

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is: —

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1954-55, as passed, by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. , DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES MADE UNDER THE ALL-INDIA SERVICES ACT, 1951—continued

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mathur, you have got two amendments. The rules have been laid on the Table of the House. Do you want to move your amendments separately or both of them together?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): I wish to take up my first amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You move your amendment.

THE INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE (PAY) RULES, 1954.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Sir, I beg to move:

That the following modifications be

made in the Indian Administrative Service (Pay) Rules, 1954, namely: —

(i) For the existing Rule 3, the following be substituted, namely: —

"3. *Time-scales of pay.* —The time-scales of pay admissible to a member of the Service shall be as follows: —

Junior Scale:

Rs. 450—500—30—800—40—1,000 (16 years).

Senior Scale:

Rs. 800—(6th year or under)—40—1,000—50—1,500—60—1,800 (26 years).

Special Pay: (i)

Rs. 2,000. (ii)

Rs. 2,250.

(iii) Rs. 2,500 to be drawn by senior-most persons, total number not exceeding 10 per cent, of the cadre:

Provided that a member of the service to whom any other time-scale of pay was admissible under any order in force immediately before the commencement of these rules shall have the option to retain the old scale."

(ii) For the existing Schedule I, the following be substituted, namely: —

"SCHEDULE I

[See rules 4(2) and 5(2).]

Scales of pay for the Indian Administrative Service

Year of Service	Junior Scale	Senior Scale
	(Monthly rates of Pay)	
	Rs.	Rs.
1st	450	800
2nd	500	800
3rd	530	800
4th	560	800
5th	590	800
6th	620	800
7th	650	840
8th	680	880
9th	710	920
10th	740	960

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

Year of Service	Junior Scale	Senior Scale
	(Monthly rates of Pay)	
	Rs.	Rs.
11th	770	1,000
12th	800	1,050
	Efficiency Bar	
13th	840	1,100
14th	880	1,150
15th	920	1,200
16th	960	1,250
17th	1,000	1,300
18th	..	1,350
19th	..	1,400
20th	..	1,450
21st	..	1,500
22nd	..	1,560
23rd	..	1,620
24th	..	1,680
25th	..	1,740
26th	..	1,800

Special pay Rs. 2,000; Rs. 2,250 and Rs. 2,500 p.m. for selected posts not exceeding 10 per cent. of the total cadre."

(iii) In Schedule III,—

(a) in Part 'A.—Posts carrying pay above the time-scale pay in the Indian Administrative Service under the State Governments", for the figures "2,500", and "2,250", wherever they occur, the figures "2,250" and "2,000" respectively be substituted; and for the figure "2,150" the figure "2,000" be substituted:

(b) in Part "C.—Posts carrying pay above the time-scale or special pay in addition to pay in the time-scale under the Central Government when held by members of the service", for the figures "3,000" and "2,500", the figures "2,500" and "2,250" respectively be substituted; and for the figure "2,750", wherever it occurs, the figure "2,250" be substituted.

Sir, I am speaking in respect of the three amendments relating to the Indian Administrative Service. It is for the first time that we in Parliament are putting our seal of approval

to this pay structure and all that it implies. I further wish to emphasise that we cannot examine the pay structure of the All-India Services in isolation. They will have to be examined in the proper context. They will have to be examined in relation to the grades and the pay scales that are obtaining in the other branches of the administration. Not only that we will also have to take into consideration the pay scales that are obtaining in the private sector. These are all considerations which cannot be ignored when we are examining the pay structure of any particular service. While moving these amendments I was fully conscious—and I wish to stress that point—that the Indian Administrative Service constitutes the most important limb of our administration. That also constitutes the cream of our educated persons. We cannot afford to discuss the Services lightly. We cannot afford to discuss the pay structure of the Services lightly, because it is bound to have great repercussions. Corrupt and inefficient Services can drive this country to rack and ruin. We know, what happened to the Chiang-kai Shek Government. Efficient and honest Services, satisfied and contented Services can help the administration in carrying out its policies. The administrative machinery of the Government depends to a very great extent on the efficient working of the Services and the Indian Administrative Service constitutes such an important sector of the Services that if only we could ensure that in the Indian Administrative Service we have got really the right type of persons,— persons who understand the trends in the country, persons who are fully satisfied, persons who are prepared to take the fullest responsibility—I think the burden of the administration would be very much lightened, and we will find our schemes being implemented as we all desire them to be. I have stressed these facts because I may not be misunderstood as not realising the importance of the Services, that I may not be misunderstood as not understanding what we owe to the Services.

Because when I ask for a cut in salary at the top,—a cut which I have proposed at the top only as the first step,—we cannot afford to ignore the real position, we cannot give a sudden shock to the Services. The cut which I have proposed is at the top by bringing down the highest scale of pay from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 2,500. I was fully conscious of these facts and it is with a full recognition of these facts that I have felt most compelled to ask for this reduction. Sir, along with the reduction that I have asked for at the top I have further suggested that we should not follow the pattern which is given in these pay-structures. What they have done, Sir, is that they have listed certain post's, and the only posts which carry a salary of Rs. 3,000 are the posts of Secretaries of the Central Government. For very good reasons, Sir, I want the Government to depart from that practice. I will give my reasons, and I hope the hon. Minister will see through them.

Sir, in justifying this fact, the first thing which I would like to do is to invite the attention of this House and of the hon. Minister to the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission. The Central Pay Commission, Sir, which made its report in 1946 went very thoroughly into the whole question. They examined all the aspects of the case, and they recorded evidence of eminent economists. And in the light of that examination, the recommendation made by the Commission was that while recognising the fact that we should not ignore the present socio-economic structure, while recognising the fact that there was an insistent demand from the public sector for a great reduction in Services; while recognising the fact that the prices had gone up abnormally, and while recognising the fact that we were allowing no dearness allowance to people drawing a salary of more than Rs. 1,000, the salaries should not exceed Rs. 2,000, and it should be only in certain exceptional cases that we should allow, for certain special posts, a little more

And that figure too was not to go beyond, say, about Rs. 2,500. We have ignored the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission. The Central Pay Commission recommendations were made, Sir, as far back as 1946, and they made out a very strong case and they suggested that this was the first step which should be taken. I must, while cutting down this special pay at the top to Rs. 2,500, make it clear that it is the first step which I suggest. Well, Sir, the Pay Commission gave a warning, and I wish we take note of this warning. I give this warning not only to the Government. This is a warning to all of us; this is a warning to the country as a whole. Sir, I will be reading a small extract here from the Report, which says that "It is common knowledge that people in India have of late been influenced by the trend towards socialism " .

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS AND STATES (DR. K. N. KATJU) : May I know what you are reading from?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I am reading an extract from the Report of the Central Pay Commission.

DR. K. N. KATJU: That is all right. I am sorry to have disturbed you.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): It can be laid on the Table!

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Yes. I am myself laid bare on the Table. So the Report says " Classes who were hitherto content to accept their lot now show an intolerance of unsatisfactory conditions of work and an increased desire to improve their standard of living. The sufferings of the humbler classes of public servants have created in their mind a bitterness which delayed and grudging measures of relief have not by any means helped to assuage." We cannot ignore the present socio-economic structure. In the Report, Sir, they said that they would very much like

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] to cut down the salaries to Rs. 1,500, as suggested by certain economists, but it would be too rude a shock and it would be too sudden. It is therefore, Sir, that they suggested that the salaries should be cut down to about Rs. 2,000, the maximum. In spite of all these, I have put it at Rs. 2,500. There are other reasons as to why I have kept it at Rs. 2,500, as to why I felt compelled to cut it down from Rs. 3,000.

As I told you, Sir, the salaries have got to be examined in a certain context. **You cannot take them as isolated cases. If you will just examine the pay-structures in certain other countries—I am not dealing here with the pay structure of the other establishments, clerks and other services; I am only dealing with the people who are at the top, and it is here that I wish to invite the attention of the lion. Minister—you will find that in no other country, the Services get more than the Ministers get. I am leaving out the Prime Minister altogether, Sir, because the Prime Minister has acted in his own prudence by accepting the same salary which the other Ministers are taking. And it is his greatness that he has conceded such a position. But I would only like to mention by passing that we should not make a domestic affair of the pay-structure. After all, we have got to examine the pay-structure according to certain principles. It is quite all right that the Prime Minister may not like to accept more than Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 2,250. But the pay-structure has got to be fixed not for individuals but for the Services and for the Ministers as such. I am only quoting those democratic countries. What is the relationship between the salary of a Minister and the salary of the highest-paid civil servant there? In the U.S.A. the Ministers draw about 22,500 dollars a year, while the highest-paid civil servant does not draw more than 13,500 dollars. Here in India, Sir, it is the other way round. The Ministers draw**

Rs. 2,250 as their salary, while the salary which we are now fixing is Rs. 3,000 for the Secretaries.

ME. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which, rule do you refer to, Mr. Mathur?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: The salary for the Secretary is fixed in the Schedule. I have cut it down to Rs. 2,500. I have changed the complete Schedule, Sir. If you will look at page 947 of these Rules—this Gazette—you will find that the Secretaries to the Government of India get Rs. 3,000. There are two points which I am making. We go only by posts. And it is only to this particular class of people that we are paying a salary of Rs. 3,000. There are two parts to this amendment, and it is one part which I am criticising at the moment. Sir, in the U.K.—I am leaving out the Prime Minister who gets about 10,000 pounds a year—the Ministers get about 5,000 pounds a year, while the highest-paid civil servant is getting about 3,750 pounds. In India, Sir, it is Rs. 2,250 for the Ministers and Rs. 3,000 for the Secretaries.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): But you forget that

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I am not forgetting it, if you will kindly bear with me a little bit. Well, Sir, I know that the Ministers are getting a free house and they are getting certain other amenities. It is exactly what was in my mind. So, making an allowance for that, I thought that they were getting a little more than Rs. 2,500. If we add 10 per cent, or so, it would come to about Rs. 2,750.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Not less than Rs. 3,000, in any case, because they have houses, furniture, gardens, and so on and so forth.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: My hon. friend must remember that the Secretaries are also given similar houses

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But they pay rent.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: At what rate? It is again 10 per cent. So, when you strike a balance, you will have to take into consideration the Secretaries' salary plus other amenities, etc. We are striking the difference between the two. It should have been more. If I were to maintain the difference which I have quoted, it is 2,500 dollars a year in the U.S.A. as against 13,500 dollars.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: You mean 2,000 dollars as Ministers' salaries?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: It is 22,500 dollars a year which is the disparity between the two. I say we are not asking for the disparity but to be reasonable, to see that our pay structure looks a little balanced, we cannot permit the Secretaries to draw a higher salary than the Minister.

There is another point which can be of very great importance. Our Ministers might say or it might be argued by many of our Congress friends that the Ministers are not drawing this salary on the same level as other servants are drawing, that their conception of a democratic set-up is different from that of the U.K. Maybe that this sort of argument comes forth. I should consider that argument to be a big fraud. Either let our Ministers say that they have a very different standard for themselves, that they follow the Gandhian way of life and they follow the Gandhian standard of life—then their salary of Rs. 2,250 and all these amenities would never be justified by any consideration and by any argument but if they follow the ordinary principles of life, the ordinary code of life, the same code of democratic structure which is obtaining in the U.K. and all other places, I say the present position is indefensible and, Sir, it further leads me to think that they do not follow the Gandhian way otherwise why have they kept their salary as Rs. 2,250—that is almost the maximum which is given for the I.A.S. officers? That is what we kept as the maximum when we were considering the pay structure of the I.A.S. That is why they

have adopted this for themselves. So it would be absolutely wrong and incorrect to say that our Ministers are following the Gandhian way of life or the Gandhian standard. In that case, of course, they should have been living in much smaller houses with decent amenities and facilities and not in these luxurious palaces with all amenities and facilities which the best of the Britishers enjoyed, and they should not have drawn this salary but a salary at the most of Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,500. Then it could have been understood

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Rs. 10.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Because the standard set by my hon. friends was Rs. 500 as the maximum. Even taking the index as having gone up three times—that would create immense difficulties when they talk of index—I am prepared to be liberal and will make it Rs. 1,500 but nothing more. Certainly you cannot draw these salaries and live in the way you are living and say that you are following a different standard of life, a different code of life for drawing your emoluments and salaries. That would be a dishonest statement to make.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But we are discussing the Administrative Service Rules and not the Ministers.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: We are discussing the pay structure of the Services and the pay structure has got always to be fixed in relationship and in the context of other things. You cannot fix it in isolation. If you will look into the report of any of the Commissions who have examined the pay structure, they will tell you how it is fixed. They will tell you that the pay structure is fixed not only in relationship with the salaries which you pay in your Government but the pay structure is fixed in relationship to the salaries which are obtaining in the private sector of life and the Commission which reported these grades for the I.A.S. took into consideration

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] the salaries which were being drawn in the private sector and the figures were that people were making, in the private sector Class I Services, from Rs. 600 per month to Rs. 3,000 per month because there are many factors which you have got to take into consideration, e.g., whether you are fixing the pay structure which will tempt people to join the Services, whether we are not driving out the people. I would for the benefit of the House mention these broad principles—basic principles—which we have to take into consideration while fixing the pay structure. The general and basic educational qualifications and the special qualifications and training required by the authorities of particular offices—this is No. 1 which we have to take into consideration while fixing the pay scales. No. 2 and even more important is the nature of the duties and responsibilities of the office which we have to take into consideration when we are fixing the pay structure. No. 3 is whether he is paid enough to maintain himself—that false notion of dignity should not be there—but he must be given enough to maintain a proper status which the Government wants him to maintain. At least he should be beyond want. No. 4 is very important—fair relativity. And what is that fair relativity? Fair relativity should be maintained between the rates of pay of certain classes not only in the Government but also in the private sector. The Government and we are taking a very big responsibility, I wish to emphasise, Sir, when we are adopting this pay structure because you must be prepared to pay similar salaries to other branches of the administration. Maybe we are today discussing the salary of I.A.S. but the country has got to be taken as a whole. The salaries of the I.A.S. will have to be in relation to the salaries to the other branches of the administration. You cannot say that the best of the persons in the Education Department or in the best of the universities—far more qualified than these people—will have to stop at Rs. 1,200 as is

the case at present and that you will permit the I.A.S. to go to Rs. 2,500. By implication, it would not be fair for the Parliament; it would not be proper for the Parliament, it would not be possible for the Parliament with all reason and right to turn down the demands from the other branches of the administration when they come up and compare their duties and responsibilities and their basic qualifications to give them a lower salary than you are allowing to these people. This basic comparison has been made even by the Pay Commission while arriving at these figures and now as it has been very saliently observed that we must also recognize that the various conditions reflect in a large measure the political development at which a community has arrived. So the pay structure which we are fixing today has got to be fixed in a consideration of so many other factors. As I pointed out in my speech the other day on my Resolution, the whole emphasis has got to change. While recognising the importance of the Services, the whole emphasis has got to change. We have got to give more salaries to people who are employed on creative work. When I say creative work, I mean people who are employed in services like engineering, on scientific research and in educational institutions. There is no country, I wish to emphasise, no democratic, progressive country which pays smaller salaries to its professors and to the scientific research people than any of the civil services. You may examine the pay structure of all the progressive countries and you will find that the pay structure is so framed that these creative people, these people who add to the wealth of the land, to the national wealth, they get a better salary than the administrative or other services. I do not remember whether I pointed out this fact that the director of an institute who is the administrative head of the institute, who is responsible for the administration of the institute, gets about Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 3,500 while the professor who is employed on research there gets almost double that remuneration. That is a

feature which you will find almost in all these countries. These are very strong considerations to my mind. But all the same, I did not want to lose sight of the real situation, the difficulties which our administration has got to face in this country. I never wanted to be driven away by my idealism and ask the Home Minister to cut down the salaries of these friends from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 1,500—I have made the cut as little as possible so that it could be adjusted in our present circumstances.

Sir, there is another big reason why I have made this suggestion and it is a very important reason. I have suggested a change and it is a very vital change that it is not only the Secretary who should draw a salary of Rs. 3,000, but ten per cent, of the cadre strength—or make it 5 per cent.; I leave it to the Home Minister—should be entitled to draw it. It is for the Home Minister to examine it and put it at 10 or 5 per cent. But I think 10 per cent, would be absolutely reasonable. It is only the seniormost people—and they will not be more than 10 per cent, of the cadre—who will get this top salary. If you do not have such a change, what will happen is only the Secretaries will get this salary and the secretary's job is a tenure job. A Secretary getting Rs. 3,000 will, on reversion get much less, may be Rs. 1,800 sometimes because the grade for the I.A.S. comes only up to Rs. 1,800. So the Secretary here whose is a tenure job will always manage and manoeuvre to stay on, even beyond the tenure period. And even according to the figures supplied by the hon^o the Home Minister here on the floor of the House, we know that the present position is that many of the Secretaries have overstayed their tenure period and are not inclined to move from here. Well, the circumstances were not so bad at the time of the I.C.S., because in the I.C.S., if a Secretary got Rs. 4,000, the Commissioner also got a similar salary. But here it is only the Secretary and the Secretary alone who gets this salary

of Rs. 3,000. So it would be only natural for him to try to stay on here, and I think all of us, if we were in that position, would do the same; we would not like to go away from the job where we got Rs. 3,000. Why should we want to go anywhere else? Therefore, I say, if we provide that the seniormost man will get Rs. 2,500 wherever he be, whether he is the Secretary or the Development Commissioner, then there would be no difficulty in getting a fresh flow of persons from the district administration to these stone walls of the Secretariat. This is a very important change and that is why I very much emphasise it. There is no reason why we should make the Secretary alone draw Rs. 3,000. There is still another reason why we should not do that.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Am I right in thinking that you recommend Rs. 2,500?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Yes, I have said Rs. 2,500 but not only for the Secretaries. I have finished with that point and the point that I am making now is this. According to your present rules, it is only by virtue of the post that the Secretary can draw Rs. 3,000. What I submit is that it should not be by virtue of the post and post only. After all it would invariably be the top man who will come here as Secretaries and they will always be getting Rs. 2,500. So if you give Rs. 3,000 to ten per cent., that will be all right. After all, you have about 1,250 hands and after your expansion you will have something like 1,500 in all and there will be a minimum of 100 persons who will be drawing the top salary and you want only about 25 or 20 people here for the posts of Secretaries here and these people will get Rs. 2,500. There are, however, others who are discharging very important functions in the field who will also be getting Rs. 2,500 each and so you will have no difficulty in sending your Secretary from here as Development Commissioner somewhere else, because he will not lose in his salary. He will not try to dig himself deep here.'

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

There is another reason for my suggestion. The present arrangement has the risk that it gives rise to a lot of opportunism and it gives rise to a lot of other evils. It is not always the seniormost man who is the Secretary. After all, it is a selection job and anybody can be picked up and posted as Secretary- He may be getting only Rs. 1,800 and on coming here he will get Rs. 3,000. But tomorrow if he is sent away he gets only Rs. 1,800 and this fact will lead to a lot of evil. The Secretaries here will not be able to assert themselves. They will not be able to discharge their responsibilities as they ought to. They will not have the strength to stand up and discharge their responsibilities because there will be this constant fear of being sent away if they displeased the Minister or the Home Minister. I do not mind the hon. Minister taking any action he likes against corrupt officers, or against inefficient officers. But you should not create circumstances or create a position which leaves no other go to these people but to dance attendance on the Ministers or dance to their tune. There will be so many circumstances that will conspire to bring down the morale of the topmost people here. It is for this reason also that I have suggested the modification.

Let us also not forget the fact, Sir, that now it is not the job of the Secretary which is so important. The job of the Development Commissioner in any of the provinces is much more important. You have got to recognise that fact and we have to change our emphasis. We are in the midst of a Plan and we are in the midst of developing our country. Are we going to ignore that fact? I hope the Home Minister who is also the Minister for States knows that a very strong recommendation was made by the Planning Commission that the Development Commissioner in a particular State because he was not the top man could not pull his weight, could not co-ordinate things and it was said that the Chief Secretary should be

brought in. But the Chief Secretary is already over-burdened. It has been submitted in so many words "that the man should be the top-man because he has got to co-ordinate the activities at su many departments. So I say a man of the status of Secretary here should be the Development Commissioner in- almost all the States—the Development Commissioner or the Planning Commissioner. This will help us in more than one way. We will have the right type of people to-do the actual administration and also to do the work in which we are most vitally interested, I mean the development of the country. And we will nave another advantage that these people on having gained all this experience in the districts will be available to come here as Secretaries. It is for this reason that I have suggested that the special pays will be Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 2,250 and Rs. 2,500 and these will be drawn by the seniormost persons, their total number not exceeding 10 per cent, of the cadre.

Sir, there are two more changes that I have suggested in these time-scales.

I have cut down the pay of the man at the top and I have very good reasons. We have been arguing for a long time that there is a very great disparity between the lowest paid clerk and the highest paid civil servant. The lowest paid clerk is getting Rs. 100 or some such thing while tne top man gets a large figure. This is what we have said. In the U.K., as I pointed out, the difference between the lowest paid clerk and the highest paid civil servant was only 8 times. You will find here, in the best of the Services, the I.A.S., the difference is eight times—the juniormost man gets Rs. 350 while the top man gets Rs. 3,000. This happens in the same service and a service wherein you want to collect the cream of the people of our country. This sort of disparity obtains nowhere else on God's earth. My hon. friends were very much touched when I talked about the Ministers. They thought that Rs. 500 was not enough, that life was so

costly. If life was costly for the Ministers—and is costly for them—it is all the more costly for these poor ' people. You have given them Rs. 350. If the cost of living has gone up by only three times, what does it come to?

DR. K. N. KATJU: May I rise on a point of order, Sir? My hon. friend seems to be concentrating on explaining the whole case to the Benches there.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: My only complaint is that the Minister is running away here and there. Instead of making any complaint, I am just consoling myself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is getting replies to the points raised by you. You have already taken 40 minutes, Mr. Mathur.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: As I told you, Sir, it will not be less than one hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you will not make an equally long speech' on the other amendment.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I think there is not likely to be a long speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: For both together, you should not take more than two hours.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I cannot say, Sir, but you will find that I am not repeating any arguments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The changes that you have suggested are very little.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: If they are very little, I am very happy to sit down without making any comment if only the hon. Minister will say that they are very little and also accept them. In that case, I will have nothing to say.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I want you to address me also.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I am sorry, I cannot address you. I am address-

ing the Chair and I am sorry I cannot address you. Do not get very envious of these people.

As I said, I have made two great, changes so far as the pay scale is concerned. One is raising the salaries of the people at the bottom. That is very necessary. I have done it for the following reason. We are paying Rs. 450 to the cream of our society, as you would like to call it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want it to be Rs. 450.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: That is the minimum.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want it to be increased by Rs. 100.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Instead of Rs. 350 I want it to be Rs. 450.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Efficiency bar?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: There are three reasons why I advocate this. I will not discuss further the ground of disparity. What is it that Rs. 450 can produce? These officers, in the best part of their lives, have to lead a *va it* miserable life. It is at this stage that we must pay them a little more. As I just now submitted, in the private sector the salaries which are obtaining at present in certain recognised firms range from Rs. 600 to Rs. 3,000. If you go to Burmah Shell or to any other class I firm, the class I people get a minimum of Rs. 600 and they get a better DA and other better amenities. I speak with a little bit of experience. Two or three of my relations who are in Class I service are restless; they do not want to stay there. My hon. friend will say that salary is not the only consideration; certainly, Sir, salary is the primary consideration. Nobody can deny it. Today, the public servant at the lowest level is a very miserable person, even if he is an I.A.S. officer. He has to go through such a mill and such hardships and treatments that he does not

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] know where he stands. I know that it may be a passing phase and I do not want to dilate upon that point and I do not want to argue but I definitely feel that the salary which you are paying is absurdly low and you cannot but leave these people open to temptation to go to the private sector. Now that we are industrialising rapidly, more people would go to the private sector. It may be true that we are getting a large number of people for the I.A.S. Thousands of people are sitting for the examination. If we examine the type of people who sit for the examination, we will be simply amused. I have made a little study of it but it would not be possible for me now to dilate on that as it will take a long time, but I do appeal to the hon. Minister to realise how he will not be a loser in the long run. I will tell him why. He has placed the junior scale for nineteen years but these junior scales never last for nineteen years except in the case of one person in three hundred; not even one per cent, of the officers ever stay in the junior scale for nineteen years. It is a question of simple mathematics. Your jobs are senior scale jobs; all the I.A.S. jobs are senior scale jobs and it is only a fixed percentage—teen or twenty—who are on the junior scale just in the beginning, for a few years. After the sixth year, the officer immediately goes on to Rs. 800. He gets Rs. 800 after the 7th year. Some people are fortunate enough to get Rs. 800 in their sixth year. Some get in the 7th year or the 8th year. So, it is only for the first five years that this change will have any effect. You are treating these people not very charitably, not very fairly. Actually, my proposals would not entail a large expenditure. This is what I wish to stress further: the private sector will not tempt them. This will stop our people from running away because the future would be very good for them. After six or seven or eight years, they get Rs. 800; in the private sector also they do not get more than that in the fifth, sixth or the seventh year of their service.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I am only trying to follow your point. The result of that argument is that it is a question of Rs. 5,000 in the first five years.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I have never said it.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I am only trying to follow the argument. You are raising the salary by Rs. 100 per month—Rs. 350 to Rs. 450—and the result is that in five years the officers will be paid Rs. 5,000 more. Is it said that Rs. 5,000 is driving people away from the public sector to the private sector or *vice versa*?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I have never said it. I do not know what is the strange argument of the hon. Minister. He has his own opinions; I never said any of these things. My argument is very simple, Sir, and I have given the justification for it. I would like the hon. Minister to explain why he has got the junior scale for 19 years. I should like him only to tell me how many persons stay in the junior scale even after six or seven years just this figure. May I know if it is even 5 per cent, or even if it is 2 per cent. It is not so and I am stressing this point because this is only as a sort of a camouflage.

Sir, another thing I have not been able to follow. Now whom I am to address I do not know. I am addressing the Chair, and I think I should have to make a point.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA (Madhya Bharat): No, no, he is here. He is drinking water.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I do not want to make anything much out of this.

SHRI B. GUPTA: He is quite confident that it will be passed.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I am also confident that I will make out a very good case. What he does is his concern, not mine.

Now, Sir, in this clause 3 there is this proviso "Provided that a member of the service to whom any other time-scale of pay was admissible under any order in force immediately before the commencement of these rules shall continue to draw pay in that scale." I do not know the implication of this, I have to confess, and I would only like the hon. Minister to explain to me why he wants the old scale to continue in the case of that particular individual because the general practice is— and it has been followed invariably—that in such cases you give a sort of discretion whether he wants to retain the old scale or come into the new scale. If the new scale is better he will certainly be in the new scale. It may be a man in the I.A.S. If you are asking him to take over those responsibilities then he must certainly be given an opportunity to have that time scale. Maybe this is meant for the old I.C.S. who had better scales, I do not know. If it is so, even then my amendment is just in order because they are free to retain their old scale. That has been happening all over, everywhere, in the railway administration, where there have been so many integrations, certain people who were drawing higher salaries were permitted that sort of discretion. I think there are certain other implications involved.

As you are very short of time, Sir, I will wind up and urge the hon. the Home Minister to accept these amendments which are very moderate, which have been made simply in view of the fact that they are such as are not a very great departure and may be acceptable to the administration realising the difficulties of the administration and all that, and I hope, Sir, he will see his way to accept these amendments.

Only one part of this amendment remains to be considered and that is at the tail end of it. Again the same thing has happened in the time-scale pay in the I.A.S. under the State Governments. For the reasons I have given in respect of such posts in the

Central Secretariat, which apply with stronger force so far as the posts in Part B States are concerned, I want corresponding reductions.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments are open for discussion.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, we have gone through the rules framed by the hon. Minister's department and presented before us for our approval and I have not a doubt in my mind that the gentlemen of the Congress Party will be whipped into supporting it and these Rules will be passed. Even if they have forgotten their past pledges with regard to the salaries of the bureaucrats

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you supporting his amendment?

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am coming to that. If you interrupt me, Sir, it will take a little more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to know, Mr. Gupta, if you are supporting Mr. Mathur's amendment.

SHRI B. GUPTA: If you allow me free, Sir, the flow will be even and smooth and we shall be within time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to know whether you are supporting Mr. Mathur's amendment.

SHRI B. GUPTA: And also you see,, after all

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't evade the question, please.

SHRI B. GUPTA. Now, Sir, they may have forgotten their pledges, but we do remember and we want to live up' to those pledges that we commonly took at one time. The parting of the ways had of course come and we understand their position.

Now, Sir, the proposals are totally unacceptable to us. If we had been in hon. Mr. Katju's position we would have seen those pays disappear a long

[Shri B. Gupta.] time ago and salary scales fixed according to the standard of living of the country and in accord with the pledges that we had previously taken during the freedom struggle. Now, Sir, I cannot accept the amendments offered by him either because they make but little change. It seems to me that the hon. Member, Mr. Mathur, has more or less accepted the fundamental proposition of the hon. Mr. Katju and between these two honourable men I find it difficult to come to a position which would be acceptable to one or the other. Sir, I wholly reject this thing, the whole abominable idea of paying heavy salaries to the officials in our country, to the Administrative and Police Services, when millions of our people are starving, when the lower-grade employees are without nourishment and food, when they have no future, when everything before them is absolutely bleak and gloomy. In such a situation they come forward unashamedly, without the slightest compunction or qualm of conscience, to provide such heavy and high salaries for the bureaucrats. This is reprehensible to good conscience. This is something which we totally oppose. Sir, it may be argued that unless the salary is provided for, the services will not be there. It may be said because, I am told, that is the cream of the society. I do know who skimmed that cream and out of what. It is the British who skimmed that cream. It may please those Ministers, but not us.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: What about the I.A.S.?

SHRI B. GUPTA: The I.A.S. is modelled in the same way, cast in the same die, and therefore let us not talk about it. We shall come to that later. Therefore, Sir, when they fixed those salaries, did it occur to them that 59 per cent, of the employees of the Government of India, other than military employees, get a salary of Rs. 51 or less? Did it occur to them that out of 9,01,000 such employees under the Government of India, about

4,33,000 get a salary between Rs. 51 and Rs. 100? I do not think that it struck them, because they are not concerned with the fate of these people, the requirements of these people. That is why completely brushing aside the long-standing demands they come forward with proposals for fixing the salary grade for the bureaucrats in high places which would put to shame any incorrigible bureaucrat in the world, and that is what I want to say. Sir, we are told

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, we are concerned only with Mr. Mathur's amendments. You have not tabled any amendments for reduction of salaries.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I reject his amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What happens then?

SHRI B. GUPTA: Of course, I reject his.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may reject, but what happens?

SHRI B. GUPTA: I do not know what will happen.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then these Rules will stand.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I reject these.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As long as you have not tabled any amendments

SHRI B. GUPTA: Then I will vote against them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not put it to vote. It is laid on the Table.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Anyway my words will carry sense.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not know

SHRI B. GUPTA: It does not matter because the Congress has got its votes in its pocket.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope it will --

SHRI B. GUPTA: I hope, Sir, you will not disturb, because you should also be interested.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, I want you to be relevant.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am trying

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to speak on Mr. Mathur's amendments—either in support or in opposition.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I oppose everything that is written here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please speak on the amendments.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am speaking and I am saying why I am opposing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing is placed for the approval of the House. The papers are laid.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am opposing his amendments and simultaneously. I am opposing these Rules also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am telling you that the Rules will not be voted upon and the Rules are only laid on the Table of the House. If you had tabled an amendment for reduction of salaries you would be perfectly relevant. You could have said anything. I would have allowed it.

3 P.M.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, I will make my position clear because it seems I have to make it clear before I get a chance to explain it fully.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must come to the amendments.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am sure you know the import of these rules. This is the last day of the session and you must understand that it is always Dr. Katju's stunt to come out at the last moment and produce such things. He has

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 15 days, before, the Rules have been laid on the Table.

SHRI B. GUPTA: He has intelligence, but that intelligence is misplaced. Now, I oppose them and why do I oppose? Because they are not satisfactory and why are they not satisfactory? Because too much is still given through his amendments. Now, it seems that I have to speak on all these things to be, what you would call, relevant. Here, they have provided Rs. 3,000 for the Secretaries. And the senior scale salary goes up to Rs. 1,800 and the junior scale to Rs. 950. We know these junior gentlemen will easily pass into the senior scale if they do their job a little better, not by serving the people, but by putting people like us in jail. It is they who are producing these scandals, the jeep scandal, the fertiliser scandal and all that. At the end of 25 years all these people would be getting Rs. 1,800. Here you will find that somehow or other my hon. friend Mr. Mathur retains that. I do not see why he should retain that. I am not in agreement with him there. It should be drastically cut down.

Now, I will take the probable arguments that Mr. Mathur may have in his mind. He sits a little close to me, but that mind is very far from me; it is impervious to my ideas. As I said, I cannot understand why my friend Mr. Mathur retains that. If it is a question of efficiency I can tell him that people who are public spirited and patriotic can serve the country on a much smaller salary with far greater efficiency and devotion. We have seen it in various other walks of life. Sir, you, I suppose, as Deputy Chairman of the House, are also very ably discharging your duties despite my interruptions. Now, how much are you getting and how much is the Chief Secretary getting? If it is a question of the efficiency being injured or the devotion of the service being injured, I say you can get people to serve the country on much less salary provided they are patriotically minded. The Congress movement itself was not built on heavy pay bills. On the contrary.

[Shri B. Gupta.] many people made sacrifices and built up the movement and it is because of the sacrifices of those people that they have ridden into positions of power and authority. Therefore, the argument that high salaries should be given for the purpose of having efficiency does- not stand to reason.

Perhaps an argument may be advanced that some standard of life has to be assured. Yes, some standard has to be assured to them and I do not grudge it. Those who are officials should be given a decent living. We are all interested in a decent living for all, not merely for the officials but for the common people also. Therefore we would not like to deny them what we stand for. Those are our categorical imperatives. But if you just squander money like that on them, there will be nothing left for the other people. It is not right therefore that you must give them Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 2,500 in the name of giving them a decent living. I am not an indecent person; neither are you an indecent person. I do not require Rs. 3,000; I do not suppose you require either that much. There are many other hon. gentlemen who are as decent as many of these officials are—I have in mind the good ones—and how many of them want Rs. 3,000? I would like to ask: is it for giving them a standard of living that you want to pay Rs. 3,000 to them? But what has it done? It has done nothing except to feed their gold lust. This high salary is conceivable only when you have in mind a steel-frame bureaucracy. In a country whose administration is run on popular lines, whose administration is actuated by patriotic and public spirit, this question of salary would not present itself in the manner in which it presents itself before us. Therefore all these questions are moonshine talk; they are not worth the paper on which the proposals are made.

Another argument was that a lot of money had been spent by them on their education because one has to pass one's B.A., M.A., then sit for the I.A.S. examination, and answer all kinds of

silly questions in the viva voce examination to get through. Here again, I would say that there are lots of people who are well educated, M.A.'s of universities, distinguished scholars, who work in the various educational institutions on a much less salary and live a very decent, honourable and respected life. There is no denying this fact. Therefore this question of expenditure on education and other things should not be brought in.

Perhaps my hon. friend will say that unless we pay them more money—I anticipate he will say that—they are liable to take to some kind of corrupt practices for meeting certain of their needs. First of all, I do not think that if we choose our people rightly for the administrative jobs, they will be corrupt people. I know there are some good people in the Administration at different levels; I am not saying that all are corrupt. But have you thought it over that in spite of these heavy salaries paid to them, corruption has not been checked? I think, Sir, the jeep scandal, the fertiliser scandal and all the other scandals that are enumerated in the Audit Reports will be accounted for if we had it in mind that the larger the salary the greater is the lust for corruption, and for more gain. It is something like presenting blood before a tiger which instead of appeasing the tiger only makes him more blood-thirsty. That is what I have got to say. Our country has got excellent traditions for public service. We have people in many walks of life who did very many great things without caring for gains. Therefore we feel that we can have incorruptible people even without providing such high salaries. Even if you pay high salaries, I say, it does not at all guarantee that corruption will be eliminated altogether. Therefore that argument also does not hold water.

So I do not see any reason except that some money should be given to them. I ask myself, why is it that an intelligent, shrewd and experienced man like Dr. Kailas Nath Katju takes to the position of granting such heavy-

salaries to the officials? And I find the answer not in the arguments that have been advanced before, but in something else. They are interested in maintaining a bureaucratic steel-frame which should have been disbanded and dismantled long ago. They need it for their administration. In order to pursue their anti-people policies it becomes necessary for them to nurse a bureaucracy at the Centre and in the States which would be ready to go against the people and carry on the anti-people policies. Therefore cut away from all patriotic traditions, cut away from the loyalty to the people, cut away from the devotion to the people, they want to place at the Centre and in the States some bureaucratic officials, who, because of the heavy salaries that will be given to them, will prove loyal to the present regime, its dictates and promptings and to the policies it pursues. That is the political reason why this bureaucracy is being maintained at this high salary. There is no other reason except that. The British, you will remember, Sir, when they established the Indian Civil Service, in disregard of the hunger and misery of the people, mulcted them of money to pay the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Police Service and what not in order to create that steel-frame which would do their bidding. And the same principle, the same logic, the same outlook, the same mentality, the same ways are being followed in the whole scheme of things. That is which we take serious objection to. Any patriotic man, whether he belongs to the Congress or not, will revolt against such a scheme, especially when our people are starving. Therefore, the whole scheme is one which must be opposed from all angles. Now, the hon. Member has said: "Increase the salary from the lower rung, from Rs. 350 or Rs. 400. because it starts from the right end." The I.A.S. is not our concern, or those in the big administrative services. In any case, they are very much well placed in life, their future is guaranteed, their tenure of service is guaranteed. I will not be interested in increasing their pay. What I would suggest is that the sala-70 R.9.D.

ries and wages be increased at the bottom.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you have finished.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Now, we should set an example.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken twenty minutes already. You do not refer to any of the amendments. You are going far wide of the mark.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a repetition.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I want to speak because I feel indignant about it. I can tell you very frankly that I feel like tearing the whole set of rules to pieces.

Mn. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you must have tabled an amendment.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I was referring to the question of example. The Prime Minister did not accept a high salary. It is quite a laudable example, although he is taking a little more than we would have given him if we were on the other side of the House. But then he would not have been the Prime Minister. Now, it is very essential that you place great faith in the administration. It is the top service; it occupies a central place in the administration of the country and in our public life. You will concede that point. Here comes the question of setting an example. If you grant such salaries to these Administrative Services, it does not lie in your mouth to tell others not to demand higher salaries when they are very justified to do so. Now having given unto yourselves such high salaries, you refuse to increase the salaries of the low paid employees and other officials. On the contrary you are interfering 'even in their private affairs, as you did in the case of the bank employees to reduce the salary of these people. That is a bad example. You want us to save money; we have been told that the country does not have capital accumulation. You have told our people to live on industry. You have said "*Aram Haram Hai*". But if you do a lot of

[Shri B. Gupta.]
work, you get nothing for it. And those people who shout "Aram Haram I Hai" earn enormous money. That is a bad example, I say. You are setting a bad example before the country. It will demoralise the country. What would the people think of us? That we in this Parliament cannot get anything done in the interests of workers — we cannot get anything done for the bank employees; we cannot get more wages for the railway workers; we cannot get more wages for the post and telegraph employees; we cannot get more wages for the ordnance factory workers; we cannot get more wages for the orderlies who are standing here or for the employees of Parliament. At the same time, these hon. Members of Parliament get up and discuss this measure and support—a majority of them—Dr. Katju in allowing such high salaries to these people. There is nothing that demoralises so much. You are, if anything, lowering the dignity of Parliament because such things should have never emanated from Parliament. That is what I feel. Therefore, you are setting an utterly bad example before the country. You ask us to economise, you ask us to save money, you ask the people to be frugal and all that. At the same time, you are maintaining white elephants in the administrative services which take away a large sum from the public exchequer. Persons on smaller salaries can discharge these duties better. Therefore I say: from the angle of public policy; from the angle of public morality; from the angle of principle; from the point of view of public exchequer; from every angle of public life, this is something which should be opposed tooth and nail. And I think if Dr. Katju has still any humility in him to live up to the standards which were once preached before the country, he should take back this abominable scheme of things which is a sheer robbery on the public exchequer and which would not set the administration on a better footing but would bring about corruption and demoralisation, decay and degeneration, and would uphold bureaucracy, wastage of public

funds and set an example of unlimited corruption and unbounded shame before the country.

श्री गांधीकृष्ण विजयचर्गीय (मध्य भारत) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय! मैंने सर्विसिज के सवाल के बारे में काफी विचार किया है और मंत्रों के लिए भी वह विषय एक आदर्श और कॉन्शंस का सवाल हो गया है। हमारे इस विशाल देश के लिए सर्विसिज बहुत आवश्यक है किन्तु जिस ढंग से इस देश में आजादी आई, उन्हीं आदर्शों पर चल कर और गांधी जी के उद्देश्यों का पालन करके हमने इस देश को स्वतंत्र किया, लेकिन हमने सर्विसिज के स्ट्रक्चर को ऐसा नहीं बनाया जो गांधी जी के उद्देश्यों के अनुसार होता।

मैंने कहा कि यह विषय मंत्रों के लिए भी जनतंत्रण कॉन्शंस का सवाल रहा है। कांग्रेस पार्टी में काम करते हुए मैंने समय-समय पर अखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी और दूसरी जगहों पर इस विषय में कई सुझाव रखे कि हमारे देश में जो सर्विसिज का ढांचा है उसका रूप बदलना चाहिये। मैं इस विषय में यह अनुभव करता हूँ कि चाहे श्री हरीशचन्द्र माधुर की आवाज न सुनी जाय लेकिन उनकी बात में काफी सच्चाई है।

सर्विसिज का सवाल किसी पार्टी का नहीं है, न तो कांग्रेस पार्टी का, न सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का, न कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का सवाल, और न ही किसी स्वतंत्र पार्टी का सवाल है। सवाल है सिर्फ सर्विसिज का, और उस पर पार्टियों को एकमत होना चाहिये। वैसे तो मैं एक नया मंत्री हूँ जैसा कि मैंने समझा, उससे मंरा यह ख्याल है कि कुछ समय पहले इस सार सवाल के सम्बन्ध में एक कमीशन मुकर्रर करने के लिए सजेरन आया था, जो कि इस सार सवाल के सम्बन्ध में विचार करेगा और सिफारिश पेश करेगा। मैं इस तरह के ख्याल के पक्ष में हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि इस पर एर तौर से जांच की जानी चाहिये और जो पुराना ढांचा चला आ रहा है उसमें कुछ न कुछ बदलाव होना चाहिये।

में कुछ समय के लिए मध्य भारत में चीफ मिनिस्टर के पद पर रहा, मैंने खुद वैसे कभी भी सर्विस नहीं की, किन्तु जहाँ कुछ अनुभव इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे हुआ उसके बिना पर मैं यह अनुभव करता हूँ कि आज हमारी सर्विसिज में ऊपर से लेकर नीचे तक सुधार होना चाहिये। हम कहते हैं कि किसानों को तकावी मिलनी चाहिये। गवर्नमेंट ने तकावी मंत्र की और जब हम जिलों में और गांवों में किसानों के पास जाते हैं तो हमको मालूम होता है कि सरकार के जहाँ कर्मचारी हैं उन्होंने तकावी बांटने में गोलमाल किया है। आज हमारे देश में जो भी काम किया जाता है अफसरों और कर्मचारियों द्वारा किया जाता है किन्तु इस समय देश में जिस ढंग से कार्य हो रहा है उससे जनता में एक तरह का असंतोष पैदा होता जा रहा है। कहा जाता है कि बड़े कर्मचारी अच्छे हैं परन्तु छोटे कर्मचारी उचित रूप से कार्य नहीं करते हैं। परन्तु उनको तो तनखाह कम दी जाती है और बड़े अफसरों को काफी तनखाह दी जाती है। मैं कहना यह है कि छोटे अफसरों का खर्चा जनता के प्रति रसपॉसिब नहीं है और इसमें साथ ही साथ बड़े अफसरों की जिम्मेदारी कम नहीं है। छोटे कर्मचारियों का खर्चा ठीक न करना बड़े अफसरों की असफलता का सबूत है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vijaivargiya, I do not want you to follow Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's example. We are concerned not with the general Services or with the Administrative Services. We are mainly concerned with the amendments moved by Mr. Mathur. If you are going to oppose them, you oppose them; if you are going to support them, you support them. You cannot go beyond that.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIARGIYA: That is right, Sir.

जहाँ तक एमंडमेंट का सवाल है और वह जिस ढंग से पेश किया है, मैं सुभाव यह है कि सर्विसिज के सम्बन्ध में एक कमिशन मुकर्रेर किया जाय

जो कि सारे सवाल पर विचार करे और अपनी सिफारिश दे। आज हम दुखते हैं कि सर्विसिज में बड़े अफसरों को तो काफी बंटन दिया जाता है और छोटे कर्मचारियों को कम बंटन दिया जाता है। अगर छोटे कर्मचारियों का बंटन बढ़ा दिया जाय तो इसमें कोई हर्ज नहीं होगा। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में पूरी जांच होनी चाहिये। और एक कमिशन मुकर्रेर किया जाना चाहिये। इस समय सारे देश में पंचवर्षीय योजना का कार्य हो रहा है अगर हमारे सर्विसिज की स्थिति यही रही तो यह हमारा सारा प्लानिंग का काम खूब जायेगा। यही हाल रहा तो हमारा कायम किया हुआ प्रजातन्त्र भी खूब जायेगा।

DR. K. N. KATJU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have had the pleasure of hearing a great oration. The correct description would be a great declamation. But I am only sorry that it has been somewhat misplaced. When I was in Calcutta, I was aware of the particular spot where declamations of this description were very appropriate and gladdened the heart of thousands. But we are here in a very small number, and we are more persuaded by a less declamatory style and a more persuasive and a more reasonable manner.

My hon. friend from Bengal did not address himself to the realities of the situation, did not give us a figure in any country, anywhere, did not tell us as to what the minimum income was and what the maximum income was in countries which he loved, in countries which he hated, in countries which he held indifferently; he just came out

SHRI B. GUPTA: We are concerned with our country, with our nation, with our ministers

DR. K. N. KATJU: So you are ours. I understand all that. My hon. friend looked at the South pole and the North pole. My hon. friend stated that the start of Rs. 350 to a young man was very hard on him; he could not maintain the dignity, the status, the rank; and he could not live upon Rs. 350. He said: "Please give him Rs. 450."

[Dr..... K.....N. Katju.]

My hon. friend on the other side did not say whether he supported Rs. 350 or Rs. 450. He only said "Let me be gin with the lower rung of the ladder " I only want to know whether he supports Rs. 350 or Rs. 450.

SHRI B. GUPTA: We do not want to support any salary which would be more than Rs. 1,000 and we do not want to support any salary which would not give an employee of the Government a decent standard of life. Have you got it down?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Very well. I understand Rs. 1,000 quite all right. But so far as the lower limit is concerned, it is all in the air, nebulous, nowhere. The amendment that the House is discussing is relating to Rs. 350 to start with. My hon. friend condemns it straightaway. Now, Sir, he was trying to explain to us, he was trying to persuade us that the acceptance of his amendment would not really mean much, because the junior scale was for 5 years, and in the junior scale he just wanted to raise the minimum by Rs. 100. He said that the man would get Rs. 100 a month, Rs. 1,200 a year and Rs. 6,000 in five years. He says that this Rs. 6,000 will make such an enormous difference. If a man finds that he will be less by Rs. 6,000 in the first five years, he will go to the private sector; he will bid good-bye to his career in the Indian Administrative Service. So, this Rs. 6,000 difference would mean a complete destruction of the whole senior scale and the junior scale. I want a clear answer from my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—he need not give it to me just now, he can give it to me later—to the question whether he supports Rs. 450

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We support

¹ DR. K. N. KATJU: I did not put the question to you.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I give the answer. We support Rs. 350. We are not for any increase.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Very well, I have got the answer from both of them.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, before we go further, I should like the House to bear in mind the background of this. This thing has been going on for years and years, ever since the advent of independence. My hon. friend mentioned here the Pay Commission. There was a Pay Commission. I suggest that it is very easy to propose a commission of this sort or that sort. But if you appoint a commission, it will take five years, because the number of Services is so vast, and then, everything is so integrated. You cannot have Central Secretariat Services apart from State Services. Over and over again, I hear complaints from poor State Governments. They say: "How can we carry on in the Writer's Building in Calcutta? In one room we have got the Central Government servants; for that very job the man is getting Rs. 150; we are poor; we have got little funds. In the next room our man is doing the same job precisely, and we are giving him Rs. 70, Rs. 80 or Rs. 100." Therefore, Sir, when we suggest examination of a question like this by the Pay Commission, let us bear in mind that no Pay Commission can function with any expectation of success, or do its job in a satisfactory manner, unless it reviews the whole field of service, every branch of it, scientific, irrigational, engineering, police, this, that and the other, both in the Centre and in the States; and it will take, I tell you, not less than five years. And by the time the Pay Commission submits its report, probably the thing will become out of date. They will say then that the prices have fallen, the prices have risen, and goodness knows what. Now, Sir, this particular question was examined by the Pay Commission. What was the result? The pay, so far as the junior scale is concerned, has been adopted. My hon. friend says "Rs. 350 is too low, make it Rs. 450." Then I ask: "What

about the State Judicial Service?" The I.A.S. man starts on Rs. 350. I do not know on what salary a State Judicial Service man starts.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: On Rs. 300.

DR. K. N. KATJU: My hon. friend says 'Rs. 300'. This morning, my hon. friend, Mr. Mathur, put me a question as to whether there was any proposal under the consideration of the Government in respect of the Indian Judicial Service. I said "No, not that I know of." What does the Indian Judicial Service mean? It means that for your *munsiffs* and judges and others there should be a service on an all-India scale. This question was gone into at great length in the British days. They had these all-India services, Education Service, Forest Service, Indian Engineering Service. And the States protested against this, because it interfered with their autonomy, and after a good deal of consideration, Sardar Patel, who was then the Home Minister, said that he could, not succeed in persuading the State Governments to agree only to two State Services, namely, the Police Service and the Administrative Service. But the question is: Where do these boys come from? Where do these young men come from? They come from the same colleges. Now, you start a man with Rs. 450, and in your State Judicial Service, in your State Engineering Service, in your State Medical Service, you start a man on Rs. 250 or on Rs. 300. Now, will they tolerate it?

If I say to them: "Very well, I am going to give Rs. 450 because Mr. Mathur says so" and these young men who come for these services are 1250 of them, one Member says 'Look at the average income of the common man. It is probably Rs. 250 per year or Rs. 400 a year.' Mr. Mathur says Rs. 350 is very little given to them. What about the hundreds and thousands of people who are doing these jobs? My respectful suggestion is—I am not making a debating point—that this is a very delicately balanced sort of structure. If you remove one brick

here, it has got repercussions elsewhere. Now, the Pay Commission says Rs. 350 is quite all right. I may tell you at once that in the so-called British India, the thing had been running on a particular scale probably on a uniform basis and therefore the salaries are Rs. 250 and Rs. 300 and they have gone on all along and there has not been much of a change but in the British times, the old Indian States were functioning—about 600 of them—on a different scale altogether. I am not going into that matter, but they differed. These I.A.S. and I.P.S. apply to all the B States also and I receive complaints every day. They said: 'You are making the position impossible for us.' Mr. Deputy Chairman, you are very familiar with Travancore-Cochin. There the High Court Judge's salary is about Rs. 1,500 and that of the District and Sessions Judge Rs. 800 or Rs. 900. Now so far as administration of justice is concerned, I say with pride that the standard of administration of justice **in the** Travancore-Cochin High Court is as superior or as high as anywhere in India. They have built up a great tradition of judicial integrity, judicial independence and judicial acumen and things of that kind and the moment you suggest this I.A.S./I.P.S. scale, the State Governments, complain "Our resources are limited: so what are we to do?" My suggestion therefore is that it is not only the case of 1,200 men or something like that. You say "it is nothing and the Home Minister should agree and should not be unreasonable enough to refuse this." The moment I agree, the repercussions I do not know in every Branch of the services. That is one.

Then comes the other question. In passing, I may deal with a comment that was made. He says 'I have never heard of it.' The position is this. Normally from junior to senior scale promotion takes place in the 5th or 6th year. Why is the Government putting down this 19? The reason is that it is a matter of precaution. In 99 per cent, of the cases it really does not come into operation but it becomes

[Dr. K. N. Katju.] effective in two ways. Sometimes either there may be no promotion at all from the junior to the senior scale. He is quite right in saying that normally the transfer takes place say within 5 or 7 years but there may be a luckless man who is not able to make any particular mark and he may be delayed, say, for another 2 or 3 years or there may be another luckless individual, viz., a man who misbehaves in the senior scale and he is sent back after 10 years' service; he may be demoted. When he is demoted, what should he get? He goes to the junior scale and he must get some salary. So these 19 steps are intended to apply to these minor matters—very rare cases. Now I come to the second point. There my hon. friend says Rs. 1,800. That is also our proposal. The Pay Commission went into this matter and they recommended that the salary should be Rs. 1,600. My hon. friend does not touch it. Therefore, technically it stands and there is no amendment on that but inasmuch as we are examining the whole salary structure, the Pay Commission had said Rs. 1,600. The matter was gone into at great length and many considerations prevailed and we said "No, the maximum of Rs. 1,600 should go up to Rs. 1,800." There is that difference.

Then comes the third point. My hon. friend says it should go up to Rs. 2,500. He calls it by a different name—as special pay in special circumstances and he mentions Rs. 2,000 and 2,250 and Rs. 2,500. If you go into the whole list in the schedule, they are illy up to Rs. 2,500 and not more.

The one particular set of officers on whom the whole weight of wrath of my hon. friend was poured were the Secretaries.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: No. If you will examine the list, there are many other officers.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I stand corrected. Let us examine the position. There are 30 or 40 of them. He was referring over and over again to the Govern-

ment of India Secretaries. Let us see why they have been so treated in such a special fashion. There are many reasons. Number one is this. I have got the authority of the Pay Commission for that purpose—the people who went into the whole matter, the people who worked, whose President was a Judge of the Supreme Court, a most painstaking, simple-minded man, a man who was more alive to the needs of India and to the standard of living in India than—I will not name my hon. friend—pardon me. There is no question of any monopoly of being virtuous and being very, very concerned or solicitous for the welfare of the people of India. We have also been in our own ways. Now I come to the second, point. The third schedule which has been annexed to the rules, is divided into two parts—Part A and Part B. In Part A you will find, Mr. Deputy Chairman, officers enumerated—Chief Secretaries to the Governments of the different States. These are officers getting Rs. 2,500 and serving in their own home States. What happens is that whenever a person comes or is transferred to the Government of India in the Secretariat, he is not a Member of the Central Secretariat. I am talking now of people who are I.A.S. people. You know every I.A.S. man is forced to join the State cadre and from the State cadre he comes over to the Government of India. Every State Government is under an obligation to contribute, whenever it is called upon to do so, a certain number of very selected men for the service of the Government of India. Now whenever he comes here, he gets his grade pay whatever he may be getting—Rs. 900 or 1,700 plus Rs. 200 or Rs. 300—what is called special pay. I don't know what is the name. The main point is this. The Deputy Secretary here may be getting Rs. 1,500 as his grade pay and he will get Rs. 250 or Rs. 300 as special pay for coming over to Delhi for building a new home, etc. The Secretary does not get it. Look at the difference. It is not really so striking. If he were a Chief Secretary in his own Government of UP. or Andhra or Madras, he would be getting Rs. 2,500 all told.

No special allowance of any kind. When this man comes over to the Government of India, he breaks up his home there—he may have his children—and he would be entitled to have an allowance of his own but the salary of Rs. 3,000 is a consolidated salary—no allowance. Supposing he were to get the allowance which is permissible in the case of a Deputy Secretary, he would be getting Rs. 300 or 250 in addition to his grade pay. What is the difference left? So, instead of saying Rs. 2,500 plus a special allowance, we put it down to a consolidated salary of Rs. 3,000. Sir, it is not my business here to praise the one or the other. You get Secretaries of all descriptions, just as in the profession that I was, there were lawyers and lawyers but I dare say that in service matters, every man who reaches the Secretary's stage is a fit individual, he has been tried and tested and he has surmounted many difficulties and he is posted here because he is a talented man. If he is; a talented man, then I respectfully suggest that under the present order of things, a salary of Rs. 3,000 is by no means a large salary.

Then, my hon. friend said about 'poor ministers'. I became a Minister when the maximum salary for a Minister was laid down from the highest quarters to be Rs. 500. Mr. Deputy Chairman, you remember it.

He is not going down to Rs. 500 here. Of course, we are not now discussing the ministers' salaries. But we may look at the salaries of ministers, not only those at the Centre but those in the States. Here we get a salary of Rs. 2,250; but if you go to the "different States, the Part B and Part A states, there the minister's salary is about 1,000 and my hon. friend himself says that the salary in the senior scale should be Rs. 1,800. Where is his argument then? He took about fifteen minutes in making it—very plausible and it makes a great impression on the outside public—that no one should get a salary higher than that of the minister. The salary of no one in the State services should be more than

the ministerial salary. Then, we come back to Rs. 1,000. Will he admit that? His suggestion itself states the senior scale should be Rs. 1,800. He seems to be only fighting about the poor Secretaries who seem to be his *Bete noire*; he dislikes them, I don't know why.

But what is the difference between the present scales and what he recommends? In the first place he wants to start higher, instead of from Rs. 350 he starts from Rs. 450. Secondly, in the senior scale there is no difference. As a matter of fact, he is more liberal, and he begins earlier. But at the top, he said, do not give more than Rs. 2,500, and his arguments were many. In one he attempted to captivate my heart. He said, "You get Rs. 2,250 and your Secretary—should he get Rs. 3,000? That is really a most monstrous state of affairs, quite intolerable that he should draw more." But I am a more rational individual and I resisted my hon. friend's argument and so I said, "What about the ministers in the different States? They get much less. If it is Coorg, the minister there gets only Rs. 500.

Therefore, what I suggest is that when this question of pay structure is being examined, it is most desirable that we do not run away with a solitary argument; but we should take the picture as a whole. Even in countries like Russia, I understand that while the minimum wage or earning is about Rs. 500 per month—I have heard it on the highest authority—there is no limit to the maximum salary or earning there. The earning may be 40,000 roubles or 60,000 roubles but the misfortune there is that there is nothing on which you can spend it and so people go to the pictures, to ballets, spend it on travels, on holiday making and so on.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Don't go there! It is forbidden ground for you; do not tread it!

DR. K. N. KATJU: Pardon? What ground?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR) : He says Russia is forbidden ground.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Oh, personally there are many others which are forbidden to me; I cannot drink myself, but I can offer my hon. friend a drink.

Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, just before sitting down, I would utter a warning. This is a very complex matter, this talking of Pay Commission and all that will not lead us very far. We should pray and strive for a rise in our standard of living, for a general rise all round. And what we should really insist upon—and strangely nobody mentioned it—is this question of integrity. My hon. friend does not say how, if I pay a man Rs. 100 or Rs. 200, I can in the same breath tell the man, "No no, my man, be absolutely honest." I am not going to provide him with money with which he will be able to teach his son and make him a graduate or a barrister-at-law or make him an engineer, nor am I going to provide him with money so that he may make his daughter a doctor of medicine. How can we do that? Therefore, Sir, with a very "safe conscience I appeal to the House to give its approval to the rules that I have placed before it and to reject the amendments proposed.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: May I ask one question, please? On page 17, for Uttar Pradesh you have said that the Chief Secretary to Government will get Rs. 2,500 and the Member of the Board of Revenue also Rs. 2,500 but you have omitted the Divisional Commissioner. In other places, for instance in the Punjab, you have provided for the Divisional Commissioners.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I have said in my speech that these rules are the product of very, very elaborate consideration. They have been under consideration for the last three or four years. As a matter of fact, they might have remained under further discussion had I not hastened the matter. The drafts were sent to every State Government and each State Government also suggested some minor changes. So the scale of salaries is not exactly the same

for these high jobs everywhere, though the junior and the senior ones are about the same. For the higher scale it differs from State to State.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But the Divisional Commissioner's post has been totally omitted here in Uttar Pradesh, though they have got Commissioners there.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I shall look into that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you press your amendments, Mr. Mathur?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Certainly, Sir. I have only heard very strange logic, as I expected.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That amendment No. I(i) be adopted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That amendment No. I (ii) be adopted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That amendment No. I (iii) be adopted."

The motion was negatived.

THE INDIAN POLICE SERVICE (PAY) RULES, 1954

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Sir, I beg to move:

II. That the following modifications be made in the Indian Police Service (Pay) Rules, 1954, namely:—

*For text of amendments, *vide* cols. 4146 and 4147 *supra*, respectively.

(i) In Rule 3, for the existing time-scales of pay the following be substituted, namely:

JUNIOR SCALE: Rs. 450-500-30-800-40-1,000 (16 years).

SENIOR SCALE:

Rs. 800 (7th year or under)-800-40-1,000-50-1,500 (22 years).

SPECIAL PAY:

- (i) Rs. 1,800.
- (ii) Rs. 2,000.
- (iii) Rs. 2,250."

(ii) For the existing Schedule I, the following be substituted, namely: —

"SCHEDULE I

[See Rules 4 (2) and 5 (2)]

Scales of pay for the Indian Police Service.

Year of service	Junior Scale Senior Scale	
	(Monthly rates of pay)	
	Rs.	Rs.
1st	450	800
2nd	500	800
3rd	530	800
4th	560	800
5th	590	800
6th	620	800
7th	650	800
8th	680	840
9th	710	880
10th	740	920
11th	770	960
12th	800	1,000
Efficiency Bar		
13th	840	1,050
14th	880	1,100
15th	920	1,150
16th	960	1,200
17th	1,000	1,250
18th	—	1,300
19th	—	1,350
20th	—	1,400
21st	—	1,450
22nd and over	—	1,500

special pay for selected posts—Rs. 1,800; Rs. 2,000; and Rs. 2,250 p.m.

70 R.S.D.

(iii) In Schedule III, Part "A—Posts carrying pay above the time-scale pay of the Indian Police Service under the State Governments", —

(a) for the existing pay-scales given against the posts of Inspectors-General of Police for the States of Andhra, Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Orissa, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Hyderabad, Madhya Bharat, Mysore, Patiala and East Punjab States Union, Rajasthan, Saurashtra, Travancore-Cochin and Vindhya Pradesh, the figure "2,000" be substituted;

(b) for the existing pay-scales given against the posts of Inspectors-General of Police for the States of Bombay and West Bengal, the figure "2,250" be substituted;

(c) for the existing pay-scales given against all the posts of Deputy Inspectors-General of Police, the figure "1,800" be substituted;

(d) for the existing pay-scales given against the post of Commissioner of Police for Madras, the figure "1,800" be substituted; and

(e) for the existing pay-scales given against the posts of Commissioner of Police for Bombay and Commissioner of Police for Calcutta, the figure "2,000" be substituted.

May I speak on it, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is a speech necessary? The same arguments, I suppose.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Only for five to ten minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Very well.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I know I am only wasting arguments here, because I know I will only hear strange logic and all important points will be skipped over. That has been my experience about the amendments which I discussed only a few moments back.

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

In this particular amendmen', Sir, I have proposed a general rise in the pay scale of the Police Service. **have** taken this bold step because I feel fully convinced about it. I air. here between two strange logics. Hi;re my hon. friend who spoke very recently about my amendment, giving a halfhearted support somewhere, talked about the salaries and in a tone that the salaries which are at present existing are ununderstandable and when I heard the hon. Home Minister, particularly with reference to the I.A.S. and particularly with reference to the small increase that I proposed in it, I was really dismayed. The very si range argument which he made out was how the increase of Rs. 100 per month— which amounts to about Rs. 1,200 per year and in about five years would mean Rs. 6,000—would make any difference. It may make no difference to the hon. the Home Minister, that is true. If he has got a heavy bank balance, it can be understood that it will not make any difference so far is he is concerned but certainly for a person who gets Rs. 350, an additional Rs. 100 does make a lot of difference. I do not think we require any logic to prove that Rs. 100 extra to a person who gets Rs. 350 per month makes a lot of difference. I would not repeat the arguments, Sir, but I strongly feel that this increase at this level is very much warranted. My hon. friends who criticise the pay structure and consider that these salaries are absolutely ununderstandable and inconceivable have, I think, a very poor knowledge of the pay structures obtaining in a country to which they could take absolutely no exception. I have purposely not mentioned the great country of the U.S.S.R. Well, Sir, I speak with a little personal knowledge today. My friends nay say that it is fantastic but I made a little study of the pay structure! *(Interruptions)* and that country has quite correctly fixed the pay structure. I think there was a little bit of exaggeration or there was a little wrong information in what the Home Minister gave, but I do not know of any Gov-

ernment servant in that country who is making 60,000 roubles a month.

DR. K. N. KATJU: May I correct myself? I said that there was no limit to the upper ranges. I never said specifically about the Government servants. You better ask Mr. Sunda--rayya. He, being in confidence, will tell you.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I do not know; the Home Minister may be able to say.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: The hon. Minister travels over a wide range and talks astray about the U.S.S.R., about 60,000 roubles and, if he goes to the States, talks about the salaries of the ministers there, and if I have to reply to all that, it will take me another hour to enable me to bring home the facts -

DR. K. N. KATJU: I would be happy to hear it.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR : but I am supposed to confine myself to the pay structure before us. In the U.S.S.R., I might submit, the average range of a Government servant as well as of a factory worker or a worker employed in a collective farm is fairly good and uniform. The average man makes something between 400 to 600 roubles a month but we should not be carried away by the money value of the 400 or 600 roubles per month because apart from what he gets monthly, he has got other amenities which go to make life comfortable and secure. There is nobody at all in the U.S.S.R. who is in the least worried about any of the social securities, something about which we are worried out of our lives. So far as education is concerned, so far as medical relief is concerned and so far as old age benefit is concerned, the average man has not got to worry. These are all well provided for. It is no use referring to the U.S.S.R. I do not like it and I particularly avoided mentioning that country in spite of having studied the pay structure and the life and conditions obtaining in that

country, but I certainly feel compelled to refer to this matter when my hon. friend here, who very much depends upon the Communist ideology, was strongly and severely critical of the pay structure and criticised it as something fantastic. He said that this sort of a pay structure cannot be justified. I say that this pay structure is as reasonable as it should be and this is supported by the pay structure in the U.S.S.R. There, as I submitted, the average man in Government service, in a workshop or in a collective farm, makes something like 400 to 600 roubles per month. There are hundreds of persons who are getting a salary of 7,000 roubles per month. I am not talking of exceptions—that part is very true—but there are hundreds and hundreds of people who are drawing a salary of 7,000 roubles. There are exceptions and I might quote the exceptions. One exception I may cite is the Head of the Moscow University who is making in all about 19,000 roubles. Let us not talk in that strain; let us be realistic and it is with perfect knowledge of all these facts that I spoke and drew up the pay structure. These amendments were not suggested in any haphazard manner. There was a little study behind that. I did look into all the aspects and I knew what the repercussions would be. I did thoroughly examine that. As a matter of fact, the hon. the Home Minister made a lot of fuss about the repercussions which would set in. If you will remember, Sir, I started my speech by saying that we cannot examine these pay structures in isolation but that they have got to be examined in the context of the pay structures obtaining here and while speaking on this subject, Sir, I definitely laid stress on the fact that when making out any pay structure for the Central Government, we cannot ignore the pay structures obtaining in the State Governments. There were bound to be repercussions. As a matter of fact, when discussing that resolution I made a very strong point and said that the States could not be ignored. As a matter of fact, the States of Mysore and Saurashtra have made

very strong representations on this very matter and I referred to it in a written question also. So, let not the hon. the Home Minister run away with the idea that I am ignorant of these facts. In spite of the criticism which I am likely to face from my friends, I stand here in my full height and defend the increase in salary which I have proposed for the Police Service.

I submit, Sir, that there is absolutely no justification for allowing a lower scale of salary for the Police Service. It may have been possible that when we required Police Officers only to lathi-charge the people and to go about doing such sort of administrative jobs at the dictation of other people, they did not require much of intelligence. How do you think now that an officer in the Indian Police Service is required to be of a lesser calibre than the officer in the Administrative Service? I have not been able to understand that and I know my hon. friend will advance all sorts of arguments. He says he cannot give me understanding; I only beg of him a little better understanding. I submit, Sir, that they come out of practically the same examination and one has got to be absolutely first class first to get into the Indian Police Service. That is one of the basic qualifications which you require for the I.A.S. Apart from that, a Police Officer has got to have more of dash; he has got to take decisions on the spot and he has got to be very daring. He, has got to lead a much more strenuous and hard life. Then, how on earth can anybody justify the fact that the pay scale of the police officers should be lower than that of the Indian Administrative Service?

I do not want to take the higher range beyond Rs. 1,500 even though in the case of the I.A.S. it goes up to Rs. 1,800. I did not like to give them a rude shock by cutting it down to Rs. 1,500. I have suggested Rs. 1,500 in this case because I do feel that we will definitely have to stop at that figure. I very certainly submit that, looking to the basic qualifications,

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] looking to the qualities required of a police officer and looking to the more arduous nature of his work, the police officer should have this scale that I have suggested. Apart from that, we now require a police officer to be an extremely intelligent person and require him not only for the purposes of investigation of cases but also for the security of our own State. We

4 P.M. have to depend upon him. Quite "a lot and we must keep him fully encouraged. Really, there is no reason why a district head like the Inspector-General of Police should get lesser salary and for the matter of that the Deputy Inspector-General of Police should get lesser salary than the Collector of a district. So I feel, Sir, if we have to strike a proper balance and if we have to go with some reason, there is ample justification for accepting my amendment. I don't want to take any more of the time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments are open for discussion.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: I want the hon. Minister to reply to my points also, Sir. When the All-India Services were integrated, when the Part B States were integrated and the plan was spread out and we all agreed to join the I.A.S. cadre

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with the I.A.S. here.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: It is the same in the I.P.S. cadre. Was it a condition that the police officers who would be taken in the Indian Police Service from the Part B States would be kept only in those respective Part B States and "would not be liable to be transferred elsewhere and if there is any job of a higher rank vacant there then they alone will be promoted and not those from other States will be transferred there? I happened to come across some such cases in Rajasthan

where I saw police officers with about 8 or 9 years' service holding the rank of Deputy Inspector-General of Police. I was simply amazed at it and I enquired why it was the case and the only explanation that I had was that it was so because the Rajasthan Government did not want to have an officer from outside. If that is so, then what is the purpose of having All-India Services at all? I therefore submit, Sir, to the hon. Minister that this sort of provincialism should not be allowed, because it is wrong that a man of 8 or 9 years' service should be holding such a high rank and the salary that he was getting there was the senior scale. Now, the scale of the I.P.S. is only Rs. 600. So that sort of thing any State may want. When such high posts fall vacant and there are not officers of that seniority and experience required for that post in that State then officers from other States should be transferred.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: This is quite different from my amendment. That is why I did not go into the various allied questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with this.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, to take the last point first, I know that in several States known as Part B States there is some confusion arising because of their anxiety to amalgamate their own men into the general I.P.S. and sometimes it may be that some confusion may have arisen. There may have been very strong recommendations for a particular officer, maybe he was an exceptionally brilliant officer and therefore he might have been taken in and maybe at the time of the integration he might have been holding the post of a D.I.G. Something must have arisen. If my attention is drawn to a particular case I shall look into the matter. Otherwise I agree that it is desirable that where there are no suitable men in the State Service then people from outside should be put in there and there should also be care

197 Amendments to Rules under [30 ;EP. 1954 1 All-India Services Act 4198

taken about them. **But, as I** said there might have been **some** irregularities because of the transitory **stage** through which we are progressing.

Then, so far as the main motion **is** concerned, I do not want to **tire the House by** repeating what I had said in the first speech dealing with the I.A.S. The points are **the same here**. My hon. friend's outlook **differs** from my outlook and the only argument that **he was able** to **advance** was that he could not **give** me understanding. I never asked.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That amendment No. II (I) be adopted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

*For text of amendments vide cols 4189-4190 supra respectively.

"That amendment No. II (it) be adopted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That amendment No. II (ii) be adopted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we have disposed of all the amendments,

The House stands adjourned *sine*

The House then adjourned *sine die* at seven minutes past four of the clock.