

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

तौर पर "लोक सभा" के नाम से पुकारा जाय, और सदन के सारे कागजों पर यही शीर्षक दिया जाय।

तदनुसार इस सदन के सचिवालय का नाम "लोक सभा सचिवालय" होगा, और अब से आगे नोटिस आदि इसी पते से भेजे जायें।

Some Hon. Members: Can we have the translation of it?

Mr. Speaker: For the benefit of hon. Members who do not know yet Hindi perfectly, I shall just state this in English.

Hon. Members know that 'House of the People' is the English expression for the Hindi term 'Lok Sabha' and as a further step in the process of adoption of Hindi as the national language in this House, I have decided with the concurrence of the Leader of the House that this House should officially be known as the 'Lok Sabha' and all Parliamentary papers should carry this title.

Accordingly, the Secretariat of this House will be known as the Lok Sabha Secretariat. Notices etc. may be addressed henceforth accordingly.

An Hon. Member: 'Secretariat' is going to be in English?

Mr. Speaker: That will be changed accordingly. The House of the People will be known now as the Lok Sabha. Its Secretariat will be known in English as the Lok Sabha Secretariat—Lok Sabha being the proper name—and in Hindi, it will be known as Lok Sabha Sachivalaya'. 'Sachiva' means a secretary.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of doubt. Will the Constitution also be changed accordingly?

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): It is already changing.

Mr. Speaker: This is in pursuance of the Constitution. The hon. Member will do well to read the Constitution again.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): May I know what the Members of the Lok Sabha will be called, instead of M.Ps.?

Mr. Speaker: That question I have yet to consider, and when I consider it, I shall say something about it.

DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPEN-
 SATION AND REHABILITATION)
 BILL

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of compensation and rehabilitation grants to displaced persons and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of compensation and rehabilitation grants to displaced persons and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri A. P. Jain: I introduce the Bill.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF
 MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament be taken into consideration."

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

I do not want to go into the history behind this Bill, because more than once I have told the House how a Joint Committee of both the Houses was constituted, and what the recommendations they made were. The House is also aware that for various reasons, though the first report was presented in July 1952, no specific legislation on the subject was passed by Parliament. Only on 27th March last, with the permission of the House, the old Joint Committee was revived, and the matter relating to the salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament was referred back to it, to consider the whole question in the light of the changed circumstances, particularly the abolition of I class in some of the railways. The Report of the Committee was placed by you on the Table of the House some time back, and the House is fully aware of it by now.

The Report of the Committee was almost unanimous, except for one partial minute of dissent. When that Report was placed before Government, they came to the conclusion that as the matter directly concerns the Members of Parliament, and as the Report of the Committee which was representative of all the groups in both the Houses was almost unanimous, it was not proper or desirable on their part to make any change in it. So, you will find that this Bill has been drafted on the recommendations of the said Committee, except for one minor change, and that is with regard to the period of option. This is the attitude of Government, in short, with regard to this Bill. Government will not, therefore, propose any amendments, except one or two of a verbal nature, of which notices have been given by me. With regard to the major points, if any amendments are moved or opposed, Government's attitude will be completely neutral. The matter is left entirely to the majority view of the House. That is always done, but more particularly in this case because it affects and concerns the Members directly. Government have, therefore, made this Bill a non-governmental and a non-party matter.

In view of this, I hope that the House will not take much time, and will pass the Bill immediately, so that I may take it to the other House for consideration before they adjourn. We are anxious that the provisions of the Bill should be given effect to from the first of the next month. Sir, I move.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament be taken into consideration."

I have received notices of two amendments.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon-cum-Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the first week of the next session."

I want to say one thing in this connection. My amendment was not originally like this. What I had given notice of was:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion from the constituencies of the Members of Parliament by the first day of the first week of the next session."

The phrase 'from the constituencies of the Members of Parliament' has been omitted. I do not know why. However, I move the amendment as it is today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: 'Constituencies of Members of Parliament' means the whole of India.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): The public opinion is that we should not be paid anything.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): May I support the amendment?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall call upon hon. Members later.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

There is another amendment by Shri Raghbir Sahai. Is the hon. Member moving it?

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Etah Distt.—North East cum Budaun Distt.—East): I am not moving it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the discussion of the original motion as well as the amendment.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): What happens to the other amendments?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The other amendments are for the clauses. They will be taken up, after the consideration stage is over.

Shri S. S. More: May I know the time allotted for consideration?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members will be short, brief and sweet.

श्री सारंगधर दास (बेनकनाल पश्चिम कटक) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Starting in a new language need not mean any difference in salary.

श्री सारंगधर दास : आज सवेरे अध्यक्ष महोदय ने राष्ट्र भाषा में कार्यवाही शुरू की है, इसलिये मैं भी आज राष्ट्र भाषा में बोलना चाहता हूँ। मैं इस बिल के ऊपर जो कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ, उस पर बहुत कुछ कहा जा सकता है। इसके प्रस्तावक महोदय ने कहा कि इसके पीछे जो इतिहास है उसमें जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें उस इतिहास के भीतर जाना चाहिये। आपकी चेअरमैनशिप में जो पहली कमेटी बनी थी उसमें कहा गया था :

"There was general agreement on the need for a reduction in the present rate of daily allowance drawn by Members".

यह भी हमारे ध्यान में है कि दो वर्ष पहले ४० रुपये रोज़ से कुछ कम करने के लिये कमेटी

बनी थी। उस कमेटी में यह भी तय हुआ था आखिर में, और उसमें बहुत बहस हुई थी और बहुत से अल्टनेटिवा दिये गये थे कि

"The Committee decided that Members of both the Houses should be paid a daily allowance at the rate of Rs. 35

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आये हुये डेढ़ वर्ष हुये। फिर भी अब तक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई। फिर जब दूसरे सेशन में मिनिस्टर महोदय इस प्रस्ताव को लाये कि दैनिक भत्ता ३५ रुपया कर दिया जाय तब जो हुकूमत चलाने वाली पार्टी है उसके एक ऊंचे दर्जे के मेम्बर एक एग्जिमेन्ट लाये कि इस प्रस्ताव को फिर ज्वाइंट कमेटी में भेजा जाय। मैं ने तभी कहा था कि हम मेम्बरों के ऐलाउंसज और सेलेरीज के बारे में जो कार्यवाही करते हैं, उससे मुक्त के सामने हम इस संसद् को हास्यास्पद बनाते हैं। अब फिर जो सेकेण्ड कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आई है उस पर गौर होगा, एग्जिमेन्ट्स आयेंगे। मगर मुझको मालूम है कि हुकूमत चलाने वाली पार्टी ने यह तय कर लिया है कि ४०० रुपया मासिक वेतन और २१ रुपया दैनिक ऐलाउंसज होगा। साथ ही ड्रेवलिंग के लिये पास वगैरह मिलेंगे। मैं हिसाब करके देख रहा हूँ कि पहली कमेटी में जो तय हुआ था कि वर्ष में ८४०० रुपया मिलेगा वह अब ४०० रुपया मासिक और २१ रुपया दैनिक के हिसाब से ९००० रुपये के ऊपर आता है। पहले २१० दिन का हिसाब लगाया गया था।

सारदार हुसम सिंह (कपूरथला मटिडा) : वह २४० दिन के लिये था।

श्री सारंगधर दास : नहीं। अब जो रखा गया है वह, जो पहली कमेटी ने तय किया था कि हमें वर्ष के लिये इतना मिलना चाहिये, उससे ज्यादा है।

में आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस महात्मा गांधी के लिये हम कहते हैं कि हम उन की संतान हैं

डा० एन० बी० खरे (ग्वालियर) : हम नहीं हैं ।

श्री सारंगधर दास : कुल हिन्दुस्तानी हैं अगर आप नहीं हैं तो आप चले जाइयें ।

डा० एन० बी० खरे : नहीं जायेंगे । हमारा भी हक है यहाँ बैठने का ।

श्री सारंगधर दास : तो जो हुकूमत चलाने वाली पार्टी है उसके सब लोग महात्मा गांधी की बात करते हैं । महात्मा जी ने जो सादागी का उपदेश हमें दिया था क्या वह इस बिल में आता है कि आप ८००० रुपये का ८५०० रुपये बनाते हैं या ९००० रुपये बनाते हैं ? मझे बहुत दुःख होता है कि जो पहले ३५ रुपये होने को थे उसको आप स्वीकार नहीं करते । आज हम एक किसम की तब्दीली करते हैं, कल दूसरे किसम की तब्दीली करते हैं । यह सब जो कुछ चल रहा है, उससे, आपको यकीन के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ, सचमुच हाउस के मेम्बरान मुल्क के सामने, एलेक्टोरेट के सामने आज हास्यास्पद बन गये हैं ।

एक बात यह भी मुझे ताज्जुब की मालूम होती है । एक प्रस्ताव ऐसा था कि ४०० रुपये मासिक और २० रुपये दैनिक भत्ता होना चाहिये । मुझे नहीं मालूम कि ४२० में क्या है । मेरे वकील दोस्त जवाब दे सकते हैं । मैं तो वकील हूँ नहीं, मैं सीधा साधा इन्डस्ट्रियल आदमी हूँ । पता नहीं इस ४२० में क्या है कि कुछ दूसरे मेम्बरान उसको कहते हैं कि २० की जगह २१ रुपये होना चाहिये । कितने कहते हैं कि हमारे मुल्क के लोग अनपढ़ हैं । मगर मेरी राय में वे दानी लोग हैं । वे कहने लगे हैं कि यह जो संसद के

सदस्य हैं, विशेषकर जो अपने को बापू जी की संतान कहते हैं, वे हैं ४२० + १ । इसलिये मैं हाउस के सामने सब मेम्बरों से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि इतना लालच न रखिये । आप ४०० रुपये और १९ रुपये कर दीजिये । अगर २० नहीं होगा तो कोई २० + १ नहीं कह सकेगा । मगर हमारा लालच तो इतना ज्यादा है कि अगर १ रुपया भी हमको ज्यादा मिल सकता है तो उसको हम लेना चाहते हैं । और चूँकि ४२० में हमारा अपमान होता है, इसलिये ४२० + १ कर दिया है ।

श्री आर० के० चौधरी (गोहाटी) : आप कितने रुपये मांगते हैं ?

श्री सारंगधर दास : मैं जो कुछ मांगता हूँ, वह जो मेरा एक एमेन्डमेन्ट है उसमें दिया हुआ है । पहली रिपोर्ट में जो ३५ रुपये था मैं उसकी ताईद करता हूँ । मैं इस बात के लिये सीरियस हूँ कि पहली जो कमेटी बनी थी और उसने जो कुछ तय किया था उसी को मान लेना चाहिये ।

मिनिस्टर साहब ने अभी बतलाया कि तब से डेढ़ दो वर्ष में कुछ तब्दीली हो गई है । फर्स्ट क्लास का जो फेयर मिलता था वह अब सेकेन्ड क्लास का हो गया है । फर्स्ट क्लास में ट्रेवल करने से फर्स्ट क्लास फेयर मिलता है और फर्स्ट क्लास नहीं है तो सेकेन्ड क्लास मिलता है । उसके साथ सेलेरी और एलाउंसमेंट का क्या सम्बन्ध है, यह मैं नहीं जानता । मैं इसको महसूस नहीं कर सकता हूँ । इसलिये जो पहले ३५ रुपया था उसी की ताईद करता हूँ । मैं इस बात को सीरियसली कहता हूँ कि हम पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर बराबर यह चाहते हैं कि सरकारी अफसरों की सेलेरी कम की जाय, या यह खर्चा कम किया जाय । लेकिन जब हमारे एलाउंस को कम करने का समय आता है तो हम इधर उधर करना चाहते हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Member is evidently speaking on an amendment which is not before the House now.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I did not speak on the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is wrong in the Bill?

श्री सारंगधर दास : बिल के बारे में यह बात है कि यह बिल जब पहले लाया गया था तो इस पर दो वर्ष तक बहस हो चुकी थी। तब फिर इसको ज्वाइंट कमेटी में ले जाया गया। यह सब करने से हम हास्यास्पद बन गये हैं। मुझे इस बिल के बारे में यही कहना है और मैं इस बिल का विरोध करता हूँ।

Shri Velayudhan: When I moved this amendment last, I was having the Report of the Committee as well as other papers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When is this to come back to the House? Is it one or two years later? What is the date given?

Shri Velayudhan: It is already given.

Shri S. S. More: Sometime after the next session, it will come.

Shri Velayudhan: When I was about to give notice of this amendment, I was having the papers supplied by the Parliament Secretariat or, rather, the Lok Sabha Secretariat as well as the Committee's Report which I hope, is with all the Members of the House. When I moved this amendment I was very serious about it, because the view I was having in my mind was that this subject should have been thoroughly known now to the public, and not only to the public but to the constituencies wherefrom we all come.

An Hon. Member: You do not know the meaning of 'constituency.'

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There was so much of discussion yesterday that the constituencies are in the melting pot.

Shri Velayudhan: When I read the Report I must tell you frankly that I was very angry.

Shri S. S. More: He was very hungry!

Shri Velayudhan: I was very angry over the members of the Committee, because I was thoroughly—I must tell you frankly—dissatisfied with the report they have presented to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The first Report or the Second Report or both?

Shri Velayudhan: The Second Report. To tell you frankly, I was not only angry but I was thinking that it was an irresponsible Report presented to this House. It is not a personal matter to me only; it is not a personal matter not only to the Members of Parliament; it is a matter which is concerned with the people of India as a whole. I was not at all feeling a delicacy over this matter; on a previous occasion, when the Salaries Bill for Ministers came to the House some two years before, I supported that Bill, simply because I felt that the salary of a Minister must have some relation to the responsibilities he is carrying. In the same way, I was wondering why when we came to the new Parliament, the Government had not fixed a salary—whatever may be the amount—for Members of Parliament. Of course, when the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs introduced this Bill today, I do not know why he said that he is keeping neutrality over the Bill, and at the same time, he was introducing the Bill on his own behalf. I must tell you that we must take a courageous stand over this matter, because it affects not only our personal constituencies but also the constituencies where we have to go and work. There were so many suggestions from so many Members, but I must tell you frankly that the Rs. 300 which was suggested by the committee or the alternative arrangement that was suggested is not agreeable to me. I must say that we must have a standard salary which must be in conformity with the responsibilities we will have to discharge not only

as Members of Parliament but as representatives of the people in the various constituencies. There is a lot of misunderstanding or ignorance.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is too much noise in the House. Hon. Members want evidently to increase the Rs. 300 to something more.

Shri Velayudhan: There is a lot of misunderstanding or ignorance in the minds of the public regarding the emoluments we are getting even now. I can tell you that there are many people in the country even today who believe that we are not only getting daily Rs. 40 for all the 365 days, but we are also getting free houses, free travel..

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Where?

Shri Velayudhan: You ask me, 'where'? Not to heaven! They believe that we are not only getting free furnished houses, not only free travel, but we are getting all the amenities including even telephones. That is the public idea. Even the other day, when some of my friends from South India came to my house, they were thinking, what a beautiful house it is, and thought at the same time that we are fr enjoying all this. They were envious of us. This is the information that is now being circulated in the country today. The public as a whole is having this feeling.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the good of circulating unless all the countrymen are brought here and shown the houses etc.?

Shri Velayudhan: I shall not cut jokes with you, Sir, in this matter. When we decide any salary, even though the matter is pertaining to us, we must see that whether a standard salary is given to the Members of Parliament because it is an internationally accepted principle—not only in Asiatic countries but in other countries also. When I read of the amenities enjoyed by the Members of Parliament in other countries, I was jealous of them. I must say that they are having a higher prestige and position than in India. The responsibility for this should be

shared by the Government also. It is not because the public is apathetic towards us; the executive will have to share a large portion of the responsibility for having left the Members of Parliament, in India the representatives of the people, in a lower category. When we go even to parties, we see Assistant Secretaries and Under Secretaries enjoying a higher status than that of the Members of Parliament. I have not seen such an attitude towards the Members of Parliament in any other country by the executive.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is not asking this House to decide on this Bill the rank and privileges of sitting and seating.

Shri Velayudhan: I was only giving an example of how Members of Parliament are being treated and this is vital part of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even after fifteen minutes, the House is not in possession of an idea as to what he wants.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Are we not to close the whole discussion to-day at 10-45? In that event, some sort of rationing has to be done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude. He may say that it should be Rs. 300 or Rs. 200 or Rs. 3,000, anything. It is only a small issue.

Shri K. K. Basu: He is not sure of what he wants.

Shri Velayudhan: I was only pleading that the Members of Parliament should get amenities for the discharge of their duties in consonance with their position and salaries. I am not for a high salary as the I.C.S. or the I.P.S.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Shri Velayudhan: We can draw from the Exchequer a moderate amount which will not be judged by the people as very high salary. At the same time, I am certain that if

[Shri Velayudhan]

we draw a salary of Rs. 400/- or something like that, the public will not think that we are drawing a high salary. I am very particular in saying that when we are attending the Parliament, we should get larger amenities in the city; not only a house but a free telephone should also be given to us. I do not say that we should be paid for the trunk calls also. But the basic charges which come to something like Rs. 30/—or Rs. 35/—should be exempted.

10 A.M.

An Hon. Member: What about the frigidaire and cooler?

Another Hon. Member: He has put it in cold storage.

Shri Velayudhan: I know some hon. Members want cooler and air-conditioning. At the same time, we must have a sense of proportion. When I was an officer of the Government, I was drawing more than Rs. 400 and I was having a car.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Whisky also?

Shri Velayudhan: But, when I became Member of Parliament, what I did first was to sell away the car. I do not know why people are very particular about a daily allowance of Rs. 21. Why not it be Rs. 20?

Some Hon. Members: 420.

Shri Velayudhan: I demand that we should get one II class fare all over India and one II class and one III class fare when we come here for the session (*Interruption*). I do not want a double II class.

An. Hon. Member: Why?

Shri Velayudhan: I do not bring my wife.

These are my proposals and I hope the House will accept them.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I

may be excused if I say this is a matter on which we have got to be serious. It is a question of our own emoluments and we are to be the judges thereof, and the country will judge us as we decide this issue. We were drawing an allowance of Rs. 45/- per day. Then, we had a voluntary cut and we drew Rs. 40/-. So far as I remember, when this question was again put before the House and a committee was appointed, it was expected that we will again undergo a voluntary cut of Rs. 5. That was rumoured to be the intention, if I remember aright.

An Hon. Member: That was the decision.

Acharya Kripalani: I do not know; that was perhaps the first decision. But, now there are many proposals that are in the air and certain proposals that have been made by the Committee.

From the earliest times of self-government, membership of Parliament, of an Assembly or a local body has been considered as a voluntary patriotic duty. The theory is that this patriotic duty should be performed as a citizen's duty and there should be no charge for it. But, afterwards, slowly as the work of the Assemblies and Parliament increase and, in the discharge of their duties, the Members incurred certain expenses it was considered fair and first that they should not be out of pocket and should receive some remuneration. So far as local self-government is concerned, even today in theory and in practice it is a citizen's duty to help in the administration of local affairs without remuneration. That being the case, I think it would be useless for us to say that our Parliamentary work is a whole-time job and that we must get the allowances which would enable us to live in comfort and keep our families in comfort. If that

were really the theory, I think a moderate household in New Delhi, if there are no superfluous children.....

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Do not speak in personal terms.

Acharya Kripalani: I think a moderate household in New Delhi would require at least Rs. 1,000. Either you accept these changed facts or the old theory. For myself, I would request the House to accept the old theory that this is not a whole-time job, that we must not expect for our parliamentary services the remuneration that would carry all our expenses, including the maintenance of the family and the education of our children, and also the money that we spent when we stood as candidates for election. If that were so, even the Rs. 1,000 would not suffice. Today when a proposal is made to increase the allowances, the theory behind it is that ours is not a whole-time job, it is in part a patriotic duty in the discharge of which if we have to suffer a little hardship, we should do so.

There is another consideration also. We, the Members of Parliament, have to be as exemplars to people in the services. The previous speaker talked of the dignity of the Members of the House. He thought that dignity consisted in our getting more facilities and more allowances. The dignity of a person according to him depended upon the salary or the allowances that he got.

Shri Velayudhan: That is misrepresenting me. I never intended that nor even said that.

Acharya Kripalani: Anyway, it may be that some people think in those terms even if he does not. To all those who think in such terms, I would point out that so long as we were fighting for freedom, our dignity consisted in other things than our earnings or emoluments. We were dignified even when we wore

dhoties as thick as canvas and with two parts sewn together, when we went into villages, when we lived with the villagers and when many of us did not know where our next meal would come from. I would wish that we approached this question of our emoluments and our personal dignity against the background of our immediate past. There may be novel ideas about dignity that have come after independence, but we must discard such ideas. We must take it that we have to live a hard life even though those whom we appoint as officers draw higher salaries and live more comfortably. We have got to set an example to them. Therefore, I would request the House, and especially the dominant party, whose vote will decide this matter, that our allowance should be a little less than what it is today. I am conscious of the fact that this will entail much hardship; but this hardship we should bear cheerfully and show that we were good patriots not only when we were struggling for freedom, but are so even after independence and that our first anxiety is to put our country on a sound economic basis. Remember, Sir, that if we go on increasing our emoluments, we will come to a stage when this poor country will find that financially democracy is burdensome. For every one Governor and four or five executive councillors who carried on the business of this country before independence we have now a Governor, who governs no more, and thirty or forty Ministers. Add to that if our own expenditure goes on increasing, from the financial point of view, this poor country will find that it is not worthwhile to have a democratic Government. The country would rather prefer an autocracy. I have seen this happening in former Indian States. People find the burden of taxation is more than what it used to be in the days of the Indian Princes who squandered money here and abroad. The luxurious life they led did not make for economy. But

[Acharya Kripalani]

today even the citizens of these Indian States find democracy more expensive than the extravagant princes who used to squander money indiscriminately. We must see that we do not make democratic rule impossible on economic grounds.

These are a few ideas that have occurred to me and I suggest them for the serious consideration of the House. If we behave properly, we will find that the services, and I am sure the Ministers also, will make proportionate cuts in their salaries.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time allotted for this Bill is two hours. What time shall I allow for clause by clause consideration—one hour? And then the third reading? I think we might give up any discussion during the third reading.

We started at 9-28: it is now nearly one hour. The only question for consideration is whether the emoluments should be in the nature of salaries or allowances; if it is to be salary what should it be; also, whether any additional amenities should be provided.

Shri N. V. Gadgil: May I suggest that instead of wasting our time at the consideration stage, we may straightaway go to the clauses?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is what I also think. Therefore, I will put the consideration motion now, and give opportunity to members at the time of the discussion on the clauses.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—North East): The point of view of our Party has not yet been presented. The whole thing hangs together: it cannot be brought in the course of the clause by clause discussion. I suggest that our spokesman may be allowed to bring up his points before the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give an opportunity to the hon. Member of the Communist Party to speak in general terms, in addition to the particular matter.

Shri K. K. Basu: There are other matters, also, like the travelling allowance, etc.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall allow opportunity for a full discussion. Is it necessary for me to put the motion of Mr. Velayudhan for circulation?

Shri Velayudhan: I do not wish to press it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Before you proceed to the clauses, may I draw your attention to a point? I understand that the Government are going to move certain new amendments to this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are formal.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: No, Sir. I do submit that they raise the question of procedure and the relationship between this House and the other.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They relate to clauses 6 and 7. When we go to them we can look into them. Now we will take up clause 2.

Clause 2 — (Definitions.)

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to move:

In page 1, after line 8, insert—

“(aa) ‘day’ means a calendar day beginning and ending at mid-night;”.

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

In page 1,—

- (i) line 12, omit "and";
- (ii) line 14, add at the end "and";
and
- (iii) after line 14, add—

"(iii) any other member whose private income exclusive of all taxes, is more than rupees three hundred per head of the members of his family;"

Shri N. S. Jain (Bijnor Dist.—South): I beg to move:

In page 2, after line 8, insert—

"Provided that when a session of a House of Parliament or a sitting of a Committee is adjourned for a period of not more than two days, such period of adjournment shall be deemed to be the period of residence on duty if the member was present at the place of the session of the House or of the sitting of the Committee on the day of such adjournment."

Th. Jugal Kishore Sinha (Muzaffarpur—North-West): I beg to move:

In page 2, line 17, after "business" insert "and the period of such residence will include the day of arrival and departure of the member;"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved:

- (1) In page 1, after line 8, insert—

"(aa) 'day' means a calendar day beginning and ending at mid-night;"

- (2) In page 1,—

- (i) line 12, omit "and";
- (ii) line 14, add at the end "and";
and

- (iii) after line 14, add—

"(iii) any other member whose private income exclusive of all taxes, is more than rupees three hundred per head of the members of his family;"

- (3) In page 2, after line 8, insert—

"Provided that when a session of a House of Parliament or a sitting of a Committee is adjourned for a period of not more than two days, such period of adjournment shall be deemed to be the period of residence on duty if the member was present at the place of the session of the House or of the sitting of the Committee on the day of such adjournment."

(4) In page 2, line 17, after "business" insert "and the period of such residence will include the day of arrival and departure of the member;"

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: My amendment seeks to introduce a new clause for the definition of 'day'. It is already existing and I shall read from rule 2 of the existing rules. The term 'day' means a calendar day beginning and ending at midnight. Though this word 'day' occurs at about ten places in this Bill, the definition is not there. It is such an ordinary thing; everybody lives in a day and yet the definition of the Audit Department is entirely different.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it not defined under the General Clauses Act?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: There is no definition in the General Clauses Act; only "month" and "year" are defined there.

If I read a letter which I received from the Secretary on a question which arose with regard to my own daily allowance and travelling allowance, the whole thing would be plain. It reads: "I am directed to

[Shri S. V. Ramaswamy]

state that on exactly the same representation made by a member of the old Legislative Assembly it was decided that the term 'days' for the purpose of rule 3 (of the rules governing the allowance of Members) should be reckoned as days for which daily allowance is admissible. According to rule 1 (D) read with the note thereunder, daily allowance is admissible to a Member for the day of arrival if he arrives in the forenoon and for the day of departure if he departs in the afternoon. Since you left Delhi on the 11th February 1953 (forenoon) and returned on the 25th February 1953 (afternoon), daily allowance for both the days is not admissible to you and so the intermediate absence is to be calculated from 11th to 25th February, 1953. The fact that you attended the Session in the afternoon of the 25th does not alter the position." So the rule is such that: my physical absence of 14 days is converted into an absence of 16 days by virtue of this rule. I took up this matter and ultimately I received this order allowing my claim: "We have accepted the claim since he arrived in Delhi on 25th February, 1953 and his absence is calculated in terms of calendar days, that is, from 11th February, 1953 to 24th February 1953, viz. fourteen days. The absence is less than fifteen days. He is allowed allowance for the above period with the concurrence of the audit and the Ministry of finance." In view of this, I hope the House will accept my definition as it would be advantageous. After I won this point, a number of hon. Members, I believe about 10 or 12, came to consult me because they also got in a similar mess and their allowances were disallowed. I gave them the points and they also got their allowances. Therefore it will obviate all further difficulties. And this is in conformity with the practice in all the law courts, the Railways, Audit, the com-

mercial world, as a matter of fact everywhere. This division of the day into forenoon and afternoon is causing great difficulty. I need not labour the point. I am sure the House will accept the amendment.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): On a point of clarification. Clause 7 of the Bill gives powers for making rules about day and part of day.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I am moving another amendment to delete that clause.

Shri S. S. More: I have already moved my amendment (No. 5). In clause 2, namely the definitions clause, a 'member' has been described. The purpose of the definition is to exclude ministers who are paid their remuneration or emoluments under a different enactment and also officers of Parliament, that is the Speaker, Deputy-Speaker, Chairman and Deputy-Chairman, for whom also there is a separate enactment fixing their emoluments. In addition to these I propose to introduce one more clause, and that clause runs to this effect:

"any other member whose private income exclusive of all taxes, is more than rupees three hundred per month per head of the members of his family".

It is very difficult to speak rather fearlessly on this particular proposal, and the previous speakers have made it still more difficult for us. But the real issue is not whether we are patriotically serving the country or not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the effect of it? The House must know. Will they work without salary or allowance?

Shri S. S. More: My submission is that we must take into consideration the economic conditions of the Members. In the terms of our Constitution we are out to reduce the inequalities in the wealth and other happiness of the people. So I say that people who have more than three

hundred rupees per head of the members of the family per month should not be given any allowance. That is the sum and substance of my contention.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Those who have got that are already losing more by way of income-tax.

Shri S. S. More: If you allow me to proceed with my argument...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is so clear. Is it necessary to labour the point?

Shri S. S. More: I am not pinning my arguments to this particular clause. I want to emphasise a principle which we ought to take into consideration in fixing our salaries and emoluments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why does he want the omission of lines 12 and 14?

Shri S. S. More: Only the word "and" in line 12 has to be omitted because it will come at the end of the first clause. It has to be inserted in line 14. That is all.

My submission is this. If you will permit me to go into the history of the House of Commons practice, before 1906 all the Members who were elected to the House of Commons were mostly coming from the rich classes, from the capitalists or big landlords. In 1906 the Members of the so-called Labour Party came into the Parliament. They were full timers for the cause of labour. They had no private income of their own and these Members found it extremely difficult to carry on their responsibilities and their duties in the Parliament effectively unless some provision was made for that purpose. Sir, in 1911 a first step was taken for the purpose of introduction of this salary and an yearly allowance of £400 was sanctioned for each Member of the House. With your permission, Sir, I will read....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is there any discrimination made between rich and poor Members?

Shri S. S. More: I will come to that and I am prepared to satisfy all your questions.

Mr. Lloyd George who was the then Chancellor of Exchequer, in introducing this measure said—it is very important that we should take into account the sentiments with which he expressed these words:

"When we offer £400 a year as payment of Members of Parliament it is not a recognition of the magnitude of the service, it is not a remuneration, it is not a recompense, it is not even a salary. It is just an allowance and I think the minimum allowance, to enable men to come here, men who would render incalculable service to the State and whom it is an incalculable loss to State not to have here, but who cannot be here because their means do not allow it. It is purely an allowance to enable us to open the door to great and honourable public service to these men, for whom this country will be all the richer, all the greater, and all the stronger for the unknown vicissitudes which it has to face by having to aid us by their counsel, by their courage, and by their resource."

Sir, when this provision was introduced and this allowance of £400 was raised to £600 in 1926—I will give you an instance—there were so many Members in the House of Commons who were not prepared to accept their pay-packets every month. I would particularly cite the instance of Mr. Baldwin who refused to have his pay-packet saying:

"I am fortunately well off. I need not draw upon the salary which has been provided. It is meant for those who have no private means of their own but who are called upon to render some sort of service to the country, and whose financial worries have to be removed by the State if they want to obtain the services of those people."

[Shri S. S. More]

Sir, this is the position which was accepted theoretically and in the history of the House of Commons. We can find so many names of Members who did not accept their pay-packet

Now, it has been pointed out by many persons that we must render patriotic service. What do we mean by patriotic service? Acharya Kripalani was kind enough to mention our sacrifices during the national struggle. But, he forgets that it was a national struggle and we were at war with a foreigner. Whenever we are at war we have to suffer so many hardships and we have to undergo so many sacrifices. But, war conditions cannot be made the perpetual conditions of human life. During war a soldier is prepared to live in a trench, but you cannot take the length, breadth and height of the trench to decide the minimum housing conditions required for him when the war is over. We have sacrificed; there is no doubt about it and some people have been reduced to the poverty of church mice. Are we expected to go on sacrificing? What is the value that we pay for the sacrifice? You know what is the plight of those who have been unfortunate enough to have large families. When we married there was no idea of family planning. It is a recent growth and we people who belong to the older generation should not be considered or judged by the modern conditions or modern concept.

An Hon. Member: Acharya Kripalani is also old.

Shri S. S. More: I do not want to refer to any personal matter. I refer to disadvantages. I do not refer to advantages because having no children is an advantage; they are fortunate.

My submission is, take for instance, many of us here are lawyers. Acharya Kripalani was very particular to emphasise that we should not treat this duty as a full time one. It is

easy to say a thing. Now, we are lawyers and no client is prepared to come to us. Not only that, our brother members in the Bar are kind enough in freeing us from the bother of clients. Whenever a client goes in search of More, and asks another member of the Bar as to where he is, our brother members of the Bar are kind enough to say: "He has gone to Parliament and he has given up practice". They are all generously appreciative of my parliamentary responsibilities.

An Hon. Member: You will not be available.

Shri S. S. More: My submission is, what am I to do? I am speaking in a personal strain. I do not want to wound the feelings of anybody else by taking him as an illustration. I would have very well taken Shri Velayudhan as my yardstick. I do not want to talk in that way.

Shri Velayudhan: I do not want you to do it.

Shri S. S. More: When he was an officer, he was getting Rs. 400 a month and he had a car. I fail to understand how a man with a large family could maintain a car unless....

Shri Velayudhan: But, my hon. friend does not know that my wife also was getting a decent income.

Shri S. S. More: I accept this confession. If she has got a decent income, he has no right to get any allowance. His wife can maintain him. She is a sort of an unemployment insurance for him.

My submission is, it is no use taking a partisan view in this matter. What is the minimum standard that a Member of Parliament is expected to maintain? If I am to do some mental work here, I have to purchase books. There are many Members who have to purchase books, leave aside filling the bellies of their

wives and their families. My submission is that you must fix up a minimum standard. In terms of the Constitution, you say that you are out for justice, political and social and economic. I do not mind if you introduce a minimum standard for every one of us which will be in tune with the average of the common people. Let that standard be applied not only to Members of Parliament, but let that standard be applied to all the business magnates; let that standard be applied to the Ministers and to everybody else who has a larger income than that required to maintain the minimum standard. It is no use asking the poor man to do patriotic work. There are occasions when our wives fall sick, when our children fall sick. We have not got the money in our pocket to get the best and competent medical aid. We are forced to go to a quack because his aid is cheaper and we have to suffer so many losses. It is a question in which the partisan spirit should not come in. The question is not between the Congress and the Opposition parties. I know there are many socialists with a fat bank account.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): They are unsocial socialists.

Shri S. S. More: In my part of the country, socialism and a big bank account go together. I know that there are many persons belonging to the higher plane of the middle class communities, who have taken to the philosophy of communism. I accept their *bona fides*. I accept their sincerity. All the same, when economic inequality is prevailing they have got their private properties and even when they do not take any allowance, they can maintain themselves at a particular high level. We people who are supposed to be poor, who have no other income to fall back upon, but on the contrary, who have a large family to maintain, are the worst sufferers. Not sufferers in body, but sufferers in mind. As a matter of fact, financial worry is a corroding

factor which saps our mind. I speak for those who are poor; I speak for those, I hope you will appreciate, Sir, who have large families. This matter of salaries should not be approached in a spirit of partisanship. Needs of a Member should be the guiding principle. There are many people who are fortunate enough. I think that those who have an income of Rs. 300 per month per head of the members of their family should not be given any allowance. Let us make it a rule that we submit a statement of our own private resources and our family needs to some authority that we shall appoint to assess our needs. Such statement shall be valuable data. The Committee which was appointed to find out the national income, has stated that statistical data are not available, and that our statistics are in a chaotic condition. Let us make a beginning by saying that all Members of Parliament who want to draw allowances should submit their resources and their family budgets and prove that they are really in need of the allowance and to them alone the allowances should be given. I do not want to take much lime of the House. This salary is not a question of Congressmen and Communists. It is not a question of those who go for the rich and those who fight for the poor. It is a question, as far as we are concerned, between the rich or wealthier section of the Members and the poorer section of this House. It is our poverty which puts us at a disadvantage. I know the rich Members can keep a car, a steno; they can keep anything. We suffer from this disadvantage that we do not have a car. I will be very frank. On occasions when we are out to attend Parliament, we have to think whether we should save four annas by walking from South Avenue to here instead of coming by bus. That is the psychology of a poor man. It is no use telling him "You have sacrificed so much for the country, Go on sacrificing." The only thing that remains with him for sacrificing is his own life, the life of his wife and the life of his children, nothing else.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. N. S. Jain. Amendment No. 6.

Shri N. S. Jain: I withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

ठाकुर युगलकिशोर सिंह : इस विषय में मेरा संशोधन यह है :

In page 2, line 17, after "business" insert "and the period of such residence will include the day of arrival and departure of the member;"

अभी श्री रामास्वामी ने जो संशोधन उपस्थित किया है उसमें यह शब्द जोड़ने के बाद ही वह कम्पलीट होता है क्योंकि उन्होंने "डे" की डेफिनिशन तो दी है, लेकिन अगर कोई मेम्बर चला जाय तो शायद उसकी गिनती ऐलाउंस के लिये नहीं होगी। आपने देखा होगा कि कोई मेम्बर अगर ट्रेन से ११ बजे पहुंचने वाला है और वह साढ़े बारह बजे पहुंचता है तो उसे उस दिन का ऐलाउंस नहीं मिलता है। हवाई जहाज से भी ऐसा होता है कि साढ़े बारह बजे के बाद पहुंचने में ऐलाउंस नहीं मिलता है। इसलिये जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, मेरा ऐमेन्डमेन्ट श्री रामास्वामी के ऐमेन्डमेन्ट को पूरा करता है। मैंने यह रखा है कि जिस दिन मेम्बर आ जाय और जिस दिन वह जाय, इन दोनों दिनों की गिनती होनी चाहिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Ramaswamy. Amendment No. 61.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Ramaswamy has withdrawn his amendment. What about Mr. Jugal Kishore Sinha?

Th. Jugal Kishore Sinha: You may put it to the vote.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What about Mr. More? Need I put it to the House?

Shri S. S. More: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will, therefore, put only these two amendments, Nos. 5 and 8, to the vote of the House.

Mr. More's amendment is that the allowance shall be given only to the poorer section and not to the richer ones. I am bound to explain to the House:

The question is:

In page 1.—

(i) line 12, omit "and";

add at the end
"and"; and

(iii) after line 14, add—

"(iii) any other Member whose private income exclusive of all taxes, is more than rupees three hundred per head of the members of his family;"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put amendment No. 8 to the vote of the House. This is intended evidently to correct the interpretation that has been put that if a Member comes in the afternoon and goes in the forenoon, then he will not get the allowance for the two days concerned.

The question is:

In page 2, line 17, after "business" insert "and the period of such residence will include the day of arrival and departure of the Member;"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is there any understanding that we may carry on discussion with regard to the Salaries Bill till it is finished today?

Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri S. S. More: Let us finish it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If that is the general understanding of the House.

Shri Satya Naryan Sinha: Yesterday I made a submission this must encroach upon the Private Members' business.

Hon. Members: We must finish it.

Shri Punnose (Alleppey): I have got an amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am coming to it.

Clause 3— (*Salaries and Daily allowances*)

Shri Punnose: I beg to move:

(1) In pages 2 and 3, for clause 3, substitute—

"A Member shall be entitled to receive a salary at the rate of three hundred rupees per mensem during the whole of his term of office plus an allowance at the rate of twenty rupees for each day during any period of residence on duty, both being subject to income-tax."

(2) In page 2, line 33, for "forty rupees" substitute "thirty-five rupees"

(3) In page 2, after line 34, insert—

"(c) All amounts received as salary on daily allowance shall be subject to income-tax."

Shri K. K. Basu: I beg to move:

In page 2—(i) (a) in line 28,—omit "at his option, either";

(b) in line 32, omit "or"; and

(c) after line 33 insert—

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision in any other law the salary

193 P.S.D.

ies and daily allowances as heretofore mentioned shall be considered as earnings under the Indian Income Tax Act, 1922, as amended"; and

(ii) in pages 2 and 3, omit lines 33 to 48 and 1 to 9 respectively".

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): I beg to move:

In pages 2 and 3, for clause 3, substitute—

"3. *Daily Allowance.*—A member shall be entitled to receive an allowance at the rate of thirty-five rupees for each day during any period of residence on duty."

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea cum-Santal Paraganas): I beg to move:

In pages 2 and 3, for clause 3, substitute—

"3. *Salaries and daily allowances.*—A member shall be entitled to receive a salary at the rate of four hundred rupees per mensem during the whole of his term of office plus an allowance at the rate of twenty-one rupees for each day during any period of residence on duty."

Shri N. R. M. Swamy (Wandiwash): I beg to move:

(1) In page 2, line 29, for "three hundred rupees" substitute "five hundred rupees"

(2) In page 2, line 31, for "twenty rupees" substitute "fifteen rupees"

(3) In page 2, lines 38 to 40, for "Chairman of the Council of States or, as the case may be, the Speaker of the House of the People" substitute "Speaker of the House of the People, or, as the case may be, the Chairman of the Council of States,"

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): I beg to move:

In page 3, after line 9, add—

“(5) Notwithstanding any provision in any law, all salaries and all daily allowances as heretofore provided shall be liable to be taxed as income under the Indian Income-Tax Act, 1922, as amended.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved:

(1) In pages 2 and 3, for clause 3, substitute—

“A member shall be entitled to receive a salary at the rate of three hundred rupees per mensem during the whole of his term of office plus an allowance at the rate of twenty rupees for each day during any period of residence on duty, both being subject to income-tax.”

(2) In page 2, line 33, for “forty rupees” substitute “thirty-five rupees”.

(3) In page 2, after line 34, insert—

“(c) All amounts received as salary or daily allowance shall be subject to income-tax”.

(4) In page 2—(i) (a) in line 28, omit “at his option, either”;

(b) in line 32, omit “or”; and

(c) after line 33 insert—

“(b) Notwithstanding any provision in any other law the salaries and daily allowances as heretofore mentioned shall be considered as earnings under the Indian Income-Tax Act, 1922, as amended”; and

(ii) in pages 2 and 3, omit lines 33 to 48 and 1 to 9 respectively.

(5) In pages 2 and 3, for clause 3, substitute—

“3. *Daily Allowance.*—A member shall be entitled to receive an allowance at the rate of thirty-five

rupees for each day during any period of residence on duty.”

(6) In pages 2 and 3, for clause 3, substitute—

“3. *Salaries and daily allowances.*—A member shall be entitled to receive a salary at the rate of four hundred rupees per mensem during the whole of his term of office plus an allowance at the rate of twenty-one rupees for each day during any period of residence on duty.”

(7) In page 2, line 29, for “three hundred rupees” substitute “five hundred rupees”.

(8) In page 2, line 31, for “twenty rupees” substitute “fifteen rupees”

(9) In page 2, lines 38 to 40, for “Chairman of the Council of States or, as the case may be, the Speaker of the House of the People,” substitute “Speaker of the House of the People or, as the case may be, the Chairman of the Council of States,”

(10) In page 3, after line 9, add—

“(5) Notwithstanding any provision in any law, all salaries and all daily allowances as heretofore provided shall be liable to be taxed as income under the Indian Income-Tax Act, 1922 as amended.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Punnoose. Hon. Members will try not to give up their points and at the same time be brief.

Shri Punnoose: In moving my amendments, I have to make a few general observations. A Joint committee of both the Houses of Parliament was set up to go into the question. If you read the proceedings of the Committee you will find that effecting economy was not one of its, but its main consideration. But what do we find? The proposals placed before us do not effect any economy. On the other hand, they have resulted in the enhancement of the emoluments of Members of Parliament.

I have to say a word about the attitude taken by the Minister. He puts on apparently an attitude of neutrality. He said that the Government was neutral in this matter. But I believe he can deceive nobody. If one reads side by side the news appearing in the papers yesterday and today that the Congress Party has decided, formally or informally, I do not know, to have Rs. 400 as monthly salary and Rs. 21 as daily allowance the meaning of neutrality is clear. Therefore, their neutrality is in word. You say: 'We will do nothing. You can decide for yourself'. Well, they know that the Party has decided.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): No decision as such has been taken.

Shri Punnoose: Very well. I am glad to hear that. But nobody on the other side has contradicted the Press reports which appeared, saying that they have determined to have Rs. 400 as monthly salary and Rs. 21 daily allowance.

Shri Velayudhan: The contradiction will come tomorrow.

Shri Punnoose: When spokesman of the Congress begins to speak like this....

An Hon. Member: He is not a Congressman.

Shri Velayudhan: He will become a Congress spokesman. Wait for six months more.

Shri Punnoose: I do not know whether the Congress Government and the leaders of the Congress Party consider this question as one which does not involve any political issue; I do not know whether it is the view of the Congress Government that this issue does not involve any political or social significance. If that is their view, I beg to differ from them. We hold that it is a question of political importance. This is a question on which certain moral issues are involved and we on our side—may be we are a little narrow minded—cannot help saying that we have decided to observe certain principles in

this context. Naturally I expected the Leader of the House—I mean the leader of the Congress Party—to come down here and tell us as to what principles ought to govern a decision on this question. I beg to differ from the hon. Member, Mr. More, who seems to entertain the idea that the chapter of sacrifices is over and that that the chapter of enjoyment has begun. He spoke about trenches. I believe it is the duty of every patriotic Indian to fight in the trenches today; I do not believe that the period of struggle is over. The struggle against poverty, against servitude, against social inequalities and against a hundred other evils is being waged and should be waged at this time. I believe that more than ever we should consider ourselves as soldiers who have a very great task before them, a great duty devolving on their shoulders. When Acharya Kripalani spoke, I could associate myself with the sentiments he expressed. Whether all of us may be able to emulate everything, I do not know. But we should try to follow it as far as possible and from this side of the House on behalf of my friends on these benches I can promise the leader of the Congress Party that however much they reduce the allowances, we are prepared to stand by them; we are prepared to suffer. We do not believe that this question is a question of justice between Members of Parliament; the question is a question of justice between this Parliament and the people at large. Already more than a crore of rupees is being spent every year, and mind you, more than 50 per cent of that crore is being consumed by the hon. Members of Parliament.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: How much?

Shri Punnoose: More than a crore, and 50 per cent of it is taken up by us, the Members. And this is not the only charge on the nation. We have to take into consideration the expenditure the country has to bear for the several legislatures—Assemblies and Councils—from Kashmir down to Cape Comerin. It comes to a huge amount.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: One question. What amount does the hon. Member propose? Is it Rs. 35? Secondly, if salary or allowance is agreed to by this House in excess of what the hon. Member asks for, will his party agree to forego the excess?

Shri Punnoose: This is the disadvantage of talking in a general way on the amendments. I will explain. So, the total expenditure that the people of India have to meet for their State Legislature and for their Parliament and for their great Ministers and Deputy Ministers—all this has to be taken into consideration. We should then consider whether it behoves the dignity of the House to demand and secure more than what is given today. This is not a small matter. It is a very serious question which we should tackle with the care it deserves. The feeling will be there that the people of India are asked to feed a white elephant of democracy which they cannot by any means feed.

Shri Kottukappally (Meenachie): You do not want these Assemblies You want a dictatorship.

Shri Punnoose: I will answer the hon. Member when he started functioning here, we were prepared to be satisfied and we stated in this House, with a small amount. When the first committee was appointed, we stood for Rs. 300 as salary and Rs. 10 as daily allowance. Then, at the time, we supported the idea that we, as Members of Parliament, should set an example and that we should stimulate the nation to make a sacrifice in the cause of the nation. We very soon found that response was not forthcoming. We knew that there are friends on the other side and on this side also who are governed by ideas which are not altogether pernicious but at the same time are not so austere as we wanted them to be. Therefore, we were prepared to be accommodative. We pleaded for a compromise and we agreed to finally to Rs. 300 and Rs. 20, as daily allowance. By all means, it is open to the majority to make a moderate proposal. We will stand by it and we

will go out and tell the country that the Congress Party was prepared to put down the scale of expenditure. But Rs. 300 and Rs. 20, daily allowance, is the proposal before us. Are you prepared to accept it? Why not the House accept it? We were prepared to accept it. Acharya Kripalani and also Shri Sarangadhar Das were saying that Rs. 35, as daily allowance could be given. Certainly, we said that it should be Rs. 35, but, at the same time, we were eager, we argued, for Rs. 300 as salary and Rs. 20 as daily allowance. The question of daily allowance had to be taken away. We did not want that option to be there, so that Members may choose which is more convenient or profitable. Then we argued, and we still believe that every pie that we get either in the way of salary or in the way of allowance should be subject to Income-tax if the provisions of the present income-tax law do not allow that, we will have to make suitable amendments to it. What is the reasonable thing that we can tell the people if we ourselves get emoluments which are free from income-tax? Should we take shelter under some provision of the income-tax law? Then, how can you find fault with all the tax evaders?

Then we want travelling facilities. The proposal in the Bill is that two II class fares and one third class fare should be given to members of Parliament. I believe I am correct. But there is another proposal also which I learnt today, and that is, the non-official 'official' resolution of the Congress. According to that, I understand that one single II class pass may be given to Members of Parliament. We do not object to that. But then, when the Members have to go and attend the Select Committee meetings, when they go for some functions other than sessions of Parliament—we do not generally do that nor do we see the Congress Members taking their families with them—they should use only the passes. For the expenses on the way we have got our salary. I request every Member on the other side to consider and reconsider this Rs. 400 business. It will be a very sad day

when we pass it. People will laugh at that. One hundred rupees on one side and the ridicule from the people on the other; these the hon. Members will have to weigh.

In order to avoid repugnant interpretation being given to 420 they want Rs. 421. Why not make it Rs. 320? By making it Rs. 421 they have made themselves guilty of 420.

In this connection I am reminded of an old woman in our place who used to make loaves and sell them. She was blind and yet she would make the loaves in such a way that they were never above the normal size; they were always below the normal size.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): That lady's instance can be applied to you.

Shri Punnoose: How?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Because you stand for less.

Shri Punnoose: We stand for Rs. 300 and Rs. 20—and we also stand for income-tax, and daily allowance shall not be excepted. It must be subject to income-tax. We also stand for one pass provided you do not allow them any travelling allowance when they come here for Committees.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Do you promise to forego it?

Shri Punnoose: I forgot to state another thing. We are against any type of option—daily allowance or salary—because it is only permitting the more fortunate amongst us to go scot-free from income-tax. We do not want that; we oppose that.

I want to answer a question that has been raised. He was asking me whether we were prepared to forego Rs. 5 or so. The hon. Member will remember that we are not discussing a charity Bill. I am sure if the Congress Members were to go on functioning like this, then soon the Government of India will have to take the begging bowl in hand.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I want a direct answer.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I have moved my amendment No. 95 in which I say that the monthly salary be raised to Rs. 400,—and the daily allowance to Rs. 21. I am making no secret of the fact that I am motivated to move this amendment on two grounds. Firstly, that it must be reasonable for us to discharge the responsibilities cast upon us and secondly, I feel, that by putting in this amendment I am not putting any additional burden on the Exchequer. About the first point, I cannot say better than in the words of my old and learned friend Mr. More. I do not say 'old' in age but old in experience and other things.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is a non-party Bill.

11 A.M.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I think it has been said by our learned friend Kripalaniji that it is not a whole-time job. Of course, it is not for him. For him, there are so many other things to look forward and look after, but for us, who have to work inside the Parliament and outside in our constituencies and so it is so. Last year, we sat here for six and a half months for the sessions and we had to come and go from the eastern corner of the country, which takes about a week. So, we had to spend seven months in the year in attending the Parliament sessions. After that, if you want to be true to the electorate, and if you are to be sincere to the electorate, you will have to move round within the constituency and tell the people what you have done or not done, and this takes three months in a year. After that, nothing is left in the year. Our learned friend refers to this and says that it is not a whole-time job. I feel that it is a whole-time job, and for that, I say that the Rs. 400 and Rs. 21 are in no way remuneration. We are not charging anything for the work that we are doing. I cannot do better than quote my hon.

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

friend, Mr. More, when he said that it is not in the way of compensation, it is not in the way of remuneration and not in any other way, but it is an opening to those very sincere friends to discharge their services to the country. We have been appealed on the ground of patriotism and on the ground of service to the country, to forego this. It is very good, and we would have very much appreciated if this statement of our learned friend had been acted on by him, and his Party. I do not find a single Member who has foregone even one pie of his allowances during the last three years of Parliament. Nothing prevented them from having a voluntary cut. It is only a Party propaganda which is directed against us, but I know the electorate is sufficiently wise to understand what should be given to its representative.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil):
More than this.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: If we give Rs. 400 as salary and Rs. 21 as allowance, it would come to Rs. 520 a month. It may be that there are Members who are blessed with no children, and Members who are blessed with other funds at their disposal, but we poor Members have neither the lift, nor the gift nor the feast. Therefore, I feel that those persons who are opposing my amendment are those who have either got not much liabilities or they have got other means to discharge their liabilities. I know our friends have got large feeders to their purse and those feeders are reaching them through underground sources. I know that they challenge us in the name of democracy. May I know what is the payment that is made to the security staff of a particular state? I suppose the payment made to the security staff in Kremlin is more than what is spent in a democratic State. It is a Party propaganda and nothing but that. If those friends who talk in this manner give a voluntary amount by imposing a cut themselves, pos-

terity will remember them, but the present generation knows them too well. Posterity may say that the Congress Members were very greedy and the communist Members were very very good people because they accepted the cut. Whatever it is, the present generation knows them too well.

Coming to the next point about the additional burden that the Exchequer may have to bear, I may say that at least one-third of the Members of the House are paying income-tax and by bringing this amendment, I suppose they will have to pay more. My friend, Shri Tulsi-das Kilachand—I do not think he is here now—will have to pay Rs. 360 out of the Rs. 400 as income-tax and there are other friends also who will have to pay more income-tax. In the form of income-tax from at least one-third of the Members of the House, the Exchequer will be getting more than what it will be spending over us in the form of salary and allowances. Our communist friends have agreed to Rs. 300 monthly and Rs. 20 a day which, if calculated in the other way, comes to Rs. 400 monthly and 15 a day. Let them calculate and find it out for themselves. I am only asking for Rs. 6 more, which will be a negligible sum for the year. Up till now I was not paying any income-tax, because I had no other income, and was just making both ends meet. Hereafter I will have to pay income-tax. Every Member of Parliament will be paying income-tax. Let Government find out what they will be spending over us, and what we will be paying as income-tax. So my objective in moving this amendment is: one, to ensure a decent amount to Members of Parliament so as to enable them discharge their duty in the Parliament as well as in their constituencies; second, not to burden the Exchequer by additional sums. I do not think any objection could be taken by anyone in this House to my amendment, unless he were actuated by considerations of political strategy.

My hon. friend Mr. Punnoose on the other side said: "I fully associate myself with what Acharya Kripalani has said." Naturally, politics sometimes makes strange bed-fellows. I warn him against our great Dada; let him beware of the good snub that they got in Travancore-Cochin. Let me tell them that we know our Dada better than communist friends do. He was for a long time our leader, friend, philosopher and guide. It is just bad luck that he is slightly far away from us. Let them not associate themselves with him too much. They will again get a good snub.

We cannot compare the salaries of Members of Parliament in this country with the emoluments they get in other countries. I know there is vast difference between the economic conditions of our country and those prevailing in the USSR, the USA, or even the United Kingdom. Mr. More referred to the raising of the allowances of the Members of Parliament in the United Kingdom.

The majority of the Members of the Conservative Party were either millionaires or big landed aristocrats and did not feel any necessity for increasing the allowance. When Labour came into power, most of the Labour Members were poor—unable to make both ends meet,—and they tried to increase the allowance. But the move was resisted by the Conservative Members. Now there seems to be a unanimous desire to increase the allowance from £1,000 to £1,500. (*Interruption*).

Let the Members of the Communist Party surrender their income in favour of the common people of India. Are they prepared to do it. Those friends who interrupt and protest have got a long purse; we common men who come straight from the electorate have nothing to lose. We

are prepared to surrender everything we have. Their speaking of sacrifice sounds like the devil quoting the scripture. They were giving us lessons in democracy and patriotism and sermons on service. Members on this side have got more service to their credit than the Members on the other side. The hon. Member protested so loudly but he thinks differently in the heart of hearts (*Interruptions*). What is the result? I feel that the arguments which are raised against this amendment are baseless and fantastic. Hyperboles and superlatives are only the characteristics of all opposition parties. They are speaking against whatever the Government says. That is the only role of the opposition. They are never guided by the circumstances in the country nor are they guided by the forces with which we are guided. Other things force them. With these words, I feel that I have amply justified my amendment on these grounds of giving at least sufficient, decent and reasonable emoluments to discharge our responsibilities, certainly without putting any additional burden on the Government.

* * * * *

Shri K. K. Desai (Halar): We have got before us the Bill presented by Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha and we are on clause 3. I would take a few minutes to explain the clause as it is which I understand is the unanimous view of the Committee that has been appointed by this House and the other House. There are some amendments also. One amendment has been moved by the Communist Party and one amendment had been moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Azad. Let us now understand what the Bill says.

Clause 3 says that the Members shall receive a monthly salary of Rs. 300 and Rs. 20 for daily attendance or, in the alternative, they may get

[Shri K. K. Desai]

Rs. 40 as was hitherto paid to the Members and they have got to exercise their option. Let us understand what it means to the Treasury. Rs. 40 per day is not liable to tax. Assuming that the House sits for 200 days they get Rs. 8,000 which is non-taxable. The taxation system is this. Over Rs. 25,000 there is a super-tax. Any thing that is more than Rs. 25,000 is liable to a taxation of about seven annas—four annas is the basic income tax and then there is an additional super-tax of 0-3-0. Apparently, whether the framers of this particular proposal have understood it or not, consciously or unconsciously, clause 3 in the Bill favours the rich people. There is an option and I have no doubt that the option would be exercised by no less than 80 to 90 per cent of the Members and the Treasury may have to pay out more and more money and it will be all free of income-tax. Let us see what Mr. Azad's amendment proposes. It proposes that there will be a salary of Rs. 400 per month and a daily allowance of Rs. 21. Rs. 400 per month comes to Rs. 4,800 annually. So the amount between Rs. 1,500 and Rs. 4,800 will be taxable at the rate of nine pies in the rupee. If it goes over Rs. 4,800 on account of the other extra income which some of the Members may get, then it will go to the higher slab and the person would pay at the rate of two annas. If it goes over Rs. 25,000 the rate will be seven annas; if it is over Rs. 40,000 they will have to pay eight annas, and so on.

So in my opinion, as far as the treasury is concerned, it is completely benefited by this amendment and not by clause 3 as it stands. Unfortunately, as I say, clause 3 in the Bill has been weighted more in favour of the rich people of this House as well as of the other House, unwittingly of course, because I know that if this matter had been pointed out to the Members of this Committee they would never have done it. What Mr.

Azad's amendment seeks to do is to remove this misunderstanding from the original clause and put it in such a way that ultimately the treasury taken as a whole would have to pay a little less than what they are paying even today.

If my calculations are wrong—because it is very difficult to know how the 750 Members are earning; it will be known in the course of a year—even then after considering everything you can again amend it. If it is found that under Mr. Azad's amendment the treasury has to pay out something more, then the whole proposition might again be reconsidered. But taken as a whole I feel that the amendment of Mr. Azad would place a lesser burden on the treasury than at present.

Then there is one more point. Of course I do agree with Acharya Kripalani as well as Shri More that when we are legislating for ourselves we have to be very careful and very cautious. I think that the amendment that Mr. Azad has moved has taken this point into consideration. Therefore I think we will be well advised in this House to accept Mr. Azad's amendment in preference to clause 3 in the Bill as it stands, as it will in my opinion mean more benefit to the treasury than otherwise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Lanka Sundaram.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Kushtagi): May I enquire from the Chair when the Private Members' Business is going to be taken up?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Private Members' Resolutions will be taken up only after this work is finished.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I rise to support amendment No. 95 moved by my hon. friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. I support it in the confidence, based upon the knowledge of the controversy which has been carried on this particular Bill for the past

year and more, that it is perhaps the best in the circumstances that one could have arrived at. I regret however that instead of having a non-party non-political attitude on this Bill, the discussion, especially during the past few minutes, had become acrimonious and not only acrimonious, had become what you call the basis of political propaganda and counter-political propaganda.

Here we got the First Report of the Joint Committee on this question, and I crave the indulgence of the House if I quote from the Minute of Dissent or Note appended to it jointly submitted by Shri Sundarayya and Shri A. K. Gopalan. It is at page 11 of the report. I would only quote one sentence:

"People's representatives are to be paid emoluments which make them free from other preoccupations and devote themselves completely to looking after the people's needs."

I am quoting that not to score a debating point over my hon. friend Mr. Punnoose or any other friend who has adopted that line of approach to this Bill. I only wish to emphasize a point, and I regret to say that I cannot agree with my esteemed friend Acharya Kripalani when he said that it is not a whole-time job, that it is a patriotic service. I have noted down his words. He said "public duty".

Acharya Kripalani: I said the theory is that it is a patriotic duty. I did not say it was not a whole time job.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I am not misquoting him. He said it was a patriotic duty on the part of legislators. I do not deny that each one of the Members is a patriot, but the point to be remembered now is: is it a whole-time job or is it not a whole-time job? Speaking for myself, I have gone to my constituency six times since I was elected, and each time I was out of pocket. Where do I get the money from? Speaking for my-

self—you know it, Sir, and I am sure you will bear me out—I have surrendered a substantial portion of my professional income by becoming a Member of this House, and I submit the allowances I have got so far are not sufficient to enable me to maintain my ordinary middle-class family reasonably, here and in the constituency. So, I quoted from the note of Shri Sundarayya and Shri Gopalan to fix the point in the debate, viz., that we of this hon. House should be free from other precautions and devote ourselves completely to looking after the people's needs. Once this principle is accepted—and I am glad it came from the quarter of my friends in the right—there will not be any further controversy on this matter.

I feel, however, that I should make one more remark. I would like to be very brief on this issue, but I regret to say that so far we have not been intellectually honest to ourselves and the country when we are debating this question. There is no harm in this hon. House telling the people, the voters, that costs of living have gone up, expenses are to be met and that a reasonable salary and allowance or salary-cum-allowance is necessary if our work has to be carried on properly.

Shri Nambiar: Apply the same principle to the workers also.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I feel very strongly that we in this hon. House are given emoluments or salaries and emoluments which are not comparable to that of a, what you may call, medium-sized official either of the Central Government or even the State Government. Comparisons are invidious, but we have got to maintain a certain status. I would ask every hon. Member present in this House to remember one point. How many people come to them for charity when they go to their constituencies? How many people impose upon them with petitions for assistance? Where do we get the money from?

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

I would make one final point before I sit down. I do not want to be reduced to the status of a beggar to function in this hon. House. I do not want to be driven to the necessity of adopting corrupt practices like, permit-hunting or *sifarish* business. I want to live as an honourable citizen entitled to reasonable emoluments, and I will go before the people and say these are the difficulties involved in keeping two establishments at two places, both in Delhi and in the constituency, and this is the minimum necessary.

Look at what is happening in England. They were drawing £ 450; now they are drawing £ 1,000. Hon. Members should remember there is a terrific controversy going on today for the augmentation of the allowances to £ 1,500.

Shri Punnoose: It is not a fact that the proposal for increase was not accepted.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: It is still under consideration, and no final decision has been taken. I would like him to go through the latest issues of the *London Times*. England is a very small country. The whole distance is under 500 miles from London to Invernes, whereas we have to go long distances. Look at the allowance position and the travelling allowance. Each one of us who has brought his family here will be out of pocket to take them back to the constituency under the new proposal. Is that fair? We are to be provided two second classes and one third class. If you have a wife and child, for the child, a portion of the money has to be paid to transport him again to the constituency. Of course, there are exceptions. We should not be put to out of pocket expenditure when we come at least to the sessions, because we have to make provision for our families, with the result that even though I would have liked amendment No. 95 to be more generous than what it is, I request every Member of this House to pass it

unanimously and put it beyond a shadow of controversy. And no political propaganda should be made out of the arguments now advanced.

Shri Gadgil: I think the question ought to be considered dispassionately and not on party lines. I do not doubt the sincerity of any Member, if he opposes the amendment moved by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. At the same time, I should like the House to consider that there must be some connection between the responsibility of the office and also the general standard of the country available outside. On the one hand, what a Member ought to receive must be adequate for the proper discharge of his duties, and for the maintenance of such dignity and such status as we have to associate with membership of Parliament. On the other hand, it would be wrong to say that because one individual has fewer needs, and another has greater needs, the whole thing should vary from one individual to another. We must go by some norm or standard. The real question here is whether it should be Rs. 300, or Rs. 350 or Rs. 400.

As for the option business, it was a matter of great importance, so far as I was concerned. Under no circumstances would I agree to option being given to anybody to opt for merely allowances. Rs. 8,000 a year for persons who are fortunately situated was something which was against my moral grain, and I fought against it right from the very beginning; I am glad that even the amendments moved as alternative to the one that has been moved by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad do not agree with or approve of option.

So, the real question is whether the salary should be Rs. 300, Rs. 350 or Rs. 400 a month. Let us not be taking a very narrow view. If people say that they should be satisfied with Rs. 300, others should not say that they are too patriotic; or, if people say that they should have

Rs. 400, they should not be run down as selfish people. Now, it is for us to consider the nature of the job, and the responsible character of the job that we do. We are here practically the architects of our country's fortune, and its policy makers and the responsibility is so great that if we realise what it is, some of us may like to say that even Rs. 400 will not be enough. But as I said, we must go by some norm or standard.

So far as the character of this membership or office is concerned, it is full-time in reality. For seven months in a year, not continuously, but for some time in summer and some time in winter, probably twice in winter, we meet. In between the sessions, there are meetings of the Select Committee, and other matters connected with Parliament.

Paldit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): There are also the Estimates Committee, the Public Accounts Committee etc.

Shri Gadgil: Those who belong to the profession of medicine or law are completely ruined. They are out of touch with their clientele. What Shri S. S. More says has been my humble experience throughout these thirty years. Whether I am a Member or whether I was outside, people say, well, Kaka Saheb is not available, either he is in the Assembly, or he is in the jail, so it is no good trusting him with any brief. For those who have independent means of livelihood, it is all right. I am, therefore, requesting this House with great humility, not to over-emphasise these small things, whether it should be Rs. 350 or Rs. 400, or whether it should be Rs. 20 or Rs. 21. In fact, I would like Rs. 21 to be reduced to Rs. 20, because it is a small matter. But so far as the salary is concerned, one great principle we have really adopted is this.

Shri Punnoose: It means Rs. 9 lakhs.

Shri Gadgil: No Member of either this House or the other House will

be hereafter free from some income-tax. So far, there have been many Members who have never disclosed what their income is. Now, every man will get a notice from the income-tax authorities, and he will have to say that he is getting such and such extra income from other sources. Even if his income is Rs. 1 or Rs. 5 or Rs. 1 lakh, it will be added on to this Rs. 4,800, and the rate fixed will be on the whole of the income, according to the income-tax rules.

So he will know what it is to be taxed. For the time being, many people—some of us who have nothing—always say 'Tax more'. Now when our own salary is being taxed—not that I will not continue to preach what I have been preaching—there will be a little more sense of responsibility when questions of additional taxation come. Then, as the personal income, the independent income—other than this—of a Member is greater, the Treasury will be getting more and more. Therefore, so far as the overall position of the Exchequer is concerned, I am inclined to agree with my friend Mr. Khandubhai Desai, that Government will have to spend less. And having accepted this principle that part should be salary and part should be paid in the form of allowance, I think many may not attend, in the same number as we have seen so far. The result will be that the quality of debate will improve. (*Interruptions*).

Shri K. K. Basu: No.

Shri Gadgil: You may not agree with me—as you never do—but in the end you will agree. If you wait, I will explain.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. When he says that the quality of the debate will increase; does it not mean that the majority of Members do not take sufficient interest in the work? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Gadgil: When the same time of the House will be occupied by fewer speakers and since they get

[Shri Gadgil]

the chance, there is every possibility of their coming better prepared before they say what they want to say in this House.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): Why do you pay them? You pay them for simply sitting at home?

Shri Gadgil: My friend, Shri Gidwani, has not understood me. When they do not come here, the expectation is that they will be working in the constituencies. The responsibilities of the office and the nature of the office both include that not only he has to ventilate what his constituency's grievances are, but at the same time he has to carry the message of this House and communicate to his constituency whatever the Parliament has done. As a matter of fact, he is a sort of postman. He comes from his constituency with certain grievances and carries whatever Parliament has said or done or achieved to the constituency. From Rs. 300 it has been raised to Rs. 400. Out of that Rs. 150 at least will go to the State. In any case, I would suggest that instead of having Rs. 21, it is much better to have Rs. 20. Rs. 400 and Rs. 20—that is what I would suggest.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I did not have the foggiest intention of participating in this debate. I was scribbling on a subject very remote from what we are discussing at the present moment. But I was provoked by certain observations which I heard in this discussion and I hope I shall be able at least to make certain observations which might conceivably commend themselves to this House. (*Interruption*). I oppose Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad's amendment because I do not for the life of me understand how we can at this stage try to raise the salary to Rs. 400 per month and have a daily allowance of Rs. 21—which is apparently his intention. I am happy that Mr. Gadgil has spoken and has made it very clear

at least that there are many Members of this House who are against the option altogether. I wish that option to go. But as far as the quantum of the salary and daily allowance is concerned, I cannot understand for the life of me how we can ask for this increase in contrast to the Report of the Select Committee and the provisions of the Bill which the Minister has presented before us. My friend, Mr. Khandubhai Desai, made certain observations about the Treasury being likely to be the gainer as a result of this increase in the salary.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): A sure gain.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I made a calculation on the basis of 200 days, which is perhaps the average number of days the House is going to sit every year. Now, if we have Rs. 400 as salary every month, then we get Rs. 4,800 in the year, and at the rate of Rs. 21 per every day of attendance, we might get about Rs. 4,200. The total comes to about Rs. 9,000. If it is 200 days' sitting and Rs. 40 daily allowance, it means the total expenditure on the part of the Treasury would come to Rs. 8,000. The difference, or the increase, amounts to Rs. 1,000. That is an average estimate.

Several Hon. Members: What about the income-tax?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am not a specialist in regard to the rate of income-tax on different slabs. I do not think that on Rs. 4,800, the income-tax, in the year, comes to Rs. 1,000. It does not. Obviously, this increases the quantum of the money which this country has to spend because of the luxury of having this Parliament. I cannot possibly justify this either to my conscience or to the country. My honourable friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram spoke, as he always does, with a great sense of responsibility. I take him at his word. He usually speaks very responsibly. He has given certain arguments. He

says we have to live decently. We have to live a middle-class, reasonable kind of life. I take him at his word. What do we see when we come to this House? We see those who are going to the gallery and watch the proceedings. We see those who work in our Lok Sabha, sachivalaya,—all good, decent, middle-class individuals. What is the average earning of these people who put on just as decent clothes as Dr. Lanka Sundaram? I would very much like to know what is the average expectation of a good, decent, respectable, middle-class earning individual today in this country. If this is the criterion—it may very well be our criterion, but some of us might choose some other kind of criterion, those who prefer to work with people who have not even got the advantages of a middle-class existence may choose a different criterion—if you choose the good, respectable, god-fearing middle-class criterion, why ask for all the appurtenances of luxurious living in Delhi? I do not understand it. I know to live in Delhi is a very difficult thing, and it is a very expensive proposition. If you give me even Rs. 1,000 a month, I cannot live in any comfort in this place. But I cannot ask of my country Rs. 1,000 a month or more, because that is the only sum with which you can live with some sort of decency in New Delhi. Now, I am told that sometimes you get some jobs to do for which you have to go from place to place. This is a fantastic place of long distances which you cannot cover. There is no communication of any sort; no transport is available; you have to ask for a taxi by telephone; do all kinds of fantastic things in this place which are out of tune with the spirit and life of this country. I say that in those cases, those who have special political errands, those who have many social engagements to fulfil, they have no business to ask the Government of this country to supply them with the money for it. If I were to do such work, if you ask me

to go on a political job, to go somewhere ten miles away from here, for some political purpose, I do not expect the expenses to be incurred to be borne by the Treasury of my country. I expect my political expenses to be borne by the funds of my political party to which I certainly make my own contribution in accordance with my own science. You must find out some definite criterion. (*Interruptions*). I expect some kind of politeness, some kind of courtesy to be extended at least occasionally, at least when we are supposed to be discussing what you were pleased to call a non-party Bill. I know that whenever urgent matters of serious national or international consequences have been discussed in this House, certain sections in this House have behaved in a manner which I do not wish to characterize, because words come to the tip of my tongue so fast that I am afraid to use them.

Sir, I want to make this very clear. Why should we have an expectation of getting out of the Treasury of my country as much money as I imagine is in conformity with the decency and respectability of the life of a Member of Parliament? I do not understand that (*Interruption*). You were a Member of this House, and its predecessors for a long time. What was the kind of standard in those days? We have seen those people. Their standard of living used to be generally much higher; they spent a lot more money than we do. Is our criterion the ability to spend money? My friend, Acharya Kripalani, made a short speech and he spoke movingly because he reminded me of those days when after all service was the badge of patriotism. If that is so, why is it that today we want that we should be paid more than we are being paid now?

My friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram gave an instance of what was being paid to Members of Parliament in England. He could not counter the question of sacrifice. The recent decision of the House of Commons is:

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

not to disturb the present arrangement regarding payment of £1,000 a year. One thousand pounds a year paid to a Member of Parliament of the British House of Commons is certainly less in terms of the services available than what you are getting here and now in this House today.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know what happens in the British Parliament better than many Members of this House. I have lived a good slice of my life in that country. We know that the British standard of living—in spite of the rising costs of living in this country at the moment—is generally much higher. The correspondence of an average Member of the British House of Commons with his constituents is very much more than with our constituents here. It is not their fault. After all, our constituents are largely illiterate and do not write to us as much as the British elector writes to the British House of Commons Member. And, the British M.P. is a very much better correspondent than the average Indian Member of Parliament. I know for a fact letters which are written to Members of Parliament are often never answered and are thrown into the waste-paper basket and, perhaps, sold by weight to people who come round.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Mr. Mukerjee, that is wrong.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The British Member of Parliament has to pay for his postage and all kinds of sundry expenses. If you are going to compare yourselves with the British Members of Parliament today.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The increased salary will enable them to correspond properly.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am talking of things as they are now, Sir. I find some of our Members are asking for certain amenities and they say

that the British Member of Parliament gets £1,000 per annum. They are today in a more difficult position than we are. Some of them asked for an increase and it was turned down. They have turned it down in a country which is many times richer than India. My hon. friend, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is perhaps getting ready to accept the amendment of Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad and, perhaps, he has sent out an unofficial whip—whether I open my mouth or not, you have to accept it.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: It is unfair on your part to say that; it is absolutely wrong.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If we are going to live up to the expectations which the country has formed about us—naturally that is our ideal and that should be our objective—if you are going to do so, let us not try to change this Bill. Let us not try to go against the considered judgment and wisdom of this House. This matter has been hanging fire for a long time. That is why, I say again that it would not be worthy of us if we try to increase the quantum of salary which is provided for in this Bill.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Sir, I move for closure. I beg to move:

“That the question be now put”.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): May I ask a question if you permit me? In the First Report of the Joint Committee, it is observed:

“But the majority decided on the basis of Rs. 35/- which would work out for 240 days for a member of the House of the People to Rs. 8,400/-...”.

They recommended Rs. 35/- per day. Now, 240x35 comes to Rs. 8,400/-. At the rate of Rs. 400/-, Rs. 4,800 would be the salary—and

the House of the People has sat for 180 days in 1953—and the allowance works out at 180×20 i.e., Rs. 3,600/- It will come to Rs. 8,400/-. This amount has been recommended. Both Mr. Sundarayya and Mr. Gopalan were on the Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Members have got the Committee's Report.

A closure motion has been moved.

The question is:

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I have nothing much to say on this point, but more than one Member from the Opposition made certain unfair remarks and they insinuated as if the Government have issued a whip and not been observing neutrality in this matter. It is easy for one to suspect another's *bona fides*. In fairness to the Members of the Government. I should say that it has been decided by us that if there is a voting on any amendment to the Bill, we, the Government Members, are not going to participate in it. There is no better proof than this that I can give in regard to our neutrality in the matter.

An Hon. Member: He is sure of his flock.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, one always must be sure of his flock. If

the amendment of Shri Azad is carried, the other amendment of Shri Punnoose with the additional clauses need not be put to vote. But if Shri Azad's amendment is not carried, the other amendment will have to be voted upon.

The question is:

"In pages 2 and 3, for clause 3, substitute—

3. *Salaries and daily allowances.*—A member shall be entitled to receive a salary at the rate of four hundred rupees per mensem during the whole of his term of office plus an allowance at the rate of twenty-one rupees for each day during any period of residence on duty."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those in favour of the amendment will say 'Aye'.

Several Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those against the amendment will say 'No.'

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The 'Ayes' have it.

Some Hon. Members: The Noes have it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Division.

The House divided: Ayes 208, Noes 42

AYES

Division No. 8]

Abdullahai, Mulla
Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Shri S. N.
Agarwal, Shri H. L.
Agrawal, Shri M. L.
Ajit Singh, Shri
Akarpuri, Sardar
Asthana, Shri

Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Banerjee, Shri
Berman, Shri
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Bharati, Shri G. S.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Dass
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C.
Bidari, Shri

Birbal Singh, Shri
Bogawat, Shri
Beroosh, Shri
Bose, Shri P. C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brahmo-Choudhury, Shri
Cheliba, Shri B. P.
Chandak, Shri
Charak, Th. Lakshman Singh
Chatterjee, Dr. Susitranjan

AYES—contd.

Chaturvedi, Shri	Kazmi, Shri	Raut, Shri Bhola
Chaudhary, Shri G. L.	Keshavaiengar, Shri	Reddy Shri, Janardhan
Chaudhary, Shri R. K.	Khardekar, Shri	Roy, Shri Bishwa Nath
Chinaria, Shri	Khedkar, Shri G. B.	Sahu, Shri Bhagbat
Choudhuri, Shri M. Shafiee	Khongmen, Shrimati	Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
Dabhi, Shri	Khuda Baksh, Shri M.	Saigal, Sardar A. S.
Das, Shri B.	Kolay, Shri	Samanta, Shri S. C.
Das, Shri N. T.	Kottukappally, Shri	Sangauna, Shri
Das, Shri Ram Dhani	Krishna, Shri M. R.	Sarmah, Shri Debeswar
Das, Shri Ramanasnda	Krishna Chandra, Shri	Satyawadi, Dr.
Das, Shri S. N.	Kureel, Shri B. N.	Sen, Shri P. G.
Deb, Shri S. C.	Lakshmayya, Shri	Sen, Shrimati Sushama
Deogam, Shri	Lal, Shri R. S.	Sewal, Shri A. R.
Desai, Shri K. K.	Lal Singh, Sardar	Shah, Shri C. C.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.	Lallanji, Shri	Shah, Shri R. N.
Deshpande, Shri G. H.	Laskar, Shri	Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
Dholakia, Shri	Madiah Gowda, Shri	Sharma, Shri D. C.
Dhulekar, Shri	Majhi, Shri R. C.	Sharma, Shri K. R.
Dhruya, Shri	Malliah, Shri U. S.	Sharma, Shri R. C.
Digambar Singh, Shri	Mandal, Dr. P.	Shastri, Shri Aigu Rai
Diwan, Shri R. S.	Masuoedi, Maulana	Shivananjappa, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand	Mathew, Prof.	Shobha Ram, Shri
Dube, Shri U. S.	Matthen, Shri	Shukla, Pandit B.
Dwivedi, Shri D. P.	Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha	Siddananajappa, Shri
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.	Mehta, Shri J. R.	Singh, Shri H. P.
Ebenezer, Dr.	Minimata, Shrimati	Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar
Fotedar, Pandit	Mishra, Pandit S. C.	Sinha, Dr. S. N.
Gadgil, Shri	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Sinha, Shri A. P.
Gandhi, Shri M. M.	Mishra, Shri L. N.	Sinha, Shri G. P.
Gandhi, Shri V. B.	Mishra, Shri M. P.	Sinha, Shri K. P.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati	Misra, Shri R. D.	Sinha, Shri Nageshwar Prasad
Ganpati Ram, Shri	Mohd. Akbar, Sufi	Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwar
Garg, Shri R. P.	Mohiuddin, Shri	Snatak, Shri
Gautam, Shri C. D.	Morarka, Shri	Somana, Shri N.
Ghose, Shri S. M.	More, Shri K. L.	Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Gopi Ram, Shri	Musafir, Giani G. S.	Suresh Chandra, Dr.
Gounder, Shri K. S.	Muthukrishnan, Shri	Suriya Prashad, Shri
Hari Mohan, Dr.	Narasimhan, Shri C. R.	Syed Ahmed, Shri
Heda, Shri	Naskar, Shri P. S.	Tandon, Shri S. N.
Hem Raj, Shri	Nathwani, Shri N. P.	Tek Chand, Shri
Hembrom, Shri	Nehru, Shrimati Uma	Telikar, Shri
Hukam Singh, Sardar	Neswi, Shri	Tewari, Sardar R. B. S.
Hyder Husein, Ch.	Nijalingappa, Shri	Thimmaiah, Shri
Ibrahim, Shri	Paragi Lal, Ch.	Thomas, Shri A. M.
Iyyani, Shri E.	Parekh, Dr. J. N.	Tiwari, Pandit B. L.
Iyyunni, Shri C. R.	Pathrikar, Dr.	Tiwary, Pandit D. N.
Jain, Shri N. S.	Pawar, Shri V. P.	Tripathi, Shri K. P.
Jangde, Shri	Pillai, Shri Thanu	Tripathi, Shri V. D.
Jayaraman, Shri	Prabhakar, Shri Naval	Uikey, Shri
Jayashri, Shrimati	Rachiah, Shri N.	Upadhyay, Shri S. D.
Jena, Shri K. C.	Raghubir Sahai, Shri	Vaishnav, Shri H. G.
Jena, Shri Niranjana	Raghubir Singh, Ch.	Vaishya, Shri M. B.
Jethan, Shri	Raghuramaiah, Shri	Varma, Shri B. R.
Joshi, Shri Jethala)	Ram Dass, Shri	Velayudhan, Shri
Joshi, Shri M. D.	Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.	Vishwanath Prasad, Shri
Jwala Prashad, Shri	Ramachander, Dr. D.	Vyas, Shri Radhelal
Kachiroyar, Shri	Ramanand Shastri, Swami	Wilson, Shri J. N.
Kajrolkar, Shri	Ramaswamy, Shri P.	Wodeyar, Shri
Kakkana, Shri	Ramnarayan Singh, Babu	
Kale, Shrimati A.	Rane, Shri	

NOES

Achalu, Shri
 Bagdi, Shri Magan Lal
 Basu, Shri K. K.
 Biren Dutt, Shri
 Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
 Chatterjea, Shri Tushar
 Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
 Chattopadhyaya, Shri
 Chowdary, Shri C. R.
 Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
 Das, Shri B. C.
 Das, Shri Sarangadhar
 Dasaratha Deb, Shri
 Deshpande, Shri V. G.

Gadlingena Gowd, Shri
 Gidwani, Shri
 Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
 Krishnaswami, Dr.
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Nair, Shri C. K.
 Nambiar, Shri
 Nanadas, Shri
 Narasimham, Shri S. V. L.
 Nayyar, Shri V. P.
 Punnoose, Shri
 Raghavachari, Shri
 Raghavaiah, Shri
 Ramasami, Shri M. D.

Rao, Dr. Rama]
 Rao, Shri K. S.
 Rao, Shri Mohana
 Reddi, Shri B. Y.
 Reddi, Shri Madhao
 Reddi, Shri Eswara
 Reddy, Shri Viswanatha
 Rishang Keishing, Shri
 Sharma, Shri Nand Lal
 Singh, Shri R. N.
 Sinha, Th. Jugal Kishore
 Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
 Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
 Veeraswamy, Shri

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In view of this amendment, all the other amendments to clause 3 are barred . .

Shri K. K. Basu rose—

12 NOON

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Members may kindly look into clause 3 again. Clause 3 relates to the salary and allowances and the option and the main portion is taken. This is in substitution of the whole of clause 3 and the option also goes. Therefore, as the amendment of Mr. Azad has been carried, all the amendments are barred.

Shri Punnoose: There is an amendment to add sub-clause (c) (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The whole clause has been substituted. (*Interruptions*). Order, order. The hon. Members ought not to rise when I am standing.

Shri Raghavachari: I am sorry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: "Sorry" alone is not enough.

Now, I will put this clause to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 4— (*Travelling allowances*)

Clause 5— (*Travelling or daily allowances for intermediate journeys*)

Clause 5A— (*Free transport by Railway*)

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I beg to move:

(1) In page 3, line 19, for "two second class fares" substitute "one second class fare"

(2) In page 4, lines 7 and 8, for "two second class fares" substitute "one second class fare"

(3) In page 4, after line 19, insert—

"5A. *Free transit by Railway.*—

Every member shall be provided with one free non-transferable second class pass which shall entitle him to travel by any Railway in India at any time, but nothing contained in this section shall affect the payment of any travelling allowance payable to a member under any other provision of this Act."

Shri S. C. Deb (Cachar-Lushai Hills): I beg to move:

In page 3, line 23, after "such journey" add—

"except in the case of a member from Assam, Manipur or Tri-

[Shri S. C. Deb]

... who shall be paid an amount equal to one and one-half of the air fare for each such journey”.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): Amendments Nos. 116 and 117 relate to clauses 5 and 5A.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : There is a mistake. Amendments Nos. 116 and 117 are for clauses 5 and 5A. I called only clause 4. The relative amendment is only 115.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): They are mutually related. Both clauses have to be taken together.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Shall I take both clauses 4 and 5 together?

Hon. Members : Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Very well. Amendments moved:

(1) In page 3, line 19, for “two second class fares” substitute “one second class fare”

(2) In page 4, lines 7 and 8, for “two second class fares” substitute “one second class fare”

(3) In page 4, after line 19, insert—

“5A. *Free transit by Railway.*— Every member shall be provided with one free non-transferable second class pass which shall entitle him to travel by any Railway in India at any time, but nothing contained in this section shall affect the payment of any travelling allowance payable to a member under any other provision of this Act.”

(4) In page 3, line 23, after “such journey” add—

“except in the case of a member from Assam, Manipur or Tripura who shall be paid an amount equal to one and one-half of the air fare for each such journey”.

Clauses 4, 5 and 5A are taken together.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : I have not to make any speech on these amendments of mine. I feel that on this point, the entire House is unanimous. The operative part of my amendment No. 117 simply provides that there should be a railway pass for every Member of Parliament, which he can use whenever he wants to travel by rail. The other two amendments to clauses 4 and 5 respectively are small amendments seeking to substitute ‘one second class fare’ in place of ‘two second class fares’. I feel that on this point, everyone in this House is agreed, and so I hope the House will pass it unanimously.

Shri S. C. Deb : My amendment reads:

In page 3, line 23, after “such journey” add—

“except in the case of a member from Assam, Manipur or Tripura who shall be paid an amount equal to one and one-half of the air fare for each such journey.”

This is a very simple amendment. The Members from these places have to travel by air from Calcutta to their place. They have to stop at Calcutta for a day. There are luggage charges and other things which are not covered by the provision in the Bill, as it stands. So, I hope hon. Members would kindly support my amendment.

Shri Punnoose : With regard to the new clause, hon. Members may have the chance to agree and see it for themselves. But we feel that when they come for attending the meetings of the Select Committee and other matters connected with Parliament, they should not be given any additional pay, but only the II class pass. We are now rich by Rs. 400 a month, and therefore, when they come to attend the Select Committee meetings. .

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik—Central) : On a point of order. The hon. Member was just saying that we want that they should not be given etc. Does it mean that there will be two different rules for two different categories of Members? I think the rule is going to be the same for all. But the hon. Member was using such language as we want that they should not be given or something like that.

Shri Punnoose: 'We' means the Members on this side of the House, and 'they' means the Members of Parliament, including us.

For intermediate journeys also, when they come for a Select Committee meeting of a short duration, they will be advised not to take their wives with them, and if they take, they will have to pay from their Rs. 400.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : What would happen if the Members are lady Members?

Shri Punnoose : Then, they should be advised not to take their husbands with them for a short period. They will have to manage without their husbands for a short while. So, we are opposed to this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

In page 3, line 19, for "two second class fares" substitute "one second class fare".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Is it necessary for me to put amendment No. 90 to the vote of the House?

Shri S. C. Deb : I press it

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

In page 3, line 23, after "such journey" add—

"except in the case of a member from Assam, Manipur or Tripura who shall be paid an amount equal to one and one-half of the air fare for each such journey."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

"That clause 4, as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

In page 4, lines 7 and 8, for "two second class fares" substitute "one second class fare".

Shri C. D. Pande: (Naini Tal Distt. cum Almora Distt.—South West cum Bareilly Distt.—North) : Sir, I have to say something.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has missed the bus.

I shall put it again. The question is:

In page 4, lines 7 and 8, for "two second class fares" substitute "one second class fare".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

"That clause 5, as amended, do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

In page 4, after line 19, insert—

"5A. *Free transit by Railway.*—Every member shall be provided with one free non-transferable second class pass which shall entitle him to travel by any Railway in India at any time, but nothing contained in this section shall affect the payment of any traveller

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

ing allowance payable to a member under any other provision of this Act”.

The motion was adopted.

New Clause 5A was added to the Bill.

Clause 6— (Allowances during short intervals etc.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Minister has an amendment.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I beg to move :

“In page 4, lines 27 to 30, for “rates specified in clause (a) or clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 according to the option exercised or deemed to have been exercised by him under that section”, substitute “rate specified in section 3”.’

The option is now deleted and therefore, this is a consequential change.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

“In page 4, lines 27 to 30, for “rates specified in clause (a) or clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 according to the option exercised or deemed to have been exercised by him under that section”, substitute “rate specified in section 3”.’

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is :

“That clause 6, as amended, stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha : Regarding clause 7, there is a verbal amendment.

Shri S. S. More : I have an amendment, No. 50, for a new clause—6A.

Shri Krishna Chandra (Mathura Distt.—West): Sir, I have an amend-

ment to add a new clause i.e. clause 6A. The number of the amendment is 112.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : It has to be looked into one after another. Let me dispose of Mr. More's amendment first.

New clause 6A— (Amenities)

Shri S. S. More: Sir, I beg to move: In page 4, after line 34, insert—

“6A. Members of Parliament shall also be entitled to the following facilities:—

- (a) a free furnished residence at Delhi;
- (b) a free telephone;
- (c) free postage for all correspondence as a Member of Parliament and relating to his public responsibilities;
- (d) free medical aid to the Member and the members of his family;
- (e) a second class pass valid all over the country and to be used for the purpose of parliamentary work with an Inter class pass for a Personal Assistant; and
- (f) other monetary aid to members who have no or meagre private source of income sufficient to enable them to discharge their responsibilities as full time workers serving their constituency in particular and the public in general according to the scales prescribed by rules.”

Regarding (e), that has been covered now. So, it will not stand now.

My communist friends are twitting me for moving this amendment. I want to point out to them that my amendment relates to the principle that from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs. That is the only thing that I wish to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put this amendment to the vote. The question is:.....

Dr. Rama Rao: On a point of order. If this amendment is accepted, it will entail expenditure on the Treasury. Have we the permission of the President for that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly explain to the House how this is in order without the President's sanction.

Shri S. S. More: If it is some additional burden on the Treasury, then only it might be said to be requiring the recommendation of the President. I feel that if the principle mentioned by me is applied, there will be reduction in the total expenditure, because as we Members keep going on, our needs will be going down. That is my submission.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid without the President's sanction I cannot allow this amendment to be moved.

I think it is the same thing with the amendment of Shri Krishna Chandra also. His amendment says:

"A Member shall be entitled to such medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities as may be prescribed by rules under Section 7."

I will have to rule that out of order. So long as the President's sanction is not obtained, it imposes an additional burden on the Exchequer.

Shri Krishna Chandra: It does not. These facilities are now given at present. We are supplied houses on payment of rent. We are supplied facilities or rather priorities for telephone. I only want that power should be given under the rules so that these facilities and amenities might be regulated by rule.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very well, I allow this amendment.

Shri Krishna Chandra: I beg to move:

In page 4, after line 34, insert—

"6A. Amenities.—A Member shall be entitled to such medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities as may be prescribed by rules under Section 7."

My amendment does not add to the cost nor does it compel the rule-making authority to allow us free telephone or to allow us free house or to allow us free medical facilities.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member say that even on payment, houses are not available, that even on payment telephones are not available and medical facilities are not available?

Shri Krishna Chandra: I only wish that these amenities may come under this law and may be regularised and regulated by the rule-making authority.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 4, after line 34, insert—

"6A. Amenities.—A Member shall be entitled to such medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities as may be prescribed by rules under Section 7."

What is the reaction of the hon. Minister?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: If the entire matter is referred to the Rules Committee and a Joint Committee of both the Houses, they may go into the whole thing, regularise it and decide. We do not commit the Rules Committee either way.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall leave it to the House to decide. The question is:

In page 4, after line 34, insert—

"6A. Amenities.—A Member shall be entitled to such medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities as may be prescribed by rules under Section 7."

*The motion was adopted.
New Clause 6A was added to the Bill.*

Clause 7—(Power to make rules)

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, I move:

In page 4, for lines 35 to 40, substitute—

"7. Power to make rules.—For the purpose of making rules under this section, there shall be constituted a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament consisting of five members from the Council of States nominated by the Chairman and ten members from the House of the People nominated by the Speaker."

My amendment is a drafting one. For the purposes of making rules under this section, there shall be constituted a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament consisting of five Members from the Council of States nominated by the Chairman and ten Members from the House of the People nominated by the Speaker. In the Constitution, we do not find 'consultation' used with any matter negotiated between the Speaker and the Chairman and it has been used only in regard to the President, in consultation with the Speaker or the Chairman. Therefore, we have just put it in proper form.

Shri K. K. Basu: How can you put the Chairman earlier than the Speaker?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: It does not matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may move amendment No. 120 also.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, I move:

In page 5, line 12 and 13, for "by the Speaker of the House of the People after consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States" substitute "by the Chairman of the Council of States and the Speaker of the House of the People."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There seems to be a grammatical mistake in amendment No. 119. The word 'will' must be 'shall'.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I have read 'shall', Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved:

(1) In page 4, for lines 35 to 40, substitute—

"7. Power to make rules.—For the purpose of making rules under this section, there shall be constituted a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament consisting of five members from the Council of States nominated by the Chairman and ten members from the House of the People nominated by the Speaker."

(2) In page 5, lines 12 and 13, for "by the Speaker of the House of the People after consultation with the Chairman of the Council of the States" substitute "by the Chairman of the Council of States and the Speaker of the House of the People."

Are there any more amendments?

Shri Krishna Chandra: I have an amendment, No. 114, which is consequential to my previous amendment which has been accepted.

Sir, I move:

In page 5, after line 10, insert—

"(g) medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities mentioned in Section 6A."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 5, after line 8, insert—

"(ee) medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities mentioned in Section 6A."

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Sir, I move:

In page 4, omit lines 44 and 45.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is too much of talk in the House. First of all let me know from the hon. Members what are the amendments that have been tabled.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I have today tabled an amendment, a very simple amendment to omit the words 'shortest possible'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it an amendment to an amendment?

Shri Barman: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, why did he not move it earlier?

Shri Barman: Sir, I had tabled an amendment earlier which wanted the addition of the words 'and convenient' after the words 'shortest possible'. Today, I have changed it and want the deletion of the words 'shortest possible'.

Sir, I move:

In page 4, line 44, omit "shortest possible".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 4, line 44, omit "shortest possible".

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, I am submitting a couple of points of importance with regard to the amendments moved by the Minister. I very strongly deprecate the manner in which the amendments are brought before the House, especially by the Minister. I quite concede the premise that anybody can move an amendment. But, I find there is a very insidious attempt made through the amendments Nos. 119 and 120 to tamper with the Rules of Procedure of the House. I do not know when he discovered that in the Constitution the Council of States is mentioned first, and the House of the People

comes next. The Bill was printed some time ago and the Bill originated in this House. Under the Rules of Procedure of this House, whenever a committee is constituted and the Members of the other House are expected to join in that Committee, the Joint Committee functions under the control and direction of the Speaker. I am not convinced at all about the reasoning offered by the hon. Minister in justification for this emergent last-minute attempt to alter the text of the Bill. I believe every hon. Member of the House will agree when I say that if a committee is appointed under a Bill that has originated in this House, that committee, even though it contains members of the other House, should function under the direction of the Speaker of the House. You would recall that a question of this character is being frequently debated in both the Houses and I do not want to exacerbate feelings. However, I do very strongly protest against this method of bringing in amendments at the last minute and pushing them down the throat of the House. I do not know why the hon. Minister could not give sufficient notice so that hon. Members could consider it.

An Hon. Member: Copies of it have been received by us.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I do not know if the hon. Member had got it officially.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Who is to preside over this committee?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: That difficulty will arise.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The Joint Select Committee will elect its own Chairman.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But it is not stated so here.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: This House is to select, under the amendment, ten Members of the House and five Members will be selected by the other

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

House, and even though the Chairman may be elected by this committee, he has got to function under the direction of the Speaker. I strongly object to the manner in which the amendments Nos. 119 and 120 have been brought and also to their contents. I would, in the first place, request the hon. Minister to withdraw the amendments, and if he does not, I would ask every hon. Member to oppose and throw them out.

Shri S. S. More: May I make a submission on a point of Law? I want to seek some clarification from the hon. Minister. Sub-clause (3) on page 5 of the Bill states—

“Any rules made under subsection (2) shall not take effect until they are approved and confirmed by the Speaker of the House of the People after consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States and are published....”

According to the amendment, the rules will have to be approved and confirmed both by the Chairman of the Council of States and the Speaker of the House of the People. According to the original provision, the Speaker was only responsible to consult the Chairman of the Council of States. He would take whatever advice that the Chairman gave, but the final opinion that was to prevail was that of the Speaker. According to this, both the Chairman and the Speaker are independently made the approving and confirming authorities, and without their approval and confirmation, the rules will not be valid. Supposing the Chairman and the Speaker do not see eye to eye on any provision, what is to happen? There will be no approval by the Chairman or there will be no approval by the Speaker; there will be confirmation by the Chairman but there will be no confirmation by the Speaker. In the case of such a tie or deadlock, whose opinion is to pre-

vail? Are we to go to the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs for the purpose of drawing lots in the case of a deadlock? There is likely to be a deadlock and it is for the hon. Minister to suggest how it could be resolved.

There is another point also. I would refer you to article 118 of the Constitution. Whenever there is a joint sitting, it is the Speaker who has to preside. I am not quoting this as everybody knows this article.

Shri Gadgil: Even in the Warrant of Precedence, the Speaker comes first and then only the Chairman.

Shri S. S. More: My friend, with his ripe experience, is helping me and I thank him for it. My submission is that under the Constitution, the Speaker is given a superior position. If at a joint sitting, both the Speaker and the Chairman come out on the plea that he is entitled to preside as he is the Chairman of the House of Elders or he is entitled to preside as he is the Speaker of the House of the People, who are the direct representatives of the people, what is to happen? For avoiding this deadlock, the Constitution has provided a sub-clause in this particular article and it is for the purpose of resolving any such struggles between two high dignitaries. We know that human nature being what it is, everybody fights for the prestige of the country, for the prestige of the Party and so on. Taking human nature into account, in order to avoid the possibility of unholy, indecent wrangles between these two high functionaries, the Constitution has specifically provided that in the case of a Joint meeting the Speaker shall preside. I think that precedence given to the Speaker ought to be maintained in every legislative enactment of ours. My submission, therefore, is that these two amendments are against the spirit of the Constitution, particularly article 118. Not only that, they create a practical difficulty for which

the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will have to prescribe some remedy. I think it will not be a quack remedy under the spurious Drugs or Magic Remedies Act.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: In regard to the question of precedence, so far as my information goes, under the Warrant of Precedence, the Chairman, because he happens to be the Vice-President gets precedence over the Speaker. (Some hon. Members: No, no.)

Shri K. K. Basu: When there is a joint sitting it is the Speaker who presides.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The Warrant of Precedence has application outside the House.

Again, so far as I know, in the Constitution wherever the two names have occurred in one place, the Chairman has come first and the Speaker afterwards. Therefore, there is no question of prestige involved. We have just followed the spirit of the Constitution.

Shri Biswas: I would request hon. Members to refer to article 97, sub-clauses (2) and (3) of article 118, proviso to articles 120 and 121. Everywhere, wherever these two officers are mentioned, the Chairman of the Council of States comes first, and then comes the Speaker.

With regard to the imaginary or hypothetical contingency of a wrangle or deadlock, we never thought about it, but we do hope such occasions will not arise.

Shri S. S. More: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is visualising a state of affairs when one party will have complete sway over both the Houses. Let us imagine a position where one party is in power here and another party is in the majority in the other House. If party feelings run high, what will happen? There is bound to be a deadlock. We should visualise that position.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: On several occasions the Speaker has been given precedence; so these amendments are quite unnecessary and they must be withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In all Parliamentary Committees, or Joint Committees, the Speaker or the other House fixes up the procedure. Not even the quorum is mentioned here.

Shri Biswas: There is provision in the rules only with regard to Joint Select Committees.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But no such provision is here: how are the meetings to be regulated? What are the rules regulating the conduct of these meetings?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The Law Minister is making a new discovery all the time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My feeling is this: as far as possible, to the best of our ability, we should make laws which are workable. There is no point in making a law which is not workable.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The Committee itself will appoint a Chairman... (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It may be added to this or I do not know under what general law the Committee may itself appoint a Chairman. Is he to be a Chairman for a meeting or permanently? These difficulties will arise. Let the rules be clear. Secondly, what is the quorum for this meeting? So long this difficulty has not arisen because the Government itself is clothed with the power and so there was no question of any quorum etc. For the first time, a Committee is appointed to frame rules and the Committee will consist of Members nominated by the Chairman and the Speaker of the respective Houses. This does not come under the Joint Committee for a Bill. Therefore, special rules must be incorporated in the Act itself.

Shri Raghavachari: There is one possibility. Under the rule-making powers that is now given, one more clause may be added that they will make rules with regard to the procedure... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The Committee will elect its own Chairman.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: And the quorum will be five?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The Committee will decide its quorum also. I have no objection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The quorum is a dangerous affair. Three people may say that they constitute a quorum. So let us fix a number, say, five or seven or whatever it is. I think that five Members will be enough to constitute the quorum.

An Hon. Member: This amendment may be withdrawn.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: It will create confusion every time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: After the first amendment, No. 119, the following may be added:

"For a meeting of this Committee, five Members will constitute the quorum."

Or, if you want, we will say 'seven Members'.

Shri K. K. Basu: If you accept the Minister's amendment which says that these rules will be confirmed by the Speaker and the Chairman, what will happen if it is not confirmed? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I would suggest that this matter should stand over till the afternoon, so that we shall just think over it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause 7 will stand over to this afternoon, when we shall meet again.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): I want to say something on lines 44 and 45, that is about the shortest possible routes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very well. He may say whatever he wants to say on that.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: As regards the allowances of the Members of the Constituent Assembly of India which are applicable to Members of either House of Parliament under article 106 of the Constitution, at that time a note was given that for the purpose of calculating mileage allowance, journey between two stations is held to be performed by the shortest route where there are two or more practicable routes, or by the cheapest of such routes as may be equally short. In this rule the shortest possible route for the performance of any journey is given. Suppose a Member is coming from Rayagarh or Ambicapur or Bilaspur or Bastar. He will take nearly forty-eight hours to reach this place. Up till now no objection was raised as regards the time which an hon. Member might have taken for travelling from Rayagarh, Bilaspur, Ambicapur or Bastar. If "shortest possible route" is omitted, then the Member will be entitled to travel by any route and he will be able to reach here.

This is my amendment and I press that lines 44 and 45 on page 4 may be omitted.

Shri Barman: I want the deletion of the words "shortest possible" in line 44 on page 4. The reasons are not far to seek. My friend from Madhya Pradesh has already stated the difficulties experienced by Members from that State, and from the other amendments tabled we find that the same kind of difficulty has been felt by some Members from Madras, Assam and Orissa. From my own State, namely West Bengal, I can state that the difficulty is very great. I do not want that any rigid rule should be made for this purpose. When we are going to constitute a Committee of both Houses and are giving it full power to consider the justice or equity of each individual case, if we retain the words "shortest possible", that Committee will be in a difficulty because we are laying

down a certain definite line of action. But if we omit the two words, there will be absolutely no difficulty for that Committee to come to a proper decision after considering the difficulty, convenience and inconvenience of each and every particular State.

So my simple proposition is that when we are going to entrust a Committee of both Houses with the power of making rules so far as journey, etc. is concerned, we should not cripple it down by the words "shortest possible", but should leave it to the free judgment of a body which will be a representative body of both the Houses.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): I support the amendment moved by my friend Shri Barman. As it is, if the words "shortest possible" are left here, the difficulties which most of the Members of Parliament are meeting will be very difficult to remove. Most of the Members come when they do not get the reservation. The difficulty of reservation also arises for the shortest possible route because by the shortest possible route reservation is not available. Members are put to difficulty with their luggages and other things. These were brought to the notice of the Parliament Secretariat before-hand. Sometimes they change the routes, some-times they go back again. So, when this is going to be enacted now, I think shortest possible route portion should be deleted. The Rules Committee will do the needful.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will place these other amendments and reserve the amendments moved by the hon. Minister for consideration in the afternoon. Amendment Nos. 119 and 120 will stand over for further consideration this afternoon.

Regarding Amendment No. 114 moved by Shri Krishna Chandra, he wants rules to be framed for the amenities etc., with respect to which new Clause 6A was added by the House just now. This is a consequential amendment. I will put it to the vote of the House.

Shri Krishna Chandra: I want the amendment to come not after line 10, but after line 8. Instead of (g) it should be (ee).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very good.

The question is:

In page 5, after line 8, insert—

"(ee) medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities mentioned in section 6A."

Shri Raghavachari: My submission is that (ee) is unnecessary. This new amendment may be (f) instead of (ee), and (f) in the Clause may be changed into (g).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very good.

The question is:

In page 5,—

(i) after line 8, insert—

"(f) medical, housing, telephone and postal facilities mentioned in section 6A."; and

(ii) in line 9, for "(f)" substitute "(g)".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then the amendment of Mr. Barman.

The question is:

In page 4, line 44, omit "shortest possible".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 54 of Mr. Saigal. Is it not covered by this?

Sardar A. S. Saigal: It is covered. I do not press it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, I do not put it to the House. The other two amendments Nos. 119 and 120 will stand over for further consideration this afternoon.

Clause 8.—(Validation of payment of certain travelling allowances).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 8 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1.—(Short Title and Commencement)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are there any amendment to clause 1?

Shri A. N. Vidyalankar (Jullundur): I have amendment No. 93 which reads:

'In page 1, line 4, for "salaries and allowances" substitute "Compensatory Allowances".'

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is this compensation? I think the hon. Member is not pressing it.

Shri A. N. Vidyalankar: I am not pressing it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are other amendments to clause 1. There is one in the name of Shri B. N. Misra. There is one in the name of Shri S. V. Ramaswamy seeking to substitute the word 'Honorarium' for 'Salaries', and another to the same effect by Shri D. C. Sharma. The hon. Members concerned are not moving these amendments. So, I shall put the clause to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clause 1 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find that for the Long Title also, there are amendments to the same effect as for Clause 1. I take it that no amendments are moved to the Long Title. However, I shall defer placing this to the vote of the House, until after clause 7 is disposed of.

We have about fifteen minutes more left now. What is the desire of the House? Shall we adjourn?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now stand adjourned and meet again at 5 P.M. today.

The House then adjourned till Five of the Clock.

The House re-assembled at Five of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL, 1954—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has any agreed solution been found?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: With your permission, I would like to add to the amendment which I had moved and I think it will meet with the general approval of the House, because the point which has been raised is made clear in this.

I beg to move:

In page 4,—after line 40, insert—

"(1A) The Joint Committee constituted under sub-section (1) shall elect its Chairman and shall have power to regulate its procedure".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I have a copy of it?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Yes.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: This amendment has just been made available to this hon. House and if you would relax the rules in my favour, I would like to move an additional amendment to it. I would like to add:

'In the new amendment proposed by Shri Satya Narayan Sinha as sub-clause (1A) to clause 7, after "Chairman" insert "from among Members of the House of the People".'

Shri Velayudhan: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members need not get agitated over a suggestion.

Shri Velayudhan: It is an unpopular amendment.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I would sustain it with arguments at the appropriate stage. I am only asking for the right to move a verbal amendment to the amendment which has been moved.