

i
Bill 1954
THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES
OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT
BILL, 1954

THE MINISTER FOR PARLIAMENTARY
AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA):
Sir, I beg to move:

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

Mr. Chairman, while moving this Bill in the other House, I made the position of the Government absolutely clear with regard to this measure. The House is aware of the history behind this Bill. In the year 1952, a Joint Committee of both the Houses was constituted to go into the matter in pursuance of article 106 of the Constitution. The report of that Committee was placed before the House—I mean the Lok Sabha—in July 1952, but it was shelved. You are aware, Sir, that I was very adversely criticised in this House for that action. I plead guilty to the charge. But I did it because of the fact that a very large number of Members of both the Houses did not like the recommendations made by that Committee.

On the 27th of March of this year, a motion was moved by me in the other House requesting the Speaker to revive the said Committee and I further requested that the matter of Travelling Allowance and Daily Allowance of Members of both the Houses be referred back to the said Committee for reconsideration in the light of the changed circumstances, particularly on the abolition of the First Class on some railways. Hon. Members of this House are fully aware regarding the contents of that Committee's report which was placed before both the Houses. When the matter came up before the Government, they came to the conclusion that as the report of the said Committee, which was representative of all the groups of both the Houses, was almost unanimous in its recommendations, it was neither proper nor desirable on the part of the Government

has met twice and the deliberations are still continuing. I am afraid that it will not be possible to lay before the House or to present to you any recommendations before the Council rises. It may have to go over to the next session.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We would like to know, even if it is not possible for the Joint Privileges Committee to present any agreed report, since we are adjourning today, what steps the Chairman is going to take, at least immediately after receiving it; or are we to leave this question pending for the next three months, because we are likely to meet only in September?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Joint Committee of the two Houses presents a unanimous report even after the House rises, if I get it, with your permission I shall take suitable action.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras) : May I ask a hypothetical question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No hypothetical question.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Suppose they don't come to an agreement.....

MR CHAIRMAN: If they don't come to an agreement, then we will discuss it when we meet next.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Even if they don't come to an agreement, I think the proper procedure would be to place the report before the two Houses and discuss it.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is an agreed thing, if the Joint Committee comes to a unanimous decision,—then I don't know what action is expected of me— but when I find it is something which I can take, with the permission of the House, I shall try to do it, otherwise not.

{Shri Satyanarayan Sinha.] to interfere in the matter. The Government accepted the decisions of the Committee and got the Bill drafted which incorporated its decisions except for one or two very minor changes.

The attitude of the Government in the other House and also here is one of complete neutrality.

After some discussion, the Bill has been passed by the other House and the Government neither opposed nor supported any amendments which were moved by several Members in the other House. All the amendments which were either accepted or rejected, were by the unfettered majority votes. I was responsible, on behalf of Government, for moving one or two verbal amendments which were ultimately accepted by the other House. The amended Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, is before this House.

I hope and trust that this House will not take much time over this measure and will see that it is put through without any change.

Sir, I move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): Mr. Chairman, I have to submit that this is one of the most amazing—and I would even say shameless—pieces of legislation that has come before this House.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Temperate language will always be effective.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, Sir, it is very temperate language that I am using. Why I say so is this. And I also know why there is so much of vociferous interruption.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE (Uttar Pradesh): Consult a dictionary and know the meaning of the word.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, I know the meaning of the word. It is the other side that does not know the meaning of the words it uses. Why I say this deliberately is because I want to go into the history of this whole question, this question of salary and allowances of Members. Sir, in July 1952, when we came here after election, this question was referred to a Joint Select Committee because the emoluments that were being given at that time, that is to say, Rs. 40 per day, were considered as high and it was felt that they should be cut and there should be economy effected. In that Joint Select Committee, our Party put forward the proposal that the salary should be Rs. 300 and the daily allowance should be Rs. 10 per day. But the Committee at that time did not accept our suggestion; but they accepted the suggestion that the allowance be Rs. 35 per day. Another recommendation of that Committee was that that the rent charged for the houses of the Members of Parliament should be approximately 10 per cent, of the total emoluments which they got per month and this was calculated on the basis of Rs. 35 per day which comes to Rs. 1,050 per month and so it was said that the house-rent should not exceed Rs. 105. This recommendation was given effect to immediately, though the other recommendation, namely, that the emolument should be cut from Rs. 40 per day to Rs. 35 a day has not been acted upon, though it is two years since that recommendation was made. I do not know how and under what rule or what legality the Government, while the Members of Parliament are getting Rs. 40 a day, have acted upon the recommendation that the rent should not be above 10 per cent. In this connection, we have written to the Ministry for Parliamentary Affairs, explaining the whole anomaly. And now, after keeping the report for two years in cold storage,

and not acting upon it, the hon. Minister comes here and he himself says that many, or rather a large number of Members do not like a cut in the salary. And they again refer it back to the Select Committee. In the Select Committee this question was again discussed and various proposals were made. The proposal has been made that there should be salary plus an allowance and whatever it may be, the total should not exceed what the Members at present are getting. That was the basis on which the thing started. So now that earlier decision of the Committee that there should be a cut has been given the go-by. Not only that, when the proposal was made that the salary should be Rs. 400 and daily allowance Rs. 15 or salary Rs. 300 and allowance Rs. 20 many Members pleaded that there should be no cut. Some said that for those who have big incomes, a fixed salary would mean paying a large sum as income-tax, that whatever they got in the form of salary would be taken away in the form of income-tax. Therefore they insisted upon the basis of Rs. 40 daily allowance and they could also choose between the two systems. We, on our side, objected to this arrangement and said there should be income-tax, that everything should be subject to payment of income-tax and that in that case there would be no need for any option to be given. Then in the Salaries Committee they agreed to Rs. 300 salary, plus Rs. 20 daily allowance and now, most amazingly, it has been amended and it has been suggested that the salary should be Rs. 400 and the daily allowance Rs. 21 per day. That means that by this measure, the Members of Parliament, if this Bill passes into law, will be getting an enhanced emolument. They would be getting at least Rs. 1,000 more than what they were getting under the old allowance regulations of Rs. 40 per day. In fact it will be more than Rs. 1,200 because this Rs. 40 per day will be for the days they attend. Now when they attend continuously, they get Rs. 4,800 per year and also allowance at the rate of Rs. 21 per day.

This way, there is a guaranteed salary irrespective of the number of days they attend. I do not quarrel with the principle that every Member of Parliament must be paid some salary which would enable him to lead a normal life, not a luxurious life and not a stringent life but a life which is moderate and which is well within the real income of our people and which will be considered by the masses as reasonable because the Members of Parliament are expected not only to work when Parliament functions or sits but they are considered as representatives of the people and as whole-time workers. They have to go into the grievances of the people and they have to represent the grievances of the people and it is from that angle that it is necessary to fix a salary for the Members of Parliament. It is possible only then for ordinary Members, who do not have separate incomes and who do not have big riches to rely upon, to represent the people. Sir, that welcome principle, that wholesome principle has been taken advantage of and salaries which have nothing to do with and which bear no proportion to the real income of the people are being voted upon.

Sir, in 1953, the House of the People met for 210 days. Normally I do not expect it will meet for more than that period which means that every Member gets Rs. 8,400 if everyone has attended all the 210 days at the old rate of Rs. 40. It is our experience that it is very rarely that all the Members or even a majority of the Members attend all the 210 days. It is only a very very few that could attend for all the 210 days because every Member of Parliament has to go and attend his own constituency and attend to so much other work connected with it even during the session of Parliament, and as such all the people do not attend for all the 210 days. But, for purposes of calculation, even if we take it that all the Members attend for all the 210 days, the biggest emolument on that basis would be Rs. 8,400. Under this Bill as originally reported by the

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] Joint Select Committee, every Member would have received Rs. 3,600 as salary and on the basis of a sitting of 210 days and at the rate of Rs. 20 per sitting, they would have received Rs. 4,200 as daily allowance which would have given Member Rs. 7,800. This would have meant a decrease of at least Rs. 600 from their emoluments as drawn under the old regulations. As a result of the amendment that has been carried and as the Bill stands before the House, at the rate of Rs. 400, they will get Rs. 4,800 and at the rate of Rs. 21 per day they will get Rs. 4,410 which comes to a total of Rs. 9,210. This means a clear increase of Rs. 1,400.

The whole salary and allowance question which we started with the ostensible purpose of reducing the salary and allowances and bringing them within reasonable limits as compared with the income of our own people, instead of reducing them have increased them by an amount of not less than Rs. 1,200. In the case of the Council of States, last year we met for about 150 days. This would have meant Rs. 4,800 as salary and Rs. 3,150 as daily allowance which would have come to Rs. 7,950. This is also an increase by Rs. 1,200 over what the Select Committee itself had recommended. Sir, I do not agree that because we sit for a little less number of days—about fifty days less—than the other House our salary should be reduced proportionately because the principle of salary has been arrived at as every Legislator is a whole-time worker and whether he works here or outside, his maintenance should be guaranteed. As such, I am not supporting differentiation, but the main thing is that there is no reason whatsoever to increase the salaries this way.

I now come to another clause in the Bill. We have been provided with an all-India pass naturally to enable us to go round the country to discharge our responsibilities to the people, to enquire into their conditions and to

represent their grievances. That is the only justification for the pass being given. When one second class pass has been given to us over and above that, Government wants to pay—if the Bill is passed as it is—another second class fare and a third class fare whenever a Member comes to attend Parliament, whenever a Member comes to attend a Committee meeting either in Delhi or anywhere in any part of the country. I can understand, when Members come to attend the Parliament session for three months, their wishing to bring their families and for that purpose the extra second class fare being given. But when they come to attend Select Committee meetings or when they go touring the country, I do not expect, nor does the country expect, that the Members of Parliament would take their wives and their relatives along with them but still when they attend Select Committee meetings or any other work connected with Parliament, they are allowed an extra second class fare. I would take it that this is not to enable the Members to discharge their duties and responsibilities but in fact it is an additional emolument to the Members concerned. That emolument—even if there are no Select Committees, even if the Members do not attend any other work connected with Parliament—would be a large sum. The other House meets three times and we meet four times which means that in the case of the other House, based on the distance from which the Members come, it may vary from a few hundred rupees to Rs. 1,500¹ to Rs. 2,000. Taking all these facts together, I have made an approximate calculation that the House of the People Members receive about Rs. 10,000 in cash, quite apart from other facilities like the second class pass, and the Council of States Members get Rs. 9,000. In the case of the Members of the Council of States it works out to Rs. 750 per month and in the case of the Members of the House of the People it works out to Rs. 800 or Rs. 825 per month. I would like to know whether the Members of Parliament are justified in drawing

this huge salary. I purposely use the word 'huge'. Arguments have been advanced that the Members of Parliament should lead a comfortable life. Of course, they need not lead a life of starvation. Nobody wants anybody to lead such a life, but is it necessary, especially having in view the condition of our masses, the hundreds and millions of our people, that we should vote for ourselves such huge sums as salaries? The other argument is that Delhi is more costly. I for one refuse to accept that Delhi is more costly. Take the food prices and the various other amenities in any part of the country, in any big town. The costs are no more and no less than what they are in Delhi. It is only a question of conveyance which is more costly when compared to Calcutta, Bombay or Madras. Delhi is a city of distances, palatial buildings, vast gardens and other things and if the Members are dispersed, it may be difficult but as far as the Members of Parliament are concerned, they have been provided with quarters very near Parliament and round about offices, within easy walking distance of ten to fifteen minutes. Why is it then that the Members have to be provided, on the basis that it becomes too costly for them, huge salaries?

Sir, another argument that has been brought is that the Members of Parliament are expected to work for eight months here, and as such they have to keep two establishments, one at their own place of residence so that the education of their children is not interfered with, and another establishment here. Sir, I do agree even if we have to maintain our family establishments in the places of our usual residence—because the family cannot become a shuttle-cock to be moved from that place to this place every month; either the family stays here in Delhi or it stays in our own locality—Sir, even then their needs can be met within the salary of Rs. 300 and when we come here we are paid Rs. 21 daily allowance. That Rs. 21 daily allowance in Delhi is more than enough.

Even if we have to put up at the Western Court or the Constitution Club it is more than enough to meet, our expenses.

Now as far as the maintenance of our families in our own usual places of residence is concerned, I ask whether Rs. 300 is not a decent amount. I certainly say it is a decent amount and I would like Members of Parliament to consider in this connection how much the legislators are getting in the various States. Sir, in Travancore-Cochin it is Rs. 125 (monthly allowance) and when they attend the sessions the daily allowance is about Rs. 12-8-0. In certain other States it is Rs. 150 only and when attending the sessions the daily allowance is between Rs. 12-8-0 and Rs. 15 only. In still other States it is Rs. 200 per month but the daily allowance is only Rs. 12-8-0. In Madhya Pradesh the monthly allowance is Rs. 250 and the daily allowance is only Rs. 10. In Punjab it is Rs. 300 per month but they do not get this Rs. 300 automatically during the period when there is a session of the legislature. The amount paid to them during this period will be in proportion to the number of days they attend the sessions in a month. Suppose the session there in a particular month is for ten days. If the Members attend on all the ten days then only they get the salary of Rs. 300. If they attend for five days only then they will get only Rs. 150. During other times in the year, when the session is not there, they get the full salary so that it means a linking-up. The linking up of their salary with the session period" has the indirect effect of compelling them to attend the sessions and if they want to draw full salary during that period then they will have to attend all the sittings of the legislature. This condition applies only during the session period. Therefore, Sir, whatever the principle may be in all our legislatures throughout our whole country the salary varies only within the range of Rs. 125 to Rs. 250. Sir, if our own colleagues in the different States car-

[Shri P Sundarayya.] manage their family affairs with a sum between Rs. 125 and Rs. 250 why can't the Members of Parliament manage their family affairs also when they keep their families in their own places, in some State or other, on the same sum, because it is the same in-come level which our own colleague legislators get in those places? Why should the M.Ps. be put in a special category different from the legislators in the States? In my opinion there is no reason why it should be so done.

Sir, I shall now make another comparison. Including the dearness allowance the wages paid to class IV employees by the Central Government, that which is the highest paid to class IV Government service does not come to more than Rs. 70. Sir, I do not know how much the attendants who are here in Parliament will get or are getting. Perhaps many of them are casual; many of them are temporary and, in any case, I do not think they are getting anything more than that fixed Rs. 70 including dearness allowance. That works out at the rate of about Rs. 2/8/ a day.

Sir, as you know, the other day the hon. the Labour Minister was saying that the national minimum wage will vary from Rs. 1/2/ to Rs. 2 per day. That is the way they want to fix the minimum wage and at the rate of Rs. 1/2/ per day it works out to Rs. 35. They have no qualms when they say that the national minimum wage should be only Rs. 35 per month on the basis of eight hours' hard work per day while they say, Sir, that Members of Parliament must get a salary somewhere between Rs. 750 and Rs. 900 plus an other facilities. Is it* justified, Sir? This is thirty times what the Government proposed to fix as the national minimum wage. On what basis can we justify these things? You may say, Sir, that class IV employees are accustomed to this life, that we are all

coming from the middle-classes and as such we must have something more than that. So let us take the question of the middle-class employees. In the case of the upper division and lower division clerks of the Central Government their pay starts from Rs. 55—and it may vary—including dearness allowance, the maximum which an upper division clerk normally gets cannot be more than Rs. 250. That means we are getting three times what normally an upper division clerk also is entitled to under the present pay scales recommended by the Central Pay Commission. Sir, it is only the Central Government employees, the upper class, who get this much. The clerks in all the States do not get even half of this amount.

Let us take another category of employees in our country. Take the question of teachers, Sir, the high school teachers, the graduates who are employed in the various high schools and other schools. How much do they get? They do not get more than Rs. 150 to Rs. 200 and that is the maximum. Recently, Sir, as everyone of us knows, the University Grants Commission has pointed out that the lecturers must be paid between Rs. 250 and Rs. 500. They are now paid less than Rs. 250 and they will get the scale of Rs. 250 to Rs. 500 if that recommendation is implemented. And if I remember correctly the professors are expected to be paid more than Rs. 500. That is the salary scale proposed to our professors in the universities, who are expected to train a whole new generation of politicians, of scientists, of builders of the nation, and for them we say that the scale of pay should be between Rs. 500 and Rs. 750 whereas in our case we are ourselves voting a salary of more than Rs. 750.

Sir, I would now like to go to another point. I know, Sir, that the salary of the under-secretaries in the Government of India, which is one of the highly paid section, is from Rs. 750 and odd¹. That means that Members of Parliament are voting, apart from

BiU, 1954

other facilities, a salary of not less than Rs. 750. Sir, I would like to point out to the Congress Members that because of their insistence this thing has come in this form.

Sir, I would like them to consider what the Deputy Ministers in the various States get. Sir, in most of the States, the Deputy Ministers get Rs. 750 plus some house allowance and other things which do not exceed Rs. 250. Sir, that means that we, the Members of Parliament, are voting for ourselves the salary of Rs. 750 which is the salary of a Deputy Minister in the States, and in some cases more than that of even a Minister in some States. Now in Travancore-Cochin the Ministers are drawing only Rs. 500 as salary but we vote for ourselves a salary of Rs. 750 to Rs. 850. Sir, is it justified that we vote for ourselves such a big salary which is completely out of proportion to the income of the average mass of the people, which is completely out of proportion to the salaries of our middle-class employees, which is completely out of proportion to the salaries derived by our scientists and our professors?

Not only this, Sir. I would like to know what has happened to Mahatma-ji's principle of simple living? What has happened to Mahatma-ji's teaching of simple living? Am I to understand, Sir, that you cannot lead a simple life on any thing less than a salary of Rs. 750 to Rs. 850? Of course Gandhiji is dead and six years have passed. Do the Congress Members think that six years is long enough to forget Gandhiji's ideals by which they swore and they swear in season and out of season? *(Interruption.)*

Then implement it at least in one of these simple things.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Will not the Member draw this salary if this Bill is passed?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am exactly going to answer that simple point.

Not only you and people like you, but people in the other House also-said *(Interruptions.)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, this kind of interruption is not going to stop me. I know, Sir, it is a question concerning their purse and such interruptions.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sundarayya, do not get excited.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I would like to point out one thing. Accusations are levelled against us and we are asked, "You oppose these salaries, but are you not going to take at these rates? Are you going to take Rs. 300?" I say that if you do not accept our amendments arid' if you pass the law, we are going to take every pie that we are entitled to under the law. *(Interruptions.)* Have patience. Hear me fully. We are going to take every single pie that we are entitled to under the law and we are going to spend that money for the organisation of the people, and see.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: All that they say is that they will be law-abiding.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA:..... and see that such people who vote for this kind of emoluments are not returned again to Parliament

DR. P. C. MITRA: But, is it

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: What is; the use of your jumping like that,, which you always do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I should like to declare that from the emoluments that we used to draw at the rate of Rs. 40 per day—many of us were not here— *(Interruptions.)* We do not come here only to sit for 210 days; we come here and then go back-to the people And that is how we-

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] understand the work of a Member of Parliament. Sir, we in both Houses do not exceed 40 in number but we have paid to the party funds and public organisation funds to the tune of Rs. 2 lakhs in the last two years.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): i Sir, how are we concerned with how his party works? (ITitemiptio?is.)

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): With foreign money. (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would like to reply to Mr. Abid Ali. He speaks of foreign money. Yes, Sir, he gets foreign money from the Ameri--cans, not we. Let him not talk this kind of rot and nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: May I know from the hon. Member whether a member of the Communist Party who was just expelled from England was in the pay of Russia or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question does not arise.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I challenge the Government to give the name. I deny that any such person is employed in any of our offices.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): They are cowards.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, this kind of nonsense should not be allowed. When there is an insinuation we have got the right to reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is time for you to w:*nd up. You have taken half an hour.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: But the Bill is such a Bill, Sir. I know that the other side has got a majority and therefore they do not bother what .argument we give. (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI B. GUPTA: You see, Sir, how they are shouting all the time.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Let me declare to the slanderers of our party that it is not for political purposes that we oppose these things. When the Bill is passed we have decided that 50 per cent, of our salary and emoluments would go to the party and to the public organisation. Let the Congress also make that as a rule. Then there will be some sense in that.

In this connection I would like to point out one thing. Why is it that they are not satisfied with Rs. 400 plus Rs. 20? Why did they increase it to Rs. 21? I am told that they do not want to get Rs. 420 because 420 will be interpreted by the people, as per section 420 of the I.P.C. as frauds.

SHRI T. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): You are misinformed.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am correctly informed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. No dialogues here.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: In order to escape this charge of coming under section 420 they are now doing 420; to escape from being called 420s, they have increased the allowance by Re. 1. They have not thought of reducing it by Re. 1; it is always a question of increasing that occurs to them. Let me tell them that if this Bill is passed in the present form the people will not stop calling them 420s; in fact, they will call them 420s *plus* one better.

We have therefore given notice of amendments to bring the salaries and allowances within reasonable limits. I say that the Government has no business to keep neutral. The Government cannot escape its responsibility by saying that it is a matter concerning the Members. The Government and the Congress Party which runs the Government cannot go before the country and say that they were neutral in this matter but that the

Members have voted for this. Let us not cheat ourselves; let us not cheat the public. If you want these high salaries and emoluments then say it frankly to the electorate. Do not take recourse to this subterfuge. Sir, this Bill must be radically amended before we can go to the people or before anybody can go to the people to justify their actions.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar): Sir, as the debate.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Be as brief as possible. We have allotted three hours for this Bill. We started at 8-35 and we must finish by 11-35.

SHRI K. B. LALL: As the debate has been given the start as expected by the other party, I feel that I should speak on the subject. The first thing that I would like to say is that I do not want to import any heat in the debate but at the same time in as dispassionate a language as possible, I would like to appeal to the party represented by the Member who spoke just now not to import any heat. It seems that this House or the Houses of Parliament have been made the forum for propaganda and I think it will not pay any party to take advantage of such a thing. They know in their heart of hearts that they are least capable of making sacrifices.

SHRI B. GUPTA: We do not possess a black heart. But it is.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not interrupt. Behave better. v

SHRI K. B. LALL: By taking such advantage they would be fouling the atmosphere of the country and confusing the minds of the masses. I think it is only the smallness of mind that can say that this sum of Rs. 400 is a huge amount. Does it bear any meaning to characterise this sum of Rs. 400 per month to a Member of Parliament as a huge amount? It is nothing but the smallness of the mind.

SHRI PRASADARAO (Andhra): What about other things?

SHRI K. B. LALL: I think that even those persons who were responsible even including an ex-president of the Congress who has changed his side and who spoke in the other House very charitably and gave expression to such benevolent remarks should have taken into consideration that it will in the long run recoil upon their heads if they fouled the atmosphere of the country in this way, because are not people so intelligent as to understand as to when they were getting Rs. 1,200 per month according to the old rate of Rs. 40 per day, how much money did such persons sacrifice? Even if they had left one day's allowance of Rs. 40 to the Government coffers at least they would have had better face today to come and say that they had made sacrifices. (Interruptions.) I am not introducing any heat; perhaps the Members there are speaking in a heated way. Please hear me. I am telling you some facts. As a matter of fact, none of our friends made any sacrifice, not even half a day's allowance, not even quarter of a day's allowance, not even a fraction of a day's allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Look at the Chair and speak. Let all Members address the Chair and not each other.

SHRI K. B. LALL: They never made any such sacrifice and how does it lie in their mouths now to say that it is a gross mistake to pay this Rs. 400 for a Member of Parliament? It is nothing but propaganda for people inside and outside this House so that in the next election they can say that those who take such a big amount do not deserve to be Members of Parliament. This is the way you want to approach. But as you will be drawing this amount, people will ask you; how much money did you sacrifice? How much, up till now, was your sacrifice when you were drawing forty rupees a day?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Two lakhs

SHRI K. B. LALL: And, even today. I can throw a challenge to them that

[Shri K. B. Lall:] from the day this higher amount *if* voted if they will not take any money and they will live on sacrifice, then it will be the best reply instead of taking more than half-an-hour of the House to give a sermon to us. If you resolve like this, then it will be a good slap in the face of all of us.

SHRI B. GUPTA: But the cheek *in* made of brass!

SHRI K. B. LALL: I know there may be classes and classes of persons. Why not put yourself in the first-class? Why not say that we are in the first class and we have come to serve the nation on a lesser salary? There may be some persons to whom this amount is very small and they may want still more. Let there be classes of persons. You place yourself in the first class and refuse to touch even this huge amount that is voted upon and say, "We will leave it to the coffers of the nation, of the country". That position you are not going to accept and you are simply making it a forum for your propaganda. This is not good; this is bad inasmuch as it leaves a bad impression outside the House, fouling the atmosphere and poisoning the minds of the masses. Poisoning the mind's of the masses on such occasions will not pay. We know you are vociferous today but when it comes to practice you are no better than the other servants of the country; the servants at least have given proof of their loyalty up till now. It is very easy to say all these things in this House, that you want the country to go on this path or on that path, but it is not possible when it comes to practical working. It will be proper for you as a responsible opposition to confine yourself to the fundamental points of difference and then you will raise yourself certainly in the eyes of the people and of the country. But, if you take advantage of such petty things and brag about big sacrifices which is no sacrifice and which you are not capable of sacrificing and which you will not sacrifice and talk about all these, you are plac-

ing yourself in an awkward position. Put a co-operative attitude in all respects; you will raise yourself in the eyes of the people if you confine your remarks to the fundamentals of the question so far as the policy is concerned. In other matters, feel like one nation and act like one people. That will raise the party and you in the eyes of the country. But, if you are thinking of grasping any stick and think that to be good enough to beat the ruling party with, then you will not place yourself in a happy position.

People were not throwing away previously what they got and we are not throwing away what we are getting, because so far as I know, it is not big enough and we are not drawing more than what we were doing before. It may be in your own paper calculation, in order to take advantage of this and try to foul the atmosphere of the country. You are putting a few calculations in your own way, so that this amount of Rs. 400 plus allowances may appear a huge amount. That is that. You forget what the hon. Members of Parliament used to get before, when the value of money was much more than it is today, and when it is compared to the salary of other persons, this is nothing. Even the clerks are laughing at us. I do not know with what face those hon. Members feel that this sum is a huge amount and say that we make a big sacrifice. I can understand this if you say, "We are working, or we are going to work, in an honorary way", it will be a big credit for you if you do that. If you feel that you can make sacrifices of this four hundred rupees or a big portion of it, that will be a big credit. If you don't take this four-hundred even and yet you can serve the country, you can keep the position-and prestige of the party. But if you feel that you can grab this four-hundred rupees as well as some aid from outside, what is the fun in your speaking so magnanimously here that, you are making a sacrifice? That, means, it is neither here nor there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go on, go on, talk on the Bill.

SHRI K. B. LALL: There should not be opposition for the sake of opposition. They should take a lesson that if they oppose in this way, it will recoil on them.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that so much heat is aroused over the salary question. I think this is a question which affects all of us and not any one party. The question that has to be considered is whether the Bill that was introduced by the Member originally and changed by the House of the People was a justifiable change or not.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Say, 'the Lok Sabha'.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Sorry, Sir, I stand corrected, let us call it the Lok Sabha and let us also have some name for our House.

To me it appears that there is no justification for the change that has been effected in the Lok Sabha. If you look at this question, as has been pointed out, a Joint Select Committee was appointed at the beginning of Parliament. The main consideration before it was that we should effect an economy, that there should be a cut. If you look at the report of the Joint Select Committee, it was clearly mentioned when the Speaker appointed the Committee that we have either to consider changing the present forty rupees into salary, or fix allowance of a lesser amount. Now, the Joint Select Committee produced almost a unanimous report. The Minister has already admitted and has pleaded guilty that the matter was delayed. I know that once it was on the order paper of the House. It recommended a voluntary cut of Rs. 5 to the allowance we are getting. But, for reasons unknown to us—perhaps members of the Congress party did not agree to that—that was withdrawn from the order paper. And, after two years there is now a Bill

35 CSD

before us, a Government Bill. Another Joint Select Committee was set up which considered the matter from all points of view and came to the conclusion that there would be a salary of Rs. 300 per month and Rs. 20 daily allowance and they also gave an option, which I didn't like very much. Ultimately it was fixed that there will be one system, not the option business. That is good so far as it goes. But here, Sir, my objection to the increase is not because I consider it to be a very huge amount, as my friend has stated, but because we must see what effect it will produce on the minds of the public. The Government has taken a very queer attitude. Government Members are not interfering. They say they are neutral. I do not think that this is a very helpful attitude. Perhaps they want this increase. Otherwise they cannot escape the responsibility of sticking to the Joint Select Committee Report. If they are true in their stand, they must obey the wishes of all the sections of the House in this matter. Sir, the first Joint Select Committee recommended Rs. 35 per day as daily allowance. But there is an increase proposed in this Bill, in the emoluments. I do not know what is the idea or the purpose behind this increase. If it is said that Members of Parliament must live comfortably and earn their livelihood, I do not accept that principle. We have not come here to earn our livelihood. We have come here to serve the people. That is the purpose for which they have sent us here. Of course I do not say that we should not have any allowance; I do not say that the principle of fixation of a salary is wrong. I do not say that. But I am very much concerned with the impression that this increase in our emoluments will leave on the minds of the people. They will say that after two years deliberations they have come forward with an increase in their own emoluments. It has been argued that even after this increase the Exchequer will be getting more on account of an increase in the rate of income-tax of some earning Members. I do not think this is a

[Shri S. N. Dwivedy.]

very healthy principle. You are going to pay the Members of Parliament more than what they were getting, and then you want to increase your own income by some other source. Why should the Government leave it to the Members to do things as they like? They know it perfectly well that most of the Congress members are in favour of an increase.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Has your party issued any whip in this matter?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Yes, my party has decided it, and we are against any increase in the emoluments that we are getting now.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Have you seen the opinions given by most of your members?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Individuals can ask for anything. That has nothing to do with the party. I would like the hon. Member to read the first Joint Select Committee report. He can find out the view that our party held. Then Sir, a circular was issued to all the Members to express their opinions. And some Members have expressed their individual opinions. But that has nothing to do with the party.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Has any one of the Socialist Members demanded a pay less than Rs. 500?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: My hon. friend perhaps does not know that the Members who were on the Select Committee were in favour of Rs. 35 as daily allowance, *i.e.*, a cut of Rs. 5. The question as to whether we should voluntarily contribute so much amount to our party or refrain from taking the increase, is outside the consideration of this Bill. I think it is wrong in principle to introduce this question. That is an individual question altogether. The only question that is for consideration before us is whether the increase that has been made in our allowances is justified or not and whether it will create a good impression

Bill, 1954 in the country. Sir, already the impression is gaining ground that democracy is a heavy burden upon the people, because there are so many Ministers, Deputy Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries not only here in the Centre, but in the States, and so on and so forth. Over and above that, if we fix a salary which is more than what we were getting previously, it will create a bad impression on the minds of the people of this country. I did not give an amendment because I knew the Government's attitude. I know that the Government indirectly wants an increase. The Government wants that the Members should draw more than what they are drawing. Therefore there was no point in giving an amendment. Therefore, Sir, I refrained from giving an amendment. Of course, Sir, I welcome the provision made in this Bill regarding an All-India Pass to the Members. That was in fact very necessary for the Members of Parliament to go round the country and see things for themselves. But against this increase in the emoluments of Members of Parliament I wish to record my emphatic protest. Sir, today is the last day of our sitting, and therefore I would request the hon. Minister who has moved' this Bill to accept the amendment that has been moved by one of my friends for reducing what has been provided in the Bill. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Mr. Chairman, we are considering an extremely important Bill. From certain points of view I must admit that it is a very embarrassing situation for any House of Parliament to determine the salaries and allowances for its own Members. But we must face facts and try to do something to the best of our judgment and see that we are true to the country in the true sense of it. The Constitution of India has imposed a responsibility on us, a peculiar responsibility, and the power is given to Parliament to fix its own remuneration.

There are two possibilities that might arise because of this peculiar

responsibility. One is that in a spirit of mendicancy we might say, "We do not want anything at all; we shall serve the country without any remuneration." That is one possibility.

Another possibility is to clutch at the powers that we have got and try to enrich ourselves to the maximum possible extent. Either of these alternatives will have to be attempted, and we must try to stick to a course of action whereby we will be creating very healthy conditions not only for this Parliament but also for the Parliaments to come in the future. I entirely agree with the general principle enunciated by Mr. Sundarayya that a Member of Parliament like any other person in the country in any other sphere is entitled to a certain re--muneration, reasonable remuneration to put it in his own words. To be a Member of Parliament today is not » hobby. Whether it is the proper word or not, one can safely call it a profession. For most Members of Parliament, it would be a matter of eight or nine months' work in the year. Membership of Parliament is like any other profession. A Member of Parliament is not expected to remain a bachelor for all time; probably he cannot do it. He must look to his family responsibility. Taking this viewpoint into consideration, the question before us is what exactly is reasonable remuneration. That is a very important question for consideration. Now, what one calls a reasonable remuneration, not a beggarly type, is a matter on which there can be difference of opinion. In fact, as the Leader of the Communist Party was pleased to say, a Member of Parliament is not merely expected to work within the four walls of this Parliament. He has got to attend to the needs of his constituency. If he takes his responsibility in the real spirit, he has to work for the full twelve months, i.e. all the 365 days in the year. Now, it is very easy to avail of this opportunity to throw mud on the parties which are suggesting this scale of remuneration. I was

expecting to hear from my hon. friend of the Socialist Party, Mr. Dwivedy, whether or not the Socialist Party wanted a bigger remuneration. I have read the recommendations of most of the members of his party who were pleased to submit their recommendations to the Committee. I dare say that some of the members of the Socialist Party recommended a remuneration as high as Rs. 1,000 a month.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: It is a lie. It is not correct.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Mr. C. G. K. Reddy, the Deputy Leader of the Socialist Party in this House, recommended Rs. 1,000 a month.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Here is the Joint Committee Report. He recommended Rs. 600.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Not a single member of the Socialist Party, to the best of my recollection, recommended anything else except Rs. 500 a month. You will appreciate, Sir, that in this matter there could be reasonable differences of opinion. What has been recommended and what was recommended by the Committee, not a Joint Select Committee, appointed to investigate into the matter? Rs. 300. The other House has amended it to Rs. 400. The controversy is only between Rs. 300 and Rs. 400. If we examine the whole matter of what a reasonable remuneration is, taking our responsibilities, taking our needs, into consideration, taking the fact that we have no other sources of income, I do not think it can be reasonably stated at any time that by fixing a remuneration of Rs. 400 a month, we have fixed something monstrous or that we have acted in an irresponsible manner. I should like really to commend the reasonableness that the two Houses are showing in this matter. Though we have immense power, when we can have patronage for ourselves and many advantages for ourselves, we have said this is sufficient. It would be reasonable if it is

[Shri K. S. Hegde.] fixed at Rs. 400. It would be appreciated that most of the Members have got to run two establishments, not out of a sense of luxury but as a matter of necessity. One establishment in the home constituency for two purposes— for the purpose of the education of his children and for the purpose of attending to the constituency. Another establishment here in Delhi. It is true that some of us probably would like to retain the old Rs. 40. I for one would accept it, if there is no other alternative. But we are now talking about the generality of things. If you consider the generality of things, about the only reasonable conclusion that one can come to is Rs. 400 per month. Any person who has no other source of income must naturally depend upon this income. Can anybody say that this Rs. 400 is something extraordinary even taking the poor conditions obtaining in the country? What is the remuneration that other countries like us pay to their Members of Parliament? I would welcome the figure if the hon. Member has got it, as to what exactly a Member of Parliament in Russia or China gets. If he has the material, it will be welcome to us. There are two sets of people who say that this amount is excessive: one set is of those people who are very rich, people who have other sources of income. The other set is of those people who have other sources of income about which we do not know. So far as I can judge, some of the Members who are opposing this do not have any other sources of income except the one that is provided for in this Bill, but there are reasonable complaints that there are some parties in this country who have got not only their inspiration but also their financial assistance from sources outside India.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is pure rubbish. Will he please say which party gets its help from outside India?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I did not indicate any individual or party. If the cap fits his head, let him have it. I have absolutely no objection.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: What are the organisations which get help from foreign countries? The hon. Member has made this statement and he cannot escape it.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I can only say that my hon. friend suffers from a guilty conscience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not raise all these questions here.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would like to know, Sir, whether you are going to expunge these words or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is unnecessary to raise all these questions here, Mr. Hegde.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: On a point of order, are these words: 'my hon. friend suffers from a guilty conscience' all right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He only meant to say that people who protest too much suffer from a guilty conscience.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: It is for this reason, Sir, that one writer wrote, "The lady protests too much."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Then all that I would say is that those people get money from America. The hon. Member made a statement that some parties in India get their funds from outside the country. When he is challenged, he says, "If the cap fits his head, let him have it." Is this logic?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not logic.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: It was not my desire to create an atmosphere of heat. I wanted to avoid it. But when a political stunt is made by attacking this amount, an explanation is required to be given to the public why exactly a particular group of individuals are objecting to this. There must be some reasons. What are those reasons? They must also be placed before this House and before the public for examination. The legitimate complaint, as you know, Sir, is—whether—

it is true or not requires investigation—that there is a party here in India which gets outside help. There is some circumstantial evidence to confirm it. As you know, Sir, in this city of Delhi.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hegde, you need not go into all that.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am only giving my arguments as to why we are for Rs. 400 and some other Members are for Rs. 300. It is only to justify my statement. A particular political party has got a palatial building here on rent. How it can manage the money we don't know, but money flows like water. The members are living a life of luxury. They have got all conveniences I have got my profession and I do have some additions to my income here, but I am not able to have this kind of luxury, but the members of the party I have mentioned have all their needs met. They have everything provided for them in the best manner possible. I am surprised to see that they are able to live this life of luxury with the remuneration they get here.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Come and live in our communes. You will know how we live.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: They have got only one invitation to make. The invitation is, "Come to the purgatory with us." I am not prepared to oblige them.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Then do not talk about it. Come and see how we are able to live within Rs. 100.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Just this morning I had an occasion to draw the attention of the House to one source of income and in the minds of the public there are other sources of income and I should.....

(Interruption.)

"We have no guilty conscience at all. j

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Nor have we. You have a guilty conscience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, you are going off the track, Mr. Hegde.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am not, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Sir, I always obey your orders. The only question is, to my mind it looks as if the arguments that have been advanced here are not with a view to convincing the other side or to accept his amendment. Nobody will be more sorry than Mr. Sundarayya himself if his amendment is accepted.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Not at all. Let him accept it. What is the use of saying these things? *(Interruption.)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is wrong to say these, Mr. Hegde.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: It is a political stunt..... *(Interruption.)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: May be.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My friend was challenging. "The country will judge it." I have confidence in my country as much as my friend has got and the recent bye-elections have shown it. We have seen. Today you stand exposed completely.....

(Interruptions.)

KURI P. SUNDARAYYA: The Travancore-Cochin elections have shown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What have we to do with elections and all the rest of it here? Let us confine ourselves to the Bill. You are making it a forum for propaganda.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am sorry that all the speeches have been made not with a view to saying anything against the Bill or for the Bill but with a view to have propaganda.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't you behave better?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I should have been only too glad to be in a position where I need not have entered into that controversy but some charges have been made which, if not met, might be taken in the minds of the public as something established. It is for that that (*Interruption.*)

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: That is exactly why we are forced to deny your falsehoods.

(*Interruption.*)

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I have absolutely no objection to appointing a very impartial committee to go into this question—whether this Bill is passed or not—but at least it should probe into it and see whether the Members of Parliament are utilizing other sources of income. It is no good saying, 'I am only taking Rs. 200 from you.' Let us see

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am prepared to take up that challenge. Let a committee be appointed to investigate into these. I am prepared to accept the challenge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is all absolutely unnecessary. I thought you friends were all more responsible this side, but you seem to be as irresponsible as the other side.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Irresponsibility, like responsibility, is contagious. I shall not proceed in the matter further but I shall just ask the House not to be swayed by extraneous considerations but to examine the matter in the way it should be examined and if you examine it in the way it should be done you will see that a great trust is imposed on us by the Constitution. You must see that Membership of Parliament is not the monopoly of a rich few who can live on their own. You must provide adequately for Members to live in a reasonable way—not in a luxurious manner—and I don't think any Parliament anywhere in the

world would have set a better example than we have done. I have no doubt and I have no hesitation in commending this Bill for the acceptance of the House.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Mr-Chairman.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are going to set a good example?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Yes, Sir. I don't believe in proletarian millionaires or epicurean mendicants. There fore personally I would have welcomed a salary of Rs. 1,000 per month. Let it not be understood that we are the riff-raff of society or the scum of the earth. In any other walk of life we could have earned much more—as business executive, as journalists, as lawyers and what not. So when it is urged that.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Government service.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May be Government service also. When it is said that Members of Parliament are voting for themselves the enormous sum of Rs. 400 per month, I am amazed to find into what a depravity of valuations we have landed ourselves. Is it being suggested that a Member of Parliament's value is worth less than Rs. 400 a month? I beg to differ. Sir, this morning I got into friendship with a taxi driver and after a friendly exchange of cigarettes I asked him, "How much are you earning?" He said, "Rs. 500 a month". A taxi driver in the streets of Delhi can earn Rs. 500 a month.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Did you ask him how much he paid for the taxi?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Let me not be interrupted. If I am to be interrupted* let it be by some intelligent interruptions.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Intelligent Members only can understand intelligent interruptions.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I personally feel that by increasing the salary from Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 the Government have sought to lessen the charge on the Exchequer. Sir, I hope you will agree, with me, that this Indian Parliament represents a cross-section of the various income-groups in this country. Now in the original Bill it was stipulated that it would be Rs. 40 as daily allowance or Rs. 300 salary plus Rs. 20 as daily allowance. It was optional. In that case what would have happened was that most of us would have gone in for daily allowance because thereby we would have got exemption from income-tax and thereby the Government would have lost quite a huge sum which they could have otherwise got as income-tax. Now Rs. 400 a month is obligatory. There is no option. Every Member is going to accept a salary of Rs. 400 per month and Rs. 21 as daily allowance. This Rs. 400 will be accountable for income-tax purposes and will be included in the world pool of income and thereby I am sure, if my calculation is correct, about 70 per cent, of the Members of Parliament will be made to pay income-tax. I know there are a good many Members in this Parliament whose income is above Rs. 25,000. Supposing the usual income of a Member of Parliament is Rs. 25,000, and this Rs. 400 per month will mean another Rs. 4,800 a year and if this is included in the world pool of income—it will be above Rs. 25,000. He will not only have to pay at the rate of 33 paise per rupee as income-tax but also a super-tax. There are people whose income is Rs. 50,000 and above. They have to pay more than 50 per cent, as income-tax. Therefore I think personally that by raising this salary to Rs. 400 and making it compulsory, the Government have lessened the charge on the public exchequer. Therefore it is futile to argue that Rs. 300 would have been better. I have nothing more to add. I personally believe that a salary of Rs. 400 a month is inadequate and my complaint against Government is that they have fixed a salary which can rightly be considered inadequate. I have nothing more to add.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE) in the Chair.]

SHRI J. P. AGRAWAL (Uttar Pradesh) :

श्री जे० पी० अग्रवाल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
जनाब वाला, मैं इस मसविदा का स्वागत करने के लिये आया हूँ, लेकिन यह चाहता हूँ कि एक शायराना ज़बान में इसका स्वागत करूँ। यह एक कमजोरी तो जरूर होगी, लेकिन एक दिल की आवाज़ होगी। मैं दो तीन मिनट से ज्यादा नहीं लूँगा।

खैरमक़दम करूँ इस बिल का इरादा है यही।
ज़िन्दगी पाए मुकुं, मतलबे सादा है यही॥
चारसौ बीस पैसे, बस एक, इज़ाफ़ा है यही।
साफ़ शफ़ूफ़ा रहूँ, मलने का शाज़ा है यही॥
इसमें तनख़्वाह भी है और है रोज़ीना भी।
तोशिए राह, सफ़र के लिये गनजीना भी॥
कुछ यह कहते हैं कि ऐहबाब में सुबकी होगी।
खादिमे क्रौम पे अग़यार की फ़वती होगी॥
मैं यह कहता हूँ कि इस बिल से दुरस्ती होगी।
अपने हलकों में सदस्यों की रसाई होगी॥
हमने माना कि पसअन्दाज़ न कर पायेंगे।
अपने हलकों में मग़र वक़्त से घूम आयेंगे॥
यह गिला है पाए आज़ार हुकूमत आई।
टैक्स इनकम का लगेगा, यह मुसीबत आई॥
मेम्बरी आई है, हममें न कि सरवत आई।
घर से बेघर हुये सौ बार क़यामत आई॥
जो असासा था एलेक्शन में लुटा आये हैं।
तब कहीं जाके इस ऐवान में आ पाये हैं॥
खैर, गर आप नहीं मानते, लीजे महसूल।
एक मुसाफ़िर से लिया जाता है जैसे महसूल॥
चार सौ, एक लगेज मान के रखिये महसूल॥
हम से आगे न कहे कोई कि दीजे महसूल॥
अपना महसूल यहीं लीजिये मिनहा करके।
निस्फ़ तनख़्वाह न दीजे यह बहाना करके॥

जनाब वाला, यही चन्द क्रिकरे थे जो
मैं आपकी खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता
था। मझे बड़ा ताज़्जुब हुआ कि हमारे

[Shri J. P. Agrawal.]

दोस्त, जो शायद कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के हैं, वे आगे के लिये बहुत नाउम्मीद हो गये हैं, वरना इस मसविदे का किसी सूरत से भी विरोध नहीं करना चाहिये या क्योंकि यह तो पराई बदशक्ती के लिये अपनी नाक काटने की बात है। बार बार यह कहा जाता है कि कांग्रेस कमजोर हो रही है और मखालिफ जमातें तगड़ी पड़ रही हैं। अगर यही सूरत है और उनकी पार्टी का भविष्य और मुस्तकबिल अच्छा है तो उनके लिये यह फिर भी बेहतर था कि वे इस बिल को सपोर्ट (support) करते ताकि आयन्दा जब मौका आता और वे इस ऐवान म आते तो उन्हीं के लिये यह बिल फायदेमन्द साबित होता। इस तरह से वे इसका पूरा पूरा फायदा उठाते और अवाम में सुबकी न होती और उनका मतलब भी बन जाता। इन अलफ़ाज के साथ मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ।

SHRI B. GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to begin by saying that it is most unfortunate that the arguments advanced by the leader of our group, Shri Sundarayya, have not been met from the supporters of this Bill. Having not met any of those arguments which the country I am sure will consider unassailable, some hon. Members on the other side of the House have resorted to certain extraneous things and tried to hurl accusations against our party. I am not going into that matter, because I think the point at issue here itself is of great public importance and is a matter to be discussed from the angle of public morality. Sir, it would have been a great thing for this House if hon. Members from both sides could combine together to have such provisions in the Bill as would be acceptable to the people at large. It is not at all true to say that we

are taking any advantage of propa ganda against the party in power. On the contrary it is generally our endeavour to see that such measures which relate to Parliament, to hon. Members of Parliament, become so acceptable to the people that we could all share a certain amount of credit for them. In that, Sir, we have failed and it is no use trying to hide that fact. Why we have failed is a different matter. But the fact is that we have failed.

10 A.M.

You will remember, Sir, that when the matter was first broached, it was broached with the object of reducing the earnings of Members of Parliament, because it was felt that the country was not quite agreeable to permit Members of Parliament accepting such salaries or allowances at that time. I remember, as a result of public criticisms voiced in the press, the Members of the Constituent Assembly of that time, mostly belonging to the Congress, underwent a voluntary cut to the extent of Rs. 5 and to that extent they had to bow to public opinion. After that, Sir, when the new Parliament was returned, the question again came up before the public and the public was agitated and rightly agitated over this question. As has been mentioned, the Joint Select Committee formulated certain provisions, certain scales of pay and allowances, whatever they may be. Sir, in consonance with the wishes of the people, in consonance with the situation in the country, some hon. Members sat across the table and made suggestions and our party in its wisdom also placed its memorandum. We did not at that time go out into the country and take advantage of it. All that we wanted was to try in the Select Committee to put forward suggestions and persuade others who would not see eye to eye with us in this matter, and to come to a workable agreement so that we could produce something which would be liked by the public, and be a credit to this Parliament. With that outlook we functioned in that Committee and

it is with that outlook that the leader of our group has advanced his arguments.

Sir, the leader of our group did not use intemperate language. Unfortunately, the Bill is full of intemperance. Even so, he gave the House figures, cited facts and worked out the position, not merely in relation to how much we shall gain or lose, but in relation to the public policy and in relation to what the people are getting outside and he showed that it would be something exorbitant, relatively speaking. At the same time he took pains to explain to the House that the salaries suggested by us, the emoluments suggested by us would have given all the Members the assurance of a sum which would enable them to function as responsible public functionaries and discharge their duties properly. That was the song of his argument. That was the theme of his -whole case. Unfortunately hon. Members got so much annoyed and also somewhat irritated, that they missed the point and they indulged in gibes and accusations which were absolutely unnecessary and which only go to show that their conscience is not clear. I am not accusing everyone of the Congress Party. There are some who do not like these things. I am not trying to fling personal aspersions on anyone. I am only trying to explain that as a matter of public policy, the Congress has lent itself to a position absolutely unacceptable to anyone who goes by good conscience, who goes by standards of public behaviour. (*Interruptions.*) I would request my hon. friend to please hear me first. I say, that is my contention. Now, Mr. Hegde is not here, but he said that we were using this as a big stick. But I ask him the question, why give us this big stick? Take it away. If you like, accept our amendment and thus deprive us of the big stick. We do not want to take any political advantage out of this matter. We would not do anything of that sort.

Then why are these things being said?
I can well see the reason behind

it—it is just to cloud the issue. If you cannot meet an argument, sometimes it becomes the practice of some people to drown such arguments in pointless argumentations and in bringing in irrelevant arguments. That is the technique that is being used here but I think our country is intelligent enough to see, behind that argument, the absolute incorrectness of the Congress case.

It has been pointed out—I would not go into that—by our leader as to how our proposals would have met the requirements of the Members of Parliament, keeping in view all the facts that need to be kept in view in this matter. May I point out here that even in England where the standard of living is much higher, where the national *per capita* income is -Rs. 3,000 compared to our Rs. 250 a year, the Members of Parliament get only £1,000 a year, that is to say, Rs. 13,000. Our standard of living is very low.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: May I know about the Russian conditions? You are talking only about the English conditions. What about Russia?

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am talking about the country of your worship. Leave Russia alone. Here I am talking about the temple in which you pay homage.

Now, Sir, when I talk about it, they K«t worried. I will not go further into it, but, as I have said, they get £1,000 annually, that is to say, roughly Rs. 13,000 a year. Their annual national income is much higher as compared to ours in India, yet we give ourselves salaries much more than what would be justified by the national income. This is a factor which should be taken into account. The country looks forward to increasing the wages of the Government employees and the wages of the workers in the Government concerns, people who had been denied the barest living. That, is what the people expect of us.

[Shri B. Gupta.] Not having done that, not having taken any steps to give the people the barest living, we give unto ourselves some salaries which are absolutely out of proportion to the national income.

Here again I would point out that 95 per cent, to 96 per cent, of the people do not enjoy this income. If you look at the income-tax chart and the reports produced by the Income-tax Investigation Commission and all that, you would find that 95 per cent, to 93 per cent, of the people do not come within the range of people who pay income-tax. We are giving, as salary much more and if we include the allowances also, it means that we place ourselves in that category of 4 per cent, or 5 per cent, of the people who are enjoying things.

SHRI D. K. MUKERJEE: It does not probably include the underground income which is derived by the sale of Russian books in this country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Order, order. Let him continue.

SHRI B. GUPTA: If I were to answer this underworld argument, I will have wasted the time of the House. So, I will leave the underworld to them.

What I am saying is that as it is, with a salary of Rs. 400, we are placing ourselves within the category of the 4 per cent, or the 5 per cent, of people who enjoy and who are outside the category of the 95 per cent, or 96 per cent, of the people who do not pay any income-tax at all. Having done that, we add the allowances and so many other things which, taken as a whole, make a huge sum, relatively speaking. It may not sound very huge in countries which are very rich but it will certainly sound huge in the context of the situation of our country. That is the point we are trying to make out.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Say, 'Physician, heal thyself.'

SHRI B. GUPTA: That is the thing and it is huge. Let there be no mistake about it. Certainly it is not as huge as Birla's or the Nizam's funds or that of some multi-millionaire sitting there, but if you look at the people and compare it with what they are earning it would certainly seem a huge amount. That is the point and that point has not been answered.

Much has been said about how we live and all that kind of thing. The hon. leader of the group has said as to how we would spend the money. That was beside the point, but because it had been forced upon us we had to answer it. We consider no sacrifice to be big enough for the cause of the people. Let there be no mistake about it.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: What about the landed property of your leader?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Let him proceed.

SHRI B. GUPTA: We never brag about the sacrifices. We have made known to the public these facts and the people would bear it out. We do not like bragging. All that we are trying to prove here is the vice of this measure and that is the most important question for us now.

Somebody suggested that this amount should not be taken by us and all that sort of thing. I think that that argument is a little childish. We shall certainly take the amount and put it to public use.....

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: Charity begins at home.

SHRI B. GUPTA: for the service of the people because we do not want to save for feeding your immoral public policy; we want to save the money so that the people can get the benefits of such saving. If you do-

not use such money for the welfare of the people, we shall undoubtedly take matters into our hands and see that the people are served in whatever little way we can. That is all. You may not like that.

In passing I should like to refer to the fact that much was made of their patriotism. I am not here to question that, but may I ask, how many of the Congress members in the Congress Parliamentary Party defaulted in paying even the Rs. 175 that is supposed to be collected from them annually? I would also like to know whether it is not a fact that the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in a party meeting made a complaint about the fact that a large number of Congress members had defaulted even in paying this little sum a year. I leave it to the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to tell the truth, because I know that the Prime Minister would not have been saying all these things if the situation had not come to that point. That is, however, beside the point.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Hyderabad): But they are nervous about it.

SHRI B. GUPTA: They have said that we get money for elections and all that sort of thing. I do not know how this is relevant, but they have to find certain arguments and, therefore, they are saying all that. In the case of the Travancore-Cochin elections they must be knowing from where their money flowed, how it came and from where it came. In the case of a number of bye-elections, the Congress has been getting

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Let us come to the Bill. This is beside the point.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am just coming to the conclusion.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: May I interrupt? Would the hon. Member kindly tell us as to where the money that

was got from the exhibition of Russian films went?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Certainly, I will answer it, Sir. You can go and examine in the office of the Board of Film Censors.

SHRI B. GUPTA: You have knowledge, Sir, as one of the members elevated to the office of Vice-Chairman. You will have noted, Sir, that we are having this argument of the Russian films and all that sort of thing brought in as if Russian films have got something to do with the Bill. These are all absolutely irrelevant things. Hitler used to say, "If you tell a lie, tell a big lie and then go on repeating it so that some people may catch it".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Let us come to the Bill.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am trying to come to the point but I am being diverted by this kind of irresponsible snippings on the part of some Members.

If they tell a big lie, let them do so, but the country has called the bluff and will also call the bluff as far as this Bill is concerned and as far as the arguments given here are concerned. That is something which I want to say. We want them to take all factors into consideration. We are not asking them to live as ascetics, not at all. Live as reasonable men who are able to discharge the duties and functions as responsible citizens, yet holding certain ideals before the country and not trying to bring a slur on Parliament that the Members of Parliament are trying to take money with both hands when the whole country is starving and is denied even the minimum subsistence. That is the point.

I have said already that in a country like ours, our efforts should be directed, especially when we are in Parliament, to set certain ideals and not to take undue advantage of the pre-eminent position that we enjoy in this House. That should have been,

[Shri B. Gupta.] our line of approach but nothing of that sort has been done. I am told that the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs—and now, of course, for Parliamentary Funds as far as the other side is concerned—has told us that the Government is neutral. Wonderful neutrality it is! Now, Sir, I would like him to say the same thing when it comes to the Preventive Detention Act, when it comes to the Press Bill, when it comes to the amendment of the Criminal Procedure Code, and I would like the hon. Minister getting up and saying: "We do not give any whip to our Members, that our Members are free to vote as they like." But there of course there is no question of neutrality at all. There is full scale aggression against the people and the hon. Ministers are in the vanguard of that aggression. But here of course, when it comes to this thing, they say they are neutral, as if they are so helpless, as if the Government cannot do anything, and yet it was necessary on the part of the Government to persuade their Members and to bring their influence to bear on them so that they would agree to a cut in their salaries and allowances. The Government having adopted an attitude of neutrality has encouraged their lust for gain. I think that does not speak well of a Government. Neutrality in this case is nothing but meekly submitting to the wishes of the Congress members, and being a party thereto. It is no use trying to regale us with this sort of neutrality, and it is no use saying that the Government is neutral.

Sir, we have spoken often enough and our viewpoints have been made known and I wish, Sir, that even at this late stage, even after the Lok Sabha has passed this measure in this form, we set it right and, Sir, it would be unbecoming of us as Members of Parliament if we do not revert to a position which would be acceptable to the people in the country, and with that end in view I would impress upon the Members of that side of the House to accept our amendments which are very very reasonable and

! not cloud the matter by raising all kinds of irrelevant issues. I think even at this late stage we can set right the situation. We can salvage the public morality being surrendered in this matter and I hope the Government side, the so-called neutral side, would at least see that for the sake of the people, to ensure public interest and, if only for a change, they should side with us in this matter. I think that, if necessary, we can adjourn the House so that the hon. Members' conscience can be made clear and they can support the amendments we have tabled.

Sir, I can tell you that this measure, if it passes out of this House, if the Parliament enacts this law, will be condemned on all hands by every section of public opinion including the Congressmen outside this House. I am confident about it. If the hon. Members think it will not be, I fling a challenge to them, and I would invite them to read the press, the Congress press, as to how they react on the subject.

We never treat it as a party matter, nor do we want to secure party advantages or make political capital out of it. I say in the interests of a democratic Parliament, in the interests of the dignity of Parliament, in the interests of the public standard of behaviour, in the interest of code of public morality, "Let us all even at this late stage accept the amendments which we have proposed." Let us see that the Bill does not pass in the form, in which it has come from the other House. Let us bring our constructive endeavours to bear upon it so that, even at this late hour the amendments are accepted, and we can pass the Bill in a form acceptable to the people, so that we can at least forge one bond with the people in this particular matter. This is all that I want to say.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will only take two minutes. It is really amazing that

any one should impute motives while advancing arguments for or against the measure. As a matter of fact, Sir, there has been very little argument and, if I may say so, Sir, very little which is relevant to this Bill has at all been said. Only the first speaker, Mr. Sundarayya, placed certain facts before the House and he made certain comparisons and he asked the House to draw certain conclusions therefrom. But I submit, Sir, that I was most amazed to find the hon. Member comparing the emoluments proposed for Members of Parliament with those for the clerks or with those of the Under Secretaries. It would have been much better if he had made no such comparison. It is most disparaging that such comparisons about Members of Parliament should be made on any point with the members in the service of the Government. If my hon. friend had any conception, Sir, he would know that a Member of Parliament takes precedence even over a Secretary of the Central Government. If there was any comparison which could have been, as has been made, Sir in fixing the salaries, well, Sir.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: The salary of a Secretary is Rs. 4,000 and it comes to this that we should get more than that.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I have answered that too. Well, when the salaries of the hon. Ministers and the salaries of the Deputy Speaker and the salary of the other Members and office bearers of Parliament were fixed, such comparisons were made. But I cannot by any stretch of imagination consider Members of Parliament being compared with the Under Secretaries, that the Under Secretaries draw Rs. 750 or a thousand rupees. I am not asking for any amendment and I am not moving for raising the salary of Members of Parliament to a thousand rupees or two thousand rupees. There are many Members who are not here for remuneration at all and they can say with pardonable pride that their salaries or their remuneration outside Parliament were much more higher and with pardonable pride I may mention

that I have got offers with me which would give me more than three times the salary that I draw here. So it is not for the salary; it is not for the remuneration that we are here and so it is absolutely unfair for us to be compared with those office-bearers in the Government. If you say that their salaries will have to be fixed in the context of the salaries obtaining in the country at present, it is quite proper and I am one with you there. If it is necessary, let us revise the pay structure of this country. I have on many other occasions asked for a better uniformity. Even in the memoranda which I have submitted—it is not here that I am arguing simply where the Members of Parliament are concerned—I have on more than one occasion in the past pleaded with the Government that if this country cannot afford to pay any of the salaries even at present obtaining in the country, let us have a commission. Let the pay structure of the country be examined. Let us scale down the salary. That is one thing. But it is absolutely absurd to think and to say that the salaries will be absolutely out of context of the pay structure which is obtaining at present in the country, and it is therefore, Sir, that I wish that, instead of imputing motives, let us examine facts. Let us examine how we stand in the midst of that pay structure. I would like to know whether there is any other country where a Minister or Member of the Cabinet draws three times a Member of Parliament does. If it is necessary for us to scale down the salaries of the Members of Parliament. I am one for it. I do not mind if the salaries of Members are fixed at a much lower level than my friend here has himself agreed to. But that salary will have to be in the context of the structure that is obtaining here, or the structure which we have accepted. And to say that we are here out to loot the Public Exchequer is absolutely wrong, Sir, and it is absolutely creating a wrong impression. I do not impute any motives to my friend here. He may be obsessed

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] with certain ideas. That is another matter. As a matter of fact I started by saying that it is unfair either for the Congress Party or the Communist Party to impute motives to each other, and particularly where we are concerned with the salaries of Members of Parliament we must take a very detached view. We are not here out to take another hundred rupees per month and to say that we are so dishonest or that the House is carried away by the consideration of bagging another hundred rupees is to do the greatest injustice to the Members of Parliament and to the Parliament of which my hon. friends themselves are Members.

So I say, Sir, let us not be carried away unnecessarily and I plead: Let us be realistic about it and if it is necessary, we can revise the, entire pay structure and see where we fit in.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: Having stated the attitude of the Government at the outset with regard to this measure, I do not like to enter into a debate on the merits of the Bill, but I would like to say one word with regard to the speech made by my hon. friend—I mean Mr. Sundarayya. I was really shocked because he started his speech with the word 'shameless' and ended with the word 'cheat'. I confess that our culture prevents me from paying him back in his own coin. I would leave the whole thing to the judgment of this House as to how far he was justified in using this intemperate language particularly when he is the leader of an important group in this House.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Then you should not have brought such legislation

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: The second thing I would like to say about the same friend is this. I have been very carefully listening to his speech. Over and over again he was emphasising one point and he was

trying to make capital out of it, that the Members under the present scheme, in accordance with the amendments that have been passed by the other House, will get Rs. 750 per month. I am not divulging any secret, Sir, when I take the House into confidence, and I think it is a matter which is known to everybody that even if you calculate at this rate of Rs. 300 per month and Rs. 20 daily allowance for the days a Member attends the sessions, it will come to Rs. 750 per month at least for the six or seven months when the House will be in session.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Very good arithmetic !

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: This proposal came absolutely from my friend Mr. Sundarayya himself and in the Committee we accepted it and I may tell him and his other friends also that when we accepted his proposal and when I took this decision of the Committee to the Government, the Government really stood by it and therefore this Bill has been brought forward. I was really surprised to hear his colleague sitting by his side because I know he is an intelligent man and I could not believe how it could come from him when he said that he could make no distinction between this Bill and the Press Bill and other things and he asked how the Government could remain neutral on this point. I placed before this House and the other House why the Government remained neutral and made it perfectly clear that because this relates to the Members of both the Houses, the public is not at all concerned with it. Therefore, the Government decided that way and said, "Here is the Majority report of the Committee. Why not stand by it?" But in spite of my friend and ourselves the House decided otherwise. What can we do? This is the rule of the majority. That is democracy. Perhaps my friends may not believe in it, but we do believe in it. Because it concerns the Members alone, we have left it to the Members to decide.

SHRI B. GUPTA: That is not true.
 It concerns the public exchequer and . as such
 the public are concerned.

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: 'That is
 a far-fetched interpretation. It is concerned
 with the Members directly. In the Committee
 all the groups of both the Houses were
 represented and they reached a decision. The
 Government said, "Here is the Bill; we have
 incorporated that decision", and this is the
 Bill. In spite of it if you do not accept our
bona fides, we cannot help it. There are some
 people with whom we cannot carry
 conviction. They go on deliberately making
 some charge or other. I cannot help it. I wish
 you the joy of it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K.
 DHAGE): The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries
 and allowances of Members of Parliament,
 as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into
 consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K.
 DHAGE): Now, let us take up clause "by
 clause consideration of the Bill. Clause 2.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar
 Pradesh): Sir, I do not want to move
 < my amendments.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. —
 DHAGE): The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K.
 DHAGE): Clause 3. There are amendments.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Sir, I do ■ not
 move my amendment.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I move.

"That at page 2,—

(i) in line 28, for the words 'four
 hundred rupees' the words 'three hundred
 rupees' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 30, for the words 'twenty-one
 rupees' the words 'twenty-one rupees' be
 substituted,".

"That at page 2, after line 31, the
 following proviso be added, namely:—

'Provided that notwithstanding
 anything contained in any other Act for
 the time being in force, all allowances
 so received shall be subject to income-
 tax.' "

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K.
 DHAGE): The clause and the amendments are
 open for discussion.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, my
 amendment to clause 3 seeks to amend that
 clause, to say that a Member shall be entitled
 to receive a salary at the rate of three hundred
 rupees, instead of as it is there, four hundred
 rupees. It should be Rs. 300 per mensem dur-
 ing the whole of his term of office plus an
 allowance at the rate of Rs. 20 per day instead
 of the present figure of Rs. 21. In the general
 speech I have explained why this amendment
 should be there. Now, the hon. Minister pilot-
 ing this Bill—the Minister for Parliamentary
 Affairs—has said that in the Joint Committee
 which went into this matter we had accepted
 Rs. 300 and Rs. 20. Nor would I be giving out
 a secret if I say that we agreed to Rs. 300 and
 Rs. 20 with a view to taking away this matter
 from the controversial plane and making it an
 agreed proposition. Otherwise we have earlier
 in the Select Committee stood for Rs. 300 and
 Rs. 10 as daily allowance. Since we did not
 want to make it a party matter, as a compro-
 mise, discussions were held in the Joint
 Committee and it was only in order to make it
 a unanimous recommendation that we
 accepted Rs. 300 and Rs. 20. We did not want
 to make this question of salaries a party matter
 and so we

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] went to the farthest limits to accommodate the Congress Members and other groups also so that there could be a unanimous report of the Committee. The only objection taken was to the question of income-tax, whether the allowance of Members should be subject to income-tax. That was the only thing with which we differed; but of course it is a material difference. As I said we went to the farthest limits to accommodate all of them so that a unanimous decision could be taken. Of course there was a heated discussion; the representatives of the Congress Party were there, representatives of other parties were also there, but in the end everybody accepted that. Now, why is it that the Congress has gone back and tried to increase the salary from Rs. 300 to 400 and the daily allowance from Rs. 20 to 21? That is exactly why it has become a controversial matter. We cannot go to the people and give them an answer as to why we have increased our own salaries and allowances. If the Congress Members think that they can go and face the people, let them do so, but it is our bounden duty to move this amendment and make our position absolutely clear. Sir, but for the unnecessary interruptions and insinuations which some of the Members indulged in, we can have argued out our case. When I compared the emoluments that we are drawing with the emoluments which an attendant in Parliament or a Class IV employee gets, or when I compared them with the emoluments of the clerical staff belonging to Class III or of professors and teachers or even of Under Secretaries. I only compared them to show their relation to the pay structure that exists in the country. I know that Members of Parliament as representatives of the people have got higher priority in the Order of Precedence and they rank above Secretaries. If that is the argument that we, as representatives of the people, come after the Ministers even before the Secretaries of the Government of India in

the Order of Precedence, is that an argument to say that we should not take salary and allowances which will be considered by our people who have sent us here as reasonable, as well within the means of the country and which people will not consider as fantastic? People do consider the salaries of Secretariat staff. Secretaries and the Ministers and others, too high. There have been consistent demands to reduce it, but when we make this suggestion here, why should there be such-objections?

If we have to follow the hon. Member's argument, then, we should not be satisfied with Rs. 400 and Rs. 20 daily allowance, but we have to take a salary of Rs. 3 to 4 thousands and then only we can keep our precedence over the Secretaries.

Then, I would like to remove one-misconception which the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs stated that if we accepted this Rs. 300 a month and a daily allowance of Rs. 20 as a compromise, it works out to Rs. 750 a month. I don't imagine the way he worked this out, and his arithmetic. Perhaps he has not been assisted by his Secretary in this. Sir, Rs. 300 a month comes to Rs. 3,600 a year, and Rs. 20 a day, assuming that the House—I mean this House—sits for about 150 days in a year, it works out to Rs. 3,000 a year. Then, the total emolument will come to Rs. 6,600. I don't understand how this could work out to Rs. 750 a month. It works out to Rs. 550 per month.

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: I said it worked out to this figure only for about six or seven months in the year.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, what kind of arithmetic is it? In that case, it is not even six months, it is only three months or at the most Ave • months, that we sit. You cannot calculate things this way and tell us that we are agreed to getting a salary of a very large amount. This kind of quibbling with arithmetic does not help anyone.

Sir, my next amendment also is there. It reads:

"That at page 2, after line 31, the following proviso be added, namely: —

'Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in any other Act for the time being in force, all allowances so received shall be subject to income-tax.'

Here, the income from this goes partly to income-tax. Sir, we do not want this pernicious principle that allowances shall be exempted from income-tax. It is another way of cheating the Public Exchequer. If the income-tax is there for any income received, it must operate for any income above a particular level. Then, why should you try to escape the income-tax? The more honest course would be to fix a higher salary. So we want that "notwithstanding anything contained in any other Act for the time being in force, all allowances so received shall be subject to income-tax". Sir, these are the things that I wanted to place before you just now.

SHRI PRASADARAO: Sir

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): I hope you will not take a very long time.

SHRI PRASADARAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am amazed to hear the arguments from hon. Members of the other side with regard to the provisions contained in this measure. They spoke of so many things, 'bhoo dan', 'shram dan', 'sampat dan' and so many 'dans'. Perhaps this is the kind of 'sampat dan' they are going to make. They are going to make this dan of public money to themselves. This is their practice. Similarly, they are speaking of implementing the Five Year Plan and pooling all the resources of the country. When they go to the people, they want loans, public loans. For that they want people to tighten their belts in

35 CSD

order to implement the Five Year Plan and make it a success. But what is this tightening of the belt for? It is for increasing their salaries. On the one hand, they are increasing their salaries and on the other they are asking the people to tighten their belts. Perhaps this is their practice.

Similarly, Sir, whenever any salaried persons, who are paid low salaries want that their salaries should be increased, whenever they agitated for a little enhancement of their salaries, they are not giving them. Recently, we have seen in Calcutta what they have done. The primary school teachers there.....

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Their salaries are enhanced there.

SHRI PRASADARAO: Once again, it has to be repeated that this is the reward that they are giving to low-paid people who want an increase of a small amount in their salaries. Now, we are increasing our salaries by hundreds and hundreds of rupees per month. Those people were given bullets and not rupees. Perhaps that is their practice.

Sir, hon. Members are saying that Parliamentary Members are very responsible Members. All that is very true. But what does it mean? It means that we are responsible to the people; we are responsible to the country and we do not want any special privileges which our common people, who have sent us here, who have elected us, do not have. They have sent us here in order to serve them. But what are we doing? In the name of V.I.P.s we are voting for ourselves more salaries. I am most amazed at the arguments made by the hon. Minister. How are you getting the money for increasing your salaries if not by appropriating the public money. Therefore, I warn that the tragedy that the V.I.P.s brought at Allahabad, at Prayag at the Kumbh Mela, will be repeated if we accept this thing. I hope that the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend may be accepted.

SHRI SATYANARAIN SINHA: Sir, I have nothing to say on this amendment. I am neither opposing it nor supporting it; I shall leave it to the House to decide.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That at page 2, in line 28, for the words 'four hundred rupees', the word/4 'three hundred rupees' be substituted."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, you may put the other amendment with regard to allowance also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The salaries are one part and the allowances are another.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, this is an important issue and the names must be recorded after a division. And the Government is neutral.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): All right, we will have a division.

The House divided:

Ayes—15;

Noes—84.

AYES

Abdul Razak, Shri (Travancore-Cochin).

Abdur Razzak, Khan (West Bengal).

Banerjee, Shri S. (West Bengal).

Dwivedy, Shri S. N. (Orissa).

Gour, Dr. R. B. (Hyderabad).

Gupta, Shri B. (West Bengal).

Mazumdar, Shri S.N. (WestBengal).

Parvathi Krishnan, Shrimati (Madras).

Prasadaraao, Shri (Andhra). Rao, Shri V. P. (Hyderabad). Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap (Bihar). Sundarayya, Shri P. (Andhra). Suryanarayana, Shri K. (Andhra).

Vallabharao, Shri J. V.K. (Andhra).

Venkata Narayana, Shri Pydah (Andhra).

NOES

Adityendra, Shri (Rajasthan).

Agnibhoj, Shri R. U. (Madhya Pradesh).

Agrawal, Shri A. N. (Uttar Pradesh).

Agrawal, Shri J. P. (Uttar Pradesh).

Ahmed Hussain, Kazi (Bihar).

Ahmed, Shri Gulsher (Vindhya Pradesh).

Aizaz Rasul, Begum (Uttar Pradesh).

Anup Singh, Dr. (Punjab). Bharathi. Shrimati

K. (Travancore-Cochin). Bisht, Shri J. S.

(Uttar Pradesh). Bodra, Shri T. (Bihar).

Chaman Lall, Diwan (Punjab).

Chandravati Lakhanpal, Shrimati (Uttar Pradesh).

Chaturvedi, Shri B. D. (Vindhya Pradesh).

Chauhan, Shri N. S. (Uttar Pradesh).

Daga, Shri Narayandas (Hyderabad).

Dasappa, Shri H. C. (Mysore).

Das, Shri Jagannath (Orissa).

Dharam Das, Shri A. (Uttar Pradesh).

Doogar, Shri R. S. (West Bengal).

Faruqi, Moulana M. (Uttar Pradesh).

Gupte, Shri B. M. (Bombay). Gurumurthy, Shri B. V. (Hyderabad).

Hegde, Shri K. S. (Madras).

Hemrom, Shri S. M. (Orissa).

Hensman, Shrimati Mona (Madras).

Indra Vidyavachaspati, Shri (Uttar Pradesh).

Italia, Shri D. D. (Hyderabad).

Jafar Imam, Shri (Bihar).
 Jalali, Aga S. M. (Jammu and Kashmir).
 Kamalaswamy, Shri T. V. (Madras).
 Kapoor, Shri J. R. (Uttar Pradesh).
 Karimuddin, Kazi (Madhya Pradesh).
 Karumbaya, Shri K. C. (Ajmer and Coorg).
 Kishori Ram, Shri (Bihar).
 Krishna Kumari, Shrimati (Vindhya Pradesh).
 Lall, Shri K. B. (Bihar).
 Leuva, Shri P. T. (Bombay).
 Madhavan Nair, Shri K. P. (Travancore-Cochin).
 Mahanty, Shri S. (Orissa).
 Mahesh Saran, Shri (Bihar).
 Mazumder, Shri S. C. (West Bengal).
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal (Madhya Pradesh).
 Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati (West Bengal).
 Mazhar Imam, Syed (Bihar).
 Misra, Shri S. D. (Uttar Pradesh).
 Mitra, Dr. P. C. (Bihar).
 Mookerji, Dr. Radha Kumud (Nominated).
 Mukerjee, Shri B. K. (Uttar Pradesh).
 Nagoke, Jathedar U. S. (Punjab). Naidu, Shri Rajagopal (Madras). Nihal Singh, Shri (Punjab). Obaidullah, Shri (Madras).
 Pande, Shri T. (Uttar Pradesh). Panigrahi, Shri S. (Orissa).
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta (Madhya Pradesh).
 Pawar, Shri D. Y. (Bombay).
 Pheruman, Sandar D. S. (Punjab).
 Pillai, Shri C. N. (Travancore-Cochin).

Prasad, Shri Bheron (Bhopal).
 Pustake, Shri T. D. (Madhya Bharat).
 Raghubir Singh, Dr. (Madhya Bharat).
 Rao, Shri Bhaskara (Madras).
 Rao, Shri Raghavendra (Hyderabad).
 Reddy, Shri A. B. (Andhra).
 Reddy, Shri Channa (Hyderabad).
 Reddy, Shri Govinda (Mysore).
 Sarwate, Shri V. S. (Madhya Bharat).
 Shaik Galib (Andhra).
 Sharda Bhargava, Shrimati (Rajasthan).
 Sharma, Shri B. B. (Uttar Pradesh).
 Shetty, Shri Basappa (Mysore).
 Singh, Babu Gopinath (Uttar Pradesh).
 Singh, Shri Ngangom Tompok (Manipur and Tripura).
 Singh, Shri R. K. (Uttar Pradesh).
 Singh, Shri Vijay (Rajasthan).
 Sinha, Shri R. B. (Bihar).
 Surendra Ram, Shri V. M. (Madras).
 Tamta, Shri R. P. (Uttar Pradesh).
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N. (Uttar Pradesh).
 Vaidya, Shri Kanhaiyalal D. (Madhya Bharat).
 Varma, Shri C. L. (Bilaspur and Himachal Pradesh).
 Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna (Madhya Bharat).
 Vyas, Shri Krishnakant (Madhya Bharat).
 The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): NOW we take up the second part of the amendment,

The question is:

"That at page 2, in line 30, for the words 'twenty-one rupees' the words 'twenty rupees' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That at page 2, after line 31, the following proviso be added, namely:—

'Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in any other Act for the time being in force, all allowances so received shall be subject to income-tax.'

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The motion is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

There are three amendments.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: I am not moving my amendment.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir. I move:

"That at page 2 —

(i) in lines 34 to 36, the words 'or a meeting of a Committee or for the purpose of attending to any other business connected with his duties as a member' be deleted.

(ii) in line 37, the words 'or the meeting' be deleted; and,

(iii) in line 38, the words 'or the other business is to be transacted' be deleted."

"That at page 2, after line 45, the following be added, namely: —

'Provided that where the journey can be performed by rail, a sum equal to one single second class fare rail is deducted from this amount.'"

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The clause and the amendments are now open for discussion. May I just say that the time for this Bill is up to 11.30 A.M. only? I would request hon. Members to be as brief in their speeches as possible.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: In clause 4, my amendments are firstly for the deletion of the words "or a meeting of a Committee or for the purpose of attending to any other business connected with his duties as a member after the words "a session of a House of Parliament". I also want the deletion of the words "or the meeting" in line 37 and "or the other business is to be transacted" in line 38. My purpose is very clear. This clause 4 speaks of travelling allowances. It says that, when a Member attends a session of Parliament or any Committee thereof or any other business connected with his duties as a Member, he must be paid a *second* class fare *plus* a third class fare. Under clause 6 we have provided for a second class pass on an all-India basis. When Parliament is in session, hon. Members may like to bring their families. In that connection they may have to incur additional expense. It may be reasonable or necessary to provide for this purpose another second class fare plus a third, class fare, but when it is a question of

attending Committee meetings in pursuance of a Member's parliamentary duties or some other duties, we do not expect Parliament Members to take their families along with them. -As such, there is no reason whatsoever to provide an additional second class fare and an additional third class fare. As such, my amendment is for the deletion of this provision. This is only giving extra remuneration though it is called travelling allowance. Under sub-clause (b) also there is another snag. If the journey is performed by air, the Member will be paid an amount equal to one and one-fourth of the air fare for each such journey. We have an all-India pass with which we can travel throughout the whole country, but still we are given this benefit. Suppose I come from

'11 AM

Hyderabad or from Bombay or from Madras or Trivandrum. Though I can travel comfortably in the train by second class, still if I choose to travel by air, apart from my second class pass, Government is prepared to pay the air fare plus, one-fourth of the air fare. Then why is the second class pass given at all? Is it given only when Parliament is not in session so that it may be used for just having pleasure trips throughout the whole country? Otherwise I cannot understand this provision at all. If the pass is to enable us to carry out our responsibilities, our task as Members of Parliament, why is there another provision that in addition to this you will get an additional second class fare and an additional third class fare whenever you come to Parliament, or attend any Committee meetings or whenever you go out on other parliamentary business? So my amendment is "Where the journey can be performed by rail, a sum equal to one single second class fare by rail is deducted from this amount." Since you have got a second class fare, if you want to travel by air, you must pay for it. This is all that my amendments seek to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: If they are interim journeys.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: If they are interim journeys, there is the other saving clause. We have not moved any amendment to it, because it will amount to less than the daily allowance, because the daily allowance question is there, because the minimum is fixed. To pay an additional second class fare for attending Committee meetings or other parliamentary duties is completely unjustified, when you pay us a salary plus Rs. 21 as daily allowance. From Trivandrum to Pathankot it would not take more than three days by rail. Even if it takes three days, when the salary and the daily allowance, which will be paid immediately you arrive in Delhi, are there, to pay another second class fare would be unjustified. Let us not vote ourselves more and more money from the Public Exchequer. We have already voted ourselves a good amount under clause 3. Let us be reasonable and not go on voting ourselves more and more in the name of travelling allowances. This is the reason why I want that my amendment should be accepted. Apart from this, I would also like to mention that under clause 8 "a Member shall be entitled to such medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities as may be prescribed by rules under Section 9." A joint Committee of both the Houses will decide what facilities a Member will be entitled to. We can reasonably expect from the composition of this Committee that some more facilities will be given. As such, I would like the House to accept my amendment.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): I rise to oppose the amendment of Mr. Sundarayya, for if this amendment is accepted, it will virtually mean that one will be debarred from travelling by air. Sir, our country is a country of distances. There are several people here who are very busy in their professions and other things and who cannot afford to waste their time by travelling by train. Many of the Members coming from the South prefer to

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.] travel by air. I for one in all my parliamentary career in the last two years have travelled by rail only once or twice. I have made it a rule to travel by air. Sir, what does it matter if 1J air fair is paid? What is gain to the Government in the Communication Department may be a loss no doubt to the Transport Department. My friend probably is under the impression that if a free railway pass is given, that means we are not paying any amount. It may be that the Member of Parliament will not pay anything for the train journey but there is some other department which will certainly pay for the Member of Parliament for that. For instance, supposing I travel from Madras to Delhi by train utilizing the second-class pass, it may be that so far as I am concerned, I don't pay anything but there will be some other agency who will be paying for the train journey that I had performed from Madras to Delhi. It may be that the Parliament Secretariat will pay for the journey from Madras to Delhi. So Mr. Sundarayya was under a wrong impression when he moved his amendment, I don't know whether I have made myself clear. We are given a free railway pass. So far as we are concerned, we don't pay anything but there will be some other department—probably the Parliament Secretariat or some other agency who will be paying the Railway Department for the journey that a Parliament Member has performed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): It is a mere adjustment.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: So far as this is concerned, I dare say that in the case of such of those who travel by train, it will be a loss to the Government and in the case of such of those who travel by air, it will be a profit to the Government. I can give one example. The second class fare from Madras to Delhi is Rs. 114, third class is Rs. 45. If a Member travels by train from Madras to Delhi, he will get Rs. 2 to or Rs. 250 if it is in

the second class and one-third, and if he travels by air, he will get only Rs. 200. or about Rs. 230.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is the same.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: The difference is about Rs. 40. This 1Jh is really a gain to Parliament and certainly not a loss to Parliament. It is for this that I oppose the amendment of Mr. Sundarayya.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, I support this amendment. I think the previous hon. Member has misconstrued the point behind this amendment. The point is, it is expected that the pass would not be used by the hon. Members who are travelling by air. A Member comes by air, maybe he has some urgent business but when he comes by air, the pass to that extent would be wasted. If he does so, he should do it at his own cost. That is to say, he will get the difference as pointed out by Mr. Sundarayya.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): What Mr. Naidu said was that the saving to the individual will be less in the case of travel by air than in the case of travel by train.

SHRI B. GUPTA: We don't know,, we have to make all these calculations here, how you are travelling, what is the road mileage, etc. We are concerned here with the approach and certain basic stand should be taken. You give a Member an all-India pass. He can come within three days from any part of India. Naturally a Member, when he comes to Parliament, can adjust his time. If he does not come, then this pass is not utilized and I don't know how adjustments will be made by the Government between the departments—it is not explained here. I can only see that it will be given, in addition to the pass which he might have used, an additional sum on account of journey by air. That is the point. As such cases would not

be too frequent, in such cases the hon. Member should agree to this question of deduction being made from the air fare. The whole thing should be taken in the context of the other proposal. The hon. Members divided and they got Rs. 400. After having got it and also Rs. 21 daily allowance, I think they can at least agree to this. The deduction will not be of such an order that it would make it impossible for hon. Members to travel by air, if it becomes very urgent to do so. It will not be a case like that. Therefore I say that this amendment should be accepted. I have noticed how readily they stand up. So I don't see much chance of its being accepted. After all reason is reason and it has to be re-asserted even if the hon. Members on that side of the House in a phalanx stand up against this.

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: I have nothing to say this way or that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That at page 2,—

<i>i> in lines 34 to 36. the words 'or a meeting of a Committee or for the purpose of attending to any other business connector! with Ws duties as a member' be deleted:

(ii) in line 37. the words 'or the meeting' be deleted; and

(iii) in line 38 the words 'or the other business is to be transacted' be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That at page 2, after line 45. the following be added, namely: —

'Provided that where the journey can be performed by rail, a sum

equal to one single second class fare by rail is deducted from this amount."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Clause 5.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Sir. I don't move my amendment.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir I move:

"That at page 3, line 26. the words 'or a sitting of a Committee' be deleted."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The clause and the amendment are open for discussion

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: My amendment to clause 5 is a very simple one. I ask for the deletion of the words 'or a sitting of a Committee'. Sir, this is a question of intermediate journey. I can understand when a Parliament session is on which normally meet? once for 100 days and at another time for 50 days that Members have to go to their constituencies and perform their duties but I cannot understand when a Member comes to attend a Committee meeting or a Joint Select Committee meeting or a P.A.C. meeting or Estimates Committee meeting which don't take more than a week at all or a fortnight at the maximum, and in between the sessions when such meetings are called for a week or at the most for a fortnight and when Members come from long distances. If they immediately come and say: "We have got some other work, so let us I go and come back", if they do it, then ! also they are given T.A. etc. Is it

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] the means to encourage economy. Is it the way that the hon. Members of Parliament are going to take their responsibilities and attend to Committee meetings seriously. After knowing fully well that a Committee meeting was going to last for 10 or 15 days, if they cannot adjust their public programmes in such a way that they can at least, without going back, attend the Committee meetings and stick to it, it is very bad. Why is it that even then a provision is made that additional T.A. is to be given? This kind of thing does not look nice. You cannot justify all these things to the people, unless you consider them as foolish or such as cannot see what you are doing. Those days have gone when people could be deceived for ever. My amendment is a very simple one that for Committee meetings this provision of intermediate journey need not be there. The Minister is completely neutral in this matter. He does not know what is happening and he leaves everything to God, and to this House to do anything. I wish they are neutral always, and they will learn some good lessons. As such I would certainly urge that this amendment should be accepted.

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: I have nothing to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That since in line 5, the words 'or a sitting of a Committee' be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Clause 6.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Sir. I don't move my amendments.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill." The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): There is one amendment given notice of to clause 8, by Shri Prasad Rao. but it is a negative one and so out of order.

The question is:

"That clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 9 and 10 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Motion moved.

"That the Bill be passed."

Any hon. Member desiring to speak on this motion may do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: No speeches. Sir.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Hyderabad):

ڈاکٹر آر۔ بی۔ گور (حیدرآباد):

جناب نائب صدر صاحب - مجھے

اجازت دیجئے کہ میں ہندوستانی میں

تقریر کروں - اس کے ساتھ ساتھ صرف ایک درخواست ہے اور وہ یہ ہے کہ کوریکشن (correction) کیلئے جو کاپی (copy) مجھے دی جائے وہ فارسی رسم الخط میں دی جائے کیونکہ میں دیوناگری رسم الخط سے واقف نہیں ہوں -

جناب والا، مجھے کہنا صرف یہ ہے کہ اس معاملہ میں گورنمنٹ کی یہ غیر جانبداری یا نیوٹرلیٹی (neutrality) سمجھ میں نہیں آ رہی ہے - وہ ایک بل (Bill) کو لا رہی ہے - اور اس کو پائلٹ (pilot) کر رہی ہے اور کہہ رہی ہے کہ اس بارے میں ہمارا رویہ بالکل غیر جانبدارانہ ہے - یہ بات میری سمجھ میں نہیں آئی - مجھے افسوس ہے کہ جن منسٹر صاحب نے اس بل کو یہاں پیش کیا ہے وہ اپنی غیر جانبداری کو سمجھانے کی کوشش کریں گے کہ وہ غیر جانبداری کیسی ہے -

دوسری بات مجھے یہ کہنی ہے کہ انریبل ممبران اس بات پر غور کریں کہ لوگ کیا کہیں گے - جو تذکروا میں آپ پاس (pass) کئے گئے ہیں اس کے بارے میں لوگ کیا کہیں گے اس کے متعلق ذرا آپ سوچیں - آپ کہتے ہیں کہ غیر جانبداری ہے اور کوزا نہیں چل رہا ہے لیکن کوزا چلا ہے اور چل رہا ہے - ہو سکتا ہے کہ فارملی (formally) ایسا کوزا نہ

ہو لیکن لوگوں نے ووٹ دیا ہے اور اس طریقہ پر آپ نے بل پاس کرا لیا ہے - لوگ ہم کو ملازم نہیں سمجھتے ہیں بلکہ اپنا اہلکار سمجھتے ہیں اور اپنا کاروبار چلانے کے لئے پارلیمنٹ میں بھیجتے ہیں - اکبر الہ آبادی نے جو شعر کہا ہے اسی کو میں آپ کے سامنے دھرا دینا چاہتا ہوں -

دھنچ لہو کو بہت ہے مگر آرام کے ساتھ
اکبر کے زمانہ میں قوم کے لہڈران حکام کے ساتھ دعوتیں کھاتے تھے
لیکن اب لہڈران اپنے ہی ہاتھوں دعوتیں لوتے ہیں -

SHRI KISHORI RAM (Bihar):

श्री किशोरी राम (बिहार) : आप भी साथ में हैं ।

DR. R. B. GOUR:

ڈاکٹر آر۔ بی۔ گور : تو یہ کہنا کہ عوام سے اس کا کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے یہ بالکل مہمل بات ہے - جو خرچ ہم پارلیمنٹ پر کر رہے ہیں اور جو اجرت ہم اپنے لئے مقرر کر رہے ہیں وہ عوام کا ہی پیسہ ہے -

SHRI KISHORI RAM:

श्री किशोरी राम : आप की तरह पार्टी से हम को तनस्वाह तो नहीं मिलती है ।

DR. R. B. GOUR:

ڈاکٹر آر۔ بی۔ گور : تو آپ اپنی پارٹی کو لہوی (levy) بھی نہیں دیتے ہیں -

[Shri R. B. Gour.]

میں یہاں صرف ایک بات کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آپ یہ دیکھیں کہ خود کانگریس کی کیا روایات ہیں - آپ اپنی تنخواہ کے متعلق جو فرما رہے ہیں وہ قومی تحریک کی روایات نہیں ہیں - یہ تو برٹش سامراجی روایات ہیں - انہوں نے اس لئے پارلیمنٹ رکھی تھی کہ ان کی مدد ہو سکے اور ایسی پارلیمنٹ رکھی تھی جس میں کہ ایسے لوگوں کی ضرورت تھی جو کہ اونچی اونچی تنخواہ لیں - لیکن جب کہ کانگریس کے لوگ قومی تحریک کی رہنمائی کرنے والے منسٹری (ministry) میں آئے ہیں تب یہ بات نہیں ہونی چاہیئے - ۱۹۳۷ میں جبکہ کانگریس کی منسٹری آئی تھی اس وقت تنخواہ اور اجرت کے متعلق کانگریس کا رویہ کیا تھا؟ انہوں نے اپنی مرضی سے تنخواہیں کٹوائی تھیں - اور قوم اور عوام کے سامنے ایک اونچا معیار اور اونچا آدرش رکھا تھا - لیکن آج اجرت اور تنخواہ کے معاملہ میں یہ سامراجی رویہ کہوں اختیار کیا ہے؟ آج کانگریس کہیں یہ روایات چھوڑ رہی ہے؟ میں اس بات کو سمجھ سکتا تھا کہ اس وقت کے کسی صوبہ کے سابق منسٹر یا یہاں کا کوئی سابق منسٹر اس طرح کا بل لاتا - اگر نواب صاحب چٹھاری جو کہ یہاں پر رہ رہے چکے ہیں اور حیدرآباد میں وزیر اعظم رہ چکے

ہیں اتنی بڑی آہنی تنخواہوں کے متعلق بل لاتے یا اگر شری جے-پی - سربو استون صاحب جو کہ بلٹال فیمین (famine) کے زمانہ میں وزیر تھے اس طرح کا بل لاتے تو میں سمجھ سکتا تھا - لیکن میں یہ نہیں سمجھ سکتا کہ کانگریس کے ہی لوگ کانگریس کے اصول کو برطرف رکھ کر یہ چیز کیوں لائے ہیں؟ پرانی وزارت پرانی برٹش گورنمنٹ (British Government) کے زمانے کے جو مددگار رہے ہیں وہ اگر اس طرح کا بل رکھتے تو یہیں سمجھ سکتا تھا - لیکن یہ کہنا کہ کانگریس کی طرف سے یہ بل آیا ہے اور سرکار کا رویہ غیر جانبداری کا ہے یہ بات میری سمجھ میں نہیں آئی ہے -

بڑی بڑی اصولی باتیں کی جاتی ہیں جب مزدوروں کی اجرت کا معاملہ ہم کرتے ہیں تو کہا جاتا ہے کہ آپکی قوم انتہائی پسماندہ ہے - اس لئے ہم ایسی اجرت نہیں دے سکتے - مڈل کلاس (middle class) کے امپلائیز (employees) کی بات کہی جاتی ہے تو بھی کہہ دیتے ہیں کہ قوم کی حالت خراب ہے اور پسماندہ ہے - لیکن آپ اپنے لئے قوم کی پسماندگی کو سامنے نہیں رکھتے ہیں - آپ اپنی اجرتوں کے سامنے اس بات کو بھول جاتے ہیں - جب ٹریڈ یونینوں (trade unions) کا ہمسائیوں کا اور مزدوروں کا سوال آتا ہے تو آپ قوم کی

کی پس ماندگی کا سوال سامنے لا دیتے ہیں۔ فائیو ایر پلان (Five Year Plan) کی بات سامنے لا دیتے ہیں۔ لیکن جب اپنی بات آتی تو وہ چیز آپ کے لئے لاگو نہیں ہوتی۔ تو آپ کے سامنے یہ ایک انتہائی اہم سوال ہے اور آج اس کو غور سے سوچیں کہ آپ کس اصول سے اتنی بڑی تضحواہ لے سکتے ہیں۔ جب آپ کی کانستٹی ٹیونسی (constituency) کے لوگ اس بارے میں آپ سے پوچھیں گے تو آپ اس کا کیا جواب دیں گے۔ وہ آپ سے پوچھنے والے ہیں کہ جو بات آپ ہم لوگوں کے لئے لاگو کرتے ہیں وہی آپ کے لئے کیوں نہیں کرتے ہیں۔

Syed MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar):

سید مظہر امام (بہار): آپ کیوں ٹھہراتے ہیں؟ آپ سمجھا دیجئے گا۔

Dr. R. B. GOUR:

ڈاکٹر آر۔ بی۔ گور: وقت نہیں ہے نہیں تو جواب دیتا۔ خیر آپ خود بہار میں چلیئے اپنی کانستٹی ٹیونسی میں چلیئے میں بھی آپ کے ساتھ چلوں گا اور تب دیکھوں گا کہ آپ کیا جواب دیتے ہیں اور پلیمبی سائٹ (plebiscite) کے ذریعہ سے ان تضحواہوں کو منظور کرواتے ہیں یا نہیں۔ ہلوک بیکو لوگ ہیں۔ ہم لوگ نہیں سمجھتے ہیں۔ تو جانے دیجئے لیکن آپ اپنی کانستٹی ٹیونسی کو سمجھا لیجئے وہاں کا

ورث لے لیجئے اور لوگوں سے کہلو لیجئے کہ آپ بہت مفلس ہیں اس لئے چار سو روپیہ لے لیں۔

آخر میں میں آپ کے سامنے یہی کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس بل کے بنانے میں اس بل کے چلانے میں اور اس بل میں سلیکٹ کمیٹی (Select Committee) سے آنے کے باوجود جس طرح سے ترمیم کی گئی ہے اس میں ان اصولوں کو بالکل ختم کر دیا گیا ہے۔ اس کے بعد آپ جس طریقہ سے اس بل کو لائے ہیں اور آپ جو یہ فرما رہے ہیں کہ ہم نیوٹرل (neutral) ہیں غیر جانبدار ہیں یہ بات چلنے والی نہیں ہے اسکو آپ کو صاف کرنا ہوگا۔ اس موقع پر اس سے زیادہ کچھ نہیں کہنا ہے کیونکہ تمام اسڈمنٹس (amendments) کو آپ نے برباد کر دیا ہے۔

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 325.]

SHRI K. B. LALL:

श्री के० बी० लाल : वाइस चेयरमैन साहब.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): There is no time.

SHRI K. B. LALL:

श्री के० बी० लाल : अब मैं थोड़ा सा ही बोलना चाहता हूँ। इस बिल के पास होने के बारे में इस तरह का भाव हो सकता है, ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता था।

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh):

श्री बी० बी० शर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
इस वक्त बोलने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है, बैठ जाइये।

SHRI K. B. LALL:

श्री के० बी० लाल : आप क्यों परेशान हैं। इतनी देर तक नहीं धबड़ाये अब क्यों धबड़ाते हैं। अगर धबड़ाते हों तो बैठ सकता हूँ।

मझे सिर्फ यही कहना है कि लीडरों को इस पर रंज तो जरूर है लेकिन दिल में आराम लेने की भी उतनी ही स्वाहिश है।

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA:

श्री पी० सुन्दरय्या : आपके दिल में आराम होगा, हमारे दिल में नहीं है। हमारे दिल में तो बहुत गुस्सा है।

SHRI K. B. LALL:

श्री के० बी० लाल : जितनी बातें कही जा रही हैं उनका इम्तिहान तो उधर से होने वाला है।

मैं इस बिल को सपोर्ट (support) करता हूँ और कहता हूँ कि यह बहुत मौजू है और वक्त पर आया है। जो कुछ और बातें हैं वे फिर हो सकती हैं, फिर संशोधन हो जायेगा लेकिन मैं इसको सपोर्ट करता हूँ। इससे हम लोग अपना कर्तव्य ठीक तरह से निभा सकेंगे और जनता की भलाई कर सकेंगे। उधर से बहुत उपदेश की बातें की गई और कांग्रेस के लोगों को उपदेश दिये गये। मेरा कहना है कि अगर ये उपदेश वे खुद पालन करते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता उन्होंने जो कांग्रेस पार्टी से ज्यादा मुहब्बत दिखाई है

उसके बारे में मझे यह कहना है कि अपनी मां से ज्यादा मुहब्बत तो डाइन करती है।

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 326.]

SHRI SATYANARAYAN SINHA:

श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह : उपसभापति जी, मैं नहीं समझता था कि इस बिल में थर्ड रीडिंग (third reading) भी होगी, लेकिन हुई। न जाने कितनी बार इस हाउस (House) में और उस हाउस में मैंने यह बताने की कोशिश की कि किस उमूल पर गवर्नमेंट ने यह तय किया है कि वह इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में बिल्कुल निरपेक्ष रहेगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे दोस्त जो बार बार इस पर एतराज करते हैं वे ऐसा नहीं है कि इस बात को समझते न हों। मैं नहीं जानता कि समझ कर भी वे क्यों इस तरह की बहस करते हैं। अगर नहीं समझते हों तो जैसी कि अंग्रेजी में एक कहावत है, उसका उद्धरण मैं आपके सामने रख सकता हूँ और कुछ नहीं कर सकता वह यह है :

"I can give reasoning but not understanding".

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 327.]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) BILL, 1954

THE MINISTER FOR REHABILITATION (SHRI A. P. JAIN): Sir, I beg-to move:

"That this Council concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha