improve further. We have also set up a pilot project in order to see whether only with the aid of assistants we can function. The assistant prepares the case and it goes directly through the section officer to the Deputy Secretary or the Joint Secretary. I would like to have the assistance of whosoever is prepared to help me in this matter because we are all interested in administrative efficiency, in ensuring speed and economy and in creating an administration in which everybody may feel satisfied with the work of those who are associated with us in administration. It is in the interests of every single officer that he should be trusted and the entire machine and mechanism should have the confidence of the people at large. For, if it is not so, then, it recoils on every one of us. So, we have continuously to make an effort like that.

I would also like the hon. Members to remember that the per capita expenditure on administration in our country is much less than in any other country, not only absolutely but also relatively. If one is to compare with others, our administrative expenditure is very low. So, we cannot say that we are extravagant in this way.

If the standards of other countries are compared with our own, then, I think, we would not fall in any sort of examination or comparison.

Even Mr. Appleby, to whom reference has been made by Shri Mathur, it might be remembered, has expressed his admiration for our administration and for the officers who are conducting it.

You must also remember that big jobs have been done and our people have been coming forward. It is necessary that there should be more of co-operation between the people and the services. They should also fully imbibe the mission and spirit of service and all should devote themselves to the service of the country regardless of any other consideration. That is what we all have been emphasising.

I may state here that Shri Mathur said that there has been no improvement so far as the disposal of cases is concerned. He has read the report. I think there he must have seen that out of 34 Ministries, at least in more than three-fourths there has been an improvement in disposal. He referred to the Posts and Telegraphs Department. There too he must have noticed that there has been a distinct improvement. And, as to the disposals, if he will refer to Appendix II he will find that month by month the disposals have been almost 99 or 98 per cent. In respect of the Atomic Energy Department, which is first on the list, the figures are: 95.6, 99.4, 104.4, 100.1, 104.1, 99.3 and so on. This is a big list covering several pages, and you will not find any case in which the disposals in a month are less than 90 per cent of the primary receipts. So, that is not I think a very disappointing record; that is something which shows that things are being done speedily.

I myself have given strict instructions that every case should be disposed of within three months. But you have to remember that we have

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

a vast country and references have often to be made not only to attached offices, subordinate offices and other offices, but also to State Governments. We have no control over them. We have to send reminders to them occasionally. They are also hard-pressed for time. But we get what we need from them. So the delay is not dismal, but the delay should be eliminated even where it is.

He referred to pension cases. Well, I am sorry that still pension cases are not being disposed of as quickly as they ought to be. But it is not only a matter concerning government servants who are directly under us, the Auditor-General and the Accountant-General also have to examine these cases very thoroughly. Then, in every case where a man goes out a preliminary estimate is made and pension to that extent is sanctioned at once; it is only for the final sanction of the exact amount in rupees, annas and pies—well, there are no annas and pies now, it is now naye paise—that he has to wait. Even this, I agree, should be eliminated, but it does take some time.

He also referred to the aspect of training. There too we are doing a lot. After all, how are the services to be improved? We have to give them training so that those who join government service may be of the proper standard. For that, we are now going to establish our National Academy of Training. It is my idea that all those who are recruited, whether for IAS, IPS, Central Services or for Accounts and Audit, should first receive a ground work for four or six months in the fundamentals of our Constitution, of our objectives, of the principles of social justice, equality, liberty etc., which are enshrined in our Constitution, and of the directive principles that are there. We have thought over the matter, and we want to have more of the Gandhian philosophy

introduced in the syllabus, so that people may at least be able to realise what we were told we have to work for, even if we are not able to act up to all the ideals and objectives.

17 hrs.

So, there is a continuous effort in every direction, I would like anyone, if he is interested in this, to help me in this task. If it is so desired, one or two or three Members can be associated in discussing administrative problems. I would be glad to discuss this matter with Mr. Mathur and others who may be interested as to how far we have got scope for work in this field. That has to be examined, because ultimately it is essentially an administrative problem and so, the matter has to be examined by those who are thoroughly acquainted with the practical operations in this field. There may for example, be very good doctors; they may be well versed in theory, but they may not yet have attained that skill which makes a great doctor. So, it will have to be considered whether we can by associating together help the purpose which we all have in view.

There are a number of matters to which I would like to refer, but I do not want to encroach upon the time of the House, especially when the exact time has been fixed.

17.02 hrs.

*SHARAVATHY HYDRO-ELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I want to read rule 55, because I have received two chits and two hon. Members have asked me to give them five minutes each in this half-an-hour discussion.

"The member who has given notice may make a short statement and the Minister concerned shall reply shortly. Any member who has previously intimated to