

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]
accept it or not. Mr. Dwivedy's amendment:

The question is:

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

'which should be completed on or before the 30th April, 1957, and for bringing about uniformity, as far as practicable, in such legislation'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Malkani's amendment:

The question is:

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

'more specially to enable the tiller to be the owner of his holding and to fix a flooring of holdings in various States according to local conditions'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House is of opinion that in order to guarantee the success of the Five Year Plan, the Central Government should recommend to all the State Governments that they should take immediate steps for the speeding up of land reform legislation in their respective States."

(after taking a count) Ayes 13; Noes 31.

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A HIGH POWER COMMISSION TO REVIEW AND REVISE THE PAY STRUCTURE AND THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF ALL THE SERVICES UNDER THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, I move the Resolution standing in my name, viz.:

"This House is of opinion that the entire pay structure and the terms and conditions of service of all the services under the control of the Central Government should be examined, reviewed and revised, and that for this purpose a high power Commission be appointed with instructions to submit its report within six months."

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN) in the Chair.]

Madam, there has been a general expression of dis-satisfaction against the pay structure obtaining in this country and particularly against the pay structure of the Central Government. Hardly any opportunity has been missed in this House as well as in the other House to give expression to such a feeling, and I am sure that, if a little study is made of this subject and if all the facts are examined, it will be found that the position of the Government in this matter is almost indefensible. It is not only unfair but they will find that it is to the detriment of the interests of the country at large. I will presently give certain facts and figures which, I am sure, will convince the House that there is an urgent need for examining this matter and for revising the entire pay structure at the Centre.

When I say this, I am not at all oblivious of the fact that only in 1946 a Central Pay Commission had been appointed and that an exhaustive report had been submitted by it—in fact the report is in my hands. I am also aware of the fact that some of the recommendations of the Pay Commission have not been implemented, and still if with all this knowledge in my possession I have ventured to move this Resolution, it is because it is expedient, as I hope presently to show to the House, in the larger interests of the country. It is absolutely impossible to deal with such a vast subject and touch on even some of the more important aspects of this problem within the space of half an hour. I propose therefore to take only

a few of the salient points which, I think, will make us feel that we must be up and doing in this matter.

I will first invite your attention to the fact that the present pay structure of the country was evolved by an alien power, by foreigners, who wanted to rule this country. They had a particular purpose in view, and that particular purpose was to maintain law and order and to collect revenue. You will find that it is that part of the administrative machinery which is concerned with the maintenance of law and order and with the collection of revenue that is getting the cream of it. That is the portion which gets the very best. You will therefore find that those departments which do creative work and the people who are contributing to the national wealth have been completely ignored. They have not got even a minimum share. They have not been treated fairly at all. Just take the scientist, the engineer, the professor, the teacher, the artist, etc. If you just examine where they stand in the scheme of the pay structure, you will find that these people who are there to increase the national wealth have been treated most shabbily. Now, it is very necessary for this country to balance the pay structure so that these departments which are entrusted with this type of work attract the best type of people in the country. Let us take the pay scales obtaining in the educational institutions. The scales differ from university to university, and the disparities are almost inexplicable. In the South in the University of Mysore or Travancore-Cochin, you will find that a professor who is the head of a department does not go beyond Rs. 700.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): May I know from the hon. Member whether these universities are under the Central Government? The Resolution speaks of the services under the control of the Central Government. I do not think that the Mysore Uni-

versity or the Travancore-Cochin University is under the Central Government.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: The hon. Minister should know that at least there are four universities which are run by the Central Government. I just want to give comparative figures. If the hon. Minister would only care to follow my argument, he will understand that the old emphasis is entirely wrong. Let us take the University of Aligarh, for which he is responsible and for which he gives annual grants.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): They are all autonomous bodies.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I know that. I am fully aware of that. That point has been raised at least ten times. I am fully aware of the fact that they are autonomous bodies, but these autonomous bodies depend entirely upon the support that they get from the Central Government.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Is not the hon. Member aware that University Grants Commission had gone into these questions?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I know that a University Grants Commission has been there. I am just pointing out the facts to you. As the position at present exists, how do you compare him with a young officer in the Police Department or in the I.A.S. who at the sixth year of his service gets about Rs. 800? I am not asking you to pull down his salary. Pay him if you can afford to pay him and you may pay him more if you can. At the 6th or 7th year of his service he gets Rs. 800 and here is a man who is much more important in many respects, who is much more capable, who is a person who has done a lot of research and when he puts in 20 years' service he hardly reaches Rs. 800. Do you think you can have any respect for the teachers? This is a country where the respect for the teachers is at the lowest and if the respect for the people who are doing

[Shri H. C. Mathur]

creative work is the lowest, you can only have a police State. You can never have a Welfare State. It is difficult to point out any country on the face of the earth where the relationship of the salaries between these two types of workers is like this. If you go and examine the pay structure of any advanced country, you will find that it is the professor, it is the scientist, it is the engineer who is respected more and who gets much more. The head of a medical institution—I enquired into so many places—is the Director of a particular medical institution and he is in charge of the administration and gets about Rs. 2,000 or its equivalent, while the professor who is visiting that hospital, who is a real man of science or is doing research, who is contributing to the advancement in that line gets at least two and a half times that salary. It is just the other way about here. The Director of Administration will get at least double of what the man who is employed on research or the man who is contributing to the advancement of the country is getting. My only point is that we have an absolutely wrong emphasis. I do not say that the Congress Government is responsible for it. This is your heritage from an alien power which was ruling in this country. They wanted to concentrate on the services which were administering law and order, which were collecting revenues and with which they were concerned much and not with these people. They only wanted the universities and colleges to manufacture clerks for the services. Therefore it was that the teachers had not the respect here which the teachers had in any other country. It served their purposes very well. These universities manufactured 1,000, 2,000 or 3,000 matriculates and graduates who would come and serve as Babus in the Secretariat. This is one important point which I wanted to emphasise.

Again I come to the question of disparities. This is the second point.

If this Government can afford to pay Rs. 5,000 to our top men, I would never grudge it. Do pay them Rs. 5,000. It is always better to give them all the incentive which you can give but certainly you can never permit the sort of disparity that exists today. I will give you some figures also in this connection which will disillusion my hon. friend here. I will give him figures only from those countries with which they are more familiar and to which they will possibly have very little objection. Let me quote the U.S.A. In the U.S.A. the lowest paid civil servant gets about 125 dollars a month—the filing clerk and the typist get about 200 dollars. Now, the highest paid civil servant in the Foreign Service gets about 13,500 dollars per year and the other highest civil servant in other departments gets about 10,330 dollars per year. What is the disparity? It is only one to eight. Let us go to the United Kingdom. There you will find that the lowest paid civil servant gets about £175 approximately and the typist would get £150 approximately per year. Here again the highest paid civil servant—the Permanent Secretary gets £3,750 per year while the Permanent Secretaries except the Secretary for Treasury gets about £3,500 a year, and the ratio does not exceed one to twenty-three.

DR. D. H. VARIAVA (Saurashtra): May I ask a point for information? What is the disparity between the cost of living of these countries and India?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: The question of the cost of living does not very much arise so far as this question is concerned. I will come to that question. The cost of living arises when we are going to fix the minimum living wage. If I was telling you that we should fix the minimum living wage as it is obtaining in England, then you can question me. My point is not that. I said here is the lowest paid man in England or in the U.S.A. This is the particular salary which he is getting as against him the highest man in

that hierarchy gets this. So the disparity between the lowest man and the highest man is this. How does the cost of living come here? I cannot understand it. I will come to your point of the cost of living and I will give you some facts and figures which will interest you.

Again, Sir, as I told you, here the disparity is 1 to 23 at the most. These are the figures which have been provided to me by the Research Section of the Parliamentary Library. I have not got them from anywhere else. We come to India. The figures they have given to me are; the lowest paid civil servant, the third division clerks get about Rs. 60—the lower division clerk gets Rs. 55 per month and the Secretary-General gets Rs. 4,500 and the Secretary gets Rs. 4,000 per month and the disparity according to them is from 1 to 72 but I would not accept that figure though given by the Research Section. I would add to it the dearness allowance and other allowances which are being given to the lowest clerks and thereupon I will calculate it. Though strictly speaking that should not be so because even if the index of prices recedes and if we come to normalcy the salary of the clerk will remain Rs. 60 and Rs. 55 while that of the Secretary will remain Rs. 4,500—it is not going to be diminished accordingly—so the proportion which has been given here is very correct—it is 1 to 72. I don't know if it is obtaining anywhere on the face of the earth. Now, Sir, here, while stressing this point, I will refer to the House and I will invite the attention of the House to what has been said by the Central Pay Commission. They made a very elaborate and thorough examination of all the facts and they have looked into this matter. Their recommendation was this. They were very cognizant of the fact that it would not be profitable or correct to pull down the pay scales suddenly and they did make a mention of it. This is what they said:

"We nevertheless think that the time has arrived when the problem

of high salaries calls for a new approach quite as much as the problem of low salaries. It would not, however, be right to lower salaries suddenly. As Dr. Gadgil himself recognises, it will take some time to change the ways and break the prejudices engendered by a long period of high salaries. As a first step, we think that it will be fair, from all points of view, to fix Rs. 2,000 per mensem as the maximum salary of public servants in India, except for a few select posts. The details of our proposals under this head will be seen from paragraphs 61 and 64 dealing with Class I Services. We must emphasise that the value of Rs. 2,000 is very much less now than it was many decades ago, etc."

They have gone into it and finally in making the recommendations they said:

"The scale of Rs. 1,800—2,000 is intended for the heads of the biggest departments and would normally be the highest point which a permanent civil servant could reach in his service. Posts now carrying a maximum salary of Rs. 3,000 must as far as possible be fitted into the selection grade of Rs. 1,800—2,000. The highest paid posts like those of Secretaries, General Managers of Railways, Members of the Railway Board, Members of Central Board of Revenue, Chairman and Members of the Public Service Commission, etc., should be fitted into scales between Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 3,000 preferably on four levels of Rs. 2,250, 2,500, 2,750 and 3,000."

Even this recommendation has not been accepted and the fullest advantage has been taken of the others. What has the Government of India done? In fixing the salaries between Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 3,000 these intermediaries have been left off and it is only the Rs. 3,000 which has been adopted by our friends who took the decisions, not to mention many who

[Shri H. C. Mathur]
got much more. This is what I want the House to realise, that even this pay of Rs. 1,800 to Rs. 2,000 which they recommended as the first step has not been taken. And now it is seven years since they made that recommendation and they have not taken even that first step. It is time when we should have been thinking of the second step. I do not know whether it would have been correct. I am not one at least who is prepared to say or who would advocate lower salaries than Rs. 2,000. I would even try, if our resources permit it, to pay Rs. 2,500. But you do not implement the recommendations of this Commission even to this extent. Sir, these recommendations which are going to benefit the Class III people and the clerks are not implemented and even this benefit which you have got to give them has not been given, while you go over and above the Commission's recommendations and give the best of the benefits to the top men. Commission after commission has made recommendations and they have brought this point and brought it out in the most forceful language that what always happens is that those people who need the most, those who deserve most eventually get the least and it is always the people at the top who manage and manoeuvre things as it suits them. What I submit is that we shall examine the whole question thoroughly. I am even prepared to say that if Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 2,500 is not good enough to attract the right type of men. But let us examine this question. That is why I have stressed this point here.

There is another aspect to the same question and that is the very demoralising effect of this disparity. In the pay structure that obtains today there is a big jump between the top man and the next one. A man gets Rs. 1,500 and the man next above him gets Rs. 2,500. There is absolutely no justification for such a big gap in the scheme of things. And what happens as a result? This man all the time is aspiring to get the higher

job. He does not apply himself to the job and that is human psychology, that is human nature. I do not know of any country where there are such wide disparities—the deputy getting Rs. 1,500 and the head of the department Rs. 2,500. I am stressing this point to show that it is very necessary to keep a proper morale among the services and so the pay structure must be examined so as to base it on rational and proper lines.

The third point that I would like to stress is this. Apart from this question of disparity, there is another factor which is very much corrupting and demoralising our services. This thing which is having such a demoralising effect on the services is the difference in the pay scales obtaining in different parts of the country. What happens? Take the case of Travancore-Cochin and see what has happened there? There is a lot of literacy there and so many educated people are available. Therefore the law of supply and demand operates and the employers make the best of it. Reference has been made to this even in this Report. Those people who employ persons take the best advantage and exploit them. They pay the employees the lowest possible salaries. As against this there are people doing the same type of jobs, but getting higher salaries elsewhere. This point has been raised by all the Part B States with the Central Government very strongly and they have urged that the salary system should be so fixed that there is some uniformity in the whole country. Let us do it. After all, we are one country. I was simply shocked when the Home Minister said the other day that it will depend on the resources of the different States as to what salaries they fix. Are we living in some medieval days? And are these States being administered by different rajas and maharajas? Is it not one country and one republic? Where does the Central Government get its resources from? I would like to know that. The Central Govern-

Structure of

ment pays its peon Rs. 60 but the State Government has resources only to pay Rs. 25 to its peons. To say that there is this disparity because with its resources the State cannot afford to pay more is simply fantastic. Who is responsible for the distribution of the resources of the country? It is the Central Government. We have got to see that the distribution of the resources is such that we can give uniform treatment so that we could expect these States also to have a reasonable level of salaries. You take away all the resources from the States and so the States will be forced to say they will not be able to pay their clerks more than Rs. 25 per month. Sir, I submit this matter of resources is entirely a matter for adjustment. If you want to give a sense of unity to the country, if you want to see fairness throughout the country, you will have to see that there is some sort of a uniformity in the salaries. I hope the hon. Minister is aware that the States of Saurashtra and Mysore made very strong representations to the Central Government on this point at the end of the Gadgil Committee's report, that they must be given some grant-in-aid so as to enable them to pay fairly to their servants. And, Sir, this problem has taken a very acute shape now because in all these States there are Central Government servants staying there. In the same building there is the Central Government peon getting Rs. 60 per month and there is the peon of the State Government, staying in the same building, and doing the same type of job, getting only Rs. 30. Does this not make for discontent? Will it not generate discontent? In the same building, for doing the same job the person employed by the Central Government gets twice as much as the man employed by the State Government. That is a most indefensible position and if the Government is going to argue on the basis of the resources of the State, I think they would be making a very great mistake. They would be digging at the

Government

ing very unfair treatment to these people and they are responsible for a genuine discontent among the services.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Next, I will come to another point. I have only spoken about the pay structure. But the terms and conditions of service are very important, and there is a tremendous difference in the terms and conditions also.

It is not possible now, within the few minutes left with me, to go into the matter but certainly I would like to invite the attention of the Government to these Constitutional safeguards for the Services. I am very much for giving a sense of security to the Services; the Services must definitely have a complete sense of security. The rules and regulations are there and the terms and conditions of service are there.

(Time bell rings.)

Have I exhausted the time, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: When you frame these rules they should contain these things but this guaranteeing of rights is absolutely new for me. I do not know if there is any country where you have such Constitutional safeguards for the services. What are these Constitutional safeguards, I cannot understand. We have got the rules and regulations and we have got the terms and conditions of service. Those rules are framed and are placed before the Parliament. In those things, give them perfect security but to give Constitutional safeguards, it stinks and you cannot have this sort of thing. I hope this matter has been referred to all the State Governments and if my information is correct, almost all the State Governments have pressed this point very much and they have also said that this article of the Constitution must be amended.

Thank you Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that the entire pay structure and the terms and conditions of service of all the services under the control of the Central Government should be examined, reviewed and revised, and that for this purpose a high power Commission be appointed with instructions to submit its report within six months".

Yes, Mrs. Bharathi.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, it is necessary that the principle of equal pay for equal work is accepted not only between man and man but between man and woman. So, it is desirable that the scales of pay and service of the different departments under the control of the Government of India are examined and the conditions of service, etc., fixed. But is it enough? You have got the States—Part A to C—and conditions of service differ not only between the different categories of States but even in the same category.

If you can bring some uniform standards of pay in all the States and the different services it may stop a lot of heart burning among the services.

The integration of States and the integration of certain services in the erstwhile princely States with the Central Services brought about many of these anomalies. I do not think that the problem arising out of the integration of the Posts and Telegraphs Department with the Travancore-Cochin State Posts and Telegraphs Department has still been solved. So long as they were under different services and under different Governments they did not mind the differences in pay but when the integration brought them under the same Government they could not brook the difference. Men with the same qualifications and experience were sitting opposite to each other and in different lar-

That is what is happening in many of the integrated departments. In the Posts and Telegraphs Department the anomaly is very striking. In our State of Travancore-Cochin, the Director and the Executive Engineer were men who had taken their degrees in engineering in England and then specialised in telephones. I am told, with integration they found that men who would not have been only linemen in the State, by virtue of other qualifications were their superiors!

Integration of services with all the similarity of conditions between Travancore and Cochin, has been hanging fire for the last six years and even today it is not complete. At every step one comes across difficulties. The problem of integration of services or bringing some uniform standards however desirable, is a pretty difficult thing because everybody would be only prepared to take the best and not the disadvantages.

The introduction of the I.A.S. and the I.P.S. has created another problem. In the Secretariat and other places you will find senior men, perhaps none too low in their efficiency, drawing a salary which is only a fraction of what a young fellow, very much junior and perhaps in grade also, is drawing. This has created discontent. A man who was drawing Rs. 500 a month and who was very happy over it and who did not look up for anything better becomes very unhappy when he finds a junior fellow getting Rs. 1000. Some of our officers were very unhappy when they went to interdepartmental conferences and made the unhappy discovery that their opposite numbers were drawing three or four times their salaries with less qualifications and very often with lesser brains.

In our little State we were able to expand education and health services because the salaries of the officers were very, very modest when compared to other States. When compared to other States you cannot say that the service there is inferior to the

others, but compared to the general income of the people, the salaries in our Government services are not bad on the whole. In the other States and in the all-India Services, the emoluments, especially in the higher grades, when compared to the general income of the people, are bright.

Some people clamour for a ceiling on landholdings. That is all right, but that must be part of a scheme in which there will be a ceiling in all incomes.

If the appointment of a high power commission can bring about standardisation in Services in both the States and the Centre, that will be quite good and I welcome it. The men in the services must be able to devote their time to their work instead of going about for promotion and interdepartmental hop-steps and jump. Only acquisition of higher technical qualifications for which ample opportunities should be given or outstanding ability to work alone should mark out for higher promotions. The most serious defect I note in the services is the fundamental defect in their outlook. "No work and better pay—no service but only bossing, hinder and not help" seems to be the outlook of many. If you put a man who was a Government servant in a commercial concern, you can be sure that he will drive all the customers out and leave you arrears for 75 per cent. of the days he worked. Even the new recruit with his idealism and zeal for work becomes indifferent and indolent after a while. Perhaps,

if you catch our future officers quite young and train them well and train them long and then have some vigilance, we may be able to improve our services. Instead of picking at random the fruits that fall in their thousands from the universities and planting them in the offices, breed your own plants. I wonder whether even the U.P.S.C. has that thoroughgoing, merciless search for ability and capacity that some of the business firms like Lever Brothers have for recruitment to their services.

The best thing will be for us to get the young folk in their formative period and then train them according to their aptitudes and our requirements for the various kinds of services. Then we may be able to instil in them a devotion to work and an inclination to service. We must produce Javerts in our services. Javert in *Les Misérables* is an example to show how by training you can plant deep in a man's soul certain loyalties. So, catch young, train well, whether it be for the police; military or civil services. If the Commission considers this question also, I think it will be well and good for the nation.

Sir, I support this Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 13th September 1954.

The House adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 13th September 1954.