

units should be organised and operated on business lines with a comparable degree of elasticity of control and business efficiency as private units in the same field. In the words of Mr. Herbert Morrison—

"When we come to a highly commercial enterprise which is very tricky on which one has to think out a lot of day-to-day problems, to think quickly and chance one's arm, like Transport and Mining and other industries with which we have been dealing or with which we may deal, then we have to get a more subtle instrument, more adaptable, more capable of quick movement and less liable to be bound by traditions and rules. I am certain that if we run these public corporations—highly commercial, highly industrial, highly economic—on the basis of meticulous accountability to political channels, we are going to ruin the commercial enterprise and the adventurous spirit of these public corporations in their work."

I am in entire agreement with these words. The only thing that I would urge is this. I have tabled an amendment to add clause 613A. It runs thus:

"The annual reports on the working and affairs of Government companies together with copies of the Audit Reports on their accounts, referred to in section 613, shall, as soon as may be, laid before Parliament."

There is no such provision now. I want that this important amendment should be accepted so that it is not merely the audit report that is submitted to up but the audit report and the reports on the working of these companies should come up before this House so that we may discuss them and if there are any deficiencies we may have them rectified after debate.

## COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

### THIRTY-THIRD REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 10th August, 1955."

This is a simple report in connection with the allotment of time for resolutions and the time to be allotted is stated in the report. I commend the report for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 10th August, 1955."

*The motion was adopted.*

## RESOLUTION RE: APPOINTMENT OF A PAY COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman: The House will now resume further discussion of the following resolution moved by Shri D. C. Sharma on the 29th July 1955:

"This House is of opinion that a Pay Commission should be appointed to go into the question of the pay structure of the country so that the disparity between the highest salary and the lowest salary is reduced to the minimum."

along with the amendments moved thereon.

Out of three hours allotted for the discussion of the resolution, two hours and nine minutes are left for further discussion today.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): I consider our esteemed friend Shri D. C. Sharma's resolution demanding the appointment of a Pay Commission to be very timely. Y-u

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

know I represent the constituency of New Delhi where perhaps the largest concentration of Government servants can be found. I move among them; I know how they feel and how they live. There has been a consistent demand on behalf of Government servants that a second Pay Commission should be appointed to go into the anomalies that exist in their present pay structure and service conditions. I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to say a few words on this resolution.

If we analyse the present economic situation, we will find that there are enough and pressing grounds for the immediate appointment of a second Pay Commission. I would like to draw your attention to two factors regarding the background against which the last Pay Commission worked and the scope of their enquiry. The last Pay Commission was appointed in 1946 when India was not independent; therefore, before the members who worked on the Commission the economic picture of an independent, free, India was not there, or at any rate it was not clear. Then, just after the war it was a very bad economic period for this country; it was a period of economic instability. The scope of their enquiry was also limited; the last Pay Commission confined their enquiry to the Central Services only. They did not take into consideration the conditions of service in the States. Though one of the objects before the Pay Commission was to bring about rationalisation in the services, I am afraid that even after the partial implementation of the recommendations of the last Pay Commission, no rationalisation has been achieved in the services. It is therefore very necessary to have a Joint Pay Commission dealing both with the States and the Central services.

The Pay Commission itself emphasised the need for uniform scales of pay. They said that social justice required that there should be equal pay for equal work. But they were

handicapped for certain reasons. Therefore, they could not recommend what they would have liked to recommend and as a result considerable disparity persists between the pay at the Centre and the States. On account of this there is a lot of dissatisfaction among the services who do equal amount of work, but get different kinds of pay. There is tension between the Centre and the States over this issue. It is therefore very necessary that some body should go into the whole question.

Not only is there disparity between the scales of pay of the services working at the Centre and the States, but even in Delhi I find there is a category of offices which are called "subordinate offices". People working there get different rates of pay. This glaring anomaly has been brought to our notice over the case of the third division clerks. There is a lot of agitation going on in Delhi about the revision of the pay of the third division clerks. This is a long-standing grievance of theirs and as a result of their agitation, Government agreed to give two increments to third division clerks. Now the people working in the Central Secretariat got these increments; but those working in the subordinate offices did not get these two increments. They are all working in Delhi; they have to spend in the same way; they do the same kind of work; but while one lot of people got the increment the other did not.

The economic situation in the country has considerably changed since 1946. I do not wish to go into the details of the economic condition between 1947 and 1951. But let us take the Plan period. In the five years of the First Plan (1951-56) according to Government the national income will register an increase of 15 per cent. Then during the second Plan period the income will register another 25 per cent increase. That means, in ten years, the national income will rise by 40 per cent. Now, if the national income rises by 40 per cent, it is but

fair that people should have a proportionate share in the prosperity of the nation. As a matter of fact, I would like to suggest that Government should enquire into the feasibility of appointing a pay commission every ten or fifteen years to review the economic situation and to suggest changes in the scale of pay.

Then there are other features in the changed economic picture. When the last Pay Commission worked they had before them a totally different economic picture of the country. The war had just terminated and there was acute food shortage in the country; there was a sharp decline in industrial production; there was acute bottleneck in transport and there was inflationary pressure on the Indian economy. Therefore before the members there was a picture of disturbing Indian economy. The present picture is totally different. The food shortage has been eased; Government claim that 18 to 20 per cent. increase has been registered in food production. In industrial production there has been an increase of 50 to 60 per cent. The transport position is very much better. The inflationary pressure has been reduced to a great extent, so much so that Government have gone on indulging in very heavy deficit financing. So instead of a disturbing economy, stabilising forces are manifest in the present economic situation of the country.

Government may argue that because there is an easing in the economic situation, advantage should be taken of it to effect economy and to make saving for various development programmes. I would like to say that saving can be effected by other ways. Saving can be made through social security payments, through insurance and provident funds, and if necessary through compulsory savings also. I feel that a country which proclaims its aim to be of the socialistic pattern of society should see that the people have a share in the prosperity of the nation. Unless people feel that they have a share in the prosperity of the

nation, the incentive to work for the betterment of the nation cannot come.

A very important development which has taken place since this Commission submitted its report is the declaration of the socialistic pattern of society at Avadi. Since this resolution was passed, the Taxation Inquiry Commission has submitted its report and you can see the change in the outlook. The Taxation Inquiry Commission have suggested that the difference of pay between the minimum and the maximum scales should not be more than 1 to 30, while in the recommendation of the Pay Commission we find a difference of 1 to 100. So, we see that the country has gone ahead; there is a radical change in the outlook since the declaration of the objective to be of the socialistic pattern. This must be taken note of and a new Commission should be appointed to go into the whole question.

After his visits to Russia and Yugoslavia, our Prime Minister has been making very appreciate public statements about the conditions of service prevailing in Russia and Yugoslavia. In Russia the disparity between earnings is only 1 to 12, while in Yugoslavia it is only 1 to 5. They do have some effect on the minds of the people. There is a greater consciousness in our country about the true picture of an egalitarian society, a new climate has emerged and the Government must recognise it and adjust its administrative machinery accordingly.

Therefore it is necessary to fix a floor and a ceiling and to see that in between there are as few differentials as possible. A scrutiny of the report of the Pay Commission shows that there are at least 25 steps in the ladder of promotion. The man who has got the lowest pay can never hope to get the highest. His progress is barred all the way through. If you really want a fair arrangement, based on social justice, there should be as few differences between the floor and the ceiling.

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

Next I come to a very important question: the relation of pay scales to the cost of living index. The Pay Commission worked on the assumption that the cost of living index will be brought down and fixed at a certain level. This assumption has proved unreal and as a result of that Government servants of the lower cadre as well as middle income groups have had to put up with higher living costs. The industrial labour has fared better, because their pay scale is adjusted to the living cost index. Also, they have got the power of collective bargaining. But Government servants have not got the power of collective bargaining. So, if you want to do them justice, the initiative has to come from the official end and a Commission should be appointed to go into the whole question. As for the cost of living index I shall just read out to you what the Pay Commission has said—I will not read long extracts but very short ones.

"We accordingly think that it would be safe to recommend a scale of basic salaries fixed on the assumption that prices may stabilise at a level which will give a cost of living index somewhere between 160 and 175 taking the pre-war index to be 100."

Then they go on to say:

"Till prices come to stabilise at that assumed level, we propose to recommend the continuance of the payment of dearness allowance to certain classes of public servants at rates varying with the changes in the cost of living index."

Then again they say:

"What length of time may elapse before a reasonable measure of stability of prices is attained, or at what level prices may stabilise, are questions which can only admit of a tentative answer."

They themselves envisage the appointment of a new commission.

"After all, if time should show that the assumptions or expectations on which our recommendations were based had not been justified or realised, it would not be very difficult to arrange for a revision."

So, they themselves thought that a revision would be necessary if their expectations were not justified.

Then I come to the present cost of living index. We have not got figures for the whole of India, but whatever figures are available fluctuate between 340 and 410. Therefore, the cost of living is totally different from what the members had expected.

Then I come to the vexed question of dearness allowance. The position is very uncertain and the Gadgil Committee had recommended that 50 per cent of dearness allowance should be merged with pay. Now with the perspective of planning with deficit financing, there is a tendency to raise the cost of living and hence the individual distinction between basic pay and dearness allowance should be done away with. Therefore, that is another reason why it is necessary to have a new pay commission.

As far as the anomalies that exist in the services are concerned, I can go on talking for four hours because they are a legion, but I will not go into details as other Members may quote them. I shall only point out one or two of them. I spoke also in the Budget Session—about the pay of the third division Clerks. The third division clerks have been agitating for years and today they are in such a desperate state that they have given notice of direct action to Government and it expires—it is their D-Day.....

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam):  
They are going to meet Shri Asoka  
answer."

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** Yes. If their demands are not acceded to, they are going to shed their clothes one by one and will attend their office in half-robed condition. They were getting Rs. 90 a month in 1931, and at that time the cost of living was 500 per cent lower. Then it was reduced to Rs. 60 due to economic depression, and as a result of their dissatisfaction the Pay Commission was appointed. The Pay Commission for reasons best known to them, which I have failed to find in the report even, recommended higher pay for all the grades except the third division clerks. For instance, they recommended the basic pay of an assistant should be raised from Rs. 100 to Rs. 140 or Rs. 160; that of a stenographer from Rs. 125 to Rs. 160; that of a peon from Rs. 14 to Rs. 30, but in the case of the third division clerks, it was to be reduced from Rs. 60 to Rs. 55 and the increment also reduced from Rs. 5 to Rs. 3 per year. The Shastri Award for bank clerks gave a better scale to the bank clerks.

The family budget for a small family is between Rs. 200 and Rs. 250 a month. The Gadgil Committee itself recommended that no pay less than Rs. 100 a month should be given to educated workers. For all these reasons it looks simply atrocious that the third division clerks have been driven to this position that they have given notice of direct action. Tomorrow in what condition they will be in their offices you can imagine.

A few weeks back I went to attend a conference of the P. & T. workers in Calcutta and I found that they too had strong feelings and resentment in this matter. I saw this in the case of both the third and fourth grade staff. The same conditions prevail in the case of railway workers. Railways employ the largest number of workers under government agency. What is the pay that is given to them? The fourth grade worker gets Rs. 10-1-35. The semi-skilled worker gets Rs. 35-1-50 and another category gets Rs. 40-1-60. With regard

215 L.S.D.

to promotions, there are so many efficiency bars, which allow the officers to promote or not to promote these workers at their sweet will. They are at the mercy of these officers. Then there are innumerable categories of service. In the Railway Service I understand there are more than 730 which have been referred to Tribunal. The actual number is more than 730 even. Then, we find other bodies besides the Government servants, recommending the need for the appointment of another pay commission and one such recommendation comes from an unexpected quarter, the Estimates Committee. The Estimates Committee recommended revision for another reason and that is the need for some parity between private and public sectors. This is what they say:

"Thus, the whole structure of employment in the public and the private sector becomes ill-balanced and leads to discontent. There is, therefore, an apparent need to lay down some general principles in this matter. The Committee suggest that the Planning Commission should examine the whole matter in all its aspects and recommend the lines on which Government should take action to bring about parity in this matter."

Even the members of the Pay Commission were not satisfied with the recommendations they were making and this will be clear from page 31 of their report to which Shri Gopalan also referred. They said that it was necessary to fix a "living wage" but financial difficulties made them to recommend just above the margin of "poverty line". Now the country is supposed to be economically progressing and we have made great changes in our outlook. The whole objective of the State has been changed and so there is an absolute urgency for the appointment of a Pay Commission to go into this entire question of the pay structure of the services.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** On a point of clarification. The resolution refers not only to Government

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

servants but also to other people—the wage-earning class as a whole. On such an important question as this, is not the presence of the Labour Minister essential? The hon. Finance Minister may reply in respect of Government servants only, but the resolution covers a wider range of people.

Mr. Chairman: The resolution refers to the pay structure of the country—these are the words of the resolution. It does not depend on the wish of the hon. Member that a particular Minister should reply on an occasion like this, I would like every Minister to be present, but I cannot enforce the presence of all Ministers here. After all, it is the choice of the Government as to which Minister should be present here for the purpose of replying to the debate. If he wants the presence of a particular Minister, I cannot enforce his presence here. I quite realise the importance of what the hon. Member says that in so far as the hon. Labour Minister is concerned, he is not present here. In fact, all the Ministers should have been present because the resolution relates to all the Ministries and the pay structure of the whole country.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Not even one Cabinet Minister is present now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has done well in bringing this to the notice of the House, but I cannot enforce their presence.

Shri Raghubir Sahai (Etah Dist.—North-East cum Budaun Dist.—East): I support this resolution wholeheartedly and am very grateful to Shri D. C. Sharma for having brought forward this important matter before the House and given us an opportunity to discuss it. This is a very old problem—disparity in the pay structure. In regard to the disparity between the higher salaries and the lower salaries, I remember in 1921, Mahatma Gandhi had written a letter to Lord Reading, who was then the Viceroy of India, and in the course of that letter Mahatma Gandhi drew the

attention of the Viceroy to his own salary, namely, Rs. 21,000 per mensem—that was what the Viceroy used to get then—and compared it with the salary of the village chowkidar, which was Re. 1/- at that time. He drew the attention of the Viceroy to this question of disparity and also the fairness whether in such a poor country as India, such disparities should exist. So much water has flown down the bridge between 1921 and now. After ten years, that is in 1931, when the Gandhi-Irwin settlement had been drawn up and the Congress Session was convened in Karachi, fundamental rights were drawn up by the Congress and at that session Congress made certain recommendations as to how the pay structure in the country should be framed. With regard to the expenditure and salaries in civil departments, that resolution said that there should be reductions and no servant should receive as pay—other than specially employed experts and the like—or should be paid above a certain fixed figure which should not ordinarily exceed Rs. 500 per month. After that we know that general elections took place in the year 1936 in accordance with the provisions of the Government of India Act 1935. We know that Congress ministries were formed in many provinces. In pursuance of the recommendations of the Indian National Congress, the Congress Ministers accepted a salary of Rs. 500 per month. That salary was drawn by them till the Congress ministries came to an end in 1939 on account of the intervention of the Second World War. At that time it was recognised that a salary of Rs. 500 was low as compared to the very high salaries drawn by public servants but the Congress ministries wanted to set an example and to show to the world at large that they could live on a salary of Rs. 500/-. After the war came to an end and the general elections took place in 1946, again Congress ministries came to power in the various provinces. But by that time things had changed vastly. Prices had shot up; the standard of living had

gone up and it was not possible for them to live within Rs. 500. So, it was accordingly decided that the Congress Ministers in all the provinces should receive a salary of Rs. 1500 per month. That was again a lower salary as compared to the public servants who received much greater salaries. That was again with a view to show that they could live honourably within the salary of Rs. 1500. Our Constitution provides that the President of the Indian Republic should receive a salary of Rs. 10,000 per month; it also provides that the Union Ministers should receive a salary equal to the salary which was receivable by them when the Dominion had been constituted. That was a much higher salary than what our Ministers are receiving at present. We know that the President has voluntarily surrendered Rs. 5,000 per month and at present he is receiving only Rs. 5,000 per month whereas the Union Ministers in accordance with the provisions of the Act regulating the salaries of Ministers passed in 1952 had agreed to accept a salary of Rs. 2,250 per month. From all these points I want to show that it has been the attempt on the part of those who agreed with the Congress resolution that they should voluntarily reduce their salaries; and that this had been done systematically. But the salaries of the higher public servants remained where they were. I am told that the salary received by some highest officers here is something like Rs. 4,000 per month while the lowest salary is Rs. 55. The ratio between the highest and the lowest comes to something like 1 to 82 whereas in the report of the Pay Commission that was formed in 1946 and which submitted its report in 1948 it was recommended that the ratio should be 1 to 22. They had also recommended that the highest salary in the present circumstances should not exceed Rs. 2,000 per month while the lowest salary should be something like Rs. 90. This would show that the pay structure of the country despite the last Pay Commission which gave its report in 1948 continued to be something which is not justifiable. I am one of those who

think that we should pay our Government servants reasonably. We should pay them enough so that they may be able to lead a decent life so that they may be able to educate their sons and daughters, marry them, live decently but in any case the salary of a Government servant should be in conformity with the average income of the country's people. This very Commission has held somewhere that the per capita income—that report was given in 1948 and so the calculations must be relating to that period—is something like Rs. 100 annually. During these five or six years, it might have increased to a certain extent but that is no justification for such a big disparity as exists at present between the highest and the lowest salary.

If we compare our pay structure with the pay structure of England where the administrative machinery is supposed to be the most efficient we shall find that things here are just the reverse of what we find there. Here the superior officers are paid in the most magnanimous possible manner while the low paid persons are paid in a very poor manner. But in England thing is just the reverse. I came across a book by Gladden—*The Civil Service in England* where the learned author says:

"We are concerned here with the administration—clerical section—and about this it can be said that the standards decline steadily as we rise in the hierarchic scale; so that those at the top on whom the welfare of the nation depends so much are remunerated at rates very much below those in posts of similar importance and responsibilities everywhere, both in private and semi-official organisations."

3 P.M.

That means that the lower the rung of the ladder higher the rate of salary. The ratio there is quite different from the ratio that exists in India. If we want to make our administration efficient; if we want that there should be more honesty, more scrupulousness and greater integrity in the adminis-

[Shri Raghbir Sahai]

trative staff we should see that our low-paid staff are paid enough. Just as I remarked a few minutes ago, I want that government servants should be given facilities to educate their sons, to educate their daughters, to live a decent life and so on, but that can be done in a different manner. Education should be made free. Cheap medical facilities can also be made available to everybody. Those amenities that are given to government servants should be thrown open to others also in the same manner so that there may be no invidious distinction made between a government servant and a non-government servant.

Sir, only the other day I read in one of the English dailies of Delhi that the third division clerks, because of their low salaries, want to register a protest. I hear that they have decided to attend their offices unshaven and only in vests and pants. I also hear that they have determined to go on in this manner till the invidious distinction or the glaring disparity in pay structure is removed. I wish that the Government should take note of the times and should baste themselves. They should appoint a Pay Commission and see that the great disparity that exists between the highest salary and the lowest salary is removed at an early date.

With these words, Sir, I support this resolution.

Mr. Chairman: Shri N. B. Chowdhury.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): I will speak a little later.

Mr. Chairman: There is no question of speaking later. Now it is three minutes past three o'clock. I would like to call upon the representative of the Government—Shri M. C. Shah—at about 3.50 and then give about 15 minutes for the Mover of the resolution. That means I can only accommodate two or three more hon. Members to speak. The hon. Member has

tabled two or three amendments; if he wants he may speak now.

Shri Achuthan (Cranganur): Let there be some time-limit for speakers—say, 5 or 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The point is this. There are only about 56 minutes at my disposal and I want to see that as many Members are put in as possible. It all depends on the Members. If each one takes 10 minutes I think we will be able to have six more speakers. It all depends on the Members and I would request them to allow others also to speak so that we may be able to put in more Members. Generally the time allowed is 10 minutes. I do not want to curtail it and I would request them to exercise the restraint themselves.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: Sir, the importance of this resolution has already been emphasised by the speakers who have preceded me. The Pay Commission that was set up in 1946 acted in an altogether different atmosphere and under conditions that were different. Now, the conditions have changed and, therefore, there must be a second Pay Commission to look into the question of this pay structure.

With regard to the disparity which is the main point in this resolution, I would like to draw your attention, Sir, to the recommendations of the Pay Commission of 1946. They say:

"Recognising the present disparity between the minimum and the maximum of public salaries, the growing demand for personnel from private business and industry and the views on the one hand that the State should not compete with private enterprise in respect of prize jobs and on the other that adequate remuneration is essential for maintaining ability and integrity in the permanent services, it is recommended that as a first step it will be fair to fix Rs. 2000 per month as the maximum



salary of public servants in India save for a few selected posts."

With regard to this question of disparity, even at that time, they pointed out that this should have been reduced. In their observations they have pointed out at page 34 the representations submitted by Shri Gadgil and other persons like Shri K. Santhanam. Shri K. Santhanam has said that the lowest salaries should be fixed at Rs. 100 per month. Shri Gadgil said that he would like to fix the salaries of lower grade officers on a scale of Rs. 100 to Rs. 300 and higher grade officers on a scale of Rs. 200 to Rs. 600. He also said at that time that the existing scales were not something which could be called socialistic. He said: "this would be far from being socialistic". After that we have heard about the announcement of socialistic pattern of society. But, today we find what difference exists, what disparity exists, between the highest paid and the lowest paid. We have already heard about the third division clerks in Delhi. This agitation is not only in Delhi, but throughout the country. We find that in different departments of the Central Government and also the departments of the State Governments in different parts of the country these low-paid employees are agitating in order to have a pay which would be adequate enough to enable them to make both ends meet. Sir, it is not a question of raising the standard of living so much as the question of meeting the bare necessities of life.

The Pay Commission at that time made a reference to the cost of living index. The cost of living index has not gone down but the pay scales continue to be what it was. As soon as this resolution was moved in this House, throughout the country, employees in different departments—in the Post and Telegraphs, Railways and other departments—organised meetings at several places and passed resolutions asking the Government to appoint a new Pay Commission in order that the entire question may be examined a new and the pay struc-

ture of the country may be rationalised.

Sir, I have already heard about a joint commission for both the Centre and the States. In the Constitution I find that according to article 39 the citizens of India ought to have an adequate means of livelihood. The pay which the low-paid employees are now getting is very inadequate. Therefore, if we are to act according to the directive principles laid down in the Constitution we ought to reconsider the pay-scales that have been recommended by the Pay Commission appointed in 1946. Then there is the question of equal pay for equal work. Since this principle has been adopted as a directive principle of the State, there is no reason why the employees of the States should get salaries which would be much lower than the salaries now drawn by the employees of the Union Government for the same kind of work. So, these disparities also have to be removed, but we heard the other day from the hon. Finance Minister that in order to attract talented people we should give them adequate remuneration. By that he means that they are to be paid thousands of rupees. We heard him say so in connection with the appointment of the Chairman of the State Bank and only the day before yesterday we heard him saying about high remuneration in order to attract the best people for managerial appointments and such other things. I have here to quote what has been mentioned at page 35 of the report of the Central Pay Commission:

"Ensuring the best public service is not by giving high salaries: by doing so you will never get a public servant of the best type".

It would give us a very poor opinion of the talented person who would not use his talent and would not render national service with a remuneration which would have some relation to the standard of living of other people in our country or to the general standard of income of our people. From all the utterances of the hon.

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury]

Ministers, it now appears that they are not at all serious about this question of rationalising the pay structure. So, I would at this stage urge upon the Government to appoint a Pay Commission not only to look into this question of the wide disparities now prevailing in the pay structure of the different Government employees—whether they belong to Class I or Class II services or to the ranks of Class III or Class IV staff—but also to make certain enunciations and recommendations with regard to the salaries which even the private employers would be allowed to give to their employees. For all these reasons it is very necessary that there should be a new Pay Commission.

Now, why I emphasise in my amendment the necessity of not only setting up a new Pay Commission but giving them directions so as to fix the minimum salary at Rs. 100 and the maximum at Rs. 1,000 is because Rs. 100 would be the barest minimum to pay to a person and afford him an opportunity to make both ends meet and as for the highest salary, because in view of our average national income and in view of the observations made by the Taxation Enquiry Commission it is necessary that the maximum should not be more than Rs. 1,000. This is the view which had been represented to the Pay Commission that was set up in 1946 by several organisations and by some important personalities also. So we feel that taking into account the task of national reconstruction before us and also the average national income, the maximum pay should be fixed at Rs. 1,000. Those people who are now drawing several thousands of rupees per mensem should now agree to have their salaries reduced, and with all these directions, a new Pay Commission should be set up.

श्री ए० एच० विश्वनाथन (बालशर) : मैं तब तब कह रहा हूँ कि मेरे दोस्त श्री डी० सी० शर्मा ने जो प्रस्ताव इस संसद के सामने रखा है, वह प्रस्ताव बिलकुल समझाने वाला है और उसकी

बहुत अधिक आवश्यकता थी। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह लोग जो अब तो पंडे हैं, बावजूद उन आशाओं के कि हम एक नया समाज समावधान के सिद्धान्तों पर बना रहे हैं, लेकिन वह इंसानों हैं कि उनकी सेल्वीव, उनकी उन्नतों बहुत कम हैं। उनको बहुत आशा हुई है इस प्रस्ताव को सुन कर और इस के समाचार को जान कर। मुझे से कहें तो पंडे सर्वेंट्स ने पूछा कि क्या पार्लियामेंट इस प्रस्ताव को पास करेगी? मैं जाना करता हूँ कि हम लोग इस प्रस्ताव को पास करेंगे और गवर्नमेंट इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करके उनकी आशाओं को पूरा करेगी।

ए कमीशन जिस समय बनाया गया था, उस समय हालात बिलकुल दूसरे थे और उन्होंने खुद इस बात को तसलीम किया है कि उन्होंने जो सिफारिशें उस जमाने में की थीं, जो कि एक बिलकुल दूसरा जमाना था और बिलकुल दूसरी किस्म के हालात थे। उनके सामने एक दूसरी तरह के स्टैंडर्ड्स थे। जब स्टैंडर्ड्स हमारा बदल गए हैं, हमारा आदर्श बदल गए हैं और जो लोग दस में बांदी तनल्हाह पाने वाले हैं, उनकी आवश्यकताएं और उनके आदर्श बदल गए हैं। हम जो सब से लोएस्ट गृह हैं, ५५—१२० का इस गृह के एम्प्लॉयर्स के डीमण्डों बजट को देखें कि आखिर इतनी कम तनल्हाह में वह कैसे अपना गुजारा कर सकते हैं। उस तनल्हाह के भीतर उनके लिए बिलकुल कोई आशा नहीं, कोई उनके सामने रास्ता नहीं जिससे कि वह उसके अन्दर गुजारा कर सकें। आप उनके बरत बजट उठा कर देखें, हमें तो उनके अन्दर घाटा ही घाटा दिखाता है। कहीं दके तो मैं हीन होता हूँ कि आखिर वह किस तरह से इस तनल्हाह के अन्दर अपना गुजारा करते हैं। जिस समय हम उनका इंप्रूवमेंट लेकर अधिकारियों के पास जाते हैं और उनके गृहस की तबदीली की मांग करते हैं तो जवाब मिलता है कि दस के पास रेंजा नहीं है, स्टेट के पास रेंजा नहीं है। हमें बहुत से काम करने हैं और तरफकी के कामों के लिए

पैसें की जरूरत हैं। मैंने देखा है कि तो पंद्रह सप्ताह इस बात के लिए तैयार हैं कि देश के कार्य के लिए अगर सारा देश कुर्बानी करे और सारा देश त्याग से काम करे तो वह इससे भी कम तनखाह लेकर, भूलें रह कर भी काम करने को तैयार हैं। लेकिन जब वह यह दिसते हैं कि बड़ी बड़ी तनखाह लेने वाले तो अपना एक पैसा भी कम करना नहीं चाहते, तो वह भी इतनी तनखाह का मतासबा करते हैं जिसमें वे अपनी गुजर बसर कर सकें।

पिछले दिनों पंजाब में और शायद सेंटर में यह सवाल उठा कि जो लोग 540 से ऊपर तनखाह लेते हैं उनका मंहगाई भत्ता कम कर दिया जाय तो हमने देखा कि किस तरह उस प्रयोजन का विरोध हुआ और नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह प्रस्ताव किसी भी प्रान्त में पास नहीं हो सका। उन लोगों ने जो 540 रुपये से ऊपर तनखाह लेते थे, उन्होंने इस बात का बचर्दस्त विरोध किया और कहा कि उन के मंहगाई भत्ते के अन्दर कमी न की जाय और उस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि हम बिलकुल चुप हो रहे और शांत हो रहे लेकिन जिस समय तो पंद्रह सप्ताह की वे 2 रुपये की बढ़ोतरी का भी सवाल पैदा जाता है, या वह मांग करते हैं कि अगर तनखाह नहीं बढ़ाई जा सकती तो हमें लोकल एलाउंस के ही धारे पर कुछ इंटीग्रिटी, कोई ऐसी चीज चाहते हैं जिससे कि 1 या 2 रुपये की तरक्की हो जाय या तो कोई उनको सुविधा ज्यादा मिल जाय, उस वक्त बितना हमारा बजट का नकशा है वह सामने आ जाता है और हम उनके सामने सारा नकशा खोल कर रख देते हैं कि आप ही बतलाइये, हमारे देश में पैसा कहाँ पर है। दरअसल वह विषमता जो हमने कर रखी है, वह पिछले पे कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के अन्दर नहीं है बल्कि वह हमारे दिमागों में निकली है। हम लोग नये आदर्शों का, समाजवाद के आदर्शों को ऊपर-ऊपर से स्वीकार तो करते हैं लेकिन हमारे दिमागों के अन्दर वह विषमता भरी पड़ी है और वह विषमता हमारे दिमागों से निकली नहीं है। मैं आशा करता था कि वह प्रस्ताव जो

कि मेरे दोस्त श्री डी० सी० शर्मा ने पेश किया है, यह दरअसल हमारी सरकार की तरफ से, आना चाहिए था और मैं अब भी आशा करता हूँ कि इसको हमारी सरकार की तरफ से मान लिया जायगा। इस बारे में मेरे दिल में एक गिस्ती कांशंसनेस है। मैं अपने दिल में गिस्ती कांशंसनेस अनुभव करता हूँ और जैसा कि मेरे एक साथी ने कहा कि दरअसल हमारे आदर्श कुछ और थे और हम चाहते थे कि देश के सामने यह नमूना रखें कि देश में पैसा कम है, देश गरीब है, गरीब से गरीब जनता के पास जाकर हम यह कह सकते हैं कि तुम्हारी हम सेवा करेंगे, तुम से कम खायेंगे और तुम से कम कपड़ा पहनेंगे, तुम्हारी हम हर प्रकार से सेवा करेंगे, लेकिन सेवा इस तरह से नहीं होती अगर हम उनसे ज्यादा शान में रहते हैं, हम तो शाननगर और माननगर में रहते हैं और संधानगर में घपरासी और मजदूर रहते हैं और फिर उनको जाकर वह कहें कि तुम अपने गुजर लायक और पैसा नहीं मांगो और देश के लिए मुफ्त काम करो, ऐसा कहना हमको शोभा नहीं देता है। देश के लिए सबको मशकत करनी चाहिए और मैं चाहता हूँ कि सब लोग काम करें और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मजदूर लोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा कुर्बानी करें, लेकिन यह उम्मी संभव हो सकता है जब सब लोग ऐसा करें और वह बड़े लोग जो बड़े अफसर हैं और जो सरकार और देश का काम चलाते हैं वह भी कुर्बानी करें और नीचे वालों के लिए आदर्श उपस्थित करें और यह कहें कि जहाँ तुम्हारा पसीना बहेगा वहाँ देश की सेवा खातिर हम अपना खून बहायेंगे। लेकिन अगर वह स्पिरिट नहीं है, तो आप यह आशा कैसे कर सकते हैं कि उन लोगों के अन्दर जो पहले से काम करते हैं, पहले से आधे पेट खाना खा कर, बच्चों को भूखा रख कर, बच्चों की दवा दारू की परवाह न कर के किसी तरह से अपना गुजारा करते हैं, वह देश के लिये कुर्बानी करेंगे। हम दिसते हैं कि आज आप देश के अन्दर दौबना अर्थात् प्लैनिंग की भावना पैदा करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन वह किस तरह से हो ? आज हम दिसते हैं कि दूसरे देशों के अन्दर

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

लोग खुद ही पगल रहते हैं, खंड से भर रहते हैं, कि दंड की प्रगति करनी है। यह स्पिरिट हमारा दंड में पैदा नहीं हो सकती है, जब तक हम काम करने वालों के अन्दर यह भावना न पैदा करें कि हमारा यहाँ कोई छोट्टा नहीं है और कोई बड़ा नहीं है, जो अच्छी पोजीशन में है, ज्यादा पैसे लेते हैं, उन को दंड की उलझनी ही ज्यादा सेवा करनी है, जो कम पैसे लेते हैं वह उसी हिसाब से कम काम करेंगे। जब तक आप कुछ आपदा अपने सामने नहीं रखेंगे तब तक जो मैन्युअल आप पैदा करना चाहते हैं वह नहीं पैदा हो सकती है। आज सांसायटी के अन्दर जो ज्यादा इंसिस्टेंस वाले हैं, ज्यादा पैसे पाते हैं उन की भावना को हमें तब्दील करना होगा। जब तक हम उन की भावना को तब्दील नहीं करेंगे तब तक हमारा दंड के अन्दर समाजवादी दृष्टि नहीं आवेगी। आज हमारी सरकार या हम कितनी ही समाजवादी की बातें कहें, जब तक हम एक के लिये खीज्ज कर्षम नहीं उठाएंगे तब तक हमारा दंड इस मार्ग पर आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता।

में समझता हूँ कि सरकार आज इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध नहीं करेगी और इस को स्वीकार कर लेगी। इस के अन्दर सिर्फ यह कहा गया है कि एक कमिशन मुकदर किया जाय। यह नहीं कहा गया कि इतनी तन्स्वाह किसी की कर दें या डिप्लोमैट्री का इतना स्पेस बना दें कि वह १:१०० या १:२५० या १:१० से ज्यादा न हो। इस के अन्दर कोई ऐसी बात कह कर सरकार के हाथ नहीं बांधे गये हैं। इस के अन्दर तो सिर्फ यह कहा गया है कि सरकार एक कमिशन मुकदर कर दें, वह तमाम बातों को दंडें और सारी मौजूदा अवस्थाओं पर विचार करने के बाद जो परिणत लोग हैं और जो जनता की और सारा दंड की सेवा करने वाले लोग हैं, उन की अवस्थाओं पर विचार करने के बाद यह करने सुभाव दें। आप को इस प्रस्ताव ने कहीं पर बाधा नहीं है। वह तो एक विस्फुट मुस्वकार से ही रस्ता है। अगर इन इन को भी स्वीकार

नहीं करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह दंड के अन्दर एक बहुत बड़ी गिनतना पैदा करेंगे, विशेषकर उन लोगों के अन्दर जिन की डेक के बस पर हम अपने दंड को ऊंचा उठाना चाहते हैं। वैसे मैं ने कहा, जो लोग मजदूरों के अन्दर काम करते हैं, उन से मिलते जुलते हैं, वह उन के अन्दर एक नई भावना पैदा करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन उन के अन्दर सरकार की उपासीनता से एक रुकावट पैदा हो जाती है। उन व्यक्तियों की भावनायें मजदूरों के दिनों की प्रोत्साहित करते करते वैसे सहसा रुक जाती हैं।

हमारा पास इस का कोई बचाव नहीं होता जब वह पछते हैं कि आज ने विस्फुट ठीक कहा, हमें दंड की सेवा करनी है, हम कुर्बानी करने के लिये तैयार हैं, इन मंगे और भूलें रह कर काम करेंगे, लेकिन आप यह बताइये कि जो आप के बड़े बड़े दफ्तरों के बड़े बड़े आदमी हैं, बड़ी बड़ी ऊंची कोठियों में रहते हैं, क्या वह दंड के लिये बरा भी कुर्बानी नहीं कर सकते? यह आखिर आगे क्यों नहीं जाते? मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब हम लोग महात्मा गांधी की भावनाओं और आदर्शों को ले कर आगे चलें हैं तो हम उन को अमली तौर पर भी बलायें, क्रियात्मक रूप में उन का परिचय दें, तभी हम दंड को इन उस्तों पर चला सकेंगे। अगर हम उन का परिचय व्यवहारिक रूप में नहीं देंगे तो दंड इन उस्तों पर नहीं चल सकता।

वह कह कर मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

And Hon. Member: There is no quorum.

Shri Bogawa: rose —

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I am ringing the quorum bell.

Now there is quorum.

Shri Kamath (Hooshangabad): I have already moved my amendment on the previous day.

So much has been said here and so many facts and figures have been placed before the House that I do not wish to burden the House with more facts and figures. I shall confine myself to what may be called the approach to this problem. The Prime Minister is never tired of tackling big things in a big way. I may, if I am permitted to do so, go a step further and say that we must learn to tackle even little things in a big way. It is not enough for the nation if we tackle big things in a big way; even little things are often important and must be tackled in a big way, with a big heart and a big mind. The Central Pay Commission, which was the last step, to investigate and enquire into his pay business have said as follows. I am reading from page 27 of the report:

"The appointment of this Commission and the prospect of impending political changes have led to the services to form vague expectations of a new order. It is against this background that their claims for enhanced remunerations, for better treatment and for improved condition of service have to be viewed. We appreciate their aspiration, sympathise with their longings and take full cognizance of the resultant trends. But we feel that no recommendations have to be made within the framework of the existing socio-economic structure."

That, Sir was the approach of the Pay Commission to the problem in 1946. During the last ten years, much has happened and the socio-economic structure has undergone some though not a radical change. There is talk of change and of the much hackneyed term socialistic pattern of society. But it is not seriously meant; it is nothing more than a socialistic pattern without the 'n'—just 'patter'. I hope the Government will take certain serious steps towards the examination of the pay structure in our country. In August 1948, if I remember aright, in the old Parliament when Mr. Tyagi—

now Minister—and I raised the question of the Governor-General's salary, the Prime Minister was good enough to say that the dignity of the State demanded no change in the salary; and the Governor-General Shri Rajagopalachari continued to draw Rs. 20,000 and odd which was drawn by Lord Mountbatten. Of course, there was a lot of hullobaloo in the Press and everywhere and later on the pay was reduced. But even the Constitution has fixed the salary of the President, as the House is aware, at Rs. 10,000 per month. I wonder whether the approach of the Prime Minister to the problem has changed. I am not quite sure that the change in approach has come about and I still think that they are thinking in terms of the dignity of the State and what not, in order to bolster up and to justify high salaries that are being paid to the public servants even today. There is neither a ceiling nor a floor in the country so far as salaries are concerned. My amendment seeks to lay down the minimum, that is to say, the floor. It may be interesting to note that whereas the Heads of Departments and Secretaries draw Rs. 3000 or Rs. 4000 per month, the educated clerks in those Departments enter service on Rs. 55 per month, get an annual increment of Rs. 3 and when they retire from service at a ripe old age, they get Rs. 120 or Rs. 130. The increment, if I may say so, of Rs. 3 a year is not more than many of the tea-boys in Bombay and Calcutta restaurants perhaps get in a day. That is the yearly increment that a vast army of our employees is getting, and that is the monthly wage.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): They get Rs. 3/- as tips every day.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Many Members of Parliament will go in for that work.

Shri Kamath: Yes, that is the amount of daily tips that a tea boy in Bombay and Calcutta restaurants gets.

[Shri Kamath]

I raised this question of minimum wage in the last Parliament when the Railway Budget was being discussed in 1950 or thereabouts. Shri Santhanam, on behalf of the Government, I believe, said that this was impossible. I even suggested that the Government might make an announcement of their policy, and that it might be implemented later on, and that it need not be implemented immediately. Even that the Government were not prepared to do. I demand today that the Government should make an announcement that their policy would be to fix a minimum wage of Rs. 100 a month. It may take some time for implementation. I do not ask that it should be implemented straightaway. But, an announcement must be made by the Government that the minimum wage shall be Rs. 100 a month. Legislation on this subject in this very House has gone through many vicissitudes. Shri Jagjivan Ram brought a Bill in the old Parliament on the question of minimum wages. It was not made applicable to all industries. It was not applied to agriculture. Still it is hanging fire and another extension of time will, I understand, be sought by the Government in this very session. That means delay in the enforcement and implementation of this legislation on minimum wages. It is a sad State of affairs that even nine years after the formation of the Interim Government and 8 years after Independence, Government have not made up their mind about even a bare announcement of their policy with regard to minimum wages.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): They have made up their mind not to do so.

Shri Kamath: My hon. friend says that they have made up their mind not to do so. I can only say that in that case they are only hypocrites when they talk of a socialistic pattern. I can only say that it is merely a socialistic patter, and not a pattern at all.

The other day, some revealing figures were laid on the Table of the House by Shri Kanungo, who has

recently been promoted as the Minister for Industry, about the remuneration for certain experts that are being imported into India for even setting up paint shops, and what not, as if we do not paint or make such things at all in our country. We have been painting for a long time in this country. We have got very fine painters and shops for many other things too: not merely for painting but for other purposes as well. India has been an artistic country. We are painting in all sorts of ways. But even for that experts are being brought from other countries. I was surprised to read from that statement that their remuneration will be Rs. 3000 per month plus all out of pocket expenses (minus drink and cigarettes). I wonder how this will be enforced. I do not know whether they will be asked to submit their bills without drinks and cigarettes.

From the hotel bill who knows whether he drank or ordered cigarettes or extra dishes to eat. That shows that the Government even today are bent upon importing experts at these phenomenal rates of Rs. 3000 plus another 3000.—I do not know to what it will come to—plus up and down flying, trotting and what not, travelling expenses. Everything included, it will cost the tax-payer Rs. 7000 or 8000 a month for each expert. It is high time that this sort of a thing is put an end to by this Government, which talks of socialism and many other things.

Lastly, I would like to refer to a news item which appeared in the Press today that the Government is thinking of appointing a wages commission. I wonder whether the Minister could throw any light on this subject, whether it is authentic news or only a piece of speculation. I do not know whether it has appeared in all papers; I shall read it:

"Government is understood to be contemplating the appointment of a Wages Commission to inquire whether the existing wage system

is consistent with the objective of socialistic pattern of society."

The Minister may throw some light on this in the course of his speech.

**An Hon. Member:** No light.

**Shri Kamath:** My hon. friend says, no light. Then let him not obscure it further.

In the end, I would only stress this. Low wages in economic science have often been described as dear wages. It is paradoxical; but it is called dear wages and it is said to be dear in the long run and perhaps from a short run point of view too. It will be found that much of the inefficiency in many of the departments is directly attributable or traceable to the low wages or less than subsistence wages of many of the employees. You can imagine an employee with an average family of 4 or 5 trying to live—I won't call it living—to merely exist on Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 or Rs. 70 a month. At the other end of the scale, there are public servants, private servants also in banks and other industries, with high salaries; in the last session it was disclosed that some of the bank directors get as much as Rs. 15,000 or 20,000 a month. It is high time therefore that a ceiling as well as a floor is fixed. At any rate, in this poor country, I would insist that the floor should be fixed at Rs. 100 a month in terms of present prices.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta North-East): I welcome the resolution and the amendment particularly of my hon. friend Shri N. B. Chowdhury. Already this resolution has received massive support from different organisations, particularly like the quarter million strong National Federation of Posts and Telegraphs employees. I wish that the Government finds its way to accept it.

This resolution does not ask for the moon, but for something which is very eminently reasonable. The Pay Commission itself has said that whenever adjustments are found necessary, they can and should be made very easily. As has been pointed out by all the

previous speakers, so much water has flowed down the Jumna bridge since the time when the Pay Commission put in this report. Conditions have changed and concepts of economic and social organisations have also advanced. I wish Government tries to meet the point that the assumptions on which the Pay Commission worked are no longer valid. The Pay Commission had expected stabilisation of prices at a certain level which has not happened. And this point has been hammered so often that I do not wish to take the time of the House over it, but I wish Government to come forward and say that since the Pay Commission itself worked on certain assumptions and since those assumptions are no longer valid, it only stands to reason that a revision of the process envisaged by the Pay Commission should be made.

I wish also to refer to what the plan-frame says in regard to what ought to be done here and now. I take it that when the plan-frame is published and Government registers its approval of it, then things as said in it are meant and are not merely so much patter, as my friend Shri Kamath suggested. In the plan-frame at page 10 it is said:

"Since the goal of a socialistic pattern has now been clearly accepted, concrete steps in this direction have to be taken during the next plan period".

"Have to be taken"—this is the language used by the author of the tentative frame-work of the Second Five Year Plan. And I ask Government to come forward with an explanation, if there is an explanation, as to this particular statement, that certain steps have got to be taken. And we are now suggesting by means of this resolution that a Pay Commission be appointed and that a ceiling and a floor be set up as regards the emoluments of our people.

Now, the Pay Commission said at page 27 of its report:

"The application of some moral principle is expected when the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Government happens to be the employer."

Now, this is a point which again needs some kind of clarification as far as Government is concerned because we find that in today's context there is a complete absence of a moral principle as far as the fixation of pay and the prospects of Government employees are concerned.

I do not wish to take any time of the House over an examination of the shortcomings of the Pay Commission. but I do wish to say this, that the new Pay Commission which we envisage is something very different. In the old Pay Commission the late Shri N. M. Joshi was the only accredited representative of the working class movement, and the proposals which he made, along with another member, were brushed aside by the majority. In the new Pay Commission we want that there should be real and true workers' representation. We find also that at the time of the old Pay Commission there were certain organisations like the Civil Aviation Department which had hardly come into existence. Now, this Civil Aviation Department is working all over the place and the employees are using precision instruments of the very highest order, and they are sometimes being made to live in conditions which are sub-human. And we feel that since there are certain agencies of Government which were not taken into consideration when the Pay Commission made its report some seven years ago, surely the case for a new Pay Commission is very much more strengthened.

We know also how the recommendations of the Pay Commission, meagre as they were, have been sought to be circumvented by all kinds of ways by Government. In the Posts and Telegraphs Department as well as in the Railways there is usually recourse to the appointment of casual labour at about a rupee and a half per day. This kind of thing goes absolutely

against the spirit of the Pay Commission's report, and not only the spirit, but also its letter. We know also how direct recruitment is sometimes resorted to, with the result that the emoluments expected by the employees even on the basis of the meagre recommendations of the Pay Commission are not available. We see also that many amenities suggested by the Pay Commission have been taken away, were not given at all. The P.T.O. for example has been taken away and this is a continuous source of irritation as far as Government employees of our people are concerned. It is very necessary for Government today to realise that some positive steps have got to be taken, and this is a point which not only we on this side of the House are trying to hammer. I am quoting from the Taxation Enquiry Commission's Report, Volume I, page 145 where the commission says:

"We can no longer afford to leave the problem of equality to the automatic functioning of economic and social forces. This is particularly true of conditions in this country. The attainment of a wider measure of equality in incomes, wealth and opportunities must form an integrated part of economic development and social advance currently."

This is an immediate demand therefore which has been voiced by even the Taxation Enquiry Commission in its report.

In regard to the disabilities which exist, some references have been made, but I cannot help quoting certain figures which I find in the budget papers of this year 1955-56. I find that in the Commerce and Industry Ministry, under the item "Pay of officers and other employees", for one Secretary the provision is for Rs. 48,000 and for 134 class IV establishment the provision is Rs. 57,300. In the Communications Ministry, one Secretary has a provision of Rs. 48,000; 88 Assistants,



clerks, stenographers and Class IV establishment have an allocation of Rs. 1,09,800. In the Defence Ministry, one Secretary has Rs. 46,000; 116 Class IV establishment have Rs. 50,600. In the Education Ministry, one Secretary has Rs. 36,000—poor man gets less than the others—80 Class IV establishment have Rs. 35,300. In the External Affairs Ministry two Secretaries get Rs. 96,000 and 129 Class IV establishment get Rs. 54,600. I know that these people have to pay a certain amount of tax, but surely in regard to that we find the Taxation Enquiry Commission giving the answer. The Taxation Enquiry Commission says at page 154 of Volume I:

"It is unrealistic to stress the disincentive effect of income-tax progression on the upper income groups while the tax system calls upon the lower income groups who constitute the masses of the country to contribute an increasing portion of their meagre incomes. It must be remembered that even with the present comparatively high rates of tax, the range of inequality between the disposable incomes of the few and the many is wider than in many countries where the rates of taxation on higher income are, in fact, lower."

I therefore say that if Government wants equality of opportunity in this country, and if Government says that the people have to make sacrifices for the sake of the new social order which Government has in view, then there should be at least a certain reasonableness as far as equality of sacrifice is concerned. And that is why it is very necessary that we do have some kind of equality in regard to sacrifice.

Now, I wish only to quote another figure and that is in regard to the salaries received by foreign experts—referred to by Shri Kamath also,—for whom our country continues to be an EL Dorado. In answer to a question on the 6th of April, 1955, it was pointed out that a Chief Engineer of the Damodar Valley Corporation,

who is an American, gets a net salary of 20,000 U.S. Dollars per annum after deduction of Indian income-tax, free furnished house at his headquarters, use of a free car and driver while travelling on official duty, travelling allowance as available to Grade I officers, free medical treatment and

self, wife and children. I have so many other instances to show how these foreign experts get so much more than our people have a right to expect, and this is because our country continues to be an EL Dorado as far as these people are concerned. Let us, therefore, try to bring about elimination of inequalities which vulgarise life in our country, which waste the latent talent of our people, and which disable the proper functioning of the economic system. And that is why I say that this demand is very reasonable, is very modest. This is in complete conformity with the recommendations of the Pay Commission and the recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Commission's report, and that is why in reason there can be no justification for Government to refuse to accept this resolution, and I am hoping almost against hope that the Minister will make an announcement which will satisfy the desire not only of Members of this House, but of large masses outside.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I have nothing to say so far as the principle of reducing the difference between the minimum and the maximum of salary in this country is concerned. In fact, that was one of the aims of the Central Pay Commission that was appointed in 1946, of which I was one of the members. The question of pay structure and conditions of Government servants is a vast subject, and one year was taken in reporting on the same, after collecting every kind of data; and the whole pay structure was revised and the time scales were revised. The relevant questions with respect to recruitment and retirement were also gone into and certain recommendations were made. Even after a lapse of nine years there is still some scope for adjusting the present state

[Shri Gadgil]

of affairs in certain departments with the recommendations of the Pay Commission. Once we appoint a pay commission, then, not only this particular question of minimum and maximum will be under discussion, but the entire problem beginning with recruitment and ending with retirement will be within the purview of that commission. There are certain definite things which one has to keep in mind while considering this question; firstly, that the Government servants should not be a privileged class and, secondly, that what they get, whether by way of minimum or maximum, must have some relation to what is available outside Government service. The Government that was there at the time the Pay Commission was appointed was a different Government; the entire character of that Government was different from what it is today. But certain circumstances, social and economic, still persist and so long as we cannot deal with them in a substantial and effective manner, the mere appointment of a pay commission with only this much by way of reference will not meet the situation. If Government is to run and if efficiency is our goal, then we must attract the proper type of persons to Government service. Experience has shown that if there is no control in the field outside Government service, that is, in the sphere of private enterprise where any amount is paid, then, whatever Government may lay down by way of directions for the minimum and maximum will not have the requisite effect. Therefore, the mere appointment of a pay commission for the purpose specified in this resolution will not be enough.

Let me state briefly what was done by the Central Pay Commission. Before 1946, the lowest salary was Rs. 15, namely, that of the peon, and the highest salary was Rs. 4,000, namely, that of the secretary. That means, the difference was of the order of 266 times, without deduction of income-tax. What was suggested by the Central Pay Commission was that

the lowest basic salary of the peon or rather the class IV servants—because the Government servants were classified into four categories, namely, class I, class II, class III and class IV—was raised to Rs. 30; and so far as the highest services, namely, the Indian Administrative Service, the Indian Police Service, the Indian Audit and Accounts Service and other all-India services were concerned the highest pay fixed was Rs. 1,800/-. But certain exceptions were made in the case of joint secretaries and secretaries, whose number at that time was near about 98. I do not know what is the number of officers in the Central Government drawing more than Rs. 3,000 at present. The position then was that about 98 persons were drawing more than Rs. 3,000. So the Pay Commission recommended that the maximum which an entrant into the Indian Administrative Service or any other all-India service should get was Rs. 1,800 except in respect of some seventy or eighty places where joint secretaries and secretaries are concerned; in the case of the joint secretary it was suggested that the maximum should be Rs. 2,500 and that of the secretary Rs. 3,000. Thus, one will see that the difference was reduced from 226 times to nearly 60 times.

Shri A. M. Thomas: But virtually there was no reduction.

Shri Gadgil: Further reduction was achieved by one of the suggestions of the Central Pay Commission. In England, when the Tomlington Commission submitted their report, they stated that it was impossible to lay down for any length of time what should be the pay scale because prices were not stabilised and were not likely to be stabilised in the immediate future. Therefore, their approach was that there should be a basic pay and there should be a system of dearness allowance whereby the rise in prices should be neutralised to the extent of 80 per cent in some cases and to the extent of 60 per cent in some other cases, the higher the salary the lesser being

the neutralisation. So, the Pay Commission here also recommended a system of dearness allowance and it added it with the prevalent index of prices. If we take that into consideration, the class IV servant is today getting roundabout Rs. 60 or Rs. 65 and the highest man is getting Rs. 4,000. But there is no dearness allowance beyond the salary of Rs. 1,000. That has still reduced the difference between the minimum and the maximum. What I suggest is that unless there is a further stabilisation of prices, and further economic stability, the reopening of this question in the form suggested will not be advisable. But I am at one with the idea that this difference should be reduced further. I am, therefore, suggesting that so far as people who are getting less are concerned, they should have more facilities in the matter of housing, medical attention, education of their children etc. Now, if these people are provided with these facilities and those who are getting higher salaries do not have these benefits, then the difference will be considerably lessened.

I remember, a few months ago, at Avadi there was a suggestion that no person should get more than what the Prime Minister of India does. That was a suggestion which was unworkable because the office of the Prime Minister is a political office whereas the officers or servants whose cases we were considering are permanently in office. I then suggested that the difference between the minimum and the maximum should be roundabout twenty times. That can be achieved if we consider not merely the monthly wages but the real wages calculated in terms of the social services made available to them. In between 1946 and the present period, real hardship was experienced by the people who were drawing less because while the basic pay was raised, the dearness allowance varied from time to time and the hardships were felt when people retired. That was the reason

why Government were pleased to appoint a committee of which I was the chairman. We recommended in that Committee that up to the salary of Rs. 750, fifty per cent of the dearness allowance should be assimilated with the basic pay. The result was that whenever a person retired after the particular date, half the dearness allowance was added to his pension and that resulted in giving great relief to him in the matter of retirement benefit.

My submission, therefore, is this. We should proceed to tackle the question on all fronts and not merely in the Government sector. If we fix the minimum and the maximum only so far as Government service or semi-Government service is concerned but leave the other field entirely free, then we will not get the type of officers or even clerks that we want. Just as we are pressing for the fixing of a ceiling on income in the Government sector, likewise, we must also see, and I think I have made that suggestion in the course of the budget debate this year,—that even in the private sector there must be a limitation on the earnings, not a limitation on the earnings by way of dividends, this and the other, but even in the matter of salary or wages or whatever it is. If something is done in that direction, then there will evolve gradually a pattern in which there will be more of equality. And that equality will be far more enduring because it will be the resultant of a well-planned action and not merely something which may be available today but which may not be available tomorrow if competition continues.

4 P.M.

My suggestion, therefore, is that this Resolution, as it is only recommending in regard to a particular section with a specific reference is not the happiest in the circumstances. At the same time, the spirit of the Resolution should be perfectly acceptable to the Government and the Government should think in what way

[Shri Gadgil]

before the economic situation stabilises further, they can take action. Only when the prices are stabilised further, should they consider the appointment of a Commission of that type. Otherwise, it is difficult to know where one stands. Now this is a thing which really creates expectation and a man who had joined, say, in 1946 or thereafter, must have joined it taking into consideration what will be his prospects if he enters Government service, what promotion he will be able to secure, and at what age, and also when he retires what will be his retiring benefits. If there is a sudden change, there is frustration of expectation and I do not think it is all to the good from a national point of view.

Shri Kamath: Did he also expect the present prices?

Shri Gadgil: The question of incentive even in a socialist society is not altogether a matter which can be dispensed with. But that incentive must function within a certain framework of economic objective. That is the reason why I am suggesting that those who are getting less today should be getting more not in monetary terms, but in terms of real wages, namely, better housing at cheaper rates, more medical help and educational facilities that will just give the result which many of us have in mind.

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): I have heard with great interest the viewpoints expressed by the Members in the debate. I must say at the outset that the Government have considerable sympathy with the viewpoints that lie behind the Resolution that has been moved, that the great and large disparities of incomes must be avoided and the standards of income of the lowest strata must be raised. The Government have considerable sympathy with these viewpoints. But I am afraid, Government cannot agree that the appointment of such a Commission will solve this problem. Nor

can we agree that this is a right approach to solve the problem.

An Hon. Member: What is your approach?

Shri M. C. Shah: The House is well aware that the Central Pay Commission was appointed in 1946. They have taken great pains to come to certain decisions, to recommend a certain pay structure, and they reported in January, 1947. Government then accepted all those recommendations except only two recommendations, namely, with regard to the special facilities of education to be given to the Government employees and some dearness allowance to pensioners. By accepting all those recommendations, Government then accepted the responsibility of increasing the expenditure to the extent of Rs. 30 crores. The Pay Commission had gone with great care into the whole question of the rationalisation of service terms, the duties that they have to perform and what wage they should get according to the cost of living then prevailing. At that time the cost of living index was about 285. They recommended that Rs. 30/- should be the minimum pay and Rs. 25/- should be the dearness allowance, that is, Rs. 55/- in all; and later on at certain points additional dearness allowance was to be paid. The Government accepted all those recommendations. If we see the conditions that prevailed before 1946, say, from 1939 to 1946, the disparity was, as was explained by my friend, Shri Gadgil, about 1 to 300. The average lowest pay was about Rs. 12/- and the highest pay was about Rs. 4,000 and when income-tax was deducted from that Rs. 4,000/-, it came to about Rs. 3,300/-. So the disparity was about 1 to 280 or so. After the Pay Commission's recommendations and the acceptance of these recommendations by the Central Government, the disparity has gone down to 1 to 30-31. Today the minimum pay is Rs. 70/-. As my friend, Shri Gadgil, has said, when the expectation of the Pay Commission about the cost of living com-

ing down was far away, the Gadgil Committee was appointed. It recommended that 50 per cent of the dearness allowance should be added to the basic pay and the remaining may continue as dearness allowance. So even without considering the other allowances, viz., house rent allowance and compensatory allowance, Rs. 70/- is the pay that is being given to Class IV employees, and the highest pay is Rs. 3,000/-. If you deduct income-tax from Rs. 3,000/-, it will come to about Rs. 2,200/-, according to the present pay scales. So the disparity comes to 1 to 31 or so. Now the resolution not only refers to the Central Government employees, but it includes the State Government employees, it includes the private sector, it includes the wage earners in so many other industries, agriculture and all those things. It is a very comprehensive examination to be conducted in the country, and it is to be seen whether it is feasible to have such a new Pay Commission which can solve this problem. If we take the Central Government employees alone and if we take into consideration the amendments that have been moved—one amendment says that the ratio should be 1 to 15; another amendment says that it should be 1 to 10, another one says that the maximum should be Rs. 1,000/-, and the amendment of my friend Shri Kamath is to the effect that the minimum should be Rs. 100/- what will be the result? Let us understand it. Today, perhaps the House may be aware, there are about 15 lakh Government employees. I am speaking only about the Central Government employees. The number of the Central Government employees drawing over Rs. 3,000/- per month is 57; the number of those drawing over Rs. 2,000/- and upto Rs. 3,000/- is 383; the number of those drawing between Rs. 1,500/- and 2,000/- is 497; the number drawing between Rs. 751/- and Rs. 1,500/- is 3280; the number drawing between Rs. 201/- and Rs. 750/- is 50,215; the number drawing between Rs. 101/- and Rs. 200/- is 1,56,476; the number drawing between Rs. 51 and Rs. 100/- is 215 L.S.D.

4,20,839 and that drawing Rs. 50/- and below is 8,14,995. So if you take those Central Government employees drawing above Rs. 1,000/-, there are about 2,500 employees. Now, it has been said that the pay of the higher grades may be reduced to Rs. 1,000/- and the saving may be paid to low-paid staff. What will be the result? On the basis of this 2,500, the saving will be about Rs. 15 lakhs per month maximum—perhaps it may be less than that. If you take the whole year, it may come to round about Rs. 180 lakhs. If they are distributed among all those rest, deducting 2,500 from those 15 lakhs of people, then the average will be about Re. 1/- per month for each employees. So this is not feasible.

There is another argument advanced that, without touching the scales of pay of people about Rs. 1,000, we might just raise the pay by about Rs. 30. That has been advocated by my hon. friend Mr. Kamath and other hon. Members. What will it come to? If you look at the figures, you will see it will come to about Rs. 28 crores more a year.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** That is little when you are spending thousands of crores.

**Shri M. C. Shah:** If we have to raise the pay scales by just Rs. 30, that is to reach a minimum of Rs. 100, we will have to raise some other grades which go up to Rs. 250. That means a few more crores. Now, is it possible for us at this stage to find that money in order to increase the pay scales?

As a matter of fact, as one of the hon. Members has already referred to the pay scales also must have some relation to the national income. What is the national income per capita? If we just see that, in 1951-52, it was about Rs. 274.5, then in 1952-53, it was about Rs. 287.4. In the provisional figures for 1953-54, it is Rs. 283.9. If you take four members to a family, it may come to about Rs. 1,150 or so. If we take that factor into consideration then the pay scales that are granted by the Central Government

[Shri M. C. Shah]

are not unduly low. At the same time, we are now on the eve of the Second Five Year Plan. We want to develop the country; we want to spend more than Rs. 5,000 crores to raise the national income by about 25 per cent. It is up to us just to pool all that we can save, all our resources together to make that Second Five Year Plan a success. So, we have to view this question in this aspect also and, therefore, it becomes rather very difficult to agree to this minimum of Rs. 100 at this moment. At the same time, when the standard of living of all the citizens of India will go up, that will be reflected in the case of these lowly paid staff also. I agree with my hon. friend Mr. Gadgil that pay does not mean only cash. As has been accepted by my friend the Mover of the Resolution, it many mean other facilities. The Government today are very keen to see that more and more facilities are given to these lowly paid staff in the nature of cheap housing, medical facilities and other facilities. We are paying them compensatory allowance, city allowance, hill allowance etc., and all these are to be considered as pay. Therefore it becomes very difficult today even if we take the Central Government's employees only into consideration to accept the suggestion that the minimum should be Rs. 100.

The question comes about the States also. Today the employees of the State Governments are paid lower salaries than what the Central Government employees get. As a matter of fact, we have received complaints from the State Governments that we raise our pay structures and they are affected. They say they cannot pay that much of pay-scales to their employees and there is always discontent. Whenever in a State there is a central office and nearby there is a State office, there is disparity in the scales of pay and they always say that there is discontent. They want to raise their pay-scales by getting subsidies from the Central Government. It is a question whether the Central Government can give subsidies to raise the pay-scales of the

State Governments. Certain State Governments have already appointed committees to go into the pay structure.

Some hon. Members had raised the question that school teachers are paid low rates of pay. There is no doubt about it. But the Education Ministry had calculated what will be the expenditure if the pay-scales are raised to the minimum of Rs. 100. That will be about Rs. 74 crores as against Rs. 38 crores spent in 1951-52. It is very difficult to tackle that now.

When we come to the private sector, we see that at the top level people are paid very high salaries. There is this difference always in the private sector. In the private sector there is always insecurity of tenure of service. One has to adapt oneself to the whims of the institution he serves or the whims of the managing people. Only at the top level there are certain high pay-scales. But how can we curb them? Is it feasible just now, when we are trying to develop the whole country industrially and otherwise? We have to take a realistic view of the whole problem. The moment we raise the standard of living by raising the per capita national income, that will be reflected in the pay scales, as I said. At the same time, I do not mean to say that the question of raising or bettering the lot of the lowly paid staff should be ruled out. That question is always before the Government and Government always looks into that question, and tries to solve the problem as much as possible. Therefore, the resolution that has been moved is rather not a practicable one, not a right approach. I would rather appeal to the Move to withdraw the resolution (*Interruption*).

Something has been said about the socialistic pattern of society. About the disparity of incomes, this cannot be solved by legislation or by fixing maximum or minimum. That can be done by fiscal measures. As a matter of fact, we have taken so many fiscal measures, one after the other, to bring about a really socialistic pattern of

society. We have already enacted the Estate Duty Act. We have raised the income-tax rates and now the Company Law Bill is there where we are just controlling the remuneration paid to the managing directors, managing agents etc. At the time of the Budget, the income-tax proposals showed that the rates of income-tax go higher and higher as we go up. Up to Rs. 4,200 there is nothing, but above that it ranges from 1.8 per cent to 87.4 per cent. So in order to bring down the disparity and to bridge the gulf, fiscal measures will be absolutely necessary and Government are taking all possible steps in that direction. I can assure the House that in each step it takes, the Government has this in view namely, whether it will lead to or bring about the socialistic structure of society which has been accepted as the goal of India by the Avadi resolution of the Congress and accepted by the Parliament and by the Government.

Therefore the appointment of a new Pay Commission will not solve the problem at all. That is my candid and frank view. The Government also feels that this is not the correct approach and, therefore, I would urge the hon. Members to take a realistic view, and not raise unnecessary expectations, because these are the financial implications. As I said, if only the Central Government employees' basic pay is increased to Rs. 100, it will mean about Rs. 28 crores. If you take the question of teachers all over the country it will mean about Rs. 38 crores more. If you take the question of States and local bodies then it will be still more. That will mean a few crores. If we take into account all these things it may be that about Rs. 100 crores will be required. Are we in a position to spare this Rs. 100 crores at this moment. Will it not be wise to spend this amount on developmental expenditure? Or is it wise to spend this amount this way? We should conserve all these resources for the successful implementation of the Second Five Year Plan in order to raise the standard of living of the citizens

of India. Therefore, I submit that we should view this question from this point of view having in mind the per capita income of the entire country. We should not press for this resolution at this moment.

Organised labour can just get what they want by negotiations or adjudication. About sweated labour, we have got some legislation—the Minimum Wages Act, etc.—and it is applicable to certain persons. About others also we are taking action to see that they get proper wages. Viewed from all these points, it will be clear to the hon. Member and this House that it is not a practical proposition to accept the resolution that has been moved by my friend, Shri D. C. Sharma, and I appeal to him to withdraw this resolution. I assure him and the House that the interests of the low paid staff are always before the Government and they would always try to see that their lot was bettered in all possible ways.

So far as housing is concerned, I may inform him that we are taking steps to provide houses to nearly eighty per cent of the clerical and other low paid staff. About medical facilities also, there is the Contributory Health Service Scheme which has been introduced, by which all the persons will get medical help. We have already done something to liberalise the pension benefits. Certain measures are also there about liberalisation of leave, and in so many other ways we are trying to better the lot of all these employees. It will be our earnest effort always to see that the lot of the low paid staff is bettered as much as possible.

So far as the highly paid are concerned, as I have said earlier, 57 is the number who are getting more than Rs. 3,000 because there are certain categories of persons who are entitled to get Rs. 4,000. Under the new scheme, for the head of the department we have agreed to the scale of Rs. 1800-2000. Post-1931 entrants will get only Rs. 2,250 for joint Secretaries

[Shri M. C. Shah]

as had been recommended by the Pay Commission. Our effort is to minimise the posts which get more than Rs. 3,000. But, at the same time, we must bear in mind one important factor—that we are spending crores of rupees on development, for which certain experts are required. By the end of the First Five Year Plan, we may have spent about Rs. 2,100 crores and we propose to spend about Rs. 5,000 crores in the next. Therefore, we will require certain people who will have to be paid some high pay.

A point was raised by an hon. Member about foreign technicians; now and then this point is raised. If it becomes absolutely necessary to have some foreign expert in order to develop the industry in our country, and if we have to pay him some high salary, we should not grudge because that industry will be in the best interests of the country, and only when it becomes absolutely necessary and we cannot do without a certain foreign expert we have to accept certain terms. So, I think the House will not be carried away by certain observations made by certain hon. friends on the opposite side that we are paying too high rates of pay to these foreign experts. Therefore, I do not think there is any justification for that. If we want to develop our country, then certainly we have to pay some price which is very little compared to the development of the entire country. Therefore, I will appeal to the hon. Member who has moved this resolution and the hon. Members who have moved amendments, to withdraw them in view of what I have stated and what I have tried to explain.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** The hon. Minister has stated that some officials have got to draw high salaries and it is necessary to pay them at that rate in view of the thousands of rupees which will be spent in connection with the Second Five Year Plan. May I ask whether the low paid employees like clerks and others who are not getting even Rs. 100/- are also not

going to do material work—I include the workers also—in connection with the implementation of the Second Five Year Plan. Is it not necessary that they should also be paid at the rate of Rs. 100 at least in order that the Plan may be made a success?

**Shri M. C. Shah:** I have already explained that the per capita income will be raised and the standard of living will be raised and these will be reflected in the pay structure of the low paid staff. What I stated was that when we develop our country, and have to create certain posts for certain heavy industries etc., is it not wise to pay something more to get the right type of men for the specialised jobs? No doubt we have to pay about Rs. 4,000 to certain ex-Secretary of State Service people and to certain pre-1931 entrants.

**Shri Kamath:** May I point out a news item which refers to Government's intention to appoint a wages commission? Is it correct or not?

**Shri M. C. Shah:** That refers to the Ministry of Labour; perhaps my hon. friend, Shri Kamath will address a question to the Labour Minister (Interruption).

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. He is not responsible for labour.

**Shri S. S. More:** Is it not a matter of collective responsibility?

**Mr. Chairman:** There is no question of collective responsibility in this. The hon. Members are now putting questions on labour.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** (Chirayinkil): On a point of order, Sir.

**Mr. Chairman:** First let us finish this point. This question should be addressed to the Labour Minister and not to Shri M. C. Shah.

**Shri S. S. More:** May I make a submission? On important occasions, all the Ministers are not present. When a particular business is taken up all relevant questions must be addressed



to the Minister who is in charge of the department and then it will be perfectly all right.

**Shri M. C. Shah:** I cannot reply to that question; the papers are not with me. *(Interruptions)*.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. These are extraneous matters.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** The hon. Minister appealed to us to be realistic and withdraw the resolution demanding the appointment of a commission. May I also appeal to him to be realistic above the purchasing power of Rs. 30 and Rs. 55 the basic pay of III & IV category Government employees.

**Mr. Chairman:** I am calling Shri D. C. Sharma; I will request him to finish within fifteen minutes.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** I thank all the hon. Members.....

**An Hon. Member:** Including the Minister?

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Except the Minister.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I thank all the hon. Members who have supported my resolution. I must say that the amendments which have been put forward are clarifications of that resolution and they fully support my resolution in the spirit. I have been able to understand everybody who have spoken on this question but there are two persons whom I have not been able to understand.

There was an hon. gentleman who said that the pay of these persons who are not paid adequately should be supplemented. I do not call them low paid or anything like that; such things do not hurt me or anybody. He said that the people whose pays were not very adequate should be given certain advantages in the domain of social welfare. They should get cheap houses. They should get medical help and other privileges; some allowance for the children's education should be given. I never said that they should

not be given these things. In fact in my opening speech I said that by pay I meant so many things. In fact I referred to the Pay Commission's report in which it is said that pay includes allowances etc. and I listed all the allowances that were given in the Pay Commission's report. I do not want to say that they should only be given a higher salary than before and that they should be deprived of the privileges which are given in a welfare State. I never said that, but I do not see any reason why a person should be averse to the enhancement of the pay of an employee, but should come forward and say that the employees should have certain allowances.

**An Hon. Member:** Who said that?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I do not want to mention names, but the differences may be hypothetical or may be theoretical. What I said was that pay includes not only salary but also allowances and, therefore, you have got to do something to level up the salaries of the persons who belong to so many departments. It has been said that it is a very complicated question. We, the Members of Parliament, are here to solve complicated questions.

**Shri Kamath:** And Government will solve simple questions!

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** We have not come here to solve simple questions. It is because the question is complicated, that I want a Pay Commission. If it had been a simple question, I would have put down my own formula which would meet the point. But this is a complicated question, and, therefore, I want a Pay Commission. It has been said that I have not adopted the right approach. I do not know what 'right approach' means. I think I have adopted the very right approach.....

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** That is very right.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Because I have drawn the attention of this House to the disparities that exist, I think I have adopted the right approach. If drawing the attention of the House to the disparity is not the right approach, I do not know what else is the right approach.

**The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi):** They consider the 'Leftist' approach to be the right approach.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I do not know what is 'Leftist' approach and what is 'Rightist' approach.....

**Shri Kamath:** 'Rightist' is wrong!

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I have made an approach which is in keeping with the Directive Principles of our Constitution, which is in keeping with the resolution of the Congress as my friend over there said, which is in keeping with the spirit of the new pattern of society that we are going to build up. If these things do not constitute the right approach, I do not know what the right approach means.

Again, I must say in all humility that we are in an adventure—the adventure of re-thinking the problems. We are all doing that. We have appointed the States Reorganisation Commission. Why have you done that? Why did you not say that the old boundaries of States should continue as before? We have done this because we want to re-think the problem. We have appointed the Law Commission. Why have you done that? Perhaps the Indian Penal Code could have existed for some more years, but we want to re-think that problem. We have appointed the Hindi Commission. We are appointing so many Commissions. We have had a Taxation Inquiry Commission. So, in India at this time a great deal of thinking is being done on all those problems which affect the country and the nation and I do not see any reason why we should not do some re-thinking on this problem too.

One hon. Member thought that he was speaking against my resolution, but really he was supporting me. He said that before the Pay Commission of 1946, the disparity between the lowest salary and the highest salary used to be 1 to 300. Then the Pay Commission was appointed in 1946 and the disparity was 1 to 80. I now say: "Reduce the disparity still further." If you want to do this in a scientific manner, the only way is to have a Pay Commission and in that case I am sure all these questions will be solved and all these difficulties will be removed. It has been said—I think I am quoting the hon. Member correctly—that it will cost Rs. 100 crores every year. It may be so, but I may tell you that we have got to tap new sources of revenue. We have got to find out new sources of income. What are those sources of income? There are so many evaders of income-tax in India at this time.

**Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada):** Let your next resolution be on that.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Everybody knows and we all know them, but we are helpless in finding out those income-tax dodgers. There are so many persons in this country who do not pay the income-tax which they ought to. They are always trying to short-circuit the Income-tax Department. Why do we not try to see that we get as much income-tax from them as it is necessary? I will not be giving away any secret if I tell the House that people have already found out ways of dodging the Estate Duty Act. They have found out ways.....

**Shri S. S. Nere:** Do they refuse to die?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Why cannot we do something in this matter?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** From death, I suppose.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Some persons can even dodge that. Those persons cannot dodge their death, but they are able to dodge their death duties. That is a very simple thing. Why is

our national income not increasing? I do not see any reason why all the persons in our country should not be participators in the joy of the enhancement of our national income.

**Shri Kamath:** The Second Five Year Plan is in the offing.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** We should do that and this joy should be spread evenly over all classes of our society—over the lowest paid people if I can call them as such, and over the highest paid.

Again there are certain persons who are drawing pensions. The Rajpranukhs are drawing very good pensions. Why do not they follow the example of our President who has surrendered his salary? If you apply your mind to the problem of finding funds, I think our Ministry of Finance would not be in such a great difficulty, but it is not being done in that way.

It has been said that some States have appointed Pay Commissions and that the salaries of teachers have been enhanced. Certain persons have received better salaries than before. My approach is that instead of doing this thing piecemeal, in an unscientific way and in a way which may leave certain ugly gaps here and there, we should do it in a scientific and studied manner, based upon facts and figures. We should take the overall picture into account and arrive at the results.

Now teachers have been given a better deal in some States. I know about Bihar where the teachers, who did not get adequate pay, threatened some kind of action and the Chief Minister of that State was so good as to say that the salaries of those persons should be increased, and it cost the State Rs. 12,00,000 a year. It is being done. But my point is that this should be done in a way which does not create in this country good States and other types of States, for in some States you may have one kind of wages and in another State you may have another kind of wages. I do not want that. Therefore, we should have a comprehensive approach

to this problem and that can be done by the Pay Commission.

I read in the papers this morning that a gentleman had come from Pakistan to find his buried treasure in a city in the Punjab. He was able to take about Rs. 30,000 from that buried treasure which was there. I read about it in the papers this morning. It is not only treasures that belong to people who had gone to Pakistan, but there are other things also. In India there are so many buried treasures and I think, if we could try to ascertain them, it will be possible for us to raise our economic position. I would, therefore, say that all these things need the appointment of a Pay Commission. It was said that a Pay Commission can be appointed only when you have economic stability. I think that India is at this time passing through a phase of economic stability. Our country is stable economically and if a gentleman says that India is not at this time economically stable I would say that he is saying something which very few people understand. India is stable economically and financially. We are forging ahead in every sense of the word and I do not think there is much economic instability. I think that one way of promoting economic stability, which is already there, is this: that the disparity in the salaries of persons should be levelled. The disparity should be abolished. We do want money for our Second Five Year Plan. Who denies that? But, if you increase the purchasing power of the people don't you think that you will be able to enable them to buy more goods? After all, we are going to lay emphasis on consumer goods in our Second Five Year Plan. If people are to buy consumer goods they must have money for that. You can give money to the people only if you enhance the purchasing power and to enhance the purchasing power you should increase the rates of salary. Therefore, I should say that by abolishing the disparity in the salaries existing in this country you are helping—not indirectly, but directly,—the fulfilment of the

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

objectives of the Second Five Year Plan. I, therefore, say that I commend this resolution to the House. I do not know what the mandate of my party would be.....

Shri Kamath: No manda.e.

Shri D. C. Sharma:.....but I think this resolution would be considered sympathetically and scientifically. If this is done I think this would do a lot of good to our country. With these words I commend this resolution to the House.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): May I ask the hon. Member for information as to what is his answer to the objections which have been raised by the hon. Minister? He has not mentioned that.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: He is not here.

Shri Tyagi: He does not disagree.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think I have referred to all the objections which have been put forward by the hon. Minister. The only thing I have done is this, that I have not mentioned his name.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's reply is very comprehensive. Now, I shall put the amendments to the vote of the House unless any hon. Member wants to withdraw and he has leave of the House to withdraw the same.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I would put the amendment of Shri Sinhasan Singh.

The question is:

"That in the resolution, for the words 'the highest salary and the lowest salary is reduced to the minimum' substitute 'the highest and lowest salaries be reduced to the ratio of 15 to 1'."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the amendment of Shri N. B. Chowdhury.

The question is:

"That in the resolution, for the words 'the highest salary and the lowest salary is reduced to the minimum' substitute 'the highest and lowest, salaries be reduced to the ratio of 10 to 1'."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now Shri Kamath's amendment.

The question is:

"That at the end of the resolution the following be added:

'and this House is further of the opinion that the minimum wage of an employee in the private as well as public sector should be one hundred rupees per month in terms of present prices'."

Those in favour may say "Aye".

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those against may say "No".

Several Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The "Noes" have it.

Some Hon. Members: No, the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those hon. Members who are in favour of this amendment may stand up in their seats.

Including Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani there are 24 Members.

Now, those who are against this amendment may stand in their seats. I see a large number.

So by an overwhelming majority the amendment is lost.

Shri Kamath: I ask for division, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have counted more than 32 and I say the amendment is lost by an overwhelming majority.

**Shri Kamath:** I want that the names of hon. Members who are for and against be recorded.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The name of Shri Kamath in whose name the amendment stands is recorded. The amendment is negatived.

*The motion was negatived.*

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

"That at the end of the resolution the following be added:

'by fixing a minimum of Rs. 100/- and a maximum of Rs. 1000/-.'

Those in favour may say "Aye".

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Those against may say "No".

Several Hon. Members: No.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The "Noes" have it.

Some Hon. Members: No, the "Ayes" have it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It means the same thing. I will again ask hon. Members to stand up. The number in favour is small. The amendment is negatived.

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now, I will put the original resolution to the vote of the House.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Sir, I withdraw my resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member when once he has introduced a resolution is not free to withdraw it as he pleases. The hon. Member must make a motion: "I beg leave of the House to withdraw my resolution".

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Sir, in view of the assurances that have been given...

**Shri Kamath:** What assurance? There was no assurance given.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** .....I beg leave of the House to withdraw my resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his resolution?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The only thing that I should do now is to put the resolution straight to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"This House is of opinion that a Pay Commission should be appointed to go into the question of the pay structure of the country so that the disparity between the highest salary and the lowest salary is reduced to the minimum."

The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes, 27; Noes, 69

Division No. 1]

AYES

[4-50 p.m.]

Chatterjee, Shri Tushar  
Chowdhary, Shri C. R.  
Chowdhary, Shri N. B.  
Das, Shri B. C.  
Das, Shri Sarangadhar  
Dashpande, Shri V. G.  
Gopalan, Shri A. K.  
Gupta, Shri Sadhan  
Gurupadaswamy, Shri M.  
215L.S.D.

Kamath, Shri  
Kripalani, Acharya  
Kripalani, Shrivasthi Sucheta  
Mascarene, Kumari Annie  
Mehta, Shri Asoka  
More, Shri S. S.  
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.  
Muniswamy, Shri N. R.  
Nayar, Shri V. P.

Randeman Singh, Shri  
Rao, Dr. Rama  
Rao, Shri P. R.  
Rao, Shri P. Subba  
Rao Shri T. B. Vittal  
Reddi, Shri Eswara  
Rishang Keishing, Shri  
Singh, Shri R. N.  
Veeraswamy, Shri

## NOES

Achuthan, Shri  
 Agarwal, Shri H. L.  
 Bhatt Darshan, Shri  
 Bhergava, Pandit M. B.  
 Bhergava, Pandit Thakur Das  
 Bhett, Shri C.  
 Bogawat, Shri  
 Borkar, Shrimati Anasayahi  
 Boroosh, Shri  
 Bose, Shri P. C.  
 Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri  
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati  
 Charak, Th. Lakshman Singh  
 Chatterjee, Dr. Nandlalalal  
 Chaturvedi, Shri  
 Chavda, Shri  
 Choudhuri, Shri M. Shashi  
 Das, Shri B. K.  
 Deb, Shri S. C.  
 Deshpande, Shri G. H.  
 Dube, Shri Mulchand  
 Dubey, Shri N. O.  
 Gandhi, Shri Poroo  
 Guha Shri A. C.

Heda, Shri  
 Hemkram, Shri  
 Hyder Hussain, Ch.  
 Jajwari, Shri  
 Jena, Shri Niranjan  
 Kajrokar, Shri  
 Karmarkar, Shri  
 Kasliwal, Shri  
 Khongmen Shrimati  
 Krishna Chandra, Shri  
 Lingam, Shri N.M.  
 Mishra, Shri R. C.  
 Mullah, Shri U. S.  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Mathew, Shri  
 Misra, Shri B. N.  
 Misra, Shri R. D.  
 Morarka, Shri  
 Natarajan, Shri  
 Nehru, Shrimati Shivarajni  
 Nayal, Shri  
 Patil, Shri Kanayade

Prabhakar, Shri Naval  
 Raghuramaiah, Shri  
 Ram Subbag Singh, Dr.  
 Ramasand Shastri, Swami  
 Ramaswamy, Shri P.  
 Rane, Shri  
 Reddi, Shri Ramachandra  
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sanganna, Shri  
 Sarmah, Shri Debeshwar  
 Sen, Shri P. G.  
 Singh, Shri T. N.  
 Sista, Shri Jhulan  
 Somana, Shri N.  
 Suresh Chandra, Dr.  
 Tek Chand, Shri  
 Thimmiah, Shri  
 Thomas, Shri A. M.  
 Tiwary, Pandit D. N.  
 Tyagi, Shri  
 Varma, Shri B. B.  
 Zaidi, Col.

The motion was negatived.

### STATE MONOPOLY OF FOREIGN TRADE

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that in order to implement successfully the Second Five Year Plan Government should immediately enforce State monopoly of foreign trade in commodities like jute, hides and skins, coconut, pepper, tea, cotton, rubber, manganese, mica, coal and other metallic ores".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that in order to implement successfully

the Second Five Year Plan Government should immediately enforce State monopoly of foreign trade in commodities like jute, hides and skins, coconut, pepper, tea, cotton, rubber, manganese, mica, coal and other metallic ores".

5 P.M.

It is now 5 o'clock. The hon. Member will continue his speech on the next occasion.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 13th August, 1955.