

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

my effort is to find out a solution to the problem and I want your cooperation to find out a solution, to see if what we have suggested is enough or not.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Charity begins at home. Mr. Nijalingappa has defected to the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra.

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :** Probably you want him to defect to your party.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** No, no. I am not saying it.

**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) :** You are too much hopeful of Mr. G.iri.

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :** Therefore, the concrete recommendations which are made, really speaking, are in the legislative field . . .

**SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar) :** Has not Mr. G.iri defected to the Muslim League, to the Akali Dal, and to so many other communal parties?

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :** I am not answering questions on Mr. G.iri. I am discussing the report of the Committee on Defections.

Therefore, Madam, the major field of recommendations that the Committee has made is the legislative measures that this Parliament should undertake. One recommendation is about the size of the Council of Ministers. The second is about barring the Members who have defected from the party in terms of the definition that the Committee has given. The third is that the Chief Minister of a State or the Prime Minister of the country should be members of the Lower House and not of the Upper House. These are the three major recommendations of this Committee. I personally feel that most of the Members or rather a majority of the Member who spoke, indicated their support to these recommendations. Naturally this report will be discussed in the other House also. After we know the views of the Mem-

bers of the Lok Sabha—we have known the views of the Members of this House—the Cabinet will certainly think very seriously about these recommendations, and then we propose to come before this honourable House with a proper legislation. I hope we will receive the necessary support at that time.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** There is one amendment in the name of Mr. Chandrasekharan. . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Madam, I expected to hear more from Mr. Chavan. He is the inventor of *Aya Ram and Gaya Ram*.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, there are few who can compete with you.

Mr. Chandrasekharan is not here. There is an amendment in his name. I shall put his amendment to vote.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) :** The Home Minister has accepted the amendment.

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :** No, no. (*Interruption.*) At the same time I do not want to go with any mandate of this House. The whole matter has to be discussed in the other House.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** The question is :

3. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that immediate legislation be undertaken to prevent defections.'"

*The motion was negatived.*

#### THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1969.

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI K. RAGHURAMIAH) :** Madam, I move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Salaries and Allowances of

Members of Parliament Act, 1954, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

During the last session I made a statement on the floor of this House indicating the decisions of the Government on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Salary, Allowances and Other Amenities to Members of Parliament. During the course of that statement I said that in respect of two matters the Government proposed to bring forward a legislation. One of them is in regard to the increase of the daily allowance from Rs. 31 to Rs. 51, and the other is in regard to a certain travel facility and the travel facility that I indicated was a facility to travel by air by paying the differences between the first class train fare and the air fare. The Bill as introduced in the Lok Sabha reflected that position. During the course of the discussions in that House, however, certain amendments were moved and accepted by the Government the result of which is now obvious in the Bill before this honourable House. I may summarise the position in the following manner. The position as emerges in the Bill as accepted by the other House is as follows. While the increase in the daily allowance from Rs. 31 to Rs. 51 will remain, in regard to the travelling allowance the following alterations have been made :

In addition to whatever facilities the Members have for travel, the Bill, by a new Section, 6A, which is in Clause 5 of the Bill, gives certain other facilities. That is to say, Members can travel in first class air-conditioned on paying the difference between the first class and the First class air-conditioned fares. That is one.

Secondly . . .

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैडम, हमारा एक प्वायंट आफ आर्डर है। संविधान का अनुच्छेद 41...

उपसभापति : क्या पढ़ते हैं आप ?

श्री राजनारायण : संविधान का अनुच्छेद 41 :

"राज्य अपनी आर्थिक सामर्थ्य और विकास की सीमाओं के भीतर काम पाने के, शिक्षा पाने के तथा बेकारी, बुढ़ापा, बीमारी और अंगहानि तथा अन्य अनर्ह अभाव की दशाओं में सार्वजनिक सहायता पाने के, अधिकार को प्राप्त कराने का कार्यसाधक उपबन्ध करेगा।"

मैडम, मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसकी अंग्रेजी भी पढ़ दूँ ताकि आप समझ लें।

उपसभापति : मैंने समझ लिया है।

श्री राजनारायण :

"The State shall within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing the right to work, to education and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement, and in other cases of undeserved want."

मेरा निवेदन है कि संविधान का जो यह अनुच्छेद है इसके अनुसार जब तक राज्य बेकारों के लिये काम की व्यवस्था नहीं करे, बूढ़ों के लिये पेंशन की व्यवस्था नहीं करे, 14 साल तक के विद्यार्थियों के लिये मुफ्त और अनिवार्य शिक्षा की व्यवस्था नहीं करे, तब तक कब्रें से कर के संसद् के सदस्यों के दैनिक भत्ते को बढ़ाना, यह शुद्धतः संविधान के इस अनुच्छेद और भावना का उल्लंघन करना है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do.

श्री राजनारायण : इसलिये मैं आपसे विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन करूँगा कि आप सरकार को यह हिदायत करें कि सरकार इस विधेयक को वापिस ले ले क्योंकि अभी तक ये ये काम जो संविधान के अन्दर आवश्यक हैं नहीं हुये हैं। जब यह काम हो जायें उसके बाद सरकार संसद्-सदस्यों के भत्ते या और सुविधाओं को बढ़ाने की बात कर सकती है, मगर आज नहीं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I hope Members would not rise on such points of orders.

श्री राजनारायण : मैडम, मैं असमर्थ हो रहा हूँ; क्योंकि मेरी वाणी में वह शक्ति नहीं है कि मैं अपने तर्कों से आपको सहमत करा पाऊँ।

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAI AH :  
Madam. . .

श्री राजनारायण : मैडम, इस पर आपकी क्या व्यवस्था हुई ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have ruled it out.

श्री राजनारायण : ज़रा बताइये तो कि क्यों रूल आउट किया आपने। हाथी जी, आप भी नहीं समझ रहे हैं।

(Interruptions.)

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAI AH : The second facility I was referring to is every Member, when he travels by first class, under this clause, will be entitled to take one person travelling by third class. (Interruptions) I will answer your point also. The third facility is, the spouse of a Member is entitled to travel from the place of residence to Delhi during each Session and back by first class. The other thing is, at present during the Budget Session twice and during the other Sessions once only a Member can go by air in respect of which he will be said full air fare. Also as the Act now stands the Member can only go to his usual place of residence. It has been represented to Government that this is causing considerable inconvenience to many Members who need not necessarily go to their usual place of residence but would like to go to a place shorter in distance, which is more economical to the Government. During the discussions in the other House, many Members felt that it is much better to leave the choice to the Member himself where to go. So the provision has been enlarged to enable a Member to go four times during a Session extending beyond 75 days and

twice in each of the other Sessions wherever he likes in India. The question is put when so many other problems are there, why are we now taking up allowances of the Members. I may bring to the notice of Shri Rajnarain that it is not out of any whim or fancy that we are doing it. He must be aware that there was a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses and it did recommend certain points unanimously and certain others by majority. I would now show him why we have taken this decision. It is true that in the case of increase in D. A. from Rs 31 to Rs. 51 it was one of the recommendations of the majority. It is not the whim and fancy of the Government. The majority of the parties were represented in that and the majority determined that to enable Members to function and discharge their duties effectively there should be an increase in the D. A., because of various reasons, like the increase in the cost of living, etc. That majority decision we have carried out. You may ask why we have not accepted the unanimous recommendations only? The unanimous recommendations have advocated certain facilities being given. The Government have gone through them very carefully and have come to the conclusion that some of them are not practicable, some of them cost more money, some of them can well be provided by a Member himself. Take for instance, the facilities required for a stenographer. The unanimous recommendation was that general assistance shall be given to each Member. How is it to be done? Is it to be done by providing a stenographer to each Member separately or is it to be done by providing a pool of stenographers for a group of Members? Is it a practicable proposition to have a pool? After all one Member is as much entitled as the other to have stenographic Assistance at the time he chooses. So a pool is not practicable. There will be so much of conflicting interests. If on the other hand the intention is to provide each Member with a stenographer, the House can imagine the enormous expenditure it will involve. There are

similar other facilities. Therefore, the Government thought that in order to really implement the unanimous recommendations but in a practicable way, the amount of DA should be increased. It will enable the Members to provide for themselves in any manner exactly the facilities the Committee recommended in its unanimous recommendations. Also I would show that even in regard to the unanimous recommendations, it is not as though we can implement them without any cost to the Government. The burden on the tax-payer remains the same. Evaluation has been done of the various recommendations and it is found that the unanimous recommendations will cost the Government an initial expenditure of Rs. 2.19 lakhs and a recurring expenditure of Rs. 52.18 lakhs. The recommendation as now adopted by the Government and implemented in the Bill, and also certain others which are to be implemented by executive orders will cost the Government initially Rs. 2.9 lakhs and recurring expenditure of Rs. 52.58 lakhs. So it is not as though the Government is giving to Members anything really more than what in substance the Committee in its unanimous recommendations has asked for. I would say that it is not the intention of the Government to enrich the Members. The Government is aware that the Members need certain facilities and therefore Government trust that this additional amount which is given by way of extra DA will be utilised by Members to have such facilities as are necessary. One of the recommendations was to give postal stamps of the value of Rs. 1200. Instead of giving cash, why not give free postage, somebody said. Postage does not come from the heavens. Their value has to be debited to the Government. I repeat, Madam, that it is the intention of the Government that the Members should be able to utilise this extra allowance in order that they may have the facilities which will enable them to discharge their duties to the Parliament and to the country more effectively and in a manner befitting the dignity of Members of the House. Madam, I move

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : (Gujarat) : I thought Mr. Bhargava was moving an amendment.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) : It will be at the amendment stage.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Madam, I am grateful to the hon. Minister for the clarification that he has offered, which should make things easier and simpler for Members to understand.

I had the honour of being one of the Members of the Joint Committee, and the Joint Committee took into account the difficulties that Members experienced in discharging their duties, and all the suggestions that were made were from the point of view of helping the Members to discharge their functions as Members of Parliament.

For instance, stenographical assistance has been discussed. In this connection may I mention in passing, Madam, that Parliament has agreed to this in principle? Therefore, a certain number of stenographers are provided both for the Lok Sabha and for the Rajya Sabha. While the Rajya Sabha Secretariat, I must say, generally has been very helpful and has been paying personal attention to many matters of convenience of Members, in the matter of stenographical assistance, I must say, it has been disappointing; the stenographers' pool—or whatever you call it—is a training pool for new hands to learn. And once they learn, they are either shifted from there and posted to some Secretary, Joint Secretary or somewhere in the Rajya Sabha Secretariat, or they are sent abroad. One of the good men who was trained here who did Hindi and English stenography, has been sent abroad to our Embassy in Nepal. Now this has been my experience. My objection is not to their being shifted from one place to another or to their being sent abroad provided the Members of Parliament

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

get good substitutes in their places. This should not be made the training ground for stenographers. A Member of Parliament's duty is important. They would like to have their letters typed correctly. They would not like to be the trainers of typists and stenographers who, when trained, are taken away elsewhere. As said, I am not against their being taken away, but the pit is we get third grade men in their places. We get new men every second session, which is rather not convenient to us. Besides, one thing may be remembered; there are so many Members, but the number of stenographers provided is small. Madam, there is the general atmosphere also. I am not blaming anyone personally, but the general atmosphere generated by my friends here of going slow and doing less work in the same period also pervades there which is not good. One simple facility, which we used to have here and which was satisfactory once, the facility of delivering our letters written from here to the Ministers that also has been curtailed. I wrote a letter to Mr. Bhagwati addressing it to 'Transport Bhavan' because there lay his office as Minister. They said that they would not send it. Now this is absurd. On Government business I get a letter from a Minister. I send an answer. Some new man, an underling, comes and says, "This letter cannot be delivered." This is wrong. I say that letters sent by Members of Parliament on official business to Ministers and Government officers round about here must be delivered by the Rajya Sabha Secretariat. I object to curtailment of this privilege. Members of Parliament are supposed to be assisted and helped in their work. This arbitrary sort of curtailment of our privilege is not right. Madam, this is just a small matter I mention in passing.

I quite agree when the hon. Minister said that it is not to 'enrich' Members—I am sure he used that word. How is a Member going to be enriched with this pittance of Rs. 50 that he

will get for his presence every day? A Member who lives with his family here in Delhi knows what it costs. If he does not live with his family in Delhi, then also he has to support the members of his family living away from Delhi. He has to maintain another establishment in his home town or in his constituency, because he has to work there and he has occasion to go back. Nobody comes to Parliament burning his boats and saying that he is not going back. Whether he is elected next time or not he has to go back and he has to keep in touch with his constituency. So Members of Parliament have the additional responsibility of having to maintain two establishments. It is from this point of view that the request for additional telephone facilities was acceded to.

I am glad that by and large they have agreed to the unanimous recommendations which are all primarily from the point of view of helping the Members to discharge their duties properly. I am sorry, Madam, and I feel it is rather not dignified to talk of enrichment of Members, of Members doing this, of Members wanting more and more, or to say that Members are greedy in this poor country. Madam, if we have to do our work diligently, we need to live and we need to live in comfort. It is a very sad story that people outside say that some Members let out part of their houses, that some Members have to be paid something to ask questions. One feels ashamed to hear such stories. One has to hang his head in shame. Now, knowing this to be a fact, what is the remedy? The remedy is to give Members enough to live in dignity, not to force them to take recourse to all that. And I am glad the Committee, by and large, agreed to this and, by and large, the Ministry has accepted this. Madam, I am not saying that what the Committee has said is all right and everything must be done and everybody must agree to it. Members may have a different view. It is from this point of view, Madam, that my colleague in the other House Mr. Masani pointed out to the British Par-

liamentary practice. If you remember, on the 27th of July the 'Hindustan Times Weekly' published what was done in the British House of Commons. We are always looking upon the British Parliament as the Mother of Parliaments for all precedents. When the question of raising the emoluments of Members of Parliament was raised, while generally the feeling was that it should be done, it was felt that the question should be referred to somebody else instead of the Members doing it for themselves, and it was suggested that for the matter should be referred to the Chairman of the Board on Prices and Incomes. I thought that that was a very nice way of doing it because, that way, the situation would be that the Members did not do it for themselves but referred it to an impartial body or a tribunal, which was concerned neither way but which would take into consideration the cost of living also, which would take into consideration how the Members should be helped to cope with the increase in their responsibilities to Parliament and the people in view of the increase in the cost of living. I wish we could do it in this form here. Unfortunately, it was ruled out saying there are no provisions in the rules I do not know. Something could have been found. We could have requested the Chief Justice of India to look into this and advise Parliament. I wish Government had accepted some such suggestion. Anyway Government had no thought it fit to do so. But I would have liked that to be done; I am sure many other Members would have liked it, because then it puts Members in a better frame of mind and Members don't feel that they are taking something to enrich themselves as the hon. Minister said, or are trying to put something into their pockets out of public money. After all, what is asked for is to enable Members to discharge their duties in this House properly, and also discharge their duties properly to their constituencies and to the country. That is what we all want. That is what, I think, the hon. Minister also wants. I do not want to raise any controversy, but I am sorry that this talk of Members

enriching themselves, such references made to them, when a Minister's house requires one lakh of rupees for repairs, is a cruel joke if not an insult to Members of Parliament. I hope all such talk will be ruled out and it will be recognised that Members of Parliament have also to live just as the Ministers live.

Thank you.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Madam Deputy Chairman, this Bill is one of those Bills which clearly shows how the Government reacts to the demands of Members of Parliament. It was in 1967 that my friend Pannalal Barupal first moved a non-official Resolution for enhancement of the daily allowance of Members of Parliament. That was discussed and thereafter it was considered necessary that a Committee of the two Houses consisting of Members of Parliament of both the Houses should be appointed to study this question and make their recommendations. Now I have always held that either you do not trust anybody, take your own decision and come forward with it before the two Houses or, if you do appoint a high-powered committee, then please do pay due regard to their recommendations. That has been my contention for high-powered committees and high-powered commissions also. Do not raise the question that "we are appointing this high-powered committee or this high-powered commission, but we may not be able to accept all the recommendations that they may make." Say that they are being appointed to solve a particular problem and "we shall abide by their decisions." But it is a sad story, as far as the Government is concerned, that we appoint high-powered commissions and committees, and when their recommendations are received, in many cases unanimous recommendations, even then they are tinkered with, they are played about, and instead of solving the problem for which the particular committee was appointed, we complicate the problem. This is what happened to the States Reorganisation Commission. This is what happened to the

[Shri M. P. Bhargava]

Maharashtra-Mysore Boundary Commission. This is what happened in the case of Chandigarh. And I can cite example after example.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : This happens with the Tariff Commission every day.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : This is the way the highpowered commissions and committees are treated, and I must warn the Government. Either decide not to appoint any committees; you are free to take any decisions you like. You are running the administration; you have the responsibility of enforcing law and order and every thing. You need not have the advice of any Committee but if you once decide to have the opinion of any Committee please do pay due regard to that Committee's recommendations.

Now coming to the recommendations of this Joint Committee, his Committee was appointed and it was told that it can think about any amenities, any facilities, about allowances, about salary, anything about the Members but the Speaker was wise enough to say, as far as daily allowance is concerned, please go slow; don't touch it. It was a very sane advice given by the Speaker. Now the Committee deliberated on the whole subject and brought forward its recommendations with a view to facilitate the working of Members of Parliament, with a view to making them more efficient. Imagine the Member of Parliament being his own writer, his own despatcher. Everything he is expected to do and yet he is expected to be an efficient parliamentarian in the House. Is it not inconsistent? Are we to go on shifting the papers which we receive? Are we to go on typing the letters which we have to send? Are we to type our own speeches which we have to deliver in the House or are we to apply our mind to thinking and bringing about some substantial things which will improve the lot of the people or will improve the conditions in the country? I would like to understand that from

the Government. If they expect us to be efficient, if they want us to devote more time over the problems which we are meant to deal with they have to provide us certain facilities. I am not one of those hypocritical people who can say that we can work without any facilities as my friends there will probably say and oppose every demand and yet as soon as the Bill is passed they will be the first to accept everything. I am not hypocritical. When I enhanced the salaries and allowances in 1964 I did it by the open door. It was raised from Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 and we agreed to pay income-tax on the increased salaries. I did not do it by any backdoor method.

श्री राजनारायण : आप हिपोक्रेट नहीं लिपोक्रेट हैं ।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : What are you are I know. Don't describe yourself. Now, coming to the various provisions of the Bill, the first clause says that this Act may be called the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Act, 1969. I have no quarrel with that. The second sub-clause says :

"This section and section 2 shall be deemed to have come into force on the 16th day of May, 1969 and the other provisions of this Act shall come into force at once."

I do not understand why a date has been mentioned.

AN HON. MEMBER : Because the statement was made on that date.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : The statement may have been made but Members of Parliament should acquit themselves in a graceful manner. They should not show to the world that they are dying for a few rupees here or for a few rupees there. Heavens would not have fallen if we had increased our daily allowance after the Act is passed. This is unseemly; it is a bad thing which is being done in an Act. Acts do not provide the day of enforcement. They become effective after the President has signed and I would have liked that in this case also rather than an exception being made.

Now clause 2 says :

"In the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in section 3. for the words 'thirty-one rupees', the words 'fifty-one rupees' shall be substituted."

Now what is the recommendation of the Joint Committee? The Joint Committee says :

"After carefully weighing the pros and cons of an increase in the rate of daily allowance, the Committee recommend, by a majority (Ayes : 9; Noes : 3), that the rate of daily allowance should be raised from Rs. 31 to Rs. 51 per day. Those members who may be unwilling to draw daily allowance at the revised rate need not do so."

What do we find? The other recommendations made by the Joint Committee, that august body which was formed by both the Houses, have been brushed aside. They will have nothing to do with those recommendations. You are not competent people; you have not come out with correct recommendations. Government will not accept them. Here is a recommendation which was passed by a majority vote, 9 Ayes and 3 Noes, and the Government grasps it. This is the one recommendation which the Government will accept and they have come forward with this Bill incorporating that one recommendation. It is a very ironical situation that a man wants working facilities but he is being told : no, working facilities will not be given to you. Here is some money which you may either spend for working facilities or for your maintaining two houses which you have necessarily to maintain in Delhi and in your place of residence. This is what we are being told. Don't ask for facilities; to keep your mouth shut we are increasing your daily allowance. Here is Rs. 51 instead of Rs. 31. So this is the position as far as this enhancement of the daily allowance is concerned.

Now I come to clause 3 which relates to journey by air. The facility given up to now was that during the Budget session you could make two air journeys to your place of residence and in other sessions one journey. Now what they have said is, you can go four times to any place, whether you are on duty or you are not on duty. They say, you are free to move anywhere in India on free air ticket. Whether you are on duty or not, you are entitled to this. What is the purpose of this except to help those moneyed people who can travel by air? I say whatever is being done through this Bill is meant to help the vested interests, these people who could afford to spend money. That is my charge against the Government. It is not meant for the common Member of Parliament; it is meant for those who have some spare money to spend and I shall presently show it is the same in all the other clauses also.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH : I can just say for the information of the hon. Member that this is one of the unanimous recommendations of the Committee.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Yes; I know it is one of the unanimous recommendations.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken 10 minutes already.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : I will take 10 minutes more. I have to explain so many things.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : That is why I wanted to speak after him. See what a confusion he is making.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Clause 4 is nothing. It is only a change of the wording. My objection is mostly to clause 5 and I am coming to that. It says :

"Without prejudice to the other provisions of this Act, every member shall be entitled—

'(i) to travel by any railway in India at any time in first class air-



[Shri M. P. Bhargava]

conditioned on payment of the difference between the railway fares for first class air-conditioned and first class."

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : That is what we can do today.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : That is not an improvement on the position today. In the case of any Member of Parliament, who cannot earn money from any other source except Parliament—we know what we earn from Parliament—it does not leave any money for him to buy an air-conditioned ticket. It is impossible. Therefore, for whom is this class meant? It is meant for those industrialists, professional people, medical men, barristers, pleaders and advocates, who have enough money earned elsewhere and spend it on travel by air-conditioned class. This is a facility provided by the Indian Parliament. Is it justified? Is it consistent with the Fundamental Rights granted in the Constitution? No discrimination has to be made between Member and Member. Every Member has to be treated equally. Either you have to make it possible for every Member to travel by air-conditioned class or you have to remove this clause relating to air-conditioned travel. I cannot pass this discriminatory clause, whereby a rich Member of Parliament can travel in the air-conditioned class and a poor Member of Parliament cannot.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : We have had this from the beginning, for the past ten years. You have got up too late in the day.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : So many things are too late in the day, but somewhere a correction has to be made. Therefore, my amendment is instead of one first class, you give two first class passes for all Members of Parliament.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : I want to ask him a question. Why should any man have the right

to travel in the air-conditioned class in a country where people travel without tickets, where there is a big queue at the railway stations? Why should you get that privilege?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : I agree with Mr. Mani and I will be the first person to agree, if you do not give air-conditioned class facilities to anybody, but you are providing that facility to be enjoyed by those who have some spare money to spend. What I want is that it should be equal treatment to everybody. Therefore, my suggestion is that instead of one first class, there should be two first-class passes, so that when a Member travels on duty or alone, he can travel by the air-conditioned class.

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA (Assam). Why should there be first class in a poor country like ours?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : I do not mind it. Under this officers drawing even Rs. 500 can travel by air-conditioned class. They are entitled to do it. Does not the point about resources of a country apply to officers? Does it only apply to Members of Parliament? I want to ask this question of the hon. Member. It should apply to everybody. If the resources of the country are poor, it is for everybody. I will have nothing to say if the air-conditioned class is abolished altogether. I will be the first man to say: Abolish air-conditioned class altogether. I am a votary of one class travel. Let the Government have the courage to have only one class of travel. Abolish first class. Abolish second class. Have only one class, but they do not do it.

श्री राजनारायण : मैडेम, यह प्वायंट वह जरा फिर से समझायें, लोगों को समझ में नहीं आया, यानी यह जो दो फर्स्ट क्लास कह रहे हैं वह क्या कह रहे हैं, आपने जो दो का कहा है वह जरा समझा दीजिये ।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : I am finishing. What I want is that Members should be allowed two first-class

passes. It, in practice, will mean that if the Member is travelling alone or on duty, he can cover the fare for an air-conditioned class, if he chooses to travel by the air-conditioned class.

**श्री राजनारायण :** अटेंडेंट को आप काट रहे हैं ।

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA :** That is the proviso. If he wants to travel with a member of his family, he can travel first class.

Now, I come to the provision relating to attendant :—

“(ii) to one free third class railway pass for one person to accompany the member when he travels by rail;”

Now, this provision is to help the monied people. They can take an attendant, not the common M.P. A common Member of Parliament is not expected to take an attendant. What does this facility mean? It means no facility for a common Member of Parliament. That is why I want to remove third class and make it first class.

Then, the third is, the spouse to travel first class. Here it is again discriminatory. Those Members who are not married will not be able to avail of this. A woman Member without a husband cannot avail of this facility. Therefore, it is again a facility which is discriminatory and any kind of discrimination is not correct.

**DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) :** Encourage people to marry and adopt family planning.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA :** (*Interruptions.*). Therefore, please let me finish. What I want is, delete this sub-clause (iii) relating to the spouse. It is unnecessary. It is uncalled for. If any Member of Parliament wants to bring any member of his family during the period he attends a Parliament Session, he should be a family member. It is a position which I cannot

think of that I sit in first class and my wife sits in third class, or I sit in first class and my son sits in third class, whenever we travel together. This is a position which I am not prepared to accept and, therefore, my amendment reads :—

“in first class, by virtue of the free first class railway pass”.

It will put every Member of Parliament on par, on an equal footing. It will enable every Member to travel, if he wants, in air-conditioned class. Consequential changes have to be made in the proviso enabling those who do not want to travel with anybody and want to travel first class only to get an equal amount of fare. That is a just proposition which I am putting forward before the House and I am sure the House will apply its mind and see that no discrimination is made between Member and Member. If any facilities are to be given, they should be given to all Members of Parliament, and not to one set of Members who can afford to earn money by fair and foul means from other sources and spend it on a facility given by the Indian Parliament.

That is all that I have to say.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Mr. Rajnarain.

**श्री राजनारायण :** अब तो एक बज रहा है ।

**उपसभापति :** आप बोलिये ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** माननीया, यह जो विधेयक माननीय मंत्री जी ने यहाँ पर रखा है इस विधेयक को मैं एंटी-नेशन, एंटी-पीपुल और एंटी-मारल कहता हूँ, यह अनैतिक है, अराष्ट्रीय है और जनहित-विराधी है, इसका जितना भी विरोध किया जाये वह सब थोड़ा ही होगा । इसलिये मैं आपके द्वारा माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूँगा कि माननीय मंत्री जी बहुत ही सहज भाव में इस विधेयक को वापिस ले लें ।

[श्री राजनारायण]

माननीया, हमने इस विधेयक का उद्देश्य और कारण क्या सरकार के विभाग में है उसका एक संशोधन भेजा था मगर मुझे मालूम नहीं वह संशोधन यहां पर क्यों नहीं आया। वह संशोधन क्या है? क्या उद्देश्य है? संसद् के सदस्यों का मुंह काला हो, जनता के बीच में कलकित हो।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पजाब) : जो पैसा लेगा उसका। आप पैसा न लीजिये। पैसा ले लेंगे तो कलकित होगा।

श्री राजनारायण : जनता के बीच में कलकित हो। हमने कह दिया हम नहीं लेंगे।

उपसमापति : अच्छा, एक बजा है। The House stands adjourned till 2 P. M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) in the Chair.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं जो संसद् के सदस्यों का भत्ता बढ़ाने और उनको विशेष सुख-सुविधा देने का विधेयक प्रस्तुत था और है उसके संबंध में बोल रहा हूं। एक-दो वाक्य पहले कहा था, मंत्री जी उसको स्मरण रखें इसलिये उसको फिर से दुहरा दूंगा। पहला यह था कि यह विधेयक अराष्ट्रीय है, जनहित-विरोधी है और प्रत्येक नैतिकता के विरुद्ध है। हमारे मित्र जो इस विधेयक को संचालित कर रहे हैं वह कह सकते हैं कि यह अनैतिक कैसे हुआ। तो मैं उनको यह बताना चाहूंगा कि दुनिया में किसी संसद् को इतना बड़ा अनैतिक कार्य करने की हिम्मत नहीं हुई है जितना बड़ा अनैतिक कार्य आप यह सरकार इस संशोधन बिल के द्वारा कराना चाहती है।

شری اکبر علی خان (آندھرا پردیش) :  
سرکار نہیں کرانا چاہتی جو الینٹ کمیٹی  
کرانا چاہتی ہے -

†[श्री अकबर अली खान (आंध्र प्रदेश) : सरकार नहीं कराना चाहती, ज्वायंट कमेटी कराना चाहती है।]

श्री राजनारायण : ज्वायंट कमेटी की बात हमारे नवाब साहब कह रहे हैं। मगर मैं आपके द्वारा श्रीमन्, उनसे निवेदन करूंगा कि ज्वायंट कमेटी के यह रिक्मेंडेशन नहीं हैं, उसके कुछ सुझाव और हैं और यह कुछ और है। मैं उसको पढ़ देता मगर उसके लिये हम तैयार नहीं हैं, उसमें सदन का समय नष्ट होगा।

... شری اکبر علی خان : اس میں  
خرچہ اوو زیادہ ہوتا -

†[श्री अकबर अली खान : उसमें खर्चा और ज्यादा होता।]

श्री राजनारायण : अगर अकबर अली खान साहब खर्च को रोकना चाहते हों श्रीमन्, तो मैं आपके द्वारा चाहूंगा कि वह हमारे साथ वोट करेंगे और पूर्णरूपेण इस विधेयक को ठुकरायेंगे क्योंकि उनके दिल में कभी कभी दर्द उठता है, कभी कभी परेशानी होती है और कभी कभी गांधीजी का भी नाम लेते हैं। इसलिये मैं समझता हूं शायद उनका वह दर्द आज उनके कर्तव्य को मजबूत करे कि वह हमारे साथ वोट करें।

मैं इसको अनैतिक क्यों कहता हूं। आप हमारे संविधान का जो अनुच्छेद 41 है उसकी ओर देखें और मैं चाहता हूं उसको मंत्री जी हृदयंगम करें। उसको सरसरी तौर पर पढ़ने से काम नहीं चलेगा। उसको अच्छी तरह पढ़ें क्या लिखा है :

“राज्य अपनी आर्थिक सामर्थ्य और विकास की सीमाओं के भीतर काम पाने

के, शिक्षा पाने के तथा बेकारी, बुढ़ापा, बीमारी और अंगहानि तथा अन्य अनर्ह अभाव की दशाओं में सार्वजनिक सहायता पाने के, अधिकार को प्राप्त कराने का कार्यसाधक उपबन्ध करेगा।”

यह राज्य को करना है। जब बुढ़ापा हो, काम न कर सकता हो, उसको बुढ़ापे की पेंशन दे, जिसकी अंगहानि हो गई हो जो अपने जीवन निर्वाह का काम न कर पाता हो उसको भी सरकार पेंशन दे, जो शिक्षा नहीं पा सकने के लिये सक्षम हों उनकी शिक्षा की व्यवस्था करे। उसी के साथ साथ बेकारी को दूर करने के लिये, बेकारी का भत्ता दे या बेकारों को काम दे। बेकारों को काम दो या बेकारी का दाम दो यह नारा भी हुआ है। बेकारी भी कुछ ऐसी चीज है जिसका दाम सरकार को देना चाहिये। श्रीमन्, यह अनुच्छेद 43 कह रहा है। इसके अतिरिक्त मैं चाहता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी अनुच्छेद 45 को भी ध्यान में पढ़ेंगे। अनुच्छेद 45 बहुत ही स्पष्ट रूप में कहता है कि :

“राज्य, डम मविधान के प्रारंभ से दस वर्ष की कालावधि के भीतर सब बालकों को चौदह वर्ष की अवस्थासमाप्ति तक निःशुल्क और अनिवार्य शिक्षा देने के लिये उपबन्ध करने का प्रयास करेगा।”

यह अनुच्छेद 45 की मान्यता है कि सरकार 14 वर्ष की उम्र तक के लड़कों को निःशुल्क और अनिवार्य शिक्षा, जरूरी तालीम देने का उपाय खोजेगी, करेगी। मगर मैं देखता हूँ कि जहां निःशुल्क शिक्षा देने की बात है वहां पहले से भी ज्यादा विद्यार्थियों की फीस बढ़ गई। तो जो सरकार बच्चों की शिक्षा महंगी करती हो, जो सरकार बच्चों की फीस बढ़ाती हो, जो सरकार सामान्य जन की औसत आमदनी बढ़ा सकने में अक्षम हो, और संसद-सदस्यों का भत्ता अधिक बढ़ाने का विधेयक

लाये, उसे शर्म के मारे डूब मरना चाहिये चुल्लू भर पानी में डूब मरना चाहिये, फिर भी हमको तर्क दिया जाता है, कहा जाता है कि यह तो सब की रिकमेंडेशन है। मैं कहता हूँ दुनिया की सारी ताकत कहे, इसको मान लो तो मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ।

**श्री डाह्यामाई व० पटेल :** मत मानिये। आप मन लीजिए। बड़ी सीधी बात है। इतने सालों से पास मिला है फर्स्ट क्लास का। मैं तो एक अपवाद जानता हूँ, उसके सिवाये कोई थर्ड क्लास में जाता नहीं। एक ही सभासद है जो थर्ड क्लास में जाता है। और कोई नहीं जाता है। अब राजनारायण जायेंगे तो हम देखेंगे।

**श्री राजनारायण :** माननीय पटेल जी जैसे आदमी संसदीय प्रथा जानते होंगे, ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ। हमारा एक प्वायंट है, और वह बिना प्वायंट के चिल्लाते हैं। अनुच्छेद 46 का भी श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा पढ़ देना चाहूंगा कि इस अवसर पर माननीय मंत्री जी का मस्तिष्क ताजा हो सके :

“राज्य जनता के दुर्बलतर विभागों के, विशेषतया अनुसूचित जातियों तथा अनुसूचित आदिमजातियों के शिक्षा तथा अर्थ सम्बन्धी हितों की विशेष सावधानी से उन्नति करेगा तथा सामाजिक अन्याय तथा सब प्रकारों के शोषण से उनका संरक्षण करेगा।”

श्रीमन्, आप स्वतः अवगत होंगे कि जब यह सरकार आज हरिजनों, अनुसूचित जातियों और दूसरे समुदायों की रक्षा करने में अममर्थ है, उनके जीवन की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती है, उनके बच्चों को समुचित ढंग से शिक्षा नहीं दे सकती है, उनके घरों में जो बेकार हैं, उनके लिए काम की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकती हैं, उनकी रोजी-रोटी की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकती है, वही सरकार आज इस तरह का विधेयक पेश कर रही है और कहती है, “ए संसद-सदस्यो, तुम 31 के बजाये 51 रुपया भत्ता लो, ए संसद-सदस्यो,

[श्री राजनारायण]

तुम अपनी पत्नी को भी अपने साथ फर्स्ट क्लास में ले जाओ, ए संसद्-सदस्यो, तुम हवाई जहाज पर जब और जहां चाहो, वहां जाओ और जो फर्स्ट क्लास और हवाई जहाज के किराये में अन्तर पड़ता है, सिर्फ वही दो"। यह क्या है ? क्या यह मजाक नहीं है। मैं चाहूंगा कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस तथ्य को अच्छी तरह से सोचें कि आज जिन्हें कानून बनाने का अधिकार है, आज वे क्या अपने अधिकारों का सदुपयोग कर रहे हैं या दुरुपयोग कर रहे हैं। हमको कानून बनाने का हक है और हम अपना भत्ता और अपनी सहुलियत बढ़ाने के लिए आज इस तरह का विधेयक पास करने जा रहे हैं।

जब अध्यापकों की तनख्वाह बढ़ाने की बात आई, उनके महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ाने की बात आई तो सरकार की ओर से कहा गया कि हमारे कोष में पैसा नहीं है। जब मजदूरों के लिए महंगाई भत्ता और तनख्वाह बढ़ाने की बात आई तो सरकार की ओर से कहा गया कि राजकोष खाली है। जब चतुर्थ श्रेणी और तृतीय श्रेणी के कर्मचारियों की तनख्वाह और भत्ता बढ़ाने की बात आई, तो सरकार की ओर से कहा गया कि राजकोष खाली है। जब यहां पर पुलिस के जवानों का भत्ता बढ़ाने और उन्हें सहुलियत देने की बात आई तो कहा गया कि राजकोष खाली है। श्रीमन्, आप यहां के चपरासियों की हालत को देख लीजिये, यहां के तीसरे और चौथे श्रेणी के कर्मचारियों की हालत को देख लीजिए। उनकी आज हालत कैसी है ? क्या वे आज अपना जीवन निर्वाह अच्छी तरह से कर सकते हैं ? जब हमारा सारा समाज इस तरह दरिद्र अवस्था में अपना जीवन व्यतीत कर रहा है तो फिर ऐसे समय में संसद्-सदस्यों को विशेष सुविधा देने की बात वही व्यक्ति या वही सरकार कर सकती है जिसका मस्तिष्क शूकर मस्तिष्क हो। जो इंसान है और इंसानी दिमाग रखने वाला है वह इस तरह का विधेयक इस सदन में प्रस्तुत करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हो सकता है। (Interruptions.)

श्रीमन्, इस समय श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी यहां पर नहीं हैं। वे प्रधान मंत्री हैं और एक हफ्ते पहले वे यहां पर काफी चहकी थीं। राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधीजी का नाम उनके मुखारविन्द में आ गया था। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि यह नाम जाने में आया या अनजाने में आया। अगर जाने में आया तो मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हू कि वे गांधीजी की एक बात को देखें। गांधीजी ने "अटु दिस लास्ट" जौर-स्विकन की किताब थी, उसका अनुवाद किया था। 'अटु दिस लास्ट' का अनुवाद बाद में मैंने गुजराती में किया था। यह मैं गांधीजी की "आत्म कथा" का वाक्य पढ़ रहा हूं और वह सर्वोदय के नाम से प्रकाशित भी हुआ है। सर्वोदय के सिद्धान्त को मैं इस प्रकार समझा :

1. सब के भले में अपना भला है।

2. वकील और नाई दोनों के काम की कीमत एक-सी होनी चाहिये क्योंकि आजीविका का हक दोनों को एक-सा है।

3. सादा मजदूर और किसान का जीवन ही सच्चा जीवन है। यह सर्वोदय के सिद्धान्त हैं जो उन्होंने "अटु दिस लास्ट" का अनुवाद करते समय गुजराती में लिखा था।

श्रीमन्, मैंने इन 3 वाक्यों को पढ़ा। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहूंगा ट्रेजरी बेंच वालों से और विरोधी पक्ष के सम्मानित सदस्यों से कहना चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्रीजी को इन वाक्यों के बारे में क्या कहना है। उसके मुंह में यह हिम्मत है कि वह यहां पर गांधीजी का नाम लेती हैं और कहती हैं कि मैं उनका अनुसरण करने वाली हूं और मैं तो गांधीवाद को चला रही हूं तथा गांधीजी की छत्रछाया में चल रही हूं। उन्हें शर्म आनी चाहिये और जीभ कट कर गिर जानी चाहिये। गांधीजी का जो मूल है, गांधीजी का जो सार और आत्मा है, उसको तो मार दिया है और गांधीजी के शरीर के चमड़े को ओढ़ रखा है। यह मरा हुआ मुर्दा क्या अपने

को गांधीवादी कह सकता है ? वह अपने को गांधीवादी हर्गिज हर्गिज नहीं कह सकता है। जो जिन्दा गांधीवादी होगा, सजीव गांधीवादी होगा, तो वह निश्चित रूप से इस काले विधेयक का विरोध करेगा। यह विधेयक काला विधेयक है, कलकित है और यह देश की जनता के सामने, देश की गरीब जनता की छाती पर वज्रपात करने वाला विधेयक है।

श्रीमन्, हमारे बहुत से मित्र मार्क्स का नाम लेते हैं। यद्यपि मार्क्स ने अपनी 'कैपिटल' को, अपनी किताब को, जर्मन भाषा में लिखा था। हमें उस भाषा में तो वह किताब पढ़ने को नहीं मिली बल्कि हमें तो अंग्रेजी भाषा में वह किताब पढ़ने को मिली। मार्क्स ने क्या कहा ? मार्क्स ने कहा कि जब द्वितीय सोपान का समय आयेगा—कम्युनिज़्म, जिसका नाम लेनिन ने नहीं दिया, मार्क्स ने कम्युनिज़्म और सोशलिज़्म का नाम नहीं रखा—मार्क्स ने तो फर्स्ट स्टेज आफ सोसाइटी और हायर स्टेज आफ सोसाइटी, यानी प्रथम सोपान और दूसरा सोपान का नाम रखा। उसका कहना था कि जब पूँजीवाद का महल ढहेगा तो प्रथम सोपान आयेगा और उसमें पूँजीवाद खडहर के रूप में धधक उठेगा। इसलिए उसने प्रथम सोपान को "फर्स्ट स्टेज आफ सोसाइटी" कहा और दूसरे सोपान को उसने "हायर स्टेज आफ सोसाइटी" कहा। द्वितीय सोपान जिसमें पूँजीवाद का नामोनिशान पूरी तरह मिट जायेगा, जिसमें कोई क्लास नहीं रह जायेगा, जिसमें वर्गहीन समाज बन जायेगा और एक ढग से लोग जीवन निर्वाह कर सकेंगे। There will be no difference between mental and physical labour. मेण्टल तो मानसिक हुआ और फिज़िकल शारीरिक हुआ। इस तरह से मानसिक और शारीरिक श्रम का भेद दोनों सोपानों में नहीं रहेगा। ये कौन-सा काम कर रहे हैं, उसके बारे में किसी को भी पता नहीं है।

हमारे मित्र भागव साहब जब बोलने लगते हैं तब ऐसा मालूम होता है कि राज्य सभा का जो गुम्बद है वह कहीं गिर न पड़े। वे जोरों से

चिल्लाते हैं और कहते हैं कि मैं हिपोक्रेट नहीं हूँ।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद भागव : आपके आने के बाद यही हो गया है।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्रीमती भागव (Laughter) श्री भागव साहब कहते हैं कि मैं हिपोक्रेट नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं यह समझूँ कि श्री भागव साहब हिपोक्रेट नहीं हैं। मैं समझूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं समझूँ कि जो कुछ वह कह रहे हैं सही कह रहे हैं। एक बड़े आदमी ने कहा है कि मनुष्य वही है जो अपने वचनों द्वारा जाना जाये। कहो कुछ, लिखो कुछ, करो कुछ, इस तरह की बात जो मनुष्य करता है वह गीदड़ है, खटमल है। जो कहो, वही करो और वही लिखो। लेनिन ने श्रीमन्, क्या कहा ? लेनिन ने श्रीमन्, यही कहा, कम और बेश। दोनों में फर्क कितना हो ? 1 और  $1\frac{3}{4}$  का। यह सही है कि स्टेलिन ने कहा था कि उनका यह मतलब नहीं था कि विशालता बढ़ती चली जाये। आज हम इसका नतीजा देख रहे हैं कि वर्कर के ऊपर वर्कर की डिक्टेटरशिप है। इसकी सफाई क्या है ? इसकी सफाई यह है कि हमारे तीन प्लान नहीं चल पाये। अगर वे तीनों योजनाएँ अच्छी तरह से पूरी हो गई होती तो वर्कर के ऊपर वर्कर का डिक्टेटरशिप नहीं रह जाता। मैं इस विवाद में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारे यहाँ आमदनी में कितना फर्क है। औसत आमदनी में कितना फर्क है।

श्रीमन्, हमारे मंत्री जी ने चाहे लोक सभा में कहा हो या कहीं कहा हो, वे कभी कभी ब्रिटेन की चर्चा कर देते हैं और कहते हैं कि ब्रिटेन में ससद् के सदस्यों का भी भत्ता बढ़ा दिया गया है। जब वे इस तरह की चर्चा करते हैं तो उन्हें पूरी चर्चा करनी चाहिये और अधूरी चर्चा करने से कोई काम नहीं चलेगा। इसलिए मेरा कर्तव्य है कि मैं यहाँ पर इस सबध में कुछ आँकड़े दे दूँ।

[श्री राजनारायण]

श्रीमान्, यू० के० मे औसत आमदनी 10,883 रु० है और सदस्यों की 1,200 डालर है। ये आकड़े 1966 तक के ही हैं। इसके बाद के आकड़े हमको लाइब्रेरी में उपलब्ध नहीं हुए। जो मुझे आकड़े दिये गये हैं वे डालर और रुपये में दिये गये हैं। इस तरह से आठ गुना का फर्क हुआ। यह आकड़े जो मेरे पास किताब है, उसमें से पढ़ कर कह रहा हूँ।

पंडित श्याम सुन्दर नारायण तन्खा (उत्तर प्रदेश) यह तो स्टर्लिंग या पौड में होंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : मेरे पास जो किताब है उसमें से मैं यह आकड़े पढ़ रहा हूँ और उसमें डालर और रुपये में ही दिया हुआ है। इसी तरह से कनाडा में औसत आमदनी 13,688 रु० है और वहाँ के सदस्य-सदस्यों की 1,200 डालर है यानी छह गुना फर्क है। औसत आमदनी एक आदमी की कितनी हो और सदस्य-सदस्यों की कितनी हो, इसमें 6 गुना का फर्क है। भारतवर्ष में औसत आमदनी 267 रु० है। अब देखा जाय कि हमको कितना मिलता है। 500 रु० महीना हम तनखा पाते हैं। 31 रु० रोज हम भत्ता पाते हैं और छह महीने से कम कभी पार्लियामेंट चलती नहीं है। अब यह जोड़ लिया जाये। हमारे आने जाने का वह पास भी जोड़ लिया जाये। हमको जिस रेट पर मकान मिलता है वह भी जोड़ लिया जाये। जो और कमेटियों में रहने का फायदा मिलता है वह भी जोड़ लिया जाये। अगर इन तमाम चीजों को जोड़ लिया जाये तो हम समझते हैं कि हर एम० पी० के पास करीब डेढ़ दो हजार रु० की रकम हर महीने में जाती है। इससे कम नहीं होगी। इसको जोड़िये तो साल भर में हो जाती है करीब 24 हजार रु० की रकम।

पंडित श्याम सुन्दर नारायण तन्खा : आपको दो हजार रुपये मिलते हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये श्याम सुन्दर नारायण श्री तन्खा, ऐसा कहने से आपकी

तनखा बढ़ नहीं जायेगी। आप बुजुर्ग आदमी हैं।

(Interruptions)

तो भारत में अगर आज देखा जाये तो एक भारतीय की औसत आमदनी में और एक सदस्य की आमदनी में करीब 70 या 80 गुना का फर्क है जबकि यूरोप के मुल्को में और दूसरे मुल्कों में 6 गुना, 7 गुना या 8 गुना का फर्क है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ पर औसत आमदनी बढ़ाने की व्यवस्था इस सरकार ने क्या की। बिना उस औसत आमदनी को बढ़ाये हुये आज यह सरकार कह रही है कि आज हम सदस्य-सदस्यों के भत्ते को 31 रु० की जगह 51 रु० कर देंगे। (Interruptions.) अब जो सवाल उठ रहे हैं, उनके हैं कोई जवाब किसी के पास? हाँ, अगर बेहयाई करनी है याजी जी की तरह तो उसका मेरे पास कोई उत्तर नहीं है। हम तो तर्क को तर्क से काट सकते हैं। इस तरह "हाव हाव" करने से कोई फायदा नहीं है। सीधी बात यह है कि आज चाहे मिनिस्टर को ले लो, चाहे मसद् के सदस्य को ले लो, चाहे देश की आम जनता को ले लो, हमारे यहाँ जब 48 करोड़ की आबादी थी तब जो फिगर हमने निकाली थी उसमें हमने यह पाया था कि करीब 30 करोड़ लोग 3 आना फी आदमी रोज कमाते हैं, करीब 16 करोड़ लोग एक रुपया फी आदमी रोज कमाते हैं और उसके बाद आगे चल कर के उनकी आमदनी बढ़ती चली जाती है। तो हमारा कहना है कि जिस देश में आज 35 करोड़ लोग, 40 करोड़ लोग तीन आना, चार आना या पाँच आना रोज की आमदनी लेते हैं, वहाँ का एक सदस्य-सदस्य 51 रु० रोज भत्ता ले, यह शर्म की बात है, यह लज्जा की बात है। इस तरह से देश के सामने सदस्य-सदस्यों को कलकित करना उचित नहीं है। हम राज्य सभा के सदस्य हैं, लेकिन पता नहीं, ठीक या गलत, मैं खुद नहीं जानता कि हमारा यहाँ रहना उचित हो रहा है या अनुचित हो रहा है, हम देश की सेवा कर पा रहे हैं या नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। मैं रोज अपने से तर्क बितर्क करता हूँ कि कहीं सदस्य में रह कर हम अपने

समय का दुरुपयोग तो नहीं कर रहे हैं। नित्य-प्रति हमारे दिमाग में यह प्रश्न उठ रहा है क्योंकि यह संसद् भारतीय समाज को संसद् के रूप में अपना काम नहीं कर रही है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि यहां के संसद्-सदस्यों की तनख्वाह इंग्लिस्तान के संसद्-सदस्यों के बराबर हो, यहां के मंत्रियों की तनख्वाह अमरीका के मंत्रियों के समान हो, यहां के वाइस-चांसलर्स की तनख्वाह अमरीका के वाइस-चांसलर्स के समान हो, मगर यहां के गरीब अध्यापकों, यहां के गरीब मजदूरों और यहां के गरीब खेतिहर मजदूरों की आज स्थिति क्या है, इसको भी अच्छी तरह से देखना चाहिये।

अब यह देखा जाये कि इस विधेयक में है क्या। कहा जा रहा है कि संसद्-सदस्य अपने कर्तव्य का पालन सुचारु रूप से कर सकें, इस लिये यह विधेयक लाया जा रहा है। कैसे करेंगे, कोई हमको बताये। संसद्-सदस्यों के संसदीय कार्य को अबाध गति से चलाने के लिये इस विधेयक में क्या है। यात्रा करेंगे यहां से हवाई जहाज से...

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी) :** अब आप वाइंड अप कीजिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** यहां से हम यात्रा करेंगे तो संसद् का काम उस समय क्या होगा। भार्गव जी के इस तर्क को मैं सत्य पाता हूं, यद्यपि मैं उसका भी विरोधी हूँ, कि इस कास्टिट्यूशन के रहते हुये इस तरह का बेहूदा विधेयक आपस में संसद्-सदस्यों का अलगाव करने वाला विधेयक आ ही नहीं सकता क्योंकि यह कहता है कि जो फर्स्ट क्लास के टिकट का डिफेंस हो उसका भुगतान हो सकेगा। अब जो संसद् का सदस्य गरीब है, जिसके पास पैसा नहीं है, जो उस पैसे को नहीं दे सकता है, वह अपनी जगह पर ही रह जायेगा। अब कहा जा रहा है कि बीबी को ले कर के आओ। यह बात उन्होंने ठीक कही कि बीबी नहीं है तो क्या होगा। तो बीबी फर्स्ट क्लास में आये, एयर-कंडीशण्ड में आये, एक अटेंडेंट आये, यह कितना बढ़ रहा है।

बीबी हम ले आयें, बीबी को हम ले जायें, सेवक को भी ले आएं, सेवक को भी बराबर ले जायें, तो यह कितना बढ़ जाता है। इसी संसद् में मैं आपके द्वारा बताना चाहता हूं कि एक श्री रामजी वर्मा देवरिया के थे। उन्होंने एक संशोधन रख दिया था कि सदस्यों को एक सेवक अपने साथ लाने ले जाने का अधिकार होना चाहिये। इसी एक संशोधन पर वे फिर जीत कर के नहीं आये देवरिया से। (Interruptions.) गुजराल साहब इस समय नहीं हैं...

**श्री शीलमन्न याजी (बिहार) :** हम सब जीत कर आयेंगे !

**श्री राजनारायण :** यह तो पहले के ही भगोड़े हैं। यह सुभाष बाबू का नाम लेने वाले और फार्वर्ड ब्लाक में रहने वाले अब इन्दिरा का चरण चूबन कर रहे हैं। अब हमें केवल यह कहना है कि अगर सरकार में हिम्मत है, सरकार ईमानदार है, जनता के प्रति वफादार है, तो इस विधेयक को जनता के बीच में भेजा जाये। गुजराल साहब बड़ा चहके थे परसों कि चल कर के जनमत का वोट ले लिया जाये। मैं चाहता हूं कि इस विधेयक पर प्रधान मंत्री जी इस्तीफा दे दें और चलें कहीं, वे अपने ही क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ लें। यह विधेयक पास हो या यह विधेयक फेल हो, हम पहले उनके मुकाबिले लड़ने के लिये तैयार हो जायेंगे। इस चुनौती को प्रधान मंत्री स्वीकार कर लें। अगर वे जीत जायें तो वे स विधेयक को ले आयें और अगर हार जायें तो इस विधेयक को न लायें। (Interruptions.)

मैं उन व्यक्तियों में से एक हूंगा जो राष्ट्रपति से इसके लिये कहेंगे। अगर संसद् ने अपने कर्तव्यों की अवहेलना की, अगर संसद् ने अपने भत्ते को बढ़ाने का विधेयक पास किया, तो हम राष्ट्रपति जी से कहेंगे कि वे अपनी डिस्क्रिशनरी पावर से इस पर अपनी स्वीकृति प्रदान न करें।

श्रीमन्, 1964 में उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में जब भत्ता 10 रु० की जगह 15 रु० हुआ और तनख्वाह 200 रु० की जगह 300 रु० हुई तो हमने वहां के राज्यपाल से निवेदन किया था...



**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी) :** राजनारायण जी, आपने काफी टाइम लिया है। बाकी मेम्बर्स को भी बोलना है। उनके लिये भी कुछ समय रहे, इसलिये आप जल्दी कीजिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, आप जब नहीं थे तो यहां पर यह तय हो गया था कि यह दूसरे हफ्ते में भी चलेगा।

**श्री ओम् मेहता (जम्मू और काश्मीर) :** नहीं, नहीं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आज ही यह विधेयक पास होने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। इतना बड़ा काला विधेयक यहां पर आये और हमसे कहा जाये कि आप जल्दी में पास कर दीजिये।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि अगर संख्या सूर के बल पर संसद् इस विधेयक को पास कर दे, तो हम राष्ट्रपति के पास जायेंगे और उनसे कहेंगे कि वे इसको अपनी स्वीकृति न दें और इसको रोकें। जनतंत्र का नाम लेना बड़ा आसान है, मगर जनतंत्र है क्या। जब तक आर्थिक विषमता का नाश न हो तब तक जनतंत्र की बात करना हिपोक्रेसी प्लस लीपोक्रेसी दोनों है। मैं आपके द्वारा भार्गव जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि हिपोक्रेसी प्लस लीपोक्रेसी से भागो और देश को मत लीपो। देश को चलने दो। इस समय जो देश की गरीब जनता है उस गरीब जनता को राहत देने के लिये जो भी विधेयक आयेगा, उसका समर्थन करने के लिये मैं तैयार हूं। मगर अपना ही भत्ता बढ़ाने वाले इस अनीतिपूर्ण विधेयक को एक स्वर से आज इस सदन को ठुकरा देना चाहिये।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ बोलने की इच्छा रखते हुये श्रीमन्, मैं आपके आदेश का पालन कर रहा हूं और बैठ रहा हूं।

**PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, my remarks on this amending Bill will be very few. It has been urged by Members of

Parliament for some time past that it is difficult for them to carry on their work in Parliament because of the small amount of daily allowance which they get. You will remember, Sir, that when I joined Parliament in 1952, the allowance was Rs. 40 a day, but there was no salary. Later on that amount was split up into two—one part of it went as salary to Members at the rate of Rs. 300 per month and the other part went as daily allowance at Rs. 21 per day. Then, when the cost of living increased and the Members again clamoured for a further rise, the daily allowance was raised from Rs. 21 to Rs. 31. Now, since 1956, when the Act was passed raising the amount of daily allowance to Rs. 31, the cost of living has increased considerably. As such, the Members find it very difficult to have the household expenses so adjusted as to be within the means of their salary and daily allowance. You know, Sir, that the Members have to have a permanent home wherever they reside and also maintain another residence here. They have to have at least two servants, one here and one there, pay house rent here, pay house rent there, and so on. Therefore, it was not wrong on the part of the Government to have acceded to the request of the Members by raising the allowance. But I should have been content if the increase had been Rs. 10 only, rather than Rs. 20, because a jump of Rs. 20 is too much, according to me and nor justified by the price rise.

**SHRI A. D. MANI :** My proposal of Rs. 41 would have been reasonable.

**PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA :** But when the members had asked for secretarial services the services of a steno-typist and all that Government thought, and I think rightly, that it was not possible to provide secretarial services to Members individually. It could be given collectively, but then some Members would have complained that they were being neglected. Therefore, they thought that it is best to so distribute the secretarial expenses in such a manner that Members may themselves be at absolute liberty

to engage whomsoever they wanted, either as part-time or as whole-time stenographer, etc. And therefore the Government thought that a further increase of another Rs 10 for such a facility should also be given. Thus this amount of Rs 51 as provided for in the Bill has been fixed. As such, even though I have proposed one or two amendments I do not object to the amount of Rs 51 which has now been provided. Some of my friends here say that this amount should not have been so high. I would say, as the Government has already made it known, that such of the Members as do not desire to draw the entire amount of Rs 51 a day will be at full liberty to surrender such part of it as they like and they need not draw it. I shall only be too glad to see, after the passing of this Bill, how many Members, whether of the Communist Party or of other Opposition parties, will be prepared to surrender the amount

SHRI K CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala) What is the use of that surrender?

SHRI A D MANI Those who advocate must set an example

PANDIT S S N TANKHA Then, Sir, regarding railway facilities, etc., certain changes have also been made in the Bill. I consider one of these to be a very good provision, namely, the provision of a non-transferable first class pass for the spouse. According to it the husband or the wife of a Member can come to Delhi and go back from Delhi once during every session. I would like to draw your attention to clause 6A (iii) which says.

" one free non-transferable first class railway pass for the spouse, if any, of the member to travel from the usual place of residence of the member to Delhi and back, once during every session "

Now, Sir, Members are entitled to come to Delhi for attending Parliament three days in advance, for which they

are paid their daily allowance. But if they choose to come even earlier than that, say 15 days or 10 days earlier, they can do so at any time they like. Now the question arises whether this pass which is meant for the spouse can be availed of at that time. For example, the present session of Parliament began on the 21st of July. Now, I had a right to come here on the 18th of July, three days in advance. But if I wanted to avail of this pass for my wife, I think under the correct meaning of this word "during" occurring in this Bill this cannot be done if I come here three days in advance. I have, therefore, suggested an amendment in which I have said that the Member should be able to avail of it three days in advance and three days after the session. I will even go to this extent and say that if he comes a fortnight in advance and goes back a fortnight later he should be entitled to use the pass for his wife.

There is another provision here— Clause 6A(ii) which says

" One free third class railway pass for one person to accompany the member when he travels by rail, "

This I consider, is not justified

SHRI A D, MANI Quite right

PANDIT S S N TANKHA It is true that certain very old gentlemen and ladies, who are Members of Parliament do sometimes need an attendant to accompany them on their railway travel to Delhi and back. But then there is no such reservation in this provision as to who that person accompanying the Member should be. What I am afraid of is that this unrestricted pass will be used for persons wholly outside the sphere of Parliament. They may be voters of the constituency brought to Delhi for sight-seeing or something else of that sort. As such, I do not think this is justified and it should not have been provided for. But if it is meant for a servant, then the free third class pass for the servant should also be on the

[Pandit S. S. N. Tankha.]

same conditions as have been provided in clause 3, so that when you come to Delhi to attend the session and set up your house here, you should have the facility to bring a servant along with you. I can understand that. But in sub-clause (ii) one free third class railway pass for one person is provided without any restriction. Instead of this, if it was intended to benefit the Members, then the Government should have provided that a Member travelling on his pass can take his wife along wherever he wants to go and any time he wants to do so. I suppose that is what Mr. Bhargava perhaps wants according to his amendment. If that is what he wants, I have no objection to that. But I do not favour his proposal for air-conditioned travel for members of Parliament. I take this objection not because it is a thing of luxury—partly, of course, because of that—but besides that by travelling in the first class or the second class or the third class, Members get an opportunity of seeing the working of the railways and their administration which is very important from the public point of view. During my term since 1952, for the last seventeen years, I have always travelled not only in the first class but in the second and the third class also. I have travelled wherever I could find a seat and have seen the conditions of railway travel myself. You will be surprised to know that on one occasion when I was coming for the 26th January celebrations this year I had to be pushed inside a third class carriage by a coolie who was carrying my luggage. When he was throwing my luggage inside I said, "There is no space there. The people there do not allow me to open the door." But he said, "*Nahin, nahin, Sahab*" and lifting me up bodily pushed me inside through the window.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : You got in well.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : But how can Mr. Rajnarain get in?

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : I had actually got in through the window.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : But how can Mr. Rajnarain get in?

(Interruptions.)

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Therefore, I am against the idea of giving the privilege of air-conditioned travel to Members of Parliament. My revered friend, Mr. A. N. Mulla, a Member of the other House, often travels in air-conditioned first class. I have often told him, "It is not right for you to go in the air-conditioned class. You must know the conditions of the railway travel and so travel in the first class."

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Why not in third class?

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Yes, even in third class. I have told you that I travel in all the classes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Please wind up.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Therefore, on the whole I support the measure. But I do hope that all that I have said about the period of three days, about the new Section, 6A(ii), will be looked into by the Minister. I shall speak more on it when I am on that clause again.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, बहुत दिनों से अपने देश में महंगाई को बढ़ते हुए देखकर सदसदस्यों की यह इच्छा हो रही थी कि इस बिल और भत्ते के बारे में कोई न कोई संशोधन अवश्य लाया जाये। लोक सभा के एक माननीय सदस्य श्री मन्ना लाल वारूपाल जी ने इस विषय में एक विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया और उसके ऊपर कुछ मित्रों ने मिल कर जब आग्रह किया तो सरकार ने एक कमेटी बैठाई। उस कमेटी में एक सदस्य के नाते मुझे भी काम करना पड़ा। वहाँ पर तीन प्रकार के व्यक्तियों की समस्या सामने आई। एक

प्रकार के व्यक्ति तो वे थे कि जो धनी थे, करोड़पति थे और ससद् में चुन कर आ गये थे, जिन्हें किसी प्रकार के 31, 51, या 101 रुपये की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। दूसरे प्रकार के वे व्यक्ति थे कि जो केवल अकेले रहते हैं और जिनको कोई बाल बच्चे नहीं हैं। गृहस्थी का उन पर कोई भार नहीं है। उनके लिए भी 51 या 31 रुपये का सवाल नहीं है।

**श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा (बिहार) :** ऐसे भूपेश गुप्त हैं।

**श्री निरंजन वर्मा :** और तीसरे प्रकार के ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं कि जो गृहस्थ कहे जाते हैं, जिनको एक स्थान से लाकर दूसरे स्थान पर अपनी गृहस्थी जमानी पड़ती है तो इन तीनों प्रकार की बातों को वहाँ पर सुनने का और उन पर सोचने का अवसर मिला और इनमें भी समिति के सदस्यों में दो प्रकार की रायें पाई गईं। एक प्रकार के सदस्य तो वह थे कि जो ईमानदारी के साथ बढ़ती हुई कठिनाइयों का सामने रख कर इस समस्या को हल करना चाहते थे और एक प्रकार के मनुष्य वह थे, जिनके लिए टेनिसन कवि ने कहा था यश के भूखे कुछ आदमी—दि लास्ट इन्फिमिटी आफ ए नोबुल माइड। वे बड़ी बड़ी ऊँची धारणाएँ रखते हैं लेकिन करते कुछ नहीं। सही काम करने वाले कुछ ऐसे व्यक्ति भी हैं कि जो अवसर का पूरा फायदा उठाना चाहते हैं लेकिन साथ ही जनता में अपना शहीदपन फैलाना चाहते हैं कि हमने बड़ा भारी काम किया। हम समझते हैं कि यदि दोनों तरह की विचार-धाराओं को दूर रखा जाये तब भी इस बात को स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि देश में और विशेषतः दिल्ली में जो कठिनाइयाँ बढ़ती चली जा रही हैं उन कठिनाइयों का हल पाने के लिए कोई यत्न आवश्यक है।

श्रीमन्, भारतवर्ष में, विभिन्न प्रदेशों में बहुत-सी असेम्बलीज हैं। उन विधान सभा गृहों में जो वहाँ पर काम करते हैं उन्होंने

आवश्यकता के अनुसार समय समय पर अपने भत्तों के विषय में और अपनी दूसरी कठिनाइयों को सुलझाने के लिए कानून में और दूसरे नियमों में संशोधन किये। ऐसी अवस्था में, हम कमेटी के सदस्यों के सामने ससार भर के दूसरे देशों के उदाहरण भी सामने रखे गये। उदाहरण के लिए जापान लका, बर्मा, इंग्लैंड, कनाडा और अन्य दूसरे देशों में ससद्-सदस्यों को कई प्रकार की सुविधाएँ हैं। एक तो उनको भत्ता मिलता है और दूसरे उनको वेतन मिलता है। इस के अतिरिक्त उनका कुछ अन्य सुविधाएँ हैं उनका उल्लेख किया गया था। मैंने जब उनका अध्ययन किया तो इस परिणाम पर पहुँचा कि भारतवर्ष में सारे ससार में सबसे कम सुविधाएँ ससद्-सदस्यों को दी जाती हैं और यहाँ के ससद्-सदस्यों के ऊपर बहुत से लोग निगरानी रखते हैं और ऐसा समझते हैं कि ससद्-सदस्यों के लिए किसी तरह की वृद्धि किसी चीज में हो जाये तो मानो आकाश उनके ऊपर टूट कर गिर पड़ेगा। मैं ऐसे मनुष्यों में नहीं हूँ कि जो केवल यश और झूठी ख्याति के कारण यहाँ पर बड़े बड़े नारे लगाये। अभी हमारे मित्र श्री राज-नारायण जी यहाँ पर गरुड पुराण बाँच रहे थे और उसमें उन्होंने गांधीजी का नाम एक बार, दो बार नहीं, दस बार उनका नाम लिया और उसके बाद उन्होंने गांधीजी के सत्य और असत्य की विवेचना भी की और विपक्षियों के लिए अर्थात् कांग्रेस दल के मित्रों के लिए शर्म शर्म की बातें कम में कम दस-बीस बार दोहराईं। लेकिन उस आदमी के व्यक्तित्व का कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़ता जा स्वयं में भी उतना चरित्रवान् न हों। उदाहरण के लिए गांधीजी ने यह कहा था कि कोई भी मंत्री 500 रुपये से ज्यादा नहीं लेगा और कांग्रेस का ऐसा प्रस्ताव भी था, अगर गांधीजी की दुहाई श्री राजनारायण जी सही शब्दों में देते हैं तो जब उनकी पार्टी के लोग मंत्रिमंडल में जाकर बैठें तो उन्होंने 500 रुपया वेतन

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

क्यों नहीं लिया, उससे अधिक क्यों लिया। कभी कभी उनको इस बात को भी सोचना चाहिए, लेकिन उन्होंने इसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव : इसीलिए भाग गये हैं कि हिपोक्रेसी की बातें न सुने।

श्री शेरखां (मंसूर) : और इसीलिए इतने दुबले भी हो गये हैं कि कुछ कहा नहीं जा सकता।

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : उनकी पार्टी वाले उनकी बात नहीं मानते हैं।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : गांधीजी जन्म भर थर्ड क्लास में घूमे। जो फर्स्ट क्लास की बात अभी बता रहे थे क्या वे उनसे यह सबक सीख सकते हैं? अगर वह फर्स्ट क्लास का पास रखते हुए थर्ड क्लास में यात्रा करते तो वह अनुकरणीय होता और हम उनका उदाहरण सामने रखते, लेकिन उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं किया। हम तो कहते हैं कि एक दल के ही श्री यनेगी लाल चौधरी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा वह ज्यादा क्रियात्मक है कि जो बिल आ रहा है, जब यह कानून बन जाएगा तो किसी के ऊपर पाबन्दी नहीं होगी कि वह उसके अनुरूप ही भत्ता ले और सुविधायें उठाये। अगर कोई चाहे तो 11 रुपये ले ले और अगर चाहे तो जैसा श्री सी० डी० देशमुख ने किया था कि एक रुपया मासिक लेकर काम किया था, वैसे ही वह एक रुपया लेकर भी काम कर सकते हैं। कोई जबरदस्ती नहीं है लेकिन एक बात, श्रीमन्, अवश्य है कि सुविधाओं के नाम पर सदस्यों का सुविधायें बहुत कम मिलती हैं। आप खयाल कीजिये एक मध्य प्रदेश का उदाहरण लीजिये, मध्य प्रदेश में सारे नौकर अमेम्बली के सदस्यों को मुफ्त मिलते हैं, वहां पर अच्छे कमरे केवल 12 आने रोज पर उनको मिलते हैं, बर्तनों का या फर्नीचरों

का कोई किसी प्रकार का किराया लगता नहीं है, आवागमन के लिये जितनी उनकी रोडवेज की बसेज हैं सब उनके लिये फ्री हैं और 500 रुपया मासिक एलाउंस के रूप में मिलता है। अब यहां देख लीजिये। मैं यहां पर सुविधाओं के बारे में निवेदन कर रहा हूँ। सदस्य-सदस्यों के लिये सुविधाओं का जब कोई प्रश्न आता है तो बहुत से कर्मचारी इतनी नाक-भों सिकोड़ते हैं कि वह समझते हैं कि न जाने क्या हो रहा है, सदस्य-सदस्य कुछ ज्यादा तो नहीं लिये जा रहा है। हम फिरोजशाह रोड के बगले में रहते हैं। श्रीमन्, मेरे सामने ए, बी, सी, डी, ई पांच प्रकार के बगलों का एक संयुक्त बगला है और वहां पर अधेरा रहता है, वहां कोई लाइट की व्यवस्था नहीं है। हम चार-पांच सदस्य-सदस्यों ने एक दरखवास्त दी और हाउस कमेटी के चेयरमैन के पास गये कि वहां पर लाइट लगाने का प्रबंध कर दिया जाये। हमारे हाउस कमेटी के चेयरमैन ने सारी बातों को बड़ी सहानुभूति के साथ सुना और दूसरी दफा मुझे भी वहां जाने का निमन्त्रण मिला, पहली बार तो हमारी बात नामजूर हो गई लेकिन दूसरी बार वहां गये तो वहां पर दो नये लडके थे, बिजली कमेटी के शायद असिस्टेंट इंजीनियर वगैरह होंगे। हम पांच-छह सदस्य बैठे थे और मैं भी खड़ा हुआ था, मैं दोनों लडकों की इशारेबाजी को देख रहा था, वे इशारे से कह रहे थे जैसे कि एम० पीज० कोई बहुत बड़ा पहाड़ लेने वाले हैं, कोई बड़ा सोना चुराने वाले हैं, कोई बड़े लाभ का पद ले रहे हैं, यह उन दोनों की मनोवृत्ति थी, कैसा लचर तर्क दे रहे थे, उन्होंने कहा कि लाइट की जरूरत नहीं क्योंकि वह 50 गुणा 50 का लान है, उन्होंने 30 फीट की सड़क एक सड़क छोड़ दी, 30 फीट की दूसरी सड़क छोड़ दी और जो तीसरी सड़क है उसको भी छोड़ दिया और 50 गुणा 50 फीट लान का बताया जब कि वह 60 गुणा 60 फीट का लान था और कम से कम 200

फीट लम्बा वह एरिया था। आप खयाल कीजिये कि वर्षा के दिनों में वहां अंधेरा है, कोई चोर या डाकू वहां बैठ जाता है, कोई चोर आ करके बंगले में चोरी कर जाता है और गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से कोई लाइट का प्रबन्ध भी नहीं हो, तो निश्चित रूप से यह एक दुःख की बात है कि उसके बाद गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से कहा जाये कि वहां पर अगर लाइट की व्यवस्था की जाएगी तो एम० पीज० को उसका खर्चा अपनी ओर से देना पड़ेगा। एम० पीज० जो यहां पर आकर बड़े आमी बने हुये हैं उनकी तो मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता लेकिन हम साधारण आदमियों के लिये कह सकते हैं कि घर पर बहुत ज्यादा कमते हैं, यहां तो हम खर्च करने को आये हैं, सौ-दो सौ रुपया बंगले का देते हैं, पांच-पचास रुपया और बिजली पानी पर खर्च करते हैं, दो सौ रुपया बचता है जो कि चपरासी को मिल जाता है, उस चपरासी की तरह से यहां लोग जीवन व्यतीत करते हैं, तो झूठी ख्याति लेकर हम बड़प्पन की बातें करके जनता में नाम करना चाहें, अच्छाबारों में नाम निकलवाना चाहें तो निकलवा लें लेकिन जो सच्ची बात है उसको यहां उन्हें रखनी चाहिये और जो सच्ची बात है उसको यहां कहनी चाहिये।

तो इस प्रकार से मेरा निवेदन है कि कमेटी में सारी कठिनाइयां देखी गईं और इसके बाद सर्वसम्मति से हमने हल निकालने का यत्न किया। जो कुछ कठिनाइयां थीं उन कठिनाइयों के ऊपर विचार होकर के लोक सभा में एक बिल आया और वहां वह बिल पास होने के बाद इस सदन के सामने आया है। हम समझते हैं कि हमने हमेशा एक बात को जरूर कहा था कि 31 रु० से 51 रु० न हो, धन बढ़ाना कोई जरूरी नहीं है लेकिन सुविधायें बढ़ा दी जायें। हम आज भी इस बात के लिये कहने को तत्पर हैं। लोक सभा ने इस पर विचार करने के बाद यह निर्णय लिया कि हमें

बहुत-सी सुविधायें इसलिये नहीं बढ़ानी चाहियें क्योंकि अगर उन सुविधाओं को बढ़ायेंगे तो उन सुविधाओं को बढ़ाने में इतना अधिक खर्चा हो जायेगा कि जो 20 रुपया का डेली एलाउंस का अन्तर है उससे भी दसगुना ज्यादा भार सरकारी कोष पर पड़ेगा और इसलिये हम सब ने सोचा कि अगर 20 रुपये के बजाये उन सुविधाओं को लेने के कारण राष्ट्र के ऊपर अधिक बोझा पड़ता है, अधिक वजन पड़ता है तो उनको न लेकर केवल 20 रु० का जो सुझाव है उसको मान लें, उसको ले लें। तो इसको देखते हुए यह बढ़ोतरी किसी प्रकार से बुरी नहीं कही जा सकती। हम समझते हैं कि बहुत से मित्र इसके ऊपर भी तरह तरह के संकल्प, तर्क और कुतर्क पेश कर सकते हैं, किसी को जबान को रोका नहीं जा सकता है और न किसी को हृदय के उद्गारों को प्रकट करने से मना किया जा सकता है लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि जितनी आवश्यकता दिल्ली में एम० पीज० को रहने के लिये है उतनी आवश्यकता के अनुरूप ही यहां पर यह बिल आया है। और इसके साथ ही यह भी है, जैसा कि श्री गणेशी लाल चौधरी ने कहा, जिन माननीय सदस्यों को यह डर लगता हो कि यह ज्यादा है या उनकी हठधर्मी हो या उनको ऐसा लगता हो कि कोई बहुत बड़ा किसी को कारुं का खजाना दिया जा रहा है तो वह कृपा करके आयें और आज आपके सामने कहें कि हमें नहीं लेना है और आगे चल कर वह न लें, यह तो उनके हाथ की बात है।

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): Sir, this Bill which amends the Act of 1954 follows the report of the Joint Committee on Salaries, Allowances and other Amenities to Members of Parliament. It was placed on the Table of the other House on 7th August 1968. My friend Shri Rajnarain spoke. I always listen to him with great care. Before that my friend Shri Bhargava had also spoken

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha]

about it. When this thing was discussed in our House a few months back, I had said that when it is in our hands to take our salaries and amenities, we should be careful about it, that we have to win the goodwill of the people and they should not think that we have come here to grab money but we should at the same time be able to see that Members who are not rich, who come from the middle classes or even poor families, either to this House or that House, are able to meet their requirements, are able to discharge the functions of Members with dignity and with ease, without being forced to beg otherwise, as Mr. Patel gave some instances. I would draw the attention of Shri Rajnarain that this Committee was represented by all parties. His party and other parties were all represented in this and there were unanimous recommendations and there were recommendations by overwhelming majority votes like 10 to 5, 9 to 3, 8 to 3 etc. If we consider all the recommendations, both unanimous as well as the ones by majority vote, we will find the correct position. Shri Rajnarain was accusing the Government. I would like him to kindly go through this report which was placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha on 7th August 1968, which speaks a great deal. Let us try to read it objectively and be fair to the Government. It is sent to every Member. If these unanimous recommendations were accepted and if the recommendations made by overwhelming majority were accepted, it would have cost the exchequer much more than what the present amendment, as passed by the Lok Sabha and now brought before us by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, will cost. Let us try to see the facts, as my predecessor did just now. Suppose we meet for 150 days, we get Rs. 20 more per day, it means we get Rs. 3000. We ask for free postal stamps for letters which comes to Rs. 100 per month or Rs. 1,200 per annum. We ask Rs. 100 per month for the stenographer. We ask for Rs. 600 for electricity, water charge, etc. All these come to Rs.

3,000. Besides that, we made numerous recommendations by majority vote which would have cost at least Rs. 100 per day and even more. I do not want to read all this and take the time of the House. I would tell my friend that saving money does not mean taking less. Saving the time of the House—because every minute we spend in both the Houses when the Session is going on costs—is more important. So, Sir, I shall be very brief because of that. And Government has taken the middle course instead of . . .

3 P.M.

श्री राजनारायण : जरा एक मिनट आप बैठ जायेंगे। श्रीमन्, जरा देखा जाये हमको क्या करने के लिये यह कहते हैं। यह लेटर हर एक मेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट को बांटा जा रहा है, पम्पलेट है . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) Mr. Rajnarain, you have to take your seat.

(Interruptions.)

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, पार्लियामेंट को किस ढंग से इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं, वह जरा देखें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : यह पढ़ा नहीं जायेगा। यह रिकार्ड में नहीं जायेगा। आप बैठें।

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: I sincerely feel that we should take the minimum, not the maximum, not even the need based optimum. Now this Bill has come from the Lok Sabha. Even to the provisions as have come from the Lok Sabha some of my respected friends have moved amendments, and they feel very strongly about them. I would like to tell them that when the Lok Sabha has done it, it does not lie in our mouth—I say this very humbly and I hope the hon. movers of the amendments will excuse me—to suggest and increase the expenses of the Government making the suggestion in this Rajya Sabha because, Sir, we

come to this House because of our public service, social service and other kinds of service rendered to the nation. Of course we earn our membership. We do not come here because somebody is charitable to us. Anyway we do not go in for election expenses. But there they go in for election expenses. Ask your friends of the other House about their election expenses. We know that friends belonging to our party have also tabled amendments, but I would beg of them not to increase the expenses of the Government any more. This is my request to them, very respectful submission to my friends who have tabled the amendments. Let us just send the Bill back as it is stamping our approval on it. It will amount to our being considered in the matter. It will amount to our taking an objective view of the whole situation. I would like to say, as my friend, Minister Raghuramaiah has said, that this amending Bill in its present form has saved a lot of money of the Government. Otherwise the recommendations which were originally made by the Joint Committee of Members of Parliament in their report presented on the 7th August, 1968, would have cost the Government exchequer much more. The Government should rather be thanked for saving public money, and Rajnarainji will agree with me that Government has saved Government money a lot, and we want that money to be spent otherwise, for better purposes.

With these words, Sir, I support the Bill, and I request my esteemed friends not to press their amendments. Thank you.

SHRI M V BHADRAM (Andhra Pradesh) Mr Vice-Chairman, if I have heard the Minister correctly, the basis of this Bill is the Report of the Joint Committee which made the recommendations. Now may I draw the attention of the House to the very terms of reference of this Committee itself? When the Motion was placed before the Lok Sabha, an objection was taken to the wording of the motion, namely, that it should refer

only to 'amenities and facilities' and the words 'salaries and allowances' should be deleted. The Speaker clarified that only the name of the Committee was "Committee on Salaries and Allowances" and "it will go into the amenities for members". Thereupon the Motion was adopted.

Therefore, it was very clear when the Motion was adopted by the Lok Sabha that it was only meant for the amenities for members but not for salaries or allowances at all. But, unfortunately, the Committee went beyond its terms of reference and a recommendation has been made by this Committee which is this and appears on page 21, in paragraph 64, of their Report.

"After carefully weighing the pros and cons of an increase in the rate of daily allowance, the Committee recommend by a majority (Ayes 9, Noes 3), that the rate of daily allowance should be raised from Rs 31 to Rs 51 per day."

An impression was sought to be created that all parties are inclined to this recommendation. It is a fact that all parties and groups are included in the Committee but, Mr Vice-Chairman, you may kindly go through the Minutes of Dissent written by Mr Kanwar Lal Gupta, Mr P K Vasudevan Nair, Mr Niranjan Varma, Mr Rabi Ray, Mr Jyotirmoy Basu and Mr A D Mani. All these people have dissented from the various recommendations of this Committee. Therefore, the recommendation, as far as this increase in daily allowance is concerned, is not a unanimous one. Of course arguments were raised that for discharging their legitimate duties Members of Parliament should have the required facilities but limited to the minimum agreed. There is no doubt about that. Now what is the minimum and what are the facilities that a Member required? There is no end to them. It may be Rs 500, it may be Rs 1000 or even it may be Rs 2,000. There is no limit. The limit can be anywhere. Sky is the limit. Why am I saying this? Mr Dahyabhai Patel



[Shri M. V. Bhadram.]

was referring to the corrupt practices indulged in by some of the Members by subletting a part of their houses and making money thereby, and also taking money for putting questions in Parliament. He was saying that because the income which the Members are getting as Members of Parliament is quite insufficient they are resorting to these unfair methods. That is how he was trying to argue out the case. I am prepared to concede his point of view, but can he give a guarantee to the House that hereafter, after the present daily allowance is increased by twenty rupees, there will be no corrupt practices indulged in by any Member of Parliament? No, because as a nation we have lost our character and have become corrupt in every walk of life, we all including Members of Parliament. We should build up the character of the nation at all levels and that is the only way to put an end to corrupt practices. Even if we get fifty rupees more than what we are getting now as daily allowance, even then these corrupt practices will continue to be in existence. We have to tackle the evil no doubt, but it should not be by increasing the salary or the daily allowance. That way it can never be eradicated. Therefore, I am opposed to this increase. We have been raising so many other issues and have been asking for remedies. For example, I would like to ask this again today. For the last eleven years the Indian Labour Conference has accepted the principle of a need-based minimum wage for all the Central Government employees and for all the wage-earners in the country, and we here have been asking for a need-based minimum wage for them. Last year, in September, when the Central Government employees wanted an increased wage to the extent of a need-based minimum wage, the Government did not concede that demand. When the same employees wanted arbitration on that, the Government did not concede that also. On the other hand, the Government came down upon them with a very heavy hand, and we all know what happened.

When it is said that the country as a whole is not in a position to pay even the need-based minimum wage to the employees in the various sectors in this country, even to the producers of the wealth of the country, how are we justified to get twenty rupees more at a jump as additional daily allowance? The last increase from Rs. 21 to Rs. 31 has been in 1964; it went up by twelve rupees from Rs. 21 to Rs. 31. Now, within a period of five years we want a jump of twenty rupees, from Rs. 31 to Rs. 51. Are we justified to get twenty rupees more per day? It means that every Member of Parliament will get a daily allowance of fifty-one rupees per day from now. It means that we will get Rs. 1,530 per month as daily allowance. Are we justified? I feel we are not justified in getting the enhanced daily allowance. Some Members who indulge in getting all these things say that it is hypocrisy on the part of others that they oppose these things and yet they ultimately accept these things. All right; say I belong to such a category of hypocrites, say we want the allowance but at the same time we oppose this thing. This is how they try to put it. I am coming to that. Some people say if they do not want let them not take it. Agreed; I am quite prepared to agree to that proposition provided every other legislation that is not accepted by some Members of the House is not extended to them. Will this be accepted? Suppose I oppose the Preventive Detention Act, it should not be applied to me. When I say I do not want this, I do not want any Member to be given this extra allowance of Rs. 20.

SHRI A. D. MANI: You belong to the Communist Party. The Communist Party gets large sums of money from various sources. There are other Members of Parliament who do not get any money from other sources.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM: This is all usual trash. If we get from various sources probably you must be getting some share also. We know the people who have got links with the industrialists are getting money from various

sources; not the Communist Party. I am proud to be a member of the Communist Party. Out of the Rs. 500 of my salary I am contributing Rs. 300 to my party every month. Probably you don't know that. With the balance and the daily allowance I am carrying on for the last three years. This is so not only in the case of the Communist Party of India but it is so in the case of the CPM also.

**SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN :** It is so with us also.

**SHRI M. V. BHADRAM :** We want to live as the common man instead of being people with a separate status. We do not want to have a status better than the common man of India. Unless the country as a whole is in a position to pay the minimum need-based wage to all the employees we will not be justified to get an increase in our daily allowance and other facilities. My hon. friend, Mr. Panda, was jocularly saying about a free pass to the spouse. Suppose one Member is having two wives, which wife is to be taken to Parliament, his first wife or his second wife?

**SHRI CHITTA BASU** (West Bengal) : It is forbidden by law; you cannot have two wives.

**SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN :** Under the Mohamedan Law you can have. For Government servants it is not permissible. For others it is permissible. There are many who have got four wives.

(Interruptions.)

**SHRI M. V. BHADRAM :** That is permissible if they had married earlier. There are cases where one is a legal wife and the other is not. If we pass this Bill the whole country including the staff of the Rajya Sabha Secretariat will laugh at us. I therefore oppose this increase in the allowance and other facilities given under this Bill.

**SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY** (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, this Bill is very simple; I do not find any

reason why we should take much time on this and why three hours have been allotted for the discussion of this Bill. In this Bill there are three points. One is the enhancement of the daily allowance from Rs. 31 to Rs. 51. The second is, instead of two air trips it has been made into four and in short sessions it was only one and now it has been made into two. The third is with regard to certain facilities when you travel by rail. Here I wish to say something about what happened in the earlier stages. When we were discussing this question in 1952 there was a hue and cry and the Opposition wanted the salary to be Rs. 300. After a great deal of discussion it was agreed that it must be Rs. 400 and as for the daily allowance it was fixed at Rs. 20. One of the Members, then an ordinary Member but now a Minister of State, said this Rs. 400 and Rs. 20 together will become 420 to which expression there is an odium attached and it was suggested it must be made Rs. 21. It is understandable because in these parts I find that four twenty means something else. That was the reason why it was made into Rs. 21. But when you increase it next I do not understand why it should be Rs. 31. Seratim we have just added Rs. 10 and it has been made into Rs. 31. The basis of making Rs. 20 into Rs. 21 was because of the bad meaning attached to the expression four twenty. But afterwards every time it has been made into Rs. 31 and now Rs. 51. Why should there always be this small tail of one rupee attached to this daily allowance?

**PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA :** It is a lucky number.

**SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY :** Everything is lucky.

**PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA :** When you give a donation you don't give in a round sum; you always say Rs. 31 or Rs. 51 or something like that.

**SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY :** We belong to the old generation and we want something added this way or

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy]

that way by saying it is auspicious and all that. The basis was to avoid four twenty at that time but even today that addition of Re. 1 is being kept on with every increase. So far as Rs. 51 is concerned, Members have argued for and against it. So far as I am concerned, I would say this. Because of rise in prices and other things we do need something more and this Rs. 51 is not very much especially if you compare with what Members of Parliament in other countries are getting. Even in Ceylon they get Rs. 1500. Even in much smaller countries than ours they get more. Consistent with the economic situation and conditions in the country this sum of Rs. 51 is not very much. Others possibly may say that they are prepared to work even for Rs. 20; it is quite possible they may say so but in actual practice they would not accept less than Rs. 51. People talk a lot in this House because in the House we can talk anything under the sun and the moon; only thing is there will be no relevancy. Whatever is talked here, though not germane to the Bill, is listened to with rapt attention by the people; it has news value. And that is how deliberations are carried on in the House. Because of the news value many things are being said in the House.

Now coming to the particular points. my friend, Mr. Bhadram—he is not here now—said that it is wrong to have all these things. He said that we were carried away by the majority decisions taken in the Joint Committee. On the other hand Mr. Bhargava said that we were having various Commissions and Committees but the Government never cared to accept the recommendations made by them. But I must say that the mere fact that Committees or Commissions are set up does not necessarily mean that their recommendations should be adopted in toto. They are only guidelines for us and out of those guidelines we take that which is workable. Workability is one thing; adoption of the entire recommendations is another

thing. If you adopt everything whether it is workable or not, I do not think you can run the Government that way. The Government has to run on certain principles. So we have to examine the recommendations made by the Committee and we will have to see which of them is workable and which of them is not workable. You may say everything is workable but what is the strain that will be imposed on the economy. The economic position has also to be considered. The Minister has stated that many of the recommendations given by the Joint Committee could not be accepted because it will involve a lot of expenditure. That is why they have said thus far and no farther. Having conceded this point to the Minister I wish to tell him that the new section 6A that is sought to be inserted is highly discriminatory, because there is provision there for travel for the spouse. In this House and the other House there are widowers and all put together it may be some 40 or 50. As regards bachelors they may be some 20 or 30. It may be that no account has been kept by the hon. Minister as to how many bachelors are there, how many unmarried women are there, how many widows are there and how many widowers are there. He has not taken that into account. He could find it out from the 'Who's Who'. If he really wanted to find out how many widowers, widows, unmarried or married men were there, he could have got the figures. . .

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa): I think it is a stricture on us. I do not have a spouse. I have a little mouse in my house. I will need a ticket to carry it everywhere.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: He wants to save money on these recommendations made by the Joint Committee. He must also say how much he can save because of these forty or fifty Members who are not married. I do not want to name any bachelors. For example, there may be bachelors who, though not married, may still have children, without calling themselves father or mother, but that is a

different thing. If he had taken it into account, he would have found that there are so many persons who really cannot bring any spouse with them. Why should there be this discrimination? To give you an illustration a Member who was married thirty years back may have two wives. He can bring one wife free in the first class and the other wife will have to travel in third class. This creates domestic disharmony. The junior wife will travel first class while the senior wife will travel in third class.

**SHRI OM MEHTA :** He can bring them by turns.

**SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY :** We do not want any turns. We know what quarrels are there. Government should not cause domestic quarrels by means of this measure. There is already plenty of quarrels. Now, the Minister must have his own experience. (*Interruptions.*) He should not create domestic quarrels. If by a provision in law you are creating domestic quarrels, it is not good for us. I can only request him to see that instead of "spouse" it should be "any member of the family". I agree with what Mr. Bhargava said about two first class passes. Otherwise, you could convert the third class into first class, in the same way as the first class ticket could be converted into air-conditioned class. The same kind of convertibility should be allowed in the case of this third class pass. If any Member wants to bring any member of his family, he must be able to do so by paying the difference between the first class fare and third class fare. He should be permitted to come by first class by paying the difference between the first class and third class fare. We have already provided this facility in the case of first class. It could be converted into air-conditioned class for himself. He may wish to bring his widowed mother or widowed sister in first class. He should be enabled to do so by paying the difference between the first class and third class fare. I only want the analogy of the air-conditioned class to be applied here. Of

course, there is no loss. I only want the same facility to be given as in the case of air-conditioned class. I wish that the Minister would consider it and see that this facility is given.

As regards the other things, Mr. Bhargava gave a very good fight, but what I find is that all his fight was for the purpose of two first class passes. He said that only richmen could travel by air-conditioned class. I agree with him. They can always go anywhere, not only in India but elsewhere also. They can do many things. Parliament can do and undo things. We cannot make a man a woman or a woman a man. Excepting that, we can do everything else. Here he gave such a fight, but ultimately he bargained for two first class passes. If that is given I have no objection. Based on economy, instead of that, he can accept my amendment.

The last point which I wish to bring home is that many of our friends here are amazed that we are fighting for our own advancement. Here we can increase our passes. We can increase our amenities, but the public must accept it. They must approve that what we do is reasonable and that it is not anything unreasonable. Whatever we do must be judged in that way. Because there is power in our hands, all of us, joined together, can make or unmake things, but the people must support us. Otherwise, they may even stone us saying : You are enjoying so much. Instead of creating a wrong feeling outside, there should be some restraint on our amenities. In the case of air-conditioned travel, we have permitted. In the same way if anybody wants to bring his mother or any other member of his family, he must be allowed to do it. With these words, I support the Bill.

**SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON** (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as you will have already imagined, I oppose this Bill. I do not want to resort to any demagoguery on this issue, but I would like to point out that in this country when more than fifty per cent of our people live on less than

[Shri K. P. Subramania Menon]

fifty paise a day, we, who are supposed to be the representatives of the people, should have some understanding of their earnings, of their difficulties, of their problems before we ourselves thrust into the limelight our own problems, our own difficulties. Unfortunately I find in this House, whenever the problems of agricultural labour, whenever the problems of workers, whenever the problems of Government employees are taken up, a hostile House. All the landed gentry in this House get up and shout 'Naxalities' and all that nonsense. But when it comes to their own difficulties, how painstaking they are, how heartrending their conditions are. They are very good at describing those things. Now, it is true that MPs may have difficulties. I agree, but then who has not got difficulties in this country? A vast majority of our people live in abject poverty, in ignorance, without knowing how to read and write. Eighty per cent of our people still do not know how to read and write. It is in this country that we are asking for more.

The Joint Committee has made certain recommendations. I should have supposed that the Joint Committee would have concentrated on certain facilities. I agree that some more facilities may be necessary to carry out the onerous duties of a Member of Parliament, but to single out this particular recommendation regarding increase in D.A. I think, is unfortunate. What is necessary, if at all, is to give them facilities to enable Members to keep in touch with their constituencies, to get in touch with their people. Giving an extra allowance to MPs is a sort of individualistic measure, which only helps MPs in their personal affairs. I do not think any MP would think that what he gets from Parliament should be used more for the purpose of going about his constituency and all that. The complaint that whatever he gets is not enough to serve the constituency will always be there. Of course, telephone facilities are there. The question of transport in

the constituency, etc. is there. Perhaps that might help an MP more to get in touch with his constituency and to serve the people better.

Another point that I would raise and which was raised earlier by another Member also is this superstition. It does not seem to leave us. Every time we must have Rs. 21, Rs. 31 or Rs. 51. It would have been better if it was made into fifty, so that a lot of complicated calculations could be avoided. Why should we go on with these superstitions every time? I do not understand it. Another point that I wish to mention is about this new provision for deducting the first class fare from the air-conditioned travel charges if a Member of Parliament proposes to travel so. Here again I do not agree with this proposition. In fact this proposition including the proposition regarding air travel will only help a few businessmen in this House who usually travel in air-conditioned class or by air. Actually the vast majority of the Members in this House and in the other House do not have the resources to pay the extra money to travel air-conditioned or by air. In case some of them occasionally, do, due to necessity, exigency, etc., that is a different matter, but to make a general provision to enable all Members of Parliament to travel air-conditioned after paying the difference is only to see that the well-to-do, the businessmen, the rich professional classes, etc., get the benefit out of it. I do not think that it helps an M. P. to carry out his duty to the constituency which he represents. With these words I conclude my observations.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Mr Vice-Chairman, I had the honour of being a member of the Joint Committee which considered the recommendations made by various Members about increase in the emoluments of Members of Parliament, and I have appended my minute of dissent on certain matters to the report of the Select Committee. I would like to say that my approach to this Bill is one of hesitating, low-key

support, not a high-key but a low-key support ..

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : But you are supporting the Bill

SHRI A. D. MANI : It is a low-key support not because I am objecting to some of the provisions but to the approach to this question (*Inter-ruption by Mr K. P. Subramania Menon*). If you go and sit in your seat, I will answer the question. I would like to mention here that the British House of Commons appointed a Committee to consider the remuneration of Members of Parliament in 1964, and the members of the Committee were Sir Geoffrey Lawrence, Mr. H. S. Kirkaldy and Professor W. J. M. Mackenzie, and it had an Advisory Panel. The question that we have got to ask ourselves is : just because the Congress Party has got a majority in Parliament and a larger number of votes must our emoluments be increased? We are bringing a Bill without taking any evidence. What impression would we make upon all these attendants who are around this Chamber, the chaprassis whose cases we referred to the Gajendragadkar Commission, a Pay Commission, which took voluminous evidence, and then asked the Minister of Labour, "Why have you not implemented it with retrospective effect?" Is it fair for us to adopt two standards, one standard for Members of Parliament and another standard for other people? This is the question I would like to ask. I would have been very happy if the Select Committee had taken evidence on all these matters and tried to arrive at a reasonable assessment of the remuneration to be paid to Members of Parliament. This has not been done. We have done it because we are the rulers of this country and we can increase our salaries and allowances just as we want. In my minute of dissent I have stated that I would like the daily allowance to be Rs. 41 because .

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON : Why is this one after forty?

SHRI A. D. MANI : Because one is a part of our superstition, of our religion, of our culture. We do not say zero. I have suggested Rs. 41 a day because taxi fares have risen in Delhi and then we have got to maintain two establishments

Sir, in this connection I would like to quote from this report—I would like hon. Members to go through this very valuable report which has been produced, they went into the duties which are necessary for an evaluation of the remuneration of Members of Parliament. They have said :

"Literature issued for canvassing purposes ;

election expenses ;

periodicals, books, newspaper cuttings, etc.;

charitable subscriptions or donations;

entertaining;

extra costs arising out of late night sittings;"

This is very important :

"expenses incurred by wives of Members, e.g. in deputising for or accompanying Members ,

Payments to political organisations for political purposes"

as the hon. friends of the Communist Party do, and I also do it to my Servants of India Society. We also make contributions to our organisations. These things are taken into account. I wish the Joint Select Committee—I am saying this because I had been a member of the Committee—had really set out the criteria for determining the remuneration of the Members of Parliament. We have done it just because we can raise it :

A number of points have been raised like that of my hon. friend, Mr. Bhargava, who wants two first-class passes in order to enable any Member to travel by the air-conditioned class. I have travelled in the air-conditioned

[Shri A. D. Mani]

class and I shudder to see beggars coming and knocking at the window when you are taking a cup of coffee and saying, "Give something to me also". In our country it is setting a very bad example for a Member of Parliament, including Mr Bhargava, to utilise Parliament money for two first-class passes for air-conditioned travel. We have no right for air-conditioned travel. It is a poor country and we just set an example...

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: You are a member of the Chelmsford Club.

SHRI A. D. MANI: My hon. friend raises the question of the Chelmsford Club. As a mofussil man I just keep it. If my hon. friend, Mr Menon, wants to be entertained, he would like to be entertained at the Chelmsford Club and not upstairs. They all want to be entertained at the proper place. That is why I am a member of the Chelmsford Club.

The question has been raised about a free pass for a servant. I am thoroughly opposed to this free pass because it is bound to lead to widespread abuses. How many times the servants' passes have been misused by railway officials to carry nephews and nieces, brothers-in-law, uncles-in-law, and so on, in the name of servants? We have got a right to take a servant anywhere in India.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: No servant.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: Not servant, any person.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Any person can be taken. In regard to this I would like the forms to be filled by the Member concerned because it is bound to lead to widespread abuses.

How are you going to issue passes for wives of Members? (*Interruption by Shri N. R. Muniswamy*). You are a person who belongs to an exclusive category. I am very sorry. He said

he was a widower. It is always open to a Member of Parliament to remedy the deficiency at any time he likes. It was unfortunate that he had passed the marriageable age. The two Houses of Parliament cannot help him. Regarding wives, we do not go round to the constituencies, but Members of the other House do take their wives, for campaigning purposes. It is a fact that they are present... (*Interruption*) My friend belongs to an Ashram, I belong to an Ashram, but I am looking at it from the point of view of a person who evaluates the working of a Member of Parliament. I will speak on my amendment at the appropriate stage. Wives of Members of Parliament should be given a railway pass also, that is to say, when they travel alone. When she goes with her husband for any political work, you must give them a joint pass. I am moving an amendment to Mr. Bhargava's amendment saying that in place of "any member of the family" it should be "wife or dependent son or daughter". This is necessary as Mr. Muniswamy mentioned that there are widowers in this House as well as widowers in the other House. It is a sad lot for a person to be deprived of the valuable services and the comfort of a spouse. I would like to ask the hon. Minister why he should use the word 'spouse'. Why cannot he use the word 'wife'? Why don't you put the word 'wife'? Why do you use the word 'spouse'? Because 'spouse' can cover a multitude of faces. I do not want any kind of a charge of corrupt practice being brought against a Member of Parliament that he brought in somebody who was not strictly a spouse. Sir, one more point. I feel that in place of "any member of the family", "wife or dependent son or daughter" should be included because in the case of a widower, the Member will be able to bring with him his dependent son to help in his parliamentary functions.

I support this Bill. He will not bring forward another Bill for another four or five years to increase our salary. But when it comes, we must do it in a proper form. We must con-

duct an inquiry so that the public at least will realise that we are setting an example. When we ask the Government servants to be very patient when the cost of living goes up and ask them to wait for the Gajendragadkar Commission's report, we must set our house in order and we must set an example if we want to impress upon the people that we are animated with the ideals of strict public service.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Sir, it is rather strange that even in regard to the salary and allowances of Members, this House and the other House could not reach any unanimity of thinking. The Joint Committee went into the question of salaries and allowances and has submitted a Report and it was in pursuance of this Report that a Bill was presented in Parliament. The hon. Minister has stated what could have been the financial commitment if even some of the recommendations which were thought to be unanimous in that Report had been implemented and what is the difference in the extent of financial commitment if the Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha is implemented. I do not think that that is a correct approach at all. It cannot be done from the point of view of mere finance. The question is, in what manner the salary or the allowances or the privileges should be revised if they are to be reviewed at all. Looked at in that way, the provisions in this Bill amount to a legislation of expediency.

The provisions of this Bill are, to some extent, unscientific and in so far as certain other provisions are concerned, they are anti-socialistic. I say that the provisions of this Bill are unscientific because there is no scheme or purpose contained in regard to some of the provisions of this Bill. Take for example this *ad hoc* increase from Rs. 31 daily to Rs. 51 daily. What exactly is the purpose of it? Is it intended to meet certain of the other requirements of the Members which were canvassed for and which found support in that Committee's Report? Is it to be given, after all, in the form of an increased daily allowance? When

a Member gets a permanent allowance which is taxable and for which income-tax is being paid—the daily allowance is exempt from income-tax—this concept of daily allowance, in the background of the permanent monthly allowance that you are drawing, is only for the purpose of meeting your daily requirement. And with that background in view, I must certainly state that this *ad hoc* increase to Rs. 51 is absolutely unjustified. We have all been living in Delhi and we have found that Rs. 31 is quite adequate. The question, therefore, is what exactly this *ad hoc* increase in allowance meant for. And this *ad hoc* increase, as I submitted earlier, is just for the purpose of meeting expediency and nothing more.

The hon. Mr. Bhargava—I was carefully listening to his speech—referred to the discriminatory provisions contained in this Bill, and there are many such discriminatory provisions. In fact, the Bill as passed in the Lok Sabha, contains more discriminations as between Member and Member than the Bill as introduced in the Lok Sabha. I do not know, Sir, as to why there should be any discrimination at all so far as Member to Member is concerned in the matter of enjoyment of his privileges. After all, a Member is enjoying these privileges only because it is thought that it is necessary that the Member should have these privileges for the proper discharge of his functions as a Member of Parliament. If that be so, there is no justification for these discriminatory provisions. And we who are committed to socialism and who say that the socialistic form of the welfare State should be implemented in full, if we are introducing such unsocialistic measures so far as we ourselves are concerned, I do not know how we are morally competent to say about the implementation of socialism.

The Bill that was originally introduced contained only two purposes. One was this *ad hoc* increase of daily allowance and the other was a provision with regard to air travel anywhere in India for any purpose, at any



[Shri K Chandrasekharan]

time, by paying the difference between the rail fare and the air fare. The first has been retained in the Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha, the second, in the form in which it was put in the Bill, has been deleted. Instead of the second, we have got another provision

Then, Sir, we have got some more provisions introduced in the Bill as passed at present. Instead of one intermediate journey that is available, the number of intermediate journeys is increased.

Then there is a statutory provision made in regard to travel by air-conditioned class. There is a free third class railway pass meant for somebody who accompanies the Member and then there is the non-transferable first-class railway pass for the spouse. And then there is also a provision that if the free third-class pass is not used, it can be accounted for the further purpose of this air-conditioned travel. I submit, Sir, discrimination is writ large in the provisions as contained in Clause 6A as passed by the Lok Sabha. I completely agree with the amendment proposed by the hon. Mr. Bhargava. If some of these provisions were to stand—I do not know whether these provisions should stand at all so far as I am concerned, I oppose them—but if they are to stand, certainly, I would like that amendment to be passed rather than these provisions in regard to the spouse alone. And I very seriously oppose the amendment that has been moved by the hon. Mr. Mani because that makes the position rather worse so far as this question of discrimination is concerned.

I submit that so far as the Members are concerned, only two things if at all, need to be considered. There are very many things. If you go into the question of privileges, if you go into the question of the benefits, if you go into the question of the necessities, they will never end because from Member to Member suggestions can be made, and if all the suggestions are totalled up, we do not know where

exactly we will be. But certainly there are two aspects which ought to be considered. In what form they should be implemented it is not for me to suggest at this stage. One is some sort of secretarial assistance being made available to the Members. It is particularly difficult to work in Delhi without that sort of secretarial assistance. It may be possible in the constituencies or in the State to which the Member belongs. He may be able to arrange for some sort of secretarial assistance there even if he is not a professional man otherwise. But in Delhi it is so expensive. This is a matter which really contributes to the efficient working of a Member of Parliament. That was considered by the Committee, but nowhere in the provisions of the Bill it is there.

Sir, the other question is with regard to accommodation. The type of accommodation to be provided, similar or dissimilar, and the rental in respect of that should depend upon the seniority of the Member or his requirement or his status whether he is a leader of a party or an office-bearer of a party and therefore, he may require a bigger accommodation. That accommodation should be provided free of cost. These two things could be given. These monetary benefits that are being given are not likely to be used for the better efficiency of a Member's functioning. That is my objection to it. Therefore, Sir, I oppose totally the provisions of this Bill.

SHRI CHITTA BASU · Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to oppose this Bill.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) · Do not oppose it.

SHRI CHITTA BASU · Just understand what I mean to say and apply your mind, my dear friend, Mr. A. G. Kulkarni, and then you support it.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI · Also say that you are going to deny the benefits arising out of this Bill.

SHRI CHITTA BASU Provided you also give me the right to say that the other laws which have been passed here would not be applicable in my case

Mr Vice-Chairman, I oppose this Bill and I oppose it for various reasons. I shall not discuss this thing at great length because my friend, Mr Rajnarain, has discussed the problem in a large canvas. Generally I will confine my remarks to what has been said by the hon'ble Minister.

The Minister, in the course of his opening remarks, observed that the daily allowance of Members of Parliament has been increased by Rs 20 per day in order to provide him certain facilities to discharge his/her duty in a very efficient manner. If that is the reason for bringing about such a measure, let us consider it from a practical point of view.

Every day you will be giving Rs 20 more than what we get today. I was listening to Mr Mani. He was reading from some book. I do not know from which book he was referring. He referred to the requirements of a Member of Parliament for the efficient discharge of his responsibilities. I heard him say that secretarial assistance is needed. It is necessary for an M P to maintain a clerk to do his office work, and if money is spent for that purpose it comes to Rs 250 pm or Rs 3 000 at the rate of Rs 20 a day for 150 days in the year. Mr Vice-Chairman, if the only object is to increase the facilities for more efficient discharge of the responsibilities of a Member of Parliament, is that amount sufficient to maintain a clerk, to maintain a steno and to maintain an office which should be readily available for a Member of Parliament without which, I think everybody will agree, we cannot discharge our responsibility properly here. You say that this money is being given for the efficient discharge of his responsibilities. I am not for giving money. I do not mind whether you give him Rs 250, Rs 300 or Rs 500. But it is necessary that secretarial assistance

or requirements which are needed by a Member of Parliament for the efficient discharge of his responsibility should be provided to him. But that purpose is not going to be served by this particular Bill. What are you doing? You are giving certain extra money to a Member. But, Mr Chandrasekharan has rightly pointed out, there is great doubt whether that money will be spent for the efficient discharge of the responsibility of a Member of Parliament. It is, in other words, bribing and corrupting Members of Parliament. You are taking the advantage of the human instinct of an opportunity for increased salary.

Mr Vice-Chairman, again, here is an element of discrimination. Some of the senior leaders of this House referred to needs. All right. If needs are to determine the wage, why should it apply to Members of Parliament alone. I think, Mr Vice-Chairman, you are a labour leader. Why the same criterion in fixing the wages for the working people should not be determined? If the salary and allowances of Members of Parliament are to be determined on the basis of his/her need, why should that particular principle not be applicable in the case of other sections of working people in our country?

Mr Vice-Chairman, when we raised this question of having a wage policy based on needs, the hon'ble Minister said that our financial position is not such as would warrant a wage policy. When we raised the question of a minimum wage on the basis of need for the bulk of our population they shed crocodile's tears. When our agricultural labour, our village people, have not got even the minimum wage, how can you think in terms of salaries and allowances for a Member of Parliament based on his need? Therefore, we cannot think in terms of fixing the wages on the basis of needs. They come out with that argument when we demand fixation of wages on the basis of need. But on the question of fixing the salaries and allowances of the Members of Parliament, you very much relish the idea of need. This is discrimination.

[Shri Chitta Basu]

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it has got some moral aspect of it. We cannot think in a vacuum. We are a part of the people, an integral part of the people, an integral part of the society in which we live, toil and work, and as a representative of that society we are here. When our vast masses as our friend, Mr. Rajnarain has observed, 60 per cent. of our population, cannot have even the minimum to eke their existence, this Rs. 51 per day is needed for us to meet our needs.

A few days ago the Prime Minister had to agree that 82 per cent. of our rural population cannot afford to spend more than Re. 1 a day, and you say that you are in a position to afford Rs. 51 a day for the Members of Parliament who also happen to be members of this society. Therefore, it is nothing but tarnishing the image of the Members of Parliament. That may

be the objective of the Treasury Benches. It may be because of their "yes-men" who are there always to raise their hands and this is perhaps the result of an attempt to satisfy them, to maintain the power equation. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will agree with me that at the present stage of the society, we cannot conceive of a wage increase for ourselves. Some of the Members referred to the salaries and emoluments of the Members of Parliament of some foreign countries. I have never been to other countries, but while referring to the question of the salaries of the Members of Parliament of other countries, we should also take into consideration the living conditions of the people of those countries. The salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament cannot be determined in isolation from the standard of living of the other sections of people.

From all points of view, therefore, this is not desirable, this is not to be accepted and I feel that this Bill should be withdrawn. Here again I want to mention one point. There is a provision in this Bill that a Member is entitled to undertake air journey

four times during a session to any part of the country. I can understand facilities in relation to travel to one's constituency. We, for example, come from West Bengal and we are required to visit Calcutta and that part of the country to maintain closer relation with our constituents.

AN HON. MEMBER : Every day.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : If it is every day, as he says, it is all the more better. But I do not know what makes it necessary for a Member of Parliament during a session to travel to any part of the country four times. By that particular benefit, the House will lose the benefit of Members' attendance. One will always be interested in going out and not in being present in the House. According to the existing rules, a Member is entitled to draw his daily allowance even if he is absent for 13 or 14 days.

AN HON. MEMBER : No, no.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Yes. You are paid for your absence. You are paid for your dereliction of duty. Therefore, I think this Bill is not desirable. It should be withdrawn and the House will do well if it records its protest against this kind of measure.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Mr. Appan. You will kindly confine your remarks to five minutes.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would neither support this Bill nor oppose this Bill. Then why do you stand up?—you may put that question. I do so because it is my bounden duty, as a representative of the people, to bring to the notice of the Government, not only of the Minister here—he is only a limb of the Government—but of the whole Cabinet, through this august body, that they should give the matter the due weight it deserves, whatever may be the differences of opinion.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is a poor country. The Members should have

the necessary amenities to discharge their functions, but not for discharging family functions or for undertaking pleasure trips when the session is going on. The voters are our masters. Can we ever try to become bigger than our masters, to earn more than our masters? This is very unfair. I really wonder which wise man has drafted these things.

Now, I do not have anything to say about the fifty-one rupees business. It has been decided. I also agree that the Members do deserve even more, even Rs. 60 provided they are honest in the work that is assigned to them, to the work that is put on their shoulders.

AN HON. MEMBER : Rs. 100.

SHRI G. A. APPAN : You can even go up to Rs 100 ; I will not grudge, if you are true to your job, if you are true to the trust that is bestowed on you, by the voters, by the electorate, and try to help them and not help yourselves.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is one wonderful clause here. I do not think anybody can accept this clause. According to this clause, you can have one free air travel up and one down even during the inter-session period. Generally, Sir, the Committee meetings are conducted only for one day or two days, or sometimes for two or three hours only. And Government money is being wasted on air fares, and allowance for three days before and three days afterwards. Mr. Vice-Chairman, it will be really imposturous on the part of anybody to accept this proposal. Give him allowance for one day before and one day afterwards, but not, for heaven's sake, as has been provided here. I want the hon. Minister to put this view to the Cabinet that there should be no free air travel for Committee sittings unless the sittings goes on for 15 days at a stretch.

There is another provision. It has been wonderfully drafted. You know, two phones are given. We have work here as well as there. But the wonderful part of it is that 5,400 free calls

here and 5,400 free calls there are allowed. But, how much does the Government lose by this? Rs. 300 here and Rs. 300 there; a total of Rs. 600 of Government money is gone. All right; let it go; it is a legitimate thing; we can grant it. But you now allow 150 calls free on either side. (*Interruption.*) At the rate of three minutes per call, a man has to spend about 150 days for this. . .

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Trunk-calls are not free.

(*Interruptions.*)

SHRI G. A. APPAN : Anyway, I would request the Government to limit the number of free calls. Free telephones are all right. But we should be reasonable in our approach and it should be acceptable to the public. So many calls will be a toll on the poor men. I will reserve the other things for a later occasion.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am grateful to the honourable Members who have spoken from various sections of the House for the broad support that has been given to the various provisions of the Bill except with some honourable exceptions. I must say at the very outset that I do not know how the honourable Shri Chitta Basu's speech will be interpreted, but I interpret it that he is in support of the Bill. I shall explain why. He concedes and in fact he has made out a case that the provision made by the Government amounts to an additional Rs. 260 a month and that is not enough to cover their required facilities. So, the Government has been more modest than he would have been had he been there drafting this Bill. I consider his speech a grand support for this Bill. I consider that the Leader of the Swatantra Party has also broadly supported the features of this Bill. He only said probably it would have been better to send it to an impartial committee. May I tell him that this is not the first time in the history of this Parliament that these salaries are given or the allowances are given or . . .

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :** I said "an impartial person" I only pointed out what had been done in England. If they could do it, why not we? That is all.

**SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH :** While a person does not include a committee, a committee includes a person. That is the spirit in which I mentioned. The point is that this is not the first time that these things have been done, that salaries are given and the allowances are increased to Members of Parliament. I do not think it has been the practice of this Parliament to entrust that purpose to anybody outside Parliament and even in this case now it will be recalled that this matter was considered by a Joint Committee of both the Houses of Parliament. It is not as if it is not considered by anybody at all

Then there is one honourable Member who said, "Well, in the case of other categories of people in this country you appoint other bodies and then you take their advice and then pass legislation giving them wages or increasing their wages" But there that is necessary because you cannot know fully their difficulties, their problems. But I expect, the Government expects, every Member of Parliament to know what his problems are, what his difficulties are, what his requirements are, what facilities he wants in order to efficiently discharge the functions for which he is here. Therefore, from that point of view, I think, it is not correct for anybody to say that Parliament shall not do it. Then, who shall do it? Who knows better where the shoe pinches so far as Members of Parliament are concerned? Therefore, I think it is but proper we do it ourselves. Also, why not have the confidence that we can always assess objectively? When we can legislate for the whole country, can we not legislate for ourselves? Cannot Members of Parliament be trusted to have that sense of an objective reality? Why should you think that other persons have a greater appreciation of your requirements? I think it is a right thing and the measure of support

which the honourable Members have given to this Bill, has proved that the assessment of the situation by the Government is proper and that what should be done has been done. Of course, there has been some criticism. For instance, Mr. Rajnarain has made a speech saying that this is anti-national, anti-people, anti-moral, and I think if he had a dictionary with him, he would have probably added anti-every word in the dictionary. We are proposing Rs 51 instead of Rs 21 because the standard of living has gone up, because certain facilities are required, because there are various inconveniences which the Members are being put to. And if it is anti-moral then, is not the honourable Member's taking even Rs 31 immoral? If Rs 31 could be moral, Rs 51 is also moral. But if Rs 31 is moral and Rs 51 is not moral, that means, morality changes in Rs 20. If a comparison is to be made between the standard of living of the poorest man in the street and that of ourselves, then, how are you justified in taking Rs. 31? Is every person in this country getting Rs. 31? You do not think of it when you are taking Rs 31. Therefore, I submit that the yardstick is not that. When there are provisions in the Constitution regarding the oppressed people, the oppressed people and various other classes and categories of people for their upliftment, we are doing it. When we talk of Members of Parliament we have to consider the situation *vis-a-vis* Members of Parliament only. It is no use making comparisons. I know probably his speech was meant to be political but I do not want to say that. I do not want to doubt his honesty or the integrity of his purpose...

**SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) :** You have already said it.

**SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH :** Then some honourable Members by way of an amendment said, "Why not have a clause allowing people, who do not want to take, not to take." Generally we include a clause only when but for that clause you cannot do a thing. But there is nothing in the law

on this matter which requires that every Member must take everything that is provided in the Bill. It is even now with the clause or without the clause open to any Member not to take. If he does not want to take, he need not take the facility. There is no compulsion. Nobody is going to compel you to avail of a facility, if you do not want to take Rs. 51, do not take it. If you think that you can discharge your functions ably and efficiently with only Rs. 31 or with only Rs. 21 or with only Rs. 10 or even with only Rs. 5, in view of your sympathy and affection for the poorer classes of the community, please do not take it. There is nothing in the law that requires you to take it. No amendment is required. I am sure the legal pundits, those honourable Members who are lawyers, also will approve of my statement that no such amendment is necessary.

Then, objection was taken to the provision of Rs. 51 on the ground that the terms of reference were only for allowances and a reference was made to a ruling made by the Speaker of the Lok Sabha that they should only concern themselves with facilities to Members and not their salaries and allowances. I think in the Joint Committee when this matter was brought to the notice of the Committee, the Committee felt that it was open to it, notwithstanding what the Speaker of the Lok Sabha observed, to make its own recommendations. And its recommendations have been of two types—one unanimous and the other by a majority vote. And when the matter came again before the General Purposes Committee of the Lok Sabha it was felt that now that the Committee made certain recommendations, it was open to the Government to formulate such proposals as it liked in the light of the recommendations. And that is what the Government has done. It is not as though the Government is doing this in pursuance of any particular direction from anybody. It is after taking into account the Committee's recommendations, and as I said, also after seeing the difficulties in implementing some of the recommendations

made which I illustrated at the beginning of my speech, that the Government has come to the conclusion that it has done here.

Then, you have my sympathy for the reference made to the widows, widowers and unmarried. I am sure no discrimination is meant by anybody in respect of those honourable Members. What happened is this. After all, children and other dependants any person can have excepting, of course, unmarried persons. A widower can have children. A widow can have children. But if there is a sufficient budgetary provision and if the railways could provide accommodation, none would be happier than all of us here to provide that every member of the family shall be brought. But we are operating in a restricted budgetary provision and therefore, it was thought that for the time being it should be confined to the spouse, because you see if a widow can take her children, if a widower can take his children, a married person will think: why not I also bring my children here? Originally a suggestion was made in the Lok Sabha by some Members that a Member should be enabled to bring all the members of his family once a year. That was the original suggestion made. Then it was considered what was really practicable and what was really possible considering the provision in the railways and other conditions. It was then thought that the provision that has been made in the Bill is the only possible one now. And no discrimination, I can assure you, is meant against anybody who is not covered by it.

Then, one honourable Member raised a point about 'during a session', that is in relation to the provision of a pass for the spouse. It is not the intention that the pass will be issued only after the commencement of a session or before the completion of a session. That is not the intention at all. The intention is that the pass should be available for each session. Originally the idea was that it shall be once a year. But then when it came to discussion in the Lok Sabha,

[Shri G. A. Appan]  
it was felt that this facility should be given in respect of each particular session. If there are four sessions in a year, four times, in respect of each session, the spouse can come and go. That is the intention. I hope there will be no difficulty in obtaining these passes in advance of a session or during a session or after the completion of a session for the return journey. That is really the intention. One of the Members said: "Why anywhere in India?". I had already explained. The provision as it stands refers to the place of residence. It has been felt by some members that this is an unsatisfactory provision because, supposing a man has his usual place of residence at Madras and now he does not want to go to Madras and only wants to go up to Hyderabad which is an intermediate station, as the provision now stands, either he has to tell a lie that he went to Madras and came back or he cannot take advantage of the provision although it is advantageous to the Government because less money is involved. Then it was originally drafted in the Lok Sabha as 'either to his place of residence or constituency or any place in the State in which he has the place of residence'. But then somebody said, suppose some work relating to the Member's constituency was there in Bombay, why not he go there? It is not as if you get both DA and this. It is an existing facility according to which you lose the DA but get your fare up to full rate. Members from the South represented that during a Budget Session which is for 3 months there and which is split into two here, it would be a great hardship for them if they could go home only twice during the entire session. So it was felt that it should be increased to four times. That is one of the unanimous recommendations. Even about the Committees about which reference was made, that is also one of the recommendations made unanimously. After all, if the Committee lasts for a day, may I ask the Member where is the time for him to go all over India and come back? Therefore it postulates that there must

be such an occasion as to be able to go during the sittings of the Committee. I am sure Members will not abuse that privilege and Members are expected to be honourable. As regards the suggestion of Mr. Bhargava to give first class instead of third class, there were certain suggestions.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : It is the discrimination that I object to.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMARIAH : The discrimination is a way of looking at life. If my friend thinks looking at the measure in the way he looks, there is discrimination, I may say that actually we have not tried to make any discrimination.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : It is obvious

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH : Not to me. Anyway there is no such intention to make any discrimination between one Member and another. If I explain the reason why this third class pass is introduced, perhaps my friend will agree with me. It was never meant as a discrimination.

SHRI AWADESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : You may speak on it when the amendment comes.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH : Thank you for the suggestion but it is better I finish because I must give the background of the clause. Originally some Members in the Lok Sabha wanted the 'A' class pass available in the Railways to some of the officers enabling the officers to go by air-conditioned coach by paying one-third of the difference and then also to take some extra maunds of luggage. That was the thing which the Members wanted. It was considered in consultation with the Railway Ministry. It was felt that we do not have sufficient air-conditioned coaches to cater to all the Members and we do not want to make some Members feel that discrimination is being made. It is exactly to avoid discrimination because if you provide coaches only to some and not to others, that is discrimination. So in order to

avoid discrimination they said that it is not possible. In any case that facility I am told, has been stopped in respect of new entrants to the services and it is available only to the old people. Therefore, instead of that, it was suggested that some of the Members would like to have somebody to assist them. It was said that one could have as well said : 'an attendant' Suppose a relation comes, why make the Member tell a lie and say that he is taking an attendant. So we thought it is much better to say 'a person'. There again it was not to make any distinction but it is to avoid a distinction being made between one Member and another and provide some Members with air-conditioned accommodation denying it to others. Sir, I move.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The House divided.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Ayes—83 ; Noes—16.

AYES—83.

Ahmad, Shri Syed  
Anandam, Shri M.  
Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati  
Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal  
Chaudhri, Shri N. P.  
Chavda, Shri K. S.  
Chengalvaroyan, Shri T.  
Chetia, Shri P.  
Desai, Shri Suresh J.  
Deshmukh, Shri T. G.  
Gilbert, Shri A. C.  
Gujral, Shri I. K.  
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal  
Hussain, Shri Syed  
Jadhav, Sardar D. K.  
Jagarlamudi, Shri Chandramouli  
Kemparaj, Shri B. T.

Khaitan, Shri R. P.  
Kollur, Shri M. L.  
Kothari, Prof. Shantilal  
Krishan Kant, Shri  
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas  
Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati  
Mahanti, Shri B. K.  
Mahavir, Dr. Bhai  
Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.  
Mani, Shri A. D.  
Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Kumari  
Mariswamy, Shri S. S.  
Mehta, Shri Om  
Mishra, Shri L. N.  
Misra, Shri Lokanath  
Mitra, Shri P. C.  
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.  
Mohta, Shri M. K.  
Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja  
Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed  
Muhammad Ishaque, Shri  
Muniswamy, Shri N. R.  
Musafir, Shri Gurumukh Singh  
Narayanappa, Shri Sanda  
Neki Ram, Shri  
Pande, Shri Tarkeshwar  
Panjhazari, Sardar Raghubir Singh  
Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.  
Patel, Shri T. K.  
Patil, Shri G. R.  
Patil, Shri P. S.  
Patra, Shri N.  
Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati  
Punnaiah, Shri Kota  
Purkayastha, Shri M.  
Puttappa, Shri Patil  
Ramiah, Dr. K.  
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama  
Reddy, Shri Nagi  
Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana  
Sahai, Shri Ram  
Samuel, Shri M. H.  
Sanjivayya, Shri D.



Satyavati Dang, Shrimati  
 Savnekar, Shri B. S.  
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad  
 Sherkhani, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani  
 Shukla, Shri M. P.  
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati  
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder  
 Singh, Raja Shankar Pratap  
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad  
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.  
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh  
 Sur, Shri M. M.  
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.  
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad  
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.  
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati  
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.  
 Varma, Shri C. L.  
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati  
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra  
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati

## NOES—16

Barbora, Shri G.  
 Basu, Shri Chitta  
 Bhadram, Shri M. V.  
 Chandrasekharan, Shri K.  
 Choudhury, Shri Suhrid Mullick  
 Gupta, Shri Balkrishna  
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh  
 Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri  
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.  
 Mokherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar  
 Murahari, Shri Godey  
 Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan  
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda  
 Rajnarain, Shri  
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda  
 Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of

the Bill. The hon. Members present may please move their amendments. Amendment No. 18 by Mr. Rajnarain is a negative amendment and so barred. He may speak on the Clause, Clause 2.

*Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3.*

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : I move :

1. "That at page 1, line 10, for the words 'fifty-one rupees' the words 'thirty-two rupees' be substituted."

SHRI RAJNARAIN : I move :

19. "That at page 1, line 10, for the words 'fifty-one rupees' the words 'thirty-one rupees and one naya paisa' be substituted."

*The questions were proposed.*

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not want to make another speech. I have already explained the reasons why I am opposing it. I am not opposing the entire thing; let there be this much nominal increase from thirty-one rupees to thirty-two rupees.

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है, एक नई प्रथा चल रही है, चले, मगर हमको डिलीट करने का पूरा अधिकार है। श्रीमन्, मैं यह समझता था कि इस सदन की परिपाटी कि मुताबिक यह कहा जायेगा कि इसको निकाल दिया जाय। यह मूव नहीं कर सकता लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि सभ्य संसदीय परम्परा में 'इसको निकाल दिया जाये' इसको मान्यता मिलनी चाहिए। पहला अमेंडमेंट हमने इसीलिए दिया था कि दूसरे क्लॉज को निकाल दिया जाये लेकिन आपने कहा तुम यह मूव नहीं कर सकते तो हमने यह कह दिया कि अगर यह न हाँ तो दूसरा संशोधन हमारा यह है कि जहाँ 51 रुपया लिखा हुआ है वहाँ 31 रुपया और 1 नया पैसा कर दिया जाये। (Interruption.) अगर अनाश्यक ढंग से कोई सरकारी पक्ष के लोग यहाँ पर विवाद को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो दूसरी बात है। शुरू में जब यहाँ पर चर्चा चली थी

तो उस दिन की कार्यवाही को मंगा कर देख लिया जाये, मैंने बराबर कहा कि जो तनख्वाह बढ़ेगी वह मैं नहीं लूंगा। बाद में कांग्रेस पार्टी के हिप और हमारे शुभचिन्तक कहने लगे कि राजनारायण बाबू आपने केवल सेलरी कहा है, आपने भत्ता नहीं कहा है, सेलरी बढ़ नहीं रही है, भत्ता बढ़ रहा है, तो आप अपने कथन के मुताबिक सही रहेंगे भत्ता ले लीजिए। तो हमने जब अपने से अकेले सोचा कि जब मैं सेलरी कह रहा था तो हमारे दिमाग में भत्ता था या नहीं, तीन बार हमने कहा, बराबर सेलरी कहता चला गया। (Interruptions.)

बदामजी मत करो, बेहैया कहीं के। मगर जब हमने सेलरी कहा तो हमारे दिमाग में भत्ता भी था, इसलिए बढ़ा हुआ भत्ता मैं नहीं लूंगा। अगर हमारे बड़े हुए भत्ते को न लेने की घोषणा से अब भी शर्म आए तो इसको वापिस ले लो।

एक सदनীয় सदस्य : 31 तो लें ?

श्री राजनारायण : अब मैं यह देखता हूँ कि बेहैयाई वह जो सिर पर चढ़ कर बोले। ये बेहैया लोग मान नहीं रहे हैं। अगर 31 मेरे जमाने में बढ़ा होता तो मैं उसकी भी मुखालिफत करता। ये जो राजनीति के दुधमूँहे बच्चे, गबरू आए हैं नए नए उनको मैं बता देना चाहता हूँ कि 1964 में हमने 15 दिन की भूख हड़ताल की थी जब यू० पी० में 10 रुपए की जगह 15 रुपए दैनिक भत्ता और 200 रुपए की जगह 300 रुपए मासिक तनख्वाह सदस्यों की बढ़ी थी। लोहिया जी थे उन्होंने आकर किसी न किसी तरह हमारी भूख हड़ताल को तुड़वाया क्योंकि विश्वनाथ दास जी ने कहा कि इस पर हम स्वीकृति नहीं देंगे। फिर 1956 में उत्तर प्रदेश में सम्पूर्णानन्द जी मुख्य मंत्री थे, 1957 के चुनाव में कांग्रेस पार्टी को खिलाने के लिए कह दिया कि 9 दिन का दैनिक भत्ता मिलता रहेगा चाहे सदन में रहो या न रहो। हमने घोषित कर दिया कि वह 9 दिन का दैनिक भत्ता नहीं लूंगा, बराबर नहीं लिया। सम्पूर्णानन्द जी हैयादार थे, उन्होंने 1957 के चुनाव के बाद कहा कि

राजनारायण ने मुझे बाध्य कर दिया, मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस 9 दिन के दैनिक भत्ते को वापिस ले लूँ और वे अमेंडमेंट लाए और उत्तर प्रदेश का 9 दिन का दैनिक भत्ता जो सदन की सेवा न करे उसको मिलता था वह सम्पूर्णानन्द जी ने वापिस ले लिया। मैं अब फिर डके की चोट पर कहता हूँ कि ये जो भत्ता 20 रुपया बढ़ रहा है इसको मैं नहीं लूंगा (Time bell rings.) श्रीमन्, आप घंटी न बजाइए। यह हमारी आत्मा की आवाज है। हमें जिस पाप में फंसाया जा रहा है उसमें हम फंसना नहीं चाहते।

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल : दूसरे पाप में फंस रहे हो।

श्री राजनारायण : डाह्याभाई, आप हमारी भावना को समझ नहीं सकते। जाके पांव न फटी बिवाई, वह क्या जानें पीर पराई। डाह्याभाई समझ नहीं सकते कि किसके प्रति यह हमारी भावना है और मंत्री हंस रहा है, मुस्करा रहा है। मैं यह कह रहा था कि हमने अपने राज्य सभा के सचिव से इस पर चर्चा की कि मान लो बहुमत, संख्या बल पर 31 का 51 हो गया और मैं नहीं लूंगा, वहाँ पर भाव जी भी थे, उन्होंने कहा कि आप लिख दो, दो विल बन जाएंगे एक 31 का एक 20, जिस पर आप साइन कर देंगे वह चला जायेगा। यह मंत्री कह रहा है कि नहीं, आप जो नहीं लेना चाहेंगे वह नहीं होगा। तो मैं चाहूँगा कि मंत्री कानून की जानकारी करें। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई न कोई ऐसा प्रावजन बने कि जो सदस्य 31 रुपया ही लेना चाहते हैं उनका 31 रुपया ही दैनिक भत्ता बने, 51 न बने। इस तरह का प्रावजन सरकार को सफाई से रखना चाहिए। केवल मंत्री का यहां बयान कानून की शक्ल नहीं लेगा।

श्रीमन्, एक बात मुझे बहुत ही चिन्ता के साथ कहनी पड़ रही है। हमारा यह मंत्री हंस रहा है, मुझे रघुरंभया से कुछ मुहब्बत है क्योंकि इनके नाम के साथ राम लगा है। इन्होंने क

[श्री राजनारायण]

दिया कि 31 से परेशान नहीं होते तो 51 से क्यों होते हैं। अगर मंत्री मात्रा भेद और गुण भेद का फर्क समझ ले—Quantity changes into quality and, quality changes into quantity. मात्रा भेद से गुण भेद और गुण भेद से मात्रा भेद यही भौतिक द्वन्द्ववाद का सिद्धान्त है। 31 लेते थे 20 और बढ़ गया। यह मंत्री किसी दिन यह कह सकता है कि जैसे 51 वैसे 510। वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, आपके द्वारा मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री जी को देश की गरीबी का इस सनय जान नहीं है। इस समय मंत्री जी मज्जाक में हैं, ये हंस रहे हैं और इन्हें जितनी हंसी आ रही है मुझे उतना क्रोध आ रहा है। हम इतने बेहैया हो गये हैं कि हम पाप भी कर रहे हैं, गरीब जनता की कमाई का शोषण कर रहे हैं और हम हंस भी रहे हैं। और तर्क क्या दिया मंत्री ने? अगर हम नहीं बढ़ायेंगे तो कीन बढ़ाएगा, पार्लियामेंट अपने मेम्बरों के लिए कानून नहीं बनाएगी तो कीन बताएगा? कानून बनयेगी पार्लियामेंट मगर उस कानून को बनाने की आवश्यकता है क्या इस बात को देखेगी जनता। अगर मंत्रियों को यह घमंड है कि उनका कानून जनता की तारीफ के साथ चलता है तो मंत्री जी आज इसको वापिस ले लें और जनता के बीच इसको दो महीने के लिए घुमा दें और फिर देखें कि जनता की क्या राय आती है। हम श्रीमन्, यहां पर कहना चाहते हैं कि अक्सर लोग बड़े बड़े लोगों का नाम लेते हैं। आज जब हम इस विधेयक पर बोल रहे हैं तो हमारे सामने क्राइस्ट आ रहा है। क्राइस्ट ने कहा है कि अगर हमारे पास दो कुर्तें हों और किसी दूसरे के पास कुछ न हो तो एक उसे दे दो, अपने पास एक ही रखो और यह मंत्री क्या कह रहा है कि अगर तेरे पास 31 है और 50 करोड़ के पास नहीं हैं तो उनसे और छीन लो और अपने 31 के 51 कर लो। यह बेहैयायी की सीमा है।

श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज मंत्री ने जो उधर समा

बांधा उससे मालूम होता है कि अब हमारे लिए रुपये की वक्रांत है। जिसको जितना ज्यादा रुपया मिले वह उतना ही बड़ा माना जाता है। तो मैं मंत्री जी से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि रुपये की वक्रांत है या काम की वक्रांत है। नंगे रह कर, लुंगी लपेट कर, गंजी पहन कर अगर देश की सेवा करनी है गांधीजी का नाम लेने वालों, तो गांधीजी की पोशाक को अपनाओ। श्रीमन्, मैं महाभारत की एक कथा सुना देना चाहता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): You had made your original speech. You are now speaking on the amendment. You have to be very brief.

श्री राजनारायण : अमेंडमेंट के बाहर मैं नहीं जा रहा हूँ।

उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपल्ल ठेंगड़ी) : लेकिन आपको ब्रीफ होना चाहिए। आपको केवल क्लार्क के बारे में बोलना है।

श्री राजनारायण : इस तरह से हम चलेंगे नहीं चले आप हमको निकलवा दीजिए। आप हमको नेम करें और उसके बाद हम निकल जाना पसंद करेंगे, मगर आज अपनी वाणी को रोक सकने में मैं असमर्थ हूँ। क्योंकि देश की जनता चिल्ला चिल्ला कर कह रही है कि इस काले कानून का पर्दा खोलो, इसकी नकाब को खोलो। इसीलिए यहां पर आया हूँ। मैं महाभारत की एक कथा आपको सुनाता हूँ। (Interruption.) मैं तो बैठंगा नहीं। मैं ज्यादा विवाद नहीं चाहता। अगर सदन के लोग सुनने को तैयार नहीं हैं तो आप अपने मार्शल को बुलाइये और मार्शल से मुझे निकलवाइये। पाप भी करो, अपराध भी करो और यहां पर पार्लियामेंटरी गुंडई भी करो। मैं महाभारत की एक कथा आपको सुना देता हूँ। एक भिखारी या और एक अकिंचन् व्यक्ति। उस अकिंचन् ने कई दिन का उपवास किया। उस व्यक्ति ने जिस दिन अपना उपवास तोड़ा तो उस दिन किसी ने उसको थोड़ा सा सत्तू भेज दिया कि तुम अपना उपवास इसी से तोड़ो। उसके पास

कोई और चीज नहीं थी। उसी समय एक भिखारी आया और उसने कहा कि मुझे भूख लगी है। वह अपना उपवास तोड़ने जा रहा था, मगर जब भिखारी आ गया तो उसने कहा कि ठीक है, आधा सत्तू तुम खा लो, आधा हम खा लेंगे। भिखारी ने आधा सत्तू खा लेने के बाद कहा कि मेरा तो पेट भरा नहीं, इस पर उसने कहा कि और आधा ले लो। लेकिन इस प्रकार वह भिखारी सारा सत्तू खा गया और फिर भी वह कहता रहा कि मेरा पेट नहीं भरा। अंत में उसने अपनी थाली को धोया और उसका पानी गिरा दिया। एक नेवला उसी स्थान पर जहां उसने थाली का पानी धो कर गिराया था, संयोग से लोट गया और उसका आधा अंग, जो उस पानी से भीग गया था जो कि उस थाली का पानी था उसमें लोटने के कारण, सोने का हो गया। बाद में राजा युधिष्ठिर ने यज्ञ किया, महायज्ञ किया तो वह नेवला राजा युधिष्ठिर के यज्ञ में भी गया वहां बहुत जूठा पानी पड़ा था। उसने सोचा कि यदि यहां के पानी में मैं लोटूं तो मेरा बाकी का शरीर भी सोने का हो जायेगा। लेकिन वहां लोटने से उसका बाकी का आधा शरीर सोने का नहीं हुआ। तो एक चक्रवर्ती राजा के गिराये हुए पानी में और एक गरीब के गिराये हुए पानी में देखिये यह अंतर है। महाभारत की कथा से इस सरकार को ज्ञान लेना चाहिए। मैं हैरत में पड़ा हुआ हूं कि हम जब तक एम० पी० नहीं थे तब तक हमारी बीबी कहीं रहती थी, हमारी बहिन कहीं रहती थी, हमारा बेटा कहीं रहता था और उससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता था, लेकिन जिस दिन से हम एम० पी० हो गये उस दिन से हमारी बहिन भी साथ रहे, हमारी बीबी भी साथ रहे, हमारा बेटा भी साथ रहे, तो यह तपस्या का जगह है श्रीमन्, कमाने की जगह नहीं है। यह बैंक बैलेंस बढ़ाने की जगह नहीं है, यह तपस्या की जगह है। अगर लोक कल्याण के लिए जन सेवक बनते हो तो जन सेवक बनो और उसके लिए कुछ कष्ट सहो, कुछ मुसीबत सहो और मुसीबत सह कर आगे बढ़ो तभी काम होगा।

**उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी):** वाइंड अप कीजिए। आप अमेंडमेंट पर कितना बोलेंगे? अभी आप बैठिए। काइंडली सिट डाउन।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं चाहता हूं कि मैं आप के आदेश को मानूं, मगर मैं आपसे इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि अगर आप दो मिनट की बात कहेंगे तो हमको अपने संसदीय कर्तव्य को निभाने के लिए कहीं ऐसा न कहना पड़े कि श्रीमन्, इस समय मैं आपकी आज्ञा को मानने से इन्कार करता हूं। हमारा यही एक संशोधन है, यही मूल संशोधन है यही संसद् के सदस्यों का भत्ता बढ़ रहा है।

**उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी):** आपने इस पर काफी बोला है। अब आप बैठिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं यह इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि लोग समझें कि यह 31 से 51 क्यों नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं यहां पर बहुत ही सफाई से कहना चाहता हूं कि यह 31 रुपये से 51 रुपये भत्ता हो रहा है यह भारतीय संस्कृति पर कुठाराघात है। हमने अपने मित्र वर्मा जी को सुना। बहुत से लोग जो भारतीय संस्कृति की दुहाई देते हैं मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या उन्होंने उपनिषद् देखा है, क्या उन्होंने गीता देखी है, क्या उन्होंने पतंजलि को देखा है, क्या उन्होंने महाभारत को पढ़ा है? पतंजलि का श्लोक है

‘समम् अजन्ति जनाः अस्मिन् समाजः’

समाज वही है जहां जन जन में समता का व्यवहार हो। उपनिषद् कहता है :

‘समतया आजः प्रकाशः यस्यः’

समता के द्वारा जो प्रकाशित हो वही समाज है। और रामायण कहती है :

‘वर न कर काहू सन कोई,  
राम प्रताप विषमता खोई’

राम के राज्य में ... नुप्त थी, तब कोई किसी से ... करता था। इसलिए मैं बहुत

[श्री राजनारायण]

ही अवधि के साथ आपके द्वारा सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह घमंड न करे। वह अनावश्यक तर्कों को वितंडावादी स्वरूप न दे। तर्कों को साफ करे और हमारे इस संशोधन को माने। या तो वह कोई निकाल दिया जाये और अगर वह उसको रखना ही चाहते हैं तो उनके संशोधन के रूप में 31 रुपये की जगह 31 रुपया 1 नया पैसा रखा जाये। यह भी प.प है, मगर चूंकि आपके यहां प्रथा में है कि कोई न कोई संशोधन होना ही चाहिए इसलिए मजबूर होकर एक खानापुरी के लिए न चाहते हुए भी मैंने 31 रुपये 1 नया पैसा 51 रुपये की जगह रखने का संशोधन किया है।

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I want to say a few words on this amendment.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): Kindly take your seat, The Minister will reply now.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Can't I express my views on this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sir, let her have a few minutes.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Sir, I appreciate the sincerity and honesty of Mr. Rajnarain in moving this amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a very sincere man.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I never doubt it either inside the House or outside. Whatever the reasons, quite a lot of Members on this side and that side of the House are not able to accept what Mr. Rajnarain has said. They have said that even if this is passed they would not take more. May I make a suggestion and appeal to the Minister—it may not be possible now to introduce any amendment here—that Members who do not want to take more than Rs. 31 and those who have voted against it may write to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat that they

would not draw the extra sum. Let the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs next year find out how many Members have not taken this and if he feels that there is a lot of people who do not want this he can bring an amendment next year. Otherwise with all the sincerity behind it I do not think we can accept the amendment.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for the reasons which I have explained at length—and I have given very good reasons as to why Government have agreed to give Rs. 51 D. A. instead of Rs. 31 I oppose the amendment. Before I sit down I would like to say this. I am very grateful to Shri Rajnarain for the statement he made that he has great affection for me. May I reciprocate that? But there is only one difference. There are various ways of showing affection. Some show it by a little beat of the drum, some by brandishing a stick, like an old man, and some do it with a smile, and that is the only reason why I smile.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): The question is:

1. "That at page 1, line 10, for the words 'fifty-one rupees' the words 'thirty-two rupees' be substituted."

*The motion was negatived.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): The question is:

19. "That at page 1 line 10, for the words 'fifty-one rupees' the words 'thirty-one rupees and one naya paisa' be substituted."

*The House divided.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): Ayes 11; Noes—85.

AYES—11

Barbora, Shri G.

Basu, Shri Chitta

Bhadram, Shri M. V.

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh

Gupta, Shri Bhupesh

Kesavan (Tazhava), Shri  
Mahavir, Dr. Bhai  
Mokherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar  
Murahari, Shri Godey  
Rajnarain, Shri  
Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant

## NOES—85

Ahmad, Shri Syed  
Anandam, Shri M.  
Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shri-  
mati  
Bhargava, Shri M. P.  
Bobdey, Shri S. B.  
Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprosad  
Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal  
Chavda, Shri K. S.  
Chengalvaroyan, Shri T.  
Chetia, Shri P.  
Deshmukh, Shri T. G.  
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar  
Doogar, Shri R. S.  
Gilbert, Shri A. C.  
Gujral, Shri I. K.  
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal  
Hussain, Shri Syed  
Jadhav, Sardar D. K.  
Jagarlamudi, Shri Chandramouli  
Kemparaj, Shri B. T.  
Khaitan, Shri R. P.  
Kollur, Shri M. L.  
Kothari, Prof. Shantilal  
Krishan Kant, Shri  
Kulkarni, Shri A. G.  
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas  
Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati  
Mahanti, Shri B. K.  
Mahida, Shri U. N.  
Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.  
Mani, Shri A. D.  
Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Kumari  
Mariswamy, Shri S. S.  
Mehta, Shri Om  
Mishra, Shri L. N.  
Misra, Shri Lokanath

Misra, Shri S. D.  
Mitra, Shri P. C.  
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.  
Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja  
Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed  
Muhammad Ishaque, Shri  
Muniswamy, Shri N. R.  
Musafir, Shri Gurumukh Singh  
Narayanappa, Shri Sanda  
Neki Ram, Shri  
Pande, Shri Tarkeshwar  
Panjhzari, Sardar Raghbir Singh  
Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.  
Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.  
Patel, Shri T. K.  
Patil, Shri P. S.  
Patra, Shri N.  
Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati  
Punnaiah, Shri Kota  
Purkayastha, Shri M.  
Ramiah, Dr. K.  
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama  
Reddy, Shri Nagi  
Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana  
Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.  
Sahai, Shri Ram  
Samuel, Shri M. H.  
Sanjivayya, Shri D.  
Satyavati Dang, Shrimati  
Savnekar, Shri B. S.  
Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad  
Sherkhan, Shri  
Shukla, Shri Chakrapani  
Singh, Shri Bhupinder  
Singh, Raja Shankar Pratap  
Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad  
Sinha, Shri B. K. P.  
Sur, Shri M. M.  
Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.  
Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad  
Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.  
Usha Barthakur, Shrimati  
Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.

Varma, Shri C. L.

Vero, Shri M.

Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati

Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra

Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati

*The motion was negatived.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 3—Amendment of section 5*

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Sir, I move :

4. "That at page 2, at the end of line 10, after the words 'sitting of the committee' the words 'meeting continuously for more than ten days' be inserted."

SHRI G. A. APPAN : Sir, I move :

14. "That at page 2, at the end of line 10, after the word 'committee' the words 'lasting continuously for more than fifteen days excluding Sundays and intervening holidays' be inserted."

15. "That at page 2, after line 10 the following further proviso be inserted, namely :—

'Provided also that a Member shall be entitled to one journey by air if the session lasts for at least ten days and he shall be entitled to two journeys by air if the session lasts for more than twenty days up to a maximum period of forty-five days.'

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Amendment No. 20 is negative.

*The questions were proposed.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : I seek the co-operation of the House. I think we shall sit a little longer and finish this business.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like the House to see clause 3, which reads :—

"Provided further that nothing in the first proviso shall apply, if the Member performs the journey by air for visiting any place in India—

(c) not more than once during a sitting of the committee."

There is no restriction about the time of sitting of the committee. Suppose I come to attend a committee meeting which is to be held day after tomorrow. Am I entitled to reach here today and go back tomorrow and come back again? Obviously this cannot be the intention. It should be specified, viz., for not less than fifteen days or twenty days or one month. I have suggested that it should be at least for ten days. If the committee meets continuously for more than ten days, then a Member shall be entitled to undertake travel by air in between the sitting, not otherwise I am sure this is a very necessary amendment. If the Minister is not in a position to accept it today, he may bring forward later an amendment restricting the period and fixing the time for it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : A Member might come and might not do anything. Why should he get it?

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : This provision seems to have been made for the benefit of the Members of the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee, or other committees which sit continuously for longer periods and which sit from day to day for two weeks or three weeks, or even more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Nobody knows for how long a committee will sit.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : If it is fixed for a period of seven days or

ten days, of course, you will be entitled. If it is only for three or four days, the Member should not be entitled

**SHRI G. A. APPAN :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have moved my amendments not without reason. I entirely agree with the hon. Minister when he says that Members are honourable and that they will behave honourably. I entirely agree with him, but I have known of cases and with regret I have to say it. I have seen some one or two Members simply coming today by air, signing and going back the next day. Mr. Vice-Chairman, further more I have seen some of the Members coming here, signing, going back and coming only after fourteen days. Having seen it, my heart burns to see how far we have kept the trust that is reposed in us. That is why I have put this thing. We do not have any objection if the Members are entitled to free air travel provided they go there and do their job in the constituency, but they do even their own private business and family business. Here that is why, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I say that they may be entitled if the Committee sits for not less than 15 days at a time. Even if we cannot sit for 15 days, why should we be here at all? If we cannot sit for 15 days, we can resign this and go away. If they think that that is a more important job, let them not sit here. Let them go and do their own business, family business and private business. How many people are misusing it? If it is their own constituency business, then at least some good work will be done. I think the hon. Minister will see that this is accepted.

**श्री राजनारायण :** देखिये, मैं अपने कर्तव्य का पालन जरूर कर दूँ कि इस समय जन कोष पर थोड़ी भी वृद्धि मैं देश की मेहनतकश जनता के साथ गहरी समझता हूँ चाहे वह हवाई जहाज से यात्रा की बात हो, चाहे वह फर्स्ट क्लास के दो टिकट या एक अटेंडेंट ले जाने की बात हो, चाहे वह मियाँ बीबी दोनों को साथ लेकर व्यवस्था करने की बात हो, जैसा भी हो, जन कोष पर वृद्धि इस समय

हम गरीब, मेहनतकश दौलत पंदा करने वाली जनता के साथ गहरी और धोखा समझते हैं। इसलिये मैं उन सब बातों का विरोध करता हूँ।

**SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH :** I am sorry that Mr. Rajnarain has used the word 'treachery' because in adopting most of the recommendations the Government has only followed the recommendations of all the Members of the Joint Committee or the recommendations of the majority in most of the cases. Therefore, I am sorry that he used the word 'treachery'. I do not want to say anything more than that. A suggestion has been made whether, if the Committee sits for one day, the Member should go by air though he may not sit in the Committee. The point is here again we have followed what exactly is the unanimous recommendation. It says, "once during a sitting of the committee". If it is a Committee for a day and if on that day he is roaming all day, then obviously he is not sitting in the Committee. As I said at the very outset, it is nothing unnatural to expect that Members will utilise honourably, justly and properly all this facility.

Another question is why should a Member go anywhere in India four times during a session period. Already provision enabling twice is there. As I explained, specially because some come from long distances, from the South even Kashmir, it was felt that the existing provision was not enough. They would like to go back to their constituencies in a long session like that for a larger numbers of times.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I would like to go to Mysore, for example.

**SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH :** You can go . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I would like to go and see Mysore which has produced Mr. Nijalingappa.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** How does Mysore come in here?



SHRI K. RAGHURAMIAH : So far as the provisions of the Bill are concerned, there is no objection to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta going to Mysore, but whether he is welcome there is a matter for him to ascertain. The reason I have given is, Members felt that the words "usual place of residence" are too restricted and sometimes compel Members to say something which is not true. We did not want to do that. We did not want to put Members in that difficulty.

Sir, I oppose all the amendments.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment (No. 4).

*\*Amendment No. 4 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The question is :

14. "That at page 2, at the end of line 10, after the word 'committee' the words 'lasting continuously for more than fifteen days excluding Sundays and intervening holidays' be inserted."

*The motion was negatived.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The question is :

15. "That at page 2, after line 10, the following further proviso be inserted namely :—

'Provided also that a Member shall be entitled to one journey by air if the session lasts for at least ten days and he shall be entitled to two journeys by air if the session lasts for more than twenty days up to a maximum period of forty-five days.'

*The motion was negatived.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The question is :

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*\*For text of the amendment, vide col. 4035 supra.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 4 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 5—Insertion of new section 6A*

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Sir, I move :

7. "That at page 2, for lines 22 and 23, the following be substituted, namely :—

'(ii) to one free first class railway pass for any member of the family to accompany the member when he travels by rail; and'

8. "That at page 2, lines 24 to 27 be deleted."

SHRI GANESHI LAL CHAUDHARY (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I move :

9. "That at page 2, line 25, after the word 'spouse' the words 'or any member of the family' be inserted."

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : I have explained my point of view while speaking earlier, and the hon. Minister said that he would look into it and arrange with the railway authorities that passes would be available for Members to bring their spouse whenever they come, whether it is three days or four days, or long in advance or after the session is over. In view of this assurance I do not move my amendment.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Sir, I move :

11. "That at page 2—

(i) in line 30, for the words 'in third class, by virtue of the free third class railway pass' the words 'in first class, by virtue of the free first class railway pass' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 32, for the words 'third class' the words 'first class' be substituted."

**SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY:** Sir, I move :

12. "That at page 2, after line 34, the following proviso be inserted, namely :—

'Provided further that where a Member desires to take another person in the first class instead of in the third class by virtue of the free third class railway pass referred to in clause (ii) above, he may do so on payment of the difference between the railway fares for first class and third class.'

**SHRI G. A. APPAN:** Sir, I move :

16. "That at page 2, line 23, after the words 'travels by rail' the words 'to attend the Session and returns therefrom, if the Session is scheduled to last for not less than fifteen days' be inserted."

17. "That at page 2, lines 25-26, for the words 'the usual place of residence of the Member to Delhi and back' the words 'usual place of residence of the Member to Delhi or any other place and back while he travels on business of the House or to attend a meeting of a Committee or a Council' be substituted."

*The questions were proposed.*

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would be very brief. I have explained at length the purpose of my amendment. It is only to assert our right that I am moving this amendment that the third class pass be changed into first class. That will enable the hon. Members who want to travel by air-conditioned class to go almost free in air-conditioned class, and when they want to go with their family, they can travel with one of their family in first class. I do not want any discrimination between one Member of Parliament and another Member of Parliament, and that is the purpose of my amendment.

It is being said that if this Bill is not passed today, it will never be

passed. I do not agree with that view. They say that it will have to go back to Lok Sabha and Lok Sabha may not pass it. I do not agree with this view because whether we pass the Bill today or we pass the Bill in November, the rights of the Members are not being affected in any way because the increased daily allowance will be paid to us with retrospective effect from the 16th May, 1969. Therefore, what I want is that every Member should think about his right and exercise his vote judiciously and in a manner befitting the rights of Members of Parliament. It is not a matter where a whip has to be issued and Members have to obey the whip. That is what I want to make clear. And every Member is free to exercise his right and it is a fight for the right, and nothing else. If hon. Members are not agreeable to these amendments, I say that the entire clause 5 of the amending Bill be deleted so that there is no discrimination between Member and Member. Either of the courses is acceptable to me.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** What is the net effect of your amendment?

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** The net effect is that instead of one first class, Members will be entitled to two first classes.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Why not a whole train?

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** Just hear me. We have to decide the basic issue, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, whether the Members of Parliament are to be allowed air-conditioned travel or not. If they are not to be allowed, I have nothing to say. But if they are to be allowed, I cannot stand any discrimination between the rich Members of Parliament and the poor Members of Parliament. That is the object and purpose of the amendment and it is for every Member to decide whether he wants his right to be asserted or not.

**श्री गणेशी लाल चौधरी :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस अपने संशोधन द्वारा यह चाहता

[श्री गणेशी लाल चौधरी]  
हू कि "स्पाउस" शब्द जो है, जहा वह इस धारा के अन्दर है, उसको परिभाषा में परिवर्तन कर दिया जाये। मैं यह बात इसलिए कहता हूँ कि अभी मैंने माननीय मंत्री जी को सुना तो उन्होंने एक बात कही कि विडोअर, विडोअ और बेचलरों के लिए यह लाभकारी नहीं होगा। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके द्वारा माननीय मंत्री जी को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में कई तरह की पद्धतियाँ अभी भी चल रही हैं। आज हमारे देश में पर्सनल ला है और यह एक सिक्युलर देश है। पर्सनल ला होने के कारण एक आदमी एक स्त्री के होते हुए दूसरी स्त्री से शादी कर सकता है। वह दो-दो या चार-चार शादियाँ भी कर सकता है। हमारे मुसलमान भाई चार-चार शादियाँ कर सकते हैं और इस तरह से कानून के द्वारा वे चार स्त्रियों को रख सकते हैं।

हमारे देश में ऐसे कानून हैं जिनकी वजह से बहुपति की प्रथा चल रही है। देश में कुछ ऐसे भी स्थान हैं जहाँ पर एक स्त्री कई पतियों को भी रख सकती है। विडोअर, विडोअर और बेचलर की बात तो मैं नहीं कहता हूँ, यह तो झगडा करने की बात घर में हो जाएगी। अगर कोई एक स्त्री को ले गया तो दूसरी स्त्री झगडा करेगी और इस तरह में मेरे खयाल में माननीय सदस्यों को यहाँ पर अपने काम करने में बाधा पहुँचेगी। ऐसी कई स्त्रियाँ हैं जो अपने एक पति को तो दिल्ली लाएँगी और दूसरे पति को वहीं पर छोड़ आएँगी। इस तरह की कार्यवाही से दोनों के आपस में झगडा बढ़ जायेगा और इस तरह सदस्यों को सदन के काम करने में बाधा पहुँचेगी।

इसलिए मैं आशा करता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी मेरे मुझाव को मान लेंगे।

**SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY:** Sir, I have tabled two amendments. In the First Reading stage itself, I have said about the spouse. We have got spinners, bachelors, widows and widowers and if these three or four categories of persons are denied the opportunity

of taking any escort with them, it will be doing injustice to them, apart from being discriminatory. Mr. Bhargava was saying about the deletion of clause 5. I agree with him, provided these things are not accepted. I have said that instead of 'spouse' you can have 'any member of the family'.

The other amendment I have moved is based on the amendment of the Government. It says—

"Provided further that where a Member desires to take another person in the first class instead of in the third class by virtue of the free third class railway pass referred to in clause (ii) above, he may do so on payment of the difference between the railway fares for first class and third class"

They have provided that first class can be converted into air-conditioned class by payment of the difference between them and one is allowed to travel in the air-conditioned class. Similarly, if a third-class entitled person is to travel in the first class, then that free third class pass given should be converted into money value and he can carry the free pass for third class but can travel in the first class by paying the difference between the first class and third class fares, as you do in the case of conversion from first class to air-conditioned class. It should be on the same analogy. It is not allowed. (*Interruptions*) My friend says that it is being allowed. As a matter of fact, it was allowed. We could always travel by air-conditioned class by paying the difference between first class and air-conditioned class. Now there is some objection from the Audit Department that it should not be permitted. Now that you make a provision that it can be converted, we can give the cash value by paying the difference. In those days in 1956-57, when we were being given free passes, we were allowed to travel even by aeroplane by paying the difference between the first class and air fare. From there to Delhi it was Rs. 190 by air, by first class it was Rs. 120. We can pay the difference

rence and travel by air. It was not allowed subsequently.

I think my amendment is a corollary to, if not the consequence of, the earlier provision wherein we had allowed that I think the hon. Minister will concede my point. It is quite normal, innocuous and it does not entail any loss to the Government. It does not make any discrimination from Member to Member. I only wish the hon. Member accepts it.

SHRI G. A. APPAN : Sir, about my amendment No. 16, we give one third class fare for one person. Naturally, whenever we come here for one day or for two days, we come here on business and it is but meet that the Government will have to attend to the benefits of Members of Parliament. But whenever we go about our own business, I do not know why the Government should bear the cost of travel of a servant also. Only a few people can afford the services of a servant. If everything is given free, it is not right. I may want pass even for my whole family, for my villager, for my friend. This is not the way the Members should ask for benefits, privileges and amenities. Members have a right to ask any amenity to improve the efficiency of their service for the constituency and for the public whom they represent. But here even if they want to take a person in the third class with them, let them do so if their work is for not less than 15 days, but not every day. That is what I want here.

Speaking about my amendment No. 17 the provision here is that you can take a person by first class to Delhi and back. I would rather put it in this way. It is only an exchange of words—to go to Delhi and back or *vice versa*. The family of some Member will be here. If they have to go somewhere else, they will have to tell a lie that they went from here or there.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, अब हम यहाँ रीडिंग पर इकट्ठा ही बोलेंगे।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : While speaking on this particular clause Mr Bhargava's case was that another first class should be given. Unless you give him another first class he would not be in a position to travel air-conditioned whereas those who have money will be travelling by A.C.C.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : You would not call it socialism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know which brand of socialism it is. But it is strange that Mr Bhargava should suffer from such frustration. It amounts to asking for air-condition straightaway. Then why not ask for it though I would not support it?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Delete amending clause 5. I am against discrimination.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : While speaking on it was it not your argument that Mr. Babubhai Chinai may easily convert it into A.C.C. by paying the difference in cash?

SHRI A. D. MANI : Why do you bother about Mr Babubhai Chinai?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Because he has got money. You also belong to that privileged category although your money is paid by somebody else. You are a journalist. Mr. Bhargava's case is why you should also not travel A.C.C. I did not expect it from Mr. Bhargava.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Shri Bhargava says why he also should not, because otherwise there will be discrimination.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The Constitution has so many provisions containing discrimination. It is a new type of discrimination. If these fellows have money they will travel. Now these fellows have money to pay for roast chickens. Does it mean you will say that you should also be given a free roast chicken? Therefore, you cannot compete with them. The best thing is to take away their money. That is the only way you can travel;

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

otherwise he has got so many things. I think he spoke out of frustration. That is why I intervened to ask: Why not a whole train be given to a Member of Parliament? That cannot happen out of frustration.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think air-conditioning should be abolished except for foreign tourists and others. First class A.C. is a monstrosity in a country like ours. Let these A.C. coaches be there for foreign tourists or for special occasions. We see a big monopolist travelling by air-conditioned reserving a whole cabin to himself. He is travelling alone and the other three seats are vacant. Members of Parliament should not normally seek to travel by air-conditioning. Already we are frozen here in this House. Why travel by air-condition to get more frozen? Your brains will begin to freeze. Therefore, do not ask for it, Mr. Bhargava. Withdraw your amendment.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, taking first Mr. Bhargava's amendment, there have been different opinions expressed whether Members should travel by first class, or by third class or by air-condition. While some said air-condition is a necessity, some others said first class is a luxury. It is a matter of opinion. One has to go by the mean. Also there is the practical difficulty. After all, we have a limited number of air-conditioned seats and it is not possible to provide air-conditioned berths for all the Members. It is not possible for the Railways to do that. Various circumstances have to be taken into account. Therefore, the provision that has been made has been thought to be proper and it should be accepted by the House.

Mr. Swamy said about convertibility of the third class into first class. This reminds me of the statement by Mr. Bhargava that even now first class is convertible into air-condition. Then why have you brought this provision, he asked. Actually it is done by an

executive order. We thought it is better to bring it here and make it a part of the Statute. We have to see that the value of the third class ticket will be taken into account in showing the difference. So when stating that we have to state the original basis, that it is convertible.

I have not had the privilege of talking to the Railway Minister. Since Mr. Swamy has moved an amendment and has explained...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have a first class and another person has a third class which you have given. Suppose I alter. I travel third and I give the first class to somebody else.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH. We know, Mr. Gupta, you are capable of doing that. That is why we did not allow it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am asking you, Mr. Raghuramaiah, whether I can do it. I am sure some time the so-called attendants, compared to us, are better entitled to travel first class. You know that. Surely there are such people in the Council of Ministers who should be changed into third and attendants should be brought into first.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: I hope in the case of Ministers under your control they will go by third class and their attendants will go by first class.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If your Ministers get into the third class all the passengers will get down.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: I have not had the privilege of discussing this matter with the Railway Minister. I shall certainly convey the general wish of the House. It should be convertible if the Minister agrees. It does not require any statutory provision if it can be done by the executive order. I shall mention the feeling of the House.

I have covered the various points raised in the various amendments. I oppose all of them."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Except amendment No. 7, the rest become infructuous. The question is :

7. "That at page 2, for lines 22 and 23, the following be substituted, namely :—

(ii) to one free first class railway pass for any member of the family to accompany the member when he travels by rail; and"

*The motion was negatived.*

\*Amendment No. 9 was, by leave, withdrawn.

\*Amendment Nos. 12, 16 and 17 were, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The question is :

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 5 was added to the Bill.*

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

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH : Sir, I move

"That the Bill be passed."

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, अब आप क्षमा करेंगे। देखिये, मैंने अपने अमेंडमेंट पर अपने बोलने के अधिकार को सुरक्षित रखा है। मैं आपके द्वारा चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री जी नेता मदन ज़रा हमारी बात को अच्छी तरह से और सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य और अच्छी तरह से सुन लें। मनिबेन पटेल जो चली गई हैं। मैं यहाँ पर गांधीजी के वाक्य को सुना रहा हूँ...

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल : मनिबेन को क्या कहेंगे? मनिबेन के पास फर्स्ट क्लास का पास है और वे थर्ड क्लास में चलती हैं। उनको क्या कहना है?

श्री राजनारायण : इसके लिये हमारी बधाई और धन्यवाद उनके चरणों पर है। तो गांधीजी ने यह कहा है :

"सुधार की गरज तो होती है खुद सुधारक को। जिस समाज में वह सुधार करना चाहता है उससे तो विरोध की, तिरस्कार की और जीवन के जोखिम कीही आशा रखनी चाहिये। सुधारक जिस बात को सुधार मानता है समाज उसे कुधार क्यों न माने? और यदि कुधार न भी माने तो उसकी तरफ से उदासीन क्यों न रहे?"

मैं चाहूँगा कि जो लोग गांधीजी का नाम लेते हैं वे गांधीजी के इस वाक्य को हृदयंगम करें। मैं यह भी कह दूँ :

"बुन्द आघात सहहि गिरि कैसे।

दुर्जन बचन सत सहं जैसे ॥"

इसलिये दुर्जन जो यहाँ पर कभी कभी बचन कह देते हैं उसको मैं बदस्त कर लेता हूँ लेकिन मैं आपको बता दूँ :

मैं तब दसन तोरिबे लायक।

आयसु पे न दीन्ह रघुनायक ॥

असि रिस होति दसउ मुख तोरों।

लंका गहि समुद्र महं बोरों ॥

यह जो विवेक आया इसको देख कर के मुझे इतना क्रोध आया कि मैं इस कांग्रेस राज्य रूपी लंका के घर को समुद्र में डुबा दूँ। मगर जब मैंने अपने नेता गोड़े मुराहरि जी से पूछा तो उन्होंने कहा कि 16 तारीख को यह लंका अपने आप ढह रही है, इसलिये थोड़ा बहुत ढाड़स बंधा। मगर मैं यह बता देना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ संख्या के बल पर हमारी सही बात को काटने की घृष्टता अब आप छोड़िये, बहुत हो गया। मैं गांधीजी का एक वाक्य फिर सुनाऊँगा।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : गांधी शताब्दी में बोलियेगा।

**श्री राजनारायण :** 30 जनवरी, 1948 को गांधीजी ने कहा था कि कांग्रेस को भंग करो और अपने अपने ढंग से विभिन्न दलों में चले जाओ। मैं समझता हूँ कि गांधीजी की वह पवित्र वाणी गांधी शताब्दी में पूरी हो जायेगी और मुझे उस दिन बहुत ही हर्ष होगा, बहुत ही खुशी होगी।

**श्री शीलमद्र याजी :** गांधीजी क्या बोले ?

**श्री राजनारायण :** चूँकि वह अंग्रेजी में बोले, मैं बाद में उसको हिन्दी में कर दूँगा। उन्होंने यह कहा है :

“Working for economic equality means abolishing the eternal conflict between capital and labour. It means levelling down of the few rich in whose hands is concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth on the one hand, and levelling up of the semi-starved, naked millions, on the other. A non-violent system of Government is clearly an impossibility so long as the wide gulf between the rich and the hungry millions persists. The contrast between the palaces of New Delhi and the miserable hovels of the poor labouring classes nearby cannot last one day in a free India in which the poor will enjoy the same power as the richest in the land.

A violent and bloody revolution is a certainty one day unless there is a voluntary abdication of riches and the power that riches give and sharing them for the common good.”

गांधीजी के दो वाक्य हमने पढ़े। अब इस अंग्रेजी का अनुवाद कर दूँ। गांधीजी ने साफ साफ कहा कि जो लोग इकानामिक इक्वेलिटी की बात करते हैं उनको समझ लेना चाहिए कि पूँजी और श्रम में निरंतर मर्वदा के लिए संघर्ष है। इसलिए श्रम और पूँजी के संघर्ष को समाप्त करो तब मामला बनेगा। इसके लिए क्या करना होगा ? जिनके पास राष्ट्र की संपत्ति संचित है उनके हाथों से लो, उनको नीचे गिराओ और जिनके पास नहीं है उनको दो।

गांधीजी ने कहा कि स्वतंत्र भारत में एक दिन के अन्दर दिल्ली की बड़ी बड़ी गगनचुम्बी अट्टालिकाओं और गरीबों की झोंपड़ियों का अन्तर मिट जायेगा। क्या यह विधेयक गांधीजी के उसी कथन को साबित करने के लिए आया है या उस अन्तर को बढ़ाने के लिए आया है ? माननीय मंत्री जी जरा इस सत्य को समझें। एक चेतावनी गांधीजी ने दी। आज मैं उसको सुना देता हूँ—कि अगर स्वेच्छा से अपनी दौलत को दौलत वाले नहीं छोड़ेंगे तो खूनी क्रान्ति भारतवर्ष में अवश्यम्भावी है, होकर रहेगी।

**श्री शीलमद्र याजी :** आपको घबड़ाने की जरूरत नहीं है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** हमारा मित्र कुछ समझता नहीं। मैं अकबर अली खां से कहता हूँ कि वे गांधीजी की इस बात को समझें। एक दार्शनिक था अमरीका थोरो। थोरो का भी एक वाक्य सुना दूँगा। उसने कहा है—

“If a State is governed by the principles of reason, poverty and misery are the subject of shame. If a State is not governed by principles of reason, riches and honour are not the subject of shame.”

**श्री ए० डी० मणि :** आज अच्छा बोल रहे हैं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मंत्री जी समझ लें कि उनकी सरकार सुबुद्धि से संचालित हो रही है या कुबुद्धि से। अगर कुबुद्धि से संचालित होगी तो जिस तरह से आज यहां पैसा देकर कुछ लोगों के लिए ज्यादा सुविधा और ज्यादा सम्मान देने की बात हो रही है वे लोग लज्जाएंगे नहीं। आज मंत्री जी देखेंगे कि उनके देश में क्या हो रहा है। कितने माई के लाल अनखाए रह रहे हैं। जिस देश में घास की रोटी खाई जाती है, जिस देश में दोनों जून चूल्हा न जलता हो, जिस देश में हफ्तों तक बाहर घूम घूम कर सड़कों पर लोग रह जाते हों, जहां आज भी जाड़े की रात रिकशा-चालक रिकशा में

बिताते हों, जहां आज भी सड़कों की पटरियों पर लाखों लाख लोग जाड़े की रात बिना देते हों, श्रीमन्, इनकी आंखों में आंसू आने चाहिये, लज्जा से सिर गड़ जाना चाहिए। मैं आपको एक वाक्य बता दूँ। हमारे यहां मुसहर जाति है। मुसहर जाति की औरतें पत्ते तोड़ कर पत्तलें बनाती हैं, बेचती हैं। दिन में वे औरतें पत्ते तोड़ने नहीं निकलती क्योंकि उनके घर में पैसा नहीं कि कपड़ा खरीद सकें, फटा चीथड़ा लेपेट कर शाम को निकलती हैं और पत्ते तोड़ती हैं। यह आज भारत की दुर्दशा है। आज हमारे देश की आजादी को दिल्ली में और राज्यों की राजधानियों में कैद कर लिया है। मैं चाहूंगा कि यह आजादी गांव-गांव जाये, मुहल्ले मुहल्ले जाये, कस्बे कस्बे जाये। इसलिए मंत्री जी ने जो विधेयक यहां प्रस्तुत किया है उसको मैं काला विधेयक कहता हूँ, उसको हम समाजद्रोही विधेयक कहते हैं, उसको हम राष्ट्रद्रोही विधेयक कहते हैं क्योंकि राष्ट्र केवल संसद् के कुछ सदस्य नहीं, आज हमारे राष्ट्र की 55 करोड़ आबादी है और ये सिर्फ 750 लोग हैं। सारी सुविधाओं को देख लिया जाये, मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर इसका टोटल होगा तो सब मिला कर 2 हजार से ढाई हजार तक चला जायेगा। इस गरीब देश में, इस असहाय देश में—गांधीजी ने कहा है—जो समाज का जितना ही पिछड़ा तबका है उसको उतनी ही मदद ज्यादा करें। क्या यह समाज का पिछड़ा तबका है। यह डाइरेक्ट डेमोक्रेसी नहीं, यह सीधा जनतंत्र नहीं है, यह इनडाइरेक्ट डेमोक्रेसी है। जनतंत्र पूर्णतः जनता के द्वारा चले जबकि आज वह जनता के लिए नहीं रह गया है, जनता के विरुद्ध जा रहा है। इसलिए, श्रीमन्, मैं आपसे अपील करूंगा, सरकार से अपील करूंगा कि जैसे ही इस विधेयक को वापिस करें, यह बहुत ही व्यापक असर डालने वाला है। श्रीमन्, मैं कल लखनऊ, उत्तर प्रदेश की राजधानी, में था और चर्चा थी, अरे, अगर पार्लियामेंट के लोगों का बढ़ेगा तो हमारा भी बढ़ेगा। खरबूजे को देख कर खरबूजा

रंग बदलता है। अगर संसद् के सदस्य अपना भत्ता बढ़ाते हैं, अपनी सहूलियतें बढ़ाते हैं तो आप यकीन मानिये सारे राज्यों की असेम्बलियों में विधानमंडलों के सदस्य देखा देखी अपने भत्ते को, अपनी तनख्वाह को और अपनी सहूलियतों को बढ़ायेंगे। एक होड़ लग जायेगी। लोग संसद् को छाया में, संसद् के शीशे में अपने प्रतिबिम्ब को देखेंगे। इसलिए मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ आज अर्ज करूंगा कि सरकार में सद्बुद्धि आये और सरकार शोघ्रातिशोघ्रा अपने इस विधेयक को वापिस ले। इससे न तो धरा घंमेगी और न गगन फटेगा। इसलिए बार बार अनुनय है, विनय है कि सरकार में सद्बुद्धि जागे और उसके असर में आ कर वह अपनी हठवादिता को छोड़े, ज़िद को छोड़े और शीघ्र से शीघ्र इस विधेयक को इस समय यहां से वापिस ले। यहां मैंने आज देखा है कि यहां पर तो सख्या का एक असुर दल है और उस सख्यासुर की बदौलत साधु सशोधन और शुद्ध सयत वाणी को यह सरकार मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। हम देखते हैं कि चाहे हम डिवीजन कराये तो भी हम हारेंगे इसलिए ऐसे विधेयक में मैं भागीदार क्यों बनूँ। किन्तु मैं यही कहूंगा कि सरकार अपने में सद्बुद्धि ला कर इसे वापिस ले।

**श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** महोदय, जो विधेयक हमारे सामने लाया गया है वह जनहित विरोधी और अनैतिक विधेयक है और हम जानते हैं कि चाहे हम जितनी भी कोशिश करें सरकार उसको पास करवाने पर तुली हुई है और राजनारायण जी के जितने भी सशोधन सामने आये उनको भी मानने को तैयार नहीं है। इसलिए हम इस बिल को पास करने में कोई हिस्सा नहीं लेना चाहते हैं इसलिए हमारे दल के लोग सदन के बाहर जा रहे हैं।

(At this stage, the Members of the Samyukta Socialist Party left the House.)

**SHRI M. V. BHADRAM :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as it is, every Member of Parliament in addition to the free



[Shri M. V. Bhadrarn.]  
railway passes, is getting one first class fare and one third class fare in cash. After this Bill comes into law it gives him one more first class pass and one more third class pass. Altogether it comes to three first class fares and two third class fares. How do we look in the eyes of the people if we as Members of Parliament get three first class passes or their value, and two third class passes? This is simply absurd. My second point is that at the commencement of a session most of the Members of Parliament would like to travel only by train because their wives will quarrel with them and say, "We will accompany you to Delhi and back." Then, the question of accommodation in the trains will be a big problem. Every train will be full of only Members of Parliament and their families and the railways will not be able to cope up with the rush. And it also looks ridiculous in the eyes of the people. Therefore, on these two grounds I once more appeal to the House to reject this measure.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu): I am very happy and I wish to congratulate and thank the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Mr. Raghuramaiah, for having brought before this honourable House a Bill which provides for the minimum and the bare necessities from the point of view of a parliamentarian's life. His approach to the whole question was a human approach and I would like very much to commend the Bill for the acceptance of this House. It is true that our friends of the opposition, some of them, if not all, have opposed this Bill. But I am sure they are going to get the benefits of this Bill. They are not going to reject the emoluments as a result of this Bill. But still if they do not bless Mr. Raghuramaiah, I am sure their wives will bless Mr. Raghuramaiah. Secondly, I hope the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will look into the relevant rules and see that there are certain incongruities which might arise as a result of this Bill. There is one aspect with reference to

road transport which is almost outmoded and outdated. The road transport mileage that is given to a Member of Parliament is something which has got to be revised considering the modern conditions. I am sure the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will look into this matter.

Lastly, some Members have made rather an unfair criticism. Many of us, unlike Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who is a very able barrister—he has sacrificed his profession for the sake of his country and Parliament—are still having a profession either as a lawyer or a doctor or a chartered accountant or a businessman. We cannot give up our business or our profession and throw our children and the family to the dust. We must have some minimum subsistence here and without that we shall not be able to discharge our duties rightly and properly for the country at large. Now, family is the bed-rock of a healthy nation. If we have to take care of the nation, we have also got to take care of our family. This is a minimum requirement. So, after the house rent allowance is deducted from Rs. 500 what we actually receive is Rs. 360 which is absolutely insufficient for us. I am sure at a future date the Government would consider. Whether following the American model or the Russian model of any other Western country, according to the conditions existing in India that it should revise the salary as such of the Members of Parliament. And this will be necessary not from the point of view getting more money, but from the point of view of rendering a more useful service and for maintaining ourselves as Members of Parliament and for serving with dignity and decorum as our country demands.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you have seen my friend starting by giving me an unmerited and absolutely unjustified tribute when he said I am a very prosperous or . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: An able barrister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : . . . an able barrister or whatever it may be. First of all I wish my friend success in his legal profession.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : I may tell you that I have been a successful lawyer. I was a public prosecutor and I resigned that job and came here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : For that I am prepared to give you five rupees more. But as far as I am concerned, I may tell you that I have not earned a single paisa nor have I sought to earn. Therefore, my ability has not been tested in that particular sphere. By a misadventure, may be, in my life, I was called to the Bar and was given one or two legal degrees. That is all by the way.

Now, we are opposing this measure on a principle. I think this matter has to be considered even at this late stage somewhat seriously. Here some of our friends have been saying that they require money for their maintenance and for efficient discharge of their functions: Insofar as that argument goes, it is a valid argument, the monetary part of it. Surely this country would like to see its Members of Parliament placed in such conditions as would enable them to discharge their functions efficiently and well in the interests of the people. This goes without saying. But the issue is, in the first instance, whether what we are getting at the moment is adequate or not, and secondly, whether we should in a given situation claim extra emoluments and extra funds from the Government for discharging what we consider our duties. These are the two questions to be discussed and settled. And our difference is precisely on these two questions. In the first instance, the monies that we get or the amenities that we get, are, in our opinion, by and large, quite sufficient. That is what I say. I say this thing not keeping in view only the needs of some of us who may not be spending much, but taking into account the needs of our other friends also. Now we are getting a salary of Rs. 500, allowance of Rs. 31 and cer-

tain other special facilities like free rail travel and other things. These are together not small, if you compare it with what others are getting in various stations of life, discharging no less important and public duties, and that is the first thing to be considered. Take for instance housing. We get subsidised houses. In Delhi a good part of the populace live in slums. The housing problem is very acute. Am I to understand that those Government employees who are in difficult conditions and whose claim should be given priority and first attention before everything else, are not discharging their duties? They are doing it also and our complaint is that we, being the law-makers here, arbiters of our own claim, look after ourselves before we look after them. That is immoral and that is something which should be avoided. That is what we are stressing.

My friends opposite have displayed quite a good deal of energy and enthusiasm in claiming these moneys and other facilities. I am not questioning their *bona fides*. Some of them certainly need some more money than others. So I am not questioning their *bona fides* but they should take into account other factors also. Am I to understand that all the hon. ladies and gentlemen sitting opposite do not have any other means of livelihood? Let them file statements with the Secretary or Chairman of the House declaring their assets and other sources of income and it will be seen that many of them who claim to be patriotic are also attending to their other requirements and means of livelihood and some of them are earning. Here sit some people, Shri Chinai will also be getting. He has so much money that I do not know where he keeps it. He will also be getting and I will also be getting. There are other in-between. So I could have understood it if the claim had been established on the basis of individual statements to the Chairman by the Members about their assets, their earning, their family membership and requirements and establishments. We do nothing of the kind. When it comes to meeting the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta:]  
claims of the workers, tribunals, arbitration, examinations, pay commissions etc. to scrutinise every little thing come and we, Members of Parliament, allow such things to happen when it comes to the wage claims of the workers. I would have liked to know how much Mr. Parthasarathy earns in courts. Surely he is not a briefless barrister.

SHRI A. D. MANI: As you are.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, I am. I have never asked for or earned money in a court but Mr. Parthasarathy goes to the High Court and I am sure, being an intelligent man, that he is, he should be earning money and now that money also should be taken into account. It is a human question. So we must take into account the concrete facts of life. You have not done anything of the kind. Therefore it is wrong that way. We are not giving a good account of ourselves before the nation. We should take into account their lot, the lot of the unemployed, hungry people. We represent this nation where 82 per cent. of the people are not in a position to spend Re. 1 a day or Rs. 30 a month and here in the Parliament the great Members shall be earning Rs. 51, if this Bill is passed, every day as daily allowance much more than what 82 per cent of the people can spend in a whole month. That is the position. This is promoting not only disparity in income, it is idealising the disparity in income. It is forcing ourselves on the nation. Have we taken the verdict of the people, those who are suffering as to whether they would like it or not? We could have gone on a referendum to the masses asking whether they would like that the MPs should have this increase. I am sure 99 per cent. of the people have given the verdict of 'no'. So we are defying the will of the people. My regret is that we are claiming this money at a time when people are suffering. Drinking water we have not provided in most of our villages and yet we have claimed the allowances and other facilities,

That is most objectionable. As far as efficiency in functioning goes, I do not know. There should be some relation to the money spent and the functioning of Members. Some Members think that their silence is golden and the Parliament should really benefit by it. I do not grudge your getting a little money but why do you make brave statements that you are doing so many other things? I do not know what we are doing but anyhow some are doing a disservice also. Then there should be a deduction from their salaries. Are you really for it? No. Now the travel has come. Mr. Bhadram has pointed out about it. A first-class pass for the Member of Parliament, high and mighty in this world; then another pass, no matter what he does with it. He may carry a blackmarketeer or profiteer or may not carry anybody. Third pass is for the spouse. Why three passes? Again a third class pass. My friend is annoyed. He is anxious. . .

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pradesh): You ought to be short.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am angering my friend. He looks as if the cash box is in the lobby so that he could take it away. So I say my friends should bear with me. One or two hometruths I will have to say.

SHRI B. T. KEMPARAJ (Mysore): What is the amount drawn by a Deputy in Russia?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you are prepared to sit here longer, I can tell you something about it. Let him ask Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani. She seems to be always thinking of Communism and Communist dictatorship. Communism does not come through Ordinances or through the Central Hall. There is no such thing as Communist dictatorship. Ask her. So I say that morally it is repugnant. It is unnecessary, it is not needed for the efficient discharge of our duties. It is absolutely a sort of bonus, underserved bonus you are giving to the Members when actually they are not really, morally or otherwise entitled to

it. Their economic needs, if you scrutinise them and then draw a sort of average, you will see that it would not also justify this. I do not know why they have got it. Finally I would say that this measure has been brought up before us in disregard of the unanimous recommendations of the Committee. Over a matter like this, it should be our moral duty to see that whatever we arrive at should be arrived at unanimously. There is a possibility of having unanimity over a matter like this. It is controversial and it relates to ourselves. We should feel a little embarrassed about it. Why the Government disregarded the unanimous recommendations and introduced new elements in it to increase the burden,

I do not understand, Mr. Vice-6 P.M. Chairman, the Government has been at fault. I am not blaming Members of Parliament. I only appeal to Members of Parliament before I sit down. You have shown great energy and initiative and enthusiasm when it comes to increasing your own emoluments and allowances. I do hope, in future at least a particle of that enterprise, initiative and enthusiasm would be shown when it comes to the demands of Government employees and other sections of our working people.

Here I oppose this unjust, repugnant insulting measure, which is an affront to ourselves and an affront to the nation.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: At this stage I rise to point out something.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI). Please be very brief.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I would be very brief, Sir.

The hon. Minister sought to discover some element of support in my arguments when I was speaking at the first reading stage. I am sorry to disappoint him, because during my speech at the first reading stage I said that even for the limited purpose of secretarial assistance the present measure is not going to help. It will be a measure to indirectly bribe and

corrupt Members of Parliament, and without discussing the matter in greater detail at this stage I still say that the measure now being proposed is unjustified and undesirable and will not in any way help in the matter of increasing the efficiency of a Member. I oppose it strongly.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: Sir, I would like to submit that most of the points have already been covered by me. When listening to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I had a feeling that he was not probably present here when I initiated the debate on the Bill as well as when I made my observations at the end of the discussion of the first reading. I think, if he reads back, he will see that most of the points have been covered by me earlier. But I would only like to say this. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is so much worried about the teeming hungry millions of the country, and it is true we are all equally anxious. One would have thought from his speech that he is opposed to the grant of anything, to the grant of allowances, even amenities and facilities. But the tenor of his speech was different. I think, at the end of his speech he was pleading for the acceptance of the unanimous recommendations of the Committee. If he had been present here when I opened the debate, he would have understood that the cost of the unanimous recommendations is roughly speaking nearly the same as the cost of the measures which the Government are implementing. In fact, if you have to give proper secretarial assistance, it is much more. Therefore, it is a case of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta asking more for Members than Government has thought fit to give.

As regards Mr Chitta Basu, it took him, I am sorry, two hours to discover that what I said is wrong. I said at that time that there was an element of support for me. He kept quiet then.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I said that even for the limited purpose of secretarial assistance the present measure will not help.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: It is called in legal parlance an after-thought and I do not want to add anything to it.

With regard to Mr. Rajnarain, I am sorry he is not here. He has quoted extensively from the Father of the Nation. I am very glad he did it. But he did not quote one thing that the Father of the Nation has said. He has said, "Stop violence, either physical violence or mental violence." The Father of the Nation pleaded for non-violence in the use of words also. I hope he will read that chapter every day before coming to the House and then benefit himself and other Members also.

Sir, I do not want to say anything more than this much. I commend the Bill to the acceptance of this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, August 14, 1969.