

[Shri V. V. Giri]

Minimum Wages Act and that, no action has been taken by the State Governments. As far as I am aware, the State Governments are taking action in cases of violation. We have also impressed upon the Ministries of the Central Government employing industrial labour, who are concerned, that they should co-operate fully with the officers responsible for the enforcement of the Act.

I think I have dealt with the most important of the points raised in the course of the debate. As I have said, these points have already been engaging the attention of the Government and many of them have recently been examined in detail by the Central Advisory Board which met recently at Bombay. Further action on the recommendations of the Board will shortly be taken. I now hope that with the co-operation of the employers, workers and the States, we will be able to go forward and cover rapidly all the workers in the sweated and unorganised industries and give them a minimum wage as an earnest of the fair wage to come.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF SALARIES (EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Deputy Minister of Finance: (Shri A. C. Guha): I beg to move.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On behalf of Shri C. D. Deshmukh, he may move this. The record would not be complete otherwise.

Shri A. C. Guha: With your kind permission, I beg to move:

“That the Bill to amend the Voluntary Surrender of Salaries (Exemption from Taxation) Act, 1950, be taken into consideration.”

This is a non-controversial Bill. The present Act, in section 2 (2) gives a list of persons to whom this exemption will be applicable. But, this list makes the whole Act something like a closed thing. If there is any addition of the officers or persons to whom this exemption is to be given, who may be ready to surrender a portion of his pay voluntarily, there would be the necessity of amending the present Act. Since the passing of this Act, there have been certain persons who have to be included in this exemption list. If the hon. Members will look into the list here, even the Speaker and the Chairman are not included in the list, for they have also surrendered a portion of their salary. That is why instead of keeping the list as a closed and fixed one, we are proposing in this Bill to keep the whole thing open so that any person who may surrender a portion of his salary and make a declaration in writing, may be given this exemption. Sections 2 and 3 of the present Act are being replaced by clause 2 of the Amending Bill.

Under the Income-tax Act, a person is liable to pay tax on his salary on a due basis. That is, he is liable to pay the tax on what is due to him and not necessarily on what he cares to receive. But for the provision in the Voluntary Surrender of Salaries Act, 1950, he would not be able to get this exemption. To remove this difficulty and obligation under the Indian Income-tax Act, I am moving this Amending Bill. I hope there will be no objection from any section of the House to accept the Bill as proposed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved.

“That the Bill to amend the Voluntary Surrender of Salaries (Exemption from Taxation) Act, 1950 be taken into consideration.”

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): We are glad that such a Bill has been brought

Amendment Bill

forward and we also approve the Bill. But, we have to make one thing clear. This sort of voluntary surrender is not the only thing that is required. What we wanted was, and we have already expressed our view, that there should be a maximum ceiling on the salaries of certain officers and certain Government officials. We have already made it clear that these salaries ranging up to Rs. 3000, 4000 and 5000, and sometimes even up to Rs. 10,000 for officers, whoever he may be and whatever position he may occupy should not be allowed. Even according to what Mahatma Gandhi said earlier, the Ministers should get only Rs. 500/- a month or something like that. I do not know exactly what he said about the Secretaries and others. When the Ministers get Rs. 500/- the Secretaries cannot expect to get Rs. 3000 and Rs. 4000/-. As the hon. Minister explained just now, if the minimum wage for an agricultural worker is Rs. 1-2-0 in India, why the salary or wage or whatever you call it, of a Government servant, including the President should be Rs. 10,000, I cannot understand. There cannot be such a world of difference between Rs. 1-2-0 per day or Rs. 35/ per month on the one side and Rs. 10,000/- on the other side for the President. Of course, the amount may be smaller for you. But, the difference is there and it is also very much. For instance, the Chief Secretaries or the Secretaries, the Members of the Railway Board Secretaries and officers here are drawing up to Rs. 3000 and Rs. 4000. There cannot be any justification for this. The Government must come forward with a Bill to seal it up. The maximum must be fixed. As things stand today, I would say that it should not go beyond Rs. 1000. There cannot be any reason whatsoever why all these things should be left to the sweet will of the officer concerned, sweet will of the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, sweet will of the President concerned to voluntarily surrender because they are philanthropical personalities. I do not want to cast aspersions on any of the officers including the President today. It is

good that they come forward and surrender a portion and we welcome to that extent. But, we cannot allow such a sort of situation to continue. With regard to salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament, you could have seen what certain Members expressed. They said that if at all a salary is to be paid, it should not go beyond Rs. 300 a month. That does not mean that the responsibility of a Member of Parliament is less than that of a Secretary who is drawing Rs. 3000. It is not on the money that it has to be decided. The whole thing has to be decided by the work that he does, by the situation in the country, whether the Exchequer is in a position to pay an exorbitant rate of wages or salaries, whatever you call it, to the officers. That is the idea. The Government should come forward with a positive Bill or legislation to fix the maximum and minimum. The minimum has been fixed by the hon. Minister for Labour as Rs. 1-2-0 per day. Even this will never be put into operation and even this sum of Rs. 1-2-0 will not be paid. He has himself said that there is no guarantee that even this minimum wage will be paid. There cannot be any salary beyond Rs. 1000 a month as things stand today, considering the economic crisis that we are facing, and considering the low standard of living of the common man in this country. I request the hon. Minister to come forward with such a legislation as early as possible. Till then, of course, these philanthropical gentlemen will give whatever they like and we will willingly accept that. To that extent, we welcome this Bill.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): I fully endorse what has been said by my hon. friend Shri Nambiar regarding the principle which we should adopt so far as the salaries and emoluments paid in our country are concerned. As the Mover of the Bill said, we should support this Bill and welcome those of us beginning from our President down to our Speaker and Deputy-Speaker who have gladly, in view of the conditions and economic distress in our country,

[Shri K. K. Basu]

voluntarily surrendered a portion of their salaries. They should not be taxed. I would only join issue with him on one question and that is a question of principle. The way in which the Act is sought to be amended by Government shows that there will be persons holding high offices who might be willing to surrender their salaries. When the salary of the President was fixed at Rs. 10,000 the consideration was that we may not be able to find persons who would be willing to serve the country in that particular capacity below a certain pecuniary level. That is a very serious mistake which the Government committed. We have, as our President, a man who has been connected with the political movement throughout his life and he is willing to shoulder the responsibility at a lower salary, because he feels that he is there as the representative of people and any consideration of pecuniary benefit should not be allowed to play any part in the selection of the person concerned. I feel that the Government is trying, by this legislation to create a psychological atmosphere in the country whereby it might be considered that an individual has been generous to surrender a part of his salary. We find in the list Ministers, the President and even the President of the Constituent Assembly, who is now the President of India, Speakers, Judges of the Supreme Court and also Governors of States. Therefore, I feel that the Government must take into consideration whether they should not scale down the salaries of these persons. They have come here as the representatives of the people; they have come to serve the people and not to earn for the future and for their children. That attitude should go. By this amending Bill the Government is trying to create a psychological atmosphere where it might be considered that particular individuals have been magnanimous enough to surrender part of their salaries. When Government finds that there are persons who are willing to shoulder the onerous

responsibility at much lower salaries, why not they come forward and fix the salaries at a lower level? We are trying to have a welfare State and this is the basic condition of a welfare State. We must try to scale down the salaries. So far as the Bill goes, we certainly support it. But we feel that such conditions should not be created as to make an impression in the minds of the people that there are certain individuals who are prepared to surrender their salaries. If there are persons who are willing to surrender a greater part of their salaries today, Supreme Court Judges and others tomorrow in our country will there not be people who will accept lower salaries than were being paid before, and more so when we have a welfare State? I therefore, say that the Government should take into consideration this principle and in future must lower down the scales that are being paid to very senior and responsible officers of the State.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.-South): Sir, I appreciate the spirit of the gentlemen who are willing to forego a part of their salaries. But, at the same time, I do not appreciate the State depending upon the charity of its servants. If they do not want the money, there are a number of institutions for which they can subscribe and give help. This is a very archaic and retrograde attitude of life. Why should the State or any department of the State depend upon the charity of a certain person with regard to the money advanced to him for the performance of certain functions?

One aspect of this sending back the money to the national Exchequer is that the person is not willing to do his duty to the fullest capacity or his capability. When once a man who has been put in a certain position offers charity to the State, the State cannot expect the full quota of his services to it. This is a very dangerous aspect of the whole state of affairs. It is not a question of a few lakhs of rupees coming back to the State Treasury but it is the question of a certain attitude.

Amendment Bill

Suppose a man who is given Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 5000 gives back Rs. 2000. By accepting this Rs. 2000 back from the government servant, the Government foregoes complete control over his activities. That, I submit, is more harmful than the few thousands of rupees left in the hands of the public servants who are expected to have hearts large enough and brains and intelligence enough to use for better public good in certain other charitable institutions.

10 A.M.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (गुडगांव): जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, यह बहुत नानकटोवर्शल सा बिल है। इस के ऊपर ज्यादा बहस की जरूरत नहीं थी। लेकिन जो ख्यालात हाउस के अन्दर जाहिर हुए हैं, मैं उनके बारे में दो एक लफ्ज अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ।

जहां इन्कम टैक्स महकमे का सवाल है, या फाइनेन्स महकमे का सवाल है, मैं इसे एंप्रिशाएट करता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो देश का मामूली कानून है, उससे थोड़ा सा डिपार्चर किया। एक शख्स अगर कोई आमदनी करता है या उसे जो पै मिलती है या और जो इमाल्युमेंट्स मिलते हैं, सारी उसकी आमदनी सब्जेक्ट टु टैक्स होती है। अगर उसकी आमदनी बढ़ जायेगी तो गवर्नमेंट की आमदनी भी बढ़ जायेगी। अगर यह बिल पास न हो तो इसके माने यह है कि जिन बड़े अफसरान ने गवर्नमेंट ट्रेजरी में देना मंजूर किया है, उनके ऊपर ज्यादा टैक्स लगेगा। उनकी जितनी आमदनी है उस सार पर टैक्स लगे और गवर्नमेंट को उसके कलैक्शन का हक हो। एक बात में फाइनेन्स डिपार्टमेंट ने जरूर जरा अक्लमन्दी से काम लिया। मुझेको एक रूलिंग याद है जिस के अन्दर एक बड़े प्रोफेसर ने इसी तरह से अपनी आमदनी का एक हिस्सा कुछ यूनिवर्सिटी स्टूडेंट्स के स्कालरशिप के लिये दे दिया था। और उसके ऊपर बराबर सारी पै पर टैक्स लगता रहा। हालांकि उसने अपनी आमदनी का हिस्सा दे दिया था फिर भी टैक्स लगाने के लिये उसकी सारी तन्स्वाह ही उसकी आमदनी करार दी जाती रही। उसने यह भी

कह दिया था कि खजाने से वह हिस्सा उसकी आमदनी का सीधे भेज दिया जाया करे, उसको न मिले, फिर भी उसका कोई असर नहीं हुआ। तो एक तरह से यह बिल उन अशख्स के हक में है जिन लोगों ने वालेन्टरी सरेंडर कर दिया है, यह बात वाजिब ही रखी गई है। पहले यह रियायत थोड़े आदीमियों को थी, अब यह कुछ ज्यादा आदीमियों के लिये बढ़ा दी गई है। लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि अभी भी यह रियायत थोड़े ही आदीमियों को दी गई है। सिर्फ शैड्यूल वाले आदीमियों के लिये पहले थी, दूसरे क्लास वालों के लिये नहीं रखी गई थी जो कि प्रोविशियल या स्टंट गवर्नमेंट्स के कानूनों से बनी हुई नौकरियां हैं उनके लिये नहीं थी। अब उनको यह रियायत दी गई है जिनकी सेन्ट्रल एक्ट या प्रोविशियल एक्ट के मातहत तन्स्वाह मुकररे हैं। अच्छा हो अगर इस उसूल का एमंडमेंट हो जाय। जो भी लोग अपनी आमदनी का हिस्सा पब्लिक काम के लिये देते हैं, या गवर्नमेंट को वापस कर देते हैं उसका रीस्ट्रिक्ट करना वाजिब नहीं था। इसीलिये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इसे रीस्ट्रिक्ट न किया जाय और ज्यादा बढ़ाया जाय।

बात यह है कि जो रियायत इन बड़े अफसरान को दी जाती है, वह छोट से छोट अफसरान को दी जाय और हर एक शख्स को दी जाय। जो भी खजाने में इस तरह से रूपया दाखिल करना चाहे उसके लिये वह सहूलियत होनी चाहिये। यह एक्ट एक तरह से बड़ा इन्नासेन्ट है, और इसके अन्दर बहुत अच्छी स्पिरिट है। अगर इसकी रियायत सिर्फ इन्हीं बड़े बड़े अफसरान को पहुंचाई जाय तो यह बहुत डिस्क्रिमिनेटरी लीजस्लेशन होगा।

दूसरी बात जो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, वह यह है कि इस से यह साबित हुआ कि हमारे यहां के बड़े बड़े अफसरान, प्रीजिडेंट साहब, स्पीकर साहब, डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, जज साहबान, हर एक अपने अमल से यह जाहिर करते हैं कि दरअसल जो इमाल्युमेंट्स

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

रक्खे गए हैं उनके लिये उन में कमी की गुंजाइश है। वह अपने आप खुद वालेन्टरी कट के लिये कहते हैं, वह हमारी मुबारकबाद के मुस्तहक हैं, मैं उनका शुक्रगुजार हूँ कि उन्होंने मेहरबानी करके इसे सोच कर कि हालाँकि वह ज्यादा ले सकते हैं फिर भी वह ज्यादा न लें, यह कट करवाया। लेकिन उनके इस एक्ट से यह साबित है कि किसी भी सबब से अगर जरूरत पड़ जाय तो दरअसल जो इमाल्यु-मेन्ट्स रक्खे गए हैं वह इतने हैं कि जिसके अन्दर वह लोग जेनरासिटी दिखला सकते हैं।

इसमें शक नहीं कि यह जेनरासिटी है अगर एक आदमी अपनी रॉटी में से कुछ निकाल दे और उसका हम जितना शुक्रिया अदा करें उतना अच्छा है। लेकिन इससे साबित होता है, जैसा कि मेरे चन्द दोस्तों ने जिक्र किया, कि तन्खाह का स्टैंडर्ड जरूरत से ज्यादा है।

इस जिम्न में दो बातों का जिक्र मेरे दोस्तों ने किया, एक सेक्रेटरी लोगों की तन्खाह का और दूसरा मिनिस्टर्स की तन्खाह का। मिनिस्टर साहिबान के बार् में तो मैं निम्बयार साहब से मुत्ताफक नहीं हूँ। अगर आज आप किसी मिनिस्टर को ५०० रुपया तन्खाह दें तो यह पब्लिक स्कैंडल होगा। जिस वक्त महात्मा गांधी ने यह फरमाया था उस वक्त रूपय की कीमत आज से चौगुना थी। आज अगर आप मिनिस्टर को ५०० रुपया देंगे तो उसका काम नहीं चल सकेगा। बहुत सारे मेम्बर सेशन के दिनों में उसके यहां जा कर ठहरते हैं तो वह उनका खर्चा कैसे बर्दाश्त कर सकेगा। हमारे यहां पंजाब में मेम्बर लोग मिनिस्टर के यहां आकर ठहरते हैं। आप मुनासिब तन्खाह दें यह ठीक है लेकिन वह ५०० नहीं होनी चाहिये।

सेक्रेटरीज के बार् में मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उसके बार् में हम मुआहिद कर चुके हैं और उनको हम तोड़ना नहीं चाहते। हम देखते हैं कि सेक्रेटरी को मिनिस्टर से ज्यादा तन्खाह मिलती है लेकिन हम अपने

मुआहिद को नहीं तोड़ना चाहते। इस वास्तु इन दो बातों पर मेरा इस्तिलाफ है।

बाकी जहांतक और बड़े अफसरान की ऊंचे तन्खाह का सवाल है मैं समझता हूँ कि अब वक्त आ गया है कि हमको दोबारा उनकी तन्खाहों का रिवीजन करना चाहिये ताकि पब्लिक के सामने यह एक चीज आए कि हम किसी की भी जेनरासिटी पर नहीं रहना चाहते। ज्यादा अच्छा होता कि वह लोग जिन्होंने वालंटरी तौर पर सरेंडर किया है वह किसी और अच्छे काम में यह रुपया दें। बहुत सारे अच्छे काम हैं। और गवर्नमेन्ट के खजाने में भी जितना रूपया आवे अच्छा है क्योंकि गवर्नमेन्ट भी बहुत से अच्छे काम कर रही है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह के वालंटरी सरेंडर से गवर्नमेन्ट का खजाना बहुत दूर तक नहीं भर सकता। यह अच्छा हो कि वह अपनी पूरी तन्खाह लें, उस पर इन्कम टैक्स दें और जो उनकी जरूरत से ज्यादा हो वह किसी अच्छे काम के लिये दें।

जहांतक रिवीजन आफ स्कैल का सवाल है मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेन्ट इसकी तरफ तवज्जह दें। अभी अफसरान और दूसरे लोगों की तन्खाहों में ज्यादा फर्क है। अब वक्त आ गया है कि हम बड़ी आमदनीयों में और छोटी आमदनीयों में ज्यादा फर्क नहीं रखना चाहते, क्यूंकि तन्खाहों में फर्क कैसे ठीक समझ सकते हैं। इसीलिये मैं इतना कह कर इस बिल को सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla):
There is one aspect to which I wish to invite the attention of the hon. Members. No doubt, ostensibly, seemingly, it seems very proper that people should give and voluntarily surrender part of their salaries. but in execution there is a concealed mischief. there is bound to be a hidden heart-burning, and that is this. A class will arise, the favoured few, who, either to earn a little kudos or because their personal wants are few or their family is limited or because they are

Amendment Bill

otherwise rich in their own way, may like to surrender part of their salary, whereas another person, not so fortunate, not so well placed, with a large family, with a large number of commitments, may find it difficult to surrender. The result may very well be the man who surrenders automatically comes into a class of the favoured few, the philanthropes, a man whose panegyrics will be sung by his bosses, and yet another helpless man because he cannot surrender will be considered unfavourably. The result may very well be that in the case of such a person voluntary surrender becomes involuntary surrender. I have serious misgivings if, among certain classes of officers, they are really surrendering part of their salary voluntarily. I entertain very grave doubts. What is likely to happen will be that because one person, either out of genuine generosity or out of sheer pique or out of some other reason, surrenders a portion of his salary, the rest will follow unwillingly parting with a part of their salaries. I wish that invidious distinction may not come into being. If the Government thinks that the standard of the scale of their salaries is too high, by all means let them reduce it. It would be very proper for them to do so. But, if they think that the standard of their scales is correct, then let them voluntarily give away what they feel to such charities as appeals to them rather than they be called upon to accept lower salaries in order to gain certain advantages which will rebound badly on others who are not in a position to follow the line. Therefore, Government should be rather circumspect in encouraging this sort of voluntary surrender which, in the ultimate result, is prone to become involuntary.

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur): This is merely a measure to enable those who want to surrender a portion of their salaries from being taxed on that amount by the Income-tax Department. No wonder is going to be worked out in this country by this. I am quite satisfied. We are more con-

cerned with revising the pay of the higher officers and giving them better facilities in other respects. It has got a psychological effect also on the country.

As Mr. Nambiar said, the common man thinks that the Congress Government is not at all touching the pays of the high officers because of the guarantees given by the previous Government. Even though when we work it out, the amount may be very little, that psychology prevails and the opposition parties take advantage of that.

In our State also this is being done. The Praja-Socialist Party which is in power has announced that the Ministers will reduce their salaries from Rs. 750 to Rs. 500. It has a psychological effect. In fact, instead of spending Rs. 750 they reduce their spending only.

Shri Nambiar: That is good.

Shri Achuthan: So, the Congress Government must reduce the pays of their higher officers and tell them: "This is the position. You will be given other facilities—housing, educational and medical facilities."

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): You say they should have taken Rs. 750.

Shri Achuthan: They are taking only Rs. 500, and they say they are not going to amend the Bill because they do not want to shut out the representatives of the other parties from taking advantage of the higher salary. That was the position taken by Mr. Thanu Pillai when we interviewed him here. So that there is not much in it.

As Mr. Tek Chand remarked, there is a psychology among officers, and when one officer surrenders because he can afford to, the others are in difficulty. The other man thinks: what can I do, and though he is in difficulties, he also parts with a part of his salary. So, the whole thing

[Shri Achuthan]

affects his patriotism, his efficiency and his earnestness in the work. That is a serious matter. But, if any man volunteers, or has consideration enough for the formation of a socialist state in this country, let him surrender and he will have the benefit in regard to income-tax.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta-South-East): I extend, with my friends Mr. Nambiar and Mr. K. K. Basu, my general support to this Bill.

This Bill is not a day too late because we do need it to enable certain officers to surrender a part of their salaries and to make them free of income-tax. But I also reiterate that the real question is not to make them surrender part of their salaries, as to reduce the salaries altogether.

Shri Velayudhan: Cut their salaries.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: There should be a cut in their salaries, as my friend says. The whole point is that we are a poor country, and, therefore, we cannot look at the salary structure from the point of view merely of the rise in the cost of living, merely of what the officer used to get at an earlier time and what he should get now. That is not the way we should look at it. We should look at it from the point of view of the tax-payer, from the point of view of the common people, who have suffered much more than the highly paid officials. We should look at it from the point of view of the low-paid employees of Government as well as of private concerns who are not getting a fair deal and who are not getting enough to make both ends meet. Under these circumstances, there is no moral justification—I should proceed further and say that it is highly immoral—to let certain people have a fat salary out of all proportion to the income of the common people of our country. When suffering has descended upon us, let us share the suffering. If the highly paid officials from the President downwards have a cut in their salaries, no doubt their lives

may be made harder, but yet there is no gainsaying the fact that it will only encroach on that part of their lives which can be called as luxuries, it will only curtail the enjoyment of certain luxuries and not affect the enjoyment of the necessaries and some frugal comforts of life. That is the standard which every highly paid official in the country from the President and Ministers downwards must set. Every highly paid official must sacrifice his luxuries in order to let his less better off brethren have a reasonable approach to a decent life. That is the point of view from which we approach the matter and we do not approach it from any other point of view. When we approach the matter from this point of view, there is a complete answer to the argument advanced by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava or to the argument advanced in his support by Mr. Achuthan. After all, everyone will realise that when Mahatma Gandhi laid it down that a Minister's salary should be Rs. 500, things were different. Now the costs have increased and today Rs. 500 may not be sufficient for a Minister. Even if costs have increased, why not have Rs. 1,000? Why have Rs. 2,500 or Rs. 3,000 or more is the question that we put. Mahatma Gandhi said that the maximum salary that a person was entitled to in our country is Rs. 500.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is Rs. 1,000 so far as a Minister is concerned.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I am obliged to Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava for the correction. Even at that rate, is the maximum not justified? Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has stated that the prices have increased four-fold. For the people getting higher salaries, I should say that the price index has increased about three or four times and so far as the people in the lower rung of the ladder are concerned, the costs have gone up and in the case of those people who have to pay only for the necessaries of their life,

the cost has gone up five or six times. If the index figure has gone up four-fold, can we say that the salaries also should go up to Rs. 4,000 a month? That is the precept which Mahatma Gandhi has laid down. Have we not a moral responsibility of conforming to that precept? Have we not a moral responsibility of fixing our salaries in accordance with that precept, taking into account, no doubt, the rise in the cost of living and also the greater inability of our tax-payer today to foot the bill of such high salaries. That is the point of view from which we approach the matter.

There is another aspect which has not been touched and which I seek to impress on the House. It is all right permitting some people to escape from the income-tax by surrendering their salaries, but there are cases where by a small surrender, the person concerned has the advantage of being taxed on a lower scale or on a lower slab, and this has to be guarded against. In West Bengal, for example, we know that a certain Deputy Minister surrendered Rs. 1,500 of his salary, and by that surrender, he has earned a relief from his income-tax, by deducting which his surrender really comes to Rs. 200 or Rs. 300. We should guard against this kind of evasion of income-tax if surrender is made. If a fame is sought to be built up or a reputation for patriotism is to be built up on the basis of surrendering salaries, let it not be from any profit motive. If a surrender is made, let us see that by such surrender, the Exchequer does not suffer unduly. Let us limit the surrender in such a way that, by that surrender, the person concerned does not go down to the next slab and have the advantage of that slab, thereby reaping a profit out of all proportion to the amount surrendered. That is a thing to be guarded against, particularly in view of Mr. Tek Chand pointing out that by surrender, they might get an undeserved reputation for patriotism and so forth. There is that argument but after all the interest of the people is greater. We

know that there are many ways in which you can earn undeserved reputation in society and we need not unduly be worried about this, but what we have to guard against is that by this undeserved reputation, they may not indirectly denude the Exchequer of an amount out of all proportion to the amount surrendered.

आचार्य कृपालानी : (भागलपुर व पूर्निया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो बिल है, वह तो ठीक है, लेकिन मुझे समझ में नहीं आता है कि उसका मतलब क्या है ? यह जो बड़ आदमी है जिनको 300 आइं पी० कहा जाता है, ये लोग खाली अपने वास्तु यह कट डालना चाहते हैं या यह कट हमेशा के वास्तु आफिसर्स पर रहेगा, यह मुझे थोड़ा मिनिस्टर साहब बता देंगे तो अच्छा होगा ।

श्री अलगू राव शास्त्री (जिला आजमगढ़—पूर्व व जिला बलिया—पश्चिम) : मिनिस्टर साहब को कुछ अभी ख्याल नहीं है ।

Shri A. C. Guha: It is a voluntary cut and it is personal.

आचार्य कृपालानी : पर्सनल है, इसका तो मतलब यह हुआ कि उनकी जगह दूसरे आ जायेंगे तो वह फिर उतनी ही तन्स्वाह ले लेंगे ।

Shri A. C. Guha: He may also surrender.

आचार्य कृपालानी : इसका मतलब यह है कि हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब को बीस हजार मिलता था, उसमें फिर वालन्टरी कट करके दस हजार किया

Shri A. C. Guha: According to the Constitution, the President's salary is fixed at Rs. 10,000 a month.

आचार्य कृपालानी : अच्छा, ठीक है दस हजार मासिक था, फिर अभी अगर वह वालन्टरी कट करके अपना मासिक पांच हजार कर लेते हैं तो क्या अगर उनकी जगह पर कोई दूसरा हमारा प्रेसीडेंट आयेगा तो वह दस हजार ले सकता है ?

श्री अलगू राव शास्त्री : जी हां ।

आचार्य कृपालानी : यह तो बड़ी अजीब बात है । इससे तो अच्छा है कि इन आदिमियों को जो लेते हैं वही लेते रहें ।

इसमें दंश को कोई फायदा नहीं है । अगर आप लोगों को और हम लोगों को ठीक काम करना है तो फिर यह जो तन्स्वाहें हैं उनको हमें कम करना चाहिये और हम करंगे तो फिर अफसर लोगों को भी कुछ शर्म आयेंगी । पहले ही पहल जब हमने काम शुरू किया था तभी हम लोग कहते लोगों से कि मंहगाई हो गई है इसलिये पांच सौ तो नहीं लेकिन दो हजार से ज्यादा किसी को भी हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं मिलेगा, तो मुझे निश्चय है कि हमारा जो अफसरान लोग हैं वह भी इसको कबूल कर लेंगे । फारसी में कहते हैं कि बिल्ली को पहले ही दिन मारना चाहिये । पहले दिन तो उसको मारा नहीं और यह आशा हम लोगों से की जाती थी क्योंकि हम लोग जब सरकार में नहीं आए थे उस वक्त हम किस तरह से रहते थे ? सरकार में आने से किस तरह रह रहे हैं अगर इसका मुकाबला किया जाय तो ऐसा दंखने में आता है कि कोई आदमी तो एक दम से साहूकार हो गया लेकिन उसको साहूकारी से रहना नहीं आता है । उसको हम अंगूजी में "newly rich" कहते हैं । यानी कभी दंखा ही नहीं था । खान्दानी नहीं था । ऐसे ही ब्लैक मार्केट वर्ग रह से आ गया । उसको रहना नहीं आता है फिर भी जो खान्दानी होता है वह उसका अनुकरण करने लगता है तो बड़ा अजीब सा जानवर लगता है और बहुत हंसी की बात होती है । तो मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि बहुत से आदमी हम लोगों को आज दंखते हैं और उनमें से हमारा परमानेंट आफिशल्स भी हैं, वह भी कहते हैं कि दंखा, यह लोग कैसे रहते थे और आज उनके दिमाग को क्या हो गया है ? उनके ऊपर इसका बहुत खराब असर पड़ता है । यानी मिनिस्ट्रों के बार में, या बड़े बड़े लीडरों के बार में वह ऐसा आक्षेप करते हैं कि दंखा भाई, यह लोग

कैसे रहते थे, आज इनका दिमाग बदल गया है । इसलिये इन लोगों के वास्तु परमानेंट सर्विसेज की कोई रिस्पेक्ट नहीं होगी तो हमें आश्चर्य नहीं होना चाहिये । उन्होंने हमेशा चार हजार रूपया कमाया और मजबूती में रहते थे । बहुत से ऐसा कहते हैं कि यह नए आदमी कहां से आ गए तो हमारा साथ मुकाबला करते हैं, इनको रहना तो आता ही नहीं है । यह तो बेचार २५, २० या ५० रु० में रहने वाले थे, इनको अब माँका मिल गया है । इसका भी बहुत खराब असर होता है । हम लोग जो करंगे, लीडर्स जो करंगे, उसी की दंखा दंखी दूसरे भी करंगे । इसी वजह से महात्मा ने कहा था कि सिर्फ पांच सौ रूपया तन्स्वाह रक्खी जाय । अब कहा जाता है कि पांच सौ तो उन दिनों के लिये थे, आज कल तो प्राइसेज बढ़ गई हैं । प्राइसेज बढ़ गई हैं तो क्या खाली हम लोगों के लिये, या बड़े लोगों के लिये बढ़ गई हैं या छोटे आदिमियों के लिये भी बढ़ गई हैं ? मैं तो समझता हूँ कि जिन लोगों को छोटी तन्स्वाह मिलती है उनके वास्तु प्राइसेज बहुत बढ़ गई हैं क्योंकि उनकी इनकम का ज्यादातर हिस्सा जो लाइफ की जरूरतें हैं उन्हीं में खर्च हो जाता है, और वह बहुत मंहगी हो गई है इसलिये उनको ज्यादा नुकसान होता है ।

आखिरकार जो हमारा दंश में क्लर्क हैं या टीचर्स हैं, हमने दंखा है कि जो टीचर्स हमारा बच्चों के गुरु हैं, उन गुरुओं को जो तन्स्वाह मिलती है वह चपरासियों की तन्स्वाह से भी कम है, और उनको सफेदपोश भी रहना पड़ता है । अगर वह टीचर्स हैं तो उनको पढ़ना भी पड़ता है, अखबार भी पढ़ना पड़ता है और जिन का ऐसा हाल है ऐसे आदिमियों से आप वालेंटरी कट न कराएं तो आपकी महरबानी है । अगर हमारा प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब, हमारा प्रेसीडेंट साहब, हमारा स्पिकर साहब कहते कि एक कन्सालिडेटेड बिल आना चाहिये जिस में इन वी० आई० पीज० की सैलरीज को दंखा जाय, और कम किया जाय, तो इसका

जनता के ऊपर बढ़ा असर पड़ता। अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी अपने हित को भी देखती और ऐसा करती तो इसका बाहर के अर्थीभयों पर इतना असर होता कि यह जो फुजूल प्रोपेगन्डा कांग्रेस को बढ़ाने के वास्ते हो रहा है, उसकी भी जरूरत न पड़ती। आदमी कहते कि यह लोग बेचारे ऐसे भले आदमी हैं कि बहुत छोटी तन्स्वाह लेते हैं।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यहां पर यह बात भी है कि छोटी तन्स्वाह वालों या मजदूरों में और बड़ी से बड़ी तन्स्वाह वालों में, या बड़ी से बड़ी जो इनकम हैं उस में बहुत फर्क है। ऐसा किसी मुल्क में भी नहीं। यह फर्क यहां पर करीब २०० दफा पड़ जाता है। अगर ५० रुपये एक मजदूर को मिलते हैं, या एक क्लर्क को मिलते हैं तो हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब को दफा हजार २०० मिलते हैं। तो २०० गुना हुआ न ? महात्मा ने एक दफा एक छोटी तन्स्वाह पाने वाले में और एक बड़ी तन्स्वाह पाने वाले में २०० गुने का फर्क निकाल कर जो हमारे वाइसराय थे उनको दिखलाया था। इससे वाइसराय को बड़ा गुस्सा आया। लेकिन यह फर्क अभी तक है। इसका मतलब मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। इसी वजह से लोग कहते हैं कि हमारा स्वराज्य स्वराज्य नहीं, खाली ढकोसला है। यह देखने में आता है कि उसमें कोई भी अदला बदली नहीं हुई है। हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि जो लोएस्ट सैलरी होगी, जो लोएस्ट इनकम होगी वह १ २०० २ आ० रहेगी। उसके लिये भी कहते हैं कि यह देहात में नहीं हो सकती। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम इनकम १ २०० २ आ० नहीं होनी चाहिये। कम से कम इनकम एक आदमी की २०० रूपया महीने में होनी चाहिये। इसके साथ जो बड़ी से बड़ी इनकम हो वह २००० २० तक होनी चाहिये। हमारे सर्विसज के आदमी कहते हैं कि दस्ता डाक्टरों को, उनको कितनी फी मिलती है, वकीलों को कितनी फी मिलती है और इन्डिस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को कितनी आमदनी होती है। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब हम पीब्लिक

सर्विसज को, और अपने लीडरों को रंगुलेट कर देंगे तो उन लोगों को भी रंगुलेट करने में बड़ी आसानी होगी। वह लोग हमारी ही मिसाल ले करके अपनी फीस बढ़ाते हैं, वकील बढ़ाते हैं, डाक्टर बढ़ाते हैं, अगर हम लोग यह करेंगे तो हम लोग उनके ऊपर भी जोर और दबाव डाल कर उनकी फीस और उनकी कमाई को भी कम कर सकते हैं। देश में किसी की भी कमाई किसी आदमी से २० गुने से ज्यादा न हो। अगर एक आदमी को एक रूपया मिलता है तो उसके भाई को, जो उतना ही काम करता है, शायद वह दिमागी काम करता हो, वह मजदूरी से ज्यादा आसान है, बीसगुने तक मिले, इससे ज्यादा नहीं मिलना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे ज्यादा हमको कभी नहीं जाना चाहिये। साथ में यह भी मैं कह सकता हूँ कि आप करें चाहे न करें, यहां सर्कम्स्टान्सज ऐसे होंगे कि आपको झक मार कर करना होगा, और आहिस्ता आहिस्ता झक मार आप लोग ऐसा करते भी जाते हैं। यह जो सर्कम्स्टान्सज आज कल करार दिये जाते हैं जिस में आपको भी फायदा न मिले और देश को भी फायदा न मिले तो यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है।

यह जो दूटा फूटा बिल आपने रक्खा है, वह ठीक है। उसमें जैसा मेरे भाई ने कहा कि कोई आदमी अगर एक स्लैब से दूसरे स्लैब में जाय, और डिक्लेअर कर दे कि मैंने २००० २०० दे दिया जब कि दिया उसने खाली २०० २००, यह हो सकता है। लेकिन इसकी दवा कैसे हो सकती है ? ऐसे आदमी दिखलाते हैं कि हम लोग तो बहुत उदार दिल के हैं, लेकिन अगर अनार्लिसिस की जाती है तो मालूम होता है कि वह लोग बहुत तंग दिल के आदमी हैं। २०० २०० देते हैं और दिखलाते हैं २००० २००।

बस मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

Shri A. C. Guha: Sir, I did not expect that this Bill would provoke such a discussion covering a wide range. I could understand Mr. Nambiar and

[Shri A. C. Guha.]

Mr. Basu taking advantage of this Bill to discuss something about the social and economic ideas. But what surprises me most is some of the remarks made by Mr. Sharma. He thinks that this Bill or a measure like this would be a sort of compulsion on some unwilling persons who may not be really willing to surrender a portion of their salary or may not like to do it for some circumstantial reasons. In a society there must be some social compulsion for every social being. Otherwise no society can carry on. There must be some social etiquette, some social convention, and also an impulse and an urge to imitate the good example set by others. I cannot understand how Mr. Sharma could take exception on that ground to the provision made in this Bill.

Shri Tek Chand has said that some may be fortunate, due to their family circumstances, to surrender a portion of their salary, but others may not be so fortunate, and a sort of compulsion will be exercised on them. That also would be an absolutely subjective thing. What I have said to Mr. Sharma's apprehension would equally apply to the apprehension of Mr. Tek Chand.

Acharya Kripalani has said many things.

Acharya Kripalani: Right or wrong?

Shri A. C. Guha: When an Acharya says anything it must be always right. How can I say that Acharyaji can ever be wrong? It may be right or wrong in an absolute sense, but may not be so in a relative sense. What he has said might be right in other circumstances or in an abstract sense; but for the circumstances and in relation to the situation with which we are dealing, most of his remarks may not be quite right.

Shri Sadhan Gupta mentioned one case of a Deputy Minister of West Bengal surrendering Rs. 1,500 of his salary. I do not know if he meant his monthly salary or a total amount from his salary.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Monthly.

Shri A. C. Guha: A Minister in Bengal, as far as my knowledge goes, gets only Rs. 1,000 or even less. A Deputy Minister gets much less. And so I cannot understand how he can surrender Rs. 1,500 out of his monthly salary. I am sure a Deputy Minister in West Bengal gets very much less than one thousand rupees.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: With allowances?

Shri A. C. Guha: Allowance is not subjected to income-tax.

Shri K. K. Basu: Some allowances are there.

Shri A. C. Guha: I know there is one allowance namely T. A.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let there be no cross-conversation. When hon. Members make any statements, let them be absolutely accurate, as far as possible.

Shri A. C. Guha: As for the points mentioned by Mr. Nambiar and Mr. Basu, I think I should refer them to the present scale of pay for I. A. S. officers. I would agree with them that the pay fixed for the I. C. S. officers is rather on the high side and may not be quite in conformity with the general standard of our people. But I think they do not know that the present recruits to the Indian Administrative Service are to get much less. Their salary, I think, has been fixed from Rs. 350 to Rs. 1,800. That is the maximum in the usual course. If they are taken to some special cadre, their salary would rise up to Rs. 3,000—not Rs. 4,000 as in the case of the Secretaries of the Central Government belonging to the I. C. S. And then out of this Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000, whatever it may be, there will be income-tax taken. If some of them reach the highest scale of Rs. 3,000—I think not more than 10 per cent. of the recruits would get that scale—they will have to pay Rs. 697 towards income-tax. So, deducting this, there would remain only Rs. 2,300 even.

Amendment Bill

As for the relation between the minimum and the maximum income, I think much may be said, and one may grow very much eloquent on this. But if we take a general review of the scales of pay prevalent in other countries, including the communist countries, and also the difference between the maximum and minimum pay in those countries, I think we would not have much reason to be ashamed of or to regret about the position here—even though I would agree that there may be scope yet for scaling down our higher scales of income, particularly in private sectors. I can mention here that for some posts, not so much of a technical nature, the Public Service Commission could not always get sufficient number of applicants on the pay that is generally attached to such posts. In some cases they have had to advertise twice or thrice and even then really qualified persons were not available, on the scale which the Government was willing to pay for them. So considering the income either in private business or in private jobs, I do not think the present scale of pay as fixed now for most of our officers is very high. Of course, one may argue that there should be scaling down of income also for the private sector. That is a far wider issue, very much beyond the scope of this Bill.

I think in spite of what all Members might have said, none has taken any exception to this Bill, and I hope the Bill will be passed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill to amend the Voluntary Surrender of Salaries (Exemption from Taxation) Act, 1950, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are no amendments to any of the clauses and so I will put all the clauses together with the Long Title and Enacting Formula to the vote of the House.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Sir, May I put one question to the hon. Minister?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

Shri S. S. More: As provision has been made for certain officers to surrender part of their salaries for the purpose of avoiding taxation or getting exemption from tax, I want to know why the same concession is not being extended if the Members of Parliament are to get any salaries.

Shri K. K. Basu: Under the amended section they can do.

Shri A. C. Guha: Now the Members of Parliament are getting only daily allowance which is free from income-tax.

Shri S. S. More: I know the present position, but according to the report which your committee has submitted, some Members may opt for salary and allowance and that salary is liable to be taxed by way of income-tax.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That will be implemented by a Bill and this provides that wherever salary is fixed by a Central Act, it will be free from tax.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, there is a column, but I want to know whether that column will be covered?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Automatically.

Shri A. C. Guha: It is not necessary to add anything; persons whose salaries are fixed by State Legislatures or the Central Legislature are already included. The salaries of Members of Parliament will be fixed by an Act of the Central Legislature and so, automatically they will come within the mischief or the benefit of this Act.

Shri Nambiar: Sir, I want to ask one question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no.

Clauses 1 and 2 were added to the Bill.

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

Shri A. C. Guha: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Shri Nambiar: Sir, I want to know whether the hon. Minister can give us an idea as to what is the amount that has been saved out of this for the last few years, or at least in one year?

Shri A. C. Guha: I have not got the figures.

Shri Nambiar: Not even for one year?

Shri A. C. Guha: No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

**BENARES HINDU UNIVERSITY
(AMENDMENT) BILL.**

(AMENDMENT OF SECTION 17)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will now take up Private Members' Business.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Benares Hindu University Act, 1915.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Benares Hindu University Act, 1915."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I introduce the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri S. V. Ramaswamy is not here. Then, Shrimati Maniben Patel.

**SUPPRESSION OF IMMORAL
TRAFFIC AND BROTHELS
BILL**

Shrimati Maniben Patel (Kaira South): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for and consolidate the law relating to suppression of immoral traffic in women and brothels, be taken into consideration."

श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल : उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह बिल ऐसा है कि जिसमें कोई ज्यादा कहने की जरूरत नहीं है। इसकी आवश्यकता में मानती हूँ कि सब लोग महसूस करते हैं। कुछ स्टेटों में इस सम्बन्ध में कानून मौजूद भी हैं, परन्तु यह उचित होगा कि सारा देश भर के लिये अगर एक सेंट्रल लेजिस्लेशन हो जाय, देश के लिये एक यूनीफार्म कानून हो जाय तो इस पर अमल करने में भी काफी आसानी होगी। हम जानते हैं और हमने अक्सर देखा है कि लोगों ने इस प्रकार का एक धंधा बना रक्खा है कि वह बेचारी लड़कियों को उठा कर ले जाते हैं और उनको बाथरूम में ले जाकर पैसा बनाते हैं। इसीलिये अगर इस प्रकार का एक कानून बन जाय तो हमारा देश और समाज में जो आज एक नैतिक अधःपतन हो रहा है उसको रोकने में हम समर्थ हो सकते हैं। पार्टिशन के बाद तो यह बुराई और भी काफी बढ़ गई है, क्योंकि काफी लोग बेचार अपने घरों से निकाले गए हैं और उनके रहने का कोई ठीक प्रबन्ध न होने के कारण मातृ एक जगह बसी है, स्त्री दूसरी जगह है और पति कहीं तीसरी जगह पर रह रहा है। इसके अलावा लोगों की आर्थिक हालत भी काफी बिगड़ी हुई है, इस कारण कई लोगों ने इसका भी फायदा उठाया है और बंगाल प्रान्त में कलकत्ते में तो अभी यह भी देखने में आया है कि वहाँ पर समाज क्लीनिक्स का धंधा लोगों ने कर रखा है, अभी अप्रैल के महीने के मॉडर्न रिव्यू में यह खबर आई है कि यह काम वहाँ पर इतने जोरों