

[Shri P. Shiv Shankar]

the tea gardens. In the Assam and Cachar area and also in Darjeeling many tea-gardens are falling and that they are dying down their number is getting reduced. I wanted to know what steps the Tea Board is taking for their replantation.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: That part I have answered in the House in a different form. In fact, in the Budgetary support also we have been spending money for replanting. This aspect I have explained. Of course, subject to the constraints on their finances, if it is possible they should do it because one of their functions is to increase the production as also the productivity. Therefore, one need not go into so much minute technicality because there is also the support from other ends for the purpose.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Why was there such a long delay for the appointment of Chairman?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have explained that in fact, in answer to different question that come up. Well appointment orders are being issued. Sometimes it does take time to get a proper person for a particular job.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: But it is now more than three years.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Well it is inherent in the system itself. Mr. Malaviya, if you were here, you would have perhaps taken even four years. But, as I said, in fact, a couple of days after I took over, we have spotted a person and I think the appointment orders are under issue.

With these words I once again thank the hon. Members who have participated in this debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Tea Act, 1953, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Sir, move:

"That the Bill be returned"

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

#### RESOLUTION APPROVING DRAFT RULES UNDER SECTION 11 OF THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MINISTERS ACT, 1952

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Now we take up the Government Resolution.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Sir, I move the following Resolution:—

"This House approves the draft Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Amendment Rules, 1986, framed under sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 (58 of 1952) and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 24th April, 1986."

The salaries, allowances and other privileges of Central Ministers are governed by the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 and rules framed thereunder, namely, the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Rules, 1957.

Rule 3 of the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Rules, 1957 provided that—and I quote—

"there shall be granted with effect from the 28th May, 1964 to the 31st June

Minister and with effect from 12th August, 1952 to every other Minister who is a member of the Cabinet a Sumptuary Allowance of rupees five hundred per mensem."

As a result of coming into force of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Act, 1985 (76 of 1985) with effect from 26-12-1985, the Prime Minister, a Cabinet Minister, a Minister of State and a Deputy Minister are now entitled to Sumptuary Allowance at the rate of Rs. 1500, Rs. 1000, Rs. 500 and Rs. 300 p.m. respectively.

It is, therefore, proposed to omit Section I and rule 3 of the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Rule, 1957.

Copy of the draft notification of the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Amendment Rule, 1986 was laid on the Table of the House on 24-4-1986 in accordance with the provisions of the Section 11(2) of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952.

The Draft Notification is as under:

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 (58 of 1952) the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Rules, 1937, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Amendment Rules, 1986.

2. Section I and rule 3 of the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Rules, 1957 shall be omitted.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this seems to be very humble proposal. Of course, he has proposed Sumptuary

Allowance of the Prime Minister and the Cabinet Ministers from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,500 and Rs. 1,000 respectively. The Ministers are also to get Rs. 500. As I said earlier, it is a humble proposal considering the hike in cost of living and the luxurious life the Honourable Ministers lead and top of the administration they usually have. But it is certainly not in keeping with the avowed principle of plain living and high thinking.

We have had curtailment of Government expenditure in many areas. You have banned recruitment. You have followed a policy of wage freeze. You have closed some Departments. You have combined some Departments in order to curtail the Government expenditure. But you have not taken an effective steps to remove the poverty. You have denied employment to unemployed youth. Already 50 per cent of our population are below the poverty line. Therefore, this seems to be not in keeping with all these things. But still the proposal seems to be humble.

Sir, in order to judge the standard of the Ministers or the amount they spent from the amount they get formally, their real expenditure and formal expenditure should be checked up. We know how much public undertakings and other institutions spend after the Ministers. We also know how much benefit they get. So all these things should be taken into account, because after all this is public money. If you see up a Parliamentary Committee to check up and find out the actual expenditure of the Ministers, we will see absolutely a different picture.

Sir, the irony of the fate is that the Minister has brought forward this Resolution very enthusiastically, but he himself does not know—what will happen tomorrow and who will enjoy these benefits. I think he should have got one such Resolution much before for the security and position of the Ministers. We do not know, whether the Ministers themselves will be able to enjoy this benefit or not. I think only the magicians know who will be put back. Anyway, Sir, I have nothing much to grudge against this Resolution. But my only

[Shrimati Kanak Mukherjee]

suggestion is that public amount spent after the Ministers should be checked up by a Parliamentary Committee. If we can do that, it will be better. If we have this type of check up against the Ministers, I have nothing much to grudge for this little hike in their salaries. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI R. MOHANARANGAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vive-Chairman, Sir, really it is surprising to note that with effect from the 26th December, 1985, the Prime Minister, Cabinet Ministers, Ministers of State and Deputy Ministers are now entitled to a Sumptuary Allowance ranging from Rs. 1500 to Rs. 300 per month. When I went through the statement I was under the impression that after so many years, a Bill has been passed regarding the salaries and allowances for the Ministers especially for our Union Ministers. If I see the salaries and allowances given to their counter parts in western countries, I feel, they get 10 to 15 times more than what they get here. Even in our neighbouring country Pakistan, Minister gets 2½-2 times more than what our Indian Minister gets here as far as Union Govt. is concerned. When that is the case, I do not want to enter into any argument with regard to the salaries and allowances of Ministers, namely Rs. 1500 to the Minister of a country with 70 crores of population and just Rs. 1000 for the minister who rule this country from Kanya Kumari to Kashmir.

For Deputy Minister, I want to suggest that instead of giving Rs. 300 Sumptuary Allowance, he can also be given Rs. 500 as it is given for the State Minister because I do not find any difference between the State Minister and the Deputy Minister and I hope, the Minister will consider this aspect. They can also be given Rs. 500 and Rs. 1500 for the Prime Minister that I think, it is better not to mention here. Just giving only Rs. 1500 for the Prime Minister of a very big country is not sufficient. Sir, my personal feeling and the feeling of my Party also is that it can be doubled. If at all, Minister is expected to be honest, as the Members of Parliament very often

speak on the floor of the Parliament that all the Parliamentarians including Ministers are honest, if at all they are to be honest, this allowance, I personally feel is not at all sufficient. It should be increased two-fold or three-fold at least. What is the use of giving only Rs. 1500 for the Prime Minister of this country, and Rs. 1000 for the Minister. Mr. Vasant Sathe will spend it within there days. Do you mean to say that Rs. 3,000 is sufficient for Minister to maintain his family in this country considering the hike in prices and the cost of living? So, the salaries which they get now is a meagre amount and the amount which you propose to increase is really a meagre one. I personally feel that it should be increased two or three times. Even though, some of the members may not agree. Sir, when I speak about the Ministers, I will be failing in my duty if I do not mention anything about our ex-M.P.s who were also once Ministers. I have seen so many ex-M.P.s, they are just loitering in the streets. Even I can mention the names of these MPs also but if I mention the names of the MPs, they feel somewhat delicate. That is why, I do not want to mention their names. Our ex-M.P.s should be given Rs. 1000 as pension. Even though it is not good on my part to include that particular item when I discuss something about the salaries and allowances of Ministers, it should be increased to Rs. 1,000 minimum. A former M.P., if at all, he is expected to lead a neat and descent life, he should be given at least Rs. 1,000 and he should be given a pass in a year to come to Delhi where he had enjoyed at least minimum five years to see how the Central Hall is especially how the old places are? (Interruptions). Our Communist Party members do not agree because their wants are limited. Our wants are unlimited. Sir, we want that all the Members of Parliament should be provided with a P. A. or a Stenographer so that they can do their job to the satisfaction of the party leaders and job to the satisfaction of all here. We should also be provided with a separate office for each and every member. That was once accepted by our Prime Minister on the

floor of this House and once the Prime Minister assured it on the floor of the House, definitely he will do it when he is in a position to solve big problems, this is not a big problem for him. He can very easily solve this problem also. So, Sir, this Rs. 300—given to Dy. Minister should be increased to Rs. 500 and Rs. 1000 given to Union Ministers should be increased at least two-fold and the Prime Minister should be given at least Rs. 3,000. Do you mean to say that Rs. 15,00 is enough for the Prime Minister?

With these modifications Sir, I just conclude the speech and I strongly support this Bill.

**श्री हुकुमदेव नारायण यादव (बिहार) :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कानून बन जाते हैं और विशिष्ट लोगों पर खर्चे किए जाते हैं। मैं इस अवसर पर सरकार से यही कहना चाहूंगा कि एक तरफ समाज में करोड़ों लोग हैं जो भूख की अग्नि में जल कर राख हो रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ मूठठी भर लोग हैं जो भोग की अग्नि में जल रहे हैं—जल रहे हैं दोनों . . .

**श्री रामानन्द यादव (बिहार)** आपकी गाय दस किलो दूध देती है ।

**श्री हुकुमदेव नारायण यादव :** मेरे पास तो गाय ही नहीं है । मेरे पास जो है उसकी उपयोगिता आपके लिए होगी नहीं । मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस पर कहीं न कहीं नियंत्रण करना पड़ेगा । सुख-सुविधा, वतन-भत्ता मामूली चीज है, लेकिन उसके अलावा जो सुख-सुविधाएँ उपलब्ध हैं वह विषमता है । एक मंत्री को जो वतन और भत्ता मिलता है जोड़कर देखें तो जो हमको वतन और भत्ता मिलता है उससे उसे कम मिलता है, लेकिन मिनिस्टर के घर पर जाते हैं तो देखते हैं उसके ठाठ-बाट, शान-शौकत, एश आराम और उनके पीछे जो चलते हैं—वही तो असन्तोष की जननी है । एक मिनिस्टर भी एम. पी. हम भी एम. पी. फिर मिनिस्टर के घर पर यह विशेष इन्तजाम—कहाँ से आता है । उनके यहां खर्चा कम होता है ? खर्चा ज्यादा देख रहा हूँ, पैसा कम मिल रहा है । यही असन्तोष है । दूसरी तरफ आप

कहने लगते हैं कि सरकारी नौकर क्लास बन आई ए एस, आई पी एस की तुलना में संसद-सदस्य को और मिनिस्टर को क्या मिलता है । यह सहज-स्वाभाविक है कि हम जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं, हम मालिक हैं, हमारे तन पर कपड़ा खराब भी रहेगा, हमारे पास कम सुख और साधन रहेंगे, लेकिन हम जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं, मालिक हैं और आई एस-आई पी एस अफसर हमारे नौकर हैं । नौकर नौकर होता है, वह नौकर कहलाएगा, हम जनता के प्रतिनिधि मालिक कहलाएंगे । मालिक और नौकर को तुलना किस आधार पर? मालिक नौकर बढ़िया रखता है तो खर्चा ज्यादा देता है, बढ़िया नौकर है तो बढ़िया बर्द्धि की कीमत देंगे । हमारी दृष्टि बदल गई है, उसकी सुख-सुविधा से हम तुलना करने लगे हैं ।

दूसरी बात, खर्चा करते हैं मिनिस्टर के नाम पर, जाएंगे पार्टी मीटिंग में, कहेंगे हम मिनिस्टर हैं हमको टी. ए., डी. ए. मिले । पार्टी की कार्योंस है, चुनाव प्रचार है, पब्लिक मीटिंग है और खर्चा हो रहा है मिनिस्टीरियल वर्क के नाम पर । इस पर कोई प्रतिबंध होगा या नहीं, इस पर रोक लगंगी या नहीं ।

आखिरी बात कहूंगा । किस तरह से खर्चा होता है उसका एक छोटा सा उदाहरण दूंगा । अतारणित प्रश्न संख्या 2147, दिनांक 19 मार्च 82 में आवास मंत्री ने मुझे जवाब दिया था—48.19 लाख रुपये, लगभग 50 लाख रुपये राष्ट्रपति भवन की रखवाली पर, देखरेख पर खर्च कर रहे हैं । इतना खर्च होता था 82 में । राजपथ सड़क के नजदीक, चिल्डन पार्क छोड़कर, राष्ट्रपति भवन तक, स्टीडियम के बीच जो मैदान उसकी देखरेख पर 12 लाख 45 हजार खर्च होता है । राष्ट्रपति भवन पर 50 लाख और इंडिया गेट तक जो दूब है, घास है उस पर 13 लाख खर्च होता है । लोगों के टहलने के लिए दूब गद्देदार हो, खाली पैर चले पैर में खर्चा न लग जाय, कहीं कंकड़ न गड़ जाय . . .

**श्री रामानन्द यादव :** आम जनता, हजारों-लाखों आदमी उसका उपयोग करते हैं ।

श्री हुक्मबख्श नारायण यादव : मुझे बोलने दीजिए । जनता उपभोग करती है यह भी देखते हैं । आम जनता कितना उपभोग करती है यह हम भी देखते हैं । यह अलग बात है कि मेरी आंखों पर गोंगल्स नहीं लगे हुए हैं और इस लिए मैं साफ साफ देखता हूँ ।

अंतिम बात मैं कहूँगा । मेरे पास सरकार का एक और जवाब है । प्रधान मंत्री की मीटिंग पर आंध्र प्रदेश में मीटिंग हुई खर्च हुआ 3 लाख असम में तीन मीटिंग हुई खर्च हुआ 2 लाख 64 हजार, बिहार में 49 मीटिंग हुई खर्च हुआ 94 लाख 97 हजार, पश्चिमी बंगाल में 63 लाख, उत्तर प्रदेश में 65 लाख, तामिलनाडु में 22 लाख, उड़ीसा में 23 लाख, महाराष्ट्र में 23 लाख, तो मैं यह कहता हूँ कि करोड़ों करोड़ रुपया साल में इस तरह से खर्च होता है और दूसरी तरफ देश सूख से तबाह हो रहा है । लोगों को पीने का पानी नहीं, तन पर कपड़ा नहीं । आदिवासी इलाके में हम दौरा करें और करोड़ों करोड़ रुपया दौरो पर खर्च करें, मीटिंगों पर खर्च करें या गरीबों को पानी दें । तो यह मिथ्यावाद हमारे आचरण में कब तक चलता रहेगा । या तो इस मिथ्यावाद का आप अंत करिये या अपने असली रूप में आप प्रकट हो जाइये कि:

यान्त्रिक जीवित सुखम जीवित, ऋणं कृत्वा घृतम पीवते

जब तक जियो सुख से जियो । इंटर नेशनल मानीटरी फंड से कर्ज ले कर खूब धी खाओ, मालपूआ खाओ, देश भले ही रसातल को चला जाय ।

SHRI YALLASESI BHUSHANA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, as a result of coming into force of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Act, 1985 (76 of 1985) passed by this House the Prime Minister is now entitled to a sumptuary allowance of Rs. 1500 per month and a Cabinet Minister, a Minister of State and a Deputy Minister are entitled to Rs. 1000, Rs. 500 and Rs. 300, respectively. There is no need to grudge this. When Ministers are to discharge their duties sufficient alloca-

tions are necessary. But I have some observations to submit to the House. I have seen a press report recently saying that one Minister is redecorating his office at a cost of a lakh of rupees. We find Ministers living in five star style forgetting that this is a land of the poor, this is a land of Gandhiji who preached strict adherence to austerity in this country. With this five-star culture and outlook how can our country flourish? We are not going to be a rich country. Even in rich countries Ministers go by buses, even by cycles as in Vietnam. So, it is that outlook and philosophy which our Ministers should cultivate. This is my submission.

I have another submission to make. Ministers go on tour I can have no objection to it. They can meet people, see their living conditions. But then there are tours of Ministers made for private affairs, personal matter and political purposes. Recently one Minister of State visited Andhra Pradesh. In order to atone for his sins he wanted to visit a temple. But at the last moment he cancelled his programme to the temple and proceeded to the next place of appointment. One of the officials who was to accompany him, since the Minister was scheduled to go to the temple, wanted to reach the venue of the next appointment direct and accordingly reached there at the time originally expected. But, for no fault of his, that official, the Collector, was rebuked by the Minister of State for not being present there earlier. In this respect therefore, there must be strict guidelines for tours of Ministers. Ministers are not expected to go on tours at the cost of the tax-payer for private affairs or ceremonial purposes or for salvation. The purpose of the visit should be strictly business like. Let us not forget Gandhiji's teachings. Ministers are indulging in lavish expenditure, whether justified or not. There is a five-star culture in them. Look at some of our public undertakings. When Ministers go on tours, the Chairmen and Directors of Boards receive them with cars and garlands. They are ready at the back and call of the Ministers, spending lakhs of rupees of the public undertakings.

There is no accountability of the expenditure either to Parliament or to anybody. A committee should be appointed to scrutinise the expenses incurred by the public undertakings on the Ministers who have gone there. We have to get that information and then we will know what it is. I think for this country the principle of simple living is very necessary. We cannot forget some of our former Prime Ministers. The late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri died without even a house. Like that there are people whom we respect. But there are also some Ministers who do not show their accounts with regard to their assets. We have to investigate into their assets. We want to bring forward the Lok Pal Bill. But, unfortunately, we are not including the Prime Minister in that. In any country nobody should be so great as to be above law. In certain foreign countries, Ministers and the former Prime Ministers have amassed money and are having accounts in the Swiss banks. I would request that the Prime Minister also should be included in the Lok Pal Bill. I have cited the example of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. But there are so many other people like him. I can proudly state that our present Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Shri N. T. Rama Rao, is taking only one rupee as his token salary and thus he is setting an example to the country. Thank you very much, Sir.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN):** Yes, Mr. Jagesh Desai.

**SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. Ministers must be given adequate facilities and salaries.

**SHRI SANKA PRASAD MITRA:** (West Bengal) Sir the earlier speaker who spoke about the five-star culture forgot to mention that the External Affairs Ministry has recently moved into a 5 star hotel.

**SHRI JAGESH DESAI:** Sir, the Ministers have to entertain so many guest. Because they happen to be the Ministers, people from the constituencies and others go to them

with their problems. I can give the example of an ex-Minister. With the salary that he was getting it was very difficult for him to pull on. But, because he was a professional person and he was able to get outstanding fees, he was able to manage. So, I am firmly of the opinion that if you want honest Ministers and hard-working Ministers, then you have to provide them with all the amenities. Otherwise, it would be very difficult for the Ministers to work in a manner in which we want or expect them to work.

Secondly, Sir, I have a very small point with regard to the MPs. Earlier, in this House, we were allowed sixteen trips from point. At that time Sir, I was given to understand that the facility would be given to their spouses also. I do not want any additional expenditure on the exchequer. But the sixteen trips which they are giving should also be extended to their spouses or companions, what ever you may call them. I do not want more expenditure to be incurred. But I want that sixteen trips should be given to members and also to their spouses or companions. I think that this was the intention of the Government that time. But when it came in the form of a law, it had only said that 16 single trips would be given to the MPs. I would request the Minister to look into this and see that this—I would not say injustice—anomaly is removed. I am sure that the Minister will look into this and bring forward the necessary amendment to the rules or the law. Thank you, Sir.

**THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN):** Now, Mr. Matto.

**SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO** (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, the leader of our Group, Shri Dhahe, asked me a little while ago to speak on the Bill. I am afraid that what all the other Members have spoken is not at all relevant to the Bill.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN):** This is only a Resolution, not a Bill.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO:

Yes, it is a Resolution. But what we are talking is not relevant at all. What I have been able to understand is—I think the Minister will enlighten me on this—that the salary is governed by the provisions of the Act of 1952. But, instead of that, this has been brought under a separate Bill and this has been brought under the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1955. When his Act was enacted, the salaries of the Members of Parliament were raised and simultaneously, the salaries and other emoluments of Ministers were also raised.

In fact, this an improvement on the previous Bill. This new Bill will come along with the Members' Salary Bill. So, I think the Minister wants that Section I and rule 3 of the Ministers' (Allowance, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Rules, 1957, be omitted.

This is a simple provision. I think this is very innocuous provision. It is an improvement on the 1952 Act. And the minister will react to it whether I was right or wrong because I had very little time to go through this.

I support this Bill.

श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला (गुजरात) :  
हमारे गुजरात में गुजराती की एक अच्छी स्टोरी है जिसमें एक दल्ला तिवारी बाह्मण होता है। शाम को वह घूम रहा होता है तो गांव में उसे एक अच्छी बाड़ी, गार्डन दिखाई देता है जिसमें बैंगन लगे हुए होते हैं। उसका मन हो जाता है कि वह बैंगन ले ले। वह बाड़ी में गया और बाड़ी से कहा कि ए बाड़ी, बाड़ी दो-चार बैंगन दे दे। बाड़ी कहां जवाब देने वाला था तो वह अपने आप ही बोला कि दो-चार क्या दस-बारह ले ले। ऐसा ही हो रहा है। जब हमारे यहां एक रेजोल्यूशन आया था एम. पी. की सैलरी का तो किसी ने विरोध नहीं किया था। हमारे अपोजिशन ने भी नहीं कहा कि हम एम. पी. को कुछ नहीं मिलना चाहिए, हमें

विरोध करना चाहिए था। आज मिनिस्टर की बात आई है, रेजोल्यूशन आपका आया है। कस्टीट्यूशन की बात आपने कही है। सबसे पहले कस्टीट्यूशन में से आप सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी निकाल दीजिए। अगर सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी की बात करनी है तो आपको यह भेदभाव मिटाना है। गांधीजी की बात करते हैं। वह आदमी बिल्कुल एक धोती पहन कर खुला नंगा बदन रख कर पूरी जिन्दगी बिताता रहा। उनके वारिस हैं तो आपको यह शोभा नहीं देता। मिनिस्टर यहां पानी मांगता है तो दूध मिलता है, पानी मांगता है तो \* \* मिलती है। चाहे आपका कोई स्टेट का मिनिस्टर हो, चाहे हमारी यूनियन का मिनिस्टर हो इनको आप देखिये इनका क्या उपयोग हो रहा है। हर स्टेट का जो मिनिस्टर है, केन्द्र का जो मिनिस्टर है...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा (मिचल प्रदेश) :  
मंत्रियों को आप गाली क्यों दे रहे हैं ?

श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला : मैं उनको कोई गाली नहीं दे रहा हूँ। (अवधान)

मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि मंत्रियों को यह शोभा नहीं देता। (अवधान)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: This is not fair. This is very serious. You are casting a very serious aspersion. You cannot say that all Ministers are corrupt. You cannot have Ministers from the affluent class. I take serious objection. It is a small Resolution. But it does not meant that the house can be silent at this condemnation.

SHRI SHANKER SINGH VAGHELA:  
What are they doing for the common man? What are they doing? इनका आप आउट-पुट देखिए (अवधान)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: You don't represent the common man.

(Interruptions)

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**SHRI SHANKER SINH VAGHELA:**  
The Ministers are not trustees. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA:** You have no right to use these words. (*Interruptions*)

**श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला :** उस समय विरोध करना चाहिए था। कोई नहीं बोला। सब ने मिल कर एक मिनट में पास करके भेज दिया। ये बातें नहीं होनी चाहिए। मैं मिनिस्टर्स की बात कर रहा हूँ। इनका स्टेटस थोड़ा अलग हो जाता है। उनको वी. आई. पी. की सुविधाएं मिलती हैं। उन्हीं का उपयोग उनको करना चाहिए। इस देश की इस समय जो हालत है वह आप जानते हैं। यहाँ पर 80 प्रतिशत जनता पावटों लाइन के नीचे रहती है। आप सोशलिस्टिक पटर्न की बात करते हैं तो आपको यह भेदभाव नहीं करना चाहिए।

**श्री कल्याण राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** आप यह गलत बात कर रहे हैं।

**श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला :** आप जानते हैं कि मिनिस्टर्स प्लेन चला सकते हैं और उसकी रोक सकते हैं, मिनिस्टर्स ट्रेन को देर से चला सकते हैं। मिनिस्टर्स क्या नहीं कर सकते हैं? हमारे देश में पोलिटिशियन्स इतने बदनाम हैं कि लोग पोलिटिशियन्स से डरते हैं। किसी को डाक समझते हैं, किसी को माफिया गैंग समझते हैं... (*व्यवधान*)।

**श्री कल्याण राय :** आप एकदम गलत बात कह रहे हैं। आपकी लोग \* समझते होंगे... (*व्यवधान*)।

**SHRI SHANKER SINH VAGHELA:**  
I am one of you. I am also a political worker.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN):** I would request the hon. Members to have a sense of decorum. (*Interruptions*) Nothing will go on record.

**SHRI KALPNATH RAI:** \*\*

**SHRI HUKMDEO NARAYAN YADAV:** \*\*

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN):** The debate is going on a little off the track, I would request the hon. Members to come back to the main track and limit themselves to the subject under consideration. Once in a way, if some observations are made, they should be within the limits of decorum. No allegations of any kind should be made.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA:** I am on a point of order, Sir. Unparliamentary words have been used with reference to Ministers describing them as Mafia dacoits and drunkards. Those words should be expunged from the proceedings.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN):** I will look into the record and if unparliamentary words have been used, they will be expunged. Now, please conclude, Mr. Vaghela.

**श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला :** श्रीमन, मैं भी इस हाउस का पाट एंड पार्सल हूँ। यहाँ पर सब बातें कही जा रही हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से विनती करूंगा... (*व्यवधान*)।

**श्री महेन्द्र सिंह बल्लि (हरियाणा):**  
आपने मिनिस्टर कहाँ देखे हैं, आपने तो बैगन देखे हैं।

**श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला :** आप मिनिस्टर्स को सुविधाएं दे रहे हैं। हमारे श्री मोहनरंगम जी ने एक्स-एम.पी.जी. को भी रेलवे की सुविधा देने के लिए कहा है। रेलवे की एक ऐसी सुविधा है जिससे पब्लिक पर कुछ बर्डन तो बढ़ता है, लेकिन यह आप दीजिये। जो पब्लिक के वर्कर हैं, जिन्होंने जिन्दगी पब्लिक में बिताई है उनको भी आपको सुविधाएं देनी चाहिए। मैंने जो बातें कही हैं उसमें किसी को

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

\*\*Not recorded.



[श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला]

डिमेज करने का कोई सवाल नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि मैं भी एम. पी. हूँ, इसलिए मेरा कोई दूसरा मतलब नहीं था।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, हमारा संविधान का यह व्यवस्था है और हमारा जो मान्यता है उसका अनुसार यहाँ पर कार्य होता है। इसमें हमने 26 दिसम्बर, 1985 को संशोधन किया जिसका अनुसार प्रधान मंत्री को 1500 रु., कोविन्ट स्तर के मंत्री को 1000 रु., राज्य स्तर के मंत्री को 500 रु. और उपमंत्री को 300 रु. सम्पच्चूअरी एलाउन्स दिया जाएगा। हमने अपन संविधान में सांशालस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सॉसायटी का प्रावधान किया है। हमारे संविधान में समानता का व्यवस्था है। इसीलिये मैं माननीय मंत्री जी यह अनुरोध करता हूँ कि वे इस पर पुनः संशोधन करें और कम से कम सब मंत्रियों के लिए 1500 रु. प्रतिमाह के सम्पच्चूअरी एलाउन्स की व्यवस्था करें। मेरी राय में पन्द्रह सौ रुपये बहुत कम है। सारा देश को इस बात की जानकारी होगी कि इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री केवल 1500 रुपये माहवारी सम्पच्चूअरी एलाउन्स ले रहे हैं, राज्य मंत्री केवल पाँच सौ ले रहे हैं और उप मंत्री तीन सौ रुपये ले रहे हैं। लेकिन मान्यवर संसद का सदस्य प्रधानमंत्री भी होता है और अन्य मंत्री भी होते हैं और एक साधारण सदस्य भी होता है। लेकिन मान्यवर, जब असेम्बली लोकसभा क्षेत्र का सदस्य जब हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में जाता है तो करोड़ों रुपये तो मान्यवर, उनकी सुरक्षा में खर्च होता है...

(व्यवधान)

मान्यवर, माननीय सदस्य सुनने के बाद बोश में आये।... (व्यवधान)

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

मैं आपके सामने यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी नै केन्द्रीय मिनिस्टर से ज़्यादा सक्किरिट्टी पर खर्च चौधरी चरणसिंह का है, यह मैं कह रहा हूँ।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : तो मान्यवर, मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि कोई भी लोकसभा

सदस्य या राज्य सभा का सदस्य अगर वह मंत्री हो जाता है और अपने क्षेत्र में राजनीतिक कार्य से जाता है, अपने दल के, अपनी पार्टी के प्रचार के लिये जाता है, जिस पार्टी का वह अध्यक्ष है, राष्ट्रीय अध्यक्ष है, उस दल के प्रचार करने के लिए जाता है तो मान्यवर, करोड़ों रुपये उस पर खर्च होते हैं। वह हवाई जहाज से जा सकता है, हेलीकॉप्टर से जाता है, रक्षा विभाग के वायुयान से जा सकता है... (व्यवधान)...

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : जन्ता पार्टी ने... (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आर. रामकृष्णन) : माननीय सदस्य जब मंत्री बन जाते हैं और अपनी क्वास्ट्रॉन्सी में जाते हैं तो तब भी वह मंत्री के रूप में ही जाते हैं।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : मैं सुझाव तो दे सकता हूँ। मेरा सुझाव देने में किसी को कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए। सुझाव देना मेरा अधिकार है। अगर मैं असंसदीय भाषा का प्रयोग करूँ तो आप मुझे रोक सकते हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आर. रामकृष्णन) : ठीक है।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : मान्यवर, मैं सुझाव दे रहा था कि इस देश के मंत्री, या प्रधानमंत्री जब अपने राजनीतिक कार्यों से जायें, जैसे कि प्रधानमंत्री जी कुछ समय पहले कर्नाटक गये वहाँ पर कांग्रेस पार्टी की सभा करने के लिए और वहाँ पर मांग की कि कर्नाटक के मुख्यमंत्री श्री रामकृष्ण हंगडें स्तीफा दे दें। (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आर. रामकृष्णन) : जो विषय से रिलेटेड नहीं है वह भाषण कृपया मत दीजिये। (Interruption) I rule it out. I have already ruled it out.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : तो मान्यवर, मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि जो सम्पच्चूअरी एलाउन्स है इसको अगर और बढ़ा दिया जाय तो मेरे जैसे व्यक्ति को इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी। लेकिन एक व्यक्ति की सुरक्षा में इस मुल्क का करोड़ों रुपये खर्च हो इस

पर मेरी आपत्ति है। इसलिये इस पर आप ध्यान दें और इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस संकल्प का समर्थन करता हूँ और पुनः अनुरोध करता हूँ कि इसको बड़ा दिया जाय।

**SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE** (West Bengal): Sir, before the Minister rises to speak, I want to keep the record straight. A reference has been made from that side that when the earlier Bill was introduced, there was no opposition from this side. That is not true. I was there. I opposed it. And also hon. Mr. Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav opposed it. That is one thing that I wanted to make clear.

Sir, the second point which incidentally I want to make is that this is in the nature of Subordinate Legislation coming in the form of a Resolution. And there is no chance of speaking on Third Reading. But with your indulgence, Sir, I want to just mention one thing. I understand hon. Jagesh Desai's support to it because he is a firm supporter of the public sector. He considers the Council of Ministers to be in the public sector and, therefore, he does not mind spending more on that. But I just want to draw the attention of the House to one simple fact which is that assuming there are 50 members in the Council of Ministers and may be as you count the number in the household both in terms of both how many members are there and how many adult members are there, let me assume that there are 30 adult members of the Council. For them, in the year 1984-85, the expenditure was Rs. 3 crores. In the 1985-86 budget it was proposed to be made Rs. 5 crores. In fact, it was Rs. 80 crores, which means Rs. 30 lakhs *per capita*. That is the unit cost of employment in the Council Ministers. Now, you can imagine, the supporter of public sector also, that the cost is rather too high. While we give one thousand rupees to IRDP and when you consider khadi and village industries this unit cost of employment of the Ministers is extremely high and it would do good to the country if the Council of Ministers try to find out whether this cost can be reduced.

**SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA**: Sir, there has been a little misunderstanding

as to the purpose of this Resolution which I would like to mention before the House. This Resolution which I would like to mention before the House. This Resolution is not for sanctioning any sumptuary allowance. The sumptuary allowance was sanctioned by the Amendment Act of 1985 and the provisions were made in that Amendment itself. The situation previous to this was that it was under the Rules, that these provisions regarding sumptuary allowance were made. So, it is a very procedural matter that since the provision for sumptuary allowance has been made in the 1985 Act itself, the presence of these provisions in the Rules is redundant, that is not necessary. Therefore, I have come before the House to say that these provisions in the Rules be deleted and taken away. So, this Resolution does not sanction or confer any sumptuary allowance for the Ministers. This is the first submission that I want to make.

Then, Sir, a lot of other observations have been made which were not very germane to the point at issue. But to say that so much money is spent on Ministers *per capita* is a complete distortion of the whole situation. If the personal staff of the Ministers, which you have for official work, is added as the cost of Ministers, or even the office furniture, or I do not know what else besides this, in this calculation, it is complete distortion of the truth and facts. (Interruptions). No, I am not yielding.

So, Sir, this is just one example of the way in which a simple proposition has been distorted out of all proportion, with due deference I may say, without any relevance to truth. A lot of other things have been said and just because they are, more or less in the same vein, I do not want to refer to them. But I would like to say one thing and that is that according to the 1985 amendment, the Ministers are being given the same emoluments as Members of Parliament. I will read the relevant provisions. Section 3(1): Each Minister shall be entitled to receive a salary *per mensem* and an allowance for each day during the whole of his term as such Minister at the same rates as are

[Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha]

specified in section 3 of the Salaries and Allowances and Pensions of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, with respect to Members of Parliament.

So, Sir, so far as the salary and emoluments of Ministers are concerned, they are the same as that of a Member of Parliament. Whatever else is spent by him or on him is appurtenant to the work which the Constitution has entrusted to him. The same distortion has been brought with respect to the Rashtrapati Bhawan and an impression is sought to be created that the personality of the person of the Rashtrapati Bhawan himself is spending that much. The Rashtrapati Bhawan is a dignified monument, it is a national monument and it is only a fact that the President lives in a small portion of it but the rest of it is open most of the time. It has beautiful gardens. And all this distorts the entire picture. It does not behove the hon. Members to involve the President's name or the Prime Minister's name in this manner.

Sir, there is no need for me to try to answer the other questions. I will beseech you and the hon. Members to pass this Bill.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN):** Now I shall put the Resolution moved by Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha to vote. The question is:

"This House appears the draft Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Amendment Rules, 1986, framed under sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 (58 of 1952) and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 24th April, 1986.

*The motion was adopted.*

**THE COAL MINES LABOUR WELFARE FUND (REPEAL) BILL, 1986**

**THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE):** Mr. Vice-Chairman,

Sir, once again I say that this is an innocuous Bill in the sense that all that we are saying is that in 1947 there was this Act, the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Act, 1947. This was prior to nationalisation of 1972. What actually happened, Sir, was that because the working class was exploited in the coal industry, the Government felt that a sort of fund should be created by imposition of a cess on sale of each tonne of coal and that cess was used for the purpose of welfare. That was the main Welfare Act. After nationalisation of 1972, the responsibility of welfare naturally came to the nationalised industry and as is well known to hon. Members, an amount of hardly Rs. 6 crores that was being spent on the welfare of workers rose to Rs. 100 crores by 1984-85 that was spent on the welfare of the workers. This is not only a responsibility but a duty of the nationalised industry and, therefore, entire welfare activity now falls within the purview and responsibility of the nationalised sector, the Coal India Limited and other companies that are there. All that this Bill seeks to do is now to repeal the redundant Act which has ceased to have any validity as it is and absorb all the labour. There is no retrenchment of a single worker out of 2500 odd workers; in the entire coal industry, there are about 7½ lakh employees. These people are going to be absorbed in the respective companies and the responsibility of welfare is going to be undertaken by the company. This is the only purpose of this Bill.

I would urge and request the hon. Members if they could restrict themselves to this aspect; I shall be highly obliged and they accept and pass the Bill. That will save their time and also the time of the House. But if they want to use this Bill to enlarge the scope and speak, as I have been seeing, on everything under the name 'coal', then of course it is their pleasure and whatever wisdom comes from them, I will try to learn from that and try to respond to that.

Thank you.

*The question was proposed.*