

Bill

Clauses 30 to 36 were added to the Bill.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Clause 1—(Short title, extent, commencement and application).

SHRI BHAGAT RAM : I beg to move :

"Page 1,—

Omit lines 10 to 15." (2)

I want to delete the following portion :

"Provided that if the Central Government considers it necessary or expedient so to do in the public interest, it may postpone or relax, to such extent as may be specified in such notification, the operation of all or any of the provisions of this Act in any State or States for such period not extending beyond one year from the date on which this Act comes into force."

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बड़ा अच्छा बिल है तो इसे एक साल तक रिलेक्सेशन दिया जा सकता है। सारे बिल में जो इतने संशोधन दिये गये हैं, उसमें कम से कम कुछ देर के लिये यह पोस्टपोन कर सकते हैं। इसीलिये मैंने प्रमोवमेंट दिया है कि इसको डिलीट कर दिया जाये।

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am afraid that my hon. friend has an unnecessary apprehension that this clause would lead to delay in the implementation of this Bill when it becomes an Act. That is not the purpose for which these words have been put into the Bill. But as my hon. friend knows, this Bill also would result in the withdrawal or the repealing of certain other Acts, which are in existence today, like the Orissa Dadan Labour Act, 1975. Automatically, when this Bill is passed and becomes an Act, if the Acts that exist in some States for the protection of such workers also lapse, there may be a situation where the rules necessary under this Act have not been framed and yet the Acts which exist in the States concerned lapse. To provide against this it is necessary to achieve some kind of synchronisation with what is to be done in the home State and what is to be done in the host State. It is to provide for this that these lines occur in this clause. I hope my hon. friend will not oppose and will not insist on this amendment.

SHRI BHAGAT RAM : In view of the explanation given by the Minister, I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Has he the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment ?

HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The questions is :

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA : I move :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

In doing so, I would like to point out that the amendment of my hon. friend, Mr. Chitta Basu, which has been accepted as Clause (g) might have to be introduced as Clause (b) and consequential changes might have to be made. Subject to that, I move that the Bill, as amended, be passed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill, as amended be passed".

The motion was adopted.

12.55 hrs.

# SALARY, ALLOWANCES AND PENSION OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move\* :

"That the Bill further to amend the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, be taken into consideration."

This Bill has been brought forward in pursuance of a recommendation of the Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament. Its objective is to provide for free air travel facility to an attendant while accompanying a blind member or a member who is so incapacitated as to require the assistance of an attendant.

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Ravindra Verma]

Since the Bill is very limited in its objective and is very simple and non-controversial, I hope that it would receive unanimous support from all sides of the House and will be passed without controversy.

I am aware that there are many other matters on which the hon. members would like statements to be made and amendments to be moved. But I do not have to be more elaborate. The hon. members will easily understand that this is meant to deal with a specific case and, therefore, I would appeal to them not to bring in anything extraneous and let this Bill be passed without controversy.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That the Bill further to amend the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, be taken into consideration."

There are Amendments to the motion for consideration, for referring it to a Select Committee and for circulation. Shri Vinayak Prasad Yadav—not here : Shri Ram Kishan—not here. Shri Purnanarayan Sinha.

SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA : (Tempur) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 15 Members, namely :—Shri V. Arunachalam alias, 'Aladi Aruna' ; Shri Raj Krishna Dawn, Shrimati V. Jayalakshmi, Shri Sarat Kar, Shri Rinching Khandu Khurma, Shri R. L. Kureel, Shri Mritunjay Prasad, Shri M. N. Govindan Nair, Shri B. Rachaiiah, Shri Sougata Roy, Shri Padmacharan Samantasingh, Shri Ram Dhari Shastri, Shri Ravindra Varma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad Verma ; and Shri Purnanarayan Sinha.

with instructions to go into the whole question of revision of Salary, Allowances and Pension and other facilities to the Members of Parliament and to report by the first day of the next session."

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would have liked to agree with my esteemed friend and my dear friend, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and would not have taken the time of the House—I do not know why he called "extraneous things" by bringing other matters, but I feel strongly on some matters related to the title of the Bill, namely, Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament.

It is quite true that it is a short Bill, a simple Bill and a non-controversial Bill. The purpose is good. Therefore, we must accept it. I stand to say I accept it fully. The facilities to the blind colleagues and to the physically incapacitated colleagues are such that we must give them, without grudging them at all. In fact, we should have done this much earlier. But my point is : Why is this facility not extended to railway journeys as well ? After all, if a blind man goes by air, he needs assistance and, if he goes by rail, does he not need any assistance ? The Minister may argue that the MP has a railway pass. But the railway pass is only for First Class and Second Class. If a blind man needs assistance directly and needs an attendant to assist him and to sit with him close-by all the time, he needs such assistance more on railway journey than on air journey because the railway journey is longer. Therefore, I would like him to assure the House that this facility will be given to the blind and physically incapacitated members on railway journeys as well. I would like that assurance to be given that that will be done.

The Long Title of the Bill has three key words, Salary, Allowances and Pension. I do not want to take the time of the House by going into all these details. Perhaps, on some other occasion we may do it.

13 hrs.

I want to say that this whole question of MPs salary, allowances and pensions is a very sensitive subject and any suggestion to increase either pay, i.e., salary or allowances or pension etc. becomes a matter of acute political delicacy. The reasons are very clear, that we, as Members of Parliament, are in a unique position in that we have absolute right to vote ourselves more money out of the public purse. Therefore, naturally people will criticise us more and therefore we have to be more cautious. I also realise that the possibility of abuse is there, and it is obvious. Moreover, we Members of Parliament should also be conscious of the fact that our use of the power, namely to increase our salary or allowances or pension, is carefully watched by the public at large and, therefore, anything we do or say should not be done hurriedly or in an ill-conceived manner. Having said that, I want to suggest... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Visvanathan, that is not the way to interrupt a Member.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR : The point is that the question of Parliamentary pay is an important and vital issue, and whatever we do is vital because what we

do or what we do not do or what we do in a particular manner can do grave damage to the respect for Parliament and to the public image of Parliament and the public image of Members of Parliament. Never before than in recent times the public at large, and particularly the intelligent, enlightened public opinion, has had a critical attitude towards us Members of Parliament and towards our institution of parliament, and that attitude is that Parliament and the MPs are both to be criticised. In other words, the image of us and the image of Parliament has not been as good or as happy or as healthy as we would have liked it to be. Therefore, this aspect of the matter has also to be looked into.

There is also an increasing populist demand for greater equality—that is, why should Members of Parliament not have the same facilities and allowances as other people have, even if MPs are doing more work. It may be that there is also perhaps an element of envy rather than of equality: I agree. But I would like to say that Mr. David Lloyd George had said in 1911 when, in the British House of Commons, for the first time he tried to introduce the idea of salary for MPs. Mr. Lloyd George, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1911, while introducing a proposal to initiate payment to MPs, said:

'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....but who cannot be here because their means do not allow it.'

Mr. Deputy Speaker, The proposal of the Chancellor of the exchequer preceded by this particular statement, was challenged in the House of Commons and it was passed by 256 votes in favour, with 158 against. Of course, much water has flown under the bridge in the River Thames in London, and much more in the River Jamuna here. I agree. But the point is this: the salary may remain static and may even continue as pure salary and nothing else, but there is a case for a certain type of increase in allowance—not in salary—which must go with the needs and requirements of the services and work and activities which MPs are expected to perform.

I will make two suggestions briefly, without going into the details, and the Committee on Salaries and Allowance of MPs may go into not only these sug-

gestions I am making but into all the suggestions in detail and give a comprehensive report so that the House can discuss it in detail, in a cool and considered manner. For example, when we go by rail, we have the facility of a pass and we do not pay anything. But in a country of India's size, long distances have to be covered sometimes more quickly. If, for instance, I go from here to Madras by rail, I go free, but if I go from here to Madras by plane, if I have exhausted the yearly eight intermediary free air journeys during the sessions, then I must pay the whole fare. Why should it not be that if, beyond eight free trips if I go by air, I must be allowed to deduct the rail fare from the air fare and pay the rest of the fare? I am not saying it should be free, but I must be allowed to get a deduction and pay the extra fare. That would be a good thing because India is a large country and we want to save time. What the Airlines lose, the Railways will gain and what the Railways lose, Airlines will gain: they are two wings of the same Government.

Secondly, I want to make another point. I believe that we Members of Parliament need an effective allowance for proper Secretarial assistance, especially the assistance of a stenographer because, like the Ministers, we have enough work and important work. I will not say we have more important work, but we have enough work and important work. The Ministers have all the facilities of the special assistance of PAs, Secretaries and other facilities, but we have none. I do not complain that they have: I am not envious of them, and I do not want to be a Minister at all. But the point is that if we are to work as Members of Parliament effectively we must get this assistance or a stenographer's allowance.

About the daily allowance I would say that there is a case for some hike because of the fact that petrol prices have gone up. To come from Palam Airport to Western Court where I stay, I used to pay Rs. 20/- for a taxi, but now I have to pay Rs. 25 or Rs. 27-50 paise, while my allowance is static. The Ministers, Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Public Corporations' Chairman, Deputy Chairman and other officials have their cars or other transport but we have to go by taxi or by a coach. I go by coach when I have time, but I have to attend Parliament in time and so I have to take a taxi. Why should I pay Rs. 27-50? Therefore, there is a case for that also.

Lastly, in the Bill there is a word called 'pension'. I know that my friend has clear and definite views in this matter and I also know that a number of my colleagues are against me in regard to this matter.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

But I want to make this point before I sit down that the provision for pension to former Members of Parliament which was made during the Emergency Parliament was illegal, immoral and unjust and it must be abolished by the new Janata Government forthwith. It is immoral because it was done in the Emergency Parliament, public opinion was not consulted and Members of Parliament were lured into it. It was given even for one term of five years. Imagine a Member of Parliament becoming a Member of parliament at the age of 26 and ceasing to be a Member at the age of 31. From the age of 31 onwards until he dies — and we want him to die as late as possible, say at 85 or 90 — is he to get pension? Do you mean to say that from the age of 31 to the age of 91 or so he should go on receiving pension at Rs. 300/- p.m.? This is a most obnoxious piece of legislation. I had opposed it at that time and I want to go on record as saying again that when I retire as Member or resign or get defeated, I will not take this pension, as long as this obnoxious measure is there on the statute book, because I do not want to say one thing and do another thing in practice. This measure must go. If Members of Parliament have to be given any assistance, let the Government come with a new Bill, a new Bill giving some kind of assistance to those Members who pay in terms of what is called a 'voluntary subscription'. If Members of Parliament want to pay every month some amount from their salary over a period of years, Government can also pay the same amount and then such amount can be given as pension. This should be limited to minimum two terms and not one term. It should be 'two terms' and not 'ten years' or any number of years, because sometimes there may be a term of less than five years. The minimum age must also be not less than 55 years. If a man is 55, then he can get pension because he cannot get a job elsewhere at that age. But if he is only 35 or 37, he can get a job elsewhere and he should not get pension at this age. He must wait until 55 years and then draw his pension till he is alive. I am making this point because I want to go on record to say that I am not against providing for old age to Members of Parliament who retire or resign or who are not in Parliament. But I am totally opposed to the whole purpose and idea of pension to Members of Parliament because Members of Parliament are not coming here to do a job; they come here to fulfil a certain public calling; it is an obligation. It is not a pensionable job. It is a public service for which, in the old age, the Members of Parliament themselves, by voluntary subscriptions, and

partly assisted by the State can certainly have it.

I want to conclude by saying that the Members of Parliament must have good salary and allowances and proper facilities in such a way that their work and efficiency are never jeopardised. We must also ensure that we do not do anything by which we will become out of pocket. We do not want only rich people and upper middle-class people to come here. We want anybody with a sense of public service to come and serve the Parliament and the people. While we must ensure that the Members of Parliament must not go out of pocket, at the same time we must also ensure that the Members of Parliament must not be allowed to pocket a lot of money and a lot of other facilities in the name of efficiency and service. This is the point I want to make. A good salary, adequate allowances and proper facilities are necessary to stop the MPs from being tempted into having part-time employment or from being lured into one or the other types of undesirable practice of raising money. If we do that, I am quite sure that our image as MPs and the image of our Parliament will go up in the eyes of the people in terms of our integrity, efficiency, honesty, dedication and sustained hard work to contribute and add to public welfare and public morality.

**SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA :** In support of my amendment and of what Prof. Mavalankar has said, I would only say this. I have a Private Members' Bill on this, but it has not been lucky enough to come in the ballot for discussion during this Session.

**SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH** (Hoshangabad) : You got Category A for it.

**SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA :** I have got it. But it has not come up in the ballot for discussion during this Session. It has got the ninth position.

Prof. Mavalankar has suitably and ably put forward the justification for giving adequate salary and allowances and proper facilities to the Members of Parliament; he does not want them to run out of pocket. But many have been running out of pocket for the last two years. I have been getting money from home in order to maintain myself. I am sleeping for only four hours. I have to attend to heavy correspondence work and the other things. I have no secretarial facilities. I am alone using three typewriters. I am typing 50 to 60 letters every day; I work upto 2 O'Clock in the morning. So, I would say that the facilities should be increased.

There is no harm if the Members of Parliament belonging to all political parties sit together, put their heads together and discuss this. My Private Members' Bill is there. That may also be amended to the extent necessary. But it should come in an official way. So, I request the hon. Minister to accept my amendment. We have only six weeks' time before the next sitting of the House, and during this period we can discuss this and make our suggestions. He should agree to it. Then a comprehensive Bill revising the salary and allowances of the Members may come up in the next Session, and we should be able to pass that immediately because everywhere there are complaints. Almost all the Members have been prompting me to bring up my Bill as early as possible. Let us through this Bill give relief to the Members of Parliament. I would only request him to accept my amendment. It only means that it goes to another Committee. He will be very much there. His voice will be very much heard there. The revision may be discussed there and a fresh Bill may be brought before the House. I moved my amendment keeping this thing in view. I request the Minister to accept my amendment.

डा० रामजी सिंह (भागलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह विधेयक तो बहुत सीमित मर्यादा में रखा गया है और हम में किसी को विरोध करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। क्योंकि आज जो स्थिति किसी एक माननीय सदस्य की हो सकती है वह एक से ज्यादा माननीय सदस्यों की भी हो सकती है। इसलिए हम संदर्भ में जो प्रावधान किया गया है उस पर मानवीय दृष्टिकोण से विचार करना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में विरोध की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। यह बहुत साधारण और सरल विधेयक है।

मैं मानविकर जी की इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि इस तरह के लेजिस्लेशन को पीसमील में नहीं लाया जाना चाहिए क्योंकि ऐसे पीसमील लेजिस्लेशन पर भी उतनी ही मेहनत करनी पड़ती है, उतना ही सबन का समय जाता है जितना कि बिस्तृत लेजिस्लेशन पर। अतः इस प्रश्न पर सरकार को विचार करना चाहिए।

एक प्रश्न हमारे माननीय सदस्यों को जो पेंशन देने का प्रावधान है, वह भी काफी विवादास्पद है और इस संदर्भ में माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी अपने विचार रखे थे। इस प्रश्न पर और भी लोगों के विचार हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन सब बातों पर एक प्रवर समिति में यदि विचार किया जाए और बिस्तृत रूप से विचार किया जाए तो काफी अच्छा होगा। मैं देख रहा हूँ कि बहुत सारे देशों में और सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज में मेम्बरों के भी भत्ताउत्तिष्ठ हैं...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You can bring in all these points when Mr. Purnanarayana Sinha's Bill comes up here. Please wind up.

डा० रामजी सिंह : ठीक है। मैं इतना कहना चाहूँगा कि इस बिल को मुल्तवी रखा जाए और इस प्रकार के बिल को समग्र रूप में रखा जाए जिसमें सारी चीजों के विषय में प्रावधान हो। लेकिन यह ठीक है कि पैसा न बढ़ाया जाए उसकी जगह सेक्रेटरी दे दिया जाए। यू० एस०ए० में एक मेम्बर 13 सेक्रेटरी रखता है। हम लोगों की तो हालत यह है कि अपने प्राप ही चिट्ठी खोलनी पड़ती है, अपने प्राप ही चिट्ठी लिखनी पड़ती है। जब मैं यह कहता हूँ तो मैं स्पष्ट कर दूँ कि मैं वेतन बढ़ाने के पक्ष में नहीं हूँ। मैं केवल इतना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्यों को सुविधाएं बढ़ा दी जाएं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल दो बातों की ओर मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहूँगा। एक तो यह कि इस को सिलेक्ट कमेटी में भेजा जाए ताकि वहां पर इस सारे प्रश्न पर पूरी गहराई में विचार हो सके। मैं यह नहीं चाहूँगा कि कोई पैसा बढ़ाया जाए लेकिन एक सेक्रेटरी अवश्य दे दिया जाए। मैं जरूर चाहूँगा कि कांस्टीच्युन्सी में घूमने के लिये सरकारी खर्च पर सदस्यों को गाड़ियां देने की व्यवस्था अवश्य की जाए। ये गाड़ियां परसनल काम के लिए नहीं होनी चाहिए। यह भर कर दिया जाए। इस के लिए पैसा बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ। इसलिए, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी से अनुरोध करूँगा कि वे इस बिल को सिलेक्ट कमेटी में भेज दें ताकि वहां पर इस पर बिस्तार से विचार हो सके और एक विधेयक सम्यक रूप में यहां पर प्रस्तुत किया जा सके।

श्री आर० एन० राकेश (चायल) : मेरा एक प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है। भलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी बिल के बिल्डिंग जो लड़के प्रदर्शन करने के लिए आ रहे थे उन पर प्राण घातक हमला किया गया है। दो सौ ज़रूमी लोग यहां पर उतारे गए हैं। हजारों लड़के गायब कर दिए गए हैं। तीन बार मर गए हैं....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह के प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर रज करना उचित नहीं है। अगर आपको कोई सबमिशन करना हो तो 377 का नोटिस दें।

श्री आर० एन० राकेश : यह बड़ा सीरियस मैटर है....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Nothing will go on record. Mr. Ravindra Varma,

(Interruptions)\*\*

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA :** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when I moved the motion for consideration I had hoped that there would be no prolonged discussion in this House on the Bill. This was because, as some hon'ble Members pointed out, it has been felt for long that a Bill of this kind was necessary to ensure that an hon'ble colleague of ours who had some difficulties was helped to see that he did not continue to suffer from the handicaps.

Therefore, Sir, the purpose of the Bill was very limited, and the objective was only to see that he does not have to suffer for a longer period as he has been suffering for the last two years. Any reference of this Bill to a Select Committee on the ground that there are many other matters related to salaries, allowances and pension of which this House must think, and come to conclusions would be to prolong the period for which the hon'ble Member is under a handicap.

Therefore, Sir, I would appeal to the hon'ble Members who have talked of a select committee not to suggest that this Bill be sent to a select committee. (Interruptions)

Then there are many points as far as salaries, allowances and pension are concerned which have been agitating the mind of the hon'ble Members. I am well aware of them. I can understand the importance of facilities to the hon'ble Members, I can understand the indignation of the hon'ble Members that the facilities that they need are not being made available to them as early as they want these facilities to be made available to them.

Sir, I do not know what I should say about the speech that I had the occasion to listen to from my hon'ble friend. Mr. Mavalankar. He is not quite sure what I am going to say.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR :** I am very sure. You will say something which will please me, but will not satisfy me.

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA :** Sir, Mr. Mavalankar is a very gifted speaker and, therefore, when he started his speech I was not quite sure which way he will proceed. I was reminded of a great oration which we have read in Shakespeare, the oration of Mark Antony.

**SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH :** That was a funeral oration.

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA :** In this case it was not a funeral oration, but I almost felt on occasions as though I was hearing the words: And Brutus was an honourable man. But he did, I must say, give evidence of his gift in that he began with an appropriate propitiation of public sentiments, and then he moved to some mundane matters where he felt that Members were suffering from handicaps. He distinguished between salaries and allowances which are essential to ensure that work and efficiency are not jeopardised. Then he went on to the question of pension, on which he made minor *démarche* in the House; he will have occasion to make a major *démarche*, having perhaps not an inconsequential impact, on some future occasion. But he did register his appropriate indignation on the question of pension as well. I began by saying that I did not want to bring in extraneous matters. When I said extraneous matters I did not mean extraneous to the words in the Title of the Bill, but extraneous to the clauses of the Bill. Therefore, Sir, I am under a handicap. I feel tempted to cross swords with my hon. friend but I shall resist that temptation because I know I will be worsted in the bargain. I did not want the House to get into things which are extraneous to the clauses of the Bill. The House is aware that Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament has gone into all these matters and other matters which the imagination or the requirement of hon. Members have prompted them put up before this Committee. Well, the Committee has made some recommendations. They are being considered. Certainly the Government will come up before the House with its own proposals on the basis of these recommendations. At that time all these things can be discussed. Therefore, Sir, I would appeal to hon. Members not to think that Ministers are not aware of the difficulties of hon. Members. Of course, it is open to hon. Members not to think of the difficulties of Ministers.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR :** We are sympathetic to you.

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA :** I know you are sympathetic. The reference in the saying is not to the stab in the front. But, be that as it may, I would appeal to the House therefore to pass this Bill and not to send it to a Select Committee.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE** (Jadavpur) : What is the substance ?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** He has asked you to pass the Bill, without sending it to a Select Committee.

There is an amendment by Shri Purnanarayan Sinha.

**SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA :** The Joint Committee considered all these for two years and I was there for one year. The Joint Committee got applications from 225 members for revision of the allowances and it could not come to a decision.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** So, you are not withdrawing it. All right. I will put it to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 15 Members, namely :—Shri V. Arunachalam alias 'Aladi Aruna', Shri Raj Krishna Dawn, Shrimati, V. Jeyalakshmi, Shri Sarat Kar, Shri Rinching Khandu Khrome, Shri R. L. Kureel, Shri Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri M. N. Govindan Nair, Shri B. Rachaiah, Shri Sougata Roy, Shri Padmasharan Samantasingh, Shri Ram Dhari Shastri, Shri Ravindra Varma, Shri Siukhdev Prasad Verma ; and Shri Purnanarayan Sinha.

with instructions to go into the whole question of revision of Salary, Allowances and Pension and other facilities to the Members of Parliament and to report by the first day of the next session."

*The motion was Negatived*

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Now the question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Clause 2—(Insertion of new Section 6D)**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Now we take up clause-by-clause consideration.

**Clause 2.**

**Mr. Mrityunjay Prasad.** Are you moving all the three ?

**श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद (सीवान) :** पहले संशोधन की ओर जाता हूँ, बाकी तीसरा और चौथा मैं प्रस्तुत करता हूँ ।

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** All right ; you can move your amendment Nos. 3 and 4.

**SHRI MRITYUNJAY PRASAD :** I beg to move :

Page 1, lines 12 and 13,—

for "air as is referred to in clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 4 or clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 5"

*substitute*

"air rail or steamer as is referred to in sub-section (1) of section 4 or section 5" (3)

Page 1, line 16,—

after "air" insert—

"rail or steamer, as the case may be, by the class to which the Member is normally entitled" (4)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Mr. Bharat Bhushan is not here. You may speak on your amendments.

**श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा काम माननीय भावलकर जी ने बहुत हल्का कर दिया है क्योंकि उनके भाषण में सब बातें आ गई हैं। सिर्फ मुझे यह कहना है कि जिनके लिये जो सुविधा आप हवाई जहाज में दे रहे हैं उनके लिये वही सुविधा अगर आप रेल में नहीं देते हैं तो बात अधूरी रह जाती है। भले ही आप यह कह दीजिये कि इनमें सीमित सुविधा है। इस धर्म में सीमित, मर्यादित हवाई यात्राओं को सुकेंगी, इसलिये आप यह कह सकते हैं, इतना सुधार कर सकते हैं कि जब हाउस बैठे तभी बैसे सबसे जब धावें, जब हाउस के काम से धावें तभी फर्स्ट क्लास में अपने साथ एक आदमी को ला सकें। यह आप भले कर दें, इसमें कोई बाधा नहीं है। किन्तु यदि यह सुविधा न दी जायगी तो यह संशोधन अधूरा रह जायगा।

दूसरी बात यह है कि अगर बोलने का अवसर हो तो 2, 4 बातें मुझे कहनी हैं, इससे थोड़ा फर्क पड़ जाता है। इसलिये मैं आपसे इजाजत लेकर कहना चाहता हूँ, सिर्फ हाउस की जानकारी के लिये।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** वह तो छाड़िये, जब बिल आयेगा तो उस वक्त बोलिये।

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA :** I would like to inform the hon. Member that the Minister of Railways, has already taken administrative action regarding this. That is why there is no provision here in this regard. Therefore, it is not necessary to have an amendment for this for which administrative action has already been taken, I hope he will not press this amendment.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Are you withdrawing this amendment because administrative action has already been taken by the Railway Ministry ?



SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA : The facility is available in the Railway.

श्री मृत्युञ्जय प्रसाद : वह हमें बता दीजिये। वह एक ही मादमी को न रहे औरों को भी मिले।

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA : For a blind Member, this facility is available.

श्री मृत्युञ्जय प्रसाद : ब्लाइंड मॅम्बर के अलावा बाकी इस बिल में जो और तरह के लाचार सदस्य हैं, उन्हें भी रेल में यह सुविधा मिलेगी न? इस विधेयक में जिन्हें हवाई यात्रा में साथ में सहायक को ले जाने की सुविधा है, वह उन्हें रेल में भी मिलेगी?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA : This facility is available for blind and otherwise incapacitated.

SHRI MRITYUNJAY PRASAD : I seek leave of the House to withdraw my amendments.

*Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 were by leave withdrawn.*

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.*

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

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA : I beg to move :

"That the Bill be passed.."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed"

*The motion was adopted.*

13.33 hrs.

UNION DUTIES OF EXCISE  
(DISTRIBUTION) BILL,

ESTATES DUTY (DISTRIBUTION)  
AMENDMENT BILL  
AND

ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF EXCISE  
(GOODS OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE)  
AMENDMENT BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, we take up the next item, Shri Satish Agarwal.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI  
SATISH AGARWAL) : I beg to move :

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad) : I am on a point of order. I am sorry to raise this point of order. We have not had the pleasure of seeing the senior Deputy Minister for several days. In the last week also, the finance Bill was in his name and he could not turn up.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is ill.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH : This Bill is in his name. Rule 76 is very explicit and unambiguous. It says :

"76. No motion that Bill be taken into consideration or be passed shall be made by any member other than the member in charge of the Bill and no motion.....etc etc.

Provided that if the member in charge of a Bill is unable, for reasons which the Speaker considers adequate, to move the next motion in regard to his Bill at any subsequent stage after introduction, he may authorise another member to move that particular motion with the approval of the Speaker."

Now, the Senior Deputy Prime Minister has been ill but today the position I would like to know is whether he has written to you about this matter.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has written to the Speaker and the Speaker has authorised Mr. Satish Agarwal to move this Bill.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH : I hope his health is better and he has been improving. We are all anxious to know whether his health is improving.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : His health is improving. Now, Mr. Satish Agarwal.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN  
THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE  
(SHRI SATISH AGARWAL) : I beg to move\* :

"That the Bill to provide for the payment out of the consolidated Fund of India of sums equivalent to a part of the net proceeds of certain Union duties of excise to the States to which the law imposing the duty extends and for the distribution of those sums among those States in accordance with the principles recommended by the Finance Commission in

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.