

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION

ELEVENTH REPORT

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN (Kangra): I beg to present the Eleventh Report of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

12.42 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: SALARIES, ALLOWANCES ETC. OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT OF INDIA AND CERTAIN FOREIGN PARLIAMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: Shri D. N. Tiwary.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj): Sir, before I make the statement, I want to draw your attention to a mistake on this item.

The impression given is that this statement is being made by me on my behalf. This statement was passed by the Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament. I being the Chairman, I make the statement on behalf of the Committee, not as a Member.

MR. SPEAKER: You are taken as the Chairman. Otherwise, it would not have been allowed.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): He is making a statement on Salaries, Allowances etc. of Members of Parliament of India and certain foreign Parliaments. What about salaries of railway workers and others?

SHRI D. N. TIWARY: I am not asking for any increase in salaries and allowances.

Sir, the item says: Statement by Member. It should be: Statement by the Chairman of the Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: It is always in the name of the Chairman or the Mem-

ber. Don't worry about it. You better read it or lay it on the Table of the House, as you like. I advise you to lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY: This is a small thing....

MR. SPEAKER: You may read the covering statement and lay the other thing on the Table of the House.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on many occasions in the past, news items have appeared in the Press about the emoluments etc., of Members of Parliament. The information given in such news items has generally been exaggerated. You will recall, Sir, when the attention of the House was drawn to a similarly exaggerated news on the 3rd December, 1973, you were pleased to observe as follows:—

'We shall try to collect every information, and if the whole information could come to us during this very session, we will lay it before the House, I will send it to the Leader of the House also.'

The Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament has since collected information from 22 countries about the salaries and allowances paid to, and amenities enjoyed by, Members of their Parliaments. With your permission, I lay it on the Table of the House.

A Member of our Parliament receives a salary of Rs. 500/- per month and a daily allowance of Rs. 51/- during sessions and for attending the meetings of Parliamentary Committees during inter-session periods. These rates were fixed in 1969. Since then the cost of living has gone up by about 53 per cent, from 173 in 1969 to 264 in January, 1974 (with base 1960—100). A Member of Parliament gets road mileage at the rate of 32 paise per kilometre which was fixed in 1954. He pays for the various services like residential accommoda-

[Shri D. N. Twary]
tion, furniture, electricity, water
transport etc.

Sir, comparisons are odious but, by way of illustration, I wish to state that a Member of the lower House of Malaysian Parliament gets a monthly salary of Rs. 2584/- and a daily allowance of Rs. 129/- for attending the meeting of the House. A Member of the Tanzanian Parliament gets a monthly salary of Rs. 1189/- and a subsistence daily allowance of Rs. 76/- for attending the meetings of the National Assembly.

The Members of our Parliament come from distant places and they have not only to visit their constituencies frequently but also to receive people from their constituencies in Delhi and look after them. They have to incur expenditure on the board and lodging of their constituents in Delhi and also to allow them to use their telephones for long distance calls. All this causes heavy financial strain on the Members.

A good number of Members of Parliament have to keep three establishments—one at their home town/villages, second in their constituencies and the third in Delhi—and certainly all of us have to keep two establishments—one at our home towns/villages and the other in Delhi. These cast additional burdens on the Members of Parliament.

Moreover, a Member of Parliament in India has to incur heavy expenditure on postage and secretarial assistance in the discharge of his Parliamentary duties because he is still not given facilities like free postage, secretarial assistance which Members of certain other Parliaments are allowed. Members of most of the aforesaid 22 Parliaments receive pension and other terminal benefits but not so the Members of our Parliament.

I have placed all this information before the House in the hope that it

will help dispel the misunderstanding and wrong impressions which prevail in certain quarters in the matter of emoluments and facilities allowed to Members of Indian Parliament.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. D. N. Tiwary has just now made a statement. I am not going into the merits of this. But I want to invite your attention and the attention of the House to the sorry state of affairs in respect of functioning of Parliamentary Committees, especially with regard to the recommendations made by this Committee. This is a Parliamentary Committee duly constituted by you and it has made several recommendations. As per the booklet brought out by the Lok Sabha I find that as early as April 1973 they had made as many as 13 unanimous recommendations. They sat and deliberated for a long time—I do not know for how long because I am not a member of this Committee. From this booklet I find that they have submitted these recommendations about a year ago. I do not know how far these recommendations have been considered and implemented by the Government. There are two aspects here: one is those items where, according to the terms of reference of the Committee, they should decide and accordingly they have decided on as many as eight items. The other items are of a recommendatory nature. Whatever it may be, I want to know what respect was given to the recommendations made by a duly appointed Parliamentary Committee. For one year, I understand, nothing has been decided by the Government. They may accept or reject, but this House should have been taken into confidence. What is the attention and respect given to the recommendations of this Parliamentary Committee? This raises a basic issue, how far these Parliamentary Committees are going to be effective. If they are not going to be respected, we might as well do away with these Committees. I would like to know from the Chairman of this Committee what was the response

he received from the Government to the recommendations he made about a year ago.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has told me that the Government is considering all these matters.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): May I say something Sir, because my office has been brought into the picture? The Committee made certain recommendations which were discussed other day. As has been submitted, some are within the competence and some are recommendations which they have made generally. There is no doubt whatsoever that we have the highest respect for the Committee; there can be no two opinions about it. But you will appreciate that, in the present economic situation, one has to go rather very carefully into all these things. We do not want to give any wrong impression to the people at large. At the same time, there may be genuine points also. All these will have to be considered very carefully. I did mention to the Committee that I was going into all these things and as soon as possible I would sit down with the Chairman and discuss these. The Committee also agreed to this procedure.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I have got a small submission to make. A committee was also appointed to go through the wage structure of the Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha staff. What has happened to that committee? I want to know when the report will be submitted. Long ago the committee was appointed....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot stand up like Shri Raghu Ramaiah and explain to you. You can ask me in my office.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): We are considering only ourselves. But what about the staff?

MR. SPEAKER: About the Lok Sabha Secretariat, you can talk to me in my chamber and not in the House. I am not sitting here as a Minister. Please do not establish new precedents. I am not agreeable to that. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): As a Member of the Committee, I want to make a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I know whatever is there. I have called item No. 15 and called your name.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): What about item No. 14?

MR. SPEAKER: It is already over.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I have sent you a notice.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. Your name is there.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I managed to attend one of these meetings and I was horrified to find that a committee of this nature was at all in existence and I found out later on that it was created by an Act. If a committee like that if at all it is to be in existence, it should be armed with all legitimate powers. A committee of Parliament is like a miniature House, like a miniature Parliament itself, and whatever decisions it takes and particularly, the decisions it takes unanimously, should not thereafter be the subject matter of governmental scrutiny. Therefore, I feel, and I feel very strongly, that this committee—I call it the committee of cringers and that is what it really is—without the rights is of no use and should be dissolved and a proper committee with proper authority to take decisions on behalf of Parliaments should be constituted whose decisions should not be subject to the scrutiny of the Government at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should be headed by Shri Piloo Mody.

SHRI PILOO MODY: It may be headed by anybody.

MR. SPEAKER: I will examine this question and I will consult you over it.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu.

12.53 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MEMBER RE. ANSWERS TO S.Q. NO. 631, DATED 10-4-74 ON BRITANNIA BISCUIT CO.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri C. Subramaniam while replying to my S.Q. No. 631 on 10th of April, 1974 stated:—

"It is true that this Company has produced far beyond the licensed capacity in the Madras unit. Their licensed capacity is 1,200 tonnes for one shift. Even if we take account that they are entitled to go in for three shifts, they can produce round about 3,000 and odd tonnes."

This is grossly incorrect. The Industrial license No. L/27(5)(1)/65-L1(1) dated 15th January, 1965 with its Registration Certificate authorises the factory for a maximum production of 1,200 tonnes per annum. There is no question of single shift involved in it. It is an authority for a total production of 1,200 tonnes per annum.

In the same question in another supplementary, the Minister has given another incorrect information which will be revealed from the following

"Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: I asked when the Govt. came to know that they were producing in excess of the installed and licensed capacity to which there has been no reply. What action did they take on the day they received this information

that this company is manufacturing in excess of the licensed capacity?"

"Shri C. Subramaniam: I am sorry, I cannot give the exact date. It was about a year or two ago that this came to our notice when they made an application for the purpose of regularising this excess production".

The truth in the matter is as far back as November, 1970 a joint representation was sent by four Indian Biscuit Manufacturers to Smt. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister pointing out this gross over-production by Britannia Biscuit Company Ltd., a foreign monopoly, giving all facts and figures. On the same day similar representations were sent by the same four Indian Manufacturers to the Minister of Industrial Development, the Minister of Company Affairs, Chairman, MRTPC, Secretary, Industries Ministry and the Senior Industrial Advisor, DGTD.

Again in September, 1972, a representation was sent by an Indian Biscuit manufacturer to Shri C. Subramaniam, the present Industries Minister and also once afterwards in November, 1972 to the Minister giving all facts and figures about Britannia's illegal expansion.

This is not a case of making an incorrect statement, but a glaring instance when the Minister had chosen to deliberately mislead the House in a planned manner by telling so many things most of which were incorrect.

I am holding the document under reference and shall produce the same before the House when they require. I am also told that in the Secretariat of Shri Subramaniam there are people who are anxious to further the cause of the Britannia Biscuit Co.

I may further point out that this is not the first time that the Hon'ble Minister Shri Subramaniam is making incorrect statements. If you will