

[Shri Alagesan.]

but there will be ample time for hon. Members to scrutinise the measure when it is placed before the House, and it can be passed to the satisfaction of all concerned.

As regards the point raised by my hon. friend, Mr. H. N. Mukerjee, it is a sort of contradictory approach. He wants that there should not be any delay in recruiting Indian nationals to serve in our ships. At the same time, he does not want any dislocation to be caused to the Pakistani seamen. It is rather difficult to adjust these two things: he is trying to go slow and fast, if I may say so, in this matter. In fact, anxiety was expressed that we should try and recruit almost the entire seamen from Indian nationals and see that the seamen who are employed in our ships are cent. percent. Indian nationals. At present, it is true that a large percentage of the seamen come from, technically, a foreign country, viz., Pakistan. They also come from Goa, which is in Portuguese India. We are anxious to increase the percentage of Indian nationals working in the ships and towards that end we are issuing what are called C.D.Cs—continuous discharge certificates to recruits, so that they can be taken back. Also New C.D.Cs are being issued to a large number of ex-naval ratings who served in the Navy during the war and have since been demobilised.

I have already referred to the Rating Training Schemes at Calcutta and at Visakhapatnam. Up till now we have turned out about 1,982 trainees from these two establishments. We propose to have another establishment also and soon we may be able to turn out about 2,000 trainees every year. They will gradually replace the foreign nationals who are now working in our ships.

As regards difficulties about visas, I am given to understand that no such difficulties exist and we do not want to place any unnecessary restrictions in the way of Pakistanis who are now employed in our ships.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move.*

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of certain

Officers of Parliament, be taken into consideration."

The Bill follows the pattern of an Act that has been passed by this House and the other one, namely the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act of 1952. The position is that under Article 97 of the Constitution the salaries and allowances of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States may be fixed by Parliament by law, and until provision in that behalf is so made, such salaries and allowances as are specified in the Second Schedule shall be paid to them. The appropriate portion of the Second Schedule (Part C) says:

"There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States such salaries and allowances as were payable to the Speaker of the Constituent Assembly of the Dominion of India immediately before the commencement of this Constitution, and there shall be paid to the Deputy Speaker of the House of the People and the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States such salaries and allowances as were payable to the Deputy Speaker of the Constituent Assembly of the Dominion of India immediately before such commencement."

Under these provisions, the salaries and allowances of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman were fixed by an order of the President. The salary of the Speaker was fixed at Rs. 3,000 per mensem, with sumptuary allowance of Rs. 500, with a fully furnished residence free of rent. Similar facility was also given to the Chairman of the Council of States. In regard to the position of the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman, the provisions varied, naturally, as under the previous arrangement a salary of Rs. 1,500 was paid per month to the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy Chairman plus the daily allowance that they were drawing, but they had no other amenities.

The present intention is outlined in the Bill. I might also add that when the salaries of Ministers were brought down from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 2,250, both the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States made a voluntary cut in their salary, equal to the amount that was reduced in the salaries of Minis-

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

ters. The position envisaged by the Bill now before the House is that the salaries of the Speaker and the Chairman of the Council of States should be equated to the salaries of the Ministers and the amenities that are provided for them by way of a fully furnished residence free of rent and a sumptuary allowance, as is being given to the Cabinet Ministers, shall be paid to them. In regard to the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy Chairman, the position now is that they shall be paid a salary of Rs. 2,000 per month plus the facilities in regard to residence, similar to what is given to Ministers and Deputy Ministers as well as the Speaker and the Chairman of the Council of States. But they will not be entitled to the sumptuary allowance. The other facilities, like travelling allowance, medical facilities, advance for purchase of cars, etc., follow the pattern of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act of 1952.

The Bill does not require any further elucidation from me, as the position is fairly clear. Hon. Members are fully familiar with the conditions that were obtaining before and what is obtaining today. I see certain amendments have been tabled. I suppose the amendments are permitted by you on my agreeing to accept them. I do not think I will be in a position to accept them. But I do not want any technicalities to stand in the way of the amendments being moved. One amendment, moved by my hon. friend Mr. Punnoose is, in my view, out of order. The hon. Member suggests that the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman must renounce all connections with political parties. I do not think that point is germane here. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to take shelter under a purely technical reason and to refuse consideration of these amendments, if you say that the amendment may be considered. But I do not think I will be in a position to accept any of them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

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

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): The hon. Minister mentioned about an amendment that I have tabled and he was pleased to observe that there is some technical objection about it. I had to command a lot of courage to speak on this particular Bill. As you know, it is rather delicate to speak on such a Bill in the context in which we are

placed. Through the amendment I have tabled and also by the observations which I propose to make, I want to raise certain questions which, I believe affect the very basis of our democracy. On this occasion I want to emphasise certain aspects of our democratic and parliamentary life which I think should be considered in great detail by you, Sir, and also hon. Members of this House.

While making these observations or in tabling the amendment, I may state most categorically that there is no reference to any person, or to any incident or imputation of any motive, or casting of any aspersion. Far from it. I want to raise a constitutional issue. I believe that these Officers of Parliament, the Speaker, the Chairman, the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy-Chairman should be above all party affiliations.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): Sir, may I rise to a point of order? Here we have a Bill regulating the salaries and allowances of Officers of Parliament. My friend is speaking about certain other qualification, namely, whether the Speaker or the Chairman could belong to this or that party. My humble submission is this: is beyond the scope of this Bill. It only deals with the salaries and allowances of these Officers. That qualification which my friend wishes to speak about should have been considered at the time of the framing of the Constitution—whether the Speaker or the Chairman or the Deputy-Speaker or the Deputy-Chairman could belong to any party or not. So far as this Bill is concerned, my submission is that this discussion is beyond the scope of this Bill.

Shri Punnoose: May I make a submission? Constitution has provided that the salaries and allowances of these Officers of Parliament be decided by the Parliament itself. The Constitution does not preclude this Parliament from giving its views, when it appoints these Officers and fixes their salaries and allowances. The Parliament has got the right to say 'we expect this from them. There is nothing that prevents this House from doing so. I am not aware of any constitutional difficulty which would place my observations out of order.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: This will be adding one disqualification to the Members of the Parliament from standing for the post of Chairman or Speaker if they belong to any of the parties. This is tantamount to a disqualification to that post. Therefore,

[Pt. Thakur Das Bhargava.]

it was in the Constitution that we should have provided for it and not by a separate Bill. And even if a separate Bill is allowable for this purpose, there is no reason why we should extend the scope of the present Bill and include the disqualification in this Bill.

Shri Punnoose: The fear expressed by my hon. friend is far away from my thoughts, because any Member of any party can stand for these posts. But once they are elected to these posts they do not belong to any party, they belong to the whole House, and in them all parties have to repose their unconditional and unqualified faith. As such, from the date of their election to these august positions they should cease to be members or functionaries of political parties. That is my point.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me dispose of this point of order—there is one point of order. I feel it rather delicate so far as this point of order is concerned. Of course I am not the only one Officer that is referred to here, nor is the reference individual. It is absolutely impersonal. Certainly, hon. Members are entitled to table any amendments and speak on them.

Regarding this particular amendment the position is this. This is a disqualification for any such person. This may be a separate thing. Now, if the hon. Speaker or the Chairman is prepared not to take a salary at all and work—after all, this amendment is under the impression that it is the salary that is the most important thing—if in an honorary capacity the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker is prepared to work, is it the feeling of the hon. Member who has tabled this amendment that they may be allowed to do any amount of propaganda for a particular party? He thinks this is the screw by which they can be forced not to take such part! I mean it will be too small an estimate of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker that merely for money considerations they work. The Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker who for the time being are lawyers can go and earn at least a fraction of the amount, and if they go about carrying on propaganda for or against any party, what happens to the object of the hon. Member?

Therefore, this is an independent consideration. Under the Constitution it was not said. It is a matter which has to be established by convention.

But I do not want to give a ruling on this because I am one of the parties concerned.

An Hon. Member: You are impartial.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Let the hon. Member have his full say. Please do not rule it out of order because you are personally concerned. We have got effective answers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there is any another Chairman I will place him in the Chair and go, so that he may give a ruling. Anyhow, what I would say at this stage is this. This matter need not be raised now. When the stage of amendment comes in, another hon. Member, the Chairman, will take the place and give a ruling bringing to bear his independent judgment on the matter.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): The point of order may raise similar difficulties for the Chairman also, if you vacate the Chair for the hon. Member who raised the point of order now!

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The provisions of article 97 are obligatory. It may be that the House may fix a nominal salary of one rupee. But if it does not, it means that what is now obtaining under the Second Schedule will continue to obtain. They cannot negative the purpose of article 97. They might dilute it by saying that the Speaker and Deputy-Speaker and the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman shall get one rupee. But they have to say it, that there shall be something nominal and not something which is really substantial. That has to be said. It cannot be said in a negative manner. I think that is where the point raised by my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava was correct.

It is not merely a matter of embarrassment to you, Sir, where there is no question of salary. The real question at issue is whether article 97 should be taken as being mandatory so far as we are concerned. And if we do not exercise our right to fix the salary, what is obtaining before would continue to obtain. That is a proposition in which the Chair's personal predilections do not at all enter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Personally I think it is a disqualification which ought to find a place in the Constitution if the House or the country large desires it. And so far as imposing a disqualification by Parlia-

ment, when there is no such disqualification in the Constitution, is concerned, it is matter which has to be canvassed.

As a disqualification it cannot be introduced in this Bill as a side-issue. In that way many other things also can be said—that the Speaker should know ten languages, he should know Hindi, Tamil, Telugu, he must have passed a test concerning the rules and points of order—all these things can also be imposed. Whether they are germane to this Bill is the only point. Personally, I am not in favour of accepting this qualification. At this point of discussion, that is in the general discussion, this need not be entered into. At the time of amendments I shall consider what has to be done.

Shri Punnose: I am thankful for the explanation, Sir. What I want to impress upon the House is that, just as Shri Gadgil said, we should try to build up a tradition by which these Officers of Parliament will be free from all party affiliations. In this as well as in other matters we have got the example of the House of Commons. I am not one of those who consider that in place and out of place we should blindly follow the example of the British House of Commons. Valuable as those experience are for us, it is open to us to have our own ways of doing things. But one cannot forget the fact that what we find in Britain today is the result of centuries of development, also, the result of the logic of events that have been taking shape all these centuries. Now they have come to a certain position where the Speaker is above all party politics. While replying to the felicitations from the floor of this House, the hon. Speaker made certain remarks about it on the day he was elected. He was pleased to say:

“The position of the English Speaker is a matter of historical growth and it has been established at the end of centuries of struggle of the Commons for independence. Its evolution to the present stage has taken place after the establishment of the full authority of the Commons. The position is undoubtedly an ideal one provided it is accompanied by the other essential corollaries of democracy.”

To the latter aspect of the sentence, I will come later on. He has openly admitted that that is the ideal for which we should strive. I must further quote. Sir, from the speech of the hon. the Chairman of the Council of States. He said:

“I belong to no party and that means I belong to every party in

this House. It shall be my endeavour to uphold the traditions, the highest traditions of parliamentary democracy and act towards every party with fairness and impartiality, with ill-will to none and goodwill to all.”

Then he goes on to explain the position in the House of Commons and calls upon both the Government and the Opposition to behave in a fashion conducive to the healthy development of democracy in this country.

There appears to be some difference in the position of the Deputy-Speaker here and the Deputy-Speaker of the House of Commons. I feel that the position of the Deputy-Speaker here is entirely different from that of the Deputy-Speaker in the House of Commons. In the House of Commons, strictly speaking, there is not an officer as Deputy-Speaker. There is the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee acting as the Deputy-Speaker. Previously the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee was appointed by the leader of the House. In later years he was proposed by a Member of the Treasury Bench and voted into power by the ruling party. If you look into May's Parliamentary Practice, you will find that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee acts as the Deputy-Speaker only during the unavoidable absence of the Speaker. I wish I could read certain portions from May's Parliamentary Practice in this connection. The peculiarity of the position there is:

“Standing Order No. 96 empowers the Speaker, after he has taken the Chair at the commencement of a sitting, without any formal communication to the House, to request the Chairman of Ways and Means or the Deputy Chairman to take the Chair, either temporarily or until the adjournment of the House; but before his Deputy can exercise the Speaker's powers under the Standing Order No. 29 and 31, the announcement of the Speaker's absence must be made”.

The Speaker can vacate the Chair without even indicating the fact to the House but the moment the Chairman of Ways and Means Committee comes to occupy the Chair, the Sergeant or the Clerk should announce that the Speaker is not there due to unavoidable reasons and then only the Deputy-Speaker can occupy the Chair. Before announcing that the absence of the Speaker is due to unavoidable reasons, the Deputy-Speaker cannot give rulings on certain important matters. Such restrictions are not here. Here, the Deputy-Speaker is a full-fledged officer of Parliament in

[Shri Punnoose]

whom confidence is reposed as in the Speaker himself. Therefore, any sort of comparison between the Deputy-Speaker of this august House and that of the House of Commons will be out of place.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): Are we to follow the Westminster practice so blindly?

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. castes): This can be a better arrangement.

Shri Punnoose: I am sure my friend will get more light when we go further. Therefore, what I want to make out is that these officers should be looked upon as persons occupying positions in which all the Members have to place their trust, their unqualified trust at all times. Previously—in the beginning—the position of the Speaker of the House of Commons itself was that of a Deputy or nominee of the Crown but gradually that changed. Today he is the guardian of the rights and privileges of the whole House, of each and every Member and he is kept out of all party loyalties. Here the hon. Speaker has said in unmistakable terms that this is the ideal for which we should strive. I hope there will be absolutely no difference between the concept of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker entertained by the hon. friends on that side and by those on this side of the House. What I feel is that there is a difference between this concept and practice. There is a contradiction between what we think about them and what is actually in practice today. It may not be due to the fault of any one but it is for us to bring existing practice in consonance with the concept we all entertain. The hon. Speaker when he replied to the felicitations made another point. He said:

“We have yet to evolve political parties and healthy conventions...”

Then he goes on:

“From this point of view as also from my moorings in the past, I cannot be out of the great organisation, the Indian National Congress, under whose banner I have had the privilege of serving, in one capacity or another, for the last 40 years. I therefore continue to be a Congressman just as any Indian can continue to be a Hindu or a Muslim or a Parsee, etc., and still he is no less an Indian so far as the national questions are concerned”.

Here we are placed in a difficulty. What exactly is the relationship be-

tween this organisation called the Indian National Congress and the party that is functioning here on behalf of the Congress? That is a difference which this House cannot understand. I could show a number of statements made by the hon. Prime Minister, the Leader of the House, in his capacity both as the Prime Minister and the President of the Congress to the effect that the Congress is fast becoming a party, and that it has ceased to be a movement. For all practical purposes, the Indian National Congress is the ruling party in this country today and the Speaker says that as a result of his moorings in the past, he cannot remain out of the Congress. I would like to know whether it is not obligatory on the part of a member of the Congress to stand for its programme and to stand for its objectives also. If it is obligatory on the part of a member of the Congress to stand for its programme, I am afraid the Speaker has certain obligations from which he cannot escape.

Then coming to the Deputy-Speaker, we read the other day in the papers that he is elected to the Executive Committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party. I have a copy of the Constitution of the Congress Parliamentary Party and the Executive Committee has got certain definite functions there. It is not a big body. It is a committee of the very select, very elite stalwart fighters of the party, who are supposed to stand through thick and thin for the party. The Executive Committee has got certain functions which are specifically mentioned here. Fifteen members elected by the members of the Congress party who are Members of the House of the People and six members elected by the Congress party will be the Executive Committee of the Congress party in the Parliament. It is said:

“The Executive Committee shall have power to examine all motions, amendments, or Bills proposed to be made or introduced in Parliament of India by any Member and to approve, modify or reject the same according as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress.”

Mark they will have power to accept, modify or reject according as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress. It is obligatory on the hon. Deputy-Speaker, in his capacity as a member

of the Executive Committee, to sit in judgment on every motion, on every amendment and every Bill and every Resolution coming up in this House and he, or in his absence, the Committee of which he is a part, takes decisions. I would very much appeal to you to consider whether this will produce a healthy sense of impartiality and will inevitably command the unqualified trust which is expected of us all by this august office which you occupy.

The position is this. We have, in this country, to tackle a lot of difficult problems. Problems which the British Parliamentary democracy had not to face in its long travel through the centuries we are called upon to face. Problems arising out of Party conflicts, and class conflicts have cropped up. At such a time, in order to develop democratic movement in this country, for the preservation of the democracy for which we have paid a heavy price, the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, occupying this Chair should give us the confidence that there is nothing that can prevent them from doing full justice. We very often come to you and talk to you on the rostrum. Sir, but, when the Whip of the Congress party mounts the rostrum, I get a shudder because he is the Whip of the party of which the hon. Deputy-Speaker is a Member. Is it a position that has to be encouraged?

I have to make one or two observations more. We have sometimes seen you at close quarters. Sometimes I have felt that some of the most undesirable, I mean, unenviable positions in the world are the positions of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Certainly not undesirable.

Shri Punnoose: I have had occasion to go to his Chamber, more often to the Deputy-Speaker than to the hon. Speaker. Sometimes, I have come away without telling him what I wanted to say. Because, I have seen him being pestered with all kinds of problems; all points of order go to him. All sorts of amendments, requests and explanations are there before him every moment. From that point of view also, this House has got a right to demand that his whole, entire, undivided attention should be placed at the disposal of the House. I cannot commend, Sir, I cannot appreciate for a moment the way in which the services of these very respectable gentlemen occupying such august positions have been utilised by the Party in power.

I place my case on two points: on a matter of principle and on a matter

of practical necessity. On a matter of principle, because that is the foundation on which we have to build. You say that the Communists in this House have no faith in Parliamentary democracy and that they are not democrats and that you on the other side are wonderful democrats. (*An Hon. Member:* Wonderful?) Yes. You must make these disbelievers, doubting Thomases believe and give them more reason for faith. This will be one step in that direction. You have to take a very courageous step. I hope the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman will fully appreciate the position. I believe there will be practical agreement among the Members of this House also, unless the whip works havoc. Because, I know, many of the Congressmen on the other side also want democratic institutions to develop in this country. And then it is humanly impossible for the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker to discharge their functions as office-bearers of this House, and at the same time, to look after the interests of some party.

With these words, I place my views on the Bill before the House.

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar): I may be given two minutes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will call Mr. Gadgil first and then others.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I have heard the speech of my hon. friend with very great attention. He will readily agree with me that when a Party is elected at the general elections with a majority, certain political and parliamentary results flow therefrom. If according to the Constitution and the rules of business in the House, certain offices in the Parliament are subject to election, they are subject to election with all the known facts that the majority has a particular political colour. If you are to lay down a proposition as broad and as tall as has been sought to be laid down by my esteemed friend just now, that because a candidate for the Speakership or the Deputy-Speakership belongs to a particular party, he must be penalised either by not allowing to stand or, if he is elected, by not paying him: (*Some Hon. Members:* No, no.) or, instead of doing this, that he should resign from his particular party.....

Shri Punnoose: May I make a personal explanation, Sir?

Shri Gadgil: May I put it this way? I have a driver who is excellent in his job of driving very well. Am I to dismiss him because he is a member of

[Shri Gadgil]

the Communist party or a trade union? It will be absurd.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Sir, on a point of order, is the hon. Member correct in his comparison, in his analogy between his driver and the Speaker of the House?

Shri Gadgil: I regret that my hon. friend lacks completely a sense of humour.

Now, proceeding with the arguments. The tradition that has been established in England with respect to the high office of Speaker was not built in a day and that has been agreed by my hon. friend. We have also our own tradition. We have not written on a *tabula rasa* even in this matter just as we have not written our Constitution on a clean slate. We have certain historic precedents. Now, before this Parliament came into existence, there was a Central Assembly, and election to the Presidency or Deputy-Presidency always went on political considerations. What was only relevant for the purpose was whether a particular man, after having been elected and having become the occupant of this high office, was impartial or not in the conduct of business. That is the only test. We must differentiate between the functions to be discharged and the political colour of the particular person. Is it the case of my hon. friend here that because the hon. Deputy-Speaker or the Speaker of this House, or the Chairman or the Deputy-Chairman of the other House, has shown a partiality for the members of or for the Party which has put him in office—if that is the case, the line of argument, so far as I am concerned, would be different, but my hon. friend has very subtly but very fairly put the proposition and wants to make out a case that there should not be a situation in which duty and interest will conflict,—if I understand him correctly.

Shri Punnoose: Here it is duty that conflicts with duty. Duty as Executive Member of the Congress Party, comes into conflict with duty as the Deputy-Speaker.

Shri Gadgil: Interest as a party-man. That is how I understand.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): A party-man is always a party-man!

Shri Gadgil: Let us compare the traditions in England and the traditions in India. Was our Speaker elected uncontested? I want to know that. Even in the General Elections he was opposed. The tradition in England is that if

the outgoing Speaker seeks re-election, then—it is a convention well understood and well followed—he is not opposed. He is elected and then elected as Speaker. What happened here? After he was opposed in the General Elections he was returned. When he was again proposed by the majority Party, and very rightly—they were within their right—for occupation of this high office, he was also opposed. Now, having not followed the tradition in England in all these essential preliminaries, you only want us to follow the net product because it suits you for the time being. I am not questioning your motives in the least. (*An Hon. Member:* No!) I entirely agree that you want to do it in the best interests of Parliamentary tradition, but a tradition is not a thing which can be built up within the twinkling of an eye. It takes quite a long time, and it is not possible unless all the Parties agree that there must be certain fundamental things which must be beyond the dispute or discussion of any momentary passions or emotions. Now as regards the Speaker of this hon. House.—I am not referring to the fact that I am his personal friend—even in 1946 and 1947 when those were very troublesome times. I need not refer to how the passions were raised—not a single Member of the Muslim League raised any doubt about the impartiality in the conduct of the business of this House.

Shri Punnoose: That is due to the merits of the person occupying the office, and not due to the merit of the arrangement.

Shri Gadgil: There was election. In spite of the momentary lapses occasionally on the part of some friends here and there, by and large the impression I have gathered so far as the Opposition Members are concerned is that they have a fair faith in the impartiality of the Speaker. Now, it is very difficult—you can just imagine how difficult it is—for a man to give up all his political inclinations or instincts or views which he may have built up in the course of his political life extending over more than a quarter of a century. By changing the clothes you cannot change the colour of your skin (*Interruption.*) By assuming office, you cannot entirely get rid of your political opinion, but the real test is: what are the expectations of this particular office, and how he is expected to conduct the business of the House. If we come to the conclusion that he has done it satisfactorily, not only before he was elected—we have a history of it—and even in this House, then we must stop

at that, and as far as the Speaker of this House is concerned, we are all agreed that he has done and discharged his task very nicely.

Now comes the case of the Deputy-Speaker. Extracts were read from the Constitution of the Congress Parliamentary Party. If the Congress Parliamentary Party lays down that whatever be the whip it has to be honoured by every Member of the Party, I think similar provision is to be found in the Constitution of every Party, including the Communist Party. (An Hon. Member: They have no Constitution) I have not the slightest doubt that if there is deviation or non-compliance with the whip of the Party, the punishment meted out to the Member of the Communist Party is any day greater, stronger and more intense than the punishment meted out to the Member of the Congress Party, but that is not the great point. The great point is while he is in the Chair, how does the whip of the Congress Party affect him in the conduct of the business of the House? (An Hon. Member: Why not?) Does the whip tell him that he must not allow more time to the Members of the Opposition, or that he must not allow a particular Member to speak, or that he should not allow a particular Member to move his Amendment, this, that and the other? (Interruption). The conduct is prescribed by the Business Manual, and so far as the Deputy-Speaker who is in the Chair is concerned, my own grievance is that he is definitely against us, Members of the Congress Party. (Interruption)

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order. Sir, is the hon. Member in order to say that the Deputy-Speaker has been unfair to the Congress Party?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are dealing with the subject most impersonally, and the point that has been raised by Mr. Punnoose is on two grounds. It may possibly create a suspicion. Then, that suspicion ought to be removed. That is his first point. Secondly, entering into personalities may be very interesting. I know what the hon. Member means. He has got very great affection for me personally, but it may raise other controversies. Therefore, let there be no personal reference to me either for or against. So far as this debate is concerned, let it proceed absolutely impersonally. The other point is whether this is all relevant. I leave it to the House. I have made up my mind not to give a ruling on the point of order. It is for the House to decide.

Enough discussion has gone on, but I will allow more hon. Members to take

part in the discussion, and ultimately the House may decide whether in the situation in which we are, that qualification ought to be imposed and whether even though it might be conceded, it has to be discussed on a different proceeding, and whether it ought to be done here as part of the discussion on this Bill. With respect to general principles, comparison with the House of Commons etc., all that can be done. I would only appeal to hon. Members not to make any reference to my individual acts so far, and how I have been doing in this House. It is not necessary, and I may be in this House or I may not be in this House, but this is for all time to come. In a dispassionate mood hon. Members will address themselves to the principles and how far this should be allowed or not allowed.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): On a point of clarification. Because we are discussing a principle and we cannot discuss principles hanging in the air, some facts will have to be marshalled in support of particular arguments. Can we not refer to facts even about your own conduct if we want to substantiate a particular point?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Leave alone my conduct. We are now dealing only with the Speaker's salary or that of the Chairman in the other House. I think it will be out of place to make any reference to the Speaker for the time being. If any hon. Member is dissatisfied with the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker or the Chairman or Vice-Chairman, there are other provisions. A non-Party man is liable to abuse his position as much as a Party-man if he does not want to be just, but we are now concerned with the point as to how far the Party will have any influence on him. Those are the general principles. In those circumstances, I do not think any individual reference should be made for or against, or showering of bouquets on the one side and brickbats on the other. That may be avoided as far as possible.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): May I point out one thing? I quite agree with you, Sir, that this debate should be proceeded with in a perfectly impersonal manner. But, reference has already been made to statement made from the Chair by a Member in this House which raised certain questions of principle regarding the position of the Speaker *vis-a-vis* the political life of our country. Now, that is a subject, Sir, which is one instance of the subjects which can be discussed impersonally. In relation to a discussion of that subject, possibly certain

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

other illustrative factors might have to be referred to. I entirely agree with you that so far as the conduct of the Chair in this House is concerned, we should not make any specific references to instances where the Chair has given a ruling one way or the other. I agree with you entirely. But in regard to the general question of the position of the Speaker *vis-a-vis* the political life of this country, and in regard also to the general question of the repercussion of the statement made by the Speaker of our House on the general conduct of Parliamentary proceedings, I submit we have a right to make our submissions that are related to the Bill under discussion, by showing the role of the Chair in our parliamentary setup and then discussing the emoluments and other things which are now proposed to be given.

Shri Gadgil: Sir, I have not finished. To continue, the point I was making was that the test is whether the functions as are expected of the Deputy-Speaker are properly and fairly discharged or not. If you insist that on his being elected as a Deputy-Speaker, he must resign from the party from which he is elected, you are penalising the majority of the Members. (*Interruptions*) Understand the implication of it. This House consists of 369 Congressmen, and we have a right because of the majority.

An Hon. Member: Right to what?

Shri Gadgil: So long as we are here, we are here. It will be an age before you come over here.

The point is that you are denying that right to the majority. That right, as I stated in the beginning is that as soon as a party is elected in a majority, certain political and parliamentary consequences follow. This is one of them. The argument advanced is that because the Deputy-Speaker is a member of the Congress Executive or a member of the Congress party, a whip will be issued, which will control him. The Whip will control his voting only and not the conduct by him as Deputy-Speaker, so far as the business of the House is concerned.

Then you have to consider not only what I said about the Deputy-Speaker just now, but also the other consequences, if we were to accept in toto what has been suggested by my friend there. Now, is he a full-time officer? He may be a part-time officer here, and not a

full-time officer like the Speaker. If he is a part time officer, and the sum given is not adequate for him, is he to give up everything else, and all the other facilities, advantages or benefits, that are incidental to the membership of a particular political party. (*Interruptions*). Do not think that way, simply because you happen to be in the Opposition. Take a larger view. Let us all agree that certain traditions have to be built, and those traditions require that in the conduct of business, whether it be the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker, he must be absolutely impartial and should maintain the tradition of democratic discussion.

Now according to numbers, the Opposition is entitled to not more than 1/4th of the time of the House. But they are actually getting roundabout 35 per cent., sometimes 40 per cent. and sometimes even equal time, and I have no grievance about that except on certain occasions when I am not called. The point is that the minority has naturally a right to enjoy some weightage in the point of time, and very recently the position with respect to the majority *vis-a-vis* the Opposition was examined in the House of Commons, and it was found that the minority party did get a little more time, and that that little more must be given. They may be small in number, but we cannot count the volume or the weight of any argument by merely counting the heads or the hands. Therefore so far as what the present Deputy-Speaker has done is concerned, although I complain that he is unfair to the Congress party—but that was only to provoke him to say what he actually said.....

[SHRI PATASKAR in the Chair]

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Gadgil: But, Sir, I respectfully submit that this is not the time, because you have not given enough time for the growing of traditions.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. He is repeatedly saying that the Deputy-Speaker or the Speaker has been unfair to the Congress party. He may consider himself too much near the Speaker, but it is our duty to protect the dignity of the Chair. (*Interruptions*).

11 A.M.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may proceed.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What is your ruling, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: I just occupied the Chair. I do not know what reference he made. But the point is that I do not think any hon. Member can make a reference to the Deputy-Speaker or Speaker....

Shri S. S. More: If he has made any reference, it should be expunged from the record. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Gadgil: You see, I referred to the practice in the House of Commons, not here.

Shri S. S. More: He is referring to the practice of the Deputy-Speaker here. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Gadgil: My hon. friend seems to have curious ideas of what is relevant and not.

The question is whether democratic discussion and traditions have been observed here or not. Though we had very little time from the start of our democracy, my own humble view is that we have kept up the traditions so far very well. If further traditions are to be built, we must allow some passage of time before we can think one way or the other. Do not try to take advantage of the present Bill for introducing something, which, to say the least, is not relevant.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Dist.—South): I have heard very attentively the speech of my hon. friend Mr. Punnoose, the Communist Member on the opposite side, and I am surprised at it. I could not understand the vehemence with which he put forward his case. The question in this Bill is a simple one, it is one of fixing the salaries, and not one of prescribing the rules for the conduct of the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. So, from that viewpoint, all his observations are irrelevant.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order Sir. He is referring to a speech made on the floor of the House. I believe the Deputy-Speaker or the Chairman will never allow any irrelevant matter to be said on the Bill. And yet he says that irrelevant remarks have been made.

An Hon. Member: That is the power of the Chair.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: There are many questions which may be admitted, but yet they may not be relevant.

What I was submitting is that this is not a Bill for prescribing the rules of conduct for the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. It is a Bill for paying the salaries to them, and to that extent, it has not much, if not no, relevancy if the question is brought in whether they should abide by the rules of the party and should be associated with the party, once they are elected, or whether they should dissociate themselves completely from their party, the moment they are elected to their offices.

The Congress party came into power in different provinces in 1937, and one of the great Speakers of a Provincial Assembly is here, the hon. Mr. Purushottamdas Tandon. And to his credit, I must say that no less a man than the Nawab of Chattari paid the highest compliment that could be possibly paid to any Chair whatsoever, that never in his long career as a parliamentarian, had he any reason whatsoever to doubt the integrity of the Chair.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Who is the second Tandon?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: In many other provinces also, under the 1935 constitution, the Congressmen occupied the Chairs; they remained members of the party, and yet there never arose any question as to the Chair favouring one party and dis-favouring another party. There was nothing to doubt the integrity of the Chair in any way whatsoever.

Sir, I may point out that there is a provision about the contempt of court. There a High Court Judge can punish an offence against himself. But there has never been any question about the integrity of any Judge, that he gave a wrong judgment because the offence was against his very person. What I am driving at is that there is a difference between personal inclination and the demand of the function of the Chair. When you are in a certain place, in a certain responsible office, that office itself has certain obligations, it has itself certain traditions, certain antecedents and certain conventions. And those traditions, conventions, obligations and duties work on the mind of the person—an average man. It is much more so in the case of a brilliant man. An average man does not occupy the Chair. It

[Pandit K. C. Sharma]

is generally the man above the average that occupies the Chair. So even the average man will play his part well when he is placed in a responsible office. So we would be discrediting our own intelligence—of the Members of this hon. House—by saying that in order to be independent, in order to be fair to every section of the House, one must resign from the party which got him elected to the seat. This is not a fair way of dealing with the question.

It is not that today the hon. Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker has been elected to the Chair. They have been working here for so many years and no question has ever arisen that any disfavour or any favour has been shown to any particular party. The things are going well and it is to the credit of all of us. So I do not think that there arises any question whatsoever that they must resign or dissociate themselves from the party on the ticket of which they have been elected to their office. With these words, I resume my seat.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): I just want to say a few words in answer to Mr. Gadgil. I did not quite follow what he really meant by saying we are trying to attack the right of the majority party, because I think that is a completely wrong way of putting the entire matter. What we have tried to point out is this: that certainly in this House every particular individual who has been elected has been elected on a party ticket and as such, he remains a political being until such time as he is elected as Speaker or Deputy-Speaker. Once he is elected as Speaker or Deputy Speaker, every effort must be made to take away from him any extraneous tags and strings which he may have to any particular political party.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Hear, hear.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: That is the position which we want to make very clear. This, I think, has nothing to do with attacking the right of the majority; because it is true that as far as the mental make-up goes, it is very difficult to judge at what time you remain a Congressman and at what time you do not remain a Congressman, and there are many occasions when many people may feel that the scales of justice which the Speaker is supposed to hold may be tipping over to the side of his party. But that granted, you who tell us so many

things about the values of parliamentary practice and always preach to us about the dignity of the House, when the ears of our friends on the opposite side are so very delicate that they cannot hear such words as 'unworthy' being uttered, such things have to be expunged from the proceedings of this House; it is right that at least such matters should be cleared up whereby we can in some manner, even though very little, expect this much, that the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker may not have any extraneous tags to any political party. That is the point we wanted to make clear.

Then coming to certain other points, I should like to say, that when the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker becomes elected to executive positions, is a party machinery, then it becomes very difficult for them to balance and keep true to their jobs as well as the principles enunciated by the very fact of their being executive members. For instance, Sir, the Executive Committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party has the power to examine all motions, amendments, and Bills proposed to be moved or introduced in the Parliament of India by any member and to approve, modify or reject the same according as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress. Mark these last few words, 'contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress party', not contrary to the rules of this Parliament. If it had been only judged from this standard that it is contrary to the rules of this Parliament, it is absolutely all right. But when they have already judged whether a particular Bill or amendment or an adjournment motion is not or is contrary to the programme and the policy of the Congress party, to sit in judgment on that from that august Chair, I think, is not correct. And therefore, we say that to be in an executive position in a party and at the same time try to wield with the air of impartiality the role of the Speaker is not possible.

Now, let us come to certain other points. It is true that this Bill has been brought with the ostensible reason that we have to make such allowances and give such facilities to the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker in order to keep up the position and dignity of this House. Now the words 'position' and 'dignity' are not absolute terms. When we think of this vast country of ours, the tribulations through which our

people are passing, that dignity has to be looked upon in the background of the dignity we are trying to attain for the masses of the people who are to-day struggling for elementary human rights and human dignity, for a square meal and a piece of cloth for the starving, naked peasants and workers. They have been bled white by years of exploitation and we are struggling against that poverty. It is against that background that we have to set up standards of dignity and of position even for the highest dignitaries of this august House. It is true we want that the Speaker should be on a par at least with the Ministers. In that, we have no quarrel. But you may remember, Sir, when the question of emoluments to the Ministers came up before this House, we made our position clear—that although the Ministers and the Speaker should be on a par, we have to judge what are the standards we are going to lay down at this particular moment of time for our Speaker and for our Deputy-Speaker which will remain consonant with the dignity of this House. And not only that; much greater than the dignity of this House is the dignity of this nation, because 'dignity' is not an absolute term. Now, if we are to judge things from absolute standards of dignity, we can ask for Rs. 4,000 or 5,000 or even 6,000, as the Executive Councillors of the British days did—and I think you can say that it will not be too superfluous; you can use that money, if you judge it from absolute standards. Nor do I by putting forward my amendment demand that the pegging of the standards should be to the standards of the lowest in the land—I am not even demanding that. I do not say that the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker should be pegged to the standard of the peasant in the village or even the working man in the town. But I do demand that we have to work out a golden mean.

You talk of dignity. The refugees, who are there on the platform of Sealdah, did they not have dignity? About three years ago, many of them owned big houses; they were wealthy people, many of them. But, what is their position today? They have to beg even for a square meal. Those who were pretty wealthy, whom we used to call the people of the *bhadra log* class in our language, what happens to them when they are unemployed? Their dignity has to be lowered to the standards and to the money which they are able to get. Therefore, Sir, I would say, we have to consider matters, in the context of the rising unemployment, in the context of the sacrifices of the refugees, in the context of the country where the *per capita* income is Rs. 25 a month—I do not mean that

the Speaker and Deputy Speaker should get the same—let them have 25 times 25—this is what we want to be considered. We are demanding that the Speaker should be given a thousand rupees and with the other emoluments that have been mentioned in the Bill—we are not cutting them down, we are not cutting down the house facilities, we are not cutting down the rates and taxes etc., the maintenance of the garden and other things that have been mentioned in the Bill—but we do say that the basic amount which will be given must be consonant to the general level of poverty, the general level of sacrifices that we are demanding from the people. Without that, Sir, I think you will not be able to enthrone people whom you are asking to make sacrifices. You are cutting down the wages of the workers. When the question of employment and wages come, you say that you have not got the money. I say, considered in that background how can we ask for emoluments, which, if you calculate, come to a colossal amount. You say, 'we give to the Speaker Rs. 2,250 as salary, which is lower than what was given to the Speaker of the Provisional Parliament or the Constituent Assembly.' But, if you add on to that all the other facilities which you are going to give to him, free house—today in Delhi if you pay rent for the buildings equivalent to the buildings that are being occupied by hon. Ministers and Speaker, I am sure you will not get them for less than Rs. 1,000 (*An Hon Member*: Rs. 3,000) I am giving the benefit of doubt to him—staff quarters, and other buildings appurtenant thereto and taxes, water, electricity etc., it will come up to Rs. 4,000.

You have got Rs. 500, sumptuary allowance. I think, in the context of today, this sumptuary allowance is something which we cannot allow. The upper middle classes the people drawing Rs. 700 and Rs. 800 as salaries have got their relations etc. They turn round and say, 'you are wealthy people; look at our families, can we draw sumptuary allowances?' We have our relations in the provinces; we have our family relations in East Bengal and we have to maintain 10 or 15 people extra; we would like to draw sumptuary allowances from our offices'. Therefore, this sumptuary allowance should not be allowed. If we are unable to entertain people, then we tell the people, 'you are making sacrifices, we too shall sacrifice, we shall live austerely'. We have heard that in the old days parties etc. were given on a more large and lavish scale than today. When the Congress government came they cut it down to some extent but they still continue. Let us be quite frank and

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

tell the people. They will appreciate it when we say that we are going to cut down all extra costs. I am sure the M.Ps. and other friends who were being invited from time to time will certainly appreciate that in order to enthuse the people from whom we ask for sacrifices, because we are the first to make those sacrifices.

I should also like to make a point of medical facilities. As you have noted in my amendment, I have not cut it because, I think, it is a very correct thing that when we ask any government servant or officer to serve the government, we must make all possible arrangements for their families and their own health. That is right. The principle is absolutely right. But, here, I will make certain observations. Why is it that we make differences between higher and big officials of the State, the Ministers and others, and class III servants. For instance, Sir, we lately know that in the railways the families of class III servants have been excluded from getting treatment in the railway hospitals. We have to guard these persons who are drawing such low scales of salary from falling a prey to such diseases as T.B. in larger and larger numbers. These facilities are withdrawn from them, while, at the same time, we are giving these facilities to the highest dignitaries of the States. These are the discrepancies or differentiations which you are making between class and class. We admit, that all government servants, whether they are Speakers, Deputy Speakers, Ministers or Deputy Ministers or class IV servants, all must be given the same facilities of having themselves and their families treated free at government expense.

I believe during the last debate on a similar Bill, some people said that there are certain facilities given to government servants in Delhi. As far as I know, in Calcutta or certain other places, there are hardly any facilities for the treatment even of government servants. They are sent to the government hospitals which are generally overcrowded. In the alternative, they are allowed to go to doctors whose fees are not more than say, Rs. 2 or Rs. 4. These are the rules laid down by the department and it is almost next to impossible for them to get specialised treatment, the treatment of specialists. These are things that should not happen: there should be no discrepancy, no differentiation. That is my point.

Now when such a debate was held last time, Dr. Katju made a long speech

about the very sad state of affairs, about how the Ministers found it so very difficult to maintain their families, how they have got their daughters to be married, their sons to be educated, their cars were not sufficient and so on. We have no objection to people having motor cars. Some of us also would appreciate having motor cars; certainly, with motor cars we can do our jobs much better. Even people drawing Rs. 700 or Rs. 800 as salary, they too have got their motor cars. I am not talking of the under-dog, the class III or class IV servants. These officers whom you are always very careful of protecting even though you may get complaints from us against them, keep cars. Why then do you want a bigger salary than them? As far as travelling goes, you have not got to incur any expenditure. That is also being covered by the Bill. All right take it. We shall certainly give everything that is necessary for your effective functioning. But, you must also show to the people that you are prepared to make sacrifices, you are also prepared to forego many things that 99 per cent. of our people are unable to get. Many of our people, when they come to Delhi, tell us, 'you are in luxury, you have got all these things, all these facilities'. 'You are talking to us of national reconstruction, you are asking us to make so many sacrifices, but when it comes to you, then the standard of differentiation is so very great'. Let it not be said that we do not mean to raise the standard of the people; if you can do that, if you can make their *per capita* income go up, you may have not only Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000 but you may have Rs. 10,000, provided that the difference is not very large between the ordinary man who is toiling and, tilling the soil and the person who sits in the Chair there. I think that is in keeping with the dignity of the House. That is why I have proposed my amendment, Sir.

Shri Namdhari (Fazilka-Sirsa): I come to the speech of the mover of the amendment, which was most irrelevant and I say that except having value as an amendment, it has got nothing to do with the Bill. The Bill speaks only of the salaries and other things, and not whether he belongs to a party or a non-party man. That question does not arise. The object of the mover is to sabotage the present working of the Parliament because that is their profession.

Two villagers were going on, and they said let us start making poetry. One man was a poet and the other man

was not. He said, 'Well, I will also reply'. The first man, who was a poet, said:

जाट रे जाट तेरे सिर पर खाट ।

The other man replied:

तेली रे तेली तेरे सिर पर कोल्ह ।

So, we can understand these people. Now, they are very clever, intellectuals. We have got a great respect for them. I know they have been trained. As I said the other day, they are graduates of the Fox University. We understand that very well. About the medical arrangements, one respected and hon. gentleman objected. They must understand that the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker occupies a sacred chair. They have to control the work of the Parliament on behalf of the entire nation. Every minute spent in Parliament costs Rs. 50. We just cannot allow either the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker to fall ill. We must give them the best medical amenities to keep themselves always in order.

I did not understand the argument of the hon. and very intellectual Lady Member, when she said, "One of them is a member of the Congress Parliamentary Party. He has to consider over the Bills there, and again he has to regulate the proceedings on those Bills here." She asked, "How can such a person be the Deputy-Speaker?" She made an indirect attack. I know she is very good. But I want to remove her misunderstanding.

Whatever Bill is passed by the vote of the Parliament, not by the vote of the Chair. So, as far as that aspect is concerned, she need not worry in any way. He can give his noble opinion there in the Party meeting, and still he can come here and guide the deliberations on right lines.

In England, the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker do not belong to a party. Perhaps, the hon. gentlemen do not know that there is no contest there for their seats. The election is uncontested. But what about France? What about our own country? Were their opponents members of the Opposition parties or not? You must understand these things.

Luckily, we have such noble Indian personalities, such God-blessed personalities, that by taking their names we are reminded of our Almighty Father. One is Dr. Radhakrishnan. The other is Shri Ganesh Vasudev Mavalankar. The third is Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar. We have such

beautiful personalities. We are very lucky to get such noble persons who will guide us outwardly, mentally, physically and also inwardly.

So, I would tell my Opposition friends not to say such things. I know, you are our own blood and our own people. Naturally, if something goes wrong with somebody in the family, we have to cure him with love. My hon. friend who has tabled this amendment should know how nicely and affectionately the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker treat all parties, whether they be Congress or otherwise.

At the same time, we have noble personalities from the Opposition also adorning the Chair. You have Sardar Hukam Singh. Then you have the great and hon. Lady Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty. When they are taken in the panel, how can you say that stepmotherly treatment is being given to you? We should be proud that we have got such noble personalities. You ought to know the tradition that has been established. You are very clever people. Sometimes, you go up, but again you come to the earth. So, you should definitely know all these things.

Shri Namblar: Are his feet in the earth?

Shri Namdhari: You know that an Indian will do everything for the common man. We have abolished rajas and maharajas and zamindars. But still those people will never change. They are still sons of *Bharatmata*. You know that your Communist Party will never come into power. So you think that at least you can sabotage the working of Parliament. That is a good way. It is just like the fox saying—

'अंगूर खट्टे हैं।' उसे तो पहुंचना है नहीं दूसरे का क्यों न बिगाड़ दिया जाय ।

It has no more value than that. The speech was very nice.

One honorary magistrate never got a case for three months. He was wondering what to do. There was no case at all. So, he called one respectable gentleman. That gentleman asked him, "What for did you call me?" The magistrate said, "I am fining you Rs. 500." The gentleman enquired, "But what have I done? I have committed no fault." The magistrate replied, "Well, if you have not committed any crime for several years, am I responsible for that? I must fine you!" This is also just like that.

[Shri Namdhari]

Because you do not get any substantial thing to oppose the Bill, you think: well, why not start something? You must always start something. That is your profession.

Anyway, I want to tell my hon. friends that we are lucky in having such great personalities to give us intellectual and spiritual light. So, we must not oppose this Bill. We have taken the very great and noble personality, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, in the panel. What more do you want?

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : सभापति महोदय, जिस विषय पर अभी बातें हो रही हैं वह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय है। आप ने मुझे इस में भाग लेने का मौका दिया, इस के लिये मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

सभापति जी, सरकारी अफसरों के बेंसन के सम्बन्ध में मैं इस संसद् में बहुत बार बोल चुका हूँ। उस को बेंसन तो कहना ही नहीं चाहिये। जनता की आमदनी को देख कर, जनता की हालत को देख कर देश में बेंसन का निर्धारण होता है। जो बेंसन आज कल हमारे यहां चल रहे हैं वह अंगरेजों के काल से चल रहे हैं, वह हमारे देश को लूटते थे और आपस में बांटते थे और हिन्दुस्तानियों को भी कुछ हिस्सा दे देते थे। मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जो तर्ज अंग्रेज सरकार का था, आज भी वही तर्ज ज्यों का त्यों चल रहा है। सभापति महोदय, किसी देश में कोई भी सरकार हो, उस को देश की सेवक होकर ही रहने का हक है, मालिक होकर नहीं। आज हमारे देश में आप जा कर देखिये तो जनता भूखों मरती है और सरकार के लोग मौज करते हैं। तो यह तो चला आ रहा है। न जाने यह पाप कब तक धुल पायेगा। यह तो भगवान ही जानता है। मैं तो परमात्मा से यही मनाता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में न्याय का राज्य हो। इस वास्ते बेंसन के सम्बन्ध में मैं श्यादा नहीं बोलूंगा। यह बात तो बिस्कुल गड़बड़

है ही। देश को आज भी लूटा जा रहा है और लूटने वाले आपस में बांटते हैं।

अभी जो बात उटाय गई है, अर्थात् लोगों ने जो यह कहा कि जो ऐसी ऐसी संस्थाओं के सभापति होते हैं, उनको किसी पार्टी का आदमी नहीं होना चाहिये। यह सुन कर तो मुझे बहुत ही आनन्द हुआ। मेरा तो यह विचार है कि अगर देश में कमी भी न्याय होना है तो जितने प्रकार की दल-बन्धियां हैं उन को खरम होना है। वह चाहे आज हो या १०० वर्ष के बाद हो। सभापति महोदय, दल बन्दी भी रहे और न्याय भी रहे यह सम्भव बात नहीं। दलबन्दी रहेगी तो अन्याय होगा। न्याय कभी भी सम्भव नहीं हो सकता। और जहां न्याय नहीं वहां मुख और, शांति की आशा नहीं। यह जो पद हैं वह तो हमारी ३५ करोड़ जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं। यहां पर जो बैठते हैं उन का काम तो इतना कठिन है कि उन को हर समय ईमानदार रहना चाहिये। दिन भर। जितनी देर यहां बैठेंगे उतनी देर। किस को बोलने का अवसर देना चाहिये किस को नहीं देना चाहिये यह भी उन को ही विचारना है। कोई बोल रहा है तो ठीक बोल रहा है या नहीं, यानी प्रतिक्षण प्रति शब्द, प्रति वाक्य में उनको विचार करना है कि जो बातें यहां हो रही हैं वह न्याय युक्त बातें हो रही हैं या नहीं। इसलिये इस में कोई शक नहीं कि यह जो पद है बहुत ही अपूर्व महत्व रखता है और यहां पर बैठने वाला जो व्यक्ति हो वह देश का चुना हुआ हो और जिसकी ईमानदारी में शक व शबह का स्थान न हो। ऐसे ही व्यक्ति को यहां जाना चाहिये।

सभापति महोदय, मैं कहता हूँ कि ऐसे आदमी के जाने पर भी उनसे गलतियां हो

सकती हैं और जो पार्टी मैन रहेंगे, उनका तो कहना ही क्या। सभापति महोदय, रामायण में एक पद है।

दोउ न होंहि एक समय भुवालू

हंसिय ठाय फूलाउव गालू।

इस पद का अर्थ यह है कि रोना और हंसना एक साथ नहीं हो सकता। दोनों नहीं चल सकते कि हम ठठाकर हंसें भी और खूब रोवें भी। तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि आपको इस तरह विचार करना होगा। एक पार्टी मैन, एक दल बंदी वाला आदमी और वह न्यायशील हो यह सम्भव नहीं है। इसको सोच लीजिये।

श्री सी० के० नायर (वाह्य दिल्ली):
आपका तजरबा क्या है।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : वही तजरबा तो मैं कह रहा हूँ। अभी उधर से बताया गया कि पुरुषोत्तम दास जी टंडन की नवाब छतारी ने कितनी प्रशंसा की। मैं ने उसी वक्त इंटरप्रेण किया था कि दूसरे टंडन कहां हैं। सभापति जी, जो नियम होता है उसका अपवाद तो होता ही है। तो जो टंडन जी कांग्रेस मैन होते हुए भी इन्साफ कर सके, सत्य पर रह सके और ईमानदार रह सके यह तो इस नियम का अपवाद है। आप माफ कीजिये कुछ लोग हंसते भी हैं, कुछ तफरीह भी करते हैं, लेकिन यहां पर जो बातें होती हैं वह ३५ करोड़ भारतवासियों के भाग्य का निर्णय करती हैं। इस पर सोचना चाहिये। अगर दलबंदी के रूप में हंसी करना चाहें तो करें लेकिन इस से देश का भला होने को नहीं है। इस वास्ते, मैं तो जरूर कहूंगा कि इस पद पर वही आदमी होना चाहिये जो किसी दल से सम्बन्ध न रखता हो। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि देश में कोई दल न हो,

किसी दल की सरकार न हो और मैं प्रत्येक भारतवासी से निवेदन करता हूँ कि वह इस बात पर सोचे। कम से कम इस पद पर तो कोई ऐसा व्यक्ति न आवे जो किसी दल का हो। लेकिन यह तो होने को नहीं है। लेकिन अगर किसी दल का आदमी इस पद पर चुन कर आवे तो चुने जान के बाद तो वह उस दल में न रहे, यह तो होना ही चाहिये। मेरा मतलब यह है कि वह किसी दल का आदमी नहीं होना चाहिए। ३६ करोड़ आदमियों का यह इतना बड़ा देश है। क्या कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं हो सकता है जो कि किसी दल में न हो? हो सकता है। सभापति महोदय, आप कहां तक न्याय कर सकेंगे। एक विषय आता है और उस पर दो बंटे बहस होगी। अब आप बताइये कि आप किस पार्टी को कितना वक्त देंगे। आप बात करते हैं ब्रिटिश हाउस आफ पार्लियामेंट की। वहां इस प्रकार बांट नहीं होती। वहां यह कितना सुन्दर नियम है कि जिस पर स्पीकर का दृष्टिपात हो उसको बोलने को कहा जाता है। यह कितनी सुन्दर परम्परा है कि जिस आदमी पर सब से पहले सभापति का दृष्टिपात हो वही आदमी बोलने का अधिकारी हो सकता है। तो आप ब्रिटिश परम्परा की तो बात करते हैं लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि वहां इस तरह का बटवारा नहीं होता है। जो लोग खड़े होते हैं उनमें से जिस पर नज़र पड़ती है वही बोलने का अधिकारी होता है। लेकिन यहां सभापति को क्लिप के हुकम के मुताबिक सोचने विचारने की आवश्यकता होती है कि कौन से आदमी को बोलना चाहिये। जब तक इस तरह का बटवारा रहेगा न्याय नहीं होगा। विशेष कुछ मुझे कहना नहीं है।

श्री सी० भट्ट (भड़ोच) : तो क्या आप की यह राय है कि चेंबर पर कांस्टीट्यूशन की पुस्तक को रख दिया जाय ।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : यह लोग तो कांस्टीट्यूशन की बात करते हैं और बात करते हैं डिमांडेसी की । डिमांडेसी तो एक अंग्रेजी शब्द है । उसको आप हिन्दी में क्या कहोगे । अगर हम उसका उल्था हिन्दी में करें तो उसको पंचायती राज्य कहेंगे । और पंच को लोग इस देश में परमेश्वर कहते हैं । जो पंच होता है उसकी उपाधि परमेश्वर की होती है । लेकिन यह उपाधि उसी को मिल सकती है जो परमेश्वर की तरह निष्पक्ष हो, इम्पार-धियल हो । हम जितने लोग यहां हैं वह सोचें कि जब वह निष्पक्ष होकर परमात्मा को साक्षी रख कर कोई बात बोलते हैं तो कितने मिनट तक, कितने घंटे तक परमात्मा की तरह निष्पक्ष होने का प्रयत्न करते हैं । तो हमारे देश में डिमांडेसी और पंचायती राज्य की चर्चा होती है । लेकिन पंचायती राज्य में हर किसी व्यक्ति को अगर किसी विषय पर बोलना है तो परमात्मा को साक्षी करके और निष्पक्ष होकर बोलना चाहिए । तो डिमांडेसी का नाम तो बहुत सुनाई देता है पर यहां पर कुछ डिमांडेसी की रूप रेखा नहीं दिखायी देती है । मुझे और अधिक नहीं कहना है । जितनी बातें यहां हो रही हैं यह सही हैं । अगर यह चीज किसी संशोधन में आकर पास हो जाय तो ठीक है कि इस पद पर वही आदमी होना चाहिये जिसका किसी तरह कि बलबन्दी से सम्बन्ध न हो और जिसकी ईमानदारी में किसी तरह का शक व शुबह न हो । यहां तो कहा जाता है कि स्पीकर का या डिप्टी स्पीकर का निर्णय हो गया है । वह तो मानना पड़ता है और मान लेते हैं । यह

एक बात है । लेकिन निर्णय तो ऐसा होना चाहिये कि जिसमें किसी को शक वह शुबह हो ही नहीं । निर्णय इतना सुन्दर होना चाहिये कि निर्णय के प्रतिकूल बोलने का किसी को साहस ही न पड़े । लेकिन सभापति महोदय में फिर आप सब लोगों से कहता हूँ कि इस तरह का निर्णय उसी आदमी से सम्भव हो सकता है जो किसी पक्ष का न हो ।

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I was wondering whether a Bill like this relating to the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker requires a long discussion like this, especially when these two officers are considered as sacred, as far as this Parliament is concerned. But I must say that the controversy over this question that has risen both on this side, as well as the other, the official side, is almost inevitable, because of the way the parliamentary democratic system is being conducted in this House.

The responsibility of the Speaker as well as of the Deputy-Speaker in promoting the parliamentary system of Government is the greatest. Their responsibility in cultivating popular faith in democracy itself is not small. Judging from the conduct of the Speaker as well as of the Deputy-Speaker during the last four years, I must say it was commendable and we have laid the foundation for a parliamentary system of Government through the guidance of these two sacred offices. But then, there were lapses not only from one side but from the other side also as far as the working of democracy is concerned. The success of parliamentary democracy depends on both sides, a Responsible Opposition as well as a Responsive Treasury Bench. Unless and until this cardinal principle is brought into practice as an article of faith, I do not think Democracy will have, not only in this Parliament but in this country, a safe sailing or a successful future.

Judging from this point I must say that in other countries where parliamentary systems have developed to a high standard a Bill like this should not require a long time for discussion and decision. But judging from the standard in which we in this country are, and judging from the standard of the Parliament itself I must say that the Bill requires a little amount of

discussion and deliberation by the Members of this Parliament.

As far as the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is concerned, I think the matter should be judged not only from the point of dignity itself but it should be judged from the point of necessity also—not only the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker but also of the Ministers as well as of the Members of Parliament. It is my firm opinion that the salary now laid down according to the provisions of this Bill to the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is not a very high salary, not from the point of dignity but from the point of necessity as well. The cost of living in Delhi perhaps is the highest in the world. That is what people say. A friend of mine came from New York a few months ago; he wanted to stay in New Delhi for a couple of weeks; but he had to cut short his programme of stay here because of the high cost of living he found in the city of New Delhi. It is not for joking that I was saying this. I have not seen anywhere else in India that if one wants to consult a doctor he will have to pay Rs. 62, for the consultation fee alone. And I have not seen anywhere else the doctors charging for medicines for a week, for a month and for two months. The system is barbarous. I can understand a doctor charging a particular amount for curing a disease; but this particular system I have not seen anywhere else. Regarding the cost of living in Delhi—food and other necessities of life—take for example the restaurants and the hotels in New Delhi and the amount they charge. I am told that no hotel in any big city in the country is charging amounts like that.

It is from this point of necessity that we have to decide the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker or those people who are in responsibility. I am not ignoring at the same time the sufferings of the poor masses. They have not even a square meal for the day. Of course that is a problem which will have to be solved. But at the same time it does not mean that we should make the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker to come to Parliament in a *tonga* or on a bicycle.

श्री के० के० बसु : (डायमण्ड हार्बर)

पैदल जा सकते हैं।

Shri Velayudhan: Tell it in English and I will answer.

In supporting this Bill I wish also to say that the responsibility of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is the greatest in bringing about a kind of permanency to the system of parliamentary democracy in India.

With these words I support the Bill.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): I was listening with attention to the speech of Mr. Punnoose when he made a reference to the Deputy-Speaker being a member of the executive of the Congress Party. In our experience in this House I may say with regard to the Communist Members and the Communist Party that we do not look at them as some other Communist members who might have been involved in some criminal cases elsewhere. We can differentiate between a Communist and a Communist Member of Parliament. We do not think that because one Member belongs to a particular party, here the Communist, he is always out for the blood of others. Simply because the Deputy-Speaker happens to be in the executive of the Congress Party, when he occupies that office of Deputy-Speaker could they not understand that the person can rise above party level and give his judgment impartially? I doubt there is a sort of autobiographical touch on the part of the Opposition; we have in the Panel of Chairmen the hon. lady Member, and often she presides. We were under the impression that she was impartial and the balance of justice did not turn this way or that. But when a member of the Congress Party is in the Chair, having been elected to that august office for saving the honour of the country and the nation, of which the lady Member was so eloquent about, when she was speaking, questioning the honesty, the propriety of Deputy-Speaker being a member of the executive of the Congress Party we are moved to question here impartiality. She spoke so much about the executive whip. Have they ever seen whips being given to the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker?

Shri Punnoose: How are we to know?

Shri Thanu Pillai: There again it is because their history is always that of implicit obedience to their party whips.

An Hon. Member: As a member of the executive has he no obligation?

Shri Thanu Pillai: So far as the Chairman is concerned there is none. Even for other things we have such liberty of speech, thought and action that whips cannot do anything. But I tell you it is also a historical phenomenon that they have got such a rigorous system of control and discipline that when it is doubted that a party man would go against the party, he is murdered.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): No.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Certainly. I challenge. There are cases I can

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

prove. They have been convicted for murder (An Hon. Member: Liquidated). I am sorry. In their language it is 'liquidation.'

Shri Namblar: Question.

Shri Thanu Pillai: We can understand the fire coming from the other side on this Bill, and one Member on this side said 'the Deputy-Speaker is partial, he is against us'. It is not to be put that way. The Deputy-Speaker being a Congressman, a Gandhite and a democrat, though he has not given up the party affiliation, has so much of honesty, straight-forwardness, gentlemanliness and the Indian *dharma* in him that he looks more to the left out of consideration that they are a minority and not to the right because they are our party men. We are proud of the Speaker for not having given more opportunities to our Members but having given more to the Members of the Opposition. If they could have challenged a Minister's salary, it is a different matter but when it is a question of the Speaker's salary whose impartial justice they have been enjoying and are enjoying now, then it is a question of the conduct of the Chair to a considerable extent. I would challenge them to prove one instance where our Speaker or Deputy-Speaker or for that matter even our Ministers have cared less for them, the Members of the Opposition than for us.

Shri Punnoose: May I

Mr. Chairman: So far as I am concerned, I will prevent any discussion about the personnel whether it be from this side or that side.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Personal references had been admitted.

Mr. Chairman: It will not be permitted so long as I am here.

Shri Thanu Pillai: A point has been raised that the Deputy-Speaker is a member of the Executive. Does this not refer to the hon. Member Mr. Ayyangar? Without naming that person, the Executive and the Chair have been linked. To that extent we have got a right to answer. We must have a discretion to answer.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir.

Shri Thanu Pillai: There is no point of order in this.

Mr. Chairman: May I appeal to the hon. Member to avoid making references like this. So far as I could find,

I will not take the reference made to his being a member of the Executive as personal. Of course he can reply to the point.

Shri Thanu Pillai: If a member of the Communist Party occupies that Chair, if she can be given the credit of doing justice by her party members, though they are not trained in that, they cannot tolerate on our side even this simple thing of the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker being a member of the party. I would like to mention here that our Speaker, who just after the elections was elected by the whole House, by a majority vote, said that though in the execution of his duties, he would be fair and impartial, he would never be without his attachment to his party. He will always be a Congressman, all his lifetime. That was what he mentioned. He can rise above the party and be impartial.

About salaries, so much was said by the Opposition. My hon. friend, Mr. Namblar, when it was suggested that the daily allowance of members should be reduced from Rs. 40 to Rs. 35 he brought an amendment to the effect that those who do not want to yield to that cut should be permitted to have Rs. 40. Some of those hon. Members drawing Rs. 40 a day are not willing to reduce it by Rs. 5. We must know that the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is not being enhanced. It is being reduced and brought to the level of the Ministers. Instead of appreciating the cut in their salaries, they say the salary of these officers is being increased. They say "Why should the Speaker get so much, why should the Deputy-Speaker get so much? Is this democracy? You preach austerity to us but are you practising it?" I ask the Communist Members "Are you throwing away this Rs. 40 or are you keeping it or giving it to others?"

(Interruptions).

Shri Namblar rose—

Shri Thanu Pillai: He can reply when he speaks. He has got a right to reply.

Shri K. K. Basu: Is it a demand from the Chair?

(Interruptions).

Shri Thanu Pillai: We thought after that international,—what shall I say,—changeover or somersault,—the Russian Government has given, a changeover in the international set up in their approach to various problems we could expect something good from

our hon. Members in the opposition, at least as far as the Speaker's salary Bill is concerned. History repeats itself. When we were fighting the battle of independence, they called it as imperialistic war and pooh-pooohed that individual satyagraha. When they came round to the people's war for being the henchmen of British imperialism, it took them several months for a changeover. After the British Communist Party gave the changeover from imperialist war to people's war, it took them so much time to translate Russian to English and English to Indian languages. So, it is nothing new in their phenomenon. They are only repeating their old story when they speak of regeneration of India and the honour and prestige of our country. I request them as an Indian to Indian to build up India. Either we may be here, or if you are destined to be here, some day, you are welcome, but do not spoil the country by putting everything obstructive, everything destructive. Think for a moment constructively and give your co-operation and do not stand in the way of the Speaker's or Deputy-Speaker's salary. If the challenge comes on a Bill or a cut motion or even on our Prime Minister's salary, we will meet it but this is a thing which should be taken as above party politics and I hope those hon. Members will hereafter at least give the co-operation.

12 Noon.

Shri Nambiar: On a point of personal explanation. A reference was made about me.

Mr. Chairman: I will give him a chance to speak.

Shri Nambiar rose—

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member spoke about a certain amendment tabled by Shri Nambiar if the hon. Member Shri Nambiar wants a personal explanation to be made here and now.....

Mr. Chairman: I am going to give him an opportunity to speak.

Shri Nambiar: My explanation is very simple. I moved an amendment to the resolution about salaries and allowances of Members. My amendment was for cutting the allowance down from Rs. 40. I went to the extent of fixing the pay at something like Rs. 300 a month and Rs. 10 a day. That is what I remember to have done. I never said that it should be anything more than Rs. 40. He is misquoting the whole thing.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): I was surprised at the speech of the last speaker. To say the least I cannot understand his vehemence against the Opposition which was not referring to a particular individual or a particular party. It is a matter of principle whether the Deputy-Speaker should be associated actually with any organisation of which he is a Member. Today the Congress Party may be in power, tomorrow, some other party may come in power. We must look at this question objectively and impersonally. Therefore, it will be a wholesome principle if the Deputy-Speaker is not associated actively with the political organisation because according to the Constitution which was referred in this House, he has to discuss many things in the party itself and as a loyal member of that party, he has to carry out certain instructions. Therefore it is in the fitness of things that he should not be actively associated with the party.

I will again refer to the resolution which was read by comrade Punnoose—"The Executive Committee shall have power to examine all motions, amendments or Bills proposed to be made or introduced in the Parliament of India by any Member and to approve or modify or reject the same as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress". Therefore, it is difficult for a person who is a member of the executive to get instructions from that executive in one day and decide impartially all questions which may not be according to the party programme. I think it is high time that we consider this problem absolutely objectively. In certain other countries I am told the Deputy-Speakers are always elected from the opposition parties. There is some sound principle involved in it. Let us not look at the question from any individual point of view. We may have personal respect or regard for the person occupying the Chair, whether he is the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. This is a matter of principle. So I would request the House to consider this from that point of view and give its support to this question.

The other thing that I want to say is this. In the Bill that has been proposed, it has been said that the salary of the Speaker and the Chairman is equated with that of the Cabinet Ministers. If that is so, I fail to see any reason why the salary of the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy-Chairman is not equated to that of the Deputy Ministers. Why should there be any difference, particularly in regard to the salary of the Deputy

[Shri Gidwani]

Chairman of the Council of States? You are all aware that the Council of States has very little work to do. Apart from the number of months they meet—it may be 3 or 4 or 5 months in a year—even when they meet, sometimes full day's work is not there. Sometimes, they adjourn after one hour, sometimes after two hours. In fact, in that House, there is no need for a Deputy-Chairman. You should have only a Chairman and a panel of Chairmen. After all, the work there is very little. I would suggest that the salary of the Deputy Chairman should not be there. He should continue to draw the allowances that he is drawing at present. That would go to save some money. We need not go into the general question of economy or the reduction of salaries. But, it cannot be denied that even a pie saved in this way will help us to do something towards the relief of many problems which face the country today. It is from that point of view that I would appeal to the Law Minister to consider whether in the Council of States also, these two officers should continue and whether the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States should get the same salary as that of the Deputy Speaker of the House of People. This is a point worth considering. It is not a party question. We must not look at every question from the party point of view. It is a question of economy. It is a question of doing justice. It is not a question of prestige or dignity. I do not know how our Deputy Ministers feel when the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy Chairman are being given a higher salary. But, then, that is a different matter. I would like to look at the question from an economic point of view. There is not enough work for the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States and he should not be given this high salary.

Apart from that, you are aware of my view that it is not necessary to continue the Council of States. Everybody knows that Upper Houses are not necessary. Even, as I understand, the Congress party has issued some kind of instructions and elicited opinion, on the question whether there should be Upper Houses. I am in favour of abolishing the Council of States and also the Upper Houses in the State legislatures as they do not serve any purpose. I say that there is not enough work for these two officers in the Council of States and that there is no need to give this high salary to the Deputy Chairman. In the case of the Chairman, he is not only the Chairman of the Council

of States, but he is also the Vice-President of our Republic. He has sometimes to perform those duties. That is a different question. As regards the Deputy-Chairman, he should not at all be given a salary. With these words, I close my remarks.

श्री हे० सी० सोधिया (सागर)

सभारति महोदय, आज के भाग्य को
सुनकर.....

Some Hon. Members: English.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I am quite satisfied with this Bill after hearing the various speeches made. It is a question of principle. I must clear the wrong notions that have been expressed while dealing with this Bill.

We are all for levelling down the distinctions between the classes. It is the main aim of the Congress party. Our Communist friends and other gentlemen also want to do the same thing. But, their action is not in consonance with their professions. There are two ways of levelling things. One is that people who are sitting there should come down and be here; another way is that people who are standing here should take up ladders and go up. Our way of levelling, as far as I can understand, is that the common man in this country ought to be elevated from his present degraded position and should be placed in a better position. We are trying to increase by all means the average earnings of the poor in this country.

Shri K. K. Basu: And you start with the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I am coming to that.

It is said that the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker ought not to belong to any party. My hon. friend Babu Ram Narayan Singh said that there should be no party politics and that there should be no difference of opinion. Well, I cannot conceive of a time when this human society will have no difference of opinion on any question. We are going to reach a stage when there will be differences, and acute differences, regarding policy and procedure. I cannot conceive of a time when party rule would be eliminated from our Parliament, and our administration. It was said that the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker ought not to belong to any party. I do not know whether these people feel that they should have no political opinion altogether.

If that is their proposition, then, they will have to go to the skies to find out people to occupy this Chair. I say that belonging to a party and discharging the duties of these posts in a manner which is desirable and proper, is quite possible. I was glad to hear from my hon. friend Babu Ram Narayan Singh that at least Shri Purushottam Das Tandon discharged that duty in the best possible way. There can be no one exception. Those who say that there is only one exception to the rule, have not seen the whole thing. I say it is quite possible to discharge the duties of the positions of Speaker and Deputy-Speaker without resigning from the party to which they belong. I am not much enamoured about cutting the trappings and caps, as was said by an hon. Lady Member from the opposite side. It depends upon the persons who occupy this Chair, whether they want to discharge their duties in the proper way or not. From my experience of the short time that I have been here, I can say that our Speaker and Deputy-Speaker have done the job in the most faultless and most praiseworthy way.

As regards the question of pay and other amenities, in these days of rising expenditure, I do not know whether any thing less than what has been proposed in the Bill could keep these dignitaries in the position in which they ought to be placed. There may be some difference of about Rs. 100 or 200 here or there. That does not matter much. We should not grudge the salary that is given to a person. We should rather be careful about the way in which he discharges his work, as to how he performs his work. Even if he requires a little more salary, we should not grudge that; we should be glad to give it. Therefore on a matter of principle, I do not find anything that comes in the way of my subscribing wholeheartedly to the Bill before us and I support the Motion wholeheartedly.

Mr. Chairman: Now, on the Agenda there is the one-hour discussion regarding the new International Wheat Agreement for the supply of wheat at 2.05 dollars per bushel.

RENEWED INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. Chairman: Those that had given notice of moving for this discussion are:

Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh,
Shri Radha Raman,
Shri Shree Narayan Das,

Pandit Munishwar Dutt
Upadhyay,

Shrimati Indira A. Maydeo, and

Shri Bhagwat Jha "Azad".

Besides, I think, about four or five other Members may like to participate. And this is only one hour's discussion, and after that discussion the hon. Minister, I understand, is likely to take about 15 to 20 minutes. Therefore, I would fix the time as ten minutes for those who have given notice of this motion and five minutes for others.

श्री राधा रमण (दिल्ली नगर): सभापति जी जिस सम्बन्ध में आपने इस सदन के सदस्यों को अपने विचार प्रकट करने के लिये एक घंटा दिया है वह विषय काफी महत्व का है। और मैं आपका विशेष रूप से धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि जहाँ हमने यह इत्नाहिश जाहिर की थी कि हमको इस विषय पर आध घंटे के डिसकशन का समय दिया जाय, आपने एक घंटे का समय दिया। इससे यह जाहिर होता है कि इस विषय का महत्व कितना है और देशवासी आज कल इस विषय पर कितनी चर्चा करते हैं।

मैं सबसे पहले आपका ध्यान इस विषय पर आकषित करूँगा कि अखबारों के जरिये मालूम हुआ है कि एक समझौता गेहूँ के सम्बन्ध में हमारे मंत्री जी ने उन सरकारों से किया है कि जो गेहूँ एक्सपोर्ट (निर्यात) करती है। अभी उस समझौते की सारी गतों हमारे सामने नहीं हैं। लेकिन इस चीज का हमें पता लगा है कि उस समझौते पर गालिबन आज दस्तखत हो चुके हैं।

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Kidwai): May I interrupt the hon. Member? Mr. T. N. Singh had asked us for certain information, and we have sent him a full copy of the Agreement. If the other Members are not aware of it, then I am sorry. We had one copy, and we sent it.