

[Shri B. K. Mukerjee.] India. Article 118(1) confers upon this House, the Council of States, the right to make rules for the procedure and conduct of the business of this Council of States. But though we have assembled here for so many days we have been denied the right to make rules for the procedure and conduct of the business of this House so far and we do not know when we will be allowed to exercise this right conferred upon us under article 118(1). I want-Sir, your ruling on these two matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN : So far as the first matter is concerned, the Chairman has the discretion to decide the allotment of time and he can do so by taking the advice of the Business Advisory Committee.

So far as the second thing is concerned, we have got a Rules Committee appointed to advise the Chairman. But you are referring to the Committee of the House. Well we shall consider the question.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

A CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT SHOWING THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON VARIOUS ASSURANCES, PROMISES AND UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN DURING THE FIRST SESSION.

THE MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : Sir, on behalf of my hon. colleague, the Minister for Production, I beg to lay on the Table a consolidated statement showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given during the first session of the Council of States. (*See* Appendix II, Annexure No. 68).

MOTION—ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF EDUCATION

THE MINISTER FOR DEFENCE I (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : Sir, on J

behalf of my hon. colleague, the Education Minister, I beg to move :

That this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chair man may direct, two members from among themselves, to serve on the Central Advisory Board of Education for a period of three years.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, two members from among themselves, to serve on the Central Advisory Board of Education for a period of three years.

The motion was adopted.

PROGRAMME OF DATES FOR NOMINATION & ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF EDUCATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I may inform the hon. Members that the 8th of August 1952 is fixed as the last date for receiving nominations and the 11th of August—by assumption we are likely to meet on the 11th of August— for holding elections, if necessary to the Central Advisory Board of Education. The nominations will be received in the Council Notice Office up to 12 noon on the 8th. The election which will be conducted in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of a single transferable vote will be held in Secretary's Room No. 10, Ground Floor, Parliament House, between the hours of 10-30 a.m. and 1 p.m.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MINISTERS BILL, 1952—*continued.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now we take up the further discussion of the motion moved by Shri N. Gopaldaswami on the 4th of August 1952 that the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of Ministers, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration. Shri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar.

THE MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : Mr. Chairman, when we broke up yesterday evening I was giving an account of the history of this question' about salaries and allowances of Ministers. I referred to the existing Act and its provisions. I pointed out that under that Act there were three classes of Ministers— Cabinet Ministers, Ministers of State and Deputy Ministers. I mentioned the emoluments that were provided for them in that Act. This Act was passed in 1947. Prior to that Ministers of Government had carried with them after the period of the transfer of power the same emoluments that had been allowed to Members of Council previous to the transfer of power. Sir, after a few months towards the end of 1947, this Salaries of Ministers Act was passed and the emoluments were brought down, at any rate the salaries were brought down from about Rs. 5,500 per mensem to Rs. 3,000. In the case of Cabinet Ministers, they had a free furnished residence. They had also a sumptuary allowance. Ministers of State got the same salaries but did not get the free furnished house or the sumptuary allowance. Deputy Ministers got a salary of Rs. 2,000 without either of these two amenities. Sir, within a year or thereabouts of the passing of the existing Act, all the Ministers of the Government of India subjected themselves to a voluntary cut of 15% of their salaries. That meant that a Cabinet Minister who was entitled to draw Rs. 3,000 per mensem had his salary reduced by Rs. 450. That went on practically till the beginning of the current financial year. The voluntary cut was limited to the period up to the 31st March 1952. After the commencement of the present financial year, the question of the amounts which should be fixed as salaries for Ministers was taken up and as I explained yesterday, Government after a great deal of thought and consideration, came to the conclusion that they must make some substantial response to public opinion which had expressed itself in various places and directions, in the direction of reducing the emoluments of the Ministers of the Central Government. The result of it is the present

Bill, As I said yesterday, when the new Council of Ministers was constituted somewhere about the middle of May last, that Council was divided into three divisions; one was Cabinet Ministers, the second was Ministers of Cabinet rank but not in the Cabinet, and the third was Deputy Ministers. Now, in the absence of another enactment, the emoluments of these Ministers had to be fitted into the provisions of the existing Act, and the question therefore arose whether, if we were to make changes in these emoluments as we wished to do, we should not amend the existing Act, and the present Bill was framed accordingly.

I would now take the House through the provisions of the present Bill. We have under the present Bill also those categories which I mentioned as having formed separate divisions of the Council of Ministers which was newly formed in May, but they are not referred to in the present Bill under the descriptions which I have already given. We have first of all a definition of Minister which includes a Deputy Minister also. The two classifications in the Bill are only Ministers and Deputy Ministers. There is no separate classification mentioned in this Bill under the title "Cabinet Ministers", as you find in the existing Act. Now, all Ministers other than the Deputy Ministers are to get the same emoluments. Each of them will get a salary of Rs. 2,250. He will get a free furnished house and he will get such sumptuary allowance not exceeding Rs. 500 as the President may by order direct. The Deputy Ministers will get a salary of Rs. 1,750. They will also get a free furnished house but no sumptuary allowance. That is the scheme of the emoluments that are provided in the present Bill. No doubt, there are some minor provisions relating to travelling and daily allowances of Ministers, medical treatment, advances to Ministers for the purchase of motor cars and so on. This is the substance of the Bill as far as its provisions go.

[Shri N. Gopalaswami.] The House has got to consider whether the emoluments and amenities provided for in this Bill are appropriate and deserve its approval. Now, Sir, the House can look at the emoluments of Ministers from many points of view. First of all, there is the point of view of whether there should be a standard of living which a Minister has got to maintain. There is the next consideration whether we should not take into account the inconveniences and sacrifices a Minister has to make in taking up an office of this description. Generally we will have in offices of this sort men of middle age or older persons. They must have families, and if they have to come to Delhi for the purpose of discharging the duties of the offices of Ministers, it is possible that their families have to be divided. Some members may remain with them at the capital ; others may have to be left behind. There are obligations which are imposed upon them because of the need for the education of their children, the need for marrying their daughters and sons, and things of that description.

Well, Sir, the third standard you might apply to Ministers is an austerity standard ; that is to say, in undertaking a public office of this sort, should they draw emoluments which might be considered to be in excess of what is absolutely necessary for making both ends meet at the place where they happen to live ? Well, all these three points of view could be supported from different angles, but I submit to the House that the main consideration should be that when you put a person into an office of this sort, he should be able to live a life not of luxury, not of abstemiousness which interferes with health, physical or mental, but he should live in ordinary comfort,..... and his mind should not be disturbed by difficulties of trying to make both ends meet in his private house which he has to look after. Now, Sir, the Government have kept this principle mainly in view in arriving at their decisions with regard to the amount J

of emoluments. They have also taken note of the fact that the kind of persons who may get into offices of this kind might be persons drawn from different grades of society, at different economic levels and so on, and in fixing these salaries, they have generally kept in view the consideration that the emoluments should be adequate for any person who gets into that office and who has no other sources of income. Putting it in a different way, a person by getting into this office should not, for the purpose of meeting the extra expenses he has to incur on that account—we would not like him—to draw upon sources other than the salary and allowances that he gets as Minister. That is one of the principles which, as the hon. the Home Minister pointed out in the other House, has been kept in view in this connection.

There is, of course, the austerity standard and often times people imagine that the Rs. 500 limit which was decided at a session of the Congress at Karachi and which was blessed by Mahatma Gandhi is an austerity standard and that it should be lived up to even in these days. Well, Sir, I want first to make the point that even if we apply that standard, this salary that we are fixing for a Minister is certainly not, in view of the rise in prices that has taken place since about 20 years ago when it was adopted at Karachi, out of tune with the rise in prices which has taken place since then. I do not think Mahatma Gandhi or the Congress intended that the Rs. 560 maximum was to be subjected to deductions for income-tax. I do not think they went into that question at all. I assume that it was the full Rs. 500 which will come into the hands of the incumbent of this office for expenditure on himself and his family during the period when he held such office. What is the salary we are fixing today ? It is Rs. 2,250/- and that amount is subject to income-tax—a much heavier rate of income-tax on such an income than what obtained in 1931 or 1932.

AN HON. MEMBER : 1931.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : 1931. Now, I do not consider that Rs. 2,250/- could be fairly described as an austerity standard. I concede the position that it is not a niggardly assessment of the needs of an individual Minister. But what is far more important for the Council to consider is whether from the public point of view it can be at all described as generous. I myself take the view that it is by no means generous if we take all the demands of a Minister on the first of every month into consideration. With a salary of Rs. 2,250 he could, perhaps, with difficulty, make both ends meet and that is about all. It is not a salary from which a saving could be built up for his own sustenance later in life when he might not be in a position to earn an income of that sort. Now I say it is not generous even from the point of view of responsibilities. I desire to draw the attention of the Council to this one fact. In the days of the British rule I believe Members of Council drew something like Rs. 6,666-10-8 per month. I believe my recollection is correct.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : It was Rs. 66,000 per year.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Later on we brought it down to Rs. 5,500, then we came down to Rs. 3,000 ; then we brought it further down by a voluntary cut to Rs. 2,550 and now we are reducing it to Rs. 2,250, that is to say, Rs. 750 per month less than what the present Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act provided—a cut really of 25% from the salary which was fixed after the transfer of power. Now, if you compare this figure with what obtained in British days, it comes to about one-third. There were, I believe, at that time something like six Members of Council. If you multiply it by three and pay each of them only one-third of the salary in spite of all that we have done by way of increasing the work, of throwing heavier responsibilities and of trying to run a democratic State, the House will, I hope, concede the

position that if anything we have tried to economise even on the total expenditure on persons who might be described as Cabinet Ministers. We have really not got 18 Cabinet Ministers at the present moment but we shall probably have more than 18 who will draw the same emoluments as Cabinet Ministers in the future. I only point this out for the purpose of showing that in spite of the fact that prices have risen three-fold and four-fold, persons who occupy offices of this description today draw emoluments that are only one-third of the emoluments that obtained when the prices were only 25 per cent, or 33-1/3 per cent, of what they are today. I do not, of course, try to put across to the House that the salaries that were in vogue in British days deserve to be justified even in the circumstances which existed then, or could be justified in the circumstances which exist today. But I only point these facts out for the purpose of showing that the present Government have made a most sincere effort to meet public opinion in this regard and though as I have said, I would not describe Rs. 2,250 as niggardly I would not describe it as generous to the individual. I also am aware of the fact that though it is not niggardly, a certain number of Ministers have got to draw upon their other sources of income for making both ends meet while they have to function in Delhi.

I know, of course, that comparisons were made in the other House between the emoluments which a Minister gets and the allowances which hon. Members of either House get, but I personally do not think it is a useful comparison to make.

The other thing that I want to refer to are the allowances. We have for each Minister other than a Deputy Minister, some sumptuary allowance. This was fixed on a uniform rate in the present Act, the rate being Rs. 500 per mensem. We are now making a provision that the amount of this allowance might be determined in each individual case by the President. It might relate to the needs of the particular Minister, the needs for

[Shri.N. Gopalaswami.] entertainment of the particular ministry of which he is in charge and so on.

With regard to free furnished houses, we have considered that this amenity should be available to every Minister, including a Deputy Minister. I thought it was rather hard on a Deputy Minister getting as he will do only about Rs. 1,750 to be asked to pay a house-rent which might come up to about Rs. 200 or Rs. 250 or Rs. 300 per mensem, and the Government have decided in their case also a free furnished house should be made available.

#

As regards other amenities, for instance medical aid, I need say nothing on that particular matter. I think it is generally recognised that public functionaries of this sort and their families should get free medical attention.

With regard to motor cars, some criticism has been advanced as to why a motor car should be necessary for a Minister. The thing is hardly worthy of being argued. I take it it is not suggested that the Minister should make his journeys on foot, whether while going to his office or to other places which he has got to see, inspect and so on. He has got to have a conveyance and in the absence of a motor car, he has got to be content, perhaps, with a bullock cart. These carts are not easily available in these days and according to one calculation, while a motor car may cost you, including the pay of a driver, something like Rs. 300 per mensem, a bullock cart, the maintenance of it which has been variously estimated, will cost from something like Rs. 250 to Rs. 400 in these days. I do not know if the Council would seriously consider asking the Ministers to give up motor cars and content themselves with bullock carts in these days.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal) : I have seen in my walks round Delhi that on many of the roads and streets in New Delhi bullock cart traffic is prohibited.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Yes, and that is another snag. And I believe most of these streets and roads on which this traffic is prohibited are the roads and streets that lead to the Parliament and the Secretariat.

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa): And also leading to the Ministers' residences.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) : The yoked bullock was the Congress symbol in the last elections.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : The only provision we have about motor cars is the payment of an advance to the Minister for purchasing the car. He does not get money for maintaining the motor car. He has to own the motor car himself and if he has to purchase one, he may be given an advance by Government for that purpose, the advance being returnable in a number of annual instalments.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated) : I must say that this is a very hard provision and it should not be there.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I could not quite catch what the hon. Member said. Does the hon. Member suggest that the motor car should be presented by Government to the Minister ?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI : Yes.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Well, in that case the Government have denied what the hon. Member is prepared to concede to the Ministers.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): Most of the State Governments are doing that.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Beg your pardon ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : He says the State Governments are doing it.,

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I do not think we are trying to fix any standards to the State Governments in this matter. We have to fix standards only for ourselves and we should leave the State Governments to follow our example if that is a good one.

I have referred to free medical aid. But I may add with regard to the advance for motor car, the Ministers will get these advances practically on the same terms as any permanent Government servant entitled to the use of a motor car can and they are not being treated in any exceptional way so far as that is concerned.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN (Bihar) : May I know whether the hon. Minister will have to pay interest on the advance he gets for buying the motor car ? If that is so, it is very hard.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Advances are given on the usual terms and the usual terms are that he should pay back the advance with interest.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN : What percentage of interest ?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I cannot give it off-hand, but I should think it is not less than 4 per cent. I do not remember it for the moment. There is interest which has got to be paid by a Minister when he returns the advance. The instalments are fixed including both part of the principal and the interest.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA (Rajasthan) : Will the Government purchase his car if the Minister has to resign for some reason or other ? It may be useless for him after he resigns.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I don't think Government would find it good business to purchase the car.

SHRI SAMIULLAH KHAN (Madhya Pradesh) : It remains Government property until advance is repaid.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : But, certainly, Government would take good care to see that their money is returned in full.

I do not feel I need say anything more in explanation of the provisions of this Bill.

Sir, I move.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

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

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, we cannot agree to the salary scales that have been shown here in this Bill for the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers. The hon. the Leader of the Council has given a number of arguments in support of these salaries. One of the principles, which he said was behind this Bill, is that the Ministers, when they take up these public offices, should not be put to any difficulties. They should have enough money to live a decent standard of life. With that principle, I have no quarrel whatsoever. But the point comes whether these salaries and other allowances fixed under this Bill can be exactly regarded as providing a decent standard or it is only providing just enough standards for the Ministers. The hon. the Leader of the Council said that it is not generous though he agreed that it is not niggardly. This question whether the scale is generous or no. should not be considered on the basis of some abstract principles. It has to be considered in relation to the standard of life in our own country and the economic life of our own country. Except in relation to that if you start arguing that Rs. 2,250, at the present level will give you only these amenities and compare these amenities with any other country which is richer or whose standard of life is higher, then, naturally, this Rs. 2,250, plus the sumptuary allowance, plus free furnished house and plus free medical facilities will certainly look very small. The Leader

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

of the Council has taken pains to show us how from an yearly salary of Rs. 80,000 as Executive Councillors in the olden days it has been brought down to Rs. 2,250 per month now. That argument is no argument whatsoever because we need not compare our behaviour with the old British Executive Councillors. They were robbing the people and they were here only for that purpose. So, we need not compare ourselves with the worst example of Executive Councillors under British Imperialism, but, let us compare with our own standards and see ourselves whether they are justified or not.

9 a.m.

Now, the salary of Rs. 2,250 plus Rs. 500 sumptuary allowance, plus free furnished house and medical facilities will come to about Rs. 4,000 if you translate these in terms of money. A free furnished house is not of the Rs. 250 or 300 class though rent of some of the smaller houses comes to that—but it will be somewhere about a thousand rupees if you take the big buildings that are placed at the disposal of the present Ministers and also if you take into consideration the charges that are being levied by the Government on various officials' bungalows. Take for instance, Constitution House itself. A room costs Rs. 90 per month which is at the concessional rate for M. P.s. Similarly, there are many things that could be pointed out. So, rates for a free furnished house will come to about a thousand rupees, especially if you take the big houses. Now I would certainly say that 4,000 rupees a month is very very generous and luxurious when you take into consideration standard of life of our people. It is calculated that the average *per capita* income in India today is, at the inflated prices prevailing, Rs. 250 per head per year which means Rs. 20 per month per head. Now, the Ministers get Rs. 4,000 which is 200 times more than what the average person gets and it is certainly luxurious and not merely not niggardly. Even this Rs. 20 is from the unemployed and the beggar to

the rich Birlas and Tatas. Take a peon employed in the Central Government Secretariat. I think, according to the Pay Commission's scale his salary and allowances come to about Rs. 75 per month which means again that a Minister is given under this Bill 50 times more than what an ordinary peon gets. Now this difference of 50 times is not necessary for the Minister to discharge his duties and responsibilities as a Minister. Well, again take the Third Division Clerks. A Third Division Clerk gets Rs. 55 as pay and another Rs. 55 as Dearness Allowance and, along with some other allowances, his total emoluments come to about Rs. 130, which, once again, means that the Minister is being paid—let us take the average as 100 rupees for Third Division Clerks—40 times more than what an ordinary Third Division Clerk gets today. Even this, we think is certainly too big an amount for a Minister to discharge his responsibilities, while the clerks, who form the basis of so much routine work, get only Rs 100.

Now, another argument that has been brought out is that when these Ministers are asked to take up these offices and responsibilities, many of them come from outside Delhi—or most of them come from outside Delhi—and, therefore, they have to keep two different establishments ; their children have got to be educated and their daughters married. Is it only for these Ministers that things like these happen ? These happen in the case of the ordinary clerks ; every person in India has got his children to be educated and daughters to be married. Then, why is it that Ministers alone are specialised and are given such salaries which are totally out of proportion with the standard of life of the people and which is more than 200 times what an ordinary man gets. I wish the hon. the Leader of the Council had not brought in such kind of argument. It makes their case worse and in any way does not improve it. If he had refrained from bringing out this argument, it would have strengthened his case, if it can be strengthened at all, instead, he has

brought out this argument as if it is something special with regard to the Ministers and is not absolutely essential for even the ordinary man in the street. Take the question of housing accommodation. It is said that the Ministers should have some housing accommodation. Yes, but even then we would say that a furnished house on a lavish scale need not be there. There was a question in the House of the People regarding housing accommodation that is given to the Government employees and the reply was—I am subject to correction—that 50,000 or 35,000 of the Central Government employees are still on the waiting list for housing accommodation. That is the position of the Central Government employees. A number of Central Government employees came to me and asked me ' Could you give us your servant's quarters because we have no quarters to live and we have been going round for the past 3 or 4 days.' I told them ' even if I could oblige you by giving the servant's quarters, which is unfit to live for any human being, which is rat-hole, even then, if I give you room, because we are Communist M. P.s if you live in our quarters, instead of being benefited, you will lose your job quickly. So, in your own interest I am not prepared to give you place and so you excuse me.'

Sir, I bring these to show what the housing situation is. When the Government could not supply housing accommodation even to its employees even in Delhi, a free furnished house of such scale to these Ministers is not necessary. We would suggest that no Minister should get any house of more than 4 rooms. That is more than enough for his living, for his own study, for his own office, for the private Secretary to work on and a sitting room to receive visitors etc. Let the Ministers come out with such adjustments of the housing accommodation. Take all these houses that are available, take the huge places that are vacant in the Rashtrapati Bhavan and other places and divide them. I don't say that you will immediately solve the accommodation problem of the 50,000 employees

by that, but at least there will be a psychological change and people will see that Government is really serious about it, that they have set an example in living in limited quarters which are absolutely essential.

Now take the question of medical relief. Certainly the Ministers should be given free medical service. Not only Ministers, the whole Government employees, the whole population must get free medical aid. At least to start with what steps Government have taken to give free medical aid to its employees ? It has not given anything. The Minister for Health the other day kindly gave us an invitation and explained that she is working on a Bill which provides insurance for health for the Central Government employees in Delhi. She has been working on that for the last 2 or 3 years, it has not yet come to fruition. We hope that it will soon come into operation. This is the position with regard to medical relief even to Government employees. You provide for medical allowance to Ministers, we don't grudge it but we certainly say that when you provide for free medical relief to the Ministers, you don't provide it for your employees and you say you have been working on these for the last 3 years, it does not redound to the credit of Government, it does not create an impression among the people that Government is anxious to solve the medical difficulties of its own employees and of the people but is only anxious to first see that free medical aid is given to its Ministers.

Now comes the question of conveyance. Certainly Ministers must have a car; I don't grudge it. It is true that it is a very healthy principle which the Government of India is following that no Minister should be given a free car, but loans may be advanced and on loans they must pay interest like any other person who is entitled to buy a car, instead of a free car that is given in different States which is a source of abuse as they go on changing the cars whenever they feel it necessary to get more beautiful cars and there is so

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] much scandal about it. So it is a very healthy principle which the Government of India has adopted in saying that even the Ministers have to buy it from the money which Government may advance but the money must be repaid. But again I would point out one thing. It is true we are giving advance to the Ministers to buy cars. Are you prepared to advance loans to the Government employees who have no quarters, who have to come from the far corners of Delhi, to buy cycles which is a far more modest conveyance than car and deduct them in small instalments? You are not prepared to do it. You have not come with any such proposal. I am comparing these not because I am opposed to car allowance or medical allowance or even free furnished house to Ministers but because the Leader of the Council said that because there was public agitation that the salaries are too high, the Government has taken this into consideration and has come with this Bill reducing the salaries. If that is the contention, viz., that because there was public agitation, to create a good impression and a psychological effect on the whole of the people that Government is not luxurious, Government is prepared to cut down its salaries and to do some work in the interest of the people, then it would have created a much more psychological effect if he had come forward with these other suggestions. The effect of your reduction to Rs. 2,250 is taken away by so many things which are being denied to the ordinary employees. The other argument the Leader of the Council gave was that Rs. 2,250 *plus* the sumptuary allowance, free furnished house etc., when compared in terms of the Karachi Resolution is nothing strange. He said from 1931 to 1951, 20 years have elapsed. The prices have shot up. When in 1931 Rs. 500 was fixed, nobody at that time knew whether it was free of income-tax or income-tax was to be paid on it. I do think, since nothing is said at the time, that the Rs. 500 is equally subject to income-tax just like any other income at that time. Now if we say that income-tax is included in that, even then it I

does not change my argument. In 1931 according to the Leader of the Council Rs. 500 was a decent maximum salary which anybody should get. If that is so, now he says—I take only salary leaving out the sumptuary allowances etc.—Rs. 2,250 is 4 times of Rs. 500 which means that he accepts that the cost of living has gone up 4 times and that it should be compensated is a very sound principle to which we subscribe. But, if that is so, even then Rs. 2,250 *plus* house and other things added comes to Rs. 4,000 i.e., 8 times of Rs. 500, which means double the rate of compensation. Now as far as Ministers are concerned, this is the argument they bring that prices have gone up and therefore our salaries are equivalent to those recommended in Karachi Resolution, on which Mahatma Gandhi insisted, gave his blessing, and we are also implementing it except that we have compensated for the price increase. Where is this sound principle of wages being increased when it comes to the question of the ordinary employees, when it comes to the question of the wages of labourers in the various factories?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : The hon. Member may compare the present rates of wages with the old.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : I am going to compare them. Take the lower grade employees. In 1939 a lower grade employee—a clerk—was paid Rs. 60. Prices have gone up since 1939 by three times or even more. The Government themselves have admitted that the prices have gone up. In fact they have gone up by four times. Is any lower grade employee being paid Rs. 250 including dearness allowance? No, What is he getting now? Rs. 100 to Rs. 150 per month. But he should get Rs. 250. Are they paying that to him? No. They have rejected this very sound principle in so many labour disputes, in so many demands from teachers and from non-gazetted officers, and from lower grade employees of various kinds. The argu-

ment the Government put forward is that they are abiding by the Karachi Resolution, only they are compensating on the basis of the price level. Yes, you are compensating on the basis of the price level. But you are not prepared to extend that principle to your own employees. Therefore, naturally, the argument loses all force. It does not create the psychological effect which you hope to create by this reduction in salaries.

Now, I come to this total of Rs. 4,000. That is what it comes to. The total of the sumptuary allowance, salary, furnished house, medical attendance—the total of all these amenities comes to Rs. 4,000. That is far too generous a salary and allowances for a Minister. Now, is it possible to take less and to live and to work on that lesser amount? I say, it is certainly possible. I will give only one example. The Leader of the Council quoted the example of the Executive Councillors of the British period. He said that compared to them, the present Ministers were living very modestly. I say: Compare our great neighbour, China, to which the Indian Government recently sent a goodwill delegation. The members of the delegation came and reported that the Ministers there get a car and a house, but their family needs are all met in terms of grain, in terms of clothes and in terms of other necessities, which, when calculated on the basis of Indian prices, do not come to more than Rs. 500. And the lower-grade employee in the same Chinese Government gets about Rs. 100. This is what some of the members of the goodwill delegation who went to China have reported. Now, Sir, if the leaders of the Chinese Government can conduct an efficient Administration with Rs. 500 per month paid as salary to its Ministers and Rs. 100 paid to its lower-grade employees—the proportion is 1 : 5—why is it that here the difference should be 40 to 50 times between the lowest and the highest? This the Ministers must consider. Of course they are considering something else, because I see they are not listening to what I am saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. The Ministers must listen to what the hon. Member is saying.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : The Chinese example is there. The highest paid individual gets only 5 times the salary paid to the lowest paid. The lowest paid gets Rs. 100 and a Minister gets Rs. 500.

The whole point is this. Why is it that the Government thinks that Rs. 2,250 with a furnished house is a very modest salary in India? There is a reason behind it. Rs. 2,250 is a modest amount when you compare the huge incomes which are allowed to the Maharajas, which are allowed to the big capitalists and which are allowed to the big landlords. There is no ceiling on profits. If you compare their incomes, if you compare the profits of the big capitalists and the Maharajas and the black-marketers, naturally Rs. 2,250 is a very modest income per month. Therefore the argument goes that the dignity of the office of a Minister will not be there if this amount of Rs. 2,250 is not paid to the Ministers, when the Maharajas, the capitalists, the landlords and the black-marketers earn in lakhs of rupees. That is why the Government think that the salary to be paid to the Ministers should be Rs. 2,250. What prevents the Government from taking away all the money of the Maharajas and the big capitalists and landlords and seeing that the salary is in consonance with the standard of our own life? The Government do not want to change that, and therefore all these gestures on their part of making some sort of reduction are not going to catch the imagination. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to come forward with a radical measure. Our amendments are there. We suggest that they accept a salary of Rs. 1,000 for Ministers and Rs* 750 for Deputy Ministers, of course with free furnished houses which should not have more than three or four rooms, and with travelling allowance. Then it will create an impression, though it would not immediately solve the problem of lower grade employees and it would not solve the problem of the people, that

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] this Government is earnest, and as a mark of its earnestness it has started with a reduction in the salaries of the Ministers. Otherwise the people are not going to be taken in with this reduction to Rs. 2,250 plus sumptuary allowance, plus a free house and so on. The people will conclude that it is a far too luxurious thing compared to our standard of life. I hope the Government will pay heed to this and will accept our amendments and set an example to the country. With these words, I commend my amendments to the House.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar) : Sir, although I am not opposing this Bill, and though this side of the House is solidly behind the Government, I feel that I should place my views before the House. We have all heard the Leader of the Council placing before the House the argument that it is on account of public opinion that this cut in the salaries of Ministers has been made. I really feel that it is a sense of modesty on the part of the Ministers that has made them cut their salaries. In my view, the sense of modesty should not be the uppermost idea with them, but rather a sense of higher duty should have guided their policy in this respect. In this matter they would have done better if they had emulated the Britishers of the old days. It is not in terms of money value that Ministers should be weighed ; it is higher policy that should always be present before their eyes. And the higher policy that weighed with the Britishers can be well illustrated by one example of those days. When the great saint-patriot of Bihar, Sir Ganesh Dutt Singh, was offered a Ministership, he made it a condition precedent to his accepting office that if the Governor agreed that he should get only Rs. 1,000 he would accept office. The Governor of Bihar in those days replied that the Government had considered his view and they were of opinion that in no case would they accept this condition of paying Rs. 1,000 to their Ministers. In those days in Bihar the Executive Councillors were paid Rs. 5,000 and the

Ministers Rs. 4,000 and he was told by the Governor "You must draw Rs. 4,000 and if at all you have a mind to live on Rs. 1,000, you should make a gift of Rs. 3,000 to charitable institutions." Sir Ganesh Dutt Singh had to agree to that and he always drew Rs. 4,000. and he made a charity of Rs. 3,000. He created a Trust Fund and he used to donate Rs. 3,000 per month to that Trust Fund and then he donated lump sums to the Patna College and other colleges and universities and so on. That is a great example. What I want to impress here is that by coming down under the weight of public opinion the Ministers would not be doing justice to the cause of the country. In the present set-up of the country, in the present set-up of society you cannot ignore the money value. When you lower down your salary to Rs. 2,500 and your Secretaries are drawing Rs. 4,000, do you know what is the impression that is gaining ground in the country ? They think that the Ministers are worth only Rs. 2,500 whereas their Secretaries are worth Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000 and so on. Secretaries themselves say that they bear the brunt of the whole work and they deserve that amount and they are worth so much amount whereas their bosses are worth only Rs. 2,500. If this is the idea that is gaining ground outside, if you lower down your value in terms of money you will not be doing any good to the country.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): Is the hon. Member weighing them against gold ?

SHRI K. B. LALL : You are under the pressure of foreign countries. You want to see India like Russia and China. You draw your inspiration from foreign countries. I know of Socialists who have preached very vociferously the Socialist ideas but when they have been offered a managership in one or the other factory, all that urge for Socialism evaporates overnight. That sort of Socialism won't do. If at all there is any sincerity in the preaching of Socialism in the country, bring about ! a revolution in the country and I will bow down to you. It is not for the

Ministers' salaries of Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000 that I advocate this. It is not for the sake of flattery that I advocate this I believe that our standard is surely not equitable at the present moment compared to the life that the masses are living. All these things are present in my mind, but I know that in the present set-up of society unless there is a social revolution, unless you have just changed the mind of the people you cannot bring about these things. I know people hobnob with the Socialists ideas. Again they hobnob with the Government officials who are drawing Rs. 4,000 and they are always in league with them and at the same time they will advocate the cause of the Government servants here. Are they trying to bring about such a revolution against the persons who are drawing Rs. 4,000 in the Government today? Not the least. It is very easy to speak against the Ministers and say that the Ministers are robbing the country. They are trying to be a burden on the tax payers and all these things. This is done with the intention of bringing down anyway the Ministers, bringing down anyway the Government and spreading an air in the country propagating against the Ministers. I can visualise that there may be Ministers and Ministers. Some persons may only put on hon cloth like Mahatma Gandhi and may live on the barest of food just as the late Ganesh Dutt Singh used to do. He used to pay to the students towards their expenses. He used to live like *fakirs* and *jogis*. If our Ministers can live like that, we welcome that but we can't expect that all persons can live like that

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think we stand adjourned now till 10 o'clock.

The House then adjourned till 10 o'clock.

-

The Council re-assembled again at ten of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SITUATION IN REGARD TO THE STATE OF JAMMU & KASHMIR

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Prime Minister may move the motion which

stands in his name. The only appeal I would like to make to you is that the situation with regard to Kashmir is a very delicate and fluid condition. The United Nations' representative is meeting our Ministers on the 25th; and the Assembly in Kashmir is meeting on the 26th. I hope that no careless and loose words will be uttered and that, with your usual restraint and sense of responsibility, you will discuss this matter.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Chairman, I beg to move :

That the Council do consider the situation in regard to the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

The history of Kashmir is an oft-repeated tale, and during the last four or five years all kinds of accounts have been heard and developments have taken place. A short while ago, I had occasion to say something on this subject in the other House and for the convenience of hon. Members here, as a background of information if I may say so, I believe what I said then has been distributed here.

Well, Sir, I do not wish to go back to the beginning of this problem. Indeed in such intricate problems, the beginnings are in the very roots of nature, but very briefly I should like to go back to the year 1946 when all kinds of talks were taking place here in Delhi City between the representatives of the British Cabinet and the representatives of India, when suddenly in Kashmir the leaders of the popular movement were arrested by the Government of the State there, the Maharaja's Government. Many hundreds of prominent persons were arrested and for a few days, there was something in the nature of martial law in the valley of Kashmir. We were rather surprised at the developments because here we were considering big changes in India, all over India including Kashmir, and here was an exhibition of something which we thought was past and done away with. Indeed the arrests were started with the arrest of Sheikh