

Shri Biswanath Das (Orissa: General): Sir, I believe that Mr. Lari has proposed an amendment which is unfair to the country and unfortunate in itself.

Let me first take the provision in article 86 of the Draft Constitution,. It lays down that Parliament shall provide for such allowances as were being given to the members before the operation of the Constitution and afterward that the Parliament will determine, by law, the salary and allowances that are to given to members. If Mr. Lari had wanted to agitate in the way he has proposed to do, the proper course for him was to come before the Assembly when a law was proposed to be enacted after the election in terms of the Constitution that we are going to pass.

Sir, the Constitution provides for salaries and allowances. for myself, I do not believe nor do I go with those who profess to advocate Parliamentary democracy that members should be paid salaries for the work that they have to do in their constituencies or in the Assembly here. I believe, Sir, that allowances, without pay, is the desirable course. However, we have to submit to the joint wisdom of the honourable Members of this House and we agree to the scale of pay and allowances to be fixed hereafter by law by Parliament. That being the position, I for myself and some friends like me feel that no pay is called for under the Circumstances but we have to submit to the joint wisdom of the Members. However, that does not make one feel to say that parliamentary democracy that is going to be installed in this country should give a statutory recognition to the Opposition, not only give recognition to the Opposition, but also provide a scale of pay for the Leader of the Opposition. I plead with Mr. Lari to point me out any Constitution in the world which is in operation today wherein a fixed salary has been provided for in the Constitution for the Leader of the Opposition. True it is that the Leader of Opposition in British Parliament gets his scale of pay and status equal to that of a Minister but that has nothing to do with a specific provision in the Constitution. Sir, parliamentary democracy needs the existence of two parties viz., the majority party in charge of office and the minority party to play the functions of Opposition so as to give it full work. Therefore Opposition is a necessary evil. An Opposition party is also a necessary evil in the operation of Parliamentary democracy. that is however in itself and by itself no justification why a specific provision should be made as it is sought in the amendment in the

Constitution of this country. After all, many things have to be done by precedents for course of events that have to come in the future. I do not find any justification whatsoever for giving a statutory recognition to the Opposition and to the Leader and also to his status and pay.

Having said so much about the Opposition Leader, I come to his proposals regarding the scale of salary he proposes for the members of the House. I feel it is unfair to the country, a country wherein the differences in the earning capacity of the top man and the people who are down trodden is so wide that the scale of pay that he proposes for members merely perpetuates the existing order and is therefore far beyond my conception. The scale of pay that he proposes is to range between one-fourth and one-third of the pay of a Minister. If the existing pay of Ministers is going to be Rs. 3,000 as has been fixed by Statute by the honourable Members of this House, then his one-third and one fourth fixes the scale of pay of members is to range from Rs. 750 to Rs. 1,000/- a month. I put it straight to him whether it is fair to himself and to his country to propose to fix a scale of salary to range between Rs. 750 and Rs. 1,000/- for each member of the House.

Shri Biswanath Das : He may be getting Rs.1,300 if he is a member of too many committees and if he is a member who attends the Assembly regularly. Even then I would plead with him that his facts are far from being correct. Because no member to my knowledge draw Rs. 1,300 a month as allowance.

I am one of those members who choose to draw only Rs. 30 feeling that Rs. 45 a day is too much for a member and I for myself, an ordinary worker. I do not need Rs. 45. I know there are members in my province who draw their monthly salaries as members of the Assembly and straightaway hand over to the Secretary of their District Congress Committee and receive a scale as fixed by the Congress Committee in preference to the pay that they draw and they go on as whole-time workers. That being the position I think he has been very unfair to his constituents and to his country in bringing a proposal such as this before the House.

Sir, for myself I feel that I can have absolutely no truck with any point covered in his amendment and I feel that it is unnecessary, unfortunate and undesirable. Therefore I support clause 86 as it is, however much I would desire that there should be no scale of salary fixed for the honourable Members of this House who ought to agree to work and serve the country being satisfied with the allowances that the Assembly would fix for themselves.