

MR. CHAIRMAN : He may resume his speech tomorrow. We will take up the half an hour discussion now.

18-30 hrs.

**HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION
REVISION OF PENSION RULES**

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sondhi.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI (Katihar) : Before he rises to initiate the discussion, I want to say one thing. I do not raise the issue of quorum now, but there was a gentleman's agreement between different parties that quorum would not be questioned after 5.30 P.M. I think Shri Sondhi remembers what happened last Monday when there was a half-an hour discussion in my name,

Because some Members of the Jan Sangh raised that question on that day, there was no quorum and I was deprived of the opportunity of putting question as the debate had to be adjourned. I want this condition to be fulfilled by Mr. Sondhi; from next time onwards he must control his party so that this question will not be raised.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : The hon. Member has been my neighbour and the saying is : treat thy neighbour as thyself. I shall say only that to him.

The purpose of this half-an-hour is to urge government to agree to a detailed consideration of the measures which must be taken to modernise the pension system in our country because this country and this government in particular aspires to make us a welfare state.

I feel free to confess that the subject matter of pension has not received the attention which it deserves by all sections of this House and also the various unions of government employees. The Government of India and the state Governments have shirked their responsibility and have ignored those who retired from public service. Today their plight is most pitiable.

The Committee on Petitions of the Lok Sabha deserved our congratu-

lations for the excellent manner in which they have highlighted the injustice to pensioners who are unable to press their demand with anything resembling militancy.

The House should make its views clear to the Finance Minister and to the Government and ask the Finance Ministry to give high priority to pensions in their programme. First, I think we are right in asking for a pensions Commission which should review the law on the subject and enquire into the conditions of pensioners in the country and should outline and social measures for a Modern Pensions Scheme. As you know, the present Act is coming from the last century and was based on a very out dated British Law. The Minister in his reply may say, as he did on an earlier occasions also, that they have medified the system. I dispute this because the system is an antiquated system. Secondly we should ask the Government to take steps to implement the recommendations on the Committee on Petitions. Thirdly, the government should accept the civilised principle of regular periodic revision of pension scales. Fourthly, the Government must evolve a machinery for consultation with pensioners whose representatives should receive the most careful attention from them because they are a section of our population, a minority, who are perhaps the weakest minority in this country and therefore special protection of this weak minority is an obligation of this Government if it prefers to call itself a civilised Government. Otherwise it is a satanic government to use Gandhi Ji's phrase.

I seek the compassion of all Members of this House for the lowest paid category of pensioners who are today living in a condition which can be described only as that of living death.

The Minister of Finance takes shelter under the plea of lack of resources. Is this on argument which can be sustained if one refers to the large and unproductive schemes which this government has embarked on for political reasons or for reasons of prestige. Political mismanagement of our country has made it possible for people to destroy public property and

the losses are in crores of rupees. One has only to see, as my friend Mr. Fernandes mentioned the other day, at the conspicuous expenditure on wasteful items in the capital such as the colossal expenditure on those glaring lights on the Republic Day. Why is this Government which claims to be following Gandhi Ji's principle is spending money on these illuminations in the most garish manner possible for forgetting the aesthetic beauty of the gentle radiance one can see on the face of free people which is the best celebration in a free country? What do they do? In our traditional culture elderly people of our land are entitled to respect for their social cooperation.

I invite the attention of the Finance Minister here to the glaring injustice, cruelty, which society is heaping upon our aged members who have served this Government. The high rise in the cost of living has made it impossible for them to make both ends meet. We know that the Government yields to pressure on various occasions. Can these pensioners be expected to come here in large numbers and hold militant demonstrations? They cannot.

Therefore, what is the significance of the subject-matter of pensions to the Government and to this House? I think there are three main points. Firstly, pensions are deferred pay and not charity. Mr. Morarji Desai is in the habit of development always an attitude which is very condescending. We do not ask for charity. We ask for justice. It is deferred pay which has to be given to them. Secondly, pensions in a modern country affect the conditions of service today, because, the Government employees of today are the pensioners of tomorrow. Government are ignoring this. Therefore, I want to know—I do not know if they are serious about the improvement of the administration of this country. Thirdly, Government, as I said earlier, must protect the minority. We talk of communal minority. That is out-of-date today. These pensioners are the real minority, who are to be protected, and as a matter of fact, there should be a statutory commission for pensioners, if you have one for the backward classes and for

other categories also. Because, in the words of one of our newspapers, I quote :

“They should not be made to feel that they are a neglected and forgotten body of men who have been written off merely because the Government considers that they have outlived their usefulness to it.”

There are many other considerations which have been suggested. The Minister, in the course of his reply in this House, said that he was considering this matter; the report which was made by the Committee on Petitions which suggested an *ad hoc* relief of about 10 per cent, and they suggested that the pension should be 50 per cent of the emoluments last drawn. They also suggested raising the minimum to Rs. 50 per mensem. Are these unreasonable demands? Where is that cry of social justice which they used to raise earlier? If they cannot work on this priority, let them realise what they have said here : because, this very Minister gave an assurance in this House that he is considering the matter. What other matter he is considering? Is it group politics in the party? What other matter is he considering? This should be a priority item because so many pensioners are literally starving today. Let the Government bring a comprehensive Bill and take this House into confidence today. Does not the Government know the facts relating to the miserable conditions of these pensioners? What is a monthly pension of Rs. 15 today, with the soaring prices in most cities and most towns? People who retired a decade ago receive a certain amount of pension and today that amount is a fictional amount. There is nothing real in it, and that continues to be their pension today. These semi-starving people point a finger at this Government which brings this country into disrepute because we cannot go abroad and tell them these conditions. The conditions in the advanced, developed countries are being pointed out. Brazil is a developing country. It gives a pension which is near about the full value of the pay drawn. There are other countries which are supposed to be developing and they have a modernised pension system, but here.

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

the requirements of the old are not recognised by the Indian law. This antiquated Indian law continues and this Government shows indifference. I appeal to the Government, let indifference give way to innovation.

There is a former Parliamentarian who has continued to voice the feelings of the pensioners. I allude to Mr. B. Shiva Rao, because I think his words should carry much weight in these matters. He says :

"A new Act is necessary in India to replace the country-old measure on the Statute-Book, with changes which a welfare State (which we claim to be) owes to those who spent the best years of their lives in the service of the State."

The Pensioners Act of 1871 was framed, as I said earlier, on the basis of the Pensions Act in vogue in Britain. This Government talks of the Commonwealth; sticks to the Union Jack and sticks to all these alien symbols. They also stick to this old Act which an imperial I power had followed. Do they not have a sense of self-respect in these matters? If they do not want to bring a new law, they copy an old law; they do not have any originality. Let them have a sense of national self-respect. Even the Conservative Party in Britain is bringing a change; it is rejecting the plea of resources shortage. But this social-Walfarist State, the Avadi socialists, are more conservative than the Conservatives of Britain, I dare say that the Minister will get up and make a plea of resources shortage.

I challenge him to show his originality and face the music when he meets Mr. Morarji Desai.

The pensioners submitted a memorial to the Prime minister signed by 20,000 pensioners. That was presumably thrown in the waste paper basket. They went to meet Mr. Morarji Desai, I would not like to repeat the words in which the pensioners described the humiliation they felt after meeting Mr. Morarji Desai. What is wanted is a modest increase and

an understanding of the difficulties of these who are in the evening of their life. Some times we rise to pay tributes to the memory of those who have left us. Is that not a moment to remember that these aged citizens in the evening of their life—should they not continue to be useful citizens?

On the one hand, this Government claims that life expectancy is going up. Naturally, we will have more aged people. They want family planning. It means, the proportion of aged people will rise towards the end of the century. They say, there are so many other people in impoverishment. Is there not a difference? These people who have served you well, to whom you gave a certain pension when they retired, have become impoverished due to no fault of their own but due to no fault of their own but due to the mismanagement of the finances of this country. Other people may be impoverished on account of various other reasons. They must provide some money for this purpose. If this Government harnesses science and technology, if it undertakes wise political management, if it is imbued with a social purpose and with a sense of social justice, if it understands the aspirations of youth in the country, it would not neglect the basis needs of this country in the name of economy. The cry of pensioners today is an anguished cry for justice. Let the ministers rise to the occasion. Let this minister, who looks to be a younger man, assert his sense of youthfulness and show that he can rise to the occasion and if discipline means enslavement, let him break the bonds of slavery and declare that he will give priority to the pensioners and, if he fails, he is prepared to quill office.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C. SETHI) : Sir, part (a) of the original question put by the hon. member in the House was :

"whether it is a fact that the existing Pension Rules are as old as 100 years ago."

In answer to it, factual information was given. It is true that the Pension Act is as old as 80 years. Part (b) was :

"If so, whether Government propose to revise these rules to meet the grievances of Government employees"

I now find that what the hon. member had in mind was not Government employees but pensioners. Our answer was based on the question he had asked. May be the hon. member was not satisfied with the answer. Now it is clear that he had in mind not employees, but pensioners.

Regarding the Act being old, there are many old Acts in this country like the Indian Penal Code of 1860 and the Cr. P. C. of 1898. It is not a question of revising the Acts. There is a provision in the Constitution—article 309—under which from time to time Government have been amending the CSPRs. According to that, the position of the pensions admissible to the retiring Government servants has been improving from time to time. Till 1949 there was no family pension, and no terminal gratuity to temporary employees. The DCR gratuity was not available. In the year 1950 the gratuity scheme was introduced. Similarly, in 1950 we started with a landmark. The family pension scheme was started in 1950. It was never in existence before. It was available for five years up to a maximum of Rs. 150. Now it is available to the widow till her life time, to the minor children till they become majors or to the daughters till they are married. The gratuity scheme also came in 1950 and the pensioners started getting gratuity. This family pension scheme was revised in 1957 and instead of allowing it for five years it was raised to ten years. Now, according to the 1964 revision, it is allowed till the life-time of the widow and till the minor sons become major. This was a great change as far as emoluments concerned. The gratuity system also changed.

Previously pension was allowed only on the basis of permanent service and temporary service was not taken into account. In 1949 quasi permanent service was also included. In the year 1950 half temporary service and full quasi-permanent service was included.

In 1960 there came a complete change by which full temporary service followed by permanent service was taken into account and benefit of six months period was allowed.

Therefore, it is not correct to say that the position of retiring Government servants has not improved from time to time.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : The question is about the quantum now that the prices have gone up.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : Quantum is related to the conditions in the country and the emoluments that the pensioners were getting when they retired.

The First Pay Commission's recommendations were considered, their effect was measured and it came in the form of decisions of the Government in regard to pensioners. It was only after measuring the effect of the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission in 1959 that the Government came forward with measures in 1960 and the position was revised. In both the cases of merger of dearness allowance the benefit has accrued to the pensioners. Therefore, since 1964 there is no pensioner who is getting less than Rs. 25 and it is not correct to say that pensioners are getting Rs. 10 and Rs. 15.

SHRI M. N. REDDY (Nizamabad) : is Rs. 25 a big sum ?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : (Bombay South) : Member of Parliament are getting Rs. 31 a day as allowance.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : The Parliamentary Committee has recommended the minimum of Rs. 50. Let the Minister take this opportunity to announce it.

SHRI NAMBIAR : There are many who get less than Rs. 25. May I take it as a promise that in those cases their pension will be brought up to Rs. 25 ?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : As far as the year 1969-70 is concerned the total budget

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

estimates for pension is Rs. 5.82 crores for civil, Rs. 32.46 crores for defence and Rs. 6.35 crores for Railway making a total of Rs. 44.63 crores. So the quantum which is being spent on pension is not a merge amount and even an increase of Rs. 5 per pensioner would mean an increase in the total by Rs. 4 crores.

For an increase of Rs. 7.50 the total impact would be Rs. 6 crores; for an increase of Rs. 10 the total impact would be Rs. 8 crores per year. Even for a slight increase in pension the total impact on the revenue of the country is not minor; it is substantial.

Certainly, we have before us the recommendations of the Rajya Sabha Committee. Now we have before us the recommendations of the Lok Sabha Committee. One of the recommendations of Lok Sabha Committee is that pensioners should be given DA on the same scale as government employees. It will cost the government about Rs. 45 crores a year. So, this is not a small matter which can be considered in a light-hearted manner. All these reports have to be examined very carefully.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Appoint a commission to examine them.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : From time to time we appoint Pay Commissions.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I was referring to Pension Commission.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : The Pay Commission considered the Problems of the pensioners also. Therefore, it is not necessary to have a separate commission for pensioners.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : These are not your views; these are the views of of Shri Morarji.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : Well, I am part of the government. I cannot express views different from that of the government. Now, the recommendations of the committee are under examination, in consultation with the Home Ministry.

Therefore, I would not agree when it is said that the question of pensioners is not examined from time to time. It has been examined from time to time Government will examine the recommendations of the Lok Sabha Committee in consultation with the Home Ministry. I would not say that this question will be favourably considered or unfavourably considered. The entire matter is under examination. Whenever any question of general revision of the pay scales or the general revision of the pensions comes up for consideration, these recommendations would also be considered. Now as the examination is going on I would only like to repeat what the Deputy Prime Minister said in the other House.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : HMV.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : That is not the view of only the present Finance Minister Several other Finance Ministers have expressed the same view. In 1965 Shri T. T. Krishnamachari Stated :

“Certainly, it is not a question of having sympathy. The sympathy is there—but the question of resources.

SHRI SACHIN CHAUDHURI : another Finance Minister, took the same line in a statement which he made in the Rajya Sabha on the 12th May 1966. The Deputy Prime Minister, while answering to supplementaries on SQ No. 91 in the Rajya Sabha stated on 7th June 1967 as follows :

“Government have not the capacity of removing the hardships of the pensioners because of the non-availability of resources.”

This position stands. It is not as if we are lacking in sympathy for the pensioner. We certainly do consider the difficulties of the pensioners. But it is a question of resources. The total impact of the increased expenditure has to be taken into consideration. I can only say that the report is still under examination. At the present juncture I would not be in a position to say anything more than what the Deputy Prime Minister said in the other House,

श्री शिबचन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : सभापति जी, बेलफेयर स्टेट में जो लक्ष्य रखा जाता है उस में यही नहीं है कि गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लॉईज के लिए पेंशन की व्यवस्था हो, बल्कि मकसद यह होता है कि तमाम लोगों के लिए प्रोव्जिडेंट पेंशन की व्यवस्था हो। पूंजीवादी समाज में भी ऐसा हो रहा है, अमेरिका में, 85 या 90 डालर प्रोव्जिडेंट पेंशन के रूप में दिया जाता है। तो मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी कर्मचारी के पेंशन की व्यवस्था तो आप ने की है लेकिन जो सरकारी कर्मचारी नहीं है या दूसरे मुहकमों में काम करते हैं उन की तरफ से जो पेंशन की मांग है उसकी कितनी पेटिशंस आप के पास आई हैं ? जैसे आप के गवर्नमेंट स्कूल का टीचर है, उसको पेंशन मिलती है लेकिन नान-गवर्नमेंट स्कूल के टीचर को नहीं मिलती है। वह लोग मांग करते हैं कि पेंशन मिलनी चाहिये। तो ऐसी कैटेगरी के जो वर्कर या कर्मचारी हैं उनकी कितनी संस्थाओं की तरफ से आप के पास पेटिशंस आई हैं और क्या आप का रेस्पॉन्स रहा है ?

दूसरा सवाल है कि अभी आप ने कहा कि 25 रुपया पेंशन आप देते हैं। आज की मंहगाई के जमाने में इस में क्या आप जांच करेंगे कि यह बहुत कम है और इसको आप ऊपर उठाने की व्यवस्था करेंगे या नहीं ?

तीसरा सवाल यह है जि सरकारी कर्मचारी के अलावा और सारे देश में प्रोव्जिडेंट पेंशन की व्यवस्था हो मौजूदा स्टैंडर्ड के मुताबिक तो उसमें कितनी रकम लगेगी, टोटल इसका कोई एस्टीमेट आप के पास है ?

चौथा सवाल यह है कि चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में पेंशन के मुताबिक आपकी क्या नीति होगी और उसकी क्या ब्राडलाइन्ज हैं ?

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : सभापति महोदय, अभी चन्द दिनों पहले

इंग्लिस्तान की सरकार ने अपना बजट पेश किया, उन्होंने अपने पेंशनरों की पेंशन में 10 प्रतिशत बढ़ोत्तरी करने का एलान किया हर पांच साल या तीन साल में इंग्लिस्तान में पेंशनरों की तनख्वाहों में कुछ फीसदी के हिसाब से बढ़ोत्तरी की जाती है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को यह भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि जो देश अपने मुल्क के बड़े लोगों की, विशेष कर ऐसे लोगों को जिन्होंने सरकारी नौकरी के जरिये देश की सेवा की है, देख नहीं सकता, वह देश कभी भी अपने कर्रैक्टर को नहीं बना सकता—जहाँ के लोग इसी सिद्धान्त को मान कर चलते हैं और जब भी वहाँ पर पेंशन के बारे में बहस होती है तब इसी सिद्धान्त को सामने रखकर वे लोग चलते हैं। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि हमारी सरकार इस सिद्धान्त को मानती है या नहीं, लेकिन यहाँ पर हमेशा रिसोर्सेज वाला मामला उठाया जाता है। मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा कहना इस सरकार को शोभा नहीं देता। आप यहाँ 30 लाख रुपया खर्च करके प्रधान मंत्री के लिए एक नया मकान बनाने जा रहे हैं, करोड़ों रुपया खर्च करके दिल्ली और अन्य शहरों के व्यूटीफिकेशन का काम चल रहा है। पिछले साल जब प्रधान मंत्री दक्षिणी अमरीका के दौरे पर गईं—उन की तस्वीर तैयार करने के लिए, दक्षिणी अमरीका के लोगों को प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में बतलाने के लिए एक छोटीसी बुकलेट छपवाने पर साढ़े नौ लाख रुपया खर्च किया गया। ऐसे लाखों उदाहरण में दे सकता हूँ। सभापति महोदय आप भी इन उदाहरणों से वाकिफ हैं—इस तरह से यह सरकार करोड़ों रुपया खर्च करती है।

सभापति महोदय, मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब लोक सभा की पेटिशन्ज कमेटी ने पिछले दो वर्षों में इस समस्या पर विचार करके अपनी रिपोर्ट दी है—मंत्री महोदय, कहेंगे कि उस पर पिछले सत्र में बहस हो चुकी है—लेकिन सभापति महोदय

[श्री शिवचन्द्र भा]

दो वर्ष पहले जब मैं इस कमेटी में था, तब इस कमेटी ने इस मसले पर विचार किया था और इतना ही नहीं इस कमेटी ने इस बार अपनी सिफारिश पेश की है—काफा गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करने के बाद उन सिफारिशों को पेश किया गया है—मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उन सिफारिशों को स्वीकार करने में सरकार को क्या तकलीफ है।

सभापति महोदय, पेटीशन्ज कमेटी इस सदन की कमेटी है, स्पीकर महोदय उस कमेटी को नियुक्त करते हैं—क्या उसकी सिफारिशों को अस्वीकार करना उस कमेटी का अपमान नहीं होगा। संसद द्वारा बनाई हुई इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को आपके उप-प्रधान मंत्री अस्वीकार करें—मैं आपोप नहीं उठाना चाहता हूँ, वरना मामला बहुत बढ़ जायेगा आपके प्रधान मंत्री अस्वीकार करें, आपकी सरकार अस्वीकार करें क्या यह इस संसद का अपमान नहीं है। इस सदन के किसी एक व्यक्ति के अधिकार के बारे में अगर बाहर कहीं भी कोई चर्चा हो, तो हम यहां पर विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न उठाते हैं। जब आप इस कमेटी की दी हुई रिपोर्ट को इस ढंग से ठुकराते हैं, रिसोर्सेज का बहाना लेकर, जो बिलकुल भ्रूठ है, गलत है, क्या इससे इस कमेटी और सदन का अपमान नहीं होता है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ—जैसा आपने कहा है कि राज्य सभा की कमेटी की दी हुई रिपोर्ट और लोक सभा की कमेटी की दी हुई रिपोर्ट पर आप विचार कर रहे हैं—यह विचार करने की कार्यवाही कब तक खत्म होगी।

हमारे मित्र नम्बियार साहब के प्रश्न के जबाब में आपने कहा कि 25 रु० से कम पेन्सन पाने वाले कोई पेन्शनर नहीं हैं, अगर हम 25 रु० से कम पेन्शन पाने वालों की सूची आपको दें तो क्या आप उनके पेन्शन को तत्काल 25 रु० करने के लिए तैयार हैं ?

19 hrs.

श्री रबिराय (पुरी) : सभापति जी,

मुझे बड़े दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारे मित्र सौधी साहब ने जब इस सवाल को यहां उठाया और जितने भी तर्क उन्होंने इस के पक्ष में दिए, उन का सेठी साहब पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ा। मैं आपके जरिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार कहती तो यही चली आ रही कि समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना करेंगे लेकिन वह सिर्फ़ आरती ही उतारती है, उनके पीछे उसका और कोई ध्येय नहीं रहता है। बार-बार यहां पर कहा जा चुका है कि रिसोर्सेज मौजूद हैं लेकिन सरकार कुछ करना ही नहीं चाहती है, वह तो पूंजीपति और राजा-महाराजाओं के चुंगल में फंसी हुई है। सरकार उन रिसोर्सेज का इस्तेमाल ही नहीं करना चाहती है। अभी अभी सेठी साहब ने हमारे सामने एक गलत-बयानी भी की है। सौधी साहब ने जब यह कहा कि अभी भी लोग 10 और 15 रुपए पेंशन पा रहे हैं तो सेठी साहब ने कहा कि 25 रु० से कम लोग पेंशन नहीं पा रहे हैं। मैं आपकी अनुमति से पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। पेटीशंस कमेटी की जो सिफारिश है उसमें लिखा हुआ है :

“Low-paid pensioners getting only Rs. 10 to 20 as monthly pension should be paid a minimum pension of not less than Rs. 40 or 50 per month in view of the extraordinary rise in the cost of living over the last 20 years.”

मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि कोई भी 10-20 रुपया पेंशन नहीं पाता है जबकि पेटीशंस कमेटी की जो सिफारिश है उसमें इस बात का जिक्र है कि हमारे देश में हजारों और लाखों की तादाद में ऐसे पेंशनर्स हैं जो कि दस-बीस रुपया पाते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो बड़े लोग हैं जोकि पांच सौ या हजार रुपए पेंशन पाते हैं उनकी बात दूसरी है लेकिन जो कम से कम पाते हैं, केवल दस बीस रुपया ही पाते हैं उनकी दशा का अन्दाजा मन्त्री महोदय लगा सकते हैं कि किस प्रकार से वे अपना और अपने

बाल बच्चों का गुजारा करते होंगे, कैसे उनको पढ़ाते होंगे। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या मन्त्री महोदय इस सदन को आश्वासन देंगे कि लोक सभा की पेटीशंस कमेटी की जो सिफारिश है उसको पहले लागू करेंगे—दूसरी सिफारिशों को बाद में देखेंगे—और आज लाखों की तादाद में जो दस या बीस रुपया पेंशन पा रहे हैं, उनको कम से कम 50 रुपए देंगे ? क्या इस सदन में इस प्रकार का एलान मंत्री जी करेंगे कि दस बीस रुपए पेंशन पाने वालों को कम से कम 50 रुपए महीने पेंशन दी जाएगी ?

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, भा साहब ने पेंशन के बारे में एक व्यापक सवाल उठाया है।... (व्यवधान)... सौधी साहब ने जो बहस यहाँ पर उठाई है वह तो केवल गवर्नमेंट पेंशनर्स के बारे में है। बाकी जो वृद्ध लोग हैं जो कि गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट हैं या नहीं हैं, उनको पेंशन मिलेगी या नहीं मिलेगी वह बात इस बहस के दायरे में नहीं आती है। यदि माननीय सदस्य इस सम्बन्ध में भी कोई बहस उठायेंगे तो उसके बारे में भी जानकारी उपलब्ध होगी उसको मैं इस सदन के सामने रखने का प्रयास करूँगा।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज ने कहा कि यूनाइटेड किंगडम में पेंशन में दस परसेन्ट की बढ़ोत्तरी हुई। यह बात सही है कि जो डेवलपड कन्ट्रीज हैं जैसे यूनाइटेड किंगडम है या यू० एस० ए० है—उन्होंने ब्राजील का भी उदाहरण दिया—वहाँ पर अपने फाइनेंशियल रिसोर्सेज के हिसाब से उन्होंने पेंशंस में बढ़ोत्तरी की होगी... (व्यवधान)... मेरा तात्पर्य यह नहीं है कि पेंशनर्स के साथ जैसी माननीय सदस्यों को सहानुभूति है वैसी सहानुभूति सरकार को नहीं है... (व्यवधान)...

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : नहीं है।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : बराबर है।

श्री रवि राय : आपके पास रुपया है, आप कर सकते हैं।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : समय-समय पर सरकार ने जो निर्णय लिए हैं उनसे सरकार की सहानुभूति प्रकट होती रहती है। यह मामला कोई स्टैटिक नहीं है कि जिसमें कोई गत्यावरोध आ गया हो जिस पर पुनः विचार ही न हो सकता हो या सरकार इस मामले पर कभी विचार ही नहीं करेगी। ऐसी बात मैंने नहीं कही है कि सरकार ने उस रिपोर्ट को ठुकरा दिया है, मैंने यह कहा कि होम मिनिस्ट्री के साथ विचार विनिमय चल रहा है और इस रिपोर्ट पर भी विचार-विनिमय चल रहा है। मैंने यह नहीं कहा कि इस रिपोर्ट को सरकार ने ठुकरा दिया। इसलिए जो चीज विचार-विनिमय की हालत में है उसके बारे में यह कहना मुनासिब नहीं होगा कि रिपोर्ट को ठुकरा दिया। लेकिन रिपोर्ट के जो मुद्दे हैं, रिसोर्सेज की जो पोखीशन है उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए, जो देश की आर्थिक स्थिति है और जो सरकारी कर्मचारी नहीं हैं उन सब की स्थिति को मद्देनजर रखते हुए देखना पड़ता है।

माननीय फरनेन्डीज साहब ने बहुत-सी बातें कहीं फिजूलखर्ची की। इस बारे में मैं यही कह सकता हूँ कि बहुत सारी चीजें आवश्यक होती हैं जिनको करना पड़ता है। बहुत-से लोग कहते हैं कि इस देश में 6 आने, 8 आने रोज की एक आदमी की आमदनी है ऐसे देश में पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को 31 रु० रोज नहीं देना चाहिए। लेकिन यह सब होते हुए भी जो आवश्यक खर्च होते हैं उनको करना पड़ता है, चाहे प्रधान मंत्री का दौरा हो, या उनके मकान के बारे में हो और चाहे सरकारी दफ्तरों में मोटर और दूसरे खर्च करने हों। जो आवश्यक होते हैं वे करने पड़ते हैं। लेकिन इसका तात्पर्य यह नहीं है कि जो फिजूलखर्ची रोकी जा सकती हो उसको रोका न जाये। उसको बराबर रोकना चाहिए।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डोज : रिपोर्ट के बारे में कब तक निर्णय हो जायेगा ?

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : समय के बारे में पाबन्दी करना मेरे लिए मुश्किल होगा ।

श्री रवि राय : 10 रु० जो पाते हैं उनके बारे में कुछ बतायें ।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : 1-1-1964 के बाद जो रिटायर हुए हैं उनको 25 रु० से कम पेंशन नहीं होगी ।

“The President has accordingly been pleased to decide that in all cases of retirement occurring on or after the 1st January 1964 where the amount of pension together with the benefit of *ad hoc* increase as admissible under the Government of India, Ministry of Finance Office Memorandum No. F 15 (13) EV (A) 63, dated 16th October 1963, thereon comes to less than Rs. 25 p, m. the same shall be raised to Rs. 25.”

श्री रवि राय : पुराने जो हैं उनके बारे में क्या कहेंगे ।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : मैंने यह कहा कि 1-1-1964 के बाद जो रिटायर हुए हैं सब के लिए नहीं कहा ।

श्री म० ला० सौंधी : 1938 में जो रिटायर हुआ है उसकी क्या हालत है ।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1-4-1958 में सरकार ने यह निर्णय लिया कि जो लोग 15-7-52 से पहले रिटायर हुए और जिन लोगों की पेंशन 50 रु० से अधिक नहीं है उन की पेंशन में 10 रु० टेम्परेरी बढ़ाया जाय और जिन लोगों की पेंशन 100 रु० से अधिक नहीं है उनका 12.50 रु० बढ़ाया जाय ।

श्री म० ला० सौंधी : वह तो एड हाक ग्रान्ट है ।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : यह कहना ठीक नहीं है कि किसी को 10 रु० मिल रहा है । 10 रु० टेम्परेरी इन्क्रिज था ।

SHRI M. L. SONDHY : It is not an alteration of law, You can take it back any time if you want.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I am coming to this point. It is not correct to say that somebody is getting Rs. 10. Rs. 10 was the temporary increase that was given. Somebody was getting upto Rs. 100 and he was given temporary increment of Rs. 12.50. It is not correct to say that everybody is getting Rs. 5 or Rs. 10 and certainly the quantum of increment in 1958 was based on the pensions the officers are drawing at the period of time. I would not claim and I have never said that there is nobody getting less than Rs. 25. What I have said was that those who retired after 1.1.64 got a minimum pension of Rs. 25.

SHRI M. L. SONDHY : This is a debating answer, not a real answer.

श्री रवि राय : मानवीय विचारों से प्रेरित होकर जो 10, 12 रु० पाते हैं उनके बारे में कुछ कीजिए ।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : पापका जो कहना है वह ठीक है । उन सब की कठिनाइयों को ध्यान में रखते हुए उसकी जांच होगी और सब चीजों को ध्यान रखकर किया जायेगा । और जो रिसोर्स के बारे में माननीय रवि राय ने प्रश्न उठाया था कि देश में काफी रिसोर्स हैं, तो यह तो एक पौलिसी मेटर हो जाएगा जो इतने थोड़े समय में डिस्कस नहीं हो सकेगा । अगर रिसोर्स है, बढ़ सकते हैं तो बेशक सहानुभूतिपूर्ण विचार होना चाहिए ।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डोज : अगर हम रिसोर्स बतायें तो स्वीकार करेंगे ?

श्री रवि राय : डा० लोहिया का तर्क था चुका है 1500 रु० का श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डोज आश्वासन तो कम से कम दें ।

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : He is almost till-treating us. He is throwing it back to us. He should at least consider it.

श्री प्र० बं० सेठी : जहाँ तक रिसोर्सेज का ताल्लुक है, उसके बारे में मैं इतने अल्प समय में बहस नहीं हो सकती है। चौथी योजना का विवाद आपके सामने आयेगा उस विवाद के समय माननीय सदस्य बता सकेंगे कि रिसोर्सेज में कहाँ बढ़ोत्तरी हो सकती है। कैसे हो सकता है उस समय इसका विचार होगा। जहाँ तक कोई एक सैप्रेट कमीशन बनाने की बात है तो कई कमिश्ंस की रिपोर्ट पर समय-समय पर विचार होता रहा है।

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Pay is not pension.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : Pay does from basis of pension. Whatever they are getting now will automatically come as part of

the pension. For example recently the Government has taken a decision that part of the dearness allowance will be merged with pay. After this decision those who are going to retire will get higher pension than those people who had already retired. Whatever the employee is getting comes as part of pension. Pension does not come from the air. It is computed on the basis of what one is getting at the time of retirement. The Pay Commission's recommendations are given due consideration. The report of the honourable Committee of the House is before us. We don't treat anything light-heartedly. All these are receiving our serious attention.

19-13 hrs.

{The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, April 22, 1969/Vaisakha 2, 1891 (Saka)