

[Shri Lavji Lakhamshi.] however, I submit that we have had only five years—only a little over four years—experience of working parliamentary democracy and therefore we should rather go very slow in forming conventions. It was suggested that this thing should not be provided by law but that it should be made a convention.

My submission is this: let us gather little more experience and then formulate our conventions in the light of the experience that we may have in future. So far, I might submit. I am very proud to submit, that there has not been any occasion whatsoever to suggest that simply because these dignitaries happen to be belonging to any political party, either to the State Legislatures or anywhere else, they were in any way partial. They have maintained the dignity; therefore, there is no question whatsoever at present before us to formulate any such conventions. That question does not arise at the present moment. That is all, Sir.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

##### THE PATIALA AND EAST PUNJAB STATES UNION APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1953

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the Council the following message received from the House of the People, signed by the Secretary to the House:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 115 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Patiala and East Punjab States Union Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1953 which has been passed by the House at its sitting held on the 2nd May 1953

2. The Speaker has certified that the Bill is a Money Bill within the

meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

I lay the Bill on the Table.

#### THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES-OF OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL, 1953—continued.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while lending support to this Bill, I have to submit, Sir, that on going through the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill, I find that an attempt has been made to equate the position of the Speaker and the Chairman to the position of Cabinet Ministers. This equation of position, at least in so far as it relates to the office of the Chairman is concerned, is to my mind wholly wrong and unjustified. We must remember, Sir, that under the Constitution the Chairman enjoys a unique position because of his holding the exalted office of Vice President of India, therefore, Sir, to equate him with the hon. Ministers of the Government is, to my mind, a very wrong thing to do. By saying this, I should not be understood to mean any disrespect to the hon. Ministers. I hold them, Sir, in the greatest respect and fully recognise the dignity of their high office but, all the same, Sir, we must not forget the fact that according to our Constitution it is the Vice President of India who acts as the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Council of States and not that the Chairman of the Council of States acts as the Vice President of India and, as such, to place the position of the Vice President of India on the level of the hon. Ministers is not quite the right thing to do. We must, further, remember, Sir, that even according to the official Warrant of Precedence the Vice President of India takes his place only after the President of India and, certainly much above the order of precedence enjoyed by the hon. Ministers. Taking this fact into consideration, Sir, I am sure the House will agree with me that the equation of the Chairman's position with that of the hon. Ministers is