

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to legal practitioners and to provide for the constitution of Bar Councils and an All-India Bar, be extended upto the 30th March 1960".

The motion was adopted.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF PAY
COMMISSION—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further consideration of the motion moved by Shri Narayanankutty Menon on the 17th December 1959, namely:—

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Commission of Enquiry on Emoluments and Conditions of Service of Central Government Employees, Government Resolution thereon and the statement made by the Finance Minister in the House on the 30th November 1959".

Time taken is 3 hours and 42 minutes. Shri Prabhat Kar may continue his speech. Meanwhile, how many hon. Members want to take part in the debate—There seems to be a good number of hon. Members who would like to speak.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): Shri Rajendra Singh will speak on behalf of our Group.

Mr. Speaker: Should we not conclude the discussion today?

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): This affects the destiny of nearly two million Government employees.

Mr. Speaker: Can the hon. Minister reply on Monday?

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: Then this discussion will go on until Private Members' Business is taken up. The hon. Minister will reply to the discussion on Monday. To that extent, the time is extended. I take it that that is the sense of the House.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Have you noted down the names of speakers, Sir?

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Mr. Speaker, Sir; as I was saying yesterday, the minimum wages recommended by the Second Pay Commission are less than the minimum accepted by the various tribunals and wage boards. I had pointed out yesterday that between 1947 and 1957 many tribunals, wage boards and Commissions were appointed and they had given their findings on the minimum wage. Here we find the Second Pay Commission coming to a conclusion which is against the common understanding of all the tribunals and adjudicating bodies which have given their judgments in the last ten years.

The Fair Wages Committee in their Report have stated this with reference to the minimum wage:

"We consider that a minimum wage must provide not merely for the bare sustenance of life but for the preservation of the efficiency of the worker. For this purpose, the minimum wage must also provide for some measure of education, medical requirements and amenities".

This was their concept of a minimum wage. The Varadachariar Committee, while discussing the question of the wage structure of Central Government employees, came to the conclusion that what they were recommending at that time were just emoluments

on the poverty line. This is what they said:

"The poverty line may be drawn at the point below which an individual would be under-nourished or it may be drawn well above the nutritional minimum, at a point where a choice of diet and the chance of some cultural life or recreation will also be possible. We think that at present we can only aspire to rise above the 'poverty line' in the first sense".

This was the recommendation of the First Pay Commission. According to them, this was the poverty line in the first sense, that is, it was just a point below which an individual would be under-nourished. Thereafter, the Fair Wages Committee submitted their Report where they indicated their concept of minimum wage, which I have already referred to, namely, that the minimum wage should not only be sufficient to keep body and soul together, it must not only provide the bare sustenance of life, but it must also provide for the preservation of the efficiency of the worker.

As I pointed out yesterday, as a result of the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission, the emoluments of Central Government employees will not be readjusted. Whatever they get in addition will be credited to their account and there will be no actual rise, barring a few chips here and there.

According to the First Pay Commission's Report, the stress was on the poverty line, that is, emoluments less than the minimum. Today when we are talking of emoluments of the Central Government employees, at least the minimum should have been granted, the minimum accepted by the various tribunals and bodies appointed by Government. I need not stress the point that at the 15th Indian Labour Conference, there was

a principle accepted as to how the minimum was to be calculated. That has been given the go-by. Apart from that, today the notion of minimum wage, as established by the tribunals, will again be given the go-by as a result of the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission. I want to know whether minimum wage will have a different meaning as between employees in the private sector and the public sector. Minimum wage is a minimum wage; it makes no difference whether a person works in the public sector or the private sector. There, the Second Pay Commission was not right in recommending a lesser amount of pay than what was considered the minimum by various tribunals and adjudicating bodies when they discussed the question of minimum wage in different industries. The second point is about the question of dearness allowance. I am really surprised how the procedure for calculating dearness allowance can be given in this manner. The Second Pay Commission has agreed that except in India and Pakistan nowhere in the world this dearness allowance is allowed to continue. It has been admitted that everywhere the wages increase according to the rise in the cost of living. Here only in India and Pakistan a new thing developed after the war and the dearness allowance continued along with the wage structure. Dearness allowance is necessary to neutralise the rise in the cost of living. There also the question has already been settled as to how the dearness allowance has to be granted. Dearness allowance is an amount which is given with a view to neutralise the cost of living and it must have a bearing on the rise in the cost of living. When the First Pay Commission gave this recommendation, it gave a formula. That formula was not only accepted by the Government at that time but was accepted throughout the country by all adjudicators. The most controversial point in regard to the grant of dearness allowance is to what extent neutralisation of the rise

[Shri Prabhat Kar]

in the cost of living should be allowed. The recommendation of the Central Pay Commission in this regard had a profound influence on the subsequent adjudication on the subject. The First Pay Commission observed as follows:

"We are of the opinion that for the classes whose pay only enables them to live on the marginal level in normal times, the allowance must be so fixed as to neutralise the rise in prices. Some of the upper grades too will require a measure of relief."

The Fair Wages Committee agreeing with the view of the Central Pay Commission recommended 100 per cent neutralisation of the increase in the cost of living for the lowest categories of wage earners and a lower rate of compensation for categories above the lowest. There may be a difference of opinion whether it should be 100 per cent neutralised or 86 per cent or 75 per cent. But the idea is that dearness allowance must be connected with the rise and fall in the cost of living. Here they have given something and I do not know how they came to this conclusion. They say:

"If during a period of 12 months the index remains, on an average, ten points above 115, the Government should review the position and consider whether an increase in the dearness allowance should be allowed;...."

Even if there is any increase in the cost of living, if there is a rise in prices, even then it will be left to the Government to decide whether the employees should be given a rise in the dearness allowance or not. Then it becomes a misnomer to call it a dearness allowance. It means that whenever there is a rise, with that rise there will not necessarily be an increase in the emoluments. The Government will consider. It is

not necessary that the Government must increase; it is left to the whims of the Government to say whether there will be an increase in the dearness allowance.

For the last ten or twelve years, after our Independence, various adjudications have been made and there is a concept of dearness allowance and its formula has almost been settled. The Second Pay Commission has given a go-by to all this formula and has given the power to the Government to decide whether there will be any increase in the dearness allowance to the employees or not.

I now come to my third point. The Second Pay Commission was appointed because the employees wanted it as they considered that the emoluments which they were getting were much less in comparison to the rise in the cost of living and also in comparison to the emoluments given to the employees in the State sector and in other industries. They raised a dispute and they wanted the Commission to go into the matter and decide what rise they should have and what further emoluments they should get. You will be able to appreciate the position Sir. A dispute is raised by a party before a judge and a prayer is made. It would be well within the right of the judge to say that the claim is allowed in full or in part or the claim is disallowed. There was the recommendation of the First Pay Commission for all this time and the Government never raised a dispute; they did not want to change the service conditions. The Saturday—half working day—has been continuing all these years. Now, the Second Pay Commission was appointed because the employees wanted that their emoluments should increase. How can the Second Pay Commission recommend that there should be two full working Saturdays. Never during these ten years, did the Government raise any dispute about the curtailment of any

right. No judge would allow anything more than what has been the prayer. Here, the only thing that a judge can say is that the prayer is disallowed. No judge can go beyond the terms of the prayer. Here, I am surprised that the Pay Commission has gone beyond that. There was no dispute about it; they never raised any question about it. But the Commission came forward with a suggestion to curtail the existing rights and privileges. I would say that this is not only not justified but something unheard of. The Second Pay Commission has gone beyond its jurisdiction. It may be that technically the terms of reference have been made by the Government but factually, there was no point raised by the Government when the award of the First Pay Commission was in force about the working hours or about the other rights and privileges which the employees were enjoying.

This is not the way in which they should deal with the employees. It is not a question of the employees going on strike. After all, we are all anxious to see that our targets for the Plan are fulfilled. We want the development of the country. Now, the whole machinery is run by the employees who are working day and night. I dare say no worker in India grudges working hard for the betterment of the country's economy. But that cannot be achieved by such things. It can only be done if there is co-operation, understanding and good relationship and not if the rights and privileges which they are enjoying today are curtailed, if their emoluments are not increased and they are not given a fair proportion of their share. They should be able to have a livelihood and fulfil their commitments to their family and society. Without that, it will be a threat, not only to the Government but to the country because with unwilling and dissatisfied workers the country cannot develop and the economic development of the country will be in great difficulties. So,

I would request the hon. Minister to reconsider this matter, whatever be the Commission's recommendation, in the light of the situation as it exists today and give what is necessary for the Central Government employees.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel that the Government, their employees and the Pay Commission all are in a most unenviable position so far as this particular issue is concerned. Now, the Government have been fighting against the ever-receding resources for the development and planning; their employees are fighting against inflation and the Commission is fighting to have a *via media* as to how to reconcile between these two ends and interests. We are also in a most unenviable position. Even though we might feel like speaking in a popular strain we are constrained from doing so for obvious reasons.

Now, Sir, I propose to address myself not in a popular strain but in a somewhat realistic way for what it may be worth. Let the fact be conceded that this Pay Commission's Report is a postscript to a saga of frustration and disillusion. The Varadachariar Committee, the Dearness Allowance Committee and everybody else had hoped that the living cost will go down, the wholesale price indices will go down. The Planning Commission had induced the entire country to put a premium on that kind of hopeful thinking. But all those hopes have been belied. If we look at our economic conditions today we find the consumer price indices are going up. They have shown a net rise of 33 per cent between 1947 and 1958. The wholesale price index between May 1955 and August 1957 has recorded an increase of 25 per cent—base year being not 1939—from 89 to 112. Then, the money value is going down as has been pointed out by the Commission, that Rs. 80 which they have recommended today is equivalent to Rs. 55 which was recommended by the Varadachariar Committee.

[Shri Mahanty]

These are some of the grim aspects of the background against which the Pay Commission's Report has to be considered.

Assuming, as the Commission has stated, the minimum of Rs. 125 for the class IV employees which was demanded is conceded, the financial implications will be of the order of Rs. 42 crores per year for the seven lakhs of class IV employees, and during a period of five years it will mean an additional expenditure of Rs. 210 crores.

Now, against the background which I have delineated at some length, I could say that it will not be unfair to give the class IV employees a minimum salary of Rs. 125 per month, which will be a fair salary, which will be a fair wage. But the other side of the picture is that during the five-year period one has to find out an additional sum of Rs. 200 crores.

The next question that will arise is, wherefrom will you get the money? Of course, if I were the Finance Minister I would ask the Nasik Press to put an extra shift of work, go on printing currency notes, put those currency notes in the pay packets of the employees, enhance the excise duties and mop up the excess that is generated. But, then, its disastrous effect on the people at large has also to be taken into account.

Then, let it also be said in all fairness to the Pay Commission that they had not the pretention to claim that they were going to prescribe a fair wage. They have not done that. They have said that what they were trying to recommend was to approximate a living wage. The only criterion that they have applied in determining this living wage is not to link it with the rise in prices. The principle which they have applied is that the structure of emoluments and conditions of service should be so designed as to ensure recruitment

at different levels of persons with requisite qualifications and ability to keep them efficient.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Was that one of the terms of reference?

Shri Mahanty: That is a different matter. I do not mean to say that it was in their terms of reference. What I am trying to point out, in all fairness, is that the Pay Commission has made no pretensions about it; they have said that the living wage that they were going to prescribe was not to be linked with the rise in prices but the only and sole determinant would be whether the salary of Rs. 80 per month was going to attract sufficient number of candidates for that job.

I do not express myself either this way or that way with the view, but what I am trying to submit is that this was the background of the Pay Commission's thinking before they made their recommendations, and here we are grappling with those recommendations for what they may be worth.

There is also another factor. The employees of the Central Government in 1948 numbered 14.45 lakhs. In 1957 their number increased to 17.75 lakhs and the total pay bill amounted to Rs. 303.86 crores. The Pay Commission was bothered with this fact that if over this increase in the pay bill a further increase is granted, it will have its repercussions which will be disastrous to all concerned.

Now, what I would like to do, Sir, in this context, is to examine how far the idea of social justice and equity are reflected in these recommendations. As I have said, whatever increase the Pay Commission may recommend, whatever increase the Government may concede, it is not going to solve the situation. For instance, food is the most important and the major item of increase in the consumer prices index. Food occupies the most important position in domestic budgets. When the employees go to the market with their Rs. 80, which

has been equated to Rs. 55 according to the Pay Commission, what do they find? They find that every day the rupee is losing its purchasing power. The food prices are shooting up in spite of increased production of food, in spite of zonal arrangements etc. etc. The other day, Sir, the Food Minister linked West Bengal and Orissa in a common rice zone and the reason given was that the food prices will go down. But today, he can go to Calcutta and he can find for himself that the price of rice there today is higher than what it used to be before the zonal arrangements came into being.

Now, this single action of the Government resulted in increasing prices in two places, both in West Bengal and in Orissa, I would like to ask, are the people, are the employees going to be responsible for many acts of omission and commission of their Government. Let the fact, in good grace, be conceded that no amount of increase to the employees of the Central Government is going to mitigate the realities of the situation.

The only solution that seems to me is that if the employees are assured of getting their foodgrains and their basic necessities of life according to a fair price—not according to the black-market, bulging prices in the open market but according to a fair price which is being fixed by the Government from time to time—then, even the Central or the State Government employees may not demand any increase beyond what has been granted to them. Therefore, the Government must either ensure a stable price or concede their demand for increased pay, the Government cannot say that they want to have the cake and also eat it. Either the Government must give them a basic living wage which should be linked not with other extraneous considerations but with the sole consideration of increase in prices as a model employer or the Government must undertake to supply to their employees the basic necessities of life according to a fair price.

Now, it may be said that it is a very difficult task and our administrative machinery cannot be geared to undertake that responsibility. But in all humility, Sir, I may point out, during the Second World War when the administration in this country was over-burdened with the responsibility of conducting the war in our eastern front, it had also undertaken the responsibility of supplying foodgrains and other basic necessities to its employees for which they had opened fair-price shops.

I also submit that the opening of these fair-price shops for the basic necessities of life for these employees will not mean any extra expenditure inasmuch as these foodgrains which will have to be sold—though other commodities will also have to be sold—will not be sold at a subsidised price but merely at a fair price. What is necessary for the Government is merely to organise and to gear their administration for discharging that responsibility. If, on the other hand, the Government feel that everything on earth is difficult for them, I see there is no reason why you should penalise the Class IV employees for your acts of omission and commission and your inability to undertake these responsibilities.

Therefore, in all humility, I would like to know from the Finance Minister or from the Government whether they have given any thought to this proposal, whether they cannot open shops for their employees wherefrom they can get their foodgrains, the only major item which has vitiated all domestic budgets and which has been the reason for the increasing spiral. I would like to know whether, to give that relief to their employees, they cannot open such fair-price shops assuming that they do not want to extend their concessions beyond what they have accepted.

Then there is another question to which I would like to invite the attention of the Government, and that is, it is most unrealistic to consider

[Shri Mahanty]

only the Central Government employees excluding the employees of the State Governments. Now, I find that with all our professions of a classless society, every day we are creating new classes. In the case of the Government employees also we have now created a class—a class of Central Government employees and a class of the State Government employees and also the class of local board employees. I am aware of the fact that in countries where federal governments are at work, there are slight differences between the salaries drawn by the employees of the State Governments and the salaries drawn by the servants of the federal government. The Pay Commission has gone into that aspect of the question and has discussed at some length the disparity obtaining in the United States of America and elsewhere. But anyone who may care to analyse that disparity will be shocked to find that the disparity that is noticed in India far exceeds the disparity that obtains in the United States of America or elsewhere. For instance, in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the total emoluments of a class IV employee is Rs. 33. Imagine the situation in the city of Srinagar where a Class IV employee under the State Government draws a total emolument of Rs. 33 per month when he comes into contact with a Class IV employee of the Government of India stationed in the same city. What kind of pattern is unfolded before him? Of course, the Government of India may say that the State Governments are masters of their own situation and have got their own budgets and that the Central Government have got nothing to do with the State Government employees; the Central Government can further plead that loans to the State Governments are offered and if they find out their matching recourse, they can increase the salaries of their employees.

But I would like to know one thing, and I would like to submit that point for your consideration. While the

Government of India have been granting loans to the State Governments for increasing the salary of their Class IV employees,—I am subject to correction—barring two or three State Governments, no other Governments have taken advantage of these loans for the reason that they cannot find the matching grants for the loans. Let us take the case of Mysore. It is a very prosperous State. It is a prosperous State by all standards. But if you come to look at the salaries which the Mysore Government pays to its Class IV employees, you will find—

An Hon. Member: It is half of the Centre's scale

Shri Mahanty: . . . not exactly half, but it is about 60 to 70 per cent of what is being paid by the Central Government. I do not want to take the time of the House by analysing the pattern of the inequity that prevails in the various States. But what I would like to submit is that today, let us have the courage in both hands and admit that in a planned economy we cannot draw a line of distinction between the State Governments and the Central Government. When the Central Government is controlling the destiny of all the State Governments, when a few members of the Planning Commission have to okay all the State Governments budgets before they are presented in the respective legislative assemblies, when the Planning Commission is practically functioning as a leviathan as no leviathan has ever dared to function in this country, it is really little short of dishonesty to say that "it is the look-out of the State Governments and we have not got anything to do in the matter". The only criterion that should be applied, according to me, is whether the salary that we are paying as a model employer will satisfy the needs of social justice, whether it will satisfy the needs of economic justice and whether it will take us a step forward in eliminating the disparity which we all profess to do.

In this context, if you look at the disparity in salaries you will also find a very undesirable situation. The disparity in the minima may be 1:5 but if you take the disparity in maxima, the disparity that is obtaining today in this country with its socialistic profession is much more than it obtains in any capitalist country. For instance, in India, so far as the disparity in maxima is concerned, it is 1:29.5; in the United Kingdom, it is 1:15; in the USA, it is 1:5; in Canada it is 1:6; in Japan, it is 1:47. I would like to know from the Government, in all humility, if they cannot assure a fair deal to their Class IV employees and the matriculate clerks, why they should rub salt into the chilblain in this fashion as far as these employees are concerned by not curtailing the maximum salary drawn by their higher bosses. It can be said that we have got hardly about 350 to 400 employees who are drawing high salaries. It is not a question of chopping the heads of the 300 or 400 employees. It is a question of principle.

I believe the Pay Commission's report symbolises the nation's aspirations for having a socialistic deal, and as it has been said, charity begins at home. If you are appointing wage boards for the private sector for various industries and if you are insisting that a minimum wage which is being prescribed by these wage boards must be paid and if you are going to fix it as a statutory amount, the country expects to know from you why you cannot begin the charity at home.

Therefore, I would end with only this conclusion: that while I am aware of the fact that no amount of increase is ever going to solve the situation and I concede that if we are going to link wages with the ever increasing prices, every year we shall have to appoint a Pay Commission. It may be that every month even we shall have to appoint a Pay Commission. While I am aware of that fact, I only feel that if the employees, both at the Centre and in the State Governments, are assured of the supply of their basic necessities at

a fair price from the Government-controlled fair-price shops, then possibly much of the discontent will disappear.

Lastly, I would only plead that the Government of India will have to exert their influence over the State Governments to see that in such States like Jammu and Kashmir, Orissa, Mysore and Madhya Pradesh, where the Class IV employees and the matriculate clerks are getting a salary which is far below the national standard, the State Governments take advantage of the concessions being offered by the Government of India so that their employees also get a fair deal and get a taste of the welfare State which we are about to establish.

श्री पद्म देव (चम्बा) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस में शक नहीं कि किसी अच्छी योजना को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए एक अच्छी मशीनरी की आवश्यकता है और वह अच्छी मशीनरी तब चालू रहती है, जब उसमें नियमित रूप से घ्रौर ठीक ढंग से तेल और सफ़ाई इत्यादि की व्यवस्था हो। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि स्वतंत्रता के पश्चात् भारतवर्ष के हर नागरिक की आय में वृद्धि हुई है। लूहार, किसान, दर्जी आदि हर एक की आय में काफ़ी से ज्यादा वृद्धि हुई है। किन्तु भांकड़े बताते हैं कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों की आय में इस प्रकार की वृद्धि नहीं हुई है, जिस प्रकार कि दूसरे सयानों में या दूसरे इवारों में हुई है। अगर सरकारी मशीनरी को चलाने वाले लोग असंतुष्ट हों और उन को भाजीविका के अनुसार धन की प्राप्ति न हो, तो फिर सरकार चाहे कितनी उच्चादर्श की हो, उस के सामने कितनी ही सुन्दर योजनायें हों, किन्तु वह कभी अच्छी प्रकार से भागे नहीं जा सकती हैं। इसी का यह परिणाम है कि सरकार के द्वारा हर साल इतना रुपया खर्च किये जाने के पश्चात् भी भाज हमारी जो योजनायें चालू हैं, उन से जनता की तरफ से उतना लाभ नहीं उठया जा रहा है, जितना कि उठया जाना चाहिये

[श्री पद्म देव]

था। उस का सब से बड़ा कारण यही है कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों में असंतोष है। मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि उनका यह असंतोष बिलकुल ही उचित है। इस विषय में तो उन लोगों को खुद भी विचारने की आवश्यकता है। अभी जब यह रिपोर्ट जनता के सम्मुख आई, तो सरकारी कर्मचारियों की ओर से खास तौर पर कई बातें सामने रखी गईं, जैसे यह कि इस रिपोर्ट ने पोन्डीशन की ऐग्ने-वेट कर दिया है, सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने रोटी मांगी थी और सरकार ने उनको पत्थर दिए, जो कमीशन बनाया गया, उसने केवल सरकार को खुश करना ही अपना कर्तव्य समझा, छुट्टियों में कमी हो गई और काम के घंटों में वृद्धि हो गई, इत्यादि इत्यादि।

जहां तक सरकारी मशीनरी को चलाने का ताल्लुक है, उसके लिये समय अधिक लगाने का ताल्लुक है, अपनी जवानी को बूधा न छोड़ अपने देश की सेवा करने का ताल्लुक है, देश-भक्ति का जहां तक ताल्लुक है, वह तो सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने अपना कर्तव्य नहीं समझा। उन्होंने कहा कि भारतवर्ष में छोटे और बड़े सरकारी कर्मचारियों की आय का अनुपात १ और २४ का है, जब कि फारेन कंट्रीज में वह अनुपात १ और ४, या १ और ५, ६, ७, ८, ९ या १० का है—जितना भी समझिए—इसलिये यहां भी फारेन कंट्रीज की तरह होना चाहिए। जब एक गरीब मां का बेटा बाहर लोगों को अच्छे कपड़े पहने हुए, अच्छा खाते हुए और अच्छी हालात में देखता है, तो वह बिना यह सोचे हुए कि उस की मां की आर्थिक स्थिति क्या है अपनी मां को कोसना शुरू कर देता है। मैं महसूस करता हूं कि जब से हमारा देश आजाद हुआ है, तब से यहां भी हमारी प्रवृत्ति यही रही है कि बिना यह सोचे हुए कि नेशनल इनकम को बढ़ाने के लिये और देश की दौलत में वृद्धि करने के लिए हम कितना काम कर रहे हैं, हम अपनी मां पर प्रस्तुत करते रहते हैं। हम

पहले मांगते हैं, और पीछे काम करने का कुछ विचार करते हैं। पहाड़ में कहते हैं—डोका दे मिरग धरनी पाती, अर्थात् मृग तो पहाड़ में है और उसके मारने के मनसूबे लेकर लोग इकट्ठे हुए हैं, लेकिन वे चाहते क्या हैं कि पहले यह फँसला हो जाय कि यह बटेगा कैसे—जब इस मृग को हम मार डालेंगे, तो कौन कौन सी चीज किस किस को मिलेगी। देश में भी कुछ इसी किस्म की स्थिति है कि हम बांटना पहले चाहते हैं और कमाना बाद में। मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों की आय में वृद्धि नगण्य हुई है। उसमें वृद्धि होनी चाहिए, लेकिन इस के साथ ही यह भी आवश्यक है कि देश के प्रति जो हमारा कर्तव्य है, उसकी पूर्ति में भी हम अपना योग-दान करें। देश के प्रति जो हमारा कर्तव्य है, उसको भूल कर केवल अधिकारों की ही उफली बजाना देश के लिए ज्यादा लाभदायक नहीं है।

जहां तक रिपोर्ट का सम्बन्ध है, हम देखते हैं कि इस वक्त जो पेन्शेन की अवधि है, वह बीस साल तक बढ़ा दी गई है। इस के अलावा डी० ए० काफी लोगों के लिए निश्चित कर दिया गया है। क्लास १ और २ के लोगों के लिए एक खास स्केल पर पढ़ूँ कर भागे बढ़ने का जो इनिशिएटिव खतम हो जाता था, उस को भी भागे बढ़ाने का इस में प्राविजन है। पहले चपरासी को तीस रुपये तन्स्वाह और ४० रुपये एलाउन्स मिलता था, जिस का परिणाम यह होता था कि उस को पेन्शन ३० रुपये के हिसाब से मिलती थी। अब उसके वेतन को ७० रुपये कर देने से उसे कुछ न कुछ लाभ ही होगा। इस लिये यह कहना कि यह रिपोर्ट नितान्त निराशाजनक है और इस को केवल अपने ही तराजू से तोलना कोई ज्यादा अच्छा नज़र नहीं आता, खास तौर पर सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिए, क्योंकि वे सब लोग पढ़े लिखे हैं और मां-बाप ने उन के लिए सब से ज्यादा पैसा खर्च किया

जब कि गांवों में खेती बाड़ी करने वालों पर उतना नहीं किया गया ।

मैं स्वयं यह अनुभव करता हूँ कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों का वेतन काफी नहीं है । इस लिए जिस वक्त इस रिपोर्ट के बारे में पे कमिशन की ओर से मुझे क्वेस्चनेयर भेजा गया था, मने उस वक्त भी उस में यह कहा था कि कम से कम सरकारी कर्मचारी की मन्थली प्राय सौ रुपए जरूर होनी चाहिए और बड़े से बड़े वर्गवारी को एक हजार रुपए से ज्यादा नहीं दिया जाना चाहिए, क्योंकि ज्यादा लोगों को इस बात की तकलीफ नहीं रहती है कि मुझे कम क्यों मिलता है, बल्कि ज्यादा तकलीफ यह रहती है कि दूसरे को ज्यादा क्यों मिलता है, आखिर मेरे भी बीबी बच्चे हैं, मैं भी खाता हूँ, मेरी भी मुश्किलत है, तो मेरे साथ ऐसा व्यवहार क्यों किया जाता है । इसलिए इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि विभिन्न वर्गों की प्राय में जो इतना बड़ा अन्तर है, उसको कम करने का प्रयत्न किया जाये । मैं समझता हूँ कि एक आदमी भूखा रह सकता है, अगर बाकी सब भी भूखे रहें । यह तो उचित नहीं है कि कुछ आदमी तो चूर्ण खा खा कर आनन्द से जियें और कुछ को पेट पर पत्थर बांध कर सोना पड़े । अगर सब लोग इस बात को समझ जायें, तो हमारे सारे कष्ट दूर हो जायें ।

जहां तक डी० ए० का प्रश्न है, मैं पहाड़ी इलाकों और विशेषकर हिमाचल प्रदेश के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । यह सुझाव दिया गया है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में तनख्वाहें पंजाब के आधार पर होंगी । मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बारह साल से हिमाचल प्रदेश में सैन्टर के वेतन चले हुए हैं और इस से वहां के कर्मचारियों को काफी लाभ है । अगर आज उन के वेतन पंजाब के आधार पर निश्चित कर देते हैं, तो प्रत्येक कर्मचारी को पांच रुपए से ले कर बीस रुपए तक माहवार नुकसान रहता है । इस लिए हिमाचल

प्रदेश के लोग खास तौर पर इस बात का आग्रह करते हैं कि हम को सैन्टर का ही स्केल दिया जाये, क्योंकि हमारी स्टेट सैन्टर की है, हमारा मालिक सैन्टर और हम सैन्टर की जागीर हैं, इसलिये इस में परिवर्तन न किया जाये ।

पहाड़ में डाकखानों और सैन्टर के अन्य इदारों में काम करने वालों का भी यही प्रश्न है । पहाड़ के सम्बन्ध में लोग अक्सर यह भूल जाते हैं कि जो आदमी शिमला में रहता है, सदियों में उस का कितना खर्च होता है । वहां पर वह धोती और कमीज पहन कर नहीं रह सकता है । वहां मोटे मोटे कम्बलों और कोयले बगीरह का इन्तजाम करना पड़ता है, जिसमें काफी खर्च होता है । इस के अलावा जूतों पर इतना ज्यादा खर्च होता है कि दस रुपए का एलाउंस काफी नहीं होता है । सब के लिए दस रुपए का एलाउंस रख दिया गया है । इस के ऊपर सरकार को अवश्यमेव विचार करना चाहिए, ताकि पहाड़ पर काम करने वाले सरकारी कर्मचारियों को कठिनाई न हो । उन इलाकों में पहले भी बिटर एलाउंस, हिल एलाउंस और कई प्रकार के एलाउंस थे । वहां केवल दस रुपए का एलाउंस पर्याप्त न होगा । मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि सरकार इस पर विचार करेगी, ताकि सब को एक ही लाठी से न हांका जाये, बल्कि हालात के मुताबिक एलाउंस निश्चित किया जाये । सरकार यह चाहती है कि सब की स्थिति ठीक हो और सब में समानता हो । अगर इस मामले में भी यह समानता बरती जायेगी और दिल्ली में रहने वालों और चीनी या रामपुर में रहने वालों सब को दस रुपए दिए जायेंगे, तो पहाड़ी इलाकों में रहने वालों को बहुत कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ेगा ।

इस वक्त हमारे देश में उम्र की वृद्धि हो गई है, हमारी औसत उम्र बढ़ गई है । क्वेस्चनेयर का जवाब देते हुए मैंने कहा था कि सविस में रहने की उम्र कम से कम साठ

[श्री पद्म देव]

साल होनी चाहिए। इस विषय में यह भी कहा जाता है कि अगर ऐसा किया गया, तो लोगों को ज्यादा एम्प्लायमेंट नहीं मिलेगी। अगर एम्प्लायमेंट के प्रश्न पर हम केवल इस दृष्टि से सोचें कि लोगों को प्राजीविका हम ने सिर्फ सरकारी कर्मचारी बना कर ही देनी है, तो फिर इस का अर्थ तो यह है कि अभी हमारा देश अंग्रेज के राज्य से भागे नहीं बढ़ सका, क्योंकि यह तो अंग्रेजों का इस किस्म का विचार था। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों की सर्विस के लिए कम से कम उम्र ६० साल होनी चाहिए। इसका एक कारण यह भी है कि जिस वक्त उनको थोड़ा सा तजुर्बा हो जाता है और हम उनके तजुर्बे से लाभ उठा सकते हैं तो हम उनको छुट्टी दे देते हैं। अगर वह रेलवे में काम करता है तो रिटायर होने के बाद वह किसी ठेकेदार के साथ मिल कर काम शुरू कर देता है, कोयले के काम में या दूसरे किसी काम में लग जाता है, अगर फाइनेंस का भ्रादमी है तो किसी दुकान में हिसाब किताब करने के काम पर वह लग जाता है। इस तरह से वह काम करने के काबिल रहता है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसकी कम से कम ६० साल की उम्र सर्विस करने की होनी चाहिए। ६० साल के बाद जब उसको रिटायर किया जाए और पेंशन दी जाए तो सरकार की तरफ से एक नियम बनाया जाना चाहिए कि वह कम से कम तीन या चार घंटे रोजाना किसी सरकारी या दूसरे काम के लिए सरकार को दे। सरकार रिटायर होने के बाद उसको पैसा देती है पेंशन का और मैं मानता हूँ कि उसके बाद उससे ज्यादा काम नहीं लिया जा सकता है लेकिन कोई लाइट काम तो लिया ही जा सकता है। वह गांव में तीन चार घंटे काम कर सकता है, अगर वह इंजीनियर है या कोई और है तो पंचायत आदि में कुछ काम कर सकता है या किसी और संस्था में उसकी सेवा से लाभ उठाया जा सकता है।

इस तरह से जो उसका टैलेंट है उसकी जो बुद्धि है, उससे जब तक वह जीवित रहता है, तब तक लाभ उठाया जा सकता है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह हमने पाश्चात्य लोगों से सीखा है कि ५५ साल की उम्र के बाद या ६० साल की उम्र के बाद भ्रादमी काम करने के काबिल नहीं रह जाता है। हमारे देश में ऐसी प्रथा नहीं थी। हमारे देश में प्रथा यह थी कि पचास साल तक तो गृह्यचारी और गृहस्थ में गुजारे और पचास साल के बाद वह वानप्रस्थी बन कर देश के लिए ही काम करे। यह हमारे देश की प्रथा रही है। इसको भूलकर आज हम कहते हैं कि ५५ साल के बाद वह किसी काम का नहीं रहता है। इस वास्ते पहले तो मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि पेंशन पाने की उम्र ५५ साल के बजाय ६० साल होनी चाहिए और उसके बाद जब सरकारी कर्मचारी पेंशन पाए तो यह शर्त जरूर लगनी चाहिए कि वह देश के काम के लिए दो तीन या चार घंटे जैसी उसकी शारीरिक अवस्था हो जैसी उसकी योग्यता हो, दे। इससे एक यह भी लाभ होगा कि देश में कोई भी सरकारी कर्मचारी बेकार नहीं रहेगा, कुछ न कुछ काम करता ही रहेगा, चाहे पैसा ले कर चाहे पैसा न लेकर। आजकल देखा जाता है कि जो लोग रिटायर होते हैं वे भारत सेवक समाज या दूसरी संस्थायें जो चली हुई हैं उन में काम करना शुरू कर देते हैं और वहां से सौ रुपया या जो कुछ भी एलाउंस मिलता है वह ले लेते हैं और बाकी उनको पेंशन मिलती रहती है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि मैं इन संस्थाओं के खिलाफ हूँ या ये अच्छा काम नहीं कर रही हैं। इन में काम करने वाले अच्छे लोग हैं और अच्छी तरह से वे काम भी करते हैं। लेकिन चूंकि रिटायर होने वाले लोगों के सामने कोई उद्देश्य नहीं होता है इस वास्ते वे इन संस्थाओं में जा कर काम करना शुरू कर देते हैं।

भ्राजकल देखा जाता है कि लोग पैसे और पद के लिए ही काम करते हैं और इन दो बातों के सिवाय और किसी बात को वे सोचते ही नहीं हैं। वे सोचते रहते हैं कि कैसे इन को हासिल किया जा सकता है। कोई तो लीडरी के लिए कोशिश करते रहते हैं, कोई व्यापार में अधिक से अधिक पैसा कमाने की फिफ्ट में लगे रहते हैं कोई किसी और ढंग से इन की प्राप्ति में लगे रहते हैं और जहां तक देश निर्माण का सम्बन्ध है, उसकी किसी को कोई फिफ्ट ही नहीं है। कई बार दिल में ख्याल आता है कि यह जो बेरूनी बात हमारे दिलों में आ गई है इसको कैसे दूर किया जाए और किस तरह से देश के लिए दर्द दिल में पैदा किया जाए। लेकिन इसका कोई इलाज भ्राज नजर नहीं आता है। बहुत से लोग भ्राज पंडित नेहरू की बड़ी तारीफ करते हैं लेकिन जब उनसे कहा जाता है कि तुम भी उनकी तरह से १८ घंटे दिन में काम करो तब वे ऐसा करने के लिए तैयार नहीं होते हैं। वे कहते हैं कि उनकी स्पीच ठीक है, उनकी पालिसी ठीक है लेकिन हम उनकी तरह से काम करना नहीं चाहते हैं। यह एक बड़ी गलत बात है।

अन्त में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो पे कमिशन की रिपोर्ट है सरकारी कर्मचारियों के बारे में यह निराशाजनक नहीं है। तनख्वाह कुछ ज्यादा होनी थी और मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस पर गौर करे। दूसरी बात यह है कि जो पहाड़ी इलाके हैं उनके वास्ते एलाउंस की जो बात रखी है उसके अन्दर कुछ वृद्धि होनी चाहिए। खास तौर पर हमारे यहाँ पोस्ट आफिस और टेलीग्राफ आफिस में काम करने वालों के केस में। साथ ही हिमाचल जो कि केन्द्र प्रशासित है, उसके बारे में जो इस रिपोर्ट में यह लिखा है कि पंजाब के मुताबिक पे स्केल लागू किए जायें, वह न किया जाए बल्कि सेंटर के पे स्केल वहाँ लागू होने चाहिए

और इसका कारण यह भी है कि पिछले बारह सालों से वहाँ पर जो पे स्केल चल रहे हैं खास तौर पर ऊपर के अफसरों के वे भारत सरकार के केन्द्रीय नियमों के अनुसार ही चल रहे हैं और उन्हीं के मुताबिक उनको बेतन मिलते हैं। ये तीन चार बातें हैं जिन पर मैं चाहता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री महोदय विचार कर लें।

श्री भुनगुनवाला (भागलपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पे कमिशन की जो रिपोर्ट निकली है उस से यह लगता है कि सरकार का खर्चा ४० करोड़ बढ़ जायगा। मैं इस प्रश्न पर केवल एक दृष्टि से विचार करता हूँ। माननीय सदस्यों ने इस को भिन्न भिन्न दृष्टियों से विचारा है और वे जो कह गए हैं, आप ने सुना है। एक बात है जिस को मैं अपने मन में रिकंसाइल नहीं कर सका हूँ। जैसा कि यहाँ पर बताया गया है कि जो सेंटर में काम करते हैं और वे जोकि प्राविसिस में काम करते हैं उन दोनों में से प्राविसिस में काम करने वाले चाहे कितने ही योग्य क्यों न हों सेंटर में काम करने वालों से परन्तु उन के पे-स्केल कमती ही रहें और जब यह सवाल रेफर किया गया तो जवाब दिया गया कि जितनी भी सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की सर्विसिस हैं सभी के बारे में विचार किया जायगा, स्टेट्स की सर्विसिस के बारे में नहीं। इस के बाद जब पे कमिशन वालों ने साफ साफ यह बात पूछी गवर्नमेंट से कि क्या सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के जो ऊपर के अफसर हैं जैसे आई० सी० एस० और आई० पी० एस० के उन लोगों के सवाल पर भी क्या कमिशन विचार कर सकता है तो जवाब दिया गया कि नहीं, इस चीज पर आप विचार न करें। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आई कि क्यों कमिशन को उन के पे स्केल पर तथा दूसरी बातों पर विचार करने का मौका नहीं दिया गया। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक फ्यूडल सिस्टम है जोकि भारत की अंग्रेजी सरकार ने हम लोगों के ऊपर लादा हुआ

[श्री झुनझुनवाला]

है, जोकि अभी भी चला आ रहा है। हमारी सरकारें जोकि प्रॉबिसिस में हैं वे प्राटोनोमस हैं। वहां पर यहां से इतनी बड़ी बड़ी पे के लोगों को भेज दिया जाता है और उन पर लाद दिया जाता है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया है कि क्यों किया जाता है। हम देखते हैं कि वहां पर जो लोग पी० सी० एस० इत्यादि के होते हैं वे इन लोगों से किसी हालत में कम नहीं होते हैं तो क्यों इन को उन के ऊपर ला कर के बिठा दिया जाता है।

हम टेक्नीकल बातों में भी इस चीज को देखते हैं। यहां पर रिक्लूमेंट इंजीनियरिंग लाइन में तथा दूसरी लाइनों में किया जाता है और एक प्रकार का थ्योरेटिकल एग्जामिनेशन लिया जाता है और उस के बाद उन लोगों को रिक्लूट कर लिया जाता है, रख लिया जाता है और इन लोगों के वहां पर आ जाने के बाद एक सिलसिला प्रोमोशन का चलता है और उसी के आधार पर उन को प्रोमोशन मिलती जाती है और यह नहीं देखा जाता है कि किस प्रकार का वे काम करते हैं, किस प्रकार की उन की एफिशेंसी है इत्यादि इत्यादि। इस का नतीजा यह ट्रेना है कि जो नीचे का आदमी होता है वह चाहे कितना भी योग्य क्यों न हो, वहां पर जो नीचे काम करने वाला है, कितना भी एफिशेंट चाहे क्यों न हो, उस बेचारे को प्रोमोशन कभी भी नहीं मिल पाती है। आज जबकि हम अपने देश को इंडस्ट्रियली ऊंचा उठाना चाहते हैं तो यह देखने की बात है। वहां पर काम करने के लिए सचमुच में हम को ऐसे लोग लेने चाहियें जोकि अच्छी तरह से काम कर सकते हों।

हम देखते हैं कि इंजीनियरिंग डिपार्टमेंट है या और डिपार्टमेंट हैं उन में ऊपर के लोग जो इंजीनियरिंग ही केवल पास करके आते हैं और जिन को क्लास १ मिल

जाती है, उन से वहां पर काम करने वाले लोग कई दृष्टियों से अच्छे होते हैं परन्तु जब इन को वहां पर रख दिया जाता है तो इस का नतीजा यह होता है कि क्लास २ को क्लास १ में प्रोमोशन नहीं मिल पाती है।

एक बात और मैं आप के नोटिस में लाना चाहता हूं। पे कमिशन के सामने यह बात जब कही गई कि जब क्लास १ की प्रोमोशन आप करते हैं तो फिर आप एग्जामिनेशन लीजिये, तो उस के जवाब में उस ने यह कहा है :—

“The difficulty about a written examination is that it cannot reveal the character of an employee and his day to day working habits, for instance, his devotion to duty, industry, punctuality, relations with fellow employees and the public, and it would be wrong not to attach weight to a person's conduct and performance as a public servant for a considerable period and take his performance at a written examination the sole determinant for further advancement.”

13 hrs.

मैं इस चीज की बड़े जोर से ताईद करना चाहता हूं। पे कमिशन ने जो यह रिमार्क दिया है, वह बिल्कुल ठीक रिमार्क है। जब शुरू में एग्जामिनेशन पास करने के बाद उन्हें १ क्लास में रख दिया जाता है, चाहे उस के लिए वे योग्य हों या न हों, यह नहीं देखा जाता कि आगे चल कर वे कैसे निकलेंगे। वह चलते जाते हैं, उन का एक तरीका बन्ध गया है, उस तरीके से उन का प्रोमोशन होता जायेगा। क्लास २ के जो काम करने वाले हैं, वे ऐसे किन्हीं किन्हीं लोगों से ज्यादा अच्छा काम कर सकते हैं, लेकिन उन को डिगरी हासिल नहीं है। वे कोई इन्तहान पास किये हुए नहीं

होते। जो क्लास १ के लोग हैं उन से वे किसी भी प्रकार से इन्फ़ीरिअर नहीं हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि इस इंडस्ट्रियली डेवेलपिंग कंट्री में, खास कर जो फ़ैक्ट्री आदि हैं, इन जगहों पर आप ऐसे लोगों को ला कर रखते हैं जो केवल एक टैक्निकल एग्जामिनेशन या थ्योरेटिकल एग्जामिनेशन पास कर के आते हैं। उन के आने के बाद क्लास २ वालों को कभी मौका नहीं मिलता कि वह क्लास १ के लिए कम्पीट कर सकें। हालांकि वे किसी भी तरह से क्लास १ वालों से खराब नहीं हैं लेकिन उन को वहीं पर पड़ा रहना पड़ता है। आपस में जेलसी बढ़ती है और काम में खराबी पैदा होती है। ऊपर वाले तो यह समझते हैं कि वे केवल सुपरवाइजरी आफिसर्स हैं, उन का काम ऊपर से ही देखने का है। हमारे यहां आज इस बात की बड़ी हाथ हाथ हो रही है कि हम लोग हाथ से काम करने में बेइज्जती समझते हैं। ब्रिटिश सरकार के जमाने से यह एक फ्यूडल सिस्टम चला आ रहा है कि ऊपर के जो लोग हैं, वह आई० सी० एस० और आई० पी० एस० के लोग सब जगह रख दिये जाते हैं। इसी तरह से व्यापारिक क्षेत्र में, इंडस्ट्रीज वगैरह में भी हम देखते हैं कि हो रहा है। मैं इस चीज की ओर खास कर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक तो यह कि आज स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स और सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के लोगों में बड़ा डिफरेंस है। काम वे वही करते हैं, बल्कि कमी कमी तो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स वाले प्रच्छा काम करते हैं, तो फिर उन को तन्वाह क्यों कम मिले? उन को भी उतना ही मिलना चाहिये, दूसरे यह कि आज हाथ से काम करने की तरफ नफरत है। हाथ से काम करने में जो गौरव लोगों में आना चाहिये वह नहीं आ सका है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन लोगों को भी वही मौका मिलना चाहिये प्रोमोशन आदि पाने का जो आज आप प्राटोमैटिकली उन प्रादमियों को दे देते हैं जो इम्तहान पास करने के बाद क्लास १ में रख दिये गये हैं।

क्लास २ वालों का मौका होना चाहिये कि वह भी क्लास १ वालों के साथ कम्पीट कर सकें। यदि आप ऐसा करेंगे तो क्लास १ वाले भी यह सोचते रहेंगे कि वह ठीक से काम करें। उन की प्रादत रहेगी ठीक से काम करने की। खाली टेबल पर बैठ कर सुपरवाइज करना ही उन का काम नहीं रहेगा। यदि आप ऐसा करेंगे तो हमारे यहां के काम में एफिशिएंसी बढ़ेगी। एक प्रिविलेज्ड क्लास के जो नीचे काम करते हैं, और जो प्रच्छा काम करते हैं, उन को आप मौका दीजिये तो आप देखेंगे कि जो ऊपर से केवल सुपरवाइज करने वाले हैं उन को जो लोग अपने हाथ से काम करने वाले हैं वे एक दम फेल कर देंगे। इसलिये क्लास २ वालों को मौका दिया जाना चाहिये कि वह कम्पीट कर के क्लास १ में आ जायें।

स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स में जो हमारे स्टेट्स सर्विस के प्रादमी हैं उन में से भी बहुत से ऐसे हैं जो बहुत प्रच्छे हैं। उन को भी आप वहीं ऊंचे स्थानों के लिए प्रोमोशन दीजिये। आप यहां से आई० ए० एस० और आई० पी० एस० के प्रादमी भेजते हैं यह ठीक नहीं है। इस से काम की एफिशिएंसी नहीं बढ़ती है, यदि आप ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में एफिशिएंसी लाना चाहते हैं, इंडस्ट्रीज में एफिशिएंसी लाना चाहते हैं तो इन बातों की तरफ आप को ध्यान देना होगा।

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, by now it has been abundantly made clear that the Report of the Pay Commission has disappointed not only the employees but also the hon. Members of this House. My major grievance is that the Pay Commission has made an approach which is entirely erroneous and wrong. In the first place the terms of reference have been wrongly interpreted because the Commission, it appears to me, acted outside the

[Shri Naushir Bharucha.]

scope of its terms when it reduced the amenities and facilities to which the employees were already entitled.

It will be seen that the terms of reference said that the Commission had to recommend in particular the extent to which benefits to the Central Government employees can be given in the shape of amenities and facilities. Therefore what they were asked to prescribe was the extent to which benefits could go. If it had been the intention of the Government to so formulate the terms of reference that they could prescribe a lessening of the benefits then certainly that intention could have been made clear. On the face of it is obvious that when a Pay Commission is appointed as a result of discontent it should not at all be considered that the Commission was entitled to increase the discontent by reducing the amenities. My first submission is that the approach of the Pay Commission was entirely wrong.

Secondly, the Pay Commission has proceeded on certain principles which themselves raise certain contentions. They have said that no improvement is possible in the condition of the employees until general improvement in the country's economic condition takes place. In the first place, it is extremely difficult to measure the general improvement in the country's economic condition. But if we are dealing with a particular category of the country's population, namely, the Government employees, may I know whether the Government employees have to wait until the entire level of subsistence of the masses has increased? It has been often contended by the Government that the Central Government employees do not stand in a special category and that the pay recommended for them is already high if we take into consideration the per capita national income. But the per capita income is only arrived at by taking into consideration those millions of masses who earn nothing whatsoever and whose unemployment

has also to be taken into consideration. Also, special responsibilities are imposed upon the employees of the Central Government which, for instance, are not imposed upon the unemployed. Therefore it will be absolutely wrong to proceed on the principle that no improvement is possible until the general improvement in the country's economic condition takes place.

The Commission purports to proceed on the principle that for the lowest grades of servants developmental planning should not involve a depression of the existing living standards. As a matter of fact what the Commission has recommended is really a depression of the existing living standards. The minimum salary of Rs. 75/-, which has now been raised to Rs. 80/-, in reality is absolutely no increase whatsoever. What is forgotten is the fact that the Government themselves admit that during the last few years the commodity value of the rupee has depreciated by 29 per cent. It will be recalled that compared to the level of prices that existed before the war, today the rupee is barely worth four annas in terms of commodity value. But even assuming that we do not take the pre-war prices as the basis, it is obvious that even then on the admission of the Government, since Independence the value has depreciated by 29 per cent. Compared to that, my submission is that the so-called increase in salary is absolutely no increase at all.

There are numerous other points, such as the question of house rent. Cities are classified on the basis of population. Perhaps this classification is inevitable to a certain extent because some sort of restrictive criterion has got to be adopted. But the trouble is that often when it comes to classification of cities, the Government takes the census figures, for instance, of 1951 for evaluating as to what should be the D.A. in 1960. These are the latest figures available.

In the meantime cities have grown by leaps and bounds. I remember a typical case, of Poona City, when in the Bombay Legislative Assembly the question was taken up. Poona was first classified as being a city with a population under five lakhs. Actually it had a population of seven lakhs and more and yet it remained classified "B" because the 1951 census figures show that it should not be classified in the "A" category. I submit, therefore, that in the matter of classification there should be a bold and generous policy.

With regard to hours of work enough has been said. People are not afraid of working more time provided they are adequately remunerated. It has been pointed out that as many as 31 days of additional workload has been imposed upon the Central Government employees. I ask whether this is not against the spirit of the Constitution itself which prohibits *begar* or forced labour. What else is it except forced labour in the guise of extension of hours of work!

Public holidays have been curtailed and reduced to 16, and casual leave from 15 to 12 days. I doubt whether, when they agitated for better amenities and when the terms of reference were framed that the Commission had to determine the extent to which the benefits had to be extended, the employees expected this type of minus benefits.

On the point of age of superannuation enough has been said, and I agree with the views expressed by my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur. Either the age should be 55 or 58, whatever it is, but is should not be left to the discretion of the Government. Personally I am of the view that 58 years is the proper time for retirement and that that age must be treated as an absolute age without any further extensions beyond that. It is rather a pity that Government, on account of considerations of economy, forces people to retire at 55 just when the mature experience they have

attained would be of immense value to the Government and the country. Why is it that Government chooses to do that? There are two reasons. The younger set wants the elder to retire quicker; secondly, Government thinks it is more economical to ask an employee to retire at 55 and have a fresh recruit in his place. I submit the Government must take a bold step; if it is going to be best to decide between 55 and 58, let us decide on 58 or 57, but that should be the absolute age, and I am against giving the Government any discretion whatsoever.

With regard to the service rules, Government servants cannot join political organisations. That is something which one can understand, but even a very casual attendance in a political meeting is also prohibited. I submit that in a democracy, simply because people happen to be government servants, they should not be presumed to have lost all interest in public welfare or political activity. They may not take active part in politics, but even a passing attendance at meetings is being penalised, and that is something which goes against the spirit of the Constitution.

With regard to trade union activities, it is rather a pity that while the Government repeatedly professes that they are in favour of encouraging trade unionism, I have known repeated cases in which trade union workers have been victimised. In the case of the National Railway Mazdoor Union Running Staff of Bombay City, active workers are being penalised and threatened with transfer. I was told that the immediate superior called the active worker and said: "We shall see whether you can be in this service any longer. The first thing I am going to do is to transfer you". Now, transfer to a Government servant is not a joke, it can break the back of the most active worker, and I think this is a thing which ought to be seriously discouraged.

I shall conclude by enlisting a few other retrograde recommendations of

[Shri Naushir Bharucha.]

the Commission, and omissions on its part.

Failure to link up dearness allowance with cost of living index figure and providing an automatic machinery for that purpose: My hon. friend Shri Prabhat Kar has dealt with the question of cost of living index in great detail, and he has pointed out how the standard of living is being undermined.

Imposition of 31 extra days work without extra remuneration is against sense of justice.

Failure to recommend amendment of the Service Conduct Rules: I think it is high time this was done.

Failure to recommend that after efficiency bar increment should be increased:

It is a retrograde recommendation recommending retrospective effect from 1st July 1959 though the Commission was appointed two years ago. That in itself is a retrograde step, but the Government has gone one better on that and said they would give effect only from 1st November, 1959. This is complete injustice to the employees.

I appeal to the Government not to stand on formalities or prestige. They must call a round table conference of leaders of labour in various spheres of trade, industry and commerce and hammer out with them what should be the adequate and just recommendation which should be accepted in the interests of harmony in industry and in the services.

I submit that the recommendations of the Pay Commission are likely to be taken as a model by other people. Not only that; in private circles also they will be copied, and they will tend increasingly to depress the standard of living of the employees. This is not the way to promote content-

ment, this is not the way to create harmony. If the Government adopts the round table conference move, I am sure leaders of labour will be found to be sufficiently reasonable to help the Government to arrive at a compromise which will be just and conduce to harmony in the services.

Shri D. C. Sharma: A great deal has been said on the recommendations of the Pay Commission, some of it very pertinent and some of it couched in a spirit of idealism. I want to approach the whole question in a spirit of realism, and I hope the hon. Members who have had no good word to say about the Pay Commission will have patience with me.

In the first place, I congratulate the members of the Pay Commission for the very hard task that they did.

Shri Rajendra Singh: So, you are coming out with apologies. This is the first I have heard so far.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think they have made a balanced approach to the solution of the problem—it is another question whether that approach has satisfied us or not. You cannot question the rightness of their motive, the rightness of their approach, though you may not agree with their conclusions. I was myself a witness before this Commission, and I can bear testimony to the fact that the members of the Commission took a deep and intelligent interest in whatever was said. So, I believe that they do deserve some words of thanks.

Shri Prabhat Kar: Because they have written 700 pages?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Yes, and you will create 700 problems for them. Listen to me for God's sake. I know you are a professional trouble-maker, and I am very glad that you are like that because we must have some people....

Shri Prabhat Kar: Sir, what is this "professional trouble-maker"?

Shri D. C. Sharma: "Professional trouble-maker" means that you subject these recommendations to such a thorough scrutiny that nothing can escape from the net of your troubles.

The Government also, if I remember aright, has not taken very long in arriving at some decisions. We may or may not agree with these decisions. I know so many commissions are appointed, so many recommendations are made, and Government takes an inordinately long time in arriving at decisions on them. I think this time Government has been more or less very careful in arriving at some decisions quickly.

Now, the question of salary, the question of holidays, the question of casual leaves, the question of pension, the question of basic salary, all these things have been subjected to very searching enquiries by the hon. Members of this House. But I would judge the Pay Commission's Report only by one criterion and it is this. That criterion is something which is warranted by, what we call, the socialistic pattern of society, by the economic and political climate in which our country is living. The question is, has the Pay Commission tried to bridge the gap between the top-most man and the man at the lowest rung of the ladder and if it has done that, how far it has succeeded. When I apply this test to the recommendations of the Pay Commission, I do not feel very happy. It is because the gap which should have been bridged adequately has not been bridged very properly. I tell you, that people are not going to judge us by the salary which the Class I officer draws; people are not going to judge us by the amount of salary that the Class II officer gets. This may be relevant in certain contexts, but the world is going to judge us, we are going to judge ourselves, by the salary which a Class IV employee gets; and so far as the Class 351(A) LSD—4.

IV employee is concerned, I think, the Pay Commission has not been fair to him. I submit very respectfully that the Class IV employee deserves a better deal, a fairer deal. Even if it had been a general thing, I would not have minded it. But the Class IV employee in my country, who is the key-stone of the arch of administration and who is also the burden-carrier of the administration, has not been given that kind of attention, as he should have been given.

I refer to late Shri Kidwai, who was the Minister in-charge of P. & T. Department and he was a great administrator. Whatever he dealt with, he made a success of it. There are some persons who turn things into gold. I have read about some fable. But he was the man who made a success of whatever he attempted. When he was in-charge of P. & T. Department, what did he do? He did not look to Class I Officers and all those big persons—I do not think they should be ignored—but he started at the very bottom.

Now, the Pay Commission should have started at the very bottom and there should have been a maximum of good done to the Class IV employees and there should have been a gradual reduction as the hierarchy of officers went, from Class IV to Class III, from Class III to Class II, from Class II to Class I. Anybody who reads the Pay Commission's Report will run away with the impression that this Pay Commission Report has not been written in free India, but has been written in the days when the Britishers were ruling our country. It is because the interests of the persons at the lowest rung of the ladder have not been as much guarded as they should have been. That is my criticism of the Pay Commission's Report, in spite of the good work that it has done.

Then, my second point is this. Enough has been said about that, but I also want to say one or two sentences about that. My criticism is about the superannuation age. Well,

[Shri D. C. Sharma].

I think, the average expectation of life has improved in free India on account of our various health schemes, on account of other things. We are now expecting to live longer than we did before.

Shri Achar (Bangalore): A good number are being born also.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): A good responsible for the number of births that take place. It is up to Mr. Achar to look to that. I have been a widower for the last 25 years and I submit respectfully that I am not doing anything of that kind!

Shri Keshava (Bangalore City): The hon. Member is asking another widower!

Shri D. C. Sharma: I was submitting very respectfully that in view of the fact that the marriageable age of people is going up, both in the case of boys and girls; in view of the fact that people are now having greater interest in higher education, in view of the fact that the joint family system is crumbling; in view of the fact that the necessities of life are requiring more and more share of the incomes of people, in view of all these facts, this concession should have been given to Government employees, that superannuation age should have been kept at 58 years. It should not have been left to the sweet will of some officers to recommend extension to one person or the other. It should have been made the right of every employee of the Central Government to retire at the age of 58. Now, in this country, I know there are some Universities where people retire at the age of 65, all honour to them; in some Universities people retire at the age of 62, I thank them. But what I would say is that the superannuation age for those persons should have been kept at 58 years.

Now, I come to my third point. The Central Government, I think, is

one of the biggest employers in this country.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): Not one of the, but the biggest.

Shri D. C. Sharma: You know difference between you and me. While you want to be dogmatic, I do not want to be dogmatic.

Shri Prabhat Kar: It is a fact.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The more you shout about the facts, the more I get alarmed.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: That is quite natural.

Shri Prabhat Kar: That is because the hon. Member does not want to see.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I was submitting very respectfully that the Central Government is a very very big employer and the Central Government has to look to the interests of all the sectors of employment. It should have an omnibus outlook. It should cast its eyes all around. But what happens is this, that the terms of reference of the Pay Commission were such that some sectors were left out of account and now we are thinking of applying these recommendations, or similar recommendations, to those sectors, for instance, the defence forces. I am not talking about civilian employees of the defence forces. I am talking of defence forces as such. The Central Pay Commission should have been given such terms of reference as would not have necessitated the appointment of subsidiary pay commissions for this segment of employment and for that segment of employment.

At the same time, I would say that one sector that has been neglected all along the line, all these years, is the sector of teachers, teachers of all grades, from the elementary school teacher to the secondary school

teacher, from the secondary school teacher to the college teacher, and from the college teacher to the university teacher. I would be told that there is the Radhakrishnan Commission's report; I will be told that there is the University Grants Commission; I will be told that there is the Mudaliar Commission's report, I will be told all that, I know. But if there is one sector of humanity in India which has not received any attention in the sphere of implementation, it is the sector of teachers.

The variegated map of teacher employment in this country presents a very sorry spectacle. There are disparities between Delhi and Punjab, between Punjab and U.P., between U.P. and West Bengal and so on; the same thing applies to the States in the south of India as well. Disparity, glaring disparity! thy name is the teacher's lot in India! Therefore, the All India Educational Conference passed a resolution at its last conference held under the presidency of Professor N. K. Siddhanta, Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, that there should be a second pay commission appointed. Of course, it may be asked: 'What has the Central Government got to do with it?'. But I ask: What has the Central Government got to do with the universities? Why did they appoint the University Commission? Why did they appoint the Commission on Secondary School Education? Why have they got the Elementary School Education Council? Why have they got the Secondary School Education Council? Why have they got the University Grants Commission? Why have they got all these things? If the Central Government think that they can meddle with all these things—they have appointed a committee for reform of examination, they have appointed a committee for moral instruction in education, they have appointed a medium of instruction committee; they are appointing all kinds of committees to deal with the various aspects of education; and I am very glad that they are doing these things—I would submit very res-

pectfully that something should be done to give the elementary school teacher, the secondary school teacher, the college teacher and the university teacher also a ray of hope. I think this is wanting.

I do not want to say this on the floor of the House, but it is being said everywhere that the elementary school teacher in some States compares very unfavourably with the class IV employees of the Government of India. Here are the nation-builders of my country, and they do not have those emoluments, which the class IV employees of the Government of India have. Of course, I want the class IV employees of the Government of India to have more; I do not say that they should not have as much, but I would certainly say that Government must give a fair deal to the teachers of India, of all classes. The teachers of India have been neglected even in free India. They have been given only reports and commissions. They have been given only working group reports. They have been given only hopes. They have been given the triple benefit scheme, this scheme and that scheme, but those schemes have not been implemented.

I would say, therefore, that the disparities between the private school teachers and the municipal school teachers, between the corporation teachers and other teachers, between the district board school teachers and others, should be examined and done away with.

I now come to my last point which deals with the staff that is employed in the Indian Embassies abroad. There are two kinds of staff there. There are some members of the staff who are sent from India, and there are some members of the staff who are recruited from the country where the embassy is located. That is very good. We need both these types of staff. I have nothing to say against these two kinds of recruitment. But do you know that an Indian member of the staff of an embassy gets far less than his counterpart who is recruited

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

from that very country? In spite of the fact that he gets some subsidy for rent, and some allowance and so on, yet his remuneration does not come up to much, and he suffers from a sense of grievance when he compares himself with the person who is recruited from that very country. I think this kind of grievance should be done away with.

So, I would say that the pay commission have done good work so far as the pay-scales are concerned, but the pay commission should have taken note, more of the needs of what I call as the under-dog than of the needs of the top-dog. I want in my country top-dog to flourish. I want in my country top officers.

Shri Prabhat Kar: Horses.

Shri D. C. Sharma: My hon. friend has got a habit of interrupting like this. That was why I called him trouble-maker; he is creating trouble for me, when I am speaking.

I want that the high officers should get all that they want; I do not deny them anything; I am not one of those persons who want to deny them anything; I am not like the hump-backed woman, who said that all women should become hump-backed. I want them also to flourish. I want everyone to flourish. But as I am a firm believer in the socialist pattern of society—it is not because I belong to the Congress that I am a firm believer in that, but even otherwise. I am a firm believer in that—I want that while all the classes of persons should flourish in my country, I want that these elementary school teachers, class IV employees—there are so many categories of them—and so on should also be given more, so that they do not suffer from any sense of grievance.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj): We are discussing a very important report which is going to affect the structure of emoluments of not only those in the service of the Central

Government, but the emoluments of those in the various industries in this country as well. Many wage boards are working. For instance, there is the wage board for the sugar industry, then there is the wage board for the textile industry, which has submitted their report; then there is the report of the wage board for the cement industry and so on. And now, we have got the report of this pay commission. And this report which is for the employees of Government, which should be the model employer, is so reactionary that I am afraid that it will have a very bad reaction on the emoluments in other industries as well.

I am surprised to find that this pay commission, namely the Jagannatha Das Commission, have not only changed the recommendations of Dr. Aykroyd about nutrition, which are so necessary for the Indian workers, and according to which certain scales have been laid down, but they have even reduced the cost of living to a figure much below what was agreed to at the Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference.

Sir, at the Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference, the Government, labour and employers' representatives agreed on a particular minimum wage and a fair wage. They laid down that the minimum wage shall not be less than a particular minimum. It was mentioned to the workers that a particular amount of food and a particular amount of cloth and certain other things will be given. On that basis Government themselves admitted that the minimum emoluments should not be less than Rs. 125. That principle was accepted by the Government themselves. But, Sir, here we find that this Pay Commission has brought down the figure for the minimum wage for 1949 prices from Rs. 125 to Rs. 70. They say that Rs. 70 is quite a good basic minimum wage. This is based on the cost of living index to be 100 on the prices prevailing in the

year 1949. On this basis they have recommended that the minimum wage shall be Rs. 70. The Cement Wage Board has recommended a wage of Rs. 94. Similarly, the Textile Wage Board has recommended a wage which comes to Rs. 120. That means that if we accept this report and its principles, then, the millowners will say that as Government have accepted this rate as model employer, the mill-owners need not pay higher wages. That means that this recommendation will have reaction all over the country.

Sir, we are now on the threshold of the Third Five-Year Plan. We want to have a big Plan and we want that it should be fulfilled. It is obvious that without the co-operation of labour, the Plan cannot be implemented and fulfilled. If labour does not get enough to eat, it cannot discharge its responsibilities. As I said, this minimum wage has been accepted by Government, labour and employers' representatives at the Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference. The workers should be provided with the requisite food, clothing and shelter and should be paid the necessary minimum wage. So, that was the principle that was accepted at that Conference. But those principles have been thrown overboard by the Pay Commission and they have advanced certain new principles.

Sir, the fundamental assumptions of the Pay Commission are wrong. If Government do not modify or review their recommendations and come to a decision, I am afraid that as it is, the whole structure of pay and emoluments of people in all the industrial establishments will also be affected. Then, Sir, what would be the result? The result would be that our Third Five-Year Plan will be affected by industrial disputes and labour unrest.

Sir, the Pay Commission refers to the middle-classes. Those people whose emoluments are affected mostly by the recommendation of the Pay

Commission are the middle-classes. They depend very much on the low salaries that they get. The middle classes are the people who are the hardest hit. And yet, Sir, it is the middle classes on whom the economic structure of any stable society can rest. It must be remembered that if they are not paid adequately the very edifice of our economy will be seriously affected. So, from the point of view of the general structure of society, the middle-class is the most important class; and yet, it is they who are the hardest hit by the Report of the Pay Commission.

I would, Sir, now go into some particular aspects of this Report. About the principles and the quantum of wage for 1949 prices as base, I have already said that the minimum wage fixed at the Conference of Government, labour and employers' representatives is Rs. 125. Therefore, the amount which has now been laid down as the minimum wage is most unjust and it will not only affect the Government servants but it will affect all the employees in all our industries.

As regards dearness allowance, the principle on which it has been worked out is also retrograde. I hope Government will consider this and see that this principle is also amended in a way that the Government servants get enough so that they may be able to work efficiently and will be able to do their full amount of work in the new Plan that we are bringing forward. It is very surprising that while we have reduced the basic minimum wage, in many other cases I find that the salaries which employees will be getting hereafter will be less after the Pay Commission's report is implemented. Several people have told me about this. I see that as per the recommendation of the Pay Commission Report the Government employees will have to work for about 30 more days in the year. Work for 30 more days is taken from them for which they will not be paid. That is most unfair, Sir. When you are increasing the load of work from them, you must

[Shri S. L. Saxena]

pay them compensatory wages. You must pay them some more remuneration. If you want more work from them, at least pay them enough, because they must be enabled to keep their body and soul together.

Then, Sir, certain other facilities which they have got have been taken away in many cases. I may say that one of the most crying needs today is the question of equalisation of the emoluments of the State Government servants and the Central Government servants. It is very painful to find that in the same place there are people who are drawing Central Government scales of pay and there are people working nearby, drawing State Government scales of pay. That creates much bad blood. This is the first charge on every State Government and they should see that the employees get the minimum wage so that they will be able to live. If the Government themselves think that Rs. 70 is the basic minimum wage, how can this be ensured? Suppose an employee of the Central Government, say, in the Railway Department, gets a salary of Rs. 70, in Lucknow. How can it be that a lower amount will be required by a Government servant working in the State Government? Therefore, even if it is accepted that Rs. 70 is the basic minimum wage, it should be made applicable to State Government servants also. There is no justification for the disparity in the pay scales between the Central Government and the State Government employees. So, I would suggest that the Government may review the whole recommendations of the Pay Commission from this point of view and see that the disparity is removed.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) : सभापति महोदय, पे कमिशन के टर्मस आफ रेफरेंस को पढ़ने के बाद और पे कमिशन ने गवर्नमेंट से एक क्लैरीफिकेशन मांगा और उस को देखने के बाद मुझे कइ धारण्य हुआ कि सेंट्रल

सर्विसेज में एक स्वर्गीय सर्विस भी होती है । एक कमिशन आफ इन्क्वायरी मुकरर किया गया जोकि उन प्रिंसिपल्स को एग्जामिन करे

which should govern the structure of emoluments and conditions of service of the Central Government employees.

सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायीज के एमोल्युमेंट्स और कंडीशंस के बारे में जांच करे और बेंजेस रेकमेंड करे । पे कमिशन ने इस के लिए गवर्नमेंट से कुछ क्लैरीफिकेशन चाहा कि यह आई० ए० एस० और आई० पी० एस० सेंट्रल सर्विसेज में आती है कि नहीं क्योंकि उन का अधिकतर अधिक संख्या में रिटूमेंट जो होता है वह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से होता है और उन की सर्विस कंडीशन्स सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में होती हैं हालांकि वह ज्यादातर काम स्टेट्स गवर्नमेंट्स के मातहत करती हैं । गवर्नमेंट से इस बारे में पे कमिशन ने सफाई चाही कि आया यह सर्विसेज भी उन के टर्मस आफ रेफरेंस में आती है या नहीं । तो गवर्नमेंट ने उस का उनको यह उत्तर दिया कि उन के बारे में पे कमिशन सोच विचार नहीं कर सकता क्योंकि यह पार्टली प्राविशिएल गवर्नमेंट सर्विस है और पार्टली सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट । अब मैं सभापति महोदय, आप की इजाजत से टर्मस आफ रेफरेंस के पैरा २ को पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ । सेंट्रल सर्विसेज में भी एक ऐसी सर्विस है जिस के बारे में पे कमिशन या किसी कमिशन को कोई विचार करने का अधिकार नहीं है ।

"We enquired from the Government whether the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service were covered by our terms of reference. Members of these Services, as such, are not Central Government employees. The majority of them work in the States, and while so working are employees of the respective State Governments. But such of the members of those Services as are

servicing the Central Government are, while so servicing, Central Government employees. Further, the time-scales of the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Foreign Service (the latter a Central Service) are identical; and so are the time-scales of the Indian Police Service and the Class I Central (non-technical) Services. In the circumstances, it appeared to us that it might be somewhat anomalous if, on a strict interpretation of our terms of reference, we were to exclude the two all-India Services from our enquiry. We received a reply from the Government to the effect that those Services are controlled jointly by the Government of India and the State Governments, that in the majority of cases members of those Services serve the Central Government on tenure deputations and while so serving hold liens on posts under the State Governments; and that in the circumstances, it was not possible for the Government of India to refer unilaterally to the Pay Commission questions regarding remuneration and conditions of service to members of those Services. The Government, however, added that if in formulating our recommendations with regard to Central Government employees we wished to make any observations regarding the all-India Services, those observations would be given due consideration. While we have had occasionally to refer to the all-India Services in the course of discussion of problems falling within the scope of our enquiry, we have refrained from making any suggestions in respect of those Services".

यह बात जबकि यहां पर अंग्रेजों का शासन था तो समझ में आ भी सकती थी लेकिन आज तो देश में स्वराज्य स्थापित हो गया है और वह भेद जो कि अंग्रेजी सरकार इस तरह की एक सुपर सर्विस बना कर कायम रखना चाहती थी, आज में नहीं समझता कि

उस को जारी रखने की क्या जरूरत है। इंडियन सिविल सर्विस के बारे में श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने स्वयं अपनी जीवनी में लिखा है कि वह न तो इंडियन है, न सिविल है और न ही वह सर्विस है। अब उस सर्विस का नाम बदल कर इंडियन ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विस रख दिया गया है। सौभाग्य से वह इंडियन तो है भले ही वह सर्विस हो या न हो और न तो वह सेंटर में सर्विस है और न प्राविस में ही वास्तव में सर्विस है और मजा यह है कि वे कमिशन उन सर्विसेज के बारे में कोई विचार नहीं कर सकता। यह जो आज एनोमली है यह दूर होनी चाहिये। इसी तरह यह स्टेट्स सर्विसेज में और सेन्ट्रल सर्विसेज में जो मिलकर बर्क करने वालों की तनख्वाहों में भेद है वह बहुत अधिक है और उस को कम किया जाना चाहिये। स्टेट्स की सर्विसेज वह बहुत कम पेज हैं और हाएस्ट पेज इतनी हैं उन के ऊपर कि दोनों का कोई सामंजस्य नहीं बैठता। उचित तो यह था कि आज के जमाने में स्वराज्य हो जाने के बाद सारे भारत भर में हमारी सर्विसेज एक तरह की होतीं और यह इंडियन ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विस और प्राविशासनल सर्विस का भेद नहीं होता क्योंकि हमारे प्राविस एक फंडरल यूनिट हैं, आटोनोमस बॉडी हैं और उन की सर्विसेज फलज हों। उन की सर्विस पर यह डैपुटेशन में जाने के क्या मानी होते हैं। वहां के लिए डैपुटेशन पर मंगाये जाने का कोई सवाल नहीं है। बल्कि वे वहां पर लाद दिये जाते हैं और आज हकीकत यह है कि एस० पी०, कलक्टर्स, आई० जी० और सेन्ट्ररीज सेंटर वाले होते हैं और प्राविस वाले नहीं होते। यह भी धजीब बात है कि प्राविस की सर्विस में जायें और वे सूबे की सरकार के अधिकार में न रहें और उन सर्विसेज के बारे में सेंट्रल वे कमिशन विचार न कर सके। मैं चाहूंगा कि यह जो एक स्वर्गीय सर्विस हो रही है उस से हम को किसी तरह से राहत मिले क्योंकि हम तो दुनिया में रहने वाले इंसान हैं।

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

श्रीर यहीं दुनिया में रहते हैं। मेरा गवर्नमेंट के अनुरोध है कि तमाम हिन्दुस्तान के वास्ते एक इंटैग्रेटेड सर्विस बनायें। अगर अलग अलग होना है तो स्टेट्स और सेंटर दोनों की अलग अलग रहें। लेकिन ऐसी सर्विस तो न रखें जो कि इस में भी न हो और उस में भी न हो लेकिन हो दोनों पर हावी। इस एनीमलस पोजीशन को दूर होना चाहिये। मैं खास तौर से ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे दो, तीन कमीशन बैठ चुके, किसी कमीशन ने उस पर विचार करने की हिम्मत नहीं की। इस के वास्ते पूछा गया तो आपने कहा कि नहीं। अब यह नहीं करने वाले आप हैं या कौन है यह आप बेहतर जानते हैं, आप के बड़े बड़े अफसरान हैं जिन्होंने बैठे बैठे कह दिया कि हम आप को बीच में नहीं ले सकते। अब ऐसी सर्विस कब तक चलेगी क्योंकि इस सर्विस में और और सर्विसेज में यह फर्क देखा जाता है कि दूसरी सर्विसेज में जूनियर स्टाफ का प्रमोशन ज्यादा होता है जूनियर स्टाफ ज्यादा होता है और उन के ऊपर सीनियर्स में टोप में बहुत कम होता है लेकिन इस सर्विस में आप पायेंगे कि टोप में ज्यादा है और नीचे कम है। १०, १२ नीचे होंगे तो ३०, ४० ऊपर होंगे। इन की तरक्की बहुत जल्द हो जाती है। चार वर्ष के बाद कलक्टर हो जाते हैं। लेकिन स्टेट सर्विसेज की कोई कर नहीं होती और उन के मुकाबिले इन का प्रमोशन बड़ा रैपिड होता है क्योंकि उन के ऊपर की संख्या अधिक है।

अब रेलवेज में आप देखें कि वहां नीचे की संख्या जूनियर स्टाफ की रेलवेज में कोई ६, १० लाख है और उन के ७ जनरल मैनेजर हैं। इसलिये मैं गवर्नमेंट से अनुरोध करूंगा कि वह यह विचार करे कि यह एक दुषिधा की सर्विस कब तक हम देश में रखें। जब हम गुलाम थे तब तो हम ने कहा था कि यह हमारे ऊपर हावी है लेकिन आज स्वराज्य प्राप्ति के पश्चात् भी उस में कोई अन्तर नहीं मालूम पड़ता है। अलबत्ता इंडियन सिविल

सर्विस का रूपान्तर इंडियन ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विस हो गया है खाली रूप बदला हुआ है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर सेंटर में रहे तो सेंटर नें लाकेट हो और प्राविन्स में दखल न दे और अगर प्राविन्स के कैंडिडेट में रहे तो फिर उस के साथ रहे और प्राविन्स के अधिकारी भी समझें कि हम भी अपने अधिकार पा सकते हैं। अब होता क्या है। प्राविशिएल सर्विस वाले इसी कोशिश में रहते हैं कि किसी न किसी रूप में आई० ए० एस० हो जायें ताकि कलक्टर बन जायें क्योंकि जब तक पी० सी० एस० रहेगा तब तक वह कलक्टर नहीं हो सकेगा। प्राविशिएल सर्विस में दो तरह की सर्विस हैं, जुडीशिएरी सर्विस और ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विस। जुडीशिएल अफसर मुकर्रर होते हैं हर एक स्टेट के मुंसिफ से और मुंसिफ से बढ़ते हुए जज होते हैं और हाई कोर्ट के जज होते हैं। और दूसरे आई० ए० एस० और आई० पी० एस० में पढ़ें जाते हैं। पहले आई० सी० एस० जाया करते थे मुंसिफी लाइन में लेकिन हमारे क्याल में आई० सी० एस० अब मुंसिफी लाइन में नहीं जाते हैं। स्टेट्स में जुडीशिएल सर्विस स्टेट लेवल पर महदूद हैं, तो उन का एक कैंडिडेट बन सकता है लेकिन आज उसी स्टेट सर्विस में भी दो तरह की सर्विसेज हो गई एक प्राविशिएल हो गई और एक सेन्ट्रल हो गई। देश में एकता के लिये और एके के लिये सारे भारत की सर्विस एक होनी चाहिये। अगर सेन्ट्रल सर्विस बनानी है तो वह पूरी तरह सेन्टर के ही मातहत रहे और इस तरह स्टेट वालों को अपनी अपनी जगह पर राहत हो सकती है।

इस के बाद मैं अब आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां बहुत दिनों से ५१७ तरह के ग्रेड बने हुये हैं। वर्षाचारी कमेटी ने सिफारिश की थी कि १५६ स्केल होने चाहिये मगर हैं ५१७ और जिस के कि कारण काफी गड़बड़ी पड़ती है। मैं आप को इस सम्बन्ध में रेलवे की एक मिसाल दूँ।

अब इस में लोएस्ट पेड शुरू होता है ६०-४-१२०-४-१५० और फिर एक हाइएर ग्रेड इसी में है १००-१०५-१२५-६-१८५। अभी एक रेलवे के मुलाजिम से मालूम हुआ कि वह ११२ रुपये पा रहा है यानी वह सेकंड ग्रेड में पहुँच गया है लेकिन अब कागज में केवल सेकंड ग्रेड नाम लिख दिया गया है। उस की पे में फर्क नहीं होना है क्योंकि वह ६० के ग्रेड से १५० तक जा सकता है और फिर १०० से ग्रेड शुरू होता है। अब यही ग्रेड ६० से १८५ तक हो जाये बजाय ६० से १५० और फिर १०० से १८५ तक होने के। ६० से १८५ तक हो जाय और उसी में उस व्यक्ति को जाना है अगर ऐसा हो जाय तो शायद इस से लोगों को सन्तोष हो जाय कि हम चले जा रहे हैं और क्रम से बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं। लेकिन अभी एक ग्रेड १५० तक जाता है जो हमें इन ग्रेडों को कम करना चाहिये।

दूसरा प्रयत्न यह होना चाहिये था कि स्वराज्य प्राप्ति के इतने वर्ष बाद ऊपर और नीचे का अन्तर कम किया जाता। इसी कमीशन ने दिखलाया है कि दूसरे देशों में सब से ऊँचे और सब से नीचे वेतन में कितना अन्तर है। उस ने बताया है कि यह अन्तर यू० के० में १ और १५ का है। यू० एस० ए० में १ और ५ का है, कनाडा में १ और ६ का है, आस्ट्रेलिया में १ और १३-६ का है और जापान में १ और ४-७ का है। और हमारे यहाँ अब बहुत कोशिश कर के इस को १ और २६ का किया जा रहा है। अभी तक यह अन्तर १ और ५० का था। क्योंकि सब से नीचा वेतन ८० रुपया था और सब से ऊँचा ४०००, लेकिन अब ८० वाले को दस रुपया का एलाऊंस और दे दिया जायेगा और ऊँचा वेतन कहा जाता है २२०० से ज्यादा नहीं होगा, इस तरह यह अन्तर अब १ और २६ का होने वाला है। इस पर कमीशन ने बहुत संतोष प्रकट किया है कि अन्तर पहले से कम हो गया है। लेकिन हम जानना चाहते हैं कि वह अन्तर १ और ५ का कब होगा। कहा जाता है कि स्टार्टिंग वेतन में तो अब

१ और ५ का अन्तर हो जायेगा क्योंकि आई० ए० एस० को शुरू में ३५० रुपया मिलेगा और कम से कम वेतन ७० रुपया रहेगा। लेकिन एक आई० ए० एस० अफसर का वेतन तेजी से बढ़ता जाता है। और कहा गया है कि यह इसलिये है कि उस का खानदान बढ़ता जाता है। लेकिन नीचे वाले का भाठ घाना साल बढ़ कर केवल ८० रुपये तक वेतन जाता है। क्या उस का खानदान नहीं बढ़ता। अब कि एक आई० ए० एस० अफसर का वेतन ३५० से बढ़ कर ३००० तक हो जाता है। उस का ८० रुपये तक ही रहता है। इस तरह यद्यपि शुरू में वेतन का अन्तर १ और ५ का रहता है लेकिन आगे जा कर यह अन्तर १ और २६ का हो जाता है। अगर एक अफसर की जरूरत बढ़ती है तो क्या एक गरीब आदमी की जरूरत नहीं बढ़ती। आज हम सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न का दावा करते हैं। समाज में जहाँ तक हो सके ऊँच नीच और अमीर गरीब के भेद को दूर करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जहाँ नीकरी का सवाल है वहाँ कमीशन को यह अन्तर कम करने की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी। अब भी वेतन का अन्तर १ और २६ का रहने वाला है। हम आज अमीरों का और ब्रिटेन की नकल करने का दावा करते हैं, लेकिन अगर हम वाकई मानी में उन की नकल करें और जिस तरह वे अपने नीचे वाले और ऊपर वाले कर्मचारियों को उचित वेतन देते हैं अगर उसी तरह हम भी दें तो यहाँ भी लोग खुश रहें। हम को यह क्या नहीं आता कि एक गरीब नागरिक की भी जरूरतें बढ़ती हैं। वह भी अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाना चाहता है। आज हमारे यहाँ रूस के प्रधान मंत्री आये हुए हैं। कहा जाता है कि उन के पिता एक माइनर थे। लेकिन उस देश में एक माइनर का लड़का प्रधान मंत्री होने के स्वप्न देख सकता है और उस पद तक आगे बढ़ सकता है। लेकिन हमारे यहाँ के माइनर का लड़का कभी यह स्वप्न नहीं देख सकता और न इतना आगे बढ़ सकता है क्योंकि उस की पढ़ाई की और दूसरी चीजों की सुविधा यहाँ नहीं है। यहाँ तो माइनर

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

माइनर ही रहेगा, उस का लड़का या वह धागे बढ़ने के स्वप्न नहीं देख सकता। यहां तो बड़ों के लड़के ही बड़े होंगे।

गांधी जी ने सब को समान शिक्षा देने के विचार से बेसिक स्कूल का विचार देश के सामने रखा लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि दिल्ली में बड़े धादमियों के लड़कों के लिये पब्लिक स्कूल कायम हैं और बेसिक स्कूलों में केवल गरीबों के बच्चे पढ़ते हैं। वह जमाना कब आएगा जब हम वास्तव में अपने धादमियों को कार्यान्वित कर सकेंगे। यहां हमारे आन्ध्र के भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री और कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष मौजूद हैं। वह ऐसा प्रयत्न करें जो देश का कल्याण हो सके।

रेलवे अरबिस में क्लास ३ में टी० टी० ६०, टी० सी०, कर्माशियल क्लर्क्स और दूसरे क्लर्क्स होते हैं। इन की क्वालिफिकेशन एक है और इन का काम भी करीब करीब एक सा है, लेकिन इन के लिये १५ ग्रेडें रख दी गयी हैं जिस वजह से उन में बहुत हार्ट बनिय होती है। इस का कारण यह है कि किसी को बड़ी ग्रेड दे दी जाती है और किसी को कम ग्रेड दी जाती है। तो मैं अनुरोध करूंगा कि इस पर भी विचार किया जाय और इन ग्रेडों में समानता लायी जाये जिस से कि उन में जो इस समय हार्ट बनिय होती है वह न हो।

रेलवे में ला इन्स्पेक्टर लिये जाते हैं। ये ला ग्रेजुएट होते हैं। इन को बाहर से तो ले लिया जाता है, लेकिन जो लोग कर्माशियल क्लास में इस योग्यता के होते हैं उन को नहीं लिया जाता। इस बारे में रेलवे बोर्ड को लिखा गया तो उन्होंने ने जवाब दिया कि इन में से भी लोगों को लिया जाता है लेकिन वह लोग हमारे पास आये और उन्होंने ने बताया कि उन में से किसी को नहीं लिया गया। वह दरखास्त देते हैं कि वह भी ला पढ़े हुए हैं लेकिन उन को नहीं लिया जाता। मैं कहता हूँ कि इस अन्तर को दूर करना चाहिये क्योंकि इस से बहुत

गड़बड़ी होती है और काम में बहुत रुकावट पड़ती है।

Shri Rajendra Singh: Mr. Chairman, it would be well to recall the different conditions and the different background under which the First Pay Commission and the Second Pay Commission came into being. During the course of the Second World War and for several years after that, the prominent issue was the rising prices and the First Pay Commission was called upon to relate the income of the workers to the needs arising out of the rising prices. The First Commission in spite of the limitations did well and it was the Government which repudiated certain of its basic recommendations and observations. It will go down in the history as a landmark in honest thinking.

But so far as the Second Pay Commission is concerned, it was set in an entirely different background. During the course of the last 10-12 years we have changed to a very appreciable degree our social outlook and the social policy which should govern the decisions regarding all matters. When the demand from the workers came for the constitution of the Second Pay Commission it was felt that the Second Pay Commission would take into account the changed conditions and orientate the salaries and emoluments of different types of workers to that end.

Viewed from that angle the report of the Second Pay Commission and its recommendations are entirely disquieting and disconcerting. The Second Pay Commission, as many speakers have pointed out very pertinently, has gone beyond its scope and terms of reference. It did not rise to the occasion and meet the needs of the time but it had also the audacity to take away from the workers things which they had gained and enjoyed after centuries of hard struggle and sacrifice.

One of my colleagues here, while initiating the debate, raised a historical issue concerning the personnel of this Pay Commission. He was very

right. Marx said a hundred years ago that a man could not be objective on economic issues; he was conditioned by his upbringing and economic interests. If it was valid during that time, this Marxian theory is still more valid today. In the First Pay Commission, the Government had the grace to take into its personnel one of the representatives of the labour but in this Pay Commission the Government did not have the honesty to include any of the labour representatives. The result is that the interest of the labour has been consistently denied. But, Sir, apart from that this Commission has done a great mischief in trying to equate all types of workers into one bracket. Although the Central Government happens to be the employer in respect of the Railways, Posts and Telegraphs and several others like that, one has to take into account the different natures of the industries in which the workers are employed. For example, Sir, in respect of the Railways it is a commercial enterprise and the salaries and emoluments given to the workers have to be related not only to the minimum that you can give to an employee of the Central Government but also the capacity of the industry to earn.

Sir, during the course of the enquiry the All India Railwaymen's Federation submitted a memorandum to the Commission in which it very emphatically and supported by statistical data brought to the notice of the Pay Commission that the Railways today has a capacity to reasonably augment its income to the tune of Rs. 165 crores. The Commission was so wooden-headed that it could not go into the details of it and outright rejected all the reasonable demands that were put forward by the All India Railwaymen's Federation. Sir, it would be in the fitness of things to remember the observation of the Varadachariar Commission which it made as a matter of future course and direction that the State should take. It said:

"State must now take steps forward in the direction of giving

effect to living wage principle in dealing with its employees; and as a matter of social policy, the lowest rate of remuneration should not be lower than a living wage and that the highest salary should also as a matter of social policy be kept down as far as possible, consistent with essential requirements of recruitment and efficiency."

The motive of the first Pay Commission was to re-orientate the whole principle of wage policy and bring it up so as to relate it to the needs of the changing concept of social justice, but the second Pay Commission very cleverly switched on to the last line where the first Commission says: "recruitment and efficiency". It will be good to remember, Sir, that this principle was enunciated by the Islington Commission which had no other interest than the maintenance of the British regime in India and all its recommendations, in spite of loud professions, were meant and designed from that angle.

The second Pay Commission interpreted the observation of the Islington Commission, which was something like a buried thing in the changed context of the country, in a very conservative and reactionary manner. I am sorry all the more for the act of the Government because this Government which times without number, in season and out of season, claims to design its whole policy and its objective for the creation of a socialist society, did not have the courage to outright reject the recommendations of the Commission but it had the audacity to accept those recommendations of the Commission which infringed on their terms of reference.

Sir, the Second Pay Commission has said that in a developing economy there is a need for marginal productivity and, naturally, some savings have to be made for augmenting the tempo of economic development in the country. Nobody can deny that.

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

14. 16 hrs.

[SHRI MULCHAND DUBE in the Chair]

I would like to ask in all humility, has there been even a single case in the whole history of any country where any increase in the emoluments of workers has jeopardised the national economy? Sir, it would be in the fitness of things to remember that when Roosevelt came into power the whole nation was suffering from a severe crisis of slump. The conservative economist's approach was to cut down the wages, to close the factories and to do things of a similar nature, but Roosevelt behaved in a different way. He increased the wages, he emphasised fuller employment and the result was something which has gone down in history as a milestone.

To my mind, Sir, it seems that the Government today lives in a pre-historic age, the age of Marshall and Adam Smith. There is, as you know, the Labour Conference constituted by the Government, private employers and the representatives of the labour. Certain decisions are arrived there every year. It is hoped that the Labour Minister who presides over this Conference will take opportunity to implement those decisions.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Sir, I should be given at least 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Only ten minutes are given now. There is one more hon. Member who wants to speak on this.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Some hon. Members were given even 30 minutes. Why should there be this discrimination in my case. I know that this Government is based on discrimination, but at least in this House there should not be any discrimination.

An Hon. Member: This is your first day, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. Member kindly not attribute partiality or anything of that sort to the Chair?

Shri Rajendra Singh: No, Sir. I am the one man who would like to uphold the dignity of the Chair more than anybody else in this House.

Mr. Chairman: By attributing partiality you are certainly not adding to the dignity of the Chair or the dignity of the House.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Sir, I have been telling that the Labour Minister presides over the Labour Conference. He happens to be a member of the Cabinet. The decisions that are arrived at in that Conference have to be implemented by the Government. At the Fifth Labour Conference the policy for the basic minimum wage was decided. But it is a sad thing that the Commission as well as this Government had shown an affront by denying their responsibilities arising out of these decisions. It is universally recognised that Dr. Aykroyd's theory is the one, so far, that could be accepted by any Government for the purpose of providing their employees with adequate calories. The Commission rejected it outright without any reason or rhyme and it had also the audacity to say that since the people in Japan can live on lower values of calories, we Indians can also do so. The people in Japan have the habit of consuming frogs. Would the Commission have the same recommendation for the Indians?

You know that in the railway, the casual labour is employed on a very large scale. By the persistent efforts of the All-India Railwaymen's Federation, the numbers of these casual labour people were very much reduced. But, due to the recommendation of the Pay Commission, what has already been done will be watered down. It is presumed that the State Governments would be fixing a minimum wage, but it would be well to re-

member that welders and fitters who happen to be skilled workers in the railway could not expect to have any improvement because many of the State Governments do not have any inclination—at least they have not shown any such inclination thus far—to fix a minimum wage and do justice to them.

I would like to show how at least in the railways the recommendations of the Pay Commission have adversely affected the workers. It nullifies the policy relating to avenues of promotion evolved by the Joint Advisory Committee, 1950, "New Deal, 1957", Justice Shankar Saran's Tribunal Award, 1958, Class IV Staff Promotion Enquiry Committee, 1958, and lays down a principle inimical to the interests of the railwaymen. Secondly, the differentials have not been worked out on a scientific basis and taking into consideration the nature of duties, and responsibilities. Reduction in the minimum and maximum of scales of pay, introduction of low rates of annual increments and unwarranted imposition of efficiency bar examinations even for the unskilled staff and at more than one stage for others result in substantial reduction of emoluments. Increase in the hours of employment and curtailment of leave and holidays is contrary to the provisions of the Adjudicator's Award and will result in loss to the tune of Rs. 23 crores to the railwaymen alone and to greater unemployment to others. There is curtailment in the pass and PTO facilities granted to the railwaymen since the very inception of the railways. There is curtailment in the medical benefits available to the railwaymen at present. There is an increase in the house rent by the calculation of the rent on the basis of six per cent of the capital cost instead of four per cent at present and adding to it the cost of site. There is reduction in the overtime allowance. There is an adverse recommendation on promotion and character rolls, service conduct rules, disciplinary and other departmental rules including the pro-

vision of rules 148 and 170 (para. 2) of the Establishment Code, Vol. I, whereby a railwayman can be removed from service without assigning any reason, a provision which is uncommon to other departments of the Central Government. There is a denial of civil, political and trade union rights to the railwaymen and rendering them as second class citizens of the country.

I have enumerated, of course not much in detail, the points that need consideration. I have enumerated them at least in a broad way, and these are the aspects on which the railwaymen who number about ten lakhs and who run the transport service by rail throughout the length and breadth of this country are going to lose.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): Madam.

Shri Rajendra Singh: They will have to provide for that. Therefore, in all humility, I would urge on the Government to revise its mind, to search its heart; (*interruption*). I do not know whether they search their heart.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: They have got no heart. How can they search?

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: He is paying a big compliment for the first time! (*Interruption*).

Shri Rajendra Singh: Well, Sir, I had been urging on the Government at least to associate the All-India Railwaymen's Federation while framing the rules and implementing the recommendations which are acceptable to the federation, and to appoint immediately a permanent wage board for the railwaymen consisting of representatives of the Railway Ministry and the All-India Railwaymen's Federation with a neutral chairman to determine the scales of pay and

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

service conditions for the railwaymen commensurate with the risk, responsibility and hazards connected with the duties of railwaymen which are peculiar to the railway service and uncommon to other Government services. With these words, I would again counsel the Government. . . .

राजस्थान और अर्सेनिक व्यय मंत्री (डा०
 डे० गोपाल रेड्डी) : दो मिनट बाकी हैं,
 और दो मिनट बोल लीजिये ।

Shri Rajendra Singh: One issue which has been raised by the hon. Members is that since the State Governments are not going to relate the salaries and the emoluments of their employees to the salaries and emoluments of the Central Government employees, it is not in the interests of the economy of the country to allow the Central Government employees to get what others would not get and make them a privileged class. If I remember aright, the hon. Minister who is sitting here, while inaugurating a conference of some departmental union of the employees, rebuked the Central Government employees that they should not insist on getting a better treatment, a privileged treatment, from the Government since the peasantry of this country, the common people of the country, are not having all that they want and for years together they would not have them. Therefore, he went on to say that they must keep out from demanding such things from the Government. I agree that the economy of the country is not such as can permit us to indulge in luxuries. But if it is applicable to the under-dogs, in the words of my hon. friend the professor over there, those who are the top-dogs should also be prepared to make similar sacrifices in the name of the country and in the name of social justice. It is equally justifiable to demand from them that they should make such sacrifice. (Interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: It is 2.30 now.

14.31 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE
 MEMBERS' BILLS AND
 RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-FIFTH REPORT

Shri Jadhav (Malegaon): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 10th February, 1960."

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): I have tabled the following amendment.

"Subject to the condition that the time allotted for the discussion of the resolution regarding quitting the Commonwealth be increased by one hour."

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I second that amendment.

Mr. Chairman: I believe that granting one hour more is in the discretion of the Chairman who may be there at that time. So, I think this may be held over till that time.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: All right, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 10th February, 1960."

The motion was adopted.

14.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: COMPULSORY
 MILITARY TRAINING IN EDU-
 CATIONAL INSTITUTIONS—
 contd.

Mr. Chairman: The House will now resume further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri