

Mr. Speaker: We are not observing that as a Parliamentary holiday; therefore we shall be working. And let us not continue our detention without the law being passed.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): In view of the extraordinary interest in this Bill and the large number of speakers likely to participate in the discussion, can there be some sort of a working arrangement for a time-limit for speakers?

Mr. Speaker: There, I shall be going by the sense of the House. If the House so desires we might have a rough and ready time-limit—we shall not be very strict. In view of the limited scope for discussion now, I think a limit of about 15 to 20 minutes may be put if the House is agreeable. Leaders of parties might have more time—it may be left to them as to what time they ask for. That is how I would suggest it. The result will be that, if such a thing is agreed to a larger number of Members will get an opportunity to speak—if it is not agreed to, in spite of the days we are allotting, a smaller number will get the chance.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The only consideration is that if it is left to the parties to allot time among themselves.....

Mr. Speaker: The parties may make their own arrangements and let me know. I shall be prepared to be guided by what the House desires in this matter.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): How long is this Session going to last?

Mr. Speaker: That will depend upon the hon. Members—the shorter and the more relevant the speeches, the earlier the end of the Session.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Shall we have to wait until the Preventive Detention Bill comes back from the other House?

Mr. Speaker: I think the House will have to, and taking that into consideration the other business such as Kashmir and the other two Bills which have been put in from the 7th onwards, the House may not be wasting its time. We shall see how things go. In any case this House cannot disperse before that Bill is disposed of in the other House.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Is it not necessary that the last date of the Session is fixed so that the Members may make their arrangements for departure?

Mr. Speaker: It is not competent for us to do so because we cannot set a

time-limit for the passage of this Bill in the Upper House. They are entitled to have their own time and they may have any time—we do not know what it is.

The Prime Minister and Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I know whether there will be any questions for tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: No, there will be no question hour for tomorrow. In fact, hon. Members might have noticed that when I extended the Session by three days in the first instance, it was not possible to allot any time for questions. That extension is being extended again, so there is no time now to give any notice for questions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think, Sir, on Saturday next we are also sitting in the afternoon?

Mr. Speaker: Tomorrow there will be an afternoon sitting, the day after tomorrow and on all the days that we are sitting now.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): You said there will be no question hour. What about Short Notice Questions, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: If there are any urgent Short Notice Questions they will certainly come in, but not the normal questions which are coming up and taking up one hour every day. Now the result of this will be that the House will be getting about five hours more. That means practically one day and in terms of the normal length of sittings up to now, that is in terms of hours, the Preventive Detention Bill will be coming up for 8½ days.

Now let us proceed to the other business.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MINISTERS BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of Ministers, be taken into consideration."

As there is a lot of misunderstanding on this question of salaries of Ministers in this House, as I notice from newspaper comments in the country, you will permit me to make for a very few minutes some general observations. I think that the basic principle in determining these salaries should be that it should be a salary on which a Minister

*Moved with the previous recommendation of the President.

[Dr. Katju]

should be able to live and discharge his duties in such a manner as the House may approve of. I do not think it is desirable, nor is it in the public interest that in assessing salaries we should expect that any Minister must of necessity feel it imperative to supplement his mode of living by drawing upon his private resources. That is not the object. We want that Ministers should be drawn from all classes of society, from among those who have got private means and those who have none. If we make it either a general rule or there is a sort of a mental reservation that Ministers, simply because they want to be Ministers, should feel it obligatory to draw upon their private resources in order just to carry on, then I submit we would be making a great mistake. I have known in the past many cases—at least one case I have known in which a gentleman who was held in great respect, a Taluqdar of Oudh, who was Home Member for five years who did not draw a single rupee as salary—this was in the British days—simply because from his zamindari he had an income of Rs. 22 lakhs a year and he had therefore no necessity.

I am making these remarks because in the amendments which have been tabled various figures have been mentioned. Now, after very great consideration the Government came to the conclusion that almost the minimum salary that should be allowed to a Minister, so that he might live in the standard of living which you expect of him, is Rs. 2250. Before I go further I should like to inform every Member of the House what exactly that means. In the Bill there is a provision that the Minister should also have a fully furnished House free of rent. Now, this amenity does not preclude him, so far as the income-tax department is concerned, from paying income-tax upon this amenity provided for him. I have got the figures checked and in calculating the income-tax, the cash salary and 12½ per cent. of the fixed salary in lieu of rent for the fully furnished residence taken into consideration the total sum comes to about Rs. 30,000 a year and.....

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Rs. 30,000 for all Ministers or for one Minister?

Dr. Katju: I really do not want to say anything in reply to this. I wish there may be a Bill saying that no Minister shall be paid any salary at all,

and then that observation would be justified.

Now, Sir, the net income-tax payable by every Minister on the proposed salary of Rs. 2,250 plus the fully furnished residence would be Rs. 481 per mensem and the net salary that he would get would be Rs. 1,700 and odd per mensem. I worked the figures out so that they might appeal to hon. Members more strongly. On a daily basis, it is exactly Rs. 59 per day. I understand that the daily allowance here is Rs. 40. I am not getting any allowance as a Member of Parliament. So I found that out. Now, for purposes of comparison, I must say that an hon. Member of Parliament gets Rs. 40 a day and the much envied Ministers get Rs. 59 a day. So far as the Deputy Ministers are concerned, they do not get any fully furnished residence.

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Dist.—South): Are you referring to the present Rs. 40 allowance or to the future one?

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Minister proceed uninterrupted.

Dr. Katju: I want the House to have full time for the Preventive Detention Bill. So, what is the good of interrupting me?

Now, Sir, so far as Deputy Ministers are concerned, their salary is Rs. 1,750 per month. They do not get any fully furnished residence.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: No, no. Under the Bill they will be entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is better to let the Minister proceed in his own way. Let us hear from him patiently all the facts he has to give before anyone interrupts him.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Even if his statement is against the Bill?

Mr. Speaker: Still, a patient hearing is his due. He may move some amendments later. Just now, he is only moving the motion for consideration.

Dr. Katju: According to my calculation, the poor Deputy Ministers get about Rs. 45 a day and their job extends for ten or eight hours a day extra. This is the salary and I ask the House to consider whether it is excessive. I am sure the House would agree that Rs. 59 a day is not an excessive sum. Ministers come from all parts of India—south, north, east and west. I suppose many of them have to maintain a double residence—a double home.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South—East): A double home in Delhi?

Mr. Speaker: He can proceed with his arguments without minding the interruption.

Dr. Katju: Really it is sometimes very difficult to follow the working of the minds on the other side. I request the House to consider me as an emblem of purity and austerity. When I used the words "double home", I said so deliberately. They have their families and children, some here and some living in their own places. Supposing there is a Minister from Tamil Nad, of course he will leave his children there in order that they may be educated in their mother tongue. Similarly, a Bengali Minister. He would not like to have his children educated here, because there is no pure Bengali of the Rāoindrānath style. It is in such cases that I said that they have to maintain a double establishment and then the cost of education is fairly high. I do not consider that every Minister should be about seventy-five years old or he should be as young as I am. We want middle-aged people who have responsibilities, daughters to marry, sons to educate, sons to settle in life and so on—all upon this salary. I should emphasise that point. Look at the cost of living. You the hon. Members of this House do not probably know this, because you are living—most of you—in Constitution House or Western Court, where everything is provided for you. But Ministers have to engage sweepers, cooks, bearers etc. and each item costs Rs. 80 or 90 a month. I say it is astonishing. Short of providing that anyone in India who has an ambition to become a Minister must render his services on a voluntary basis; this is the minimum that you can provide. Let us be quite clear about it.

And then I have not touched upon one other matter. I make no complaint about it, but in every province or State, whether it be Part A, Part B or Part C, where such Bills have been passed, they have been enacted as a matter of necessity that a motor car should be provided to every Minister at State expense and that it should be maintained at State expense. When I came to Delhi I thought that a motor car would be available as a matter of course. My astonishment was simply great, you know, when I was told that no motor car was provided. Having been fifteen years out of my profession, I naturally made enquiries as to which was the smallest car going in the market and I was told it was a four-seater and would cost Rs. 10,000. The maintenance of a car these days means Rs.

100 to Rs. 120 for the driver and Rs. 200 for actual running expenses. In the capital, i.e. New Delhi and Old Delhi combined, you cannot possibly do any job without a car. Members here are very fortunate. They live all around Parliament House and they can walk half a mile or a mile to reach it, but the poor Ministers have to go about here, there and everywhere and if they engage tongas that would consume five hours a day and if they keep motor cars that would consume Rs. 300 a month from this small salary. When some hon. Members have been kind enough to give notice of an amendment that a Minister should be paid Rs. 1,000 a month, I really do not know on what they would like the Ministers to live. They live on air. I know some of them do. It is a constant surprise to me to find that they are always flying by air and go from here to Berlin, Moscow or Peking. I receive applications for passport almost every day. It is a constant wonder to me on what they live. They represent the poor masses—the poor classes, the down-trodden labourers—and they live on air, they fly in the air. Where they get the funds from I do not know. There is no such fund available for Ministers here. Then comes in this thing of envy, namely, a house free of rent. People say, "Look at these Ministers. They are living in free furnished houses." Well, I am coming here after four years residence in one of the biggest homes in India. My friends know it. I do not want to call it a home—it is a house. So far as I am concerned, I live just in two rooms and if you give me a house here, I promise that I shall live in one room. If you do not give me a house here, probably I may go to a village and live in a hut to your inconvenience, because if I go ten miles away and live in Okhla, Ghaziabad or Mehrauli I shall be deprived of the pleasure of meeting hon. Members several times a day. Therefore, this house which is provided for Ministers is not done only for their convenience. I am not joking. I live just in one room. I need a house because Members of Parliament do me the honour of coming and seeing me. Visitors from all parts of India come. Where am I to receive them? I cannot receive them under a *pipal* tree. All sorts of people come and see me. I would like them to come in and sit and have a cup of tea with me in my house.

So, a freely furnished residence is not so much for the benefit of Ministers as it is for your benefit, so that you may sit in comfort there, not I. You cannot sit in my bed-room. You would not like to sit in a *toungue*. In that

[Dr. Katju:]

case I can live in a hostel, or the Constitution House. Can you carry on private conversations in the Constitution House?

Lastly, to my surprise, I find that hon. Members have taken the strongest objection to the medical treatment at the Wellington Hospital. I do not know what exactly they want. Do they want that they should not be treated in the Wellington Hospital? The Wellington Hospital is maintained for all Government servants. My hon. colleague to my left has started a scheme to which we are required to contribute. Let us not, therefore, treat this matter with hilarity; it is something serious. Look at the figures; look at the liabilities; look at the income-tax payment; look at the net income; look at the amount which a Minister must spend. I am not talking of hospitality. Really there is no provision for it. When I was in Calcutta, if I invited anyone to a cup of tea it cost me Rs. 3 or somewhere near that. If you give them rasgullas and all that, it will be more. Every rasgulla costs in Calcutta four annas and my hon. friends eat a lot. My experience of Calcutta is so recent and my affection for the people of that province is so great that I love them all. But in Delhi what is the salary? Rs. 1,769 net—Rs. 59 a day, on which you expect a Minister to purchase and maintain a motor car—please remember this. For that he may have to take a loan, if the Finance Minister agrees to give him such an advance. Supposing he is a Minister only for two years, then a second-hand motor car, with its value depreciated from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 5,000 is left in his hands.

Then he has to educate his sons, marry his daughters. Education of a girl is a pretty expensive proposition these days. What do you want us to do?

I will not take any more time of the House. I move.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

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

There are two amendments tabled to this. Mr. Velayudhan.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Scheduled Castes): Sir, I want to move...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are the names ready?

Shri Velayudhan: I shall give them after my speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The names must be mentioned in the motion and the names can be decided only after consultation with the Members, as to whether they are willing to serve on the Committee. I am afraid I will have to go to the next motion.

Shri Velayudhan: I am giving the names.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What are they?

Shri Velayudhan: One is yourself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. It is not such an easy matter as that. I cannot be asked on the floor of the House to serve on a committee, as if the hon. Member is making a grant of it to me. He must go to hon. Members and take their consent. It is very improper to suggest my name as if it is a grant of land or chunk of property given to me.

Shri Velayudhan: I would like to say one thing.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will not allow the hon. Member to proceed.

The names have to be mentioned in the motion itself; I am yet to receive the names.

I will now proceed to the next motion. Mr. Vallatharas. Has he got the names of hon. Members to serve on the Committee?

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai): I have not approached anybody. So far that has not been the practice. There have been occasions when the whips of the parties were allowed time to ascertain the names. Here all of a sudden this matter is sprung upon us.

I do submit to the ruling of the Chair, but what is the use of putting us in a difficult position for which there is no justification at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The point is this. In a non-contentious matter, where a Bill is referred to a Select Committee, the Chair may be a little indulgent. Here, when it is a matter of whether the Bill should at all be referred to a Select Committee, an hon. Member whose name the Member may suggest may not agree to be on the committee. We had a similar experience in the case of the Preventive Detention Bill. I would not like that story to be repeated. Each case has to be judged on its merits, and a deviation may be

made in exceptional cases, but generally the rules must be followed. So far as this case is concerned the names of Members willing to serve on the Select Committee must have been submitted to the Chair. As in neither of these cases it has been done, I cannot wait until the names of Members are gathered and their consent obtained. I am not going to adjourn this Bill. The House will proceed with the consideration of the Bill.

Shri Velayudhan: I have got the names ready.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What are they?

Shri Velayudhan: Shri More, Shri Sarangdhar Das, Shri Damodara Menon and Shri A. K. Gopalan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House has been indulgent to the hon. Member. He is not able to get even 4 or 5 names together.

Shri Velayudhan: I have got the names. I have read out the names.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Only 4 names. What is the quorum?

Shri Velayudhan: The quorum is one.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the date by which the report of the Select Committee has to be made? (*Inter-ruption*) Order, order. There is no meaning in going on like this. I will not allow these motions. Both these motions are ruled out. The discussion on the consideration of the Bill will go on.

Shri Sarangdhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): On a point of information.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order. order. The point of information may be relegated to a later time. There is no point of order.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): Left to myself. I would have opposed the provisions of this Bill not on the ground that the salary is too high, but on the ground that the salary is too low. I have experience of the cost of living in Delhi. I can very confidently say that the salary which is provided for in this Bill is far too inadequate. It is quite possible that hon. Ministers have their own other sources of income. It may be landed property or something else. Otherwise they would not be prepared to be on the salary which is proposed in this Bill. I should submit that at the end of the term of these Ministers, they will have to leave Delhi with a heavy debt. I submit that it is simply impossible for a Minister to

live on the inadequate salary which has been provided in this Bill. The Ministers have various sorts of obligations. They have to entertain guests and they have to entertain their fellow workers. Whenever fellow workers come from the mofussil, they naturally expect that the Minister would be able to provide them with shelter and food. I know of my own Deputy Minister from Assam who is on a very poor salary. He has been living on this poor salary for the last 2 years. What has been the result? He had to give up his lucrative work and he has been living on this poor scale, but at the same time he has to entertain a large number of guests from time to time from Assam. People come to him from Assam which is a distant place; they cannot afford to live anywhere else. Naturally they go to the Ministers or to the Members of Parliament. I ask: how can a Minister provide for these people who come to stay with him? He will have to make a declaration that henceforward no one should expect any hospitality from him.

10 A.M.

We as Members of Parliament are getting Rs. 40 a day but a Minister will be getting even a lesser emolument than that. Even the Members do not find it possible to live within the allowance they get. They have to live away from their relations and friends and they manage it somehow. The city of Delhi is very expensive. It is like New York. Even London is much cheaper than Delhi. A hotel meal in London costs only Rs. 1-4-0. I would, therefore, appeal to hon. Members not to oppose the provisions of this Bill. I feel that it looks very unfriendly. If I was not subject to party discipline, I would have opposed this Bill on the ground of the inadequacy of the salary. Now I cannot do so because the Ministers might have discussed this matter amongst themselves and they must have come to the conclusion that they ought to make some sort of sacrifice. I have gone and seen the hon. Prime Minister at 12 o'clock at night at his residence. He is working at his desk from morning till late at night. Is it fair for the Members of this House to reduce the salaries of Ministers? I would appeal with all the emphasis at my command and ask hon. Members not to oppose this Bill. If Ministers accept the existing salaries, they may do so because they may have their own resources but you must have a reasonable standard for a minister's salary. I shall have that reasonable standard according to my experience. I appeal to my hon. friend, Dr. Mookerjee not to oppose it. He knows the cost of living in Delhi. He may have other

[Shri R. K. Chaudhury]

sources of income. He may have drawn upon his brothers. He very well knows the number of guests he had been feeding. The poor relations of a Minister think that one of their kith and kin had become a Minister. They come to see Delhi. I have seen in his house dozens of people living for an interminably long time. He now comes forward and pleads for a lesser salary for the Ministers. Unless there are other sources of income a Minister would become a heavy debtor and within six months after the termination of his office a suit will be instituted in the court against him and if he does not appear, an *ex parte* decree will be passed against him.

The hon. Prime Minister said at one time that he had to bring some money from his home. He may have some other resource, but we must not judge every other Minister according to this. He must be judged by the standard of the poor Assam Minister. I submit that the salary of Rs. 2,250 which the Deputy Minister from Assam is getting is not sufficient for him. I appeal both to opposition Members as well as the Ministers to fix a reasonable standard for all Ministers so that they may not borrow money from others. By doing so, they place themselves under an obligation; it may be an obligation to a friend or it may be otherwise, but it is an obligation all the same. It may be that he may discharge that obligation by giving a Government favour. I think that sometimes he may be tempted to do so because we are giving him such an inadequate salary. When the Ministers have themselves agreed to reduce their salaries, let us not quarrel over this point. Let them be quite content with their salary but I feel that we must give them a reasonable status. Supposing the hon. Home Minister decides to go back to Calcutta and start practising, his successor will not be able to manage on the salary that he is getting now. Therefore I submit that the scale of salaries should not be decided according to the position of the present Ministers; it must be decided according to the requirements of the Ministers, and with reference to the hospitality that the Ministers have necessarily to extend. Otherwise, they will be considered rude and mean in their constituencies. A reasonable scale has to be fixed. I submit that the scale now fixed along with the other amenities which seem to have been provided is quite reasonable. I most emphatically protest against the lowering of the scale of salary for the Deputy Ministers. The salaries must be uniform and if possible an amendment

should be made making the salary of the Deputy Ministers equal to the salary of the Ministers.

An Hon. Member: What about Members?

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I am sorry the question of allowances for Members has been brought into this Bill by the hon. Home Minister. The hon. Home Minister has to remember that a Member has to pay a monthly rent for the telephone; I have to pay it; it may be in arrears; it will be adjusted some time. For furniture, he has to pay Rs. 27 or 34.

Some Hon. Members: Forty rupees; fifty rupees.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: He has also to pay for the flower beds which are in some public place. He has got to pay for other services. I do not know what those other services are; perhaps they are of a confidential nature.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; the hon. Member thinks evidently that this is a Members' Allowance Bill. He need not go into the details with regard to Members' allowances.

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): It was raised by the hon. Home Minister and the question has to be answered.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A comparison was made with the total amount. Let him take rupees 45 or 50 and compare.

Shri Syammandan Sahaya: He feels prevention is better than cure.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I am only answering that question. We will stay here for six months. Some of us have got to keep the houses for the whole year round. Otherwise, for some reason, the house may be taken away. We have to pay the water tax, and other taxes. Our earning is stopped. If a Member is a lawyer, he cannot take up any case. So, there is no comparison with the Members' Allowances and if any comparison lies, it should lie in favour of the Members. I shall speak about it later on.

I would appeal to the hon. Members in the Opposition not to press their amendment for a further reduction of the salaries. I only submit that in pressing the amendments, they will show no respect for the dignity of the House and the dignity of the Ministers. After all, the dignity of the Ministers is the dignity of the people of this country. The people of the country should place the Ministers in a proper position

so that they may not worry about anything else except the work of the office and service to the country. The Opposition must remember that they will feel sorry for what they are doing now for the reduction of the salary of the Ministers. If any Member of the Opposition were to come into power, if he holds any power, he will find that he cannot carry on with the salary that he now wants to fix for the Ministers and then he will have to bring forward a Bill for the increase of salary, which would look very selfish on their part. Therefore I again and again repeat,—I hope the House will excuse me and I appeal to all sections of the House—my appeal to the Opposition not to create an unseemly sight by insisting on their amendment.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I am sorry that the object with which these amendments have been moved, the principles underlying them, have not been understood and the Home Minister in his usual way, even before saying the principles underlying the Salary Bill, looked at this side and said they are living on air, they are going by aeroplanes, and actually he showed his first anger. What I have to appeal to the Ministers is that that is not the case. We do not live on air; we do not want you to live on air also. What we say as far as the salary of the Ministers is concerned is this. We will never object to a salary of even 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000. There are certain principles on which we have based these amendments and I want the hon. Ministers and other Members to understand them.

It is not the case of our saying that everybody should have a salary of only rupees 50, or 100. What we say is, all people in this country including the hon. Ministers should live happily and the standard of living of the people must be improved. But, considering the position in the country today, unfortunately, we have not been able to raise the standard of living of the people. As we see in the country today,—that is at least what I have witnessed—the general psychology of the man is, when he starves, he looks at other people who are happy and he always envies them. In the country today, because the Government had not been able to solve the problems of the people, they look at the Ministers and other officers and say, look at these people, how they are living, why should they have so much money when we are all starving. Not only the ordinary people, but even small salaried officers who are getting Rs. 45, 50, 100 or 200, the NGOs look at the Ministers and feel dissatisfied.

They say, when we are getting only Rs. 100 or 200 or 500, the Ministers are getting more than what is necessary. They compare the salaries and say, why the Ministers cannot have only double of what we get. The Ministers also get free medical facilities. Every one must get free medical facilities. We have not given any amendment saying that the families of the Ministers should not be given free treatment. My opinion is that they must be given. My opinion is also that all those small salaried people, peons, clerks, officers and all of them must be given these facilities. I am certainly not against free medical facilities for the Ministers. We have nothing personally against the families of the Ministers. We do not want them to be laid up. We want free treatment to be given to them. But, the principle on which this free treatment is given to the families of the Ministers should be extended to others. There are those who get Rs. 200 and they have to spend at least 50 or 60 or 70 rupees to go to the hospitals. Not only that; there are many Secretariat officers drawing Rs. 200 or 300 who do not even get admission to the hospitals. What will be the condition of these people? How will they feel? We have to take into consideration that, especially today in our country.....

Dr. Katju: May I just intervene for a minute. My learned friend, the hon. Member may be informed that every single Government servant, whether he be a clerk or a chaprasi or an officer is given free medical attendance in the Willingdon Hospital. He had better ask Dr. Mookerjee.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am not talking of Delhi; I am talking of the whole of India; I say generally. I do not say about what is done here. I have seen a number of hospitals in many places where officers have gone and have had to pay for special class. They have had to pay Rs. 2 a day. I am not talking of Delhi and the Willingdon Hospital.

Dr. Katju: They are allowed medical facilities everywhere in every Government hospital.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I have been in a Government hospital for five days in a special ward. They have to give Rs. 2 per day, whether one is a Government servant or not. But for a Government officer, there is another ward. There also he has to pay some money. No Government officer would be treated without paying anything. If all the Government officers and their families

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

get free medical treatment, it will be good. I do not know whether it is done, but the Minister says that all over India Government officers get such treatment. I do not know who are included in the category of officers. Does it include even the poor clerks and others and their families? Are they given free medical treatment? My knowledge is they are not. If they are given, it is a good thing.

The Home Minister proudly says that he belongs to the Congress Party. In 1932 the Congress passed a resolution at Karachi that the maximum salary of a Minister should be Rs. 500. They say it may be Rs. 500 or Rs. 1,000, but I want to ask what is the principle on which the Congress passed the resolution that the maximum must be Rs. 500. The principle is that certainly when the Congress came to power, they should still be prepared for some sacrifice, and make the people understand that they are doing work not for the salary, for the sake of mere money, but for the sake of the country, for the sake of the people. If it is for the high work that is done by our hon. Home Minister, then I say not even this Rs. 2,200 is enough for the cleverness and intelligence he has to use for bringing the Preventive Detention Bill and so many other Bills. Certainly Rs. 10,000 must be paid. I only want to ask: are you getting the salary for the work you are doing? If it is so, then the Congress Ministers are like the Britishers or some officers in Government getting salary for their work. I will withdraw the amendment if you say: "I want to be paid for my work according to my intelligence, ability and capacity; I am turning out so much work, I must be given so much". What I thought was that the Congress Ministers today are working for the sake of the people, because the Congress has been saying that they have been doing so for the last so many years, and that their two principles were non-violence and sacrifice. The Congress said so, so that the people may understand them and have confidence in them. They thought that when they came to power they must make the people understand that they were not there because they wanted higher salaries than the Britishers, but because they wanted to help the people. The people will not say that the Ministers should not have houses, or that they should not have food. There must be confidence that the salary that is drawn by the Ministers today is very low, and the people must say that they must take more. Today the position is not like that. And the Minister eloquently said: "See what poor salary

we are getting". He said these people are getting Rs. 2,250/- and they have to meet so much expenditure. What are the other items? And if really money is paid, how much will they have to spend? Take item by item. As far as Ministers' houses are concerned, I think if they are given out for rent, you will have to pay Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000. Then there is another allowance, Clause (5), Sumptuary allowance to Ministers. If no visitors come, then the allowance will be for the Ministers themselves, and not for the visitors. This is Rs. 500/-. Then there is Rs. 2,250/- salary, and another Rs. 1000/- for house, and medical treatment for the Minister and his family. There are so many diseases, and where they want treatment, it will come to another Rs. 500/-. Besides this, there is travelling allowance and daily allowance to Ministers. I do not know about the Central Ministers, but I know about Madras Ministers. Even when they have the Assembly Session, they are travelling, and the Minister belonging to my part of the country had drawn the biggest travelling allowance—Rs. 5,000 within three months. It may be that Central Government Ministers do not travel much but considering the travelling that has been done for the last one month—we know that the Food Minister had to travel throughout India. He went to Bengal, Bhopal and so many other places. If the travelling allowance is added, that will also come under expense.

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): The Ministers do not get any travelling allowance at present. They get the actual expenditure they incur in travelling.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: So they have no expenditure for that. That is what I say. I do not say he is getting anything from it. I only say he has no expense to incur by travelling. He must pay rent for the House. That is there. Then medical expenses and food. I do not know whether there is any other expense for an ordinary man.

As far as travelling allowance is concerned, it is provided:

"travelling allowances for himself and the members of his family and for the transport of his and his family's effects"

"travelling and daily allowances in respect of tours undertaken by him in the discharge of his official duties, whether by sea, land or air."

They get their travelling allowance and daily allowance. They are given

free medical treatment. They are given free houses, furniture and other things. So, this Rs. 2,250 or whatever it is is only for their pay. So what I have to say is that at least if these allowances of the Ministers are cut short, the people will feel that the Ministers are also making sacrifices though they have not been able to raise the standard of living of the people immediately.

As I said the Karachi resolution was passed by the Congress to show to the people that the Congress Ministers will continue to sacrifice, even after coming to power. It is not the amount, Rs. 50 or Rs. 100, but it is the principle that is important. I know the Ministers have to keep up their position. As far as I am concerned before I came here as a Member of this House, I was only wearing simple dress. It is only now that I am wearing this kind of dress. That is necessary even on our part. When I go to my place, I wear only simple dress. I had been living within Rs. 30, without food for days just as the Congress friends on the other side had sacrificed. When you come to power you should keep up that spirit. You must see that the spirit is such, and the salary is such that the ordinary man feels that the Ministers and others are also sacrificing. When we are unable to raise the pay of the lower employees, certainly they feel discontented, and a mere cut of Rs. 10 or Rs. 20 is not enough. They will say this is nothing. What we want is a drastic cut and the Ministers have to tell the people and also the officers and others, we have done this not because the salary is sufficient for us, we will hardly be able to live within it, but we have done this for the sake of the country, for the sake of the people. We are trying to raise the standard of the people, and we know that we will be able to do it only in course of time, but before that in order to convince the people that their sacrifice is shared, the Ministers should cut their salaries. In order to show to the people that although they are Ministers, they are also the ordinary people, and that they have also come from the people, it is necessary that they make a drastic cut in the salary, so that they can get the confidence of the people.

In my amendment also, I have not said anything against the provision of free houses. I also say that free houses must be given, free medical treatment should be given and so on. But I have said something against the sumptuary allowances. If a person goes to a friend's house, ordinarily nobody charges anything for entertaining him. If tea parties cannot be given, at least

some water parties, or some lime-juice parties may be given, and the Ministers can say 'We are not getting any sumptuary allowance from the Government, so we can only give you lime-juice or something like that.' Even supposing a Minister does not invite anybody for any parties, then also the sumptuary allowances go to that Minister. There is no account saying that 'I have invited 10 people or 15 people, I have given them so much of coffee or tea or other things.' So, whether any parties are given or not, this sumptuary allowance goes over to the Minister, full Rs. 500, even though he might have actually spent some Rs. 100 or Rs. 50 only. So the total emoluments for a Minister are Rs. 2,250, plus Rs. 500 sumptuary allowance, plus Rs. 750 or Rs. 1,000 towards house and furniture, plus Rs. 500 worth of medical expenses, on an average per month, plus a daily allowance of Rs. 30, which will come to about Rs. 1,000 per month,—all this will come to about Rs. 5,000. In spite of this, they say they have made a voluntary cut and reduced the salary to only Rs. 2,250. What we are saying is that a further reduction may be made in the salary only, not in the rent, not in any other thing, but only in the salary. So I appeal to the Ministers to make a drastic cut in their salaries, so that they can set a very good example to the officers and others, and also to the people at large, and say to them, especially the people who are starving, the poor policemen and others who ask for more pay: "Look here, we have ourselves made a sacrifice by reducing our salaries, so you can also make a similar sacrifice for one or two years, we are trying to raise the standard of living of the people. When that is raised, you can also have more pay, then we can also have more pay." But till then, the difference between the income of the people and that of a Minister should not be very much. Considering the situation in the country, if the Ministers make a reduction in their salary, the people will understand that some real changes are being made; otherwise if a token cut is made, they will only say that so far as the actual expenditure is concerned, there is not much reduction to talk about. I once again appeal to the Ministers to make a cut in their salaries, in order that they can gain the confidence of the people. Difficulties there may be, but they will have to face these difficulties, in order that they can convince the people that they are working for the sake of the good of the people.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): The hon. House will agree that the evidence

[Shri Gadgil]

of an ex-Minister is the most relevant in the discussion of to-day. The principles on which the salary is fixed are generally in relation to the office, the character of work discharged and the average needs of the incumbent. Obviously this is a political office and we cannot take into consideration those factors which are very relevant when we lay down the pay structure of officers who are in permanent service of the country. The character of this office is two-fold. First, the Minister has to work as an administrator. The other aspect of his office is that he is a political leader to some extent and has to keep contact with the political workers and the political spheres in the country. The average needs of such a person are slightly different from a person who is in the permanent service of the republic. These needs undoubtedly include an element of subscription to party funds and to various other ancillary activities which the parties carry out, plus the expenses of the election, past and the future to come. I do not want to suggest that all these elements should be fully taken into consideration, but when we are considering the salary of a Minister, all that I humbly urge is that these considerations are not irrelevant.

Having made this preface, I shall just describe briefly my own experience from the 15th August 1947 to the morning of 13th May 1952, when I was to my own satisfaction relieved from the captivity of this office. On the 15th August 1947, when I was asked by the Deputy Prime Minister Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel to go and occupy No. 26, Ferozshah Road, New Delhi. I was simply struck dumb and I requested him to give me a smaller house, although I did not realise what it financially meant to me to keep a house with 28 rooms and 134 light points. Sardar Patel in his characteristic way said: "Look here, my boy, you have lived

enough in jail अभी महल में रहो But it proved not a Mahal but more than a jail, Sir. On the 15th August 1947. I also visited our elder statesman Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar for his blessing. With his long and varied experience, he quietly asked me, "Look here, Gadgil, have you any margin with you apart from this office?" I told him that there was nothing else to fall back upon. Then he said, "Even this Rs. 5,500 will not be sufficient for you." I simply laughed at it, but I realized in the course of a year or two that there was great truth in what Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar told me. This luxury of Rs. 5,500 salary was a three months' won-

der. By the end of December, the salary Bill was passed, and from the 1st January 1948, the salary was reduced to Rs. 3,000 and an extra allowance of Rs. 500 for a Cabinet Minister. Although the salary for the previous months was Rs. 5,500 on paper—I was one of those fortunate who had not any other income, and who had done nothing by way of business, nor had I piled up any amount worth the name in my profession, and so I had actually no other income which could be taxed on the scale applied to the higher income slabs—I actually got Rs. 3,100 or thereabouts, for the four months, September, October, November and December. But when the salary Bill was passed, and it came into operation on the 1st January 1948, the salary was reduced to Rs. 3,000 subject to income tax, plus Rs. 500 sumptuary allowance. And I can assure this House that most of us religiously spent this Rs. 500 on entertaining Members of Parliament, friends and other guests, and so far as I am concerned, you have only simply to refer to Mr. Shashi Ram, the caterer, and you will find that this is amply borne out. Leaving aside this Rs. 500 allowance, after deducting income-tax, I actually got about Rs. 2,100 or so. Then in October 1949, the Cabinet decided to have a voluntary cut and the salary came down to Rs. 2,500, when I actually got Rs. 1,810 or so. Now the salary is sought to be reduced to Rs. 2,250. From August 1947, up to the present date, the prices have been increasing, while the salaries have been decreasing. We started with Rs. 5,500, and now the hon. Home Minister comes with a very modest proposal, in my humble opinion, for a salary of Rs. 2,250.

Now, Sir, other amenities. I shall deal with them—what the other amenities were. There was a clause for a free furnished house after the first of January 1948 when the new Salaries Bill was passed. It was interpreted by the permanent services that free furnished house meant that only Mali's pay would be paid by the Government, the rest of it must be borne by the occupant. That meant an expenditure of about Rs. 100 per month—on sweeper and other items. Then, Sir,—of course I was responsible for it—power used for heating water had to be paid for. Only light and fan, whatever power was consumed by these, that was paid by the Government. Then as regards refrigerator, it is a sad tale so far as I am concerned, for in the course of 4 years and 9 months at the rate of Rs. 40 I paid Rs. 2,280. With that sum I would

have purchased at least two refrigerators. Then as regards air conditioning, only one room had been air-conditioned in each Minister's bungalow and in the first year the charges came to Rs. 153 per month for 6 months. I was completely frozen and discarded the whole thing for the remaining three years because I could not afford. Now consider Rs. 153 a month—in some bungalows the charges come to Rs. 213—that was the complaint of my friend, Dr. Syama Prasad; I am sorry even in office I could not oblige him though I am quite willing to oblige him now. Then there is a scale of scheduled furniture and some Ministers, not knowing that there was a strict Works Minister, asked for more furniture and I said: "No, you must pay for the extra furniture or certify to me that it was necessary for the proper and efficient discharge of duty". They could not honestly do so. Therefore, they had to pay and will have to pay for the extra furniture that they may require.

Then reference was made to travelling allowance. There has been considerable misunderstanding. In these four years and nine months I did not get a copper coin for travelling allowance. The procedure is: if I want to travel by special train,—I had to do it once—I had to requisition and then the train was ready; if I had to engage a chartered plane.....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I spoke about daily allowance.

Shri Gadgil: I will come to it. Do not be in a hurry. If I had to go by a chartered plane, the same thing applies; if I had to go by a saloon the same thing applies and if I had to go by a coup—to be assaulted—it was the same procedure. Not one copper coin—I want to assure my friend, Shri Gopalan, and I am sure he has still an open mind—in these four years and nine months, not one copper coin I got.

Then daily allowance. The rule was that you could draw Rs. 30 per day. As far as I know, most of us did not draw at all and some of us who drew, drew it at the rate of Rs. 15 or the actual expenditure whichever was greater. Probably we do not know the worries of a Minister in office. If he visits another province or stays at Government House or stays somewhere else, you will be surprised to know that he has to pay—I am sorry to say—tips for more than what he gets by way of daily allowance if he chooses to draw. Then I know it to my cost, and I ask hon. Members to believe it, that even out of this no Minister has ever made even a copper coin. Now with the

proposal of Rs. 2250, after deducting the income-tax you will have hardly Rs. 1,600 left. Then deducting Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 on maintenance of car and depreciation and so on, you will hardly have Rs. 1200 to Rs. 1300 left, which is as much as a Member of this House draws. Then as regards car, I have also a sorrowful tale to tell. I got an advance of Rs. 9,000 from the Finance Department and I promised to pay them in 18 instalments of Rs. 500. I thought it was a good bargain; there was nothing in the agreement that I was to pay interest. Then the car was hypothecated to the President of the Union, so that I could not sell it and make money even if I wanted to do that. When I paid the 18 instalments, I thought I was out of this bargain, but the bill for the subsequent month came—Rs. 394 for interest. Such are the greedy and Argus-eyed officers of Mr. C. D. Deshmukh's department!

Then the question was raised as regards the standard of life of the general population remaining where it is. But if you merely go by the monetary increase in their emoluments, what they used to get in August 1947 and compare it with what they get today, if you just move on those lines, you will find that Rs. 2250 is at least 50 per cent. less than what on this principle they would be entitled to have. I should say this gesture is really genuine. Now, I want to ask hon. Members in all fairness to compare what our Ministers here in the Centre get with what corresponding persons in authority get in other countries. Total up everything, what they get in cash and what they get in the way of supply of facilities, and I have no doubt you would come to the conclusion that what our Minister gets is not more than but what is relatively fair. It is true, no doubt, that the Government should make a gesture. They have already made a gesture from Rs. 3000 to Rs. 2250. What would be the saving, after all? If assuming we accept the proposal of my esteemed friend, Mr. Gopalan, what would be the saving and how is it going to help raise the standard of living of the people. I think his sympathy is undoubtedly genuine. I do not want to challenge the *bona fides* of my friend, Mr. Gopalan, but I do feel that although it is the business of the Opposition to oppose always, occasionally reasonableness is not certainly out of place. So he has to consider the dignity of this office. Ten years hence they may come here and some of us—if we are alive—may go over to the other side. I promise him in those circumstances if you bring a Bill of that char-

[Shri Gadgil]

acter, I shall at least not oppose (An Hon. Member: you will not be allowed to oppose). The character and dignity of the office you should consider. Do you want your Minister to go on a bullock-cart in Delhi which is known to be a city of distances? And there are so many engagements, social and others, which he cannot escape; it will be impossible.

Now, as regards sumptuary allowance, Mr. Gopalan said "you should have water party" (Interruption). I was not present at yesterday's dinner and from what I read in the morning papers, his associate Professor Mukerjee, in fact pleaded that there should be more and more of such occasions. If that is so, if the purpose of giving sumptuary allowance.....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: They gave it not at the expense of Government; they gave at the expense of those who were there.

Shri Gadgil: We are individuals also. Suppose Mr. Gopalan goes to the house of Dr. Katju—I hope he will call on him one of these days—and if he merely talks over matters, there will be such a formal atmosphere, but a cup of coffee and a rasgoola or two immediately break the ice and there is a heart-to-heart talk. After all.....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: If he gives out of Government money, I will say, I do not want; if he is ready to sacrifice his money.....

Shri Gadgil: After all it is said that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach. I would just adapt it and say that if you want to establish a sort of comradeship between two opposing parties the best place is a restaurant or a club with the tea table standing between them. I assume that we are agreed on certain fundamental categories—otherwise there is no meaning in constitutional agitation or belief in constitutional propriety or conduct. We are agreed that whatever changes we want in the life of the community or for the matter of that in the fundamentals of the Constitution, those changes will be brought about according to the provisions of the Constitution. That is the fundamental category on which we are agreed. And if we are not agreed, then most humbly I suggest that those who do not agree have no place in this country. Similarly, the republican character of our Constitution is a fundamental category on which we are agreed. There are certain fundamental categories on which agreement is necessary before parliamentary institutions can function.

So, these are matters for consideration. Tomorrow Opposition may be in office. After all is this a big sum? Or, if you insist that Ministers should have less, then even if they always live according to a standard as austere as some of us have been living, is it suggested that those who have got a little more should part with it? Is socialism a private virtue or is it a programme, an ideal which has got to be concretized through proper constitutional channels? I should therefore very respectfully ask the Members of the House: What is the good of suggesting Rs. 1,000? Out of that Rs. 300 will go by way of income-tax and another Rs. 400 on account of motor car maintenance. Do you want a Minister of Bharat, a country with a population of thirty-six crores, playing a leading part in world politics, do you want a Minister of such a country going about with Rs. 300 a month?

Dr. Katju: On air.

Shri Gadgil: I think it is absurdity *par excellence* and I am sure no Member will go to that extent. I therefore respectfully urge this for the consideration of those Members who have tabled amendments and would say that they would be extremely reasonable in withdrawing them and showing a spirit which is very appropriate.

Shri Velayudhan: As I was listening to the speech of the hon. Home Minister I was reminded of the salary of a Minister suggested by Gandhiji many years ago. That suggestion of Gandhiji was accepted in Madras at the time but it was not accepted by some Provinces or by some Ministers. It was an idea which was set up by Gandhiji at the time, but I would humbly submit that times have changed a lot and in my opinion it would be very difficult for a Minister or even for a Member of Parliament to live on that amount. After my graduation when I was working in the Harijan Sevak Sangh, I was asked to receive Rs. 6 a month. That was the amount fixed by Gandhiji and I have drawn at that time Rs. 6 per month but at the same time I was provided with a set of clothes which I used to wash myself. Now when I remember those days I think that was perhaps the happiest moment I had in my life.

Today times have changed and things have become complex and expenses have become high. We are now living in a different India altogether. I am sorry to say, I completely disagree with my friend, Mr. Gopalan when he says that a Minister should live on Rs. 1,000 per month. That is my personal

opinion. Today circumstances have changed, cost of living has gone very high. When we fix a salary it is not on the basis of an ideal or a theory that we do so—we decide it on the basis of expediency, convenience and environment, and on the whole it is common-sense that decides these things. When I read the Bill and now when I heard the hon. Home Minister, I thought it was a proper and reasonable arrangement that the Treasury Benches have made. Even we, Members of Parliament, are daily getting letters that we should send so much to this organisation and so much to that, so much to this relative and so much to that relative, simply because they think we are drawing Rs. 40 per day even though they know that Parliament does not sit on all the 365 days. There is another big misunderstanding amongst the public. They think that we are living in rent-free houses and that we are also given free conveyance. That is the impression not only among the poor people but also among the educated classes. I myself was under the impression that the Central Ministers would be getting free cars from the Government just as the Ministers in the States do. But one or two months ago when I had an occasion to get into a car with a Minister I asked him how much it had cost and when he had purchased it, he said it was bought by his own money and not purchased by the Government and that in the Centre every Minister will have to purchase his own car. My opinion is that a Minister should be given a State car and he should not be made to spend for it. Why does he come here? He comes here not for his own purpose—he wants to serve the nation. I speak so from this side without jealousy and discontentedness. Tomorrow I also want to get into the Treasury Bench. I am not jealous of Ministers or Members of Parliament drawing some money. It is a different question if they are in power today. But the salary question should be looked at from a different angle. Gandhiji looked at it from a different angle when he said it should be Rs. 500. He wanted to have a society which was much less complex, much less costly, and he went on the basis of non-violence. We all accepted that principle at the time but we have failed to carry out it so far. Nor do I think we are going to adopt it whether it is Congress that is in power or some other party. About the principle behind the salary question, I may say that today a Member of Parliament, or for that matter even a Minister, is the most hard hit person. As far as I am concerned, I may say that last year when I was a Member

of the former House I had not only my allowance as Member but as my better half was also a Member here, it came to Rs. 80 daily and at that time it was a big income—it was a double income. But when I left Parliament last year I had hardly Rs. 2,200 in the bank.

● **Sardar Hukam Singh** (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Your wife must have had a separate account.

Shri Velayudhan: No. Actually I had no bank account—she had it. It is a fact, it can be verified by anybody. And Delhi is a very costly place. Before I became a Member here I was having a car. I was getting a salary of Rs. 600 to 700 as Information Officer of the Government of India. In fact, what I did when I became a Member of Parliament was that I sold the car because I found it very difficult to maintain a car with such an uncertain income. For example, the Parliament is over and it will not be summoned for two months. I will always be thinking when the next session will commence because I have no other income. I am not doing any business. Nor am I doing any journalistic work. I do not belong to a rich family. I belong to an untouchable family and I am depending upon myself. Therefore, I have no other income. Unfortunately, in this country a very miserable and dangerous thing that is happening is that people criticise the party which is enjoying power, because the critics have not enjoyed it. That is the main malady. When a man becomes an M.P. or M.L.A., people look on him with jealousy. In Travancore-Cochin, an M.L.A. gets only Rs. 120 p.m. but people envy him, because, perhaps, he wields much influence in politics. But he is poor at the same time. In the same way, I can quote my own example and the example of many friends on this and the other side.

The other day I was going through the proceedings of the House of Commons Debates on the Salary Bill. We are here to develop a parliamentary democracy—I mean people on this side and on the other. We are here to look at things from the country's point of view. Therefore, I wish to remind the Treasury and Opposition Benches that the debate in the House of Commons took not more than five minutes on this subject.

An Hon. Member: But you have taken more than five minutes!

Shri Velayudhan: When I moved this amendment I thought that there would not be much discussion. We are responsible people here. The Treasury

[Shri Velayudhan]

Bench is not a collection of untouchables. Similarly, we on this side are not also untouchables. All of us are part of the Government, part of the Nation. After all, people do not feel jealous about the salary drawn by big business magnates. Who feels jealous about a Tata, or a Birla, or a John Matthai getting Rs. ten thousand per month; Nobody. But when a Velayudhan goes to some place, people start saying, "You are drawing Rs. 40 a day. Why do you not do something for me?" It is a real malady with the people today. My humble opinion is that if it is to be cured, we should have a different type of approach between the Opposition and the Treasury Bench. We have got an opportunity for the next four or five years to develop parliamentary democracy in India through this Parliament and become a model to other Asiatic countries. If we want to do that, if we want to solve the problems of the people, then the Treasury and Opposition Benches should not fight like enemies. No Minister should be asked to live on Rs. 40 or 30 a month. Somebody said, "Give the Deputy Minister only Rs. 750 a month." I do not like that type of approach: I am against it.

Then there is another point regarding the Deputy Ministers and the Parliamentary Secretaries. Why can they not be given the same amenities as Cabinet Ministers? The Bill does not give them those amenities.

Dr. Katju: May I interrupt for a minute? I myself overlooked it, but you will find that in the definition clause the word "Minister" is so defined as to include Deputy Ministers. So, wherever Deputy Ministers are mentioned, they are entitled to the same facilities.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: That means Deputy Ministers also will have free houses. This is what I was trying to point out to you.

Shri Velayudhan: The sumptuary allowance of Rs. 500 is not given to Deputy Ministers. You may fix the amount at Rs. 250 or something like that; but as the other Ministers the Deputy Ministers must also get the sumptuary allowance. The Deputy Minister is a responsible person. In many respects, I think he is more responsible than the Minister. We have got some first class men on the other side. Take Mr. Jain. He was here with me some time ago and he is one of the best Ministers. Then take the case of the able Mr. Karmarkar. They are all very responsible people. They have ex-

penditures too. Why can you not extend the same facilities to them? The Parliamentary Secretaries are another tribe. I do not know why they are treated as untouchables. They are not even given a room in which to work just as a Joint Secretary or Secretary would throw some papers to the Superintendent, some papers are thrown to these Parliamentary Secretaries and they work according to the whims and fancies of the Ministers. My humble opinion is that a Parliamentary Secretary should be given due respect, due consideration. In regard to his work also, he should be treated on par with Deputy Ministers. All concessions extended to Ministers and Deputy Ministers must be extended to the Parliamentary Secretaries. I completely agree with the Home Minister in regard to the remarks that he made.

With these few words, I conclude.

11 A.M.

The Prime Minister and Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

May I for a moment speak not as Prime Minister but as a person who a little over twenty-one years ago proposed a resolution at the Karachi Session of the Indian National Congress, in which there was a part which suggested that normally the salaries to be paid should not exceed Rs. 500 a month. That resolution has often been pointed out to me and to many of my colleagues in recent months. I believe a great many references were made to it during the election campaign. I am perfectly prepared to admit that those references and criticisms were *prima facie* justified. That resolution said that as a rule Rs. 500 should be the maximum salary, except in the case of experts etc. Well, a great deal has happened since then and even taking that resolution which we put into practice largely when some of our colleagues became Ministers in Provincial Governments in the middle thirties. They took Rs. 500 as salary, but they took—and it was inevitable—certain other privileges like a State car etc. and a house too. That was in a sense inherent in that Karachi resolution too. Actually therefore, if you work it out, it works out to much more than Rs. 500 if you give a car and a house etc. But apart from other things, the House knows very well how things have changed and 500 rupees of those days are not worth so much today in regard to both the value of the money and its purchasing power due to devaluation and the much higher taxes than one has to pay. If any kind of rough and ready calculation is made, it will be found that there is very little

difference between Rs. 500 then plus the privileges attached to them and what we suggest should be paid to Ministers now. It is difficult to be accurate about these calculations but I do submit that there is no major difference and we have tried our best to follow generally speaking that policy that was laid down then.

Of course, I am for the moment talking about the salaries of Ministers and not about the other salaries that are paid and that are governed by all kinds of rules, laws, assurances and the like. That is a separate matter. All that took place four or five years ago at the time of the change-over in the Government. All kinds of assurances were given and naturally those people who have given those assurances want to abide by them. It is not good for assurances to be given and not to be kept, unless there is a *force majeure* or something else that happens. Sometimes, I think it may be said rightly, that many of the assurances that were given were not justifiable or right in the larger scheme of things. That is a matter which we can examine.

For the moment we are dealing with Ministers' salaries and we in the Cabinet gave a great deal of thought to this matter. We all of us had personal experience of it during the last few years. On the other hand we wanted to reduce the salaries to the lowest possible scale, not merely to save a little money for the Government, but because we realised that after all Ministers of the Central Government should set an example to others. It is more from that point of view that we do this, in that it will have a certain sobering effect on others too, if not immediately, well, gradually.

Now most of us calculate, I suppose, our expenditure on various necessities, etc. Inevitably a Minister, I think, ought to have what I consider certain facilities for work, if you want good work from him—a quiet place to work in. He cannot work if he is surrounded all the time. You should give him those facilities whether it is a house or wherever it may be and certain other conveniences so as to get the best work out of him. They cost a little in the shape of the residence you provide. My hon. colleague, Dr. Katju, said that he would gladly live at Okhla or some distant village near Delhi and come here. It is not convenient either to him or to the work or to those who have to deal with him.

Then, we have to deal—all of us here, not only Ministers, but Members also—with this extraordinary city of New Delhi, which is situated quite near one of the most ancient cities in the

world, that is Old Delhi and yet is so different from it, so mixed with it and yet so different, where standards of living or expenditure are so very heavy, that I may say they are heavier than most capitals in the world. It is extremely difficult. I wish that all of us really gave thought to it as to how to control New Delhi. Each hon. Member here has to face the situation. I think the average rent in Delhi is amazingly high. If a person wants to build a house in Delhi, my hon. colleague the Minister of Works, in that particular New Delhi Area charges a premium, which is colossal, apart from the rent and other things.

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): That is the market rate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The market here is governed by a few millionaires and others. The result is that other people do not have a chance. I do not know how to get over the difficulty, but there it is.

Anyhow we gave a great deal of thought to this matter and I do submit, speaking from a good deal of experience, that the figures we have given are about the lowest that could possibly be given, if you want those minimum facilities, etc., that have been mentioned.

My hon. colleagues and I may carry on work to the liking or not of some hon. Members. Our policies may be objected to or criticised. But one fact, I think, is very clear, that we in this Government are terribly hard-worked. We may work foolishly or wisely, but we are hard-worked and the strain on us is tremendous, the strain of actual work, the strain of Parliament, the strain of interviews. We do not even have what other countries normally have, some off-days, Sundays, Saturdays. It is a continuous strain and in that strain it becomes necessary to organise one's life carefully so as to get the best out of it in the shape of work and not to collapse. That fact also might be borne in mind.

Now, if I may speak just for a moment personally, the hon. the Home Minister said that one test should be, and it is a good test, you must not take into consideration the personal income of a Minister, because if you do it, then you may get only persons who have personal income. Suppose there are some Ministers who can afford to augment their salary with their personal income. Then there is an invidious distinction and difficulties. One tries to keep up standards which the other cannot keep up, and it is not fair. Therefore, while having a salary as low as

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

possible, it should be enough for him to do his work and keep up such dignity, etc., as a person should keep up in such a position, without any addition from his personal income. I know that many of my colleagues have been hard put to it to do this and have had to resort to such personal resources as they possessed.

The House will forgive me for being rather personal. My own income, the only income practically speaking that I have apart from the salary, has been the author's income. Those royalties from books stopped practically when I became a Minister, because I could not write books. Some of them overflowed from past periods; some royalties continue to come, but naturally they shrink and gradually disappear after a few years. I am a little fortunate that if I am hard put to it, I can earn by writing again. So, I have no fear from that point of view.

When I first joined Government, I was not used to salary, having never received any salary in my life, and it was a kind of extra to me—I felt and I was rather lavish with it. I did not possess a motor car when I joined Government. The previous time I had a car was fifteen years back when it was taken by the police and I thought it was not necessary to purchase a car. I did not possess a car for many years. So I bought a car. I felt I had plenty of money; I did not realise that I was spending far above my means, although in those days we used to get double the salary we are getting now.

So, we came down in the scale of things. I am fortunate or unfortunate, as you like, in that I have no family to support. I am a widower; I have no children to educate and I have relatively simple habits. Now, one thing I should like to make clear. An hon. Member has put in an amendment about the Prime Minister getting a sumptuary allowance of Rs. 1,000 a month, while the other Ministers get nothing at all. Well, the Prime Minister—I want to be quite frank with the House—is a favoured individual in this respect. He does not draw the Rs. 500 allowance. But he is connected with what is called the Government Hospitality Organization of Rashtrapati Bhavan, so that all his official hospitality automatically goes to the Government Hospitality Organization. The result is that there is no point in the Prime Minister drawing an allowance. He does not draw the Rs. 500; possibly he spends much more than Rs. 500; it varies, of course but it all goes automatically to the Government

Hospitality Organization so that in future too if this arrangement continues, he will not draw this sumptuary allowance; his establishment is a part of the Government Hospitality Organization. So far as other Ministers are concerned, of course, it depends on the Ministers; but inevitably all of them certainly—some a little more than others—have to indulge in some hospitality. People may think that hospitality means 'feasting'. It is not. It is really an occasion to meet people, not only people from our own country; foreigners may come here. Each Minister has to deal with all kinds of delegations, deputations, conferences and the like and New Delhi becomes more and more an important centre of international and national conferences. One has to meet them, one has to ask them to meals, parties, small or big and that is costly business. I doubt very much if any Minister spends even his sumptuary allowance. He oversteps it. He cannot help it. Perhaps occasionally he might. Normally he goes beyond it because he cannot help it.

I just heard a reference was made to Parliamentary Secretaries. Parliamentary Secretaries were started in the Provincial Governments some years back. The parliamentary secretary here is different from the parliamentary secretaries in the States as they were. The parliamentary secretaries in the States really corresponded to some extent with the Deputy Ministers that we have here now. They ought to have corresponded with them, but in actual fact, perhaps they did not. So when we have Deputy Ministers here it seemed to me that there was no point in having that type of parliamentary secretary here. It is just having more people and there is no point in it. Therefore last year when I started this system of parliamentary secretaries, there were honorary parliamentary secretaries getting no payment at all of any kind except when they were called upon to do some official work in between session times; it may be that if they are summoned—they were not supposed to do regular work—they came or they were sent for two or three days somewhere to enquire into a particular matter and normally Member's daily allowance for these days were allowed to them. They are honorary parliamentary secretaries and personally I think that that should not be changed. It is a good practice. I should like to have a number of parliamentary secretaries in this way each Minister to have one or two to help him. That is no additional burden on the Exchequer and it

gives some training also and employs a number of usually younger Members in the House in certain Government work; that gives them an insight into it also. Therefore, I would suggest that parliamentary secretaries should not be brought into this paid grade and they were deliberately kept out of it. After all if a person is to be paid, there is the Minister, there is the Deputy Minister. It is not quite clear to me why you should have another grade for the parliamentary secretary. That, of course, is for the House to consider. It is a matter of principle. I am merely giving my own opinion about it.

Then there is this question of residence and as I said a residence should be a place where a person, a Minister can do work quietly and efficiently. As to the old so-called Ministers' houses, of the old Executive Councillors' houses I dislike them intensely from every point of view, whether it is the external appearance or the internal lay-out or the furniture there or the darkness that surrounds them inside and outside. It is an extraordinary place there, and yet they are big, costly to keep up and a nuisance. I would much prefer convenient and smaller houses. The burden of rent will be less and the burden of upkeep will be less too. In fact, in future, I suppose and I hope that no big houses would be built in Delhi at all. The foreign missions may build them if they like. One of the reasons why New Delhi is so expensive is because of these big houses with large compounds. If you have to go to your next door neighbour, it is half a mile away practically. It is not a city; it is a spread out place. So we have to fill that in and make it more like a city so that one can walk across or bicycle across and do things, instead of being forced to maintain a standard which very few people can afford to maintain. I submit that the Bill as placed by my colleague has taken into consideration all these matters and I commend it for the approval of the House.

Shri Vallatharas: So far as the principle is concerned, the dignity of the Minister and the convenience for him to discharge his duty must be properly attended to. The manner in which the status and convenience have to be maintained is the only point for consideration, and whether it can be managed with Rs. 2,000 a month or with any thing more or less is a matter for liberal consideration. So far as the payment is concerned, the question of the taxpayer must be taken into account, as to how much he has to pay year after year for the upkeep of this Government and the Government officials and the

benefit that he derives. During the last five years, not to speak of the previous years, however much these hon. Ministers might have laboured hard over their work, the dissatisfaction prevailing in the country goes to show that the constitutional form of Government has not been conducive to the welfare and happiness of the people in general. Particularly with this atmosphere in the background the Ministers will have to view the situation. Personally I have no grievance because I know what amount of money is needed for the upkeep of an educated man and also a person who deals in several businesses and has several friends. Here only a little moral courage is needed. If the hon. Minister so decides, he can confine his expenditure to Rs. 750 or Rs. 500. There is absolutely no use saying: We have got to feed an army of people; we have to maintain two families; we have to receive guests; we have to give them coffee. After all the dignity of the taxpayer is not maintained. I have no sympathy with those hon. Ministers who say all this. I know that their standard of diet and personal living should be on a higher level than the ordinary taxpayer. I do not want them to live in slums or to be starved out. They who are working hard in this country on behalf of these poor people should also be able to show to the public that they are maintaining the same old standard. For instance, I can tell you that I am having this two cubits of cloth, two cubits of dhoti and a simple shirt. I have got half a dozen of them for the whole year round. I can increase this standard to any extent; I do not prefer that. When it is the President's dinner or the Ambassador's dinner, unless they allow me in this dress, I am not prepared to accept the invitation. I have no experience of hon. Ministers' ways of living in Delhi except for the last three months. These Ministers are less romantic. But the provincial Ministers are highly romantic. I know of the financial conditions and equipment and life of many of these Ministers when they entered the ministerial office. Today they are by far richer. Each has got his own individual concern. Many of them have got concerns in the names of others. I can prove this if the Government wants. To become a Minister is a blessed thing in this country. Therefore, as a matter of fact, I do not feel that any Minister feels any scarcity of money.

There is a story told in Trivandrum: I hope my Kerala friends will not misunderstand me. There was a peon serving under His Highness for a number of years; of course, the pay scale was very low. He was 80 years old and he had not property of his

[Shri Vallatharas]

own. Then, he requested His Highness to discharge him from service, and he was discharged. On that date, he asked a favour of His Highness, His Highness wanted to know what the favour was. He asked His Highness to give him an order in writing that he should be counting the waves at Cape Comorin all round the year. Feeling it to be a funny thing, His Highness gave the order. I do not know whether this is true or false; but there is the story. The man came to Cape Comorin and began to count the waves. If a pilgrim came there and wanted to have a dip in the sea, he would not allow him by saying that he has got His Highness' order to count the waves and that there will be disturbance. Then he will be tipped two annas or three annas and the pilgrim will have his dip. In that way he became rich and built a big bungalow. When His Highness visited Cape Comorin some years later, he was pleased to see that his order had been put to proper use. To be named as a Minister for name's sake, that itself is sufficient; one can boss over. As a matter of fact, the question of pay does not rest anywhere. I have seen the life of the Ministers who were hard workers and who have lived with me in detention for several years. I should speak, though rebelliously within my mind, without any restraint—when I speak out I have to preserve a sense of decorum; I should not say which of the Ministers has been honest and which of the Ministers has abused his position; I only wished to touch upon the point.

I am not concerned with these things. Here it is a question of the capacity of the tax payer. I have come here. Mr. Velayudhan said that he and his wife have not been able to save any amount. I should say that even with this 40 rupees a day, if we maintain a certain standard, we are bound to save a good lot, at least Rs. 5,000 a year.

Some Hon. Members: A year?

Shri Vallatharas: I will do it; I shall show how, unless you soar high above this standard.

Shri Velayudhan: Some have five or six children.

Shri Vallatharas: There are different categories of people. Here, the pay of an hon. Minister ranks on a level with those officers who have been left to us as a legacy by the bureaucratic foreign Government. I see Deputy Secretaries and Secretaries are receiving salaries of 2,500, 3,000 and 4,000.

But, they have been brought up in a different atmosphere. They were maintained on a separate basis. Our position is not like that. The scales of pay of the officers in the permanent regular services have also to be reduced a lot. We expect those people to make voluntary offers of cut. They will not make it in their life time unless we pull them down by statute or other means.

So far as the Ministers are concerned, they must make up their mind somehow or other to reduce the amount which they receive from the public purse towards their equipment. There are several amendments. I have moved an amendment that the Minister's pay will be about Rs. 1,750 and that the Deputy Minister's pay will be Rs. 1,000. I have calculated on this basis. The Members of this House get Rs. 40 a day. For 30 days, it comes to Rs. 1,200. I allow another Rs. 500. I think this is a very reasonable scale. Our Prime Minister has stated the difficulties that each one has to face. I really appreciate his difficulties. At the same time, I would plead for greater moral courage to be built up, in respect of the scales of pay that they want to allow. Our Prime Minister has been in a very pleasant mood today and he has also pleased us so far as his representation is concerned. On the other hand, I want to make one observation. So long as your standard of living sticks to a certain position, you do not come down. You must come down. I am a lawyer; I have come here. I have been earning Rs. 1,000 or 2,000; I do not have anything now. I have a debt of rupees 20,000 or 40,000 as a result of my political life. Am I to plead that because I have lost my profession, and everything, at least here I have to live here in a higher standard with greater pay and remuneration. But, I must tell point blank that in the face of the popular dissatisfaction that there has not been a good Government, to the well being of the people, we are not justified in drawing any amount which would go to show that we are maintaining a higher standard of living than the ordinary taxpayer.

As a matter of fact, tapping the sources of Income-tax are not yet fully exhausted. Income-tax is in an infant stage. It has not reached such a stage as to put in sufficient revenue in the coffers of the State to meet all these expenses. There is a sort of, what is called in Tamil *matranthai* step-motherly treatment so far as Income-tax proposals for the capitalists are concerned. But, the poor man is taxed. Along with this, there are several

other things that go to make this taxation system a permanent one for some years to come. That is another question.

Finally I have moved some amendments. After hearing the hon. Prime Minister, I am not going to press them. I do not suspect his *bona fides*. I do not dispute his statement of facts when he puts them in such a manner. Any way, I wish to say that there must be a moral courage on the part of the Ministers to reduce their pay and emoluments at least to the extent of keeping them on a level with the ordinary Members of this House. Therefore I want, that between 1,000 and 1,750 rupees they must try to live as far as possible. If they feel that their dignity is not maintained, they must come forward and explain how the dignity is to be maintained. From Rs. 5,000 it has come to Rs. 2,000 and their dignity has not suffered. Of course a scale of 500 rupees was envisaged in 1921. I was also surprised when Mr. Gopalan supported that principle. So many years ago Rs. 500 was fixed. Now, we must at least allow three times 500. I think Rs. 1,500 will be normally adequate, if we take into account the sum of Rs. 500 that was fixed in 1921. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to stick to that scale. Any way any single pie over

will not be favoured by popular opinion in this country. That is why I submit that there must be moral courage on the part of hon. Ministers to feel that they were once workers and that they are not living a more abundant life which is so out of tune with the days gone by. By our behaviour, the permanent Service officers who are receiving Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 4,000 must come down with voluntary cuts of salary. This tendency for high salaries in our officers, whether ICS or IAS has not come down. Without suggesting that their pay should be cut down to some extent, they still think that they are high-born creatures and high bred creatures that they ought to be maintained in the interests of the country. I can tell them this. After the Opposition assumes some strength, at least in course of time, they will have a very severe visitation. I should say that their salaries would be reduced to any extent. Even if those officers boycott, the country will bear that, and efficient people from among the middle classes will come up to discharge those duties properly. It is not as if the country will be in a despair if these officers happen to go on strike.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is not the Officers' Salary Bill. The hon. Member is straying away far.

Shri Vallatharas: I am only drawing a comparison. We are not thinking in such water-tight compartments. I crave the indulgence of the Deputy-Speaker.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not covered by this Bill.

Shri Vallatharas: When we talk of a certain matter, we have to assume certain liberties. In this case the officers' pay goes higher than the salary of the Ministers under this Bill. We cannot have Ministers on a low pay and servants on a higher pay. That cannot be there always. In these circumstances, I would appeal for greater moral courage and withdraw my amendments. I do not want to make further comments.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack): I do not wish to go into the controversy that the Home Minister raised when introducing the Bill.

Dr. Katju: What controversy? About Rasagullas?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Have patience, Sir, He has mentioned a salary of Rs. 2,250 and in order to arrive at the net amount, he has deducted Rs. 481 on account of Income-tax assessing the house rent at 12½ per cent. of the salary, I believe.

But the rent is not included. That is what I understand. The income-tax on the rent has been taken into account, but the rent has not been included in the salary. The rent of the bungalow as well as the upkeep of the bungalow with *Malis* and other servants—the amenities that the Minister enjoys—are not included in the salary. My friend Mr. Gopalan has got some figures from somewhere which I do not have, but I believe if all those amenities, medical service, telephone for private use—that is to say the Minister must have a telephone which the Government must pay for in the performance of his official duties, but he is using that for private purposes also—if we take all that into account, I have no doubt it will come up to at least between Rs. 3,500 and Rs. 4,000.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): What are the private purposes?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I do not want to harp on the Congress resolution of about 21 years ago which fixed the maximum salary at Rs. 500. Five-hundred rupees at that time is equivalent to Rs. 1,500 or so now. And also the kind of life that the Ministers as well as we ourselves were leading in different places during the independence movement was far different

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

from what it is in Delhi. Not only the Ministers, but also the Members of this House know that there is a sort of compulsion here and your expenditure goes up when you come from your provincial town to Delhi. The observation that I want to make in this connection is this. Whether it is necessary to have a salary of Rs. 1,500 or Rs. 2,000—is not the point. The point is this. India is a poor country. Her per capita income is very small. From that point of view, are we justified—whether Ministers or Members of this House or of the Legislatures—to have such a disparity in our emoluments, such a disparity from the ordinary man's income? And if that disparity becomes too much, then, to that extent, we take ourselves away from the common mass of people.

I know in Delhi the Ministers, whether they are Members of this House or not, as soon as they become Ministers, they have streamlined cars. Some have a Packard, some have Rolls Royce and so on. But should we not think of some way of behaving in the matter of the purchase of cars so as to keep their expenditure down and not to look so aristocratic in comparison with the common people around us? That is the point. So, I agree with my friend, Mr. Vallatharas, when he said that the Ministers should have courage. I would add to that that the Members of this House should have the courage to lower the style.

For instance, the Prime Minister himself said these bungalows for the Ministers—all the bungalows,—were very expensive. I might mention here that many years ago when I lived in Japan I had a chance to see the ways of living of the Japanese. They are a very artistic people; they work with their own hand,—children, women, everybody—and if the number of members in a family is very small, they do not have a large compound. They have such a compound as they can keep beautifully and artistically. Now we have compounds here and also in the provincial capitals which are too big, and yet there is a paucity of plots for building new houses. So, these big compounds that the Ministers and big officers occupy now should be divided up into small plots and small bungalows should be built on them.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): That is being done now.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: In that way could we lower the style. This style was the style of the Britishers, the conquerors who wanted to live in

grandeur so that we would bow down before them.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): They were getting Rs. 5,500.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: That is a point. With their Rs. 5,500 they were able to keep the compounds beautifully. You cannot keep the compounds beautiful; half a dozen *Malis* are required to do that—on Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 2,500 a month. Consequently, it becomes necessary to cut down the size of the compound, and the size of the house whereby you can keep it on a lower income than what the Britishers were getting. My point is that the British system of prestige, and their style of living should be forgotten now, and according to the Indian style whatever is necessary, should be provided so that the Ministers can function properly, and do their work properly. I do not mean to say what the salary should be, Rs. 2,250 or less than that. I only appeal to the Ministers and also to the Members of this House that in determining the emoluments that we, the representatives of the people, should receive, it would depend on how far we are willing to lower the style of our living that we have been having in Delhi for the last number of years.

I also wish to point out another thing. The hon. Minister said a car is absolutely necessary. How is it then I have been told by people who visited Europe that in Norway only one Minister—the Minister of Finance who is a wealthy man—has his own car, not at Government expenses, but at his own expense. Even the Prime Minister does not have a car. The Prime Minister's wife goes in trams and buses for marketing. Whatever it is, I wish to impress on the House that when we are Members of the House, we go about walking in the streets, and sometimes when it is necessary, we go in a tonga, but how is it that the moment I become a Minister, I must have a streamlined car? No more walking, no more tonga for me! We must get rid of that idea, and only in that way, can we keep ourselves in contact with the masses to whom we had belonged during the independence movement.

With regard to salaries, in Japan which is a small country but which has been highly industrialised, the salary of the Prime Minister was somewhere about Rs. 750 or Rs. 1,100. I do not know what it is now. Although it is a long time since I lived there, I still remember that their life was such that they could easily mix with the ordinary people. There was

no disparity as we have here. The hon. the Minister does not wish me to go into the salaries of officers. But all along we have been having that kind of disparity. Take the Postal Department for instance. A postman now gets somewhere about Rs. 25 or Rs. 30 per month, while the head of the department may be getting some Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000. In Japan and in America, the two countries with which I was closely acquainted—I do not know anything about European countries and so I do not want to say anything about them—the disparity was never more than four or five times the pay the lower man gets.

Inasmuch as our *per capita* income is very low, there is no justification for us, or for the capitalists to make lakhs and lakhs of rupees to store up for themselves. If we increase our *per capita* income, we will be justified in having those stream-lined cars, but I would say that at the present time, with conditions in India as they are, a motor-car is a luxury. These luxuries should be reduced as far as possible, consistent with the Ministers doing their work efficiently as servants of the public. I have no amendments in this respect, nor am I supporting any amendment, but I only want to bring this to the attention of this House and also the hon. Ministers, that they must do something in the near future to reduce the style of living, so that they will be nearer the masses. Otherwise there is no use pointing out "You live on air, we shall live on milk and honey." That thing will not do. I should like to ask the hon. Home Minister—and I hope he will tell us in his reply—whether it is fair to say that Rs. 2,250 minus Rs. 481 is all the income of an hon. Minister, when all the amenities are there, such as a free house, a garden, a telephone and such other things, and if these are all included, the income would be much more than Rs. 1,770.

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

"That the question be now put."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As soon as a closure motion is made, I have to put it to the vote of the House. When we come to clause 3, hon. Members who have not spoken on these things can have their say. So, I do not think there is any need to put it to the vote of the House, and I shall call upon the hon. the Minister to reply.

Dr. Rajju: After the very illuminating speeches delivered about their own personal experiences, by my hon. friend the Prime Minister and Mr.

Gadgil, I do not think it necessary to detain the House for more than three or four minutes. Much has been said about the Ministers taking to luxurious standards of life, and I really was unable to follow this line of argument. You want us to work, you want us to go about attending Conferences, meetings, Cabinet meetings, Subcommittee meetings, etc. Now what do you want us to do. Do you want us to go on a bullock-cart or on a tonga? There must be some sort of a conveyance, because I do not know how many hours I may have to work: when I come. I understand that if you take a tonga from Parliament House to the Old Deih station, very likely it will cost about Rs. 3, and if you have to go there four or five times a day, the expense would come to about Rs. 15 or so. And keeping a bullock-cart these days is very expensive also. The bullocks have to be fed. Therefore on the whole, keeping a motor-car is less expensive than keeping a tonga or a bullock-cart. That is all I have to say, so far as this luxury business is concerned.

The hon. the Prime Minister has already dealt with the 500 rupees resolution which was adopted at Karachi. I shall add one bit to that from my own personal experience. I became a Minister in the United Provinces in 1937 and I started with a salary of Rs. 500, plus a residence, and a motor car which was handed over to us by Government, and two years later, when we resigned, we had to return them, and I believe there was a maintenance allowance of Rs. 150. Compare that with what obtains today. The hon. Member who spoke just now said that the net income comes to about Rs. 1,769 excluding income-tax. From that you deduct the cost of maintaining a car, about Rs. 300. This car you have to buy for yourself, and you have to pay for it, as my hon. friend Mr. Gadgil said. He paid for it in 18 instalments of Rs. 500 each. And he was charged interest also, and I believe the car must have depreciated in value by half. All this put together will leave him with only Rs. 1,450. As everybody knows a rupee of 1931 is equivalent to As. 4 only, considering the purchasing value of today. And I should like to make another point clear. The Deputy Ministers who are getting Rs. 1,750 under this Bill, will be taxed to about Rs. 245 per month, so that their net income will be Rs. 1,505 a month.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I just interrupt the hon. the Minister here for a minute? So far as this tax is concerned, the Deputy

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

Ministers and also the Cabinet Ministers who have got personal incomes will have to pay more by way of income-tax.

Dr. Katju: Of course it is there. I am not mentioning it, because there is always the hatred for the rich people. They dislike them. If anybody has the misfortune to have any other extra income, then he will come within the higher slab of income groups. My hon. friend Mr. Bhargava has mentioned this. But I do not want to go into these details. Rs. 2,250 a month means Rs. 27,000 a year. The supertax starts immediately after Rs. 25,000 a year is reached. Out of this rupees 2,000 is subject to supertax. If unfortunately anybody has got a personal income of Rs. 6,000 from his own funds, then this Rs. 6,000 added to this Rs. 27,000 becomes Rs. 33,000. And the tax is payable at the rate of about 4 annas in a rupee, plus a surcharge on the income tax plus a supertax at the rate of some 3 or 4 annas or so per rupee.

And that is why the 12½ per cent. which is charged on account of rent for income-tax purposes pays super tax, pays surcharges and everything. Of course, these are minor matters with which hon. Members are not concerned.

Then there was another thing said—in making my point I use very homely language—somebody said: "Live a very austere life". I entirely agree. One hon. Member over there said: "Live in dhoties". I do so myself. Look at me. I am not wearing anything more. Probably you have got much more yardage on you than I have got. And I do not change it. I had a discussion about it at Sevagram one day and I put this question to my sister sitting there—and that is a vital question. I said, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to live on almost nothing—15 rupees or 20 rupees or 30 rupees. (*Interruptions*). Do not interrupt me, it is a very vital question. But what about the children? There are two questions before you. Any prospective politician in India or prospective Minister in India, if he wants to follow the standards of austerity which my hon. friends over there lay down, he should make up his mind to remain a bachelor and not marry. Because if he does not marry, then he incurs no responsibility. I do not want that he should marry and then get rid of his wife, but he should not marry at all. Then they will have no family to maintain. But I think it is not fair, not just to the children that you beget them and you do not properly educate them. It is no use imposing your standards of life, of

simple living and high thinking, on your children whom you have got to educate. You have got to make them Doctors, you have got to make them Engineers, you have got to make them high technicians so that they may be able to make their own living afterwards and set up their own life. It is not a question of setting up any standards before the citizens of this country. The citizens of this country, if you do not mislead them, they understand it quite well. They are not misled, but it is the daily drum-beating. "Here it is. Look at the Ministers, they are living in comfort, in luxury and so on". And you may be able to mislead some others. Hon. friends here talk about gardens. Well, I have got a garden in my house. But I never go there. Whenever I want to breathe fresh air, I just cross into the big open areas and walk there. The garden does not benefit me. I just look at it; it does not belong to me; I cannot sell it; I cannot touch it.

The Prime Minister referred to comfortable and convenient methods of transacting business. I repeat it solemnly once again that the house in which I live or the Prime Minister lives or any other Minister lives, is much more used by the visitors than by the residents. It is kept for the convenience of visitors so that they may come and talk in a comfortable, homely manner and assist us.

The subject has been discussed and I do hope that the Bill will be carried without any further discussion.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): By way of information, may I know the amount a Minister draws every month as gross income, including salary and all the expenses?

Dr. Katju: I think the hon. Member was not here while the discussion was going on. There is no question of gross income drawn. He gets Rs. 2,250, nothing else, and if there is any sumptuary allowance; that is all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Bill will now be taken clause by clause.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.—(Salaries of Ministers)

Shri P. T. Chacko (Meenachil): Since the Treasury Benches insist that they want only 2,250, I do not want to move my amendment for 3,000.

12 Noon

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

In page 1, lines 7 and 8, for "two thousand two hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "one thousand rupees".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 1, lines 7 and 8, for "two thousand two hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "one thousand rupees".

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

In page 1, lines 7 and 8, for "two thousand two hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "two thousand rupees".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 1, lines 7 and 8, for "two thousand two hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "two thousand rupees".

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

In page 1, lines 8 and 9, for "one thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "seven hundred and fifty rupees".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 1, lines 8 and 9, for "one thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "seven hundred and fifty rupees".

Shri Veeraswamy: I beg to move:

In page 1, lines 8 and 9, for "one thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "one thousand two hundred and fifty rupees".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 1, lines 8 and 9, for "one thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "one thousand two hundred and fifty rupees".

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): I was listening very carefully to what has been said by the hon. Prime Minister as well as by the Home Minister. I do really appreciate that there are some difficulties in the way of making drastic reductions in the salaries of Ministers. As things stand now, they have got their obligations. They have got to entertain guests, to keep up certain social standards—I do agree. But as long as we stick to these standards and these ideas of social life, there is no hope of a change. The present Ministers—of course some of whom have their take over from the past—may be satisfied with this salary. But if we

are to proceed like this without having certain set standards for our social life, for our expenses at Government level, a time will come when this is going to be too high. I do understand that they must have all the facilities to work, but what is their work? That is the question. They must be able to transact their business. What is their business? Is it a question of looking into so many bundles of files? I think our Ministers are 'suffering' from too many files; the less of them the better. The real business of the Ministers today, the real purpose of the Government in this country today, is to take our people along with them, to mobilise them, to stimulate them to a supreme national effort, to inculcate in them a feeling of noble endeavour. The question I want to ask is: whether our sticking to old standards of ministerial life, of palatial buildings and all that, are conducive to the creation of that spirit among our people? Looked at from that angle, I believe the present standards are too high. When the ministers ask me: 'What are we to do? How are we to educate our children? How are we to maintain two establishments—and all that, I may not be able to answer every question satisfactorily, but one thing I am very clear about and that is, we must continue the noble traditions of our national Movement. When Rs. 500 was fixed, I do understand, it was not meant to be a cut-and-dried standard for all time, but the spirit was there that our public men, the people who are in charge of our nation must be able to live as near our masses as possible. Therefore, the present high salaries have to be reduced; the Ministers should take courage in both hands and do it. When they were not in power, when they were leading the national movement, I hope they were not very poor, I hope they were doing a lot of work. What has happened to all that? How have all your standards changed in so small a time? I just fail to understand.

Secondly, it is said Ministers have got a lot of work. But I want to ask whether all the Ministers have got such heavy work. For example, there is the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. He is also in the list of Ministers. Very frankly I tell you I have never seen him doing any sort of work. In the House I have seen him going round whispering. I do not understand what exactly his work is. Before I am asked to vote on this, please explain to me what exactly is his work? He is never on his legs in the House, he never speaks on anything, he never answers questions. Is he piloting the Bills? I do not understand it. What exactly is his work as a high-ranking Minister of Cabinet level?

[Shri Punnoose]

I looked into May's Parliamentary Practice to see what happens to the Chief Whip of the ruling party: He may be treated as a Parliamentary Secretary. That is what obtains in Britain. Then why is this practice followed here? As a whip he has got onerous responsibilities, but even those have not been discharged properly. That is what I feel. If the Congress Party feels that it has got the blessings of a very good Whip, well and good, but you must pay for it, you cannot ask the national exchequer to pay for it. I think even the primary task of a Chief Whip of the Government, namely to consult the Opposition Party Whips to have an idea about the whole business of the House and then to so allot time that the most important things will get the maximum amount of time, well, he has not done. My party does not feel any amount of gratitude to the existence of the Chief Whip of the Government Party here.

Therefore, Sir, I strongly recommend that this question of reducing the salaries be taken up in right earnest. Please do not take it in the spirit of "Communists want to spite us"—no, it is absolutely wrong to think so. I am very strongly arguing for reduction, emphatically suggesting that salaries might be reduced because if by some fortune or misfortune we happen to be there, there shall be no temptation on our part to have these high salaries. I am not suggesting it in a spirit of spite. Secondly, I have referred to the sort of unnecessary expenditure. Have a Parliamentary Secretary instead of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

Shri Veeraswamy: As the extension of session is indefinite and every minute is precious, I do not propose to take much time of the House. The hon. Home Minister said that the Members are getting Rs. 40 daily and the Minister are drawing just at the rate of Rs. 59. But the hon. Minister has forgotten that the Members who draw their allowances do so only during the sessions of the House whereas the Ministers draw their salaries throughout the year.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: They work throughout the year—Members do not work throughout the year.

Shri Veeraswamy: The hon. Minister said that Ministers have children to educate, sons and daughters to marry, dependants to support, relatives to receive and guests to entertain. But what about other Government servants? They too have got their children, their daughters, and their dependants

relatives and guests. They too have to educate their children, marry their sons and daughters, help their relatives and entertain their friends. While those who are getting below Rs. 100 are able to live—cannot the Ministers live with Rs. 2,000? That is a question I want to put to the House for its consideration. The Ministers are going to get at the rate of Rs. 2,250 a month each and the Deputy Ministers Rs. 1,750 a month each. They are provided with houses, fully furnished. They are getting free medical treatment and are also getting a sumptuary allowance of Rs. 500 a month. Altogether each Minister gets about Rs. 33,000 per annum. Out of this amount he may be able to save at least Rs. 20,000. It is not very difficult for the Minister to save that much because he lives in a free house, he gets free medical treatment not only for himself but for the members of his family, and he travels at the cost of the Government. Not only that, when the Minister goes on tour from State to State, I do not think he spends his own money when he stays in a place for food and for other conveniences that he may need. Wherever he goes the public receive him, wherever he goes the officials and the State Ministers make every arrangement for his stay, for his food and for his conveniences. Therefore I do not think that the Ministers are spending every month hundreds of rupees from their own pockets for their personal needs and conveniences during their tours. But what about the clerks, what about the teachers, and the low-paid Government servants and police constables? The Home Minister, during the course of the debate on the Budget said that a constable in the City of Delhi was drawing altogether Rs. 92. "Is it not a decent sum in the City of Delhi?", he asked the House. I ask the hon. Home Minister, "Is it a decent sum?"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member need not repeat arguments that have already been advanced. His amendment is a small one seeking to change the figure from Rs. 2,250 to Rs. 2,000. On what principle he reduces it by Rs. 250 is a matter on which he may address the House.

Shri Veeraswamy: Now, there are lakhs of people in Government service who, when they retire after twenty or twenty five years of service, do not have even a few thousand rupees. Take peons. They do not have even a few hundred rupees. How can they save anything? But the Ministers can easily save Rs. 60,000 during their term of office. Therefore, I suggest that they should be satisfied with Rs. 2,000. The

Cabinet Minister should pay Rs. 250 house rent and the Deputy Minister Rs. 150. Further, the Ministers may get free medical treatment but for the members of their family the Ministers should pay from their pocket. Government servants do not get free medical treatment for their family members; they have to pay for it. Since it is said that ours is a republican and democratic government, our attitude must be to reduce high salaries and increase low ones, so that the low-paid people may live happily and contribute towards the establishment of democracy in our country. So, I appeal to the good sense of the Ministers, especially the Home Minister, to accept a further reduction and also bring in a Bill increasing the salary of Police constables, teachers, lower division clerks, upper division clerks and other non-gazetted officers. If you do that, the country will be satisfied and our Ministers will be setting an example not only to this country but to other countries as well in this important matter.

With these words, I withdraw my amendments.

The amendments were by leave withdrawn.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I support this motion and agree that the scales laid down are fully justified. But it would have been much better if the hon. Home Minister had given us those facts which could have revealed that the Ministers were voluntarily suffering a reduction in their salary. We were told on a previous occasion that they gave up Rs. 500 and now we are told that there is a further voluntary cut of Rs. 500. But these reductions are not shown in the figures. The statement only says that the salary shall be Rs. 2,250. Taking into consideration the other comforts open to them, the amount may be more, but if all the facts are made public, people would know that the Ministers have voluntarily suffered a reduction. At present, people cannot find out that there is a real sacrifice being made.

As I have said, I do not grudge this salary. The Prime Minister has given his experience. In a costly city like Delhi, it is difficult to maintain oneself within this amount. Even with Rs. 40 per day, I find it difficult. You have to pay Rs. 300 for rent and Rs. 40 or 50 for telephono and other charges. We have been told that the Ministers have to maintain a certain standard. I agree. But I would advise that the standards should not be such as would make the Ministers feel sorry when they are dropped out. We cannot have ideal Ministers everywhere, as is the case with our Prime

Minister. He has no responsibilities. He has no children to educate. We cannot expect every Minister to be so ideal. We should allow them these comforts and equipment. About transport, we have been told that it is the cheapest in Delhi that the Ministers are getting. They must necessarily have a car. Our Home Minister has a curious way of reasoning and making out a case. He said that even a cart would be expensive. I agree. If he has to maintain two bullocks and probably a driver as well—because he cannot drive the cart himself—then certainly he would need a servant to look after the bullocks. All this would mean a large expenditure.

If I support this Bill I do not do so on the grounds advanced by Shri R. K. Chaudhuri. He cautioned the Opposition that it may come into power and may then feel sorry why it did not vote for an increase. Nor do I support the grounds of Mr. Velayudhan who said that he had hopes of soon coming into power and occupying the treasury benches. I have no such hope and I agree with the analysis made by the Finance Minister that the Opposition would have to remain in the wilderness for a long time still. Perhaps the Congress Party thinks that it has a future for a very long period. Because the Finance Minister's calculation must be exact, I take his advice and would tell Mr. Velayudhan that he should not hope against hope but should remain in the wilderness for some time if he really wants to come into power. My reasons, therefore, for supporting this Bill are different from those of my hon. friends. I and my party feel that the salary is not much. We should not grudge it. Therefore, we extend our whole hearted support.

श्री नन्द लाल शर्मा (सीकर) :

नमोऽस्तु रामाय सलक्ष्मणाय
देव्यै च तस्यै जनकात्मजायै ।

नमोऽस्तु रुद्रेन्द्र यमानिलेभ्यो
नमोऽस्तु चन्द्रार्कमरुद्गणेभ्यः ॥

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं विशेष कर के अपने कम्युनिस्ट बन्धुओं की इस चीज़ को समझ सकता हूँ कि जिन को राम के नाम से सम्भवतः शत्रुता हो सकती है । मैं ने आज तक अपने कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों के प्रति कभी भी जंगली उठाने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया, यह समझ कर कि साम्यवाद हमारे

[श्री नन्द लाल शर्मा]

घर की ही वस्तु है। परन्तु बन्दर की तरह बन कर अगर पूँछ घिस घिस कर साम्यवाद बनता हो तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी समता एक जगह नहीं ठहर सकती। कभी दो मनुष्य संसार में एक जैसे नहीं हुए, दो मनुष्यों की बुद्धि कभी एक जैसी नहीं हुई, दो मनुष्यों के काम करने की शक्ति एक जैसी नहीं हुई। इसलिये हम डंडे के बल से, बंड ऑफ मैफिस्टाफिलोज़ की तरह सब को छीलछाल कर समान बनाना, यह साम्य मृत्यु का ही साम्य कहलायेगा।

मैं अब इस विषय पर और अधिक न कह कर के इस वेतन बिल के सम्बन्ध में बोलता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ऐसी वस्तु नहीं है कि जिस को मज़ाक से, बड़े हल्के तरीक़े से, कह दिया जाय, जैसे अभी यह कहा गया कि क्या काम करते हैं मिनिस्टर? मिनिस्टर के पास कौन सा काम है, इसका इस के कि दो चार आये। यह केवल मिनिस्टरों की योग्यता के ऊपर ही नहीं, मंत्रियों की योग्यता पर ही उंगली उठाना नहीं है बल्कि देश के सारे के सारे शासन प्रबन्ध को निकम्मा बताने का प्रयत्न करना है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल एक दृष्टिकोण से कुछ सुझाव देता हूँ।

यह निश्चित बात है कि वर्तमान जैसा खर्चा हम देखते हैं, उस खर्च के अनुसार २२५० रुपये कुछ भी नहीं है और किसी साधारण से साधारण व्यक्ति का खर्चा जो दिल्ली में इन परिस्थितियों में रहता है जैसे हमें रहना पड़ता है और मिनिस्टरों के लिए, जो कर्तव्य पालन करने पड़ते हैं यह रकम कुछ भी नहीं है। लेकिन मैं तो केवल दृष्टिकोण में परिवर्तन चाहता हूँ और वह है जैसा कि मैं ने रामराज्य के एक श्लोक को पढ़ कर सुनाया:

अर्थ कामेष्वासक्तानां धर्मज्ञानं विधीयते
धर्मं जिज्ञासमानानां प्रमाणं परमं श्रुतिः॥
अभी हम ने कल ही तो जनता के सामने उन से वोट प्राप्त करते समय एक प्रार्थना की थी और हमें आज भी और सदैव इस बात को स्मरण रखना चाहिए कि हम यहां सरकार में केवल जनता जनार्दन की सेवा करने के लिए आये हैं, और किसी प्रकार का सुख भोगने के लिये नहीं आये हैं। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ और आज की परिस्थितियों को देखते हुए यह निश्चित बात है कि इतनी वस्तुओं के अन्दर हमारे मंत्रियों को कोई सुख प्राप्त नहीं होगा और यह भी ठीक है जैसा हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री हुक्म सिंह ने कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय इस विषय में एक आदर्श हो सकते हैं, क्योंकि एक तो वह विधुर हैं और फिर कोई उन के पढ़ाने लिखाने लायक सन्तान

मिल जायें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा बहुत सारा काम हल हो जायगा। मैं केवल अपने मंत्रियों के दृष्टिकोण में परिवर्तन देखना चाहता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन का वह स्वरूप भारतीय परम्परा और इतिहास के अनुकूल हो। अगर आप अपने भारतीय इतिहास को देखें तो पायेंगे कि मंत्री लोगों का राज्य के खज़ाने से एक कौड़ी भी न लेने का नियम रहा है। चाणक्य का उदाहरण आप के सामने है। वह तो बहुत बाद के हैं, मैं आप को रामराज्य काल से आरम्भ करूँ। गुरु वशिष्ठ जो राम, दशरथ, अज, रघु तथा दिलीप के राज्य मंत्री रहे, तो उन्होंने राज्य के खज़ाने से एक कौड़ी भी नहीं ली और वैसे ही वामदेव, मुमन्त्र आदि बिना राज से पैसा लिए राज्य का संचालन करते रहे और राज काज के कामों में मंत्रणा देते रहे। उन्होंने सब से उत्तम वृत्ति शिलो-ञ्छंबृत्ति का आश्रय लिया। अब उस के

आगे और बढ़िये, महाभारत काल में आप पायेंगे कि पांडवों के काका विदुर, जो स्वयं राज्य घराने से थे और जिन को राज्य के खजाने में से पैसा लेने का अधिकार भी था, मंत्री रहते हुए वह स्वयं जंगल में रहते थे और जंगल में रहकर जो कुछ रूखा सूखा अन्न व फल आदि प्राप्त होता था, उस से अपना काम चलाते थे, लेकिन सरकारी खजाने से कोई पैसा नहीं लेते थे। उस के बाद चाणक्य का काल आता है। किस प्रकार उन्होंने सादगी के साथ अपना जीवन निर्वाह किया और राजा के मंत्री का कार्य करते हुए भी सरकारी खजाने से कोई पैसा नहीं लेते थे। कल सदन में चाणक्य का जिक्र आया जब हमारे एक बन्धु ने कौटिल्य शास्त्र का हवाला दिया। मैं निवेदन करूँ कि कौटिल्य शास्त्र का पूरी तरह से परिज्ञान प्राप्त करना कठिन होगा। वह हमारे बन्धु कौटिल्य शास्त्र को सिर्फ तलाक के नाते जानते हैं, दूसरा और कुछ नहीं जानते। उन को जब अवसर आयेगा मैं बतलाऊंगा कि कौटिल्य शास्त्र क्या है। कौटिल्य ने स्पष्ट रूप से यह रक्खा है :

अमोक्षो धर्म विवाहानाम् ।

कौटिल्य ने, कभी धर्म विवाह में मोक्ष (divorce) का नाम नहीं बतलाया, और मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो कौटिल्य को इस बारे में कोट (quote) करें वह अच्छी तरह से देख भाल कर के कोट किया करें। मैं कौटिल्य अर्थ शास्त्र का उस समय का चित्र आप के सामने प्रस्तुत करूँ कि जब यूनान देश का एक यात्री यहाँ घूमता हुआ आता है और पूछता है कि इतने बड़े साम्राज्य का प्रबन्ध करने वाला प्रधान मंत्री कहाँ रहता है, मैं उस का मकान देखना चाहता हूँ, तो गली में घूमता हुआ एक बच्चा कहता है कि हमारा प्रधान मंत्री आप को महलों

में नहीं मिलेगा और अभाग्यवश अगर वह महलों में रहना शुरू कर देगा तो उसी दिन से राज्य की प्रजा भूखों मरने लगेगी, प्रजा के ऊपर टैक्सों की भरमार शुरू हो जायगी और राज्य में से सुख और शान्ति का अन्त हो जायगा। इसलिये वह कहता है कि चाणक्य आप को ऐसे स्थान में मिलेगा जहाँ उपलक्षकलमेकं भेदकं गोमयानां

वटुभिरुपहृतानां बहिषां स्तोम एषः ।

आपको चाणक्य उस स्थान पर मिलेगा जहाँ यज्ञ के लिए उपले तोड़ने के लिए पत्थर का टुकड़ा पड़ा होगा और वहाँ वह आप को विद्यार्थियों द्वारा लाये हुए कुशा के घास फूस के शोपड़े में बैठा हुआ अपने विद्यार्थियों को विद्या दान देता हुआ मिलेगा और वह पुरुष इतिहास का साक्षी है कि उसने विशाल भारतीय साम्राज्य का योग्यतापूर्वक संचालन किया और महा-प्रतापी आर्य सम्राट् चन्द्रगुप्त भी उस के सामने पीपल के पत्ते की तरह कांपते थे। भारतवर्ष के अतीत इतिहास से आंख मूंदने वाले सज्जन जरा इस की ओर ध्यान दें। यह कोई अमरीका या रूस की कथा नहीं है जिस के लिए हमारे मित्र कहते हैं कि दूसरे देशों की तरफ देखने से क्या फ़ायदा, हमें अपने देश की तरफ देखना चाहिये। मैं उन से निवेदन करूँगा कि वह जरा भारत के पीछे का भी इतिहास देखें तब उन्हें पता चल जायगा कि पहले हमारे पूर्वज कहाँ थे और आज हम कहाँ पहुंच गये हैं। यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य का विषय है कि इस तथ्य को पहचानने का कोई प्रयत्न नहीं किया गया और न ही उस से कोई शिक्षा ग्रहण करने का।

जब मेरे परम धार्मिक माननीय गृह मंत्री डाक्टर काटजू ने ऐसा कहा कि हम मंत्री लोग कोई पीपल के पेड़ के नीचे तो बैठ कर जनता को रिसीन (receive)

१ [श्री नन्द लाल शर्मा]

कर नहीं सकते, तो मुझे उन की यह बात चुभ गई, क्योंकि अगर किसी दूसरे के मुंह से यह बात सुनता तो शायद उतनी नहीं चुभती, क्योंकि उन के प्रति मेरे मन में बहुत श्रद्धा है, धार्मिक प्रवृत्ति के आदमी हैं और आरम्भ से ही मेरे हृदय में उन के लिए बहुत श्रद्धा है। उन के मुंह से मुझे ऐसी बात सुन कर बड़ा दुःख हुआ। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप दो, चार दिन के लिए ऐक्सपेरिमेंट (experiment) कर के देखें और दिल्ली नगरी में किसी एक जगह खड़े हो कर वह घोषणा कर दें कि मैं अमृक पीपल के वृक्ष के नीचे अमृक दिन बैठूंगा, और जिस किसी को कुछ कहना सुनना हो, अपना दुःख रोना हो, वह मुझ से उस स्थान पर मिल सकता है, तो आप देखेंगे कि चार दिन के भीतर दिल्ली की जनता आप के पीछे प्राण देने लगेगी और उन मंत्री महोदय को देवता समान पूजने लगेगी। इस में मुझे किसी प्रकार का संदेह नहीं है। इसी तरह से मुझे यह कहना है कि जैसे हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नेहरू, जिन का भोजन आदि रहन सहन मिनिस्टर के वेतन मात्र से नहीं चल सकता, क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि उन का खर्चा उससे कई गुना अधिक है, वह यदि आज यह कह दें कि मैं राज्य के खजाने से अपने लिए एक कौड़ी भी न लूंगा, तो मैं कहता हूँ कि आज अकेले भारत ही नहीं सारा विश्व उन को देवता की तरह पूजना आरम्भ कर देगा। अभी कल ही की तां बात है, कि समाचारपत्रों में यह समाचार प्रकाशित हुआ है कि कांग्रेस के भूतपूर्व अध्यक्ष डाक्टर पट्टाभि सीतारमैया ने एक वक्तव्य दिया है कि राज्यपाल के रूप में निरन्तर बार बार पाटियां खाते खाते मैं ऊब गया हूँ और वह कहते हैं कि उन पाटियों में वही लोग बराबर आते हैं, और इसलिये कोई आनन्द भी नहीं आता।

इस से अच्छा होगा कि जो लोग हम को पार्टी देना चाहते हैं वह दस, बीस, या पचास शरीबों को भोजन खिलायें तो वह ठीक होगा। यज्ञ हम इसीलिये करते हैं। सोशलिज्म (socialism) का सब से बड़ा सिद्धांत है यज्ञ करना। यज्ञ के द्वारा जितना भी धन इकट्ठा किया गया है, वह दान दुःखी लोगों में बांट दिया जाय, यही यज्ञ करने का सब से बड़ा सिद्धान्त होता है। मैं और अधिक न कहते हुए सिर्फ यह कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर हम खर्च मात्र की दृष्टि से इस विषय को देखेंगे, तो इस में कोई संदेह नहीं कि यह जो २२५० रुपया एक मंत्री के लिए नियत किया गया है, वह बहुत कम और अपर्याप्त सिद्ध होगा और निश्चय ही उस को बढ़ाना पड़ेगा, आज नहीं बढ़ायेंगे तो कल बढ़ाना पड़ेगा। यह भी ईश्वर की कृपा है कि हमारे सौभाग्य से आज के मंत्रिगण अच्छी सद्भावना वाले हैं और अगर इसी प्रकार की भावना वाले मंत्री बने रहे, तब तो ठीक है, नहीं तो ऊपर की आमदनी इन के पास भी आने लगेगी और बहुत मुसीबत बढ़ जायगी। अगर ऊपर की आमदनी यह लोग न लेना चाहें तो इतने खर्च में उन के लिए ईमानदारी से काम चलाना कठिन हो जायगा। हां, यह अवश्य है कि अगर वह सज्जन उच्च भावना वाले हैं और जनता की सेवा करते हुए त्याग कर सकते हैं तो उन को स्वयं को एक आदर्श बना कर जनता के समक्ष रखना चाहिये और वह एक त्याग और आदर्श के दृष्टिकोण से त्याग का जीवन व्यतीत करने का प्रयत्न करें, तो जनता पर भी उस का अनुकूल असर पड़ेगा। जैसा श्री गाडगिल ने कहा कि उन मंत्री लोगों को पिछले और आगे आने वाले चुनावों का खर्चा भी तो देसना है, अगर कहीं इस तरह हमारे मंत्रि-

गण और संसद् सदस्य सोचने लगे कि उस खर्च का भी हमें इंतजाम करना है, तो मैं कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि देश और जनता का कल्याण सम्भव नहीं।

आज कोई गरीब आदमी चुनाव में नहीं खड़ा हो सकता। किसी की शक्ति नहीं है कि वह लाखों रुपया खर्च करे। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि काँग्रेस पत्र पर कोई भले ही पांच छः हजार लिख दे लेकिन खर्च इस से बहुत ज्यादा होता है, और इसे कोई भी अपनी अकल से जान सकता है। अगर आप को इस सारे प्रपंच से छुटकारा पाना है तो आप को यहां के आकर्षण को मिटाना होगा। योग्य पुरुषों के मन की बात मैं नहीं कहता। और देशों में भी योग्यतम प्राणी वहां के दरिद्रतम प्राणी रहे हैं। प्रोफ़ेसर एमैनुअल कांट तथा जर्मनी के दूसरे तत्व-वेत्ता जैसे व्यक्तियों का भी जो बड़े तत्वदर्शी माने गये हैं यही हाल रहा है। हम लोग चाहते हैं, हमने बड़े बड़े दार्शनिकों के जीवन देखे हैं उन से मालूम होता है कि उन का भोजन तक कैसा रहता था। कारण क्या है जो देश का, राष्ट्र का और विश्व का कल्याण चाहते हैं उन को अपने स्वार्थ का परित्याग करना पड़ता है और यही मैं ने कहा:

अर्थ कामेष्वसक्तानां धर्मज्ञा विधीयते।

—मनु

जो लोग अर्थ नाम लक्ष्मी देवी को बटोरने में लगे हुए हैं और कामना यानी इच्छाओं और वासनाओं को पूरा करने में जो व्यक्ति लगा रहता है वह कभी भी संसार को भूल नहीं सकता। अपनी वासना और तृष्णा का त्याग कर के ही चलने वाला व्यक्ति दूसरों की सेवा में आगे बढ़ सकता है। और यही कारण है कि स्वर्गीय श्री गांधी जी ने कांग्रेस के ऊपर अपना प्रभाव डाल कर पांच

सौ रुपये तन्खाह का प्रश्न खड़ा किया था। पांच सौ में उन को कुछ होता नहीं लेकिन यह तो एक उदाहरण के तौर पर था। उस के अन्दर केवल एक सिद्धान्त था कि आत्म बलिदान से और आत्म त्याग से ही दूसरों की सेवा हो सकती है। अपने स्वार्थ पर चिपके रहने से दूसरों की सेवा नहीं हो सकती, यही हमारा भाव है और इन्हीं विचारों से हम अपने सुझाव देते हैं कि समस्त मंत्रिमंडल इस को अच्छी तरह से सोचे और इस दृष्टिकोण से जो जो सज्जन अपने जीवन में परिवर्तन कर सकें, या स्वयं परिवर्तन कर के दिखा दें, उन का मैं ही नहीं बल्कि सारा राष्ट्र धन्यवाद करेगा और स्वागत करेगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There was to be a half hour discussion today, but in view of the fact that this Bill is half-finished, I think that that may well stand over to next Thursday. We will finish this by one o'clock.

Dr. Katju: I have nothing to say. I oppose those amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

(i) In page 1, lines 7 and 8, for "two thousand two hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "one thousand rupees."

(ii) In page 1, lines 8 and 9, for "one thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees" substitute "seven hundred and fifty rupees."

The motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.—(Residence of Ministers)

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I beg to move:

(i) In page 1, lines 10 and 11, for "without payment of rent" substitute "on payment of stipulated rent."

(ii) In page 1, line 13, after "no charge" insert, "other than the stipulated rates".

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): My amendment is the same as the other. I want to say something on this: I am not moving my amendment.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: With your permission, Sir, I shall just say a word; I am not moving my amendment. I do not like the word 'fully' in the clause. If you remember, Sir, in 1946 when there was a mixed Ministry of Muslim League and Congress, in the case of the late Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, a dispute arose as to what is a furnished house and how much could be spent on furnishing the house. He wanted to spend a very large sum on the house which he got. Now, the wording in the clause is 'fully furnished residence'. The term 'fully' stinks in the nostrils. What is a fully furnished house? A house may be furnished; it may not be fully furnished if there is no air conditioning in the latrines. I do not want the word 'fully' here. It may lead to misinterpretation. Only if the hon. Minister is prepared to accept my amendment, I move it; otherwise not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That will be considered.

Shri Keshavaiengar (Bangalore North): I was only attempting to improve the language. I leave it to the hon. Minister to appreciate the effect of the language. I do not propose to move the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Vallatharas is not in his seat. Mr. K. K. Basu is not moving I think. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is also not moving I think.

So the amendments moved are Nos. 9 and 10.

Does he want to speak?

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: No.

Shri K. K. Basu: A good deal of discussion has taken place on the enactment before the House. I wanted to move an amendment to this particular clause. In view of the fact that the amendment moved by my hon. friend fully covers that point, with your permission, I shall speak on it.

I quite appreciate that in places like Delhi Government should provide accommodation for Ministers, etc. But, I feel that there should be a stipulation of rent, because, in our country there is a feeling that Ministers are developing into a special class. They are living in houses which, as has also been admitted by the Prime Minister, cannot be called either utility or good

houses—good in the sense, with a huge compound and as was said by Mr. Gadgil, with 28 rooms. I do not know whether the same accommodation is available in all the houses. I feel that the Ministers should have such accommodation where they can work. It does not necessarily mean that they should have palatial buildings. I think the idea of living in a palatial building has a tendency to corrupt the habits of the person concerned. The Home Minister was living in our place in a house with 40 or 42 rooms. Of course, he was an eminent lawyer and he can well afford to have a house similar to that or nearly similar to that. There may be persons who come from the ordinary rung of life. If they get into the habit of living in such big houses, they develop a tendency and an attitude of mind that does not conduce to good public service. They have come here to serve the people.

That is why I say some sort of rent may be fixed and that can be paid by Government, and this system of houses without limitation of the accommodation of size given to the Ministers has a bad effect on the general tendencies and attitude of people. And the common people feel that they are developing into, as you call it, the Nababs and *Maharajas* of the country in the new set up. That is why I suggest and I hope at least they will build these houses into really habitable and economic units instead of such big palaces with big compounds. With these words I suggest some sort of rent should be fixed and paid by Government.

Dr. Katju: I am unable to accept it, and I should like to mention one fact. The rent that is suggested at the stipulated rates—I think it is ten per cent. of the salary generally; probably for furnished houses, it will be another 2½ per cent, in all 12½ per cent—comes to Rs. 283. I was just calculating the income-tax and super-tax that is paid upon it by the unfortunate Minister—i.e., seven annas in the rupee plus a surcharge of another one-tenth, and that would be roughly 7½ annas per rupee. So, let us be quite clear about it and not create a sort of conception that Ministers are living in free houses and paying nothing for them.

And secondly, so far as big houses and palatial houses are concerned, I really do not understand all these things. It all depends on the man's temperament. Let the Government give small houses and the Ministers will shift into them. It is all at the choice of Government. Personally I do not

want, and none of my colleagues want, a house of a particular description, a particular area, with a number of rooms. So far as the house in which I am living is concerned, it contains four or five bed rooms, one office room and one sitting room.

Pandit A. R. Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West):
About the word "Fully furnished"?

ठाकुर दास जी ने जो कहा 'फुल्लि फर्निशड' उसके बारे में ?

Dr. Katju: So far as Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's amendment is concerned, I accept it.

Amendment made:

In page 1, line 11, omit "fully".

—[*Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava*].

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we come to amendments by Mr. Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

The question is:

In page 1, lines 10 and 11, for "without payment of rent" substitute "on payment of stipulated rent".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is.

In page 1, line 13, after "no charge" insert, "other than the stipulated rates."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 4 as amended stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 as amended was added to the Bill

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we will take up Clause 5. Babu Ram Narayan Singh.

Clause 5.— (*Sumptuary allowance*)

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह (हजारी बाग पवित्रम): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दस बाग्ह मिनट बचे हैं। सभी लोग व्यग्र होंगे कि यह बिल जल्दी से पास हो जाय। इस पर वाद विवाद भी हो चुका है। इस विधेयक का अधिक विरोध भी नहीं हो रहा है यद्यपि होना चाहिये था। जिस समय गृह मंत्री जी इस विधेयक को प्रस्तुत कर रहे थे उस

समय का भाषण तो मुझे ऐसा लगता था जैसे कि एक खेल हो रहा हो, एक अभिनय या नाटक हो रहा हो। उन का जो दूसरा भाषण हुआ उस के लिए मैं उन को वधाई दे सकता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: सारा संसार नाटक है।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर इस बात का मब को जान हो जाय तब तो शायद किसी से कोई अनर्थ होने ही न पावे।

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The hon. Member is speaking about the world being a *natak* and all that. Is it all relevant to the clause under discussion now?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is coming from the world to the clause.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: इसी तरह बात बढ़ा दी जाती है। लोग यह नहीं समझते कि जब कोई बात कही जाती है तो उस की भूमिका जरूर होती है। श्री ठाकुरदास भार्गव जी तो वकील हैं ही। जब अपना केस किसी के सामने रखते होंगे तो चुपके से अपनी बात नहीं कह देते होंगे भूमिका जरूर बांधते होंगे। इसलिये इन को इनना टैकनिकल नहीं होना चाहिये कि इसी पर बोली। खैर मैं इसी पर बोलूंगा।

बात यह है उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि वेतन तो मंत्रियों का मंजूर हो चुका, साढ़े बाईस सौ रुपया। किसी के मुंह से सुना कि यह लोग बहुत त्याग कर रहे हैं। त्याग किस बात का? क्या उन की जागीर थी, क्या उन की अपनी सम्पत्ति ही चुकी थी? यहाँ त्याग का तो प्रश्न नहीं है। अभी हमारे मित्र नन्द लाल जी ने हमारे सामने प्राचीन काल का आदर्श रखा? हमारे देश में जब मुसलमान आ गये थे उस समय में भी औरंगजेब और नासिरुद्दीन बादशाह का आदर्श सामने

[बाबू रामनारायण सिंह]

है कि कोई कुरान लिख कर और उस को बेच कर खाता या कोई टोपी बना कर खाता था। और गांधी जी हमारे सामने हैं।

डाक्टर पी० एस० देशमुख (अमरावती पूर्व): आई० सी० एस० लोग उस वक्त नहीं थे।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: इस समय आप आदर्श को छोड़ दें। अपने हृदय में न्याय भाव तो लाये। यह जो मंत्री हैं...

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: सम्पचुअरी ऐलाउंस (Sumptuary allowance) के बारे में कहिये।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: वही मैं कह रहा हूँ, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि वेतन तो मिल ही चुका और पूर्णतया मुसज्जित महल भी मिल ही चुके अब यह जो सम्पचुअरी ऐलाउंस मिलता है यह क्यों मिलता है ?

एक माननीय सदस्य: आप को खिलाने के लिए मिलता है।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: मेरे एक साथी ने कहा कि हम को खिलाने के लिये मिलता है। मैं सन् २६-२७ से इस सदन का सदस्य हूँ। इन मंत्रियों के सम्पचुअरी ऐलाउंस में से मुझे एक दिन भी हिस्सा नहीं मिला। तो यह अगर खिलाने भी है तो किस को खिलाने हैं ? शायद अपने हित मित्रों को खिलाने होंगे और जो उन के अनुकूल बोलते होंगे उन को कभी खिलाने होंगे। तो अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि यह पास तो हो ही जायगा। कोई रोक नहीं सकता। लेकिन मैं यह कह रहा था कि आप आदर्श को छोड़िये। आप अपने दिल में न्यायभाव को रखिये। न्याय के साथ विचा-

रिये। यह वेतन, यह महल इस तरह का भाषण और यह सब रूप रंग सुखी भारत के लिए तो शोभा देता है लेकिन जिस समय हमारे देश में हाहाकार मचा हुआ है उस समय जो आप यह काम करते हैं और अगर आप एक पैसे का भी खर्च लाते हैं तो उस के लिए आप को देखना पड़ेगा। हमारे मंत्री लोग क्या हैं ?

डाक्टर काटजू: सेवक।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: वह तो जरूर कहेंगे कि वह देश के सेवक हैं। अगर वह देश के सेवक हैं तो उन का मालिक कौन है ? जनता। जनता के लिए उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कहा जाता है कि हमारे देश में करीब ९० प्रति शत लोग ऐसे हैं जिन को दोनों जून भोजन नहीं मिलता।

डाक्टर काटजू: हम भी कल से एक ही वक्त खाना खायेंगे।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: यदि ऐसी बात हो तो वह बड़ी खुशी की बात है। प्रश्न यह है कि हमारा मंत्री मंडल कैसा है। ये लोग अपने को देशभक्त और देश सेवक कहते हैं। जनता जनार्दन इन की मालिक है। वह भूखों मरे और यह मौजूद करें, यह न्याय भाव कहाँ है वह अपने हृदय से पूछें।

इस के साथ साथ मैं एक बात और कहे देता हूँ, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय। वह यह है। ये देश भक्त हैं, देश की सेवा करने के लिए आये हैं, देश का काम करने के लिए आये हैं। उन का दावा ठीक हो सकता है कि उनकी परवरिश होनी चाहिये। लेकिन देश का काम करने में यह मौजूद करें यह तो शोभा नहीं देता है। हमारे डाक्टर काटजू साहब ने कहा, गरीब मिनिस्टर लोग। यह कहने

में तो उन को संकोच होना चाहिये । कहा जाता है कि इस से कम में कैसे काम चलेगा? बहुत ठोक है ।

एक दफ़ा हमारे भाई ठाकुर दास जी जब कि हम ५०० की बातें करते थे तो इन्होंने कहा था कि ५०० में कैसे काम चलेगा? तो मैंने उस वक्त कहा था कि ५०० में कैसे चलेगा, इस के लिए सारा देश गुरु बन कर बैठता हुआ है । एक गुरु नहीं, दस गुरु नहीं, दस लाख गुरु नहीं, सारा देश गुरु बन कर बैठता हुआ है कि ५०० माहवारी वेतन में कैसे चलेगा । अभी इस वक्त २२५० रुपये वेतन हो गया, सुसज्जित भवन भी हो गया । उस के ऊपर यह जो सम्पचुअरी ऐलाउंस है, यह तो घोर अन्याय है । इस के लिए तो मैं कहूंगा कि आप लोगों में इतनी दया हो, दया तो दूर रही, इतना न्याय भाव हो, इतनी ईमानदारी हो कि यह सम्पचुअरी ऐलाउंस न रखें । आतिथ्य सेवा के लिए आप को जो मिलता है, आप की जो आमदनी है, उसी से आप को अगर अपने अतिथि की पूजा करनी है तो अपने भोजन से, अपने वेतन से आप उन की पूजा कीजिये । उस के लिए देश सम्पचुअरी अलाउंस भी दे, यह तो बिल्कुल अन्याय की बात है । यह किसी हालत में नहीं होना चाहिये ।

मैं जानता हूँ कि सभी भाइयों के हृदय में न्याय भाव है और सब के हृदय में ईश्वर भी बैठा हुआ है । उन के हृदय में बैठे हुए ईश्वर से मैं निवेदन करता हूँ, प्रार्थना करता हूँ, कि जो कोई काम करो और खास कर जब ऐसे अवसर पर काम करो तो ज़रा उस ईश्वर का ध्यान कर के, न्याय भाव ला कर के काम करना चाहिये । मैं कहूंगा कि चाहे तो यह चीज वापस ले लें नहीं तो जो यह धारा है इस 'को सब कोई मिल कर के रद्द कीजिये । आप को याद रखना

चाहिये कि ऐसी ऐसी धारायें हम लोगों की देशभक्ति पर, हमारी न्याय की भावना पर कलंक के टीके के तौर पर रहेंगी जो सब तरह से देश को बरबाद करती हैं । आप के पास सब कुछ तो है ही । फिर आप किसी को एक गिलास पानी पिलावें तो एक पैसा लें लें, सोडा वाटर पिलावें तो चार आने, इस का क्या हिसाब किताब है ?

तो यह तो किसी भी हालत में पास नहीं होना चाहिये । इसलिये मैं आप से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अपने परमात्मा को साक्षी रख कर वोट दें और यह नहीं कि जनता को लूट लूट कर खाते जावो ।

Dr. Katju: I do not agree with this amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 5 stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6.— (*Travelling and daily allowances*)

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Regarding my amendment "after 'allowances' insert 'for himself'", I understand that even today the rule is that the Minister gets the allowance, but the family does not get it. I only wanted the amendment for the purpose of clarification.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When he comes to take charge only....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: My amendment is not for that. My amendment is to insert "for himself" in line 34 under (b) after "travelling and daily allowance". This is clear. There is no doubt this is the rule today. Only for the purpose of clarification I tabled the amendment. I tabled the amendment because in (a) we have got "for himself and the members of his family" etc. But in (b) we have got "undertaken by him".

1 P.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In (b) "by him" is there whereas family is specifically mentioned in the earlier portion. When only "by him" is mentioned here it means the family is not included.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: If the hon. Minister goes out on a long tour for a month, is he not entitled to take his wife with him?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. It is not in the scheme of the present Ministers. New Ministers may do that.

The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7.— (*Medical treatment etc.*)

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I have an amendment to clause 7. It runs thus:

In page 2, line 6, after "medical treatment" add "available in India".

Dr. Katju: I do not accept that.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: So far as India is concerned, they are entitled to have the best treatment available in the country, but if any Minister is sent to America or somewhere else for treatment the difficulty will be that the people will not appreciate it and the House will not agree to this amenity.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: The Home Minister should accept this very simple amendment, Sir.

Dr. Katju: I am not willing.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I have laid it before the House, but if the hon. Minister is not willing to accept it I am not moving it, Sir.

Shri K. K. Basu: I too have an amendment which runs thus:

In page 2, line 5, after "family" insert "which includes wife, dependent parents and the children".

I want to qualify the word "family" because in our country the joint family system is prevalent in many places. We may have a family as large as that of the Dhritarastra of Mahabharat. We have experienced in Bengal when

Mr. Fazlul Haque was the head of the Government how many people used to occupy the best rooms in the Tropical School. That is why I want to qualify this word family.

Dr. Katju: This is really hypersensitiveness. Supposing my daughter-in-law looks after me then she will not be treated! I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He only wants to add to the categories.

Dr. Katju: No, he wants to limit the family. He says:

After "family" insert "which includes wife, dependent parents and the children".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Evidently the amendment does not carry out the intention of the hon. Member. He wants to restrict the scope of the term "family", but his amendment does not do so.

Shri K. K. Basu: Then I will not move it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 8 to 13 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

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

Dr. Katju: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 1st August 1952.