

[مولانا آزاد]

ہوگا کہ پرسوں آپ مجھے کونشن کے بعد وقت دین میں کوشش کرونگا کہ بیس منٹ کے اندر اپنی تقریر ختم کر دوں۔

[Maulana Azad: Sir, I have heard with utmost attention the speeches of my hon. friends. As there is no time left now, I think that it would be better if you give me time day after tomorrow after the question hour. I will try to finish my speech in 20 minutes time.]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा ठीक है ।

**Shri Sinhasan Singh** (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): The question-hour may be dropped on Monday, Sir.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members who have tabled questions will not accept it.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** May I ask a question of you, Sir? Can those who have not given any cut motion go against the policy of the Government and take up most of the time during the debate? We want a ruling on that point. They have not moved a single cut motion and yet they have taken up the lion's share of the time.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** The difficulty lies elsewhere. The Opposition takes more time.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Why does he not have the courage to bring forward a cut motion?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let there be no cross-discussion. The hon. Lady Member has raised a point. I will answer that point. Every hon. Member is entitled to participate to throw out the demands. Every hon. Member can speak on a cut motion, by whomsoever it is moved. I have been asked to give a ruling on that point and I have given the ruling. That disposes of that matter.

## RESOLUTION RE SALARY AND ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now take up the Resolution on the report of the Joint Committee on the payment of salary and allowances.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas** (Ujjain): I have got a point of order to raise.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let the Resolution be moved. In a vacuum there cannot be a point of order.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra** (Aurangabad): I want to raise a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Later on. Let the Resolution be first placed before the House.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** This point of order is in relation to the question which has been discussed before—the matter which we have been discussing before.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If that is so, there cannot be any point of order. That matter has been disposed of. The point of order must have been raised then and there. The hon. Member cannot prevent further proceedings until that point is decided. The hon. Member has missed the bus.

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

"That this House approves and accepts all the recommendations of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on the payment of salary and allowances to, and abbreviations for Members of Parliament, and in particular the recommendation that the rate of daily allowance should with effect from the commencement of this Session of Parliament be reduced from Rs. 40 to Rs. 35 by a voluntary cut."

Sir, ten days ago—on the 17th March—while replying to Dr. Lanka Sundaram's motion, I had promised the House to bring the Resolution on the 27th, i.e., today. I have accordingly moved that Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Good.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** The House will remember that on that occasion I had said that the Government would like to refer the resolution back to the Committee to reconsider the question of T.A. and D.A. of Members in the altered circumstances. I do confess that since the Committee made its recommendations, much water has flown down....

**Several Hon. Members:** Where?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Literally so, Sir.

It is therefore proper that the entire question should be discussed, considered and reviewed *de novo*.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** By a new Committee?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** On the Order Paper, I find a multitude of amendments standing in the name of several of my hon. friends, I do not want to say anything with regard to any of those amendments on merits except that of Mr. Venkataraman, which suggests a reference of the whole question to the old Committee. That amendment, I am going to accept.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam):** The one circulated this afternoon?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** The latest amendment which was circulated this afternoon.

**An Hon. Member:** What is that?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** I will read it out to you.

The House is also aware that the Joint Committee, which was nominated by the Speaker in consultation with the Chairman of the other House, consisted of Members of all the groups in both Houses. There have been two vacancies, one of this House and another of the other. The vacancy of this House was caused by the sad demise of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee and of the other House on

account of the retirement of Mr. Amolak Chand.

**Shri A. P. Sinha (Muzaffarpur East):** Mr. Amolak Chand has been re-elected.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** He has not been sworn in and therefore he is *functus officio*.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri also.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** He is a Minister and he does not cease to function unless six months elapse.

Through you, Sir, I would request the Speaker to fill up these vacancies, the vacancy of this House and the vacancy of the other House in consultation with the Chairman.

With all respect to our friends who have given notice of amendments, I would say that no useful purpose would be served by discussing these amendments at this stage. In my humble opinion, Sir, this matter could be better discussed informally amongst the Members of the various groups.

**Shri S. S. More:** Why?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** The Committee, as I said, consists of representatives of all the groups. Ultimately, the matter will be finally decided—of course, finalised—in that Committee. The recommendations of the Committee will be incorporated in a Bill which the Government is going to bring forward, if necessary, before both Houses. I think the House will have ample opportunity to discuss the provisions of the Bill. I would, therefore, appeal to the House to accept my Resolution, of course, with Mr. Venkataraman's amendment, which is going to be moved formally, and pass it at least *nem con*, if not unanimously. I again repeat the desire of the Government to do all that is possible to put through this legislation in both Houses during this session.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That this House approves and accepts all the recommendations

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on the payment of salary and allowances to, and abbreviations for Members of Parliament, and in particular the recommendation that the rate of daily allowance should with effect from the commencement of this Session of Parliament be reduced from Rs. 40 to Rs. 35 by a voluntary cut."

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** May I raise a point of order now, Sir?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** In raising a point of order, I am not against the Resolution as such. But, I feel that we should not conduct our business here against the rules. My point of order is that under the Rules a Parliamentary Committee can be appointed only in two ways; either by a motion—that will be before the House—or by nomination by the Speaker. Of course, in this case, the Committee has been nominated by the Speaker. Under different rules, different provisions have been made for the appointment of these Committees. For example, if you look at rule 32 regarding Business Advisory Committee, rule 40 regarding Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions, rule 180 regarding Committee on Petitions, rule 245 regarding Committee of Privileges and rule 246 regarding Committee on Subordinate Legislation.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is too fast for me, but what is the point he wants to make out?

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** My point is simply this. There are definite rules under which the Speaker is authorised to appoint a Committee of the House and it is called a Parliamentary Committee. Now, this Committee has been appointed by the Speaker but it has not been appointed by the House as has been provided under the rules. This Committee cannot be called a Committee of the Houses. Moreover

there is no provision under the rules for appointing any such Joint Committee unless it is a Joint Select Committee and then also, the concurrence of the other House is necessary. In this case, firstly, whether this can be called a Parliamentary Committee, secondly, whether a Joint Committee can be nominated by the Speaker, and thirdly, even if we adopt this Resolution and make it a Parliamentary Committee, whether we can do so without the concurrence of the other House, are the points which, I hope, you will kindly look into, and if it is not according to the rules, some suitable action must be taken. The motion may be formally moved: and then we may provide that the concurrence of the other House must be obtained. These are the points that I wish to bring to your notice for consideration.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Has the hon. Minister anything to say? The hon. Minister does not think it necessary to reply to such a simple matter. Let me say.....

**Shri S. S. More:** We would like to have something from the hon. Minister on this point.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** This point could have been very well raised by hon. Members when the first Committee was appointed. The point was not mentioned then and so there is no validity to move this motion out of order now.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I find from the records that an announcement was made by the Speaker on the 6th June, 1952, in this House regarding the appointment of the Joint Committee on Payment of Salaries and Allowances to Members. This is what I find in the proceedings:

"Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the hon. Members that I have, in consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States, appointed a Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament consisting of.....  
.....to con-

sider and report to Parliament—

(i) (a) Whether it is desirable to change wholly or partly the present system of the payment of daily allowances to the Members of Parliament.....

3. The Committee is a Parliamentary Committee and shall have all the powers and privileges of a Parliamentary Committee."

Therefore, I say that silence is half consent.

**Shri S. S. More:** No, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Unfortunately, that is my view. The House has approved, according to me, of the appointment of this Committee.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** That was only an information given to the House. *(Interruption).*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** So far as this matter is concerned, this was not raised at that time. Secondly, when it is referred back to the Committee, all that the hon. Member has to see is—whether the previous Committee is right or wrong—that the Members whose names were there then are hon. Members of the House now.

So far as the third point is concerned, it is for the other House to take up the matter and send its Members. If they do not do so, this Committee will function without them.

So, I do not see any point of order in this. The House will now proceed.

**Shri S. S. More:** Sir ...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** After I have given my ruling, I will not allow any further discussion.

**Shri S. S. More:** I want to raise a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There cannot be any point of order on the Chair's ruling.

**Shri S. S. More:** Unless you hear me, how can you say whether there is any fresh point of order or not?

58 P.S.D.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the fresh point of order?

**Shri S. S. More:** My submission is that you were kind enough to throw out a suggestion that the hon. Minister should mention the names of the Members who were formerly members of that Committee.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No, no. The hon. Member has misunderstood me. What I said was that instead of reading out those names, they may be taken as names of the members of this Committee, because they are part of the proceedings of the House. It may be treated as a resolution asking those very persons whose names have already been read and form part of the record of this House, to be Members of this Committee to whom this matter will be referred.

**Shri S. S. More:** My point is this. Supposing your suggestion is accepted by the hon. Minister. It would mean that he would be reading not only the names of the Members of this House but also the names of the Members of the other House, without their consent, or without the consent of the other House. Will that be a proper procedure?

Then there is another point—whether this Committee whose names as per your suggestion he has to read—will be a fresh committee, or it will be the same committee reconstituted, because fresh directions will have to be given. Your ruling creates more confusion, as far as procedure is concerned. So, I would request you to apply your mind to the problem which we have raised and give your considered ruling.

You have also said that because no objection was raised at that time, that committee was a validly appointed committee. The Committee, as will be observed, was appointed on the 6th June 1952, according to the First Edition of the Rules of Procedure. We were then fresh to the House and had not read the rules. Our ignorance on that occasion should not be construed as our consent.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have heard this argument *in extenso*. I cannot, on any of the three points, rule out this Resolution as out of order. For one thing this matter was placed before the House on a previous occasion and the House accepted it.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members may say 'No'. I say 'Yes'.

Now, when the hon. Speaker made this announcement, any hon. Member could have got up and said: "We do not agree". When I place a question before the House for its decision, if any Member so desires, I ask the House to express its opinion. So far as this Committee is concerned, hon. Members kept quiet, which was taken as their consent. There is no meaning in raising a point of order now. Not that I asked the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to set out the names. It can be construed to mean as the very names there.

A point was raised that he cannot set out the names of Members of the other House. If there is any technical objection, the other House can take up the matter and then let us see.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** So far as the members of the old Committee are concerned, they were included with their concurrence. If we have another set of new members the question of their concurrence will arise. So far as the old Committee was concerned, I think the concurrence was there.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Further this is only an Advisory Committee and unless this is implemented by a Bill there could not be any change in the old rules; they will continue. There is no point of order.

**Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore):** My friend, Mr. Radhelal Vyas raised the question of.....(*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Member may move his amendment.

**Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur):** The ruling has been given.

**Shri Venkataraman:** I will first move my amendment and then of course I can speak on any matter of relevancy and nobody can stop me from referring to some things.

I beg to move:

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back to the Committee with instructions—

(i) that in view of the abolition of the First Class on Railways, the question of T.A. admissible to Members or grant of free passes should be examined and recommendation made as to the conditions under which T.A. or free passes should be regulated; and

(ii) that in view of the further experience gained since the Report was presented, the question of salary or allowances or salary-cum-allowances for Members should be re-examined."

**Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada):** Sir, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I know the point of order.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** How do you know without my mentioning it?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** On what is the point of order raised? He has only read his amendment. Let him continue and let us hear what exactly he wants to put before the House.

**Shri Venkataraman:** Since the Report of the Committee.....

**Dr. Rama Rao:** He cannot proceed with his amendment if you accept my point of order.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It has not been placed before the House. He has

merely read it. Before placing it before the House I will hear the point of order and if I agree with the hon. Member then I will not place it before the House.

**Shri Venkataraman:** Since the Report of the Committee was presented certain new factors and new circumstances have arisen. At the time when the Joint Committee reported Members of this House were eligible for payment of T.A. at the rate of one and three-fifths first class. Since then first class travel has been abolished in several Railways recoveries have been made by the Parliament Secretariat on the ground that there exists no first class and that Members are entitled to one and three-fourths second class. This matter was not under contemplation before the Committee and, therefore, it requires re-examination.

Then there is also a feeling that the system of remuneration should be by way of a salary. If we look through the amendments there is some feeling—I might emphasise on the word 'some'. As the number of amendments which have already been tabled and which have been circulated would show, there is a large volume of opinion amongst Members here favouring remuneration by way of salary-cum-allowances and this matter also has got to be examined.

I thought when I submitted this amendment that we might discuss this matter in the Committee. My friend, Mr. Chatterjee knows—he is a barrister and he wears a gown at the back of which there is a pouch. The convention or the fiction is that barristers do not receive fees and the clients when they are interested put it in the pouch...

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly):** It is honorarium.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** What about you?

**An Hon. Member:** Is it your experience?

**Shri Venkataraman:** I am an advocate and my gown does not contain a pouch.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** So you take it openly?

**Shri Venkataraman:** The convention has a meaning. People who are doing some public service should not be looked upon as doing it for money. But the fact that they have to live has also to be taken into account. Therefore I thought when Members of Parliament have got to perform certain public duties they would not like very much to discuss what salary they should get, what daily allowance they should get, what travelling allowance they should get, and all sorts of things, on the floor of the House in the gaze of public opinion. I thought as the Leaders of Groups are represented in the Committee, the Groups will be able to take the concurrence of their respective Members and be able to come to a unanimous decision, so that it may be adopted without much of wrangling over a matter which does not do much credit or good to ourselves to discuss about.

Then there is another reason also. After all this Parliament is intended to discuss public affairs and not questions relating to ourselves. For that reason I thought the time of the House may be saved if this goes to the Committee back again so that they may look into the question and come to a decision.

My amendment has two virtues.

**Shri Nambiar (Mayuram):** It has all virtues.

**Shri Venkataraman:** Thank you very much. For once in my life I have got the support of my friend opposite.

The first virtue is that it will not be discussed on the floor of the House. The second is that the time of the House may not be taken up. (*Some Hon. Members:* Why not?)

The objection which my friend Shri Radhelal Vyas took is based on the new Rules of 1954. These Rules were not in existence in 1952, and unless he proves to the House that under the Rules as they existed in

[Shri Venkataraman]

1952 this motion is out of order, he cannot say it is out of order. I am submitting this to influence the opinion of the Members not to be carried away by the point of order raised.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We have disposed of that point of order. What is the point of order of Dr. Rama Rao?

**Dr. Rama Rao:** In the List of Amendments No. 1, Mr. Venkataraman's amendment, is not moved. My amendment is No. 13 which has been passed over, and the last unnumbered amendment which must be something like No. 30 or No. 40, he is allowed to move.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He will look into the other rule. It is open to the Chair to pick out any amendment and give it preference. There are one or two fundamental points. It is open to the House to decide. The original Resolution says that here and now the report of the Committee, which says that Rs. 40 or Rs. 35 daily allowance shall be received by Members, shall be accepted. That is one thing, accepting the original report. There are a number of amendments tabled which desire that that report should be modified saying that house allowance, this, that or the other must be given, it should be converted into a salary *plus* allowance etc. Here and now if these amendments are pressed, we have to discuss and come to a conclusion on each particular one—telephone, salary or otherwise, if salary how much, if allowance what amount, for what period and so on. These are all details into every one of which we will have to go now; that is the scheme of the amendments that have been given, that is on the footing that we are going along with these. Shri Venkataraman's amendment is a different scheme altogether. When a Bill comes up before the House, if there is a motion for referring it to select committee or for circulation, that amendment has precedence over individual amendments to any particular clause. If the motion is not accepted

we then go clause by clause and discuss the whole matter. Here, therefore, this amendment will have preference over the others and I have allowed it. There is no point of order.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** Sir, I want to raise another point of order. The terms of reference as announced by the Speaker in consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States says:

“(ii) Whether instead of cash allowance paid to the Members for travelling they should get free railway pass for travelling to Delhi and back in connection with such journeys as are undertaken on the business of Parliament and if so, on what conditions such free railway pass should be issued.”

Now, this amendment widens the scope that was originally in the announcement made by the Speaker. I want to know whether this House by a Resolution, without the previous consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States, can widen the scope that was announced by the Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Their concurrence is not necessary for our reducing our salaries ourselves. This is not a Bill. So far as they are concerned, if they do not want to agree with this they may go without travelling allowance, or go on with the old allowance; that is for them to decide. Even on a Bill, hon. Members are aware, this point was raised sometime before, when the Preventive Detention Bill was being discussed. It is open to us to send such direction to the Committee to look into even such matters which are not originally referred to. Therefore, there is no point of order in this. If this point is accepted an additional reference will be made, and if it is not accepted, it will be deleted and the original will stand. Now, this amendment is the bigger one and if the House accepts this, it is not necessary to consider further amendments. I may also inform the House that under the rules for any select com-

mittee or a committee of this kind, hon. Members can be present, speak, convince and participate in the discussions; only they may not have voting.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Is it your suggestion that this particular motion should not be discussed on its merits?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What I say is this: there are a number of amendments tabled. Now regarding house there are two or three amendments by Mr. More, one saying that a free furnished house must be given and another saying that telephones are to be given. He also suggests that such allowance as may be consistent with the dignity of Members and to provide them comfort may be given. Of course, there is one family here, another family there, a number of children who are all studying, all these things naturally will have to be gone into on the floor of the House. The question is, therefore, whether we shall go into these details now or sit in a committee where we can look into such things. If the House is against referring this to a committee and it wants to consider it now, I have no objection; it may take some time. If it is referred to a committee all Members can sit together and decide. I am not concerned with the one or the other. All that I am concerned is in putting this before the House. If the House accepts, we will not discuss it here; it will be sent to the committee; it may come back in another form or in the same form and it is for the House to accept or reject it.

**Shri S. S. More:** I find that the amendment of Shri Venkataraman has been duly moved, but there are some other amendments which raise some fundamental points;—as a matter of fact, you were kind enough to refer to my amendment. What happens to such amendments? Are they supposed to be moved?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They will also be considered.

to Members

**Shri S. S. More:** My submission is that all these amendments may be formally taken to be moved and in the light of these amendments, those who are desirous of expressing their views as fully and frankly as possible—because I realise the difficulty in expressing our views frankly, and particularly persons who have very large families.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I appreciate the hon. Member very well.

**Shri S. S. More:** I know, Sir. Therefore, my submission is that you will be kind enough to allow us an opportunity to have our say. Of course, some Members said, and Mr. Venkataraman said, that this matter be not discussed. As a matter of fact, when we have discussed the salaries of Ministers, when we have discussed your salary and the salary of the Speaker, very bluntly too, there is no reason why we should not discuss our own salary.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What I understood Shri Venkataraman and the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to say was that it goes into such details. There are so many things here. Nowadays, on account of increased work, we have to sit here nearly for 8 months. (Some Hon. Members: Six months.) Six to eight months. There are a number of points which have to be considered. Alternatives have to be suggested. If it would satisfy hon. Members, I will treat all these amendments as moved and then this may be referred to the Committee. I am only making a suggestion. There, all hon. Members can sit together and evolve a solution. If still they do not agree, this House is always there.

**Shri S. S. More:** Why there. Why not here?

**Shri Saraagadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack):** We want to discuss this matter here.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat):** Every point mentioned in these various amendments has been



[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

thoroughly thrashed out by the Committee. Nothing new has come up except the first class affair, that has been abolished and now the second class is there. I do not know what this wonderful new thing is. If we go on like this, we can again say that we do not want to go into all the details, and so refer it back. There will be so many Committees. So many new amendments will come in again.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I find there is the amendment of Dr. Rama Rao. He has suggested a salary of Rs. 300 plus an allowance of Rs. 10 per day. That is a different scheme: not merely allowance, but salary and allowance. The point is whether that should be discussed here. In view of what has been stated here, I shall allow discussion only as to whether it ought to be referred back or not. After this is disposed of, I will take amendment after amendment and will go on giving opportunity to hon. Members, if they want to oppose. Now, I will place Shri Venkataraman's amendment before the House and allow opportunity to the hon. Members to speak on this point as to whether it is to be referred back or disposed of here and now. If it is to be disposed of here and now, if that is the vote of the House, I will go on with amendment after amendment.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** There is another thing. Before you place the amendment before the House, may I suggest a verbal amendment to Mr. Venkataraman's amendment? I suggest that the words "in the light of the amendments on the Order Paper, and the proceedings of the Committee be notified to the House and the Members be allowed to be present" may be added.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Members of the House can be present even under the rules.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Then, these words "in the light of the amendments on the Order Paper" may be added at the end.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He wants to add 'in view of the amendments on the Order Paper'. All right; that will come at the end.

**Shri S. S. More:** If you are going to give your ruling now....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is stating something and I am trying to write it out here. I know I cannot give any final decision unless I take the opinion of the hon. Members.

**The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas):** May I make a humble suggestion, Sir? I suggest that the amendment be that the matter be referred back to the Committee. Don't say, having regard, etc. The whole matter will be before the Committee and the Committee will be in a position to take notice of all the amendments and other matters too not covered by any of the amendments. If the reference back is in very general terms, that would satisfy and ought to satisfy the whole House.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Will you allow me to move my amendment?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am not allowing any amendment.

**Several Hon. Members rose—**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members have not understood what I have said. The first point is whether this is to be referred back to the Committee or not. If this is decided by the House one way or the other, if this is disallowed, then we will go to the other amendments. There is Dr. Rama Rao's amendment.

**Shri S. S. More:** Is it not our right to discuss even the motion that you are now suggesting, the motion whether this matter is to be referred back to the Committee or not?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am placing this motion before the House. I will allow a limited discussion on the matter. Now, this amendment of Mr. Venkataraman, together with the

small modification as suggested by Dr. Lanka Sundaram and incorporated by me is now before the House.

**Some Hon. Members** rose—

**Dr. Rama Rao:** I oppose it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I know all of them are opposing it. I will call them one after another to state their reasons and convince the House. If the House is not convinced, they will have to sit down.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** Then on that I will take the vote, and if it is referred, no amendments will be moved here.

Is Mr. Venkataraman agreeable to Dr. Lanka Sundaram's amendment, viz., to add the words "in the light of the amendments on the Order Paper" at the end?

**Shri Venkataraman:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We will put this suggestion somewhere in the preamble, like this:

"That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back, together with the Amendments on the Order Paper, to the Committee with instructions...."

Will this be suitable?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I will be satisfied with that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back, together with the Amendments on the Order Paper, to the Committee with instructions—

(i) that in view of the abolition of the First Class on Railways,

the question of T.A. admissible to members or grant of free passes should be examined and recommendation made as to the conditions under which T.A. or free passes should be regulated; and

(ii) that in view of the further experience gained since the report was presented, the question of salary or allowances or salary-cum-allowances for members should be re-examined."

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** I oppose the amendment for this reason. I am not conversant with law to go into the various points, but as a layman I say that this House is making a laughing-stock of itself before the country.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Quite right.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** I remember in the Constituent Assembly, when the allowance was brought down from Rs. 45 to Rs. 40, there was no objection from any side. It went through very smoothly, but in this case, when in 1952 the proposal came and it was referred to the Committee appointed by the Speaker, I happened to attend some of the final meetings under your Chairmanship, and I remember that every alternative was discussed. Three hundred rupees salary and Rs. 20 allowance; Rs. 400 salary and Rs. 15 allowance—all these were discussed, and finally the conclusion was that it should be Rs. 35. Now, that report comes before this House, and again, after dilly-dallying for over a year...

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Two years.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** Though not two years, about a year and a half.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna):** One year and nine months.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** It again comes here and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs brings a Resolution that this House do accept the findings of the Committee—the recommendations of the Committee, i.e. Rs. 35 daily allowance and travelling allowance as it was before, i.e., first

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

class, because at that time first class was not abolished.

Some Hon. Members: It was abolished.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: It was not abolished.

And now the Mover of the amendment, Mr. Venkataraman says...

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Labour leader!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: ...many things have happened. The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs says much water has flowed under the bridge.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

I would like to know where that water is, where it has gone, because... (Interruption).

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Perhaps the hon. Member is not aware that every day water is pumped out from the underground of this House!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: When first class was allowed, Members were supposed to travel by first class. When it is abolished and second class is given, we are supposed to travel by second class. Where is the difference?—because everybody who was travelling by first class is now travelling by second class, and our travelling allowance has been brought down from first to second class. In this way, we are making this House a laughing-stock before the country. I therefore oppose this amendment and I wish that it should be discussed here and we vote on this amendment. At the same time, I must say I support the motion made by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs for which he should thank me.

7 P.M.

Dr. Rama Rao: I oppose this amendment of Mr. Venkataraman. He has been good enough to admit that the intention of referring it back to the Committee is to do things in *purdah*. We do not want the public or those people sitting here and laughing at us

to know how our minds are working about our salaries and allowances. My submission is that this matter has been before us for nearly two years. We complain about inordinate delays in other Ministries and Departments, but we have not been able to settle our own pay, during the last twenty-one months. Every session, a number of amendments are tabled, and reams and reams of paper are spent on these amendments. I would suggest that this matter should be settled here and now. Let hon. Members come out with what is in their minds. Let us be plain...

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea cum Santal Parganas): First be plain yourself.

Dr. Rama Rao: My proposal is Rs. 300 p.m. salary, and Rs. 10 allowance during the session, per day. (Interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let the hon. Member proceed. Other hon. Members who want to participate will have their chance later. Let the hon. Member go on now.

Dr. Rama Rao: Our representatives in the Joint Committee definitely suggested this salary of Rs. 300 p.m. and an allowance of Rs. 10 per day during the session. At that time, nobody accepted it. I am glad that the ruling party, as we understand from the newspapers—and these journalists have also an iota of truth about them—is now thinking in terms of pay, salary and allowance.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Your friend also. (Interruptions).

Dr. Rama Rao: I would like to answer them, if I hear these questions properly.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): You need not answer. (Interruptions).

Dr. Rama Rao: At least the principle of pay, salary, and allowance has been accepted, though not openly. Let us settle how much salary and how much allowance we must have. Of course, none of us can live on air.

We all want salaries and allowances or something to live by. But my point is that it must have some bearing and some relation to the poverty and unemployment of the people whom we have the honour to represent.

**Sardar A. S. Saigal:** Custodian?

**Dr. Rama Rao:** We are all custodians.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Are we discussing the merits now?

**The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas):** May I point out one thing? While the Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair, he gave the ruling that he would limit the present discussion only to the question whether there should be a reference back to the Committee or not.

**Shri S. S. More:** Does that mean...

**Shri Biswas:** If the motion is lost, he would allow full discussion on the merits of the proposal. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri S. S. More:** On a point of order...

**Mr. Chairman:** I do not want to hear this point of order.

**Shri S. S. More:** May I seek a clarification from you?

**Mr. Chairman:** It is quite clear.

**Shri S. S. More:** It is not clear to me. I am saying that.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. Will the hon. Member kindly hear me? I did not take objection, because I know that when he is just opposing the amendment, he is entitled to say all this. (*Interruptions*).

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Let us be straightforward. Let us come out with what we want. Of course, it is true that Delhi is costly, and we want a certain amount of allowance on which we could live. My point is, as I have already stated, that it must have some relation to the people outside, whom all of us represent. Instead of postponing things for another year or so,

and having things in *purdah*, let us put things before the House, and get them passed; and let us finish this matter once and for all. We blame others for not taking decisions in time, for keeping papers pending for months and months, and yet we keep things waiting for nearly two years.

I would appeal to all hon. Members, particularly the Congress Members, who, of course, will finally decide the issue, that we should maintain a certain standard and set an example to others. We want economy and moderation in respect of highly paid officers. When it concerns ourselves, let us be a little moderate.

There must be a modicum of moderation, if not sacrifice. I would repeat again that we can live on a very small wage. The suggestion which I have made and which my party has been making from the beginning is that there should be a salary of Rs. 300 per month with a daily allowance of Rs. 10 during the sessions.

**Mr. Chairman:** I would request the hon. Member not to go into the merits of the question. The question before the House is whether the report should be referred back to the Committee or not.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** I appeal to hon. Members not to refer this matter back to the Committee and then get into clash again with the Council of States and then postpone and postpone, but accept this principle. Let there be some moderation.

There is just one thing more. There is a talk of our dignity and status. Certainly, we have status and dignity because we have the honour to represent lakhs and lakhs of people. But status and dignity are not maintained by the money we spend or the salary we get. Most of us have had the good fortune of being associated with Gandhiji, leave alone older workers. He has talked...

**Mr. Chairman:** I am afraid the hon. Member is again going into the merits of the question.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Leave alone simplicity. We must at least settle it here instead of following these dilatory tactics.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I am sorry my hon. friend, Dr. Rama Rao, sought to suggest that the present procedure taken recourse to by the Government Benches is to indulge in dilatory tactics. I wish I could agree with him, but I cannot.

There are two specific undertakings given by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. On the 17th of this month, he said:

"It will be the earnest endeavour on the part of Government to see that that legislation is put through in both Houses before we disperse for the next session."

Then, today he has related it. The House will recall that I raised this on the adjournment motion and moved sometime back, and also on the 17th of this month when I raised this point, in reply Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha made his statement. Now, if I were convinced that there was any intention of Government indulging in dilatory tactics, I would not have suggested my verbal amendment. Nothing is lost now. It is only a recommittal to the same Committee. That is the point at issue.

As regards the merits of the question, I would like to say very little because your ruling is clear—we cannot go into the merits. But I would like to quote what Shri Sundarayya and Shri A. K. Gopalan, leaders of the Communist Groups in both Houses, have said in their Note of Dissent to the Joint Committee's report. This is at page 11.

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

Then at another place they have said:

"Instead of accepting this healthy basis of emoluments for

people's representatives, to bring forward the argument that Council of States members can pursue their gainful occupations for their livelihood because they are interrupted in their occupations only for a period of 4 months comes close to the arguments of wealthy men who want to dominate the whole show and to eliminate have-nots."

I have only to make this request to the Committee, in case this amendment is accepted by the House. Remember, it is not the dignity of the Members of the House which is at stake; it is the utter economic impossibility to carry on our duties as Members of this hon. House, maintaining two establishments with the allowance made available to us. That is the only point I would like to make, and if this amendment is accepted, I am sure I will have an opportunity to examine it in Committee.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra** (Monghyr North-East): Members of the Opposition, Sir, are certainly in an advantageous position at least for once, because we can take it that if we threaten to break one nose, then perhaps the Congress will lose four noses! That may be one mentality. If I threaten to cut my leg, then perhaps 350 legs on that side will be cut! Therefore, we are certainly in an advantageous position on that point. (*Interruptions*). I will also say that there are representatives of the poor—I may be a representative of the poor—with the backing of the purse of America or the backing of the purse of Russia or with the backing of the moneyed people of India.

[*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair*]

So there are different kinds of people in this House who represent the poor people.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We are on the simple point whether this should be referred back to the Committee or not.

**Shri Nambiar:** I want to know how a person representing here the Indian

people can have the backing of the American purse or the Russian purse. This is not the first time that we are hearing such things; we are hearing it again and again.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All that Mr. Nambiar says is that a reference to the Russian purse or the American purse is absolutely irrelevant. Now, this is a simple point whether the amendments and other things necessitate its sending back to the Committee and whether it will be useful or not. That has already been considered; or, whether we must dispose it of one way or the other here. Surely, each Member may take two minutes and then finish it off.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** The question of the backing of the purse comes like this. Before becoming Members of Parliament we went to the polls and at that time all this came in.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All this is irrelevant. It is wrong. There is no meaning in going into what all we did or we were expected to do or are going to do. The only question is the salary and travelling allowance of Members.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** Therefore, my request to the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and other people is that they should not make a humbug of this....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. It is unparliamentary.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** What does he want to say? Should it go back to the Select Committee or not?

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** My request is that they should make up their minds and decide quickly and thrash it out here.

**श्री बी० जी० देशपांडे :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव को उस समिति के पास फिर से भेजने का तीव्र विरोध करता हूँ। मेरे इस विरोध का पहला कारण तो यह है कि एक ऐसी कमेटी ने जिसमें इस सदन के बड़े योग्य और सम्माननीय नेता शामिल थे और उन्होंने दोनों सदन के सदस्यों की

इस सम्बन्ध में सलाह लेने के पश्चात् उनका मत जान लेने के पश्चात् यह प्रतिवेदन तैयार किया और वह सदन के सामने एक साल से पेश है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह हमारा कहना कि हम यह प्रतिवेदन देखना नहीं चाहते हैं, कुछ इस तरह की बात करना मेरी समझ में इस समिति का अपमान करना है और उसकी अवहेलना करना है। इसके अतिरिक्त हम इसे सदन के सामने इसलिये ले जाना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि हम पदों में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं और इसलिये मैं नहीं चाहता कि यह चीज़ पदों में रख कर की जाय। यह कहा गया है कि इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत सी बातें हैं जो पत्रों में नहीं जानी चाहियें, उनकी चर्चा नहीं होनी चाहिये। मेरी समझ में इसमें कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है। हम अगर अपने लिये तनख्वाह ज्यादा लेना चाहते हैं तो इसमें छिपाने की क्या बात है, हम आकर खुल्लम-खुल्ला कह सकते हैं कि हम इतनी तनख्वाह लेना चाहते हैं। हम देश के बड़े से बड़े नेताओं को किसी को २७ हजार देते हैं किसी को ६० हजार देते हैं और किसी को ७२ हजार रुपया देते हैं, तो इससे उनके प्रति हमारे आश्चर्य की भावना कम नहीं होती है, तो अगर गरीब बेचारे संसद् के सदस्य को हम ज्यादा तनख्वाह देने की बात कहते हैं तो इससे हमारे भवन की या हमारे लोगों की प्रतिष्ठा देश में कुछ कम हो जायगी, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। जहाँ तक मेरा सम्बन्ध है, मैं स्वयं यह तनख्वाह बढ़ाने के पक्ष में नहीं हूँ। यहाँ पर प्रश्न यह नहीं है कि मैं बढ़ाना चाहता हूँ या कम करना चाहता हूँ, प्रश्न इतना ही है कि यह प्रतिवेदन आने के पश्चात् ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हुई है और हमारे जो पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स के मंत्री हैं उनके द्वारा या हम लोगों के द्वारा इस प्रतिवेदन को फेंक देना उचित न होगा और ऐसा करके हम गलती करेंगे। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह बात क्यों हो रही है, इसमें उनका उद्देश्य

[श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे]

फिर से से कमेटी के पास भेजने में यह कि आपके कुछ लोग तनखाह बढ़वाना चाहते हैं और फिर से इसे कमेटी में भेज कर अपना मकसद हासिल करना चाहते हैं और साथ ही जनता के सामने यह कह सकें कि इसके लिये ए० के० गोपालन भी कहते हैं और हम लोग भी कहते हैं, असल में इसको समिति के पास फिर से भेजने में यही चीज काम कर रही है। मैंने तो जैसे पहले कहा मैं इसमें कोई छिपाव नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में जिम्मेदारी से अपनी सिफारिशें रखे और उनके अनुसार इस सदन के सामने बिल ले आये, अब यह सदन उसका समर्थन भी कर सकता है और उसका विरोध भी कर सकता है। आपका इसको फिर समिति के पास भेजना इस मंशा से कि वहां जाकर तनखाह बढ़वा सकें लेकिन सदन के सामने इसको छिपाना इतने बड़े लोगों के लिये इस प्रकार की नीति शोभा नहीं देती है। इसलिये यह प्रतिवेदन समिति के पास न भेजा जाय, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है।

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** With all respect, I must say that I have not been able to follow some of the hon. Members' criticisms on the Resolution. Some of them are absolutely beside the mark and unnecessarily they have been rattling their sabres in the air. So far as the Government's intentions are concerned, some of my friends charged us of doing things sometimes behind the *purdah*. We are not used to do that and others may believe in doing things behind the *purdah* or underground. I tell you here and now that it is open to the Government to bring a legislation on the point independently of this Committee.

**Shri S. S. More:** Why did the Government not do so?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** We only save an opportunity to the Members

of the House as we wanted to ascertain their opinions before bringing a legislation. It is not necessary on the part of the Government to bring in legislation incorporating anything that the Committee suggests. It is open to the Government, even after the Committee's suggestions, to bring in another legislation altogether, and when that legislation is before the House, Members will have ample opportunities to move that the whole thing should be referred to a Select Committee or to oppose any of the provisions.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister wants to have the greatest amount of concurrence on this matter.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** There is no Party question in this matter. So far as the Government is concerned, I should like to say that there is nothing in the mind of the Government now either to increase or decrease the daily allowance. If the Members want that it should be reduced to Rs. 20 or Rs. 15 or that it should be increased to Rs. 50, Government has no objection. I want to make it perfectly clear that Government has no intention whatsoever in this matter and if hon. Members ascribe motives to us, it is most unfair. Government's mind is absolutely open in this matter. If the majority of the Members want the *status quo* to continue, we have nothing to say against it. As has been explained, the reason for our suggestion to refer the matter back to the Committee is the abolition of first class on some of the Railways and that matter is being referred to the Committee. Naturally, that question will be reviewed by the Committee. The Members are indulging in dilatory methods because they think that Government is anxious over this matter.

**Shri S. S. More:** Not the Members.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** But I may say that Government will try to bring in a legislation on this question in this Session as soon as possible.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is.....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I would like to ask the hon. Minister...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. It is too late now. I am putting Sri Venkataraman's amendment to vote.

The question is:

"That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back, together with the amendments on the Order Paper,

to the Committee with instructions—

(i) that in view of the abolition of the first class on Railways, the question of T.A. admissible to Members or grant of free passes should be examined and recommendation made as to the conditions under which T.A. or free passes should be regulated; and

(ii) that in view of the further experience gained since the report was presented, the question of salary or allowances or salary-cum-allowances for Members should be re-examined."

*The motion was adopted.*

*The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Monday, the 29th March, 1954.*