

[Shri O. V. Alagesan.] able to look into the particular provision.

As far as the stability information is concerned, the International Convention itself says that it should apply only to new ships because this stability information is to be given when a ship is newly constructed and it may not be possible to enforce this with reference to old ships. Even the Convention envisages such information to be supplied only with regard to new ships.

Then, Shri Reddy said something about ship coming in distress. The proviso is "Provided that this subsection shall not have effect if the ship would not have entered any such port but for stress of weather or any other circumstances that neither the master nor the owner nor the charterer, if any, could have prevented or fore-stalled." If the ship is not definitely coming into our port then certainly we do not have powers to enforce provisions against it. It may be that the ship may be intended to go to some other port in which case it would not be our business to enforce these restrictions and I think that is the reason for this proviso.

Sir, I commend the motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to enable effect to be given to an International Convention for the Safety of life at Sea, signed in London on the tenth day of June, nineteen hundred and forty-eight, to amend the provisions of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923, relating to life-saving appliances, wireless and radio navigational aids and to other matters affected by the said Convention, as passed by the House of the People be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause

consideration. There are no amendments of which notice has been received.

Clause 2 to 31, clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is.

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL, 1953

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMA-CHARI): Mr. Deputy Chairman, may I have your permission to move this on behalf of my colleague, the Law Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of certain officers of Parliament, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

[SHRI B. C. GHOSE, (The Vice-Chairman) in the Chair.]

I do not think, Sir, that this Bill, requires any elaborate explanation from Government. Clause 3 of this Bill, the hon. Members will please note, reduces the salary that has been drawn by the Chairman of the Council of States and the Vice President of India and the Speaker of the House of the People from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 2,250. In fact, Sir, these two

dignitaries have voluntarily reduced their salary from Rs. 3,000 ever since the new Salaries Act, as far as the Ministers are concerned was passed, so that they could approximate the salaries that they were drawing to that of the Ministers.

The other part of clause 3 provides for the Deputy Chairman of this House and the Deputy Speaker of the House of the People to be paid a salary of Rs. 2,000 per month. Sir, what has been happening all along is that these two officers were getting Rs. 1,500 per month during the time when their respective Houses were in session besides the Daily Allowance that they were entitled to draw as Members of the two Houses, namely, Rs. 40 a day. On a calculation, Sir, of what would ultimately accrue to the recipients the hon. Members would be able to find out that the provision of Rs. 2,000 subject to tax is a departure not in favour of the two officers. In fact it may act the other way about for the daily allowance drawn by them is not subject to tax but the Rs. 1,500 is subject to tax. It might be, Sir, that from the pecuniary point of view there has been a sacrifice in the case of these two officers. Another point to be noted in this connection is that both the Deputy Chairman of this hon. House and the Deputy Speaker of the other House are non-officials and they could pursue their profession. In fact it is known that at least the Deputy Speaker of the other House is a lawyer and he practises during the inter-sessional period whenever he is able to go home, but as a result of this measure they will become whole-time officers and they would not be permitted to pursue their profession. Then it has been said or it may be said that the Chairman of this House who has other functions to perform as well and the Speaker of the other House who has continuous work to do should be paid a fixed salary as also the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman. In point of fact, Sir, the work of these officers of Parliament is now

becoming more or less a continuous one. The Deputy Speaker of the other House is Chairman of the Estimates Committee and the services of the Deputy Chairman are constantly in demand by Government and he is asked to preside over committees because of the fact of his long experience as Member of Parliament and also because of the objective nature of the outlook which he develops as Chairman of a body of this nature. Therefore taking all these things into consideration these two officers will be making sacrifices rather than obtaining advantage by accepting fixed salary and becoming a wholetime servant of Parliament. Then, Sir, there is the other clause which provides amenities for them. In a place like Delhi, it is a very necessary factor as otherwise life will become almost intolerable. It may be said that some of them get magnificent houses to live in with a lot of amenities thrown in. But I would say in point of fact that the bigger the house the bigger the burden and at the present cost of living this salary, which looks fairly big, cannot leave even that much of a surplus which they could spend even on the upkeep of a big house. My own feeling is that if any Minister or officer of Parliament, who gets a house free, chooses a big house, unless he is a very rich man it would be unwise on his part to do so and to undertake a burden which his salary would certainly not enable him to so undertake.

I do not think that the question of sumptuary allowances for the Speaker and the Chairman is at all to be discussed for the reason that both of them occupy positions which are almost international in their significance. The Chairman of this House is the Vice-President of India, a high dignity of the State, a position which is very superior, and the Speaker also by virtue of the fact that he is the Speaker of the House of the People in a country which is very big and from the point of view of

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.] a democratic world occupies a place of importance. They have to do a certain amount of entertainment not merely for the visitors that come in here but also keep in touch with what is happening in the world by maintaining contacts with the diplomatic colony. So it would be wrong on the part of the Government not to provide them with the necessary wherewithal to keep up their position as they serve not the Parliament alone but also the country. Then there are the clauses providing for travelling and daily allowances, medical facilities, advances for purchase of motor-cars and all the other things which we find repeated in the Ministers Salary Bill. That is the sum total of the provisions of this measure before the House. Of course We as individuals do hold different opinions and it has often been said what we must bring down salaries, and quite rightly too in a country like ours. Of course we cannot afford to have the luxury of high salaries but then the salary must bear some relation to the existing cost of living and the standard of living to be maintained. Actually if we get accustomed- to the types of standards obtaining in the country certainly a lower salary is possible. Take for instance the question of motor-car. It seems more or less obligatory on the part of officers of Parliament as well as Ministers to maintain a motorcar, but nobody seems to calculate and find out the fact that a motorcar at the lowest costs Rs. 400 per month—probably a little more—because you have to pay a driver Rs. 120 and pay for the petrol and even if you do not take a loan, Rs. 100 for depreciation which is otherwise paid by way of discharge of the loan which you take at the time of purchasing the car. The position is that in the course of a couple of years the price of the car will come down to a third of its original value. After paying Rs. 400 per month towards the cost of maintenance of a motor-car, you can calculate what is left for the purpose of freeing body and soul together and

entertaining the guests, who will come whether you want them or not. So there will not be left any surplus. So hon. Members of this House should not look at it from an ideological point of view. Of course you have got to make a beginning and that is what we have been doing by reducing it from Rs. 5,500 to Rs. 3,000 and then from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 2,250 progressively. I think that when we are able to reduce the cost of living we hope to bring the salaries down by say Rs. 250 to Rs. 2,000. Of course the Karachi Resolution was for fixing a limit of Rs. 500/- but I doubt if the cost of living prevailing at present would ever come down to that level prevalent at the time of the Karachi Resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Members?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Hon. Members get Rs. 1,200 a month free of income-tax.

AN HON. MEMBER: During off-time what do we get?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: We shall go back to our homes. I don't mind telling my hon. friend that I have had the experience of being a non-official Member and I am also a Minister now. I had, every time the session was over, to go back. At that time I was staying on here with some friends and I had no car and it was not necessary for me to own a car with the allowances that I was then getting. I used to be paid my travelling allowance for my frequent journeys from and to Madras. In spite of all this I was living reasonably comfortably with some pocket money left over. But today, Sir, as I said in the other House. I find that every time I draw up my balance sheet for the month I have got to resort to the red ink. Much as we would like to reduce our salaries it is not possible in these days if we have got to live in keeping with our position and our obligations, I merely mention it by the way and I should like to be forgiven for my having digressed into personal matter.

T do not think, Sir, that there is anything more for me to add at this stage and I do hope that this very simple measure would not encounter any opposition from any hon. Member

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of certain officers of Parliament, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

The motion is open for discussion.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I confess that I did not expect that this Bill would *come* up for discussion today and I was not prepared for the debate and could not table any amendment. Still, Sir, I shall do so and repeat the stand that our party took on a previous occasion. We are for reducing the salaries. Even in this case, Sir, we stand for reducing the salary to Rs. 750 per month and I do not like to go into long arguments in support of this stand. Sir, I say that we yield to none for our respect to the Chairs of both the Houses: we also yield to none in the matter of upholding the dignity of the Chairs of both the Houses. But, Sir, we think that the dignity does not depend on the amount of salary which the person occupying the Chair will draw. Therefore, I still reDeat the position taken by our Party that the salaries should be reduced to that sum which I have just mentioned

Secondly, in this connection I am prompted to draw your attention and *nho* the attention of the House to one matter. Sir, according to the Constitution the powers of the Chairman of this House in some matters are circumscribed. The Chairman of the House cannot preside over the meetings of the Rules Committee and perhaps of the Privileges Committee because he is not a Member of this House. Sir, while in the Constitution

it was provided that the Vice-President of India will also preside over the deliberations of the Council of States, he should also have been given powers to preside over these Committees and all these analogous matters and powers which are given to the Chair in the other House.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras) : I presume he is Chairman of some Committees.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I stand subject to correction, but so far as I understand, he cannot preside at least over the Rules Committee. However, that position will be clarified either by the Chair or by my friend.

Lastly, Sir, I am provoked *to* pass a few remarks because of some remarks of my hon. friend the Commerce Minister, about the possibility of cost of living going down and all these things. Sir, I find that Government is speaking with different voices on this matter. When the question of increasing the salaries and wages of labourers and lower paid employees comes before the Government, they speak with one voice when the question of retrenching Government employees comes up before them, they speak with one voice. On this occasion Government is speaking with a different voice. Here I should like to say, Sir, that I do not mean any reflection on the Chair, because about that I have made *my* stand quite clear. I have been prompted to take up this matter only by the remarks of my hon. friend the Commerce Minister, because it is not proper that Government should speak with two voices on a similar matter.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: What exactly is the point?

HON. MEMBERS: He wants YOU to repeat what you have said.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Hon. Members are saying that you want me to repeat what I have just said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: He wants clarification.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Oh, clarification. I was saying that when the question of increasing the salaries and wages of labourers and low paid employees come up, Government says one thing. They say: "We cannot have that; there is no money. They should provide within their means." The consideration off the possibility of the cost of living not going down in the near future and the expenditure involved in running the household and all these things do not come up before them at that time. I was trying to stress that fact that in this matter Government is speaking with two voices.

As I said, Sir, I was not prepared for this Bill coming up today and &s such, I could not prepare the amendment. So I conclude my speech.

SHRI K. B. LALL (BiharV: Sir, I give my support to this Bill, but with a little 'but' to it. The little 'but' is that I do not agree to having a salaried whole-time Deputy Chairman for this House, and my argument is based on economic grounds as well as on other grounds. Of course, the general remarks I made during the debate on the Ministers' Salary Bill are already there. So far as this Bill is concerned, I do not think there is any necessity to dilate on those points now and I did not understand why the hon. Minister in moving this Bill should have laboured on that point saying.....

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: It is my lot to labour.

SHRI K. B. LALL: But it was not necessary, because you have already established that. Sir, by no stretch of imagination can one think that the hon. the Speaker or the hon. the Chairman is inferior in position or should draw less salary. I did not see any meaning on that point. But

I feel that there should be some standard of salary fixed for all in the country—not that some should get Rs. 5,000. even though he is a subordinate officer, while a Minister should get only Rs. 2,000. I do not want to dilate on this point either. Here my point is that for this House there is absolutely no need for a salaried permanent Deputy Chairman and it is not on any personal grounds that I urge this viewpoint. My friends may think that I am saying this because of some personal friction between the Deputy Chairman and myself; not at all, far from it. It can never be that the interests of the country should be subordinated to personal friendship or differences. My point is based on economic grounds and Government will be soared of spending Rs. 2,000 per month, which they actually do not require to spend. Administrative work in this House is not so much as in the other House where there is so much of questions and other matters to be disposed of. They all have to go to the Speaker and he may naturally require an Assistant. Here in this House, there is very little, if not very little, at least not sufficient. That can be disposed of by the Chairman himself. So on economic grounds I do not see that there is any justification for a salaried Deputy Chairman for this House.

Now, besides, there is another ground also. That is this system of a permanent Deputy Chairman may not attract seasoned men of the standing of persons who have occupied the place of the Speaker in the other House or in the old Assembly or even here and the result may be we may not have suitable persons. Suppose I am made the Deputy Chairman—I may have my own prejudices. my own bias—and as my position is, as capabilities are, as my culture is, I may take it into my head to do things in my own way and I may begin to victimise this or that person because I am permanently seated there and therefore I can have my will carried

out that way. Now that will be affecting the morals of the House and the morals of the country. If we had only a panel of Chairmen—and not a salaried permanent Deputy Chairman—we can perform our t&ik very well, honestly and with justice. Suppose I am not there permanently, even though I may have any prejudice, grudge or bitterness against any gentleman, since I am there only temporarily, I may not behave that way. And no one need be afraid of me because they will be thinking that I am only there temporarily and that I cannot harm anybody permanently. In that way. Sir, Justice will be more secure in this House if we had a panel of Chairmen and that will also provide opportunities for others to get experience.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Sir, I rise to a point of order. The hon. Member is, I submit, out of order. Article 89 of the Constitution provides as follows:—

"(1) the Vice-President of India shall be *ex-officio* Chairman of the Council of States.

(2) The Council of States shall, as soon as may be, choose a member of the Council to be Deputy Chairman thereof and, so often as the office of Deputy Chairman becomes vacant, the Council shall choose another member to be Deputy Chairman thereof."

Actually, until this Constitution is amended, what my hon. friend Mr. Lall suggests cannot be carried out. I do not think this discussion should be made an excuse "or an occasion for going into details which cannot be discussed unless on an amendment of the Constitution. I hope you will rule this question out of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: The correct position, I think, is this, that the hon. Member was going to say that probably the Constitution should be amended to give effect to that proposal.

SHRI K. B. LALL: Everybody is saying that this speech is irrelevant and that speech is irrelevant.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: I said the hon. Member was correct.

SHRI K. B. LALL: I suggest that the hon. Mr. Hegde should not be so hectic in raising points of order. I am not attacking any one personally. I say that even if there is an obstacle so far as the Constitution is concerned, we should be prepared even to amend the Constitution. We are going to fix a salary for the Deputy Chairman. We are going to keep a salaried Deputy Chairman. However, I have done with that point and I need not deal with it any further. There are advantages in not having a salaried permanent Deputy Chairman who may be let loose on the Members.....

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar): He may not give you time to speak.

SHRI K. B. LALL: There is no question of my not being given time to speak. If I am put there, I may take it into my head to obstruct anybody and say always that this is irrelevant and that is not to the point and so on. Every thing may be relevant, but who is going to question the Chair? The member is a doomed man. He is helpless. Therefore, if such a man is placed as Deputy Chairman, it will mean injustice in this House.

Then, again, Sir, my proposal is worth being considered in view of the fact that this appointment involves a big sum, though it may not be big enough for my hon. friend who has moved this motion, and it may not be considered big as compared with the sums we are spending. We never spend less than lakhs. From that point of view it is not a big sum. But when we compare ourselves outside this House, when we travel in third class compartments or in buses and see how our countrymen live and in what position they are, then we realise at what level we are maintaining **our**

[Shri K. B. Lall.] *i
administration in the country. From that point of view I say that it is a big amount which we may save. But I do not think that a saving of Rs. 2,000 is anything much in the way of economy. But we have been repeating in season and out of season about the cut in the daily allowance of Members—that they should at least forego Rs. 5 so that they may show to the world that we have effected a cut in our daily allowance. In that way, we may have something to show to the world that we also think of economy in the administration, and it is from that point of view that I urge it for the acceptance of the House. It may be a point of economy also not to have superfluous posts created.

Of course I have said that it should not be taken as anything personal against anybody.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may rest assured that nobody is taking it in that light.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Protesting a little too much!

SHRI R. M. DESHMUKH (Madhya Pradesh): The Minister has propounded that by fixing this salary they would be making a saving on what they are paying now. So it is a saving from that point of view.

SHRI K. B. LALL: It may be a saving in that respect. It may be justified. But I do not think that this consolidated sum is a saving. A Deputy Chairman would not himself like to submit to this, because he is going to be tied down to something which may go against his independence to engage himself elsewhere. Today any Deputy Chairman or anybody included in a panel of Vice-Chairmen is not bound to abstain from engaging in any other avocation. He may take to any other profession and his talents may be utilised by the country elsewhere. But here, he is debarred from engaging in any other profession. So, the country may lose the talents of a man who can be utilised elsewhere. So, no Deputy Chairman

would like to make a double sacrifice—sacrifice to himself and sacrifice of his services to the country. His talents, for instance, may be required outside the country. Why should he tie himself up to this job on Rs. 2,000? It is a sacrifice for him personally, and the country also loses his services which would have been utilised elsewhere. From that point of view, I am sure that the Deputy Chairman or even the Deputy Speaker, if at all he is a permanent Deputy Speaker, should not be deprived permanently of an opportunity of giving their services to their country. Suppose he is a good engineer, his services may be required elsewhere, in the present state of development of our country. Why should we deprive the country of his talents? Suppose he is a lawyer of outstanding merit; is he merely to be asked to hold the scales even in this House, as is represented in the symbol about his head? I do not want to dilate on this point. I do hope that the House will take into consideration this proposal of mine.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I express entirely my own personal views and not of the party. I may say that at the time when the Hon. Minister's salary was being fixed, then also I submitted that it was really a sacrifice on their part to have accepted Rs. 2,250 after reducing it from Rs. 3,000.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Is this House interested in party affiliations? Does it take into account the party affiliations of Members?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: No. I am clarifying that what I am saying need not be considered as the opinion of the party. It may not be the opinion of the party. It is my individual opinion. In clarification, I think it was a mistake to reduce the salary of Ministers from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 2,250. Therefore I welcome the proposal to fix the salary of the Speaker and the Chairman at Rs. 2,250, with the proviso that I hold that there is no need for the Chairman's salary to be fixed.

The Chairman is not a Member of this House. He holds the office of Vice-President of India, and I submit that the salary of the Vice-President should be fixed on entirely different considerations.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Under the Constitution there is no provision for fixing the salary of the Vice-President.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If at all any salary is fixed, it should be fixed as Vice-President of India.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: 'Unfortunately article 17 is the article under which we are now proposing to legislate. That wants the salary to be fixed as Chairman.

1 P.M.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: We may fix the salary of the Chairman but the Chairman is not a Member of the House. He is an *ex-officio* Chairman but not a Member of the House because the hon. Member has read out that from among themselves the Members will select a Deputy Chairman. So the Deputy Chairman is a Member of the House while the Chairman is not a Member of this House.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): May I just ask, Sir, whether the office of the Vice-President has to carry no salary at all?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Unless we pass a separate Act, there is no provision in the Constitution. Whereas there is a provision in the Constitution that the Chairman should be paid a salary under article 97 and the Constitution also clearly says that the Chairman is an officer of Parliament, and on that there is no doubt. It is open to the Parliament to provide resources for additional amenities for the Vice-President because what is not mentioned in the Constitution is not forbidden. We might have a separate Act for that purpose. That is my limited knowledge. I have neither looked into it nor I am an expert in Constitutional matters. But so far as the scope of the present measure is con-

cerned, it means that he is an officer of the Parliament. Article P7 expressly says that Parliament is to provide salaries for Chairman.....

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was drawing the attention of the House to this fact that as the Chairman is not a Member of this House, we should not really fix the salary for the Chairman and we should fix the salary of the Vice-President of India. When we are fixing the salary of the Chairman, we should give due regard to the fact that the Chairman is also the Vice-President of India and that in fixing that salary his status should be brought on par with the status of Governors of the various States.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: More than that.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: So by fixing a salary of Rs. 2,000 for the Chairman or the Vice-President of our country we are reducing his status, at least as far as the salary is concerned, below that of the Governor of any State.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: We are not fixing the salary of the Vice-President of our country. We are fixing the salary of the Chairman of the Council of States.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, it was pointed out that according to the Constitution the salary of the Vice-President cannot be fixed.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Nobody said that.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: He is honorary at present.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Anyhow, Sir, I will now come to the second point and that is with regard to the salary of the Deputy Chairman and the Deputy Speaker. If we make any discrimination in their salary and that given to the Deputy Ministers, there will be some cause of heartburning. The Deputy Ministers are at present paid Rs. 1,750 per month. So, I would submit that the Deputy

[Shri Kishen Chand.] Speaker and the Deputy Chairman should be placed at par with Deputy Ministers in the same way as the Chairman and the Speaker have been placed at par with Cabinet Ministers. So there will only be two categories and we will have simply to say....

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin): What is the reason for placing the Deputy Chairman and the Deputy Speaker on par with

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: When the hon. Member speaks, he can advance his arguments. There will always be an arbitrary figure. I w_s only say ing that..... (Interruption) we do not want to have too many categories of officers in this country. V/e have fixed the salaries of Ministers and Deputy Ministers. Even there it will be found that whether the Minister belongs to the Cabinet or is not a Member of the Cabinet, he is given the same salary and therefore the tendency is to reduce the number of classification. An hon. Member has pointed out that our country is a poor country and the salary of Rs. 2,250 paid to the Minister or the Chairman and the Speaker is too high. In this connection I may point out that the average per capita income of our country is Rs. 250/- per year. And if we suppose that five persons make a family, it will give us an income of Rs. 1,250 a year, i.e. nearly Rs. 100 a month. It is a matter for the consideration of this House as to what should be the ratio between the per capita income of this country and the highest salary to be paid to any officer. In various countries managed by Socialist type of administration or even in the Communist countries the usual ratio varies between 1 to 30 and 1 to 30 and if we follow this formula, the average national salary comes to Rs. 100 per month. Thirty times that will give us Rs. 3,000 per month. I have already explained that the members of a Minister's family do not work. Every worker does not earn only Rs. 250 a year. A wage earner

generally earns about Rs. 30 per month while his grown-up son earns another Rs. 70. That means the two together make Rs. 150. So I am taking a conservative figure of Rs. 100 per month as the average income of an ordinary working family. And therefore thirty times come to Rs. 3,000 per month and we should really regard it as a great sacrifice on the part of the Chairman and the Speaker when they are accepting the salary of Rs. 2,250 per month. We should not bring forward the argument that at Karachi a resolution was passed to the effect that the maximum salary should be Rs. 500 per month because from that time to the present time there has been a great variation in the price index and it has really gone up to four times.

Then, Sir, I come to another point that in this Bill there should have been some provision to the effect that these whole-time officers who are drawing their salary from the Consolidated Fund of India should not have party affiliations. The moment they become officers of Parliament, they should sever all connection with their party. They can go on supporting the party in their private life but actively they cannot remain members of that party or take any active part in it. This is the tradition in all democracies and particularly in the House of Commons this tradition has been established for several centuries. By convention the Speaker is elected uncontested at every general election. Till he resigns his post, the Speaker is elected from election to election.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kishen Chand, will you take more time?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Yes, a few minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Then you can continue on Monday. The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. on Monday, the 4th of May,

The Council then adjourned till a Quarter past eight of the clock on Monday, the 4th May 1953