

COUNCIL OF STATES

Wednesday, 5th August 1952

The Council met at a quarter past eight of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF THE INDIAN DELEGATION TO THE FIFTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

THE MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : Sir, on behalf of my hon. colleague the Health Minister, I lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Indian Delegation to the Fifth World Health Assembly held in Geneva in May 1952. [Placed in Library, *see* No. IV E. O. (27)/52.]

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

MR. CHAIRMAN : Further discussion on the motion moved by the hon. Leader of the Council on the 4th 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 D. D. ITALIA (Hyderabad) : Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Bill. Let me inform the House that to my mind the salaries fixed for the Ministers and Deputy Ministers are very inadequate. After all, what will the Ministers and Deputy Ministers get after income-tax has been deducted ? I think they will get Rs. 1,800 and Rs. 1,400 respectively. Does anyone think that it is a high and huge salary ? I say, not at all. The Ministers have to maintain two houses—one at Delhi and one at their own place. Some hon. Members referred to Mahatmajī's suggestion at the Congress Aession at Karachi in 1931 that Ministers must not get more than Rs. 500 a month. If you consider the value of the rupee which prevailed in 1931 and which prevails today, you will agree that today the rupee is worth only four

annas compared to 1931. So, the Ministers will get only Rs. 450 and Rs. 350 on that basis, which is even less than what was suggested by Mahatmajī in 1931. If Mahatmajī were alive today, he would have suggested even a higher salary than what is proposed to be fixed today. After all, the Ministers have to maintain their dignity, prestige, their honour and live a comfortable life. Many of the hon. Members know that some of the managing agents and managing directors of companies get more remuneration than the Ministers get. Some of them get Rs. 5,000 and even Rs. 6,000 a month. It was very good of the Ministers to have voluntarily come forward to forego 25 per cent. of their salaries. We are grateful to them. If they had not done that I would have suggested that they must get at least half of the salaries which the Councillors used to get in the British regime, that is, Rs. 40,000 a year or Rs. 3,333-5-4 per month, a free furnished house and also a free motor car or at least a motor car allowance.

Some hon. Members complained about the inadequate salaries which police constables and third-grade clerks are getting. According to my calculation, they are getting four times what they were getting 20 years ago. I do not mind if the salaries of constables and third-grade clerks are increased. Lastly we must not degrade our Ministers in the eyes of people outside India.

With these words, I support this Bill wholeheartedly.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, I also rise to support this Bill. I am of opinion that the Ministers when they draw their salary should feel that they are above want, that their daily needs are met adequately. As the previous speaker has said, they have to maintain two establishments—one in their own place and one in the city of Delhi. And we know what the cost of living is nowadays. Most of us know how much it costs for a person to live in Delhi. I feel sure that this Rs. 2,250 without

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.] exemption from income-tax is not at all adequate for any Minister in these days. There are some Ministers who, I know for certain, are here at very great sacrifice. I may quote one or two instances. For instance, Dr. Katju, if only he had continued as an Advocate of the High Court, would be getting Rs. 15,000 or Rs. 20,000 a month; and his coming here as a Minister on Rs. 2,250 a month is a very great sacrifice indeed. From the point of view of age also, we find there are certain Ministers who are here at very great sacrifice so far as their health is concerned. They are here not because they are getting Rs. 2,250 per month, but out of love for their country. I do not want to mention any further names, but almost all the Ministers are here at a very great sacrifice.

Sir, the Ministers have their own responsibilities, and they have their own expenses to meet. They have to maintain the dignity of their office. I know that if one happens to be a Minister many persons come to him for charity and all that. Apart from that, they have to entertain guests and relatives who come all the way from their place. They have got to pay something to party funds. I have got very good experience of that. One of the members of my family was Chief Minister of Madras, and though he was drawing about Rs. 5,500 a month, yet by the end of the month nothing was left with him. And when he relinquished his office, he had nothing with him. I know that however much a Minister may get, towards the end of the month nothing will be left with him.

I have to point out one serious matter in this Bill. I find that by issuing executive instructions Government have provided medical facilities to the Ministers so far. That is in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. The hon. Minister will say it is only a very formal amendment. But I find that since 1947, in addition to the salaries, Ministers have been given medical facilities and also advances for purchase of motor cars. They say that though the previous Act, the Ministers' Salaries

Act, 1947, had not provided for any medical facilities to the Ministers, yet these facilities have been availed of by Ministers through the issue of executive instructions. I do not know why when this Act was amended in 1950 this was not incorporated in the amending Act and that practice was not legalised. I also do not know why from the year 1947 the Ministers have been drawing advances for the purchase of motors only through the issue of executive instructions. And I find that, conveniently, by clause 12 of the Bill, all the acts done by the Government under such executive instructions hitherto are sought to be covered by giving the provision retrospective effect. I very strongly object to clause 12 finding a place. We must say that we do not appreciate the acts by which amounts were drawn by Ministers by the issue of executive instructions.

Again, Sir, I do not like any advances to be paid to the Ministers for the purchase of cars, for the simple reason that if the discretion is left to them, there will be no uniformity. I find that some Ministers are owning baby cars and some Ministers are owning big cars. There is absolutely no uniformity. If Ministers cannot afford to purchase cars, why should not the State purchase them and give them to the Ministers? The Government can deduct something out of their pay. Let the car be owned by the State. Let it not be owned by the Minister. That will also go some way in reducing the amount of travelling allowance for the Minister.

Lastly, I wish to make a suggestion. Hitherto the administration was run by a few Ministers. Now the number of Ministers has increased. There are some Ministers who have not shown their face to this House—though one hon. Minister sat here for the first time yesterday just to hear the Prime Minister's address. I wonder why there should be so many Ministers and Deputy Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, thus increasing the expenditure. I find that only very few Ministers are having a busy time in this House. So many Ministers are not necessary. Let

us reduce the number of Ministers, or at least let us not increase the number of Ministers that we have now. Let us pay them adequately, so that the administration may be carried on efficiently. Hitherto the Government was run by only a very few Ministers. And I do not find any reason why we should go on increasing the number of Ministers, Deputy Ministers, Ministers of State and Parliamentary Secretaries and so on. That would be my simple suggestion, Sir. Thank you.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal) : I take my stand to oppose this Bill, Sir. It seems that some of our friends on the other side are very impatient of any opposition. Even the mildest criticism from the Opposition makes them impatient. I do not know the reasons, Sir, why it is so. Perhaps in the Provisional Parliament they were not accustomed to have a virile and stronger Opposition to face them with harsh truths. They want us to play the game of a docile Opposition. But we cannot oblige them. We shall continue to face them with harsh truths. In this House, Sir, the other day one of my hon. friends Shri Kailash Behari Lall said that the Opposition Members themselves do not live according to the standards which they profess.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : Could the hon. Member speak a little more loudly ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : He says that Shri Kailash Behari Lall said yesterday that the hon. Members did not live up to the standards which they professed.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR : Well, Sir, I do not like to go out of my way to answer all these irrelevant arguments and thereby lose my time but I shall simply say that I invite those of my friends to come and compete with us in austerity standards.

While listening to the arguments of the Leader of the House yesterday I

was wondering whether there are two standards or methods—one for the Ministers and the other for the poor workers, the poor employees, clerks etc. The arguments which were advanced by my hon. friend the Leader of the House can equally apply to the case of increase in wages, dearness allowances and other amenities for labourers and poor employees but we find only few words of sympathy are spoken for them. I shall say the Prime Minister himself was surprised to discover that the workers in Kanpur were living in the worst conditions—conditions in which human beings cannot live. But that discovery is very late. It is always there and it need not require any voyage of discovery to find out the conditions of labourers existing in the country. About the poorer middle class employees there is no question of comfort. They simply want a little freedom from mental worry to look after their families. The poor employees are completely deprived of their just rights. Whenever the workers and employees have placed their requests, they have been asked to be a little more patient. They are asked to tighten their belt and they are given sermons about the Indian traditions of living in austerity, sacrifice, *vairagya* and all other things. Sir, I do not know, whether there are two standards or two methods of following up the Indian traditions, that the poor workers should live in austerity and Ministers will give an example of being *Rajarishi in Kaliyug*. There are traditions and traditions. There are traditions of Ashok and Harsh and in this very city of Imperial Delhi Badshah Nasiruddin earned his livelihood by copying out Quran. I do not say that in the 20th century the Ministers should try to emulate those examples but I am forced to say these things because I find almost on every occasion there are these two standards, one for the poor workers and the other for Ministers. When employees and workers goaded by hunger, goaded by sickness, goaded by desperation want to place their claims, then the machinery of repressive measures is brought into action against them. Instead of giving them a wage increase, instead of considerations for

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

their ordinary comfort or giving them relief from mental worry, instead of considering their most human feelings for their families and for their children, they are answered with *lathi* charges, tear gases, bullets, preventive detentions, etc. If the picture was other than this, I would not have had the need of speaking out these harsh truths.

About the medical allowance also I can say that the Ministers and their families are provided with free medical facilities and the same consideration is not shown to workers and poor employees. It is well-known, Sir, that the incidence of disease is higher with those who are poorly paid, who are poorly fed, because of malnutrition, because of insanitary conditions of living. And those who enjoy a better standard of living, among them the incidence of disease is comparatively lower. So from all these points of view priority should be given to the other side.

And lastly about the dignity and honour of office, Sir, we are often reminded of the Indian traditions. Sir, in India is it necessary to live in luxury with high salaries in order to earn dignity, in order to rise in stature in the eyes of the people? Or is it by simple living, by good work, by honesty, by suffering and sacrifice that persons can rise in stature in the eyes of the people? So, Sir, from all these arguments we find that these are wonderful arguments advanced by the other side.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA (Rajasthan) :

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने जब इस बिल को देखा तो मैंने इसको एक बहुत ही साधारण बिल समझा था और मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास था कि इस सदन में इस बिल को हम सर्वसम्मति से केवल स्वीकार ही नहीं करेंगे, वरन् उन मंत्रियों को, जिन्होंने वेतन को अधिक न होते हुए भी और कम कर लिया है, हम लोग सर्वसम्मति से बधाई और धन्यवाद देंगे, परन्तु मेरा विश्वास गलत निकला और हमने देखा कि हमारे विरोधी भाइयों ने इस विधेयक का भी विरोध किया। मुझे तो

निश्चय सा हो गया है कि उनका उद्देश्य ही यह है कि कोई भी बात हो, चाहे अच्छी हो या खराब हो, सही हो या गलत हो, उसका उन्हें विरोध ही करना है।

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras): Yesterday, we supported the Kashmir policy of the Government.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA : There too they had given some amendments.

मेरा तो कहना यह है, जब कि आज की सरकार को जनता ने चुन कर भेजा है, तो क्या हमारे विरोधी भाई यह समझते हैं कि देशवासी इतने मूर्ख हैं कि वे अपने हित और अहित को नहीं सोचते और उन्होंने ऐसे मिनिस्टर्स या प्रतिनिधियों को चुन कर मेजोरिटी में भेज दिया जो उनका एक काम भी सही नहीं कर सकते? जब वे हर एक बात का विरोध करते हैं तो उसके माने यह होते हैं कि सरकार एक भी काम सही नहीं करती है। या तो यही माना जाय कि जनता इतनी मूर्ख है कि बिना अपना हित और अहित सोचे ऐसे लोगों को भेज देती है जो उनके हितों के विरुद्ध ही, विपरीत ही, सब कार्य करते हैं, अन्यथा यह समझा जाय कि विरोधी भाई केवल विरोध के लिये ही विरोध करते हैं और वे देश तथा जनता का हित और अहित नहीं सोचते हैं, क्योंकि यदि वे जनता का हित सोचते तो यह जरूर सोचते कि यह सरकार भी कोई बात सही करती होगी और कम से कम कही तो उनकी सहमति होनी ही चाहिये थी। मेरी एक छोटी सी सलाह विरोधी भाइयों को यह है कि अगर वे किसी बात में सहमति प्रकट करते और कभी विरोध, तो हम लोगों के मस्तिष्क में भी यह विचार होता कि जहां उन्होंने विरोध किया है, वहां शायद कोई ऐसी गलती है जिसके कारण उन्हें विरोध करना पड़ा। परन्तु जब वे हर एक बात में विरोध करते हैं तो यही संदेह होता है कि वे केवल विरोध के लिये विरोध करते

हैं और वे तो यहां पर हर एक बात का विरोध करते ही हैं। अतः हम उनके तर्कों पर ध्यान न देकर केवल उनकी वाक्पटुता को ही सुनते रहते हैं।

अब इस बिल के अन्दर जो वेतन निश्चित किये गये हैं, उनके बारे में मेरे जो विचार हैं, उन्हें मैं प्रकट करना चाहती हूँ। बिल में मिनिस्टर का वेतन २,२५० रुपये तथा डिप्टी मिनिस्टर का वेतन १,७५० रुपये दिया गया है। यदि मिनिस्टर का वेतन इन्कम-टैक्स काट कर लगाया जाय तो वह १७ सौ या १८ सौ रुपये ही पड़ता है। मुझे जो सबसे मुख्य बात कहनी है वह मोटर कार के बारे में है। इस बिल की ८वीं धारा से ज्ञात होता है कि मोटर मिनिस्टर स्वयं खरीदे, और सब जानते ही हैं कि मोटर रखना मिनिस्टरों के लिये नितान्त आवश्यक है। जब माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने इस बिल को प्रस्तुत किया था और इस विषय में कुछ कहा था तो मैंने यह प्रश्न किया था कि यदि मान लिया जाय कि एक या दो साल के बाद किसी कारण से मिनिस्टर को यह पद छोड़ना पड़े तो क्या उस कार को गवर्नमेंट खरीदने की गारंटी देती है। इस पर मंत्री महोदय ने जवाब दिया था कि गवर्नमेंट कोई इस प्रकार की गारंटी नहीं कर सकती कि कार को खरीदने या बेचने की जिम्मेदारी गवर्नमेंट की है। जहां तक मेरा ख्याल है उनका यही उत्तर था, यदि यह गलत है तो मुझे सही किया जा सकता है। खैर, जो गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से उत्तर मिला वह ठीक है। लेकिन अभी एक भाई ने कहा कि कुछ मिनिस्टर बेबी कार (baby car) लेकर फिरते हैं और कुछ बड़ी बड़ी कार लेकर। यह भी क्रिटिसिज्म (criticism) होता है कि अमुक मिनिस्टर बड़ा लोभी है, कैसी बेबी कार में चलता है, क्योंकि बहुत से मिनिस्टर बड़ी बड़ी कार में चलते हैं और वह एक छोटी कार में चलता है। वे यह एक्सपेक्ट (expect) करते हैं कि मिनिस्टर लोग बड़ी बड़ी कारों में

चला करें। ठीक है, वह ऐसा इसलिये सोचते हैं कि मिनिस्टरों की डिगनिटी बड़ी बड़ी कारों में चलने से मालूम होती है और होनी भी चाहिये क्योंकि यह पद देश के सबसे ऊंचे प्रतिनिधियों का है, लेकिन सोचिये कि बड़ी कार कितने में आती है। कम से कम १५ या २० हजार रुपये में एक बड़ी कार आयेगी, इससे कम में नहीं आ सकती। अब अगर एक मिनिस्टर कार एडवांस ले ले तो उसे कम से कम ४०० या ५०० रुपया मासिक कार के एडवान्स के मद्दे गवर्नमेंट को देना होगा और जैसा कि माननीय मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस प्रस्ताव को प्रस्तुत करते समय कहा था कि ३०० रुपया कार का रनिंग एक्सपेंस (running expense) पड़ता है। तो इसका अर्थ यह है कि १,८०० रुपये में से ८०० रुपये वह मिनिस्टर कार के लिये दे दे। मेरा विचार यह है कि इन केन्द्रीय मन्त्रियों के साथ यह ज्यादाती करना है, यदि उनसे कहा जाय कि वे कार खुद रखें। फिर मान लीजिये कि तीन साल बाद या पांच साल बाद एक व्यक्ति मिनिस्टर नहीं रहता तो उसने जो एडवांस लिया है वह तो चुकाना ही होगा, जब कि कार की कीमत कुछ भी नहीं रह जाती। तो ऐसी हालत में बाद में अगर उसकी हैसियत ऐसी न हो तो वह क्या करेगा। इसलिये मेरा दृढ़ विश्वास है और मैं जितना भी जोर इस बात पर दे सकती हूँ उतना जोर देकर कहना चाहती हूँ कि कार खरीदने के मामले को गवर्नमेंट पर छोड़ देना चाहिये और मिनिस्टर पर नहीं छोड़ना चाहिये। कार तो सरकार की ओर से मन्त्रियों को मिलनी ही चाहिये। यदि कार के प्रतिदिन के खर्च के लिये भी मन्त्रियों को कुछ अलाउन्स दिया जा सके तो अधिक उचित होगा; लेकिन इसमें तो कोई संदेह ही नहीं कि कार को खरीदने की जिम्मेदारी मिनिस्टर पर डालना बहुत ज्यादाती की बात होगी। मुझे तो आश्चर्य होता है कि हमारे केन्द्रीय मन्त्रिमंडल ने इसको कैसे स्वीकार कर लिया कि कार को वे स्वयं

[Shrimati Sharda Bhargava.]

खरीदेंगे। यह दलील हो सकती है कि हमेशा से केन्द्र में मंत्री लोग अपनी व्यक्तिगत कार ही रखते रहे हैं, लेकिन जब कि वेतन कम किये जा रहे हैं, तो यह दलील ठीक नहीं हो सकती कि वे अपनी कार रखें। एक डिप्टी मिनिस्टर जो कि १,७०० रुपये तनखाह पाता है, वह यदि उसमें से ८०० रुपये कार के लिये निकाल दे तो फिर वह क्या कर सकता है। मुझे यहां नम्रतापूर्वक, आग्रहपूर्वक और विनयपूर्वक यह निवेदन करना है कि कार खरीदने के खर्च की जो जिम्मेदारी इस बिल में मंत्रियों के ऊपर डाली गई है वह निकाल दी जाय और जैसे कि अन्य राज्यों में सरकार की तरफ से मिनिस्टर्स को कारें दी जाती हैं, उसी तरह से यहां भी दी जायें। यह प्रश्न भी यहां आया था कि अगर हम लोग अपने पास से कार खरीद कर रखेंगे तो स्टेट्स के मंत्रीगण भी उसका अनुसरण कर सकेंगे, जो अच्छा होगा। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि जहां स्टेट्स में मिनिस्टर्स को १,००० या १,२०० रुपये तनखाह मिलती हैं वहां इस उदाहरण को यदि हम अनुसरण करवाना चाहें तो यह गलत उदाहरण होगा। मैं तो यही कहना चाहती हूं और मेरा सुझाव यही है कि अच्छा होगा, यदि स्टेट्स की भांति केन्द्रीय सरकार के मिनिस्टर्स को भी, जिनकी कि तनखाह अब कम हो रही है, सरकार की तरफ से कार दी जाय।

अब अन्य खर्चों के बारे में भी कुछ कह देना चाहती हूं। ८०० या ७०० रुपये कार के लिये निकल जाने के बाद मिनिस्टर की तनखाह में से १,००० या १,१०० रुपये रह जाते हैं और डिप्टी मिनिस्टर के पास सिर्फ ८०० रुपये ही रह जाते हैं। यह कहा ही गया है कि उनको दो घर रखने पड़ते हैं और दोनों के खर्च का उत्तरदायित्व उनका है। अब उनका काम देखिये। सारे दिन आफिस वर्क (office work) तथा पार्लियामेंट्री वर्क (Parliamentary work) करते हैं, इसके अतिरिक्त उनके पास बहुत बड़ी संख्या में लोग इंटरव्यू (interview)

के लिये आते हैं। जिनको कि उन्हें इंटरव्यू देना पड़ता है और जितना वह समय दे सकते हैं, देते हैं, फिर भी इस सम्बन्ध में जनता को संतोष नहीं होता। तो भी जितना अधिक से अधिक समय वे दे सकते हैं, देते ही हैं। इसलिये इसके माने हैं कि वह कम से कम २४ घंटे के अन्दर १८ घंटे काम करते ही होंगे। अब जब १८ घंटे काम करने के बाद वे १२ बजे सोने के लिये घर पर जायें, उस समय उनकी पत्नी यह कहे—मैं पत्नी इसलिये कह रही हूं क्योंकि अधिकतर मिनिस्टर पुरुष ही हैं इसलिये पत्नी ही कहना पड़ेगा—कि बच्चों की फीस देने के लिये रुपये नहीं रहे और कपड़े के लिये रुपये नहीं रहे; तो ऐसी स्थिति में क्या आप यह आशा करते हैं कि वह यह जवाब दे दें कि 'हवा खाओ और बच्चों को पढ़ने-लिखने की कोई ज़रूरत नहीं है'? और यदि एक बार यह भी कह दें तो क्या आप समझते हैं कि उनके मस्तिष्क को शान्ति मिल सकेगी और उनका मन दूसरी ओर लग सकेगा। जो भाई यह सलाह दे रहे हैं कि मिनिस्टर का वेतन एक हजार हो और डिप्टी मिनिस्टर का सात सौ, और उन्होंने इस बारे में एक अमेंडमेंट भी दिया है, वे क्या कभी यह भी सोचते हैं कि सात या आठ सौ रुपया कार के लिये उसी वेतन में से निकल जाने के बाद उसके पास क्या बचेगा और फिर वह मिनिस्टर क्या हवा पहनेगा और खायेगा या बच्चों को नहीं पढ़ायेगा? इसके अतिरिक्त मैं यह भी कह देना चाहती हूं कि देहली का खर्च आपने देखा है और उसके बारे में भी आपने सोचा होगा। अब तो आप सब जानते हैं, क्योंकि देहली में रह चुके हैं, कि देहली का खर्च और शहरों से कितना अधिक है और मेरा तो यह कहना है कि कई देशों की राजधानी से भी यहां का खर्च अधिक है। कई देशों की राजधानी में इससे ज्यादा खर्च नहीं होता। देहली में बहुत ही अधिक खर्च करना पड़ता है। यह हम सब लोग जानते हैं और समझते हैं। मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि मेम्बर्स के लिये जो डेली एलाउन्स (daily allowance) रखा गया है उसके बारे

में भी काफी लोगों ने, विरोधी पक्ष के कई लोगों ने भी काफी बड़ी बड़ी सैलरी का सुझाव रखा है। इसके माने यह है कि वे जानते हैं कि देहली में रह कर कितना खर्च हमको करना पड़ता है। तो फिर आप सोच सकते हैं कि मंत्री लोगों को तो अधिकतर यहां पर ही रहना पड़ता है। ऐसी अवस्था में जो वेतन स्वयं ही कम है उसको उससे भी कम करना चाहें तो मैं यही समझूंगी कि उनको आदमी न समझ कर और पता नहीं क्या समझा जाता है।

एक प्रश्न डिगनिटी (dignity) के बारे में भी आता है। मेरा तो कहना यह है कि उनकी डिगनिटी व्यक्तिगत डिगनिटी नहीं है। वे देश के प्रतिनिधि हैं और आपने अबसर देखा होगा कि उनके पास बाहर के लोग आते हैं। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कांग्रेसें होती हैं और बहुत सी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्बन्धी बातें होती हैं और उनमें बाहर के लोग भी आते हैं और अक्सर वे मिनिस्ट्रों के यहां ठहरना भी पसन्द करते हैं या उनके घरों पर मिलने जाते हैं। तो उस वक्त यदि वे देखें कि उनके बच्चे फटे कपड़े पहन कर निकल रहे हैं या स्वयं फटे कपड़े पहने हैं तो वे बाहर जाकर क्या कहेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान इतना भूखा-नंगा है कि उसके मिनिस्टर्स इस तरह से रहते हैं। अतः मिनिस्ट्रों को मामूली व्यक्ति की उपमा देकर उनके वेतन पर विचार करना कदापि न्यायोचित नहीं है। वे देश के, जनता के और पार्लियामेंट के प्रतिनिधि हैं और उनको बाहर वालों के सामने देश का प्रतिनिधित्व करना पड़ता है। बाहर वाले देखते हैं कि हमारे जो बड़े लोग हैं, हमारे जो विद्वान हैं, हमारे ये जो नेता हैं वे किस हैसियत से रहते हैं। यह मैं मानती हूँ कि हम बाहर बहुत लक्जरी (luxury) नहीं दिखाना चाहते हैं और न करना चाहते हैं क्योंकि हमारा देश इस योग्य नहीं है। लेकिन जो वेतन मिनिस्ट्रों को दिया गया है, उसमें लक्जरी की तो कोई बात ही नहीं है बल्कि मैं तो यह मानती हूँ कि

उनको बिल्कुल वरीलैस लाइफ (worryless life) नहीं मिलेगी।

मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि वे देश का काम उचित रूप से करें और इसी-लिये हमने उनको चुना है, तो उनको घर की चिन्ता नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर उनके घर का काम निर्विघ्न होता रहेगा तो इससे एक आदमी को ही लाभ नहीं होगा बल्कि पूरे देश को लाभ होगा। इसके अतिरिक्त यदि उनका वेतन ५०० या ७०० रुपये कम भी कर देंगे तो जिन गरीबों का उदाहरण दिया जाता है और जिसकी दलील दी जाती है उन गरीबों को भी कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। इससे अच्छा यही है कि उनको अच्छी तनखाह देकर घर की चिन्ता से बिल्कुल निश्चिन्त कर दें, मुक्त कर दें, ताकि वे अपना पूरा समय देश के कार्य के लिये दे सकें और केवल देश की ही चिन्ता उनको रहे। हर समय वे देश के काम में लगे रह सकें, और जो कुछ सुधार या अच्छाई वे सोच सकें वह सोचें और इस काम तथा विचार के लिये उनको पूरा समय देने के लिये उन्हें पूरी निश्चिन्तता देनी चाहिये।

इसलिये मैं अब अपने विरोधी भाइयों से यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि वे इस विधेयक का विरोध न करके इसको स्वीकार करने में सहयोग दें।

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : On a point of order. Sir. She is referring to the Opposition as 'Virodhi Bhai'. That means enemy. It is better she refers as प्रतिपक्ष।

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA:

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : अगर विरोधी भाई विरोध करना छोड़ देंगे तो मैं "विरोधी" नहीं कहूंगी।

MR. CHAIRMAN : By 'Virodhi' she means 'Opposition'. You do not mean by it 'enemies'.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA :

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : "अपोज" कर के माने हिन्दी में "विरोध" करना ही होता है और इसलिये "अपोजीशन" शब्द के माने "विरोधी पक्ष" ही हो सकता है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Say 'प्रतिपक्षी'.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA :

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : प्रतिपक्षी तो संस्कृत का शब्द है । मामूली हिन्दी में मैंने यही पढ़ा है कि "अपोजीशन" के माने "विरोधी पक्ष" होता है और मैं मामूली हिन्दी में ही बोल रही हूँ, संस्कृत में नहीं ।

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Is there no time limit ?

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA :

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : तो जो बिल माननीय मंत्री ने यहां पेश किया है, उसका मैं हार्दिक समर्थन करती हूँ और अपने मंत्रियों को बधाई और धन्यवाद देती हूँ और आशा करती हूँ कि विरोधी पक्ष भी इसे सर्वसम्मति से स्वीकृत होने में बाधक न होगा ।

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexure No. 71.]

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the salaries proposed in this Bill for the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers are too high. On the contrary, I think that the Prime Minister because of the heavier expenses thrown on him on account of his position should have a higher salary. I feel sure that the present Prime Minister will not accept a higher salary than is given to any other Minister ; but I think that the principle of placing the Prime Minister and the other Ministers on the same footing in respect of salary is not sound. Everyone knows that the Prime Minister, because of the fact that he is the first Minister, has burdens thrown on him from which the other Ministers are free. In England for this reason, while the Cabinet Ministers get only £5,000 a year, the Prime

Minister gets £10,000 a year. This matter was considered for several years before the salary of the Prime Minister was increased. It was seen that the expenditure that he had to incur was much heavier than that which any other Minister had to bear. It was for this reason that British Parliament was compelled to recognize that the Prime Minister occupied a special position and voted for him a salary double that given to any other Cabinet Minister. The only other thing that I wish to say in connection with the Bill is that I fear that the privilege of a free residence which has now been accorded to all Ministers and Deputy Ministers may be abused. What I mean is that there may be a competition among the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers for the occupation of the best and the biggest houses in New Delhi. I hope that the Government will take this into account and see that no Minister takes advantage of this privilege to occupy houses the rent of which is too high, and if he does so, he will be open to the charge that he wants to live in a luxurious style and I am sure it is in the interest both of the Ministers and the Government that their action should not be open to any such criticism. I hope therefore that the Government will bear this point in mind and take steps to see that while Ministers get houses suitable to their position, the privilege of a free residence that is now being extended is not taken undue advantage of by any Minister or Deputy Minister.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I rise to support this motion before the House. I think the House should be grateful for the cut which the hon. Ministers have themselves imposed. The salary which they now want is only Rs. 2,250 a month. The Leader of the House has given us an analysis of the salary the Ministers drew from the time when the British Government was here. The salary proposed in the Bill is nearly one-third of that which was paid to the Ministers occupying the same position in the British days. The arguments that have been advanced from the side of the Opposition can be divided under two heads—financial and psychological. So far as the financial

aspect is concerned, my view is that it would not make much difference. If the salary is reduced to the figure of Rs. 1,000 that is proposed by the Opposition, the total saving would not be more than two lakhs a year. May I put this question to the Members of the Opposition whether this amount would be any saving in a Budget of Rs. 400 crores? May I also put another question that if this saving of two lakhs is effected, would it improve the lot of the common man whose case has been argued here by the Opposition. Therefore looking from the point of view of financial saving, I submit that this aspect has no bearing on the question of salaries that they are going to vote today. I don't know to what limits the psychological aspect can go. If there can be any psychological effect, it should have been there when they have reduced their salaries from Rs. 6,666-10-8 to Rs. 2,250. If the reduction has any psychological effect, it should have had that effect when the Congress came to power, when the Cabinet Ministers reduced their salary to Rs. 3,000 a month, when they imposed again a cut of 15%, that is, when the salary was reduced to Rs. 2,550. In the present Bill they have again cut another 300, that is, the salary is now Rs. 2,250. So if at all there can be any psychological effect by the reductions, it should be there by now. But if you carefully analyse this figure of Rs. 2,250, I submit that the cut is not only Rs. 300 a month but it cannot be less than 1,000 a month as I will presently show. The car which used to be given to the Ministers so far will have to be purchased and maintained by them.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I don't think the hon. Member is right there. No car is given to the Ministers.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA : At any rate, my point is that these cars are an absolute necessity if the Ministers are to do their work properly. No Minister can do his work properly without a car. And if a car is an absolute necessity, then the maintenance cost of the car, and the interest he has to pay on the

advance from the Government, all these will come to not less than Rs. 700 or Rs. 800 per month. If you deduct this and also the income-tax, then the net salary that the Minister would be getting would be only somewhere about Rs. 1,200 or Rs. 1,300 per month. Is this too high a sum to be paid as salary to a Minister who has to keep his position and work here day and night, as the previous speaker just now said? If Members of this House were to compare their own emoluments with what is proposed to be given to the Ministers, then I feel they would find their emoluments camporing favourably with those of the Ministers. We are allowed Rs. 40 a day which comes to Rs. 1,200 per month. And we are getting this amount tax free. Therefore,.....

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated) : For how many months in the year?

SHRI R. C. GUPTA : So long as we work here, and for the period we do not work here we probably earn more than Rs. 40 a day.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI : What about the high rents we pay?

SHRI R. C. GUPTA : My point is this. The Ministers are working here for eight months during the session. It is calculated that the period for which the House of the People would sit would be near about 240 days a year and during that period the Ministers have to work along with us. Besides this work in the Houses of Parliament, they have to do their own work, I mean the work connected with their portfolios that have been entrusted to them. That being so, can we contend that they are not working at least double the number of hours that we put in ourselves? Therefore, my submission is that looking to the work and its nature and its duration, the remuneration that is proposed to be paid to our Ministers is not sufficient. That is the only conclusion that we can come to. In fact, as Dr. Kunzru said, the salaries seem to be erring on the side of, shall I say, too much reduction? They should have been given something more than the salary which has been proposed.

[Shri R. C. Gupta.]

Something has been said with regard to medical attendance. I do not know what is the state of affairs in Delhi, but in Uttar Pradesh every government servant is entitled to free medical attendance and the Members of the Legislatures are also entitled to free medical service. So we can hardly make much of this facility.

If we look to all the circumstances, we can come to this conclusion and only to this conclusion, that the salary which has been proposed is very reasonable and fair and so the Bill now before the House should be supported.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are so many Members standing up. Well, we begin with Mr. Sobhani ; but hereafter we will restrict each speech to five minutes.

SHRI O. SOBHANI (Hyderabad) : Sir, I will not take more than four minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I rise to support the amendment so ably moved by Shrimati Sharda Devi.

9 a.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Amendment ? No amendment has been moved.

SHRI O. SOBHANI : Sir, I mean the suggestion made by Shrimati Sharda Devi. Sir, we have been told that since 1946 the salaries of the Ministers have been reduced by 67 per cent. Why was this done ? Has the cost of living gone down ? Are the Ministers given the Freedom of the City of Delhi ? Do they not have to pay for their food just as anybody else ? Do they get other things at cheaper rates ? Do they get any other facilities ? The workers have been given increase in salaries, and D. A. Is it a crime to be a Minister ? Sir, if you will permit me, I shall quote Hazrat Ali who says "If you employ a man, pay him so much that he does not need to be dishonest or does not need to look elsewhere to supplement his income." Sir, it is well known that our Ministers and Deputy Ministers work for more hours than we do. As Shri T. T. Krishnamachari stated the other day, some of

them start at 5 o'clock in the morning and work right upto about 11 o'clock at night. They are also human like ourselves. Why should they not be paid in such a manner that they do not have to look elsewhere to supplement their income ? If we do not do that, then I submit that we must not expect them to be honest. The Ministers need cars, whether they are big or small it does not matter. And these cars have to be maintained. Shrimati Sharda Devi has rightly asked, what is the poor Minister to do after his term of office is over ? Sir, in both the Houses we have about 700 Members, the majority of whom are not rich. Do you want to prevent the middle-class or the poor persons from accepting offices ? If you want to have able men, then you must put them in a position where they can carry on their duties with dignity.

With these few words, Sir, I wholeheartedly support the suggestion already made.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa) : Mr. Chairman, while commending the excellent example shown by our Ministers in imposing a voluntary cut on their salaries, I rise to support the view that over and above that, they should go even further and of their own accord, limit their incomes and donate a large part of it to charities and other institutions useful to the nation, after the example of the great saint who wore the loin cloth and showed us the way to live economically and at the same time earn for ourselves a prestige that is respected throughout the world.

THE MINISTER FOR LAW (SHRI C. C. BISWAS) : How does the hon. Member know that the Ministers do not pay for charities ?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : I beg your pardon ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : He asks how do you know how the Ministers spend their money—whether on charities or otherwise ?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : I do not know, but I was only putting forward a humble suggestion of mine.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED (Vindhya Pradesh) : That is very good of you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : Sir, I would also like to draw your attention to the traditional example of Ministers in our land, as depicted in The "*Mudra Rakshas*" where a great Minister of the Mauryas—Chanakya—in spite of his great position, lived in the same state of poverty and in the same hut of the simple Brahmin, but wielding a power and earning a prestige that were unequalled

SHRI T. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : All Ministers are not Brahmins and they cannot live like Chanakya.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : I could not catch what my hon. friend said.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He says all Ministers are not Brahmins and they do not wish to live like Chanakya.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : But I would plead that although all Ministers may not be Brahmins, the example set by this Brahmin Minister of old in our country can be followed by everyone here, irrespective of his caste, on the pattern shown to us by Mahatmaji who was not a Brahmin. To this statement of mine, this recommendation of mine, rather, I would like to add that the sight of the representatives, of Ministers, before me adds greater force, because, Sir, I see that they are in the fourth stage of our *Ashrams* (आश्रम), i.e., social divisions, namely, the final stage of *Vanprasth* (वानप्रस्थ), i.e., (retirement to the forest) or *Sanyas* (संन्यास), i.e., (renunciation). When I look at them, I am forcefully reminded of the Sanskrit verse:

वृद्धत्वे बुद्धिहीनः कुशविषशतनुः
स्वासकाशातिसारैः

HON. MEMBERS : What does it mean ?

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : Don't translate it.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : The translation has been done more orce-

fully by the King of English Poets namely, Shakespeare, in his 'Seven Age of Man', when he speaks of the sixth age :

And the sixth age slips into the lean
and slippered pantaloons
With spectacles on nose and pouch on
side.

His youthful nose well-worn,—
A world too wide, for his shrunk shanks.

Hence, Sir, I recommend to the House that by inflicting a further voluntary cut on their allowances they will not only be setting a good example but they will be helping themselves because they will be protecting themselves against criticism.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN (Bihar) : On a point of information, Sir. Is the hon. Member prepared to wear lion cloth, accept one rupee a day and function as a Member and thus set a good example ?

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Sir, I rise to support the motion. All that I want to say is that from the Opposition side there seems to be a presumption that those who are supporting this motion are perhaps indifferent or at least less solicitous about the welfare of the common man. I think there is hardly anybody in this country who is not painfully aware of the plight of the poor people in India. I think, this slight reduction or increase in the salaries of Ministers is not going to make any perceptible difference in the lot of the common man. If we want to help him, there are other ways of doing it, by having a more efficient administration and a more honest administration, eliminating grant and all the rest of it. As for the Ministers setting an example, I think we should all set an example. I am reminded of a very huge sign that I once saw in front of a restaurant near Los Angeles. This happened to be on the cross roads and during the time of depression. The situation there was that poor men, what are known as bums, they used to walk in and ask the waiter to get him a cup of coffee and sandwich. The air-

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

served and at the time of making payment, the customer will merely shrug his shoulders and say "Well, I've got it" that is, "I have not got the money". This went on for some time and in sheer desperation the proprietor put up this huge sign that I have seen with my own eyes : "The world may owe you a living but why pick on me?"

SHRI T. PANDE :

श्री टी० पांडे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्रियों का पारितोषिक विधेयक जो पेश किया गया है, उसका समर्थन करने के लिये मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। राज्य का काम चलाना बहुत ही कठिन होता है। यों तो हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के भाइयों ने इस बिल का हर तरह से विरोध किया है, मगर मैं उनसे एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिन उद्देश्यों से वे काम करना चाहते हैं और जिस देश का वे यहां पर उदाहरण अक्सर देते रहते हैं, उस देश के जो सबसे बड़े लीडर स्टालिन हैं उनके जीवन में और वहां के एक साधारण कर्मचारी के जीवन में क्या अन्तर है और वे किस तरह से जीवन व्यतीत करते हैं, क्या यह बात उनको मालम है। अगर उनको रूस जाने का विशेष अवसर न मिला हो तो वे कम से कम रूस के राजदूत, जो हमारी राजधानी में हैं, उनके राजभवन में जाकर देख सकते हैं कि उनके राजदूत और वहां का एक साधारण कर्मचारी किस तरह से जीवन व्यतीत करते हैं। जो राजकाज चलाता है, उसके लिये साधारण जीवन रखना बहुत ही कठिन हो जाता है। अब्दुरहीम खानखाना जब यहां राज्य करते थे और जब वे खाना खाने बैठते थे, तो उनके दस्तरखान पर २० हजार आदमी एक साथ हाथ उठाते थे। इस तरह से उन्होंने अपना राज्य चलाया। राज साधारण बातों के कहने से या साधारण आलोचना करने से नहीं चल सकता है।

मंत्रियों को जो वेतन दिया गया है और जिस पर उन्होंने स्वेच्छा से यह विधेयक उपस्थित

किया है कि हमारे वेतन में कमी की जाय और हमें जो मोटर और अन्य सवारी में सहूलियत दी जाती थी उनमें कमी की जाय, जो विधेयक उन्होंने स्वेच्छा से उपस्थित किया है उस पर हमारे विरोधी भाई तरह तरह की आलोचना कर रहे हैं, यह अच्छी बात नहीं मालूम होती है। मैं इस बिल का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

मगर एक बात मैं आपसे अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम देहात के रहने वाले हैं। जैसा कि मुझसे पहिले एक वक्ता ने यह बात कही थी कि साधारण आदमी या संसद् के सदस्यों के मुकाबले में मंत्रिगणों का जीवन-स्तर बहुत ऊंचा है। मगर मैं यह कहता हूँ कि वस्तु स्थिति यह नहीं है। इस संसद् में कई किसम के लोग हैं। बहुत से लोग तो कांग्रेस के कार्यकर्ता हैं, जिनका जीवन सामान्य लोगों की तरह ही है। वे देश की बहुत समय से सेवा करते आये हैं और उनको अपनी जीविका के लिये साधारण साधनों पर ही निर्भर रहना पड़ता है। उनके पास किसी प्रकार के विशेष साधन नहीं हैं। उन्हीं लोगों में से हमारे मंत्रीगण आजकल देश की सेवा कर रहे हैं। मैं स्वयं उत्तर प्रदेश का रहने वाला हूँ और मैं बहुत से मंत्रियों को जानता हूँ जिनको कि अपना जीवन निर्वाह करना बहुत ही मुश्किल हो जाता है और जो इस समय कर्ज में हैं। मैं यहां पर किसी का नाम लेना उचित नहीं समझता हूँ। मगर मेरा सरकार से यह कहना है कि यह शासन का कार्य हो जाता है कि वह इस ओर ध्यान दे। मगर मैं यहां पर देखता हूँ कि मंत्रियों ने खुद ही अपने वेतन के लिये यह विधेयक उपस्थित किया है जिससे वे अपने खर्च में कमी करना चाहते हैं। उन्होंने जो उदाहरण हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत किया है, वह राज्य की दृष्टि से, जनता की दृष्टि से अगर देखा जाये तो उनका यह आदर्श, उनका यह जीवन हमारे लिये और हमारी आगे आने वाली सन्तान के लिये एक आदर्श उदाहरण रहेगा।

उन्होंने जो विधेयक उपस्थित किया है और स्वेच्छापूर्वक अपने वेतन में कमी की है, अपने लिये सहूलियतों में कमी की है, उसके लिये मैं उनकी प्रशंसा करता हूँ और हृदय से इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexure No. 72.]

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar) :

डा० पी० सी० मित्रा (बिहार) : चैयरमैन साहब, जो बिल मंत्रियों की तलब के बारे में पेश किया गया है, उससे यह मालूम होता है कि मंत्रियों को डिग्रेड (degrade) और ह्यूमिलेट (humiliate) किया गया है। मिनिस्ट्रों के नीचे जो अफसर ह, वे तो आजकल चार हजार और पांच हजार तनखाह पा रहे हैं और इस बिल से मंत्रियों को दो हजार सैलरी (salary) मिलेगी। अगर इस 'सैलरी' की जगह पर 'आन-रेरियम' कहा जाये तो बहुत ही ठीक होगा। सैलरी कहने से तो उनको ह्यूमिलेट करना है और उनको गुलाम बनाना है। उनके अफसर तो पांच हजार रुपया पायें और जो मिनिस्टर हैं वे केवल दो हजार रुपया पायें। यह तो ऐसी बात हो गई "He is the employer of five thousand rupees salaried man".

इसलिये मेरा यह कहना है कि यह जो आप सैलरी का बिल रख रहे हैं, इसको सैलरी न कहा जाय, बल्कि आनरेरियम (honorarium) कहा जाये, तो अच्छा है। सरकार मंत्रियों को तनखाह नहीं देगी बल्कि वह उनको अपने खर्च के लिये आनरेरियम देगी। यह जो सैलरी बिल रखा गया है उसमें तो बहुत ही कम पे (pay) है, इसको सैलरी का नाम न देकर यह कहा जाये कि हम मंत्रियों को आनरेरियम दे रहे हैं।

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexure No. 73.]

SHRI D. NARAYAN (Bombay) :

श्री डी० नारायण (बम्बई) : सभापति महोदय, हमारे मंत्रियों के वेतन के सम्बन्ध में इस तरह से बहस-मुबाहिसा जो यहां पर किया जा रहा है, उससे बड़ा दुःख मालूम होता है। हम और आप सब लोग यह समझते हैं कि मंत्री लोग जनता द्वारा चुने हुए हैं और जनता के विश्वासपात्र हैं। इस महान् देश की नौका को चलाने के लिये ये योग्य पुरुष हैं। वे योग्य हैं इसीलिये जनता ने उनको चुना। ऐसी हालत में जब कि उन्होंने यह चाहा कि हमारे अपने वेतन में कमी होनी चाहिये, कमी की ओर इस हाउस के सामने यह बिल पेश किया। फिर इस बात पर तरह तरह की बातें कहना, उस पर चर्चा चलाना, यह मैं उचित नहीं समझता हूँ। इस मामले में वे जो मानते हैं, वह ही हमें मान लेना चाहिये।

आप सब लोग जानते हैं कि जिस समय देश को त्याग की जरूरत थी, उस वक्त हमारे मंत्रियों ने अपना सर्वस्व त्याग किया। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि अगर फिर समय आया तो वे उससे भी ज्यादा त्याग करने को तैयार रहेंगे, जिसकी हम औरों से आशा भी नहीं कर सकते हैं। हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के भाई तो हमेशा विरोध की भावना से ही हर एक बात का विरोध करते हैं। आज उन्होंने दो हजार रुपये की जगह एक हजार रुपये की बात रखी है। अगर कल मंत्रीगण यह सूचना दें कि वे एक हजार रुपया तनखाह लेंगे तो विरोधी पक्ष की ओर से कहा जायेगा कि ५०० रुपया दिया जाना चाहिये। अगर आप ५०० रुपया कहेंगे तो विरोधी पक्ष वाले २५० रुपया कहेंगे। आप जो बात भी कहेंगे, वे उसका विरोध करेंगे और आपकी बात उनकी बात से कभी भी मेल नहीं खायेगी।

[Shri D. Narayan.]

हमें तो यह सोचना है कि जिनके ऊपर हमने इतने महान् देश का राज्य चलाने का भार सौंपा है, उनकी छोटी छोटी बातों पर अगर हम ध्यान देंगे, तो किस तरह से हम उनसे बड़े बड़े कार्यों के बारे में आशा कर सकते हैं। वे इतने बड़े देश का शासन करते हैं। हमको उनके वेतन सम्बन्धी छोटी बात के ऊपर इतनी बहस नहीं करनी चाहिये। वे योग्य आदमी हैं और उनकी योग्यता को ही देखकर आप लोगों ने उनको इतने बड़े राज्य का भार सौंपा है। तो क्या वे इतने पात्र नहीं हैं कि अपने लिये हजार दो हजार रुपया भी खर्च कर सकें। इस तरह की मामूली बातें, टुटपूजी बातें, बाजारी बातें, हम मंत्रियों के सम्बन्ध में कहते हैं। मुझे उससे बड़ा दुःख होता है। त्याग कहने से नहीं हुआ करता है। त्याग स्वयं करना पड़ता है, त्याग उदाहरण पेश करने से होता है। "Example is better than precept."

इसलिये मैं यह चाहूंगा कि इस बात की चर्चा बहुत कम की जाये। हां, एक बात मैं खास कहना चाहता हूं और वह यह है कि जो डा० कुंजूरु जी ने कल उनके प्रासादों के सम्बन्ध में कही। उन्होंने कहा था कि हमारे मंत्रीगण जिन मकानों में रहते हैं, वे वैभवपूर्ण हैं। यह बात नहीं है। वे उनमें अपनी खुशी से नहीं रहते। अंग्रेजों ने दिल्ली में हिन्दुस्तान की राजधानी जिस ढंग से बनाई वह हमारे देश के योग्य नहीं थी। मगर क्या किया जाये, इस राजधानी में हमको रहना पड़ता है। मुझे पता है कि जिस वक्त राष्ट्रपिता जिन्दा थे, उस समय इस बात की चर्चा हुई थी कि दिल्ली से राजधानी हम कहीं दूसरी जगह ले जायें। परन्तु हमें आज इस राजधानी में रहना है, क्योंकि इस राजधानी के बनाने में देश का करोड़ों

रुपया खर्च किया गया है। इसमें विशाल भवन बनाये गये हैं, हमें इन विशाल भवनों का उपयोग करना होगा। इसलिये हमें इस प्रश्न को इस निगाह से देखना चाहिये, न कि इस निगाह से देखना चाहिये कि मंत्रीगण बड़े बड़े भवनों में रहते हैं। आखिर में, मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि हम सबको विशाल हृदय रखना चाहिये, उदारता का अनुसरण करना चाहिये, संकीर्णता छोड़नी चाहिये। इतने बड़े महान् देश की जिम्मेदारी का काम बगैर विशाल हृदय के हम पूरा नहीं कर सकते। दरिद्री कल्पनायें फेंक देनी होंगी।

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexure No. 74.]

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Sir, in supporting the Bill, I wish to bring one or two points to the attention of the House. It has been the practice in some of the State Governments that the salaries of Ministers are kept low at about Rs. 1,500 a month, but they are given motor cars, sumptuary allowance which in certain cases extends up to Rs. 750 a month and they are also given free furnished houses. As has been pointed out here, Sir, there is a likelihood of these houses being misused. May I suggest that it will be better, as per the recommendations of the Pay Commission which has fixed Rs. 3,000 as maximum salary, if we give to our Ministers Rs. 2,500 a month or even Rs. 3,000 a month, but nothing should be given free besides that. They should select houses according to their likes and dislikes. If certain Ministers who have got big families want a big house, they shall have to pay a higher rent. If another Minister wants a small house, then he need pay only smaller rent. I therefore suggest that instead of giving Rs. 2,250 and a free house, it will be far better if you give a salary of Rs. 2,500 for Ministers and Rs. 2,000 for Deputy Ministers, but no free house. It has been pointed out, Sir, that out of this 2,500 or Rs. 2,250 plus house, about Rs. 500 a month will go towards income-tax. If we deduct

this Rs. 500 income-tax from Rs. 2,250 they are left with Rs. 1,750 and if out of this something is allowed for conveyance charges which has been variously estimated between Rs. 300 and Rs. 500, a Minister is left with Rs. 1,250 which I think is pretty low for maintaining his dignity and for being above any suspicion of corruption and bribery. I do maintain, Sir, that instead of giving a salary of Rs. 2,250 plus free house, we should make it Rs. 3,000 without any free items. It will be much better. Then I would add one word more to what has been said by Pandit Kunzru, that we must make a distinction in the case of our Prime Minister. It is very good of him that he is insisting on taking the same salary as is being given to other Ministers, but I would suggest that we should give to our Prime Minister at least Rs. 3,000 a month, a free official residence and about Rs. 1,000 as sumptuary allowance. It has been pointed out that the *per capita* income of our country is only Rs. 240 per year, but some of the critics forget that it is to be calculated for a family of five persons and if you multiply 240 by five, because in poor families most of the members are generally earning members.....

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : May I intervene and ask whether Rs. 240 is not *per capita* income of our country ?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : Rs. 240 is the *per capita* income of our country and as I said in a family of five persons if you multiply 240 by five it comes to Rs. 1,200 which means Rs. 100 a month. It has been suggested that a ratio of 1 to 30 should be maintained between the lowest paid and the highest paid and according to that formula if you multiply 100 by 30 it comes to Rs. 3,000 a month.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sundarayya's speech yesterday was as propagandist.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Every day it is propagandist.

SHRI RAMA RAO : Yes, you are right. Every day his speech is propagandist.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : But the Government has not benefited by my propaganda.

SHRI RAMA RAO : I pity him for it. Sir, his speech would be in place if he made it to a Communist society. I am not a Communist ; I am not going to be a Communist. The majority of the Members of Parliament are not Communists and we have no desire to be a Communist Republic. Therefore whatever he said was utterly irrelevant to the issues before us. He was talking about clerks. We are not discussing clerks here ; we are discussing Ministers. When we discuss clerks, let him come out with a proposition of his own and we shall think about it. He asked : "What about the psychological effect of Ministers having such high salaries ?" The answer is simple. This Bill brings down the salaries of Ministers and the psychological effect of that should be that the clerks should themselves ask for lower salaries.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Wonderful argument !

SHRI RAMA RAO : But I am not suggesting that. I am only pointing out that his is a very faulty line of argument. Let us level up, not level down. It was Bernard Shaw who said that he would shoot anybody who did not have 500 in the bank and that if a man did not have the money, the State should put it in for him. That would be an ideal State, but we are not yet quite advanced enough for it. We are striving to reach that ideal. I hope I shall live that long and pocket the money.

Often the example of Russia is quoted. I have not been to Russia, and they will not allow me into Russia, either. But I understand that there is a kind of *varnashram dharma* there too. It may be denied, but it is there. As regards China, the wine is new in the bottle. Do not discuss China in this House, because we do not want to pass adverse remarks against a neighbour whom we deeply love.

[Shri Rama Rao.]

Then, as regards the burden on the exchequer which this Bill throws, it is very little. Much has been already said about the value of money at the time of the Karachi Resolution and the much lower value of money today. I am not traversing that ground again, but it would be sufficient for my purpose to say that hard-worked Ministers, as the Prime Minister said, are entitled not only to a decent remuneration while they are working, but they have a right to think of the future and provide for their families. If I claim the right to look after my family, there is no reason why I should not concede that right to Ministers also. If the Communist argument is to be accepted, that Ministers should take only Rs. 1,000, as my hon. friend over there suggested, I would say that in a Government of the Communist conception, there will be place only for two sorts of men—very rich men and very poor men. I take it that the Communists are thinking of a future where the middle class is wiped out. We, Sir, refuse to be wiped out.

It is more over false economy to reduce salaries at this time, because prices are rising. Sure, the Karachi Resolution laid down austerity standards, but not starvation standards. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is reported to have said, when he heard about the Karachi Resolution: "Well, well, if this is going to be the idea of the Congress Government of the future, and if the Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court is going to be paid Rs. 500, then justice will be sold in the streets of Allahabad." Remember that we have got to maintain certain standards, and that will be possible in the present orthodox economy only by paying people well. Sir, our infant democracy is being called upon to set up new standards, and it can very well go by the examples set elsewhere. Democracy and the *petit bourgeoisie* are not free from that grand morality which the Communists preach. If you take the case of the United Kingdom, you will recall the report of the Parliamentary Committee submitted at the time of Lloyd George's Ministry. Herbert Henry Asquith giving evidence before the

Parliamentary Committee, said that when he was practising at the Bar he had ample income but when he retired as Prime Minister of England, he was poor as a church mouse. And we all know the tragedy of his later days when he had to be maintained by his friends. Averell Harriman, who is Adviser to President Truman in matters concerning the New Deal legislation and administration, can, I am told, earn half a million dollars every year; but at the call of duty he goes to the White House to advise the President and undertakes all kinds of onerous jobs. And for all that he gets very little.

I would therefore suggest that the *petit bourgeoisie* have also their morality, and I am sure that in days to come when sacrifices have got to be made they will be made, and made in plenty. The Communists are not going to lecture Congressmen on that because the lives of Congressmen have been sagas of sacrifice.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Sir, this Bill has on the whole had a very good reception, if I may say so. There have been a few criticisms offered against the provisions of this Bill. Most of them have related to details. But there was a fundamental resistance offered to the Bill by the Leader of the Communist Group. He thought that the figures of salaries which we have provided for in this Bill were too high. He tried to prove it by certain arithmetical calculations which showed, according to him, how unsustainable our proposals are. For instance, he took the figure of the average *per capita* income in this country. He took it to be about Rs. 250 per annum. He raised the figure of salaries provided for in this Bill by adding to it his own valuation of the privileges and amenities that are also provided for in the Bill, and arrived at a figure of something like Rs. 4,000 per month for each Minister. Then he juxtaposed this Rs. 4,000 with the Rs. 250 divided by 12, and arrived at the somewhat disquieting proportion of 200 : 1. In other words, his inference was that a Minister was going to get about 200 times the average *per capita* income in the country. I will

suggest a different kind of arithmetical calculation—though I may not be able to reach the proportions which my hon. friend was able to reach with his own arithmetic. Let us reduce the *per capita* income per annum to *per capita* income per day. I believe it will work out to 10 annas and 8 pies per day. You can compare it with the recommendation which my hon. friend and the Floor Leader of the Communist Group in the other House are supposed to have made with reference to the allowances for Members of Parliament. I believe their recommendation is that there should be a salary of Rs. 300 per mensem plus a daily allowance of Rs. 10—which works out to something like Rs. 20 a day. Now, if you juxtapose 10 annas and 8 pies with Rs. 20, you would probably arrive at a proportion of 30 times. Well, that of course is very much less than 200 times, but it is certainly a very considerable measure of inequality of income.

We can go on making arithmetical calculations of this sort, but we cannot blind ourselves to the actual reality that incomes are unequal. But I am quite prepared to justify the proposals made in this Bill on the basis of a principle which the great organisation which my hon. friend belongs subscribes to. I believe one of their tenets is : “To each according to his needs.” I do not think we are conflicting with this principle so far as the emoluments we have entered in this Bill are concerned. As I said yesterday, these figures do not show that the emoluments are niggardly. On the other hand, they are not in any sense generous. I draw the inference that what is provided for each Minister is simply something which will satisfy his essential needs. So, I think that the proposals in this Bill are not out of tune with Communist doctrine.

Let us consider some of the criticisms that have been advanced against certain provisions of this Bill. There were one or two points raised by my hon. friend from Madras, Mr. Rajagopal Naidu. His first point, I believe, was that there was an amending Act in 1950, and he wanted to know why the occasion

for that amending Act was not seized for the purpose of giving statutory sanction to certain matters provided for in this Bill. I would only take him through the history of this legislation. In 1947 we passed an Act in which we statutorily fixed the salary of each Minister. That Act did not differentiate between one class of Minister and another. Later these classes developed. We appointed Ministers of State and Deputy Ministers, and the question arose as to whether a salary fixed in the Act of 1947 should be paid to each one of those two additional categories, because under the Constitution they also were Members of the Council of Ministers. The decision taken was that there should be some distinction in regard to the salaries of Ministers also. So we provided that a Cabinet Minister should get a fully furnished house and a sumptuary allowance in addition to his salary which was in a sense the salary of a Minister of State. A Deputy Minister's salary also was fixed at Rs. 2,000 instead of Rs. 3,000 which a Cabinet Minister and a Minister of State were authorised to draw under the amending Act. The purpose of the amending Act was only to make these particular points clear so far as salaries and amenities went.

There are of course other things referred to in the present Bill, for example travelling allowances, motor car advances, free medical attention and so on and so forth. Now under the Constitution the salaries and allowances of members of the Council of Ministers were to be fixed by parliamentary enactment. But until they were so fixed, they were authorized to draw salaries and allowances that had been drawn by them before the commencement of the new Constitution. Now so far as the other allowances not mentioned in the Act of 1947 are concerned, they continue to be governed by the saving clause. Now that we are making a fairly comprehensive Bill as regards both—the salaries and the allowances—of Ministers of all classes, they have been brought into this new statute. That is the explanation as to why these were not statutorily provided for in 1950.

[Shri N. Gopalaswami.]

With regard to the suggestion that clause 12 of the Bill should be deleted altogether, clause 12 is a transitory provision, if I may so put it. Certain things which on the assumption that certain legislation would come up had been drawn by certain classes of Ministers during the interval between their appointment and the passing of this Act. Such drawals of public money did not go beyond what was due to them under the old arrangements. If they came into conflict with the provisions of the new enactment, this clause provides that any small excess that may have been drawn by them should not be recovered from them. That is all it is intended to do.

Dr. Kunzru referred to two points. The first point he made was that the Prime Minister should get a higher salary than other Ministers. I personally appreciate this suggestion. But there is no prospect, so far as I am in a position to judge the mind of our Prime Minister, of his agreeing to receive a higher salary than that of his colleagues. He is *primus inter pares*. He does not want to elevate himself by way of emoluments into a stature which is something apart from that of his colleagues. And in view of that I would like the House to leave the provision in the Bill as it stands alone.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar) : May I ask whether it is a question of the Prime Minister agreeing to this? Why should there be any question of his agreeing to this or not? We should not look to personalities. It is for the dignity of the office of the Prime Minister—whether it is the present Prime Minister or any other Prime Minister—we have to look to. We should leave out personalities and preserve the dignity of the office of the Prime Minister.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI: I appreciate my hon. friend's point of view, but unfortunately the mind of the Prime Minister does not work in the way my hon. friend's mind works. We have got to take note of that fact. It is not a question of thrusting on a

person a dignity which he does not consider that he acquires by reason of the fact that he is Prime Minister and so should get a higher salary than his other colleagues. There are points of view and I personally think that in a matter of this sort, we should defer to the point of view of the person who holds this office at the present moment. If we do get a Prime Minister later on who thinks in the terms of my hon. friend who has just spoken, perhaps my hon. friend will bring in an amending Bill.

SHRI K. B. LALL : Again it becomes a question of personality.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : There was another point which my hon. friend, Pandit Kunzru, made, that it is possible that provision of a free residence for every Minister including a Deputy Minister might give rise to unhealthy competition amongst Ministers and Deputy Ministers as to who should capture which house. Well, I think my hon. friends should trust to the discretion of the persons whom they put into office as Ministers. If there is a tendency toward unhealthy competition and any kind of bad feeling is likely to result from any such thing, they might trust to the Government to take such steps as would regulate the allotment of houses to particular Ministers. As a matter of fact I believe even now such allotments are made in consultation with and with the concurrence of the Prime Minister.

There was an interesting suggestion made by my hon. friend from Orissa who suggested that Ministers had not made sufficient sacrifices. In fact, he said that, in addition to getting this reduced salary, they should make a greater portion of this salary over to charity. If there was that margin, any substantial margin between the needs of a Minister for sustaining himself in life and in his office and the salary that we are fixing under this Bill, the argument would be conclusive for reducing the salary by the amount which he can spare. There is no point in suggesting that Government, out of public funds, should place in the hands of a Minister a sum the bulk of which he will be in a position to make over to

private charity. That is certainly not the principle which underlies this Bill. As I said, this is just sufficient to make a Minister live in comfort and without anxiety as to whether he will be able to make both ends meet so far as he himself is concerned.

There was something said about motor cars. I greatly sympathise with the point of view which my hon. lady friend put to the House, viz., that motor cars should be supplied at Government cost to every Minister; not only that, that the maintenance charges should be borne by Government. All that I can say is that it will be a departure from the practice at the Centre we have been following hitherto. Motor cars have been purchased only out of the private resources of Ministers who also maintain them out of the income they get, and it certainly would not be a response to public opinion which we wanted to respect by bringing in this measure, if we now add to the emoluments of Ministers sums on these two accounts. It must be taken by the House that in fixing the salaries that we have in this Bill, we have taken notice of the fact that expenditure of this sort will have to be incurred out of the private resources of Ministers. It will certainly make Ministers much more comfortable if they are found the Rs. 15,000 or Rs. 20,000 to invest in the motor cars. It will be a very difficult thing for them, I think, to be able to get an average expenditure of Rs. 300 per month for maintenance and so on, but I think they have to make an effort and they have to continue the practice that has gone on. That is also the practice that is followed in the case of the permanent civil servants of the State.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh) : May I point out that it was the practice when the salary of Ministers was Rs. 5,500 ? You have now brought it down to Rs. 2,250. How can you expect them now to bear the expenditure on cars and their maintenance ?

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA : But they are getting more salary and their post is permanent.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That point has been met.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I made it clear that it was fixed at a time when the salary was Rs. 5,500, when persons were supposed to be able to put some little fortune by, but we are not fixing the salaries on that basis in this Bill. Sir, I have met most of the points that have been raised in the course of the debate. I have nothing more to add.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : Mr. Chairman, Sir, by clause 12 we try to regularise certain payments which had been made without proper authority. I find that three categories are mentioned in clause 12, i.e. (i) all salaries paid or payable for the period commencing on the 14th day of May 1952 and ending with the commencement of this Act to Ministers described as Ministers of Cabinet rank (but not Ministers of the Cabinet), (ii) all charges incurred in respect of the accommodation provided in any hospital maintained by the Central Government for the medical treatment of any Minister or any member of his family and (iii) all payments by way of travelling or daily allowances to any Deputy Minister.

May I submit, Sir, that the advances made for the purchase of cars which we find in the Statement of Objects and Reasons have not been regularised in clause 12 ? I would submit that if the advances made for the purchase of motor cars also are not regularised, there will be a lacuna in the Act, and I suggest that the advances made for the purchase of cars should also be included in clause 12.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : The answer to that is simple. By the Constitution we are supposed to make statutory provisions only for fixing the salaries and allowances. Advance to a Minister is neither salary nor an allowance. It is a case of a loan made to a Minister for the purchase of a

[Shri N. Gopalaswami.]
motor car and is liable to be repaid in instalments. Hon. Members may ask: If that is so, why have a clause in this Bill for that purpose? The only reason for that is that, when we are trying to enact a piece of legislation to cover all sorts of monies that might go into the hands of a Minister from the Government exchequer, we thought that though this particular clause was not absolutely necessary to be put into this Bill, it would be a matter of convenience for all these things to come together in one enactment.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA : (Madras) : May I ask the hon. Leader of the House whether the Ministers are entitled to draw T. A. or D. A. when they file their nominations for election and when they go for doing propaganda for election?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : My answer is 'No'. If they go out for election purposes, they cannot draw T. A. or D. A. from the office.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA : May I know whether any Minister is allowed to have.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is not Question Hour.

The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There is no amendment to clause 2.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is:

That clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

There is an amendment by Shri B. Gupta. He may move it.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, yesterday the Leader of our Party made certain proposals for reduction which have been subjected to all kinds of criticisms, some naturally misconceived, others are absolutely beside the points. Sir, the proposals contained in our amendments are, to our judgment, reasonable and if we had not thought so, we would not have made these proposals at all. It is no use just trying to brush aside what we have said by all kinds of insinuations and suggestions. If we thought that the proposals would place difficulties on the Ministers or impede their work, we would not have placed them at all here. Sir, the Communist Party is also a ruling party in a third of the world. When we talk, we talk with some amount of responsibility of the class that has become the ruling party in many countries of the world today. Therefore it will not be wise for the Congress leaders to just dismiss our suggestions in the manner they have been doing it. I listened with the utmost attention to the argument put forward by the hon. Defence Minister in support of this Bill. I must confess that I felt not a little sorry at the manner in which he treated the subject. In fact, in trying to make out a case for the Bill, he introduced a sort of personal touch when he gave arguments about daughter's marriage, son's education, etc. I don't say that these are immaterial considerations. They have got to be taken into account. For us nothing human is alien. But at the same time where a question such as this has to be examined, it should be examined, mainly from the point of view of public policy, from the point of view of public morality, and it should be judged by the standards of public behaviour. Now it will be our endeavour to establish our case from that angle. I hope the House will view it from a broader angle of vision. I feel, it is impossible to get on with the discussion if we restrict ourselves to the narrow confines of certain very urgent needs of this or that family.

Unfortunately some of the leading spokesmen of the Party in power appear to be strangers to those standards of public morality. They don't consider them in a way they should. It appears to me that some of them have rather cultivated the art of making small things look big and big things look small, and that is a very dangerous state of mind on the part of those who sit on the Treasury Benches. Imagination should be there. It is no use trying to get away by using all kinds of pettifogging arguments.

Now before I deal with the points that have been raised by the hon. Members on that side of the House—the hon. Minister and the remarkably obliging camp-followers, if I may say so.....

10 a.m.

AN HON. MEMBER : No camp-follower here.

SHRI B. GUPTA : I mean the Congress camp. I should like to say if I am making any error here in this matter, I fear that I am erring on the side of extravagance and not at all on the side of frugality. For, probably even in our amendment we are making certain sanctions which are not admissible if you take into account the standard of living of the people and other social considerations. Some Members of the Congress Party have waxed eloquent on the merits of the Ministers as if the worth of the public men like Ministers has to be immediately price-listed in a particular Bill. We don't judge the worth in that manner. The hon. Congress Members, many of whom swear by the name of Gandhiji, seem to forget that the greater the man the bigger must be the spirit of sacrifice, and readiness to sacrifice. It is by the sacrifice and it is by the readiness to conform to social norms that a man is judged today.

Sir, I can understand their state of feeling. It seems some of them have come into a mental

state through a political metamorphosis but into that I need not go—by which they judge people by the size of their cars or probably by the number of their leveried orderlies ; but that is not our way of judging public men in such high position. Far be it from me to teach morals to our Congressmen who have almost discarded all the principles at one time enshrined in many Congress Resolutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please speak on the amendment.

SHRI B. GUPTA : I am speaking on the amendment. This is a matter of public policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Public policy need not be dilated on at this stage.

SHRI B. GUPTA : My speech will fall on deaf ears as far as that side is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Not at all.

SHRI B. GUPTA : Some mention has been made of the old Congress Resolution which fixed the highest salary at Rs. 500. Now I am very much to the point. The hon. Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyanger, with an ability that he will soon demonstrate in the coming negotiations perhaps, has sought to make out a case magnificently in order to show that the present salary—I mean the salary proposed in the Bill—is not out of tune with the Karachi Resolution. I should only like to tell him that the Karachi Resolution fixed the salary for the highest paid official of the State. And as far as I understand, the Ministers today are not the highest paid official so that when they calculate their salaries on the basis of rise in prices, they should take Rs. 500 as the starting point. Quite apart from that as has been pointed out, the Ministers are taking much more than what the Karachi Resolution would allow. That, of course, is nothing new when you remember that the Congress Ministers from the moment they took up office in 1947

[Shri B. Gupta.]

have been drawing salaries far in excess of all Resolutions passed by the Congress. And here, if I may, I would like to quote Dr. John Mathai who was one of the Ministers of the first interim Government formed in September 1946. Writing in an article which was one of a series that he was writing in the *Times of India*, entitled "Four Years in Office" he says:

"When I reached Delhi, I found that the question of revising the salary had never been considered and that it was taken for granted that the Members of the New Cabinet would draw the same remunerations as their predecessors. One of us, a leading Congressman, even drew the outfit allowance prescribed in sterling for the Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. Similarly we lived in the same large houses, with extensive grounds and spacious lawns as the Members of the former Council."

Sir, this is published in the *Times of India* of 14th August 1951. This spirit has not departed the Congress leaders since they assumed office here.

Sir, I think some facts have to be given. I find from the Budget estimates of 1951-52 that 26 Ministers, or rather 13 Cabinet Ministers, 7 Ministers of State and 6 Deputy Ministers, between them have been costing, even after deducting what are called voluntary cuts, about Rs. 7,46,100. This may be a small amount to people who are accustomed to thinking in terms of millions; but it is a very heavy amount for the poor persons who form the great majority of our citizens. Sir, there is another interesting fact to which I would like to invite your attention. A former Minister went on tour to Orissa and here is something which I would like to tell the House—I do it with authority as I always do when speaking of Government documents. A certain Minister went out to Orissa on tour and here is the expenditure incurred on him. I take it from the proceedings of the Orissa Legislative Assembly where in answer to an interpellation, the Chief Minister there replied, that certain guests from the Government of India had come and then revealed this startling fact about "Hon'ble Shri H. K. Mahtab, Minis-

ter for Industry and Supply, Government of India." He was there for a period of three days or rather four days, if you include both the days, from 10th October 1950 to 13th October 1950, and the expenditure on this guest comes to Rs. 5,340-12-3. If this is the sort of thing happening, if we are to spend Rs. 5000 and odd on a Minister, then probably the time will soon come when we shall hear people talking not of white elephants, but of Congress Ministers. Sir, these are things to which I wanted to draw the attention of the House, because these things have got to stop. It is a question of public morality and that is what I am trying to impress upon the House.

Shri Gopalaswami Ayyengar has said that the increment is very necessary because of the rise in the cost of living. He has also proposed that there should be an increase of at least 400 per cent. over the amount sanctioned by the Karachi Resolution. Then why not make the same increment in regard to the government employees and other people who are much more needy and who are really starving, and live on the verge of destitution? There is no indication that the moral principle so much upheld here would be applied in the case of these other people who are starving and are famished.

I would like to compare the figures prevailing in our country with those of other countries, but I would not take the figures of Russia or China because they would be beyond the comprehension of some of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. I would therefore mention those countries about whom they feel so enthusiastic and inspired and for whom they have got an abundance of love. If we compare India's position in regard to this matter with what is prevailing in other countries it is like this. In Britain, Sir, the annual salary of the Cabinet Minister has been set at £5,000 which is about Rs. 71,000 per year. And the *per capita* income there is Rs. 2,577. It means that

the Cabinet Minister there gets about twenty-eight times the *per capita* average income of the British citizen. Now, I come to another country—the United States of America. There, according to Act XV of 1949, the States Secretary—they do not call them Cabinet Ministers there, but they call them State Secretaries—the State Secretary draws a salary of 22,500 dollars per year, including everything. That comes to Rs. 1,12,500. And there the *per capita* income is Rs. 5,119. That is to say, the American Minister or rather the State Secretary gets about 22 times the *per capita* income of the American citizen. In Canada—another country in the Commonwealth—a Minister gets—not the Prime Minister, but the other Ministers—including car, seasonal indemnity, etc., 16,000 dollars a year ; and the *per capita* income there is 900 dollars. And so it comes to about 17 times the *per capita* income. In Australia they do not have this kind of salaries. They have a Cabinet Fund out of which the Ministers get their salaries and the salary there comes to about £1,500 and that is about 10 times the *per capita* income of a citizen in terms of the national income there. Therefore it is clear that in India we are outdoing all that, and our Ministers are outmarching all of these people in the countries I have mentioned who are their friends and from whom they get a lot of inspiration. But this is unbelievable and scandalous in India which is so poor and where poverty is writ large on the face of every common man. In this country the Ministers get 200 times the average earning of a citizen, as their salary, 200 times the *per capita* income of a citizen.

Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar has also used statistics about our suggestions on M.P.'s allowances. In view of the majority that they have, we made these proposals about allowances so that the Congress may find them acceptable. But if we had our way we would have drastically cut the allowances and made our proposals accordingly. We have not done so. We

have only made proposals which may appear reasonable to you and which you may be able to accept.

Sir, before I go to the next point I would like to refer to a little arithmetic, for that is necessary. You must calculate on the basis of arithmetic and you cannot get away from arithmetic when it does not suit you. On the basis of the *per capita* income in our land, we find that the basic wages that our Ministers are drawing every month are equal to what an Indian citizen would earn in nine and a half years. Let us have that clear in our minds. That is to say, the basic wages that the Minister who is supposed to serve the country gets in a period of one month is equal to what the average citizen in this land earns in nine and a half years. After all, Sir.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Move the amendment.

SHRI B. GUPTA : I have nearly finished. I do not want to dilate upon this point. I think I have made it clear that there is no use saying that we are imposing on you certain austerity standards or ascetic standards.

It is nothing of that kind. If you look at the Ministers and their definition of austerity—look at Shri Krishnamachari and the car which he drives—a M. G.—it would give us.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : No personal reference.

SHRI B. GUPTA : No, Sir. Since you are here, we cannot do, but look at that. After all we are not imposing austerity standards. By any means we do not want to do it. What we say is "Come to the standards that are permissible in this society today. Take into account the facts of life that exist ; take into account the sufferings and privations of millions of people ; take into account the sufferings and privations of the Government employees who are running the machine for you. You cannot

[Shri B Gupta.]
have an efficient administration when these people, thousands of them, are sunk in want and poverty. You can get neither efficiency nor devotion in that situation. Therefore, please standardise, whatever the values you hold dear. I say that the hon. Ministers should have the courage to stand up and say that we have made cuts and we are prepared to make further cuts. I know that you have a little altered your position. But the I.C. S. officers are there still drawing Rs. 4,000. Even then, you have made certain changes and from what I see in our province of West Bengal and what the Ministers are doing—I want you to set an example before them. When I think of the West Bengal Ministry. I am just reminded of Ali Baba's cave. They are running riot there. By all means set an example so that....

MR. CHAIRMAN : No reference to other States. Have you moved your amendment ?

SHRI B. GUPTA : Sir, I made a reference only to illustrate my points. If they can make reference to China and Soviet Union.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : No China. (Interruptions) Order, order.

SHRI B. GUPTA : With these words, I move my amendment :

That on page 1, in line 7, for the words 'two thousand two hundred and fifty' the words 'one thousand' be substituted ; and in line 8 on that page the words 'one thousand' be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gopalaswami, would you like to say anything or shall I put it to the vote ?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I think, Sir, so far as the amendment and the speech of my hon. friend on this amendment are concerned, it is only a continuation of the debate we had on the motion for taking the Bill into consideration. Of course, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has put a case that was argued on behalf of his group by his leader in different words.

They think there is anything in the case.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Different facts.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : ... which requires a serious reply from me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That on page 1, in line 7, for the words 'two thousand two hundred and fifty' the words 'one thousand' be substituted ; and in line 8 on that page the words 'one thousand' be deleted.

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That clause 3 stand part of the Bill

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

There is an amendment in your name, Mr. Gupta, but confine yourself to the residence.

SHRI B. GUPTA : Yes, Sir. Absolutely.

I move :

That to clause 4 of the Bill, the following proviso be added :—

"Provided that such a fully furnished residence shall not ordinarily contain more room-space than a bungalow allotted to one or more Members of Parliament."

Now, Sir, this is a very simple amendment and I think this is more or less justified by the speech that the hon. the Prime Minister.....

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal) : I suppose the former amendment was an arithmetical amendment, while the present amendment is a geometrical amendment.

SHRI B. GUPTA :made in the other House. He seems to have developed, and very rightly so, a dislike for these big houses. They are a waste for one to live or for one family to live. I suggest, Sir, that the hon. Ministers can go to the smaller houses in which we live. They can take one house where many of us are living. They will have three rooms

and many more rooms also besides and they can discharge their duties very well there. Apart from this, they have got rooms in the Parliament House and have also rooms in the Secretariat. Therefore, there will be no difficulty in their discharging their responsibilities unless they want to hold courts in their own houses. We do not need such big houses at all. Therefore, I say, come out of these houses. They are a challenge to our sense of values. They were used by those people, the people whom we hated, the British. Turn over the houses for public use, start hospitals, nursing homes or put your children, also, if you like, in creches there, but, for heaven's sake, come out of those houses. You cannot only set a good example, but also put the things to better use. Therefore, I would like to ask the hon the Defence Minister to accept my amendment. I know that he would not do it, but even so, I think that if this amendment is accepted, the housing problem to some extent would be solved. You do not use such big houses, I heard that one of the Ministers—he is no longer in the Cabinet—had a house which contained about 27 or 28 rooms. I don't know how many of the rooms were used. I also do not know how many rooms a Mughal harem contained but there must not have been many more. If you like, you can put some of the M. P.s there who can share the accommodation. We would welcome it. In that way you can solve the problem and also to some extent save your face.

PROF. G. RANGA : I was unable to support my hon. friend in regard to the other amendment and, therefore, I did not seek the opportunity of rising. So far as this amendment goes, it is not acceptable to me as it stands, but the idea behind it, as presented by our friend and not the manner in which he has done it, has considerable attraction to me. I have seen these big bungalows and many of these Ministers are unable to maintain them properly. I know the maintenance charges are met by Government, but they are not able to pay any attention even to the main-

tenance of the thing. Many of the rooms are kept in a very bad condition. Even their dining rooms are not kept in good condition, as also the scullery and the various wash rooms. They are not looked after at all by anybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN : How did you look into them all ?

PROF. G. RANGA : Fortunately, Sir, after we had attained our independence, I had the opportunity of being invited by some of our friends. I went in there and had the opportunity of seeing how our friends were maintaining their houses.

Then, there are these lawns. I think we can easily build four houses—commodious houses—in the four corners of these lawns while at the same time providing sufficient space for lawns, for gardens for airing and all these things for all these five families, including the Central building.

Secondly, it was a wrong idea on the part of the British to build one-storeyed houses here in New Delhi. We can very well afford to build two-storeyed houses at least and that would go a long way in solving our housing problem and each one of these houses which are there for most of these Ministers can be repaired and reconstructed so as to accommodate easily two Ministers and in that way we can economise very much. It would help in easing the housing problem and also the space problem in New Delhi. This lush portion or the healthy portion of New Delhi is important. There is a very great demand for this. If it is broken up into a large number of sites and built upon with a much larger number of houses—not bungalows—I am sure, Sir, not only the Ministers but all these Ministerial people—we have now nearly 35 of them and very soon it may come to 40 with Parliamentary Secretaries thrown in—and I have no objection to that—our own Members of Parliament and some of the Secretaries also can come to be accommodated and it will help in the deve-

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

lopment of a better city and a better housing position for the Ministers as well as for others.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : With the spirit underlying this amendment, I may say at once, that I personally have great sympathy, but so far as the actual terms of the amendment go, it is not possible for me to accept it. I certainly believe that the kind of houses that have been provided for Ministers could certainly be improved upon both as regards the conveniences required for the occupant and from the standpoint perhaps of economy. These buildings have come into existence in the course of years, if we were now engaged on trying to build houses which can be considered sufficient for Ministers and locate them in the minimum possible space of land and so forth, we should probably embark on a scheme of building houses for Ministers, which houses, when completed, would look very different from certainly a good many of the houses which Ministers are now obliged to occupy. But that does not come into the provisions of this Bill at all. What this Bill says is merely that a free furnished residence will be supplied to each Minister. As to what the space for each such residence should be, how it should be furnished and so on, is a matter for the Government to consider. In fact, if hon. Members wish to see their ideas translated into practice, we ought to set up a committee to evolve a type design for a Minister's residence, giving them the minimum of accommodation as they are given the minimum of salary for discharging their functions. I for one am not against it at all. The only thing I would say is, I am not quite sure if the hon. Member is trying to treat the bungalows that are provided for M. P.s as something like a model for a residence for anybody and everybody including the Members of Parliament themselves. Those bungalows require to be re-adapted to the needs of M. P.s themselves. There are certain things which would justify a certain amount of difference between the accommodation that is provided for an

M. P. and the accommodation that an unfortunate Minister has to occupy throughout the year in the climate of Delhi. So while I am in favour of a new type design—a type design which would reduce the accommodation in some of the larger bungalows which some of us are obliged to occupy—as I have said, certainly I am not in favour of inserting any amendment in this Bill. In fact, it is, I think, irrelevant to the provisions of the Bill.

SHRI B. GUPTA : In view of the sentiments expressed now, I am withdrawing my amendment, Sir.

The amendment* was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The amendment given notice of by Shri Bhupesh Gupta to clause 5 is an absolute negative and therefore it cannot be permitted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor who gave notice of an amendment to clause 7 is not here. Therefore the amendment is not moved.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are two amendments to clause 8, one given notice of by Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor and the other by Shrimati Sharda Bhargava. Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor is not here and Shrimati Sharda Bhargava does not want to move her amendment.

Clauses 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Sir, move that the Bill be passed.

*For text of the amendment, see column 3138 ante.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The motion is :

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

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN : Sir, in England and other countries in the West, the salary of the Prime Minister is double that of his colleagues.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Tajamul Husain, that question was raised by Dr. Kunzru who made out that £5,000 was the salary of the Cabinet Minister and £10,000 was the salary of the Prime Minister in U. K. Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar answered that question, but you were unfortunately away and we cannot allow that question to be raised again.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : I only want to refer to two points which the Leader of the House has pointed out in his reply. He pointed out, as a counter most probably to our argument without being able to meet my own arithmetic, that we ourselves had suggested that there should be 30 times the *per capita* income. Of course my colleague Mr. Gupta has already answered that point. When we suggest Rs. 500 for M. P. or Rs. 1,000 for a Minister, we do not contend that the present standard should be there. As I have been explaining in my speech, we were demanding certain other facilities, we were demanding a rise in the salaries of lower paid employees also. Without taking this into consideration, merely to say that we want thirty times the *per capita* income as salary for Members of Parliament is not correct.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : My hon. friend did not make that allowance in his own arithmetic when he deduced the 200-proportion.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : I related this allowance to my proposal which the Government is not prepared to accept. My proposal was to raise the wages of lower paid employees and provide amenities like a free house, medical allowance, advance for purchase of a bicycle, and so on. When they do not give all

these, they should not come with proposals for salaries which will amount to Rs. 4,000 per month. That is the point I have been making. When we suggested the pay of Rs. 500 per month as salary and allowance when the M. P.s are here, it was on the understanding that our demand on behalf of lower paid employees would also be accepted, and that nobody would receive less than Rs. 100 with immediate effect.

My second point is this. We are always told : "You are only putting forward suggestions for propaganda." Many Members on the opposite side always say that whatever we say is propaganda. There is nothing wrong in propaganda, if we can convert the Government on the other side. But they are so deaf that they refuse to accept our reasonable amendments. We suggested that Rs. 500 should be the salary of an M. P. and Rs. 1,000 should be the salary of a Minister. Further an M. P. is not given a house or a sumptuary allowance, whereas we suggested a free house for the Ministers so that we should provide proper amenities to enable them to discharge their responsible duties.

Another point which the Leader of the Council has made is that this salary is in accordance with the principles of Communism itself. I can understand this kind of statement coming from the Minister opposite, because he does not know anything about Communism. He quotes the Communist principle as being "To each according to his needs." Sir, the Communist principle is this : "From each according to his ability ; to each according to his needs." The Communists never say that this principle should apply only to Ministers. It should apply to the whole population. So, this principle can be quoted only when it is applied to all the people. We hold that it is possible only when our exploiting sections are deprived of their capacity to exploit. If that society is to be evolved, it will take years and years. Then only can the principle "From each

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

according to his ability, and to each according to his needs" be applied. It is not correct to take one portion of this principle and say that Ministers need so much and therefore we are paying it. Therefore, to say that this Bill is in accordance with the principles of Communism is nothing but distortion ; it is nothing but ignorance of the Communist principle.

Sir, we have moved certain amendments and the House has rejected them. It was never our intention to put forward impossible suggestions—suggestions which are not practicable. We wanted to suggest things which are practicable and which, if the Congress Ministers desire, they can implement immediately, and which any democratic Government would implement immediately. It is unfortunate that the Government could not see its way to act according to our suggestions.

PROF. G. RANGA : Sir, as I said at an earlier stage, I did not want to intervene in this debate. But after hearing my friend Mr. Sundarayya, I was wondering why my hon. friends from the Communist group were so very keen on this move. My hon. friend who preceded me said that it was not their intention to do propaganda. But he has no objection to doing propaganda. I agree with him. There should be no objection at all to doing propaganda, because we have got to educate our people in regard to what we believe in. What is it that my hon. friend wishes to do?

He says that he is going to provide a minimum wage of Rs. 100 immediately for all the people in this country. I challenge him and all those from whom he learns his Communism to achieve that within five years from now without violence. I tell him, and I tell his party also, that it is absolutely impossible. *(Interruption.)* I know they can do it through violence. They can rob my peasants of their produce—as it is happening in other countries behind the Iron Curtain like China. Then

they can say to the people : "You are being fed ; you are being clothed ; you are being housed ; and you are being paid Rs. 100." But if they are to do justice to all sections of the people in this country and do it in a non-violent manner, in a truly parliamentary, democratic manner, they will find themselves, through their own experience, in the position of one who talks through his hat.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : When we come into power, we will do it.

PROF. G. RANGA : They say that Rs. 1,000 should be paid. And they are now asking us to go back to the Karachi Resolution. As regards this Resolution, I would like to remind the House that even when this Resolution was first being proposed in Bombay, when the Fundamental Rights Resolution was before the A.-I.C.C., I had the honour of warning the A.-I.C.C. that Rs. 500 would not be enough, and I moved an amendment suggesting that the maximum salary should be Rs. 1,000. Why did I do so ? It is all right for me to try and appear to be living on very little if I have various other sources from which I can possibly enrich myself and manage my household. If, on the other hand, I have to remain as a public functionary, either as a Minister or as a Secretary of a Department, if I have to live as an honest citizen, as an honest functionary, then I should certainly be kept above want in society. My friend Mr. Sundarayya has said : "Well, it takes years and years to evolve a new society." That is exactly my point. It takes time. In the meanwhile, you have got to take into account the fact that we are living in a certain society. You may call it a capitalistic society, or anything you like ; but this is the society in which we are living. In this society you have to see that your functionaries are kept so far above want that you can expect from them not only efficient service but also honest service. Only the other day my friends were very loud and eloquent, and rightly so, in favour of honesty in public service and in their passion against corruption.

If you have to put down corruption, if you have to enhance the standards of honesty prevailing in our services, then, Sir, we should be willing to look to their needs. My hon. friend said here that he would not be so inclined as to ignore their needs for marriages, children's education and so on and so forth. We should be willing to pay them not only adequate but decent salaries, salaries which would keep these people above temptation and that is most necessary. My friends were themselves agreeable to this when they were saying: "Pay the lower paid officers and Government employees adequate salaries and allowances so that they would be above want, above temptation and so that you can expect honest service from these people." Now if they were to be consistent with this, they should be willing not to come forward with these puerile amendments which according to me are meaningless except for the fact that they want to do a propaganda which itself would be a misfire.

SHRI B. GUPTA : What are you doing ?

PROF. G. RANGA : I am doing the same propaganda which would not be misfired. But they should on the other hand appreciate the gesture made by the present Cabinet in coming forward to this House with their proposals. These are the proposals, as some of our friends had said, which seek to reduce the salary of a Minister at the Centre by nearly two-thirds from the standards which obtained at one time. Now it is true that in some of the States the salaries are lower. But what is the position, Sir, with regard to the standard of living of the middle class people and others ? You can get a cup of coffee in Madras for two annas. Can you get it anywhere here in Delhi, in Connaught Circus or in Old Delhi ? You cannot get anything for less than four annas. The worst possible coffee you might be able to get here and there for three annas. Naturally everything else also is more costly and so you have got to pay more and what do we suggest to pay ? What is being suggested here ? Nothing so very extraordi-

nary. They want us to go back to those countries where after all these 30 years they have been able to achieve a gradation of 1 to 20.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR : Those countries are a bugbear to you.

PROF. G. RANGA : They are no bugbear to me. The only thing is that I want to learn something from those countries. I am in a country where I am happier, people are happier, they are enjoying much greater liberty than in those countries. And that is why I do not want my people to go the way of those countries on behalf of which my friends are here as unpaid ambassadors and also advocates. (*Interruption.*) I have paid my friend a compliment by saying that he is an unpaid ambassador. If he wants to reverse that compliment, that is his lookout.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Speak on the Bill.

PROF. G. RANGA : Therefore, Sir, I think it is wrong on the part of my friends to tell us here in season and out of season that they stand for a different social philosophy and morality. Different social philosophy and morality we have got here in this country ever since Mahatma Gandhi has been teaching us. And what is the exact position here in this country ? Our Prime Minister, I know it for a fact, is obliged to spend more than what he is paid today or what he was paid even a year ago. He was in fact depending upon his income from royalties. I know of another Minister also who was drawing upon his private income. I know yet of another Minister who was helped by his friends. I do not want these Ministers to be treated in that way. I want these Ministers to be able to maintain themselves in decency so that by the time they leave their ministerial *gaddi* they would not be the poorer. They would be able to go back to their home, whatever their home may be—without any more liabilities, if that is possible. With these salaries, I am sure, Sir, that we should be satisfied and that is

[Prof. G. Ranga.]
 why I am in favour of this Bill and I am not prepared to accept the criticisms made by our friends in regard to these salaries.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is the third reading of the Bill and I am doubtful whether we can go into the details of the provisions made in this Bill. But anyhow we have to support this Bill and we do support the Bill though some of us very reluctantly, as we are not in favour of our Government and the Cabinet being subjected to criticism from the other side. We wish that our Ministers should take courage and stand to defy all the criticisms levelled against them in order to bring about improved conditions in this country. I do not know how to treat some of the amendments which were just now moved and negatived by this House. I do not know whether those amendments are to be treated with contempt or with sympathy. When I consider that these people want to make use of the platform of this Council of States for propaganda not for themselves, not for this country, but for the countries which are not concerned here, I think these amendments must be treated with contempt by everybody, every national of this country. But these amendments may also be treated with sympathy because our friends of the Opposition did not know what they were doing. They are just like children. If you give a sword in the hands of a child to cut the throat of his enemy and warn him by saying, "Be careful, it is very dangerous. You must not cut your own hand or any part of your body", even then after some time the boy will try that sword on his own neck and cut his own neck. That is the condition of our friends sitting on the Opposition and sending this sort of amendments. I have got examples to show how they have brought about chaotic conditions in our country by their unwise policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is not necessary here.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE : I am only warning our Government to take note of what I am going to state now. I do not want the Government to reduce the standard of living any further. We are reluctant to pass this Bill of reduction. We wanted to increase the emoluments of Ministers because we know that on the Ministers' standard of living depends the prestige and prosperity of this country. We are not in favour of reducing our standard of living. We have been fighting all our life to upgrade, to raise the standard of living of the masses and if we initiate a policy today of reducing the standard of those men who are to fight for raising the standard of living of the masses, automatically the standard which is contemplated goes down.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA : You will start from the Ministers ?

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE : I wish our Ministers not to submit themselves to the threats of Opposition and further reduce the emoluments that we are going to pass today. Of course we would have supported if they had brought out an amending Bill to increase these salaries because we want to raise the standard of living.

Now I will cite one example for future guidance of this country, to show how the attitude of the hon. Members on the other side of this House in the trade union movement of this country proved dangerous. These people tried to organise the working classes of our country and they initiated a policy because they were not true to organise or they were not true to raise the standard of the workers in our country.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mukerjee, we are not now discussing the trade union movement. We are discussing the Salaries Bill.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE : I want to cite an example that in the trade union movement they were opposed to the subscription to be paid by the members of trade unions and they were also opposed to the

salaries to be paid to the Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the trade unions. What was the result ? They fought tooth and nail and I have no hesitation in admitting here today that as we made a mistake 30 years back when we were afraid of their threats, their challenge, their criticism, the trade union movement of this country could not prosper during these years and I want everybody to take note of this that they did not want any subscription from the trade union workers, from the trade union members. Therefore, the trade unions could not pay their officials and when they could not pay the officials, either the officials did go and encourage corruption somewhere or depended on the pittance sent from other countries to corrupt this country, to sell this country to another foreign nation. That was their theory then and we are feeling today the disastrous consequences of that propaganda, of their threats, of their criticism. It is not good for us to submit to the criticisms, coming from the other side. We should not be guided by their criticism. We should have the courage to stand up to them and rebut their criticism. Whether the hon Ministers take Rs. 2,200 or Rs. 3,300 or Rs. 4,400 they will always be criticised. If the hon. Ministers do honorary work, even then they will be criticising the Ministers. Their criticism will always remain because this criticism which they level against the Congress and the Congress Ministers is not for the betterment of this country but for the betterment of another land, which they call their fatherland.

Another thing, Sir. I cannot understand the meaning of this amendment. It is a contradiction in terms. A man should be paid according to the needs. I do not think anybody has read these amendments carefully. They are so fantastic that they should not be treated seriously. If any Member reads these amendments carefully, he will find that it is provided that Ministers should get Rs. 1,000 and Deputy Ministers should get Rs. 750. I do not know why this difference between Ministers and Deputy

Ministers. They are performing the same kind of duties, the same type of jobs, the same type of work.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : You ask Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar to explain.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE : The whole difficulty is that they are not serious about these amendments. They are not serious about the salaries which will be paid under this Bill. They are serious about one thing only and that is to criticise. Whatever the measure may be, they will criticise. Therefore my submission is that our Ministers should not try any more to reduce their emoluments that have been passed today. If at any time they feel that these scales of salaries and allowances are not sufficient, let them not feel shy to come forward again and ask us to increase the remuneration. One friend said that Ministers are not living today in the position in which Ministers should live, they are not maintaining their houses as Ministers should. This is not a very good sign for the country where 40 crores of people live.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think you have spoken more on the amendments and other things. It is only the stage now for general consideration.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE : I request the Government and our Ministers not to try to reduce their remuneration any further because of criticism from the other side. If they bring a Bill again to increase their emoluments, we will be only too glad to pass it.

11 a.m.

SHRI B. GUPTA : We have been subjected to such harsh criticism at this third reading stage that I would like to say a few words. It was not my intention to participate in the debate but we have been subjected to such malicious attacks which are nothing uncommon from those hon. Members. We have been accustomed to this kind of political delirium in this House before and it is not anything new. If we make suggestions and if we speak on the basis of certain facts, they

[Shri B. Gupta.]

call us propagandists and various other kinds of names. When they do this, I think they are trampling under foot all sense of public morality. Do they want, Sir, I want to ask you, this Parliament to be turned into a Fascist Grand Council where these people can come and praise their Ministers, demonstrate their sycophancy and exhibit their propensity for flattery, or do they come here to accept Opposition criticism, to understand our point of view and try to give effect to it in so far as it is possible ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I want to point out to you that, while the Government have negatived the first amendment, so far as the second amendment is concerned the Leader of the House has expressed his sympathy with it. A gentleman got up and talked as you sometimes talk also and so many other people talk. I am merely putting it to you that the Leader of the House had expressed his sympathy with your amendment and you were good enough to withdraw your second amendment in the light of the assurance given. That gentleman has spoken and you have spoken and I think that is enough now for the present.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay) : Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to speak on this Bill which I consider to be a harmless one and an ideal set before the country. The Leader of the Communist Party wants the minimum wage to be Rs. 100 for everyone in the country, especially the Government employees, and Rs. 1,000 to be the maximum for Ministers who are carrying all the burdens of the State. I have a few observations to make on this point. Mr. Ranga replied that they can achieve that ideal of Rs. 100 minimum wage only by violent means. I say, Sir, that even by violent means this ideal of a minimum wage of Rs. 100 cannot be achieved in this country in a short time. It is not by violent means or by the distribution of wealth that the standard of wages can be increased. It can be done only by the production of additional wealth. It is only by this means that the standard

of living can be raised in this country. If my hon. friends on the other side put obstacles in the way of the constructive ideas by which this Government stands and which they want to translate into a reality in the next five years, I think the desire to have a minimum wage of Rs. 100 for the ordinary worker will be delayed for a very much longer time. It is only by the creation of wealth that the standard of wages can be increased. It is only with such ideals in view that the Ministers have accepted this low wage of Rs. 2,250 which is hardly sufficient for their requirements, hardly commensurate with the onerous duties they discharge. When they have accepted this wage, they have accepted it with the idea of showing to the Indian public that sacrifices are required for the country. They are setting an example before the country. I hope that Members on the other side understand it in the right spirit. This is all what I wanted to say.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAID YA (Madhya Bharat):

श्री कन्हैयालाल जी० वैद्य (मध्य भारत): अध्यक्ष महोदय, अपोजिट बेंचेज (opposite benches) से समय समय पर अनावश्यक और कभी कभी बहुत भद्दी बातें कही जाती हैं। अभी हाल ही में यहां तक कहा गया कि कम्युनिज्म की जानकारी हमारे हाउस के लीडर को है ही नहीं। इसका उत्तर तो वे ही देंगे किन्तु हम इस सदन में बैठकर इस साइड (side) के लोग इतना ही कह सकते हैं कि सत्ता की भूख को ले करके हम इन सीटों पर नहीं बैठे हैं और देश के लिये अधिक से अधिक त्याग करने में हम लोग कभी पीछे नहीं रहे हैं। इस देश में महात्मा गांधी ने जो कुछ रास्ता हमें बताया और उनके समय में जो कराची में प्रस्ताव रखा गया था, उस प्रस्ताव को सामने रख कर ही जवाहर लाल जी ने इस देश के सामने इस बिल को रखा है और दूसरे सदन में अर्थात् हाउस आफ दि

पीपुल्स में जो कुछ भी इस विषय में उन्होंने कहा है उसमें स्पष्ट कर दिया था कि जनता द्वारा जो क्रिटिसिज़्म हो रहे हैं उनका विचार करते हुए ही यह बिल लाया गया है। लीडर आफ़ दि हाउस ने भी यहां इस चीज़ को स्पष्ट कर दिया है कि जवाहर लाल जो वे व्यक्ति हैं कि जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर होते हुए भी उस से अधिक कोई रकम को लेना मंज़ूर नहीं करेंगे, जितनी वे अपने साथियों के लिये देना चाहते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं समझता हूं कि उस महान् क्रांति को जो कि महात्मा गांधी ने की थी महात्मा गांधी के उत्तराधिकारी के रूप में जिस व्यक्ति ने सफलता पर पहुंचाया उसने उसी भावना को ले कर इस बिल को रखा है।

स्वतन्त्र होने पर भी आज जहां इस देश में असमानताएँ हैं, जहां अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद की देन सामन्तशाही और जमींदारशाही रही है और जहां अभी तक राजप्रमुखों की एक संस्था चली आ रही है और जहां आई० सी० एस० और सिविलियंस आज भी बड़ी बड़ी तनख्वाहें ले रहे हैं, उन सब के सामने इस बिल के रूप में जो आदर्श माननीय प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने अपनी तनख्वाह कम करके रखा है, क्या वह हृदय परिवर्तन के लिये, 'चेंज आऊ हार्ट' के लिये प्रेरणा देने वाला नहीं है? क्या इसका असर उन पूंजीपतियों के हृदय पर नहीं होगा, जो कि हज़ारों रुपये कम्पनियों के डाइरेक्टर और मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर के रूप में मासिक खींचते हैं? हमारी संस्कृति का यह तकाजा है और जिस राजनीति को हमने "नान-वायलेंट" (non-violent) रूप में हृदय परिवर्तन की भावना से चलाया है, उसका भी यह तकाजा है कि हम हृदय परिवर्तन की भावना को ले कर साम्यवाद की स्थापना यहां करें। लेकिन यह साम्यवाद अथवा समाजवाद वह समाजवाद नहीं है, जिसे

कि दूसरे देश की साम्यवादी धाराओं को लेकर हम चलाना चाहेंगे। वैसा करना तो बिल्कुल धोखा होगा। मैं तो कहता हूं कि इस देश का प्रत्येक प्रगतिशील व्यक्ति समाजवाद को लाने के लिये प्रयत्नशील है और यह वह समाजवाद है, जिसका नेतृत्व महात्मा गांधी ने किया था और जिस 'क्लासलेस सोसाइटी' (classless society) के सिद्धान्त को उन्होंने हमारे सामने रखा था। मैं सामने बैठे हुए मित्रों को विश्वास दिलाता हूं कि जो इन बैठों पर बैठे हुए हम लोग हैं, जो हमारा मंत्रिमंडल है, जो कि जवाहरलाल जो के नेतृत्व में शासन कर रहा है, वह देश को निश्चित रूप से उस ओर ले जायेगा, उस समाजवाद की ओर ले जायेगा जिसकी कि महात्माजी ने कल्पना की थी और उन आदर्शों की पूर्ति जरूर होगी जिनके लिये विरोधी बैठों से बड़े बड़े नारे लगाये जाते हैं; किन्तु वह कार्य महात्मा जी द्वारा बताये हुये मार्ग पर चल कर ही होगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूं और आशा करता हूं कि हमारे देश के दूसरे सामन्ती तत्व, जिनके विरुद्ध आज जनता उभर रही है और जिन राजप्रमुखों के बारे में विधान का प्रश्न उठ रहा है और जो ऊंची तनख्वाहें लेने वाले आई० सी० एस० के लोग हैं, वे इस आदर्श का अनुसरण करेंगे, जिसको कि हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने इस बिल के रूप में देश के सामने रखा है।

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexure No. 75.]

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to keep the Council for any length of time by way of replying to the speeches that have been made on the third reading of

[Shri N. Gopalaswami.] this Bill. I shall confine myself to two points. The first is that I wish to remove from the mind of hon. Members like my hon. friend Mr. Mookerji a thorough going misapprehension of the reasons which served to persuade Government to bring a Bill of this sort before this House. I do not know if he meant all that he said and implied. He suggested that Government had shown some weakness in yielding to criticisms from the parties or groups which compose the Opposition in this House and he warned us against repeating this weakness in the future and bringing in an amendment Bill which would reduce the emoluments of Ministers even further. This is a thorough going misconception. I thought I made it perfectly clear when I made my first motion for taking the Bill into consideration that the Government's decision was made in response to public opinion. Government did take into account all that public opinion and because they considered that opinion reasonable, they examined the whole matter and came forward with a Bill for enacting this legislation. That public opinion was largely that of the Indian National Congress in the country. It was not the opinion which was voiced by groups opposed to the Indian National Congress that persuaded us to come to this position and I think my hon. friend has misjudged public opinion if he thought that this Bill was not in consonance with the opinion of that section, the overwhelming section of the people of this country of whom he is himself a representative in this House. That is one thing I want to get clear.

The second thing is a matter which arises from the speech of my hon. friend the Leader of the Communist Group on this third reading. He charged me with a certain amount of ignorance of the Communist doctrine. I believe he used the word 'ignorance'. It is perhaps difficult for me sitting where I am to claim the intimate familiarity with Communist doctrine that sitting where he is, he should be expected to claim. But let

me tell him that I have read his masters also—Karl Marx. Engels and the rest of them—and while without entering into conversation with him on more intimate levels, it will be difficult for me to claim that my knowledge of what they had written is superior to his, I think I still can claim a certain amount of familiarity with the doctrine for which they stood and which my hon. friends on the other side are supposed to implement in the conditions of the present day. I respect a good deal of what they had said but I am not one of those who have placed Karl Marx above the Bhagvad Gita and if I sometimes have looked upon what they have said and written with a critical eye, it is only because I have tried to use such intelligence as I possess in trying to judge whether I would allow their dogma to guide my own life.

Now, coming to the particular point about which he charged me with ignorance, he said that I had used the words 'to each according to his needs' without understanding their full import. He made two points. One was that it was only half the doctrine as enunciated. The full doctrine was 'from each according to his capacity'. I think that was the word used though my hon. friend used the word 'ability'. "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs."

I certainly concede the position that these two things are usually juxtaposed. But it took my breath away to see the kind of inference he tried to draw from that juxtaposition. He seemed to suggest that unless you took from each according to his capacity, you could not give to each according to his needs. Now, what does this imply? I think he agreed that when we say, "To each according to his needs" we do not confine the "each" to the Ministers with whom this Bill is concerned. We are really referring to each person in the whole population of the country. What does it mean then? Are you going to deny to each according to his needs, because you have not taken from each member of the population

of the country according to his capacity ? Or are you going to deny yourself the application of the principle—"From each according to his capacity" until you have reached a stage when you could give to each according to his needs ? If that is the proposition for which the hon. Member stands.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : If I am given a little time, I will explain the position.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No need. There is a well-known saying that nobody has full knowledge of Communism; there are only varying degrees of ignorance. So let us not get into doctrinal discussions.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Sir, the hon. Member launched upon a doctrinaire discussion and charged me with ignorance, forgetting that there was very much greater ignorance on his part of his own doctrine than any ignorance on my part of his doctrine.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : The very speech of the hon. Minister shows that he is ignorant.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes, there are different degrees.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : It is difficult, Sir. It must be a case of different degrees of ignorance when you enter into what is known as Marxian dialectics. There is so much ignorance and so much knowledge also that it is difficult to say who is ignorant and who is well-informed. I shall say no more so far as the debate on the third reading of the Bill is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is:

That the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

THE COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY BILL, 1952

MR. CHAIRMAN : We now take up the next item :

"That the Bill to provide for the appointment of Commissions of Inquiry and for vest-

ing such Commissions with certain powers, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.)

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras) : Sir, before the hon. Minister moves this Bill, may I submit that this is a Bill which affects the privileges of this House and as such, I feel it absolutely necessary that the author of this Bill—the hon. Shri Kailas Nath Katju—should himself move this Bill. As it is, it is only the Lower House that is given the power to pass any Resolution for the appointment of Commissions and that means that a privilege of this House is being ignored. The procedure in our Parliament is based on that of the Parliament of England and there I may point out that the English Constitution has provided that the Upper House also has the power to pass similar Resolutions along with the Lower House. That being so, I cannot understand why this provision has been ignored here. It is for this reason that I submit that the author of this Bill might kindly move this Bill.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : May I say a word ? Sir, this Bill is one for which the Government as a whole are responsible. There is the principle of collective responsibility and for everything that is put before the House it is the Cabinet as a whole that is responsible.

Now it is true that the Member in charge of a Bill should be usually the person who should pilot it even in this House; but the exigencies of public business today are such that the Minister is wanted in both the Houses at the same time and he cannot possibly be present at both the places at the same time. So far as my colleague the Law Minister is concerned, I am sure he will do more than full justice to any debate that may take place in this House on this Bill, and I suggest that my hon. friend may accept that position.