

की इजाजत नहीं दें। आप मन्त्री जी से कहें कि इस तरह के विधेयक को फौरन से पेस्तर निकाल कर यहाँ से बाहर फेंक दें। अगर आप इस तरह की बात करेंगे तो आपको जनता मुबारकबाद देगी और कहेगी की कि चेयर में श्री अकबर अली खान साहब बैठे थे और उन्होंने एक अच्छी रूलिंग दी और सरकार को एक काला विधेयक, नापाक विधेयक को प्रस्तुत करने की इजाजत नहीं दी।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि आप बार बार घंटी बजा रहे हैं, इसलिये मुझ बैठना ही होगा। नमस्कार।

REFERENCE TO STRIKE IN THE DELHI UNIVERSITY

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Mysore) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I make a submission before you call another Member. It seems that just now there has been a strike going on in the Delhi University and the police have resorted to lathi charge and many students have been wounded. I would like you, Sir, to ask the Government to make a statement either before the rise today or tomorrow.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : दिल्ली यहीं पर है और हम चाहते हैं कि आज सदन उठने से पहले इस सम्बन्ध में माननीय मंत्री जी अपना वक्तव्य दें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It can be made if possible, today; otherwise tomorrow.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Why it is not possible?

यह तो यही की घटना है और इसमें पॉसिबल का सवाल ही नहीं उठता है।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, you should ask the Government to make a statement before we adjourn today, before 5 o'clock. We would like to know what the position is.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमान्, यह तो दिल्ली की घटना है और इस पर आज बयान अवश्य होना चाहिए।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : I also think that the statement should be made on this issue before the House adjourns today.

THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MINISTERS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1969—contd.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the scope of the Bill is rather limited but the question involved therein is a vast one and is always in the mind of the public. The public is very much agitated and is also critical of the manner in which the Ministers' salaries and other allowances are being paid and amenities are being misused.

Sir, it is difficult to make an assessment of the expenditure on each Minister. My friend, Mr. Rajnarain, said that it comes to about Rs. 30,000 per day in the case of the Prime Minister and Rs. 2,000 in the case of other Ministers. I do not make that claim. But I do say that the amount involved is tremendous. Even with the most elementary addition of the items involved, one comes to the conclusion that each Minister gets about Rs. 7,000 to Rs. 8,000 per month. People may ask me the manner by which I get at this amount.

Sir, a Cabinet Minister gets Rs. 2,250 plus Rs. 500 without tax. That is why the sumptuary allowance, not taxable, is equal to Rs. 1,000 in that level of income. Therefore, a Cabinet Minister gets Rs. 3,250. A Minister of State gets Rs. 2,250 in all. The amount thus paid is negligible compared to the amount otherwise paid. First of all I will take up the Ministers in the Ministry. Should it be necessary for me to say that there are 55 Ministers in this Government . . .

SHRI OM MEHTA : Out of whom five are gone.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : And we will not take them back.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Anyhow, whether it is 55, 52 or 50, that is immaterial. But the number is excessive. One day I asked a friend whether half of these gentlemen ever make their appearance in the House, and suppose they are no more there, would they be missed?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : ' As it is, they do not make their appearance in the House.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Whether they make their appearance in the House or not, their role in the Government is insignificant, but they do add to the strength of the Government.

The most important item, apart from a Minister's salary, is the car. Everybody knows that huge imported, foreign cars usually available to the public at Rs. 90,000 or so, are at the disposal of the Ministers. And what is the expense on such a car? What is the wear and tear? It will not be less than at least Rs. 2 or Re. 1 per mile. And the cars are used indiscriminately; petrol is spend indiscriminately. Therefore, the least that I can say is, Rs. 2,000 per car is the maintenance expenditure—driver, overtime, etc.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is the position?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Rs. 2,000 on car alone per month, not for wear and tear but for maintenance—driver, overtime, petrol, tyres and tubes, etc.

Then comes telephone. It is a very small item. People may ask "Why do you grudge this telephone expense to the Ministers?" But of late, this item of telephone has become a tremendous one. I am told that one Minister spent in the month of August Rs. 10 lakhs on trunk-calls.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Have you verified that?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Yes. I will explain to you.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Let the Government explain.

{Inhnuptions}

SHRI C D. PANDE : I will explain. A lightning call is charged eight times an ordinary call. A personal call for three minutes to Calcutta is ordinarily Rs. 15.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : No.

SHRI C D. PANDE : Yes; Rs. 12 plus 25 per cent. Now, Ministers do not make ordinary calls. They make lightning

calls. A call to Calcutta which would cost me Rs. 15 costs Rs. 120 for a Minister. And if a Minister of importance with a large political following in the country makes 200 calls a day, you can calculate the amount for one month. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta can put a question as to what was the amount spent by seven or eight top Ministers in the month of August on trunk-calls. That will explain the position.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi) : VWhy'August?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : August, of course, everybody knows. After all, you are politically so conscious.

Then there is the question of house. Leaving aside the vast grounds, even the rental of the House which a Minister enjoys cannot be less than Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000. Business people are paying Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 to houses which are ten miles away. You can imagine what must be the rental of the , House which a Minister occupies in the heart of the city. It cannot be less than Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000.

Then I come to another item which seems to be very small—water and electricity. When I was associated with Pandit Pant . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In what capacity?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : As a son-in-law. I suggested to him that it should be divided into two portions : one is the household which the Minister must pay from his own pocket, and the other, security, visitors' room, etc., should be paid by the State. Nothing of the kind is being done. The electricity bills of Ministers, if you check it, cannot be less than Rs. 1,000 a month. If it is less than that, I shall be surprised. Rs. 300 or Rs. 400 or Rs. 500, according to the number of baths they take .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : We have got a Bill with a very limited purpose.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, so far as water is concerned, we cannot complain because they commit so much sin that they have to wash.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sir, the purpose may be limited, but the implications should be brought to public attention. If you just say "Ministers' Salaries and

Allowances Bill— hange 15 days to one month", it has ni value, unless we speak on these items winch the public want to know; the quali y of their work, their expenses, these a e the things which must be brought to light. I was also sitting there and people used o assail us about these outrageous expei es,

Now, I come to he trips of the Ministers. I think it is imposi ble to make an estimate of the expenditu e on trips. My friend was iust saying tl at if there is a marriage of a friend's dai ghter or son, people travel a thousand miles by a special plane to attend that in tniage. I do not mean the Prime Ministt ' attending the marriage of Bahuguna's daughter. (Inhrrup'ijns) So many Ministe -s go to attend marriages and spend lakhs of rupees. Every day Ministers are going from Delhi to Bombay, Calcutta ;iuid Madras merely for inauguration of a dam or a bridge or to attend the marri.ige ceremony of a niece or a niece of some friend. And this is also permissible ?...

sft *rŁWIR w* mvtf (^=mr sr^rr) :

SHRI C. D. PASDE : There is another aspect of this. I can understand the wasting of money on marriage ceremonies, on inauguration, on laying of foundation stones.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I cannot understand.

SHRI C. D. PANDE . But what is much more serious is the expenditure on tours for canvaffng political support. This is a thing which this House must take notice of. Is it proper for a Minister, as most of the Ministers are doing now, to go 'o different places to collect as many people as possible to attend the Bombay session of the Coiite'ess ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Ah-medabad ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : For Ahmedabad you have no Ministers.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Pande, that is group politics,

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The whole j Government is based on group politics. I

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My Suggestion is that they should all go to Ahmedabad via Calcutta. We can have some business.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : This is the basis of polttical life.

श्री एन० पी० चौधरी (मध्य प्रदेश)
मैसूर में मिनिस्टर क्या करने वाले हैं ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : That is all right. If the Assembly of Mysore castigates the Chief Minister there, I shall have no objection.

(Interruptions)

श्री एन० पी० चौधरी : आपको मालूम होना चाहिए कि आगरा से स्पेशल जा रही है ।

श्री सी० डी० पांडे : उसका पेमेन्ट दिया जा रहा है ।

श्री मोहन लाल गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
आगरा से जो स्पेशल जाने वाली है वह लोगों के अपने खर्चे पर जा रही है ...
(Interruptions)

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : ये लोग मक्कारी कर रहे हैं ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Order, please. When a Member is in possession of the House, other Members should not rise.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sir, I assert my right to speak on this aspect of the Bill. The Ministers' Salaries and Allowances Bill is under consideration and no discussion would be complete if we do not refer to the amounts spent on various items by the Ministers and the commensurate returns from the trips they undertake. It is quite possible that some Ministers go to some places and do some work also. I do not say that every trip is a fake one. But most of them are either for gohig to attend a ceremony or whatever it is, of a public nature or of a private nature.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa) : That is the practice of" the Congress since independence.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : May be, I am not defending it. (*Interruptions*) So, these are the things to which serious attention is required. The number of trips must be curtailed.

One thing more. The Minister sign^s his own T.A. bill. The ordinary officer^s and even Mr. Banerjee have to get the consent of the higher authority. But the Minister signs his own T.A. bill. He can spend any amount.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You can bring some amendment .

SHRI C. D. PANDE : But I must explain to the House .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, when a son-in-law is in a state of revolt, we get all things.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Even as a son-in-law, my advice was for practising economy. And you can see the reward. Pandit Pant used to pay .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No, no.

Shri C. D. PANDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a rule even now that if a car used for any purpose other than official you have to pay six annas or eight annas per mile. Pandit Pant used to pay Rs. 200 a month. .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : And we have also the privilege of knowing you. We do not know who was the gainer ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : He used to day Rs. 200 a month for the car. I do not know; whether I used it or my wife used it, that was the amount fixed, Rs. 200 a month, for personal use. It may have exceeded sometimes; it may have been less but he paid Rs. 200. Now, these are the things which Ministers must emulate. Today if I ask a Minister "Why are you using a big car, do you think that Jawaharlal Nehru who used to . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My complaint is that Govind Ballabh Pant was not emulated by his son-in-law.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What I am saying is, these amenities should not be misused and the cars should be such as are available in India. Is it not possible, when

Jawaharlal Nehru could ride an Am bassador car, for any other Minister to ride an Ambassador car ? These cars are big cars and they go to annoy the public. People do not like these. Therefore it is in your interest that you should take these cars away and reduce the expenditure. You tell your P.A.s and the members of your household not to use them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But what happens if Mr. Ram Subhag Singh happens to be the Minister ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Smaller car smaller house, less furniture . . .

(*Interruptions*)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, यह अच्छो ईकामिशन दे रहे है तो उनको बोलने दीजिए ।

C. D. PANDE : I remember one case. When a new Minister came, one Minister of State, not of the Cabinet, he was residing in a house; he changed the whole pattern. Then the office bought a carpet for Rs. 5,000 What is this? (*Interruptions*) This is your mentality. Do you think that your P.A. does not know this thing? Do you think that he does not tell his freinds ? Do you think that the press people who come to your house do not know it ? There are five drawing rooms, one in this corner, one in the other and so on. Do you think that your friends would lend you support ? Therefore the public is annoyed at the huge expenditure on Ministers, their salaries, their emoluments, their cars, their house, their telephone bi'lls, taeir water bills, etc. I only want to tell you that it is in the interests of the Government to reduce expenditure on Ministers. Thereby you will save yourself; otherwise this cancerous disease will eat the body politic,

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am happy that I was called after Mr. Pande and Mr. Raj-narain. I was feeling some how that the Ministers' salaries and the perquisites are only the visible part of the iceberg while the invisible part is much more than what is visible. But I did not have a clear idea as to what the real emoluments or the real perquisites amounted to. We have all the time been saying and addressing the Ministers here as the leaders of the ruling political party and after independence every body in the country expected that the leaders of the ruling political party would set an example in

the country as to their personal behaviour and personal conduct which would be emulated by others. The example set by invariably all—I would not go to the extent of saying everybody but I must say—invariably all—has been a very disappointing one. Somebody is accused of evasion of income-tax, Somebody is accused of corruption somebody is accused of booking trucks and putting the public exchequer to the loss of Rs. 10 lakhs a month as told by Mr. Pande.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : I said extraordinary Minister.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : But who was the Minister ? Why keep us in the dark about that ?

SHRI G. D. PANDIT : Extraordinary Minister.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Extraordinary Minister of whatever it is, I do not know. Perhaps he means the Prime Minister. Even if it is the Prime Minister if the public exchequer has been put to a loss of Rs. 10 lakhs in a month

AN HON. MEMBER : How do you say it is a loss ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It is a definite loss. If the public exchequer has been put to a loss of Rs. 10 lakhs in a particular month then the House expects some explanation from the Minister who was responsible for this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : There is no basis. He has not given you the name.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The Chairman wants to know who the Minister is.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What I want to say is that at the election time five or six Ministers did their best in asking...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : He was mentioning Rs. 10 lakh in one month by one Minister.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : Who is that Minister ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : I have said extraordinary Minister.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, ही मीन्स प्राइम मिनिस्टर । पांडेय हमसे कह रहे हैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर को मैं कह रहा हूँ ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री० अकबर अली खान) : यह आप कह रहे हैं । मैं पांडेय से पूछना चाहता हूँ ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If Mr. Pande asserts that a Minister spent it he should have the guts to say who the Minister is.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : When the Presidential election took place in the month of August there would have been at least Rs. 10 lakhs expenditure in one month. It looks very impossible.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Who is the Minister ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The most powerful Minister who could influence the country—Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, क्या इस भवन में एक हम ही आदमी हैं जो इन की बात समझ जायें । आप को भी उन की बात समझ लेनी चाहिए थी, एक्सट्राऑर्डिनरी मिनिस्टर यानी प्राइम मिनिस्टर ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Whoever is the Minister, it does not matter. But if trucks calls have been made which have nothing to do with Government business then...

MISS M. L. M. NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh) : If the Prime Minister cannot talk who can talk ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please leave that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I am sorry for Miss Mary Naidu who is very up to date in her information because she very often goes to the United Nations. I thought she would be most up to date. If anybody has to speak to the nation, he or she does not have to speak through the telephone. That is all a private matter and speaking through the telephone will never be right.

MISS M. L. M. NAIDU : Who said that it is private matter ? It was only said that it was spoken.

श्री राजनारायण : राष्ट्रपति के चुनाव में श्री वी० वी० गिरि और रेड्डी के चुनाव में प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने 10 लाख रुपया खर्च किया टेलिफोन का पर। मैं इस के लिए इन्वॉयरी की मांग करता हूँ। प्राइम मिनिस्टर के करप्शन के लिए इन्वॉयरी कमीशन बिठ- लाया जाय और वह पूरी जांच करें कि वह अपने पद का कितना दुरुपयोग कर रही हैं।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Talking to the nation is never done in any country including Soviet Russia through a telephone. Through a telephone what is conveyed is either a personal message or a secret message of the Government, or may be a message which may not be secret and may not be personal but a message for conveying to the other Government on something to do with the Government. Therefore, if talking to the nation means also according to her vocabulary and her dictionary that telephones can be used for talking to the nation, then where is your place, Mr. Gujral ? Therefore talking to the nation is something else. Let us not talk about it now.

Now, Sir, the point was that whosoever may have been the Minister if Rs. 10 lakhs have been spent not on Government business . . .

MISS M. L. M. NAIDU : How do you mean not on Government business ?

3 PM.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I prefaced it by saying, "If it is for Government business..." The allegation is here. I have no personal knowledge here. There have been Members her* in this House who have alleged that the Prime Minister has spent .

MISS M. L. M. NAIDU : You could never have said it when you were here.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : But the election took place after I came over to this side.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, माननीय सदस्या को इस तरह से उन पर आक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिए था कि चूँकि वह हमारी साइड में आ गये इसलिये कहते हैं। उनको समझना चाहिये कि हमारी साइड में आ जाने से बुद्धि का विकास होता ही है और अगर कुमारी मेरी

नायडू भी आजाएंगी तो उनकी बुद्धि का विकास हो जायगा। वह यहाँ आयें।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : But the point remains that whosoever may have been the Minister responsible for this expenditure—and it looks too colossal to be spent during a month on telephone bills—whosoever the Minister, he or she, has to explain to the House as to whether the entire amount of Rs. 10 lakhs that was incurred on the telephone expenses during the month of August as is being alleged here, was spent on Government business or was incurred on something else. Now, the example set by our Ministers, I said, was extremely disappointing. They are expected to inspire the people to behave better. They are the leaders in the country. And more so, the responsibility is much greater when the leaders belong to the ruling party. But they do not seem to care for their own behaviour either in the House or outside. I am told that the perquisites enjoyed by Ministers along with their salaries would come to something like Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 thousand . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : How?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You need not explain, Mr. Misra.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : No, no, Sir.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : That is the point. Honourable Members who have a lack of understanding of the Government arrangements, should insist on their Ministers to come forward and lay on the Table of the House a statement showing how it has been spent. If they do not have the power of understanding which their leaders have, why do they not insist on their leaders to lay a statement on the Table of the House where I can stand corrected, everyone will stand corrected ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : I also stand corrected.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The very fact that the Ministers, Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee's leaders, are keeping mum, goes to prove that they are definitely guilty. If they are not guilty, with a propaganda machinery like the 11-India Radio in the able hands of Dr. Goebbels

the Ministers would have come forward saying, "No these re the total perquisites; including the salary and allowances a Minister gets only Rs. 2,500." And there have been talks 011 the AIR what they call after the nevs bulletin 'spot light' and so many othei things where it would have been repeated for days together to show that the Prime Minister is an ideal socialist, Dr. < loebbel, who is Mr. Gujral, is an id aJ socialist follower, Mr. Bhupesh Gup l is an ideal socialist and all that would lave been repeated...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What did you say ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : No, no nothing. Therefore, it only goes to prove that the leaders in the Government are definitely guilty aaid they admit of their guilts only becaus> even with the able, efficient, bureaucracy at their command they have not be< n able to produce a statement and lay it on the floor of the House. In spite of l he repeated allegations that huge sums, crores of rupees, are being spent on them, they have not been able to produce a statement before the Parliament to prove that they spend much less than what is being alleged. This in itself fully goes to prove that our contention.

(In rruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : They should appoint a commission. ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No cross talk please.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, for his information I may tell him in my State ,uy Chief Minister appointed a commission to examine the conduct of the present Ministers in Orissa. Therefore, it would be much better for the Government here to appoint a commission of inquiry .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : In Kerala Mr. Namboodiripad appointed a commission and therefore, he had to quit.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I do not know that. The Ministers during their life time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Now come to the Bill.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It is all in the Bill. If the Salaries and Allowances

of Ministers Bill is going to be amended) you cannot take in isolation the amend" ment only and leave behind their salaries and allowances.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : We are dealing with the amendment only.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It will be perfectly logical

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa) : You will have to say simply, "Let the title of this Bill be passed—Salaries and Allowances."

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It will be perfectly logical and relevant to bring in the entire scope of the Bill to be discussed on the floor of the House because many honourable Members like Mr. Yajee do not know how much their socialist Ministers are drawing per month. I must educate him. So far as he is concerned, he is a socialist, a confirmed socialist. I have no doubt about it. What he lacks is knowledge. He is a socialist who lacks knowledge. I, therefore, need information to go home ...

SHRI RAJNARAIN : He is not socialist.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Let us admit he is as much a / socialist as you are. You are a socialist and he is a Socialist also.

श्री राजनारायण : सोशलिस्ट जो होगा वह नकाराविलयत रख ही नहीं सकता ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The next point is this. (Time-bell rings) Sir there have been many interruptions. The next point that I wanted to emphasise was that all these perquisites are got, free and a Minister during his lifetime is one of the most privileged in the country. He is, for the purposes of convincing the Members of Parliament, a Member of Parliament. He calls himself a Member of Parliament. But for the purposes of his special perquisites he isolates himself because he does not want others even to know about it, not to share but even not to know about it. A Member of Parliament is guided by certain principles, the principles being that even a deduction at source of income-tax from the Member's salary is not allowed because he is not to be employed by any body. If that is the case, I would ask honourable Members

[Shri Loknaath Misra]

on the Treasury Benches as to how it is justified when the honourable Minister draw their salaries after the deduction at source of income-tax ? I am not employed by anybody. I am free and I would remain free. I would love to remain free. How is a Minister employed and whose employee is he ? The Income-Tax Act, says...

SHRI M. SRINIVASA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : The Income-Tax Act appears to be lacking in common-sense.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : If the Income-Tax Act lacks common-sense, your Finance Minister lacks it much more because he or she is the author of this Act...

SHRI M. SRINIVASA REDDY : How?

SHRIMATI VIMAL PUNJAB DES-MUKH (Maharashtra) : You mean the present or the previous Finance Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No interruptions and no cross talk.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, if there is an interruption, it can never go unanswered. That is always the principle which I have followed on the floor of the House. If I cannot speak in my own right, I will have to quit. If I cannot sit in the House or I cannot get up in the House or I cannot speak in my own right if anybody makes an interruptions, I will have to quit. If there is any interruption, that interruption has to be nit back. That has been my theory all the time. Otherwise what is the use of sitting here and continuing as a dead Member? Therefore, Sir, if there is any interruption, I would all the time hit back. Sir, they are people not sufficiently knowledgeable.

Sir, one particular thing which I want to bring to your notice is this : What is a salary? Section 15 of the Act says :

"Salaries.—The following income shall be chargeable to income-tax under the head 'Salaries'—

(a) any salary due from an employer or a former employer to an assessee in the previous year, whether paid or not;

(b) any salary paid or allowed to him in the previous year by or on behalf of an employer or a former employer though not due or before it became due to him."

This is what can be construed as 'salary'—

Now what is this deduction at source? About it the Act says :

"Salary.—(1) Any person responsible for paying any income chargeable under the head 'Salaries' shall, at the time of payment, deduct income-tax on the amount payable at the average rate of income-tax computed....."

Now, Sir, if a Minister has to be considered as an employee, who is his employer ? Does he get his salary from his employer? If it is conceded that there is an employer who pays him salary, I would be charitable enough to continue the present system of deduction at source. You will kindly understand the implications of it. A Minister gets perquisites worth Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 thousand and nothing of it is taxable, because whatever is taxable is deducted at source from his Rs. 2250 only. Even the sumptuary allowance of Rs. 500 that he gets is not taxable. Sir, for taxation everybody comes under a particular slab. Now the maximum slab for a Minister is Rs. 2250 while actually he gets the benefit of Rs. 10 or Rs. 15 thousand per month. Anybody else serving in a public limited company or elsewhere has to pay income-tax on his income and on all his perquisites. Even on the rental value of his house he has to pay tax; that is charged. Therefore, Sir, it is a colossal fraud on the public exchequer. Now a Minister enjoys all this invisible income even though the eyes of the Direct Taxes Board are wide open to assess the taxes in the country, but there is no law here. Members in the U.K. enjoys some special advantage because they are employees of Her Majesty's Government. There they may take advantage of it but here who is the King Emperor ? Who employs Ministers as his servants? Can I get a satisfactory explanation from the Government on this? If that could be proved, then all this invisible income which is enjoyed by the Ministers would be non-taxable. But if that could not be proved, then the convention of giving this particular benefit to the Ministers should go in the interests of the country and it would benefit the country very much.

Now, Sir, the only other point which I want to make is that there is a glaring discrimination between Members of Parliament and Ministers, so far as income-tax is concerned. As I indicated, the Ministers go on enjoying this particular privilege even without a rule while it is discontinued in respect of Members of Parliament. Now as you know, Sir, Ministers get but no tax but Members of Parliament have to pay the rent. What is this socialist/c pattern of society? A lot has been said about socialism but I think it is so ambiguous and so confusing and so vague that I do not even understand what they mean by it. Only Jawahar-lal Nehru used to say 'socialistic pattern of society'. I doubt whether he himself understood it, the definition of it, because he never gave any definition of it. Now it is being loudly talked about that "We believe in socialism". It is difficult to define it. It can be even defined as communism but they do not want to publicly come anywhere near Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, because they are scared of him.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : You will have to see their socialism through socialistic eyes.

SHRI LOKESH NATH MISRA : I have to purchase a pair of goggles from the Government in order to see their socialism. So, Sir, this socialist Government makes a serious discrimination between Members of Parliament and Ministers. When a Member of Parliament dies, his widow gets the advantage of occupation of the house for a month or 15 days, I do not know, but she gets it on payment of rent. Nothing is made available to a Member of Parliament free but in the case of a Minister they enjoy the best of everything in the country. This socialist Government always goes on preaching about socialism. In that case at least it should not make this discrimination. A Minister enjoys the public exchequer during his lifetime and also after his death. Sir, in Oriya there is a proverb saying that if the elephant is alive, it is worth a lakh of rupees, even if it is dead, then also it is worth a lakh of rupees. So let not the Ministers try to prove themselves as being those proverbial elephants worth one lakh of rupees while they are living and also while they are dead. Therefore, Sir, I sincerely and seriously oppose this particular measure and I hope the Government would not plead in the house for its passing.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT :
Mr. Vice-Chairman, although 6-1 R.S./70

the scope of the Bill proposed was very limited, the spectrum of the discussion that followed it has been very wide. Of course I would not like to consider the speeches delivered by some hon. Members from the Opposition in the spirit they were delivered in and suspect the wisdom of Rajya Sabha, but I would certainly concede on merit in their argument that if a Government is to be popular, if it wants to lead the nation towards desired social objectives, it must practise austerity.

But then, Sir, there is also the question, that on a comparison of the normal life of an average citizen today with as it obtains today with that of this counterpart three decades ago, we find a wide contrast. In those earlier days, when national patriarchs like C. R. Das or Motilal Nehru addressed meetings, they had to do without the aid of any loud-speaker. There was not all that apparatus which we have today for addressing vast concourse of people. Similarly, there were not many motor-cars also. Even a cycle used to be something precious which men of middle class greatly coveted. But today, Sir, whether it was the trade unionist, whether it was the social workers, whether it was a political leader or whether it was a Minister, or anyone belonging to any section of society, he has undergone a social metamorphosis. A kind of modernism has overtaken them all. Therefore, what I wish to say is that, even though the need for austerity is great and compelling, we should not be oblivious of the increasing demands of modernism. More and more are being built by the State in Delhi and they are being allotted to those who are entitled to them. Some of them, today are occupied by Members of Parliament and some of them by Ministers also. Sir, it is very easy to make a statement against any person, be he an officer or a Minister. But it is very difficult to practise what one professes for others. Therefore the question boils down to this; that is you really want to examine the reasonableness of the perquisites of Ministers, why don't you compare their perquisites with the perquisites that are availed of by Members of Parliament or with the perquisites that are availed of by other people employed in public service? Dr. Pandey was talking a little earlier about the rental value of the houses occupied by the Ministers. What about the houses on Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road and/or Ashok Road occupied by Members of Parliament? He should speak in the same forthright manner and apply the same standard.

[Shri Jagdish Chandra Dixit]

to those other houses occupied by the Members of Parliament and tell us what is the rental value of those houses in the market. Why should we fight shy of telling the public as to what is the amount that is spent by the Government on the Members' travels in trains and planes? If at all I was to be a sanitary inspector—as Dr. Sampurnanand used to say, sometime we are—and watch the amount of dirt that flows down the streets in this country, then I might say that a senior Member of Parliament, who is a member on so many committees, earns not less than two thousand rupees. So of what use is saying all this today, and why should all this be said at a time when the House is just considering an amendment. Would you kindly recall that when the original Bill was adopted and that Bill was made a statute, this House granted those privileges? Now to question all that past is to question our own wisdom and our own action? It does not show respect to our predecessors in this House in the spirit in which things are debated today. It is not in consonance with what had happened earlier. We are at the moment considering only an amendment to the parent Act, while such a small issue holds sway over the debate today, which according to my understanding is not of much significance, whereas, I am sorry to say, Sir, that many matters of urgent public importance, whether raised by way of questions or by way of motions, lapse for the lack of time. They do not sometimes get the time even for being raised in the House, because of such debates as the one now going on. After all, why should we make accusations like this? If we go on making such accusations against Ministers or against the Prime Minister and if, in return, somebody outside this House says similar things against the Members of Parliament, what impression the public at large would have of us, what image the public at large would have of our Ministers? Are we not by such methods throwing that democracy in jeopardy, which we are proud of, and which we cherish very much? Therefore, Sir, while I agree with the point they have driven home that austerity needs to be practised to inspire the nation to rise to lofty patriotic heights, let us remember that this argument should not be stretched to such an extent that out-public activities suffer?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : What image we are creating?

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT : 'Let us see when we go outside the Parliament we are reminded by the people that Gandhiji used to travel in III Class in trains, why do we Members of Parliament fly by planes and travel in I Class in trains. Therefore let us admit that we are not following Gandhiji's standards, and it may also be true that we are not following any standards. So I am inclined to suggest that some kind of norms and standards should be fixed for the expenditure of Ministers and M.Ps, but I should underline that they should be reasonably fixed keeping in full view the public activities the Members of Parliament and Ministers have to undertake to safe-guard the interests and vouchsafe the development of the country.'

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : श्रीमन्, सदन के समक्ष यह बिल लाया गया है और हम समझते हैं कि बहुत से जो बिल पार्लियामेंट के सामने आते हैं उनकी तरह इनमें कोई नई बात होगी। अभी एक महाशय ने इस बिल के संरक्षण के सम्बन्ध में अपना एक व्याख्यान दिया और उन्होंने यह बताने की कोशिश की कि जब पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों तक को विविध प्रकार की सुविधाएं तथा भत्ते मिलते हैं तो अगर मिनिस्ट्रों को भी वहीं चीजें मिलें तो कोई बड़ी बात नहीं। जब गांव के लोग संसद सदस्यों से फर्स्ट क्लास में सफर करने के बारे में पूछते हैं तो इसी तरह से जो दूसरी सुविधाएं मिनिस्ट्रों को मिलती हैं उनके बारे में भी वे कह सकते हैं। हम समझते हैं कि अपने पक्ष को पुष्ट करने के लिए दूसरे लोगों की मिसालें दी जाती हैं ताकि उनके पक्ष का समर्थन हो सके। इस तरह से न उनके पक्ष का समर्थन होता है और न इससे जनता संतुष्ट हो सकती है।

वास्तव में बात यह है कि यह जो बिल लाया गया है वह अत्यन्त गलत बिल लाया गया है और इसका पूर्ण रूप से विरोध किया जाना चाहिये। यह बिल एक प्रकार से ऐसा है कि जैसे हिन्दू धर्म शास्त्रों के अनुसार पहले यह कहा जाता था कि अगर कोई मर जाता है, हिन्दू धर्म को मानने वाले व्यक्ति मरता है, तो वहां के पंडे मरने वाले व्यक्ति को परलोक के लिए एक अधिकार दिया करते हैं

और उस अधिकार को देने के लिए उसके परिवार वालों से पैसा लेते हैं कि परलोक में वैतरणी नदी को पार करने के लिए इतना पैसा खर्चा आयेगा। आज जो बिल लाया गया है ठीक उसी प्रकार से यह बिल भी है।

श्री ए० जी० कुलकर्णी (महाराष्ट्र) : आप पांडे बोलते हैं या पंडे।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : श्रीमन्, कुलकर्णी जी ने शायद यह पेशा छोड़ दिया है मगर उनके पुरखे जरूर यह काम करते हैं। श्रीमन्, इस बिल में क्या है। अगर कोई मन्त्री मर जाता है तो उसके परिवारवालों को महीने, दो महीनों के लिए संरक्षण दिया जा रहा है और अगर उनका बस चलता तो शायद मिनिस्टर्स को जीवनपर्यंत, जिस प्रकार से राष्ट्रपति को पेंशन मिलती है उसी प्रकार से उन्हें भी इस तरह की सुविधा प्राप्त होती, लेकिन यह बात, सम्भव नहीं है और इसीलिए सरकार इस तरह का बिल सदन के सामने लाई है।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमारे बहुत से मित्रों ने यहां पर कुछ बातें बतलाई हैं और मैं उन सब बातों पर जाना नहीं चाहता हूं। लेकिन मैं एक दो बातों के सम्बन्ध में सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं कि आज किस प्रकार मन्त्री गण अपनी सत्ता, अपने वेतन और अपने टेलिफोन का दुरुपयोग करते हैं। मैं इसका उदाहरण सदन के सामने यह देना चाहता हूं कि अभी श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी को बुलाने के संबंध में एक बयान दिया था और माननीय सदस्यों को मालूम ही होगा कि उन्होंने अपने बयान में कहा था उन्हें जो टेलिफोन किया गया था वह सरकारी नहीं था। जब उनसे पूछा गया था कि क्या वह टेलिफोन व्यक्तिगत था तो वे व्यक्तिगत कहने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं थीं। तो कहने का मतलब यह है कि जितनी भी इस तरह की बातें होती हैं, जितने भी इस तरह के मामलों के ऊपर सरकार का खर्चा होता है

वह केवल व्यक्तिगत लाभ उठाने के लिए ही किया जाता है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : क्या पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर फोन नहीं करते हैं।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : यह तो एक साधारण सी बात है। याजी को यह भी मालूम नहीं है कि हम जितने भी ट्रंक काल करते हैं उनका पैसा देते हैं।

SHRI G. D. PANDE : All trunk calls are paid by us.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : प्राइवेट ट्रंक काल करते हो या नहीं।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मेरा ऐसा ख्याल है कि श्री शीलभद्र याजी जितने भी ट्रंक काल करते हैं वे सब सरकारी खर्च पर ही करते हैं। हम तो जितने भी ट्रंक काल करते हैं उसके लिए पैसा देते हैं और जितने और माननीय सदस्य करते होंगे, वे भी पैसा देते होंगे। अगर आप इस तरह से ट्रंककाल करते हैं तो इसके बारे में सरकार को कुछ नहीं कहना चाहिये।

इसी तरह से श्रीमन्, एक दूसरी बात है। अभी ए०आइ०सी०सी० की मीटिंग में भाग लेने के लिए मध्य प्रदेश के मन्त्रीगण यहां पर आये और हवाई जहाज में बैठकर आये, तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि वे किस के खर्च पर आये, इसका सरकार को ध्योरा देना चाहिये।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप हवाई जहाज में जाते हैं या नहीं।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : तो मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि इस तरह से जो अनियमित, अवैधानिक और जनता के कोष पर भार डालने वाला खर्चा किया जाता है, उसके सम्बन्ध में यहां पर कहा गया है कि वह निश्चित रूप से और अधिक समय तक किया जाना चाहिये। अभी इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में एक बात यह भी है कि इस बिल को अगर यह पास हो जाता है तो 1966

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

से लागू माना जावेगा। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि 1969 से इस बिल को क्यों नहीं लागू किया जाता है या फिर 1970 से क्यों नहीं लागू किया जाता है। शायद गवर्नमेन्ट के प्रिय लोग जो पहले मन्त्री रह चुके होंगे उनको कुछ सुविधाएं देने के लिए ही इसको 1966 से रिट्रास्पेक्टिव लागू करने का विधान इस बिल द्वारा किया जा रहा है।

हम समझते हैं कि इससे उन्होंने एक बात को छिपाया है। जानता के सामने और पार्लियामेंट के सामने उनको यह बात बतलानी चाहिये थी कि वे 1966 से क्यों चाहते हैं, 1969 से क्यों नहीं चाहते। इसी सन्दर्भ में निवेदन करूंगा कि मंत्री लोग किस प्रकार की सुविधाएं उठाते हैं जो उनको नहीं उठानी चाहिए। कई उदाहरण हैं। 1966 में हमने प्रधान मंत्री से पूछा था कि आप सोशलिज्म की बहुत बातें करती हैं, आप बताइए कि मंत्री लोग बाहर से इम्प्लोआ और दूसरी जो बड़ी बड़ी गाड़ियां लाई जाती हैं एक एक लाख की, अस्सी-अस्सी हजार की उनको क्यों नहीं छोड़ देते। प्रधान मंत्री ने यहां पर राज्य सभा में स्वीकार किया कि हमने इस प्रकार के डायरेक्शन्स दिए हैं कि सब लोग भारत में निर्मित छोटी गाड़ियों का उपयोग करें। इसी महीने में हमने प्रधान मंत्री से पूछा एक प्रश्न के द्वारा कि आप यह बताइए कि आपने जो हमको आश्वासन दिया था कि सारे मंत्री छोटी गाड़ियों का उपयोग करेंगे उनमें से कितने मंत्री ऐसे हैं जो छोटी गाड़ियों का उपयोग कर रहे हैं और ऐसे मंत्री कितने हैं जो बाहर की विदेशों की गाड़ियां इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं और इस साल में कितनी विदेशी गाड़ियां आईं। आपको आश्चर्य होगा कि एक भी मंत्री का नाम वे नहीं बता पाई जो भारत निर्मित छोटी गाड़ियों का उपयोग करता हो और 12 नई गाड़ियां इसी वर्ष बाहर के देशों से मंगाई गई हैं। तो हमारी प्रधान मंत्री

इस तरह का विपरित आचरण करती हैं। एक आचरण यह है कि यहां कुछ वक्तव्य देती हैं और उसके बाद आचरण दूसरा करती हैं। तब सब लोगों को सन्देह करने की गुंजाइश होती है।

एक दो मित्रों ने कह दिया कि मेम्बरों को भी कुछ सुविधाएं मिलती है। जितनी सुविधाएं मेम्बर उठाते हैं उससे कहीं ज्यादा सुविधाएं मंत्री लोग उठाते हैं। यहां परम्परा रही है देश में—याजी साहब विद्वान हैं वे जानते होंगे—“राजा कालस्य कारणम्”, “यथा राजा तथा प्रजा।” आप राज्य कर रहे हैं आप जितनी सुविधाएं लेंगे जनता उससे ज्यादा सुविधाएं मांगेगी। आप सुविधाओं का त्याग कीजिए, कम सुविधाएं मांगिए, नहीं तो जितनी आप मांगेंगे, जनता उसकी डेढ़ गुनी मांगेगी। गांधी जी के समय में—उस समय आप में से बहुत से लोग नहीं क्योंकि नए आए लगते हैं—यह तब हुआ था कि 500 रुपये से ज्यादा वेतन कोई मंत्री नहीं लेगा। उसके 600 ले लेते, 700 ले लेते, 750 ले लेते। अगर त्याग के लिए आप इस सिंहासन पर बैठे हैं तो फिर इस तरह का विधेयक क्यों लाते हैं? दुनिया भर में समाजवाद का ढोल पीटते हैं और फिर समाजवाद की आड़ में अपनी रोटीयों को संकते हैं। तो समाजवाद की बात छोड़ दीजिए। 10 हजार रुपया भत्ता ले लीजिए यहां कहने को कुछ है और करने को कुछ है। हमारे योग्य मित्र आचरण नहीं करते, बातें बड़ी बड़ी करते हैं इसलिए जनता में समाजवाद के प्रति घृणा फैल रही है। अगर सही अर्थों में समाजवाद के अनुरूप आचरण करते तो जनता उससे प्रभावित होती, समाजवाद का जयजयकार करती, नारे लगाती लेकिन समाजवाद के नाम पर मंत्री के मरने के बाद एक महीने तक विशेष सुविधाएं और एक महीने के बाद कुछ पैसे देकर विशेष सुविधाएं की मांग की जाती है। इसलिए इस तरह के बिल का समान रूप से विरोध किया जाना चाहिए और हम निश्चित

इसे यह आशा करते हैं कि कांग्रेस पक्ष के, डीकेट पक्ष के, समाजवादी विचारधारा के व्यक्ति—उनमें से बहुत से इस समय विराजमान नहीं हैं, याजी साहब बैठे हैं—इस बिल का जरूर विरोध करेंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : इस तरह का विधेयक रहता तो इस तरह की चिट्ठी उनको जाती ? राजनारायण जी ने बड़ा छाती खोलकर रलिता शास्त्री का नाम लिया। इस विधेयक को लाने की आवश्यकता पड़ी क्योंकि इन्होंने कहा कि उनको चिट्ठी गई...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : कसलिए ?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मरने के बाद जो उनके बच्चे बचें रह गए थे। आज ये घड़ियाल के आंसू बहा रहे हैं, यह बिल न रहता तो इन्हें घड़ियाल के आंसू बहाने की आवश्यकता पड़ती।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान, आप इन्हें बताए कि हम घड़ियाल के आंसू नहीं बहाते, इनसान की वाणी बोलते हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : ये कहते हैं कि (Interruption)

(Interruption) **रायण :** मैं तो इनसान की जवान बोलता हूँ, घड़ियाल के आंसू ये बहाते होंगे।

फिर मूखे वैसा ही जबाब देना

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am inclined to agree to the amendment but was amazed at the reasons given by the Deputy Minister for bringing forward the amendment. He said that some Ministers had been told that they can keep the House for one month and therefore it has become necessary to bring this Bill.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : I deny it. I did not say that the Bill is brought forward for that.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Now this raises a very fundamental question : are we to legislate for the acts of omission or commission of somebody? That is the question which has to be answered fairly and squarely by the Government. I can understand if you say that the Bill will be given effect to immediately or from a certain date to be mentioned in the future but to bring forward a measure and to say that it will be deemed to have come into force from 1st November 1966 is something which cannot go into my head. There seems to be some motive behind fixing this date of 1st November, 1966 and my charge is that it is being done to help somebody, who had resigned about that time. It is not a straight forward measure where the date for enforcement is being fixed over three years back. I do not understand; what is the reason for this being done?

Now, much has been talked about the amenities being given to the Ministers. It has been an age-old convention that the Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, are entitled to the use of IAF planes for official work but I understand this facility has been extended to some other Ministers who enjoy the confidence of the Prime Minister. Whether it is for work or for other considerations, I would like to know from the Government which are those Ministers who enjoy this facility of travelling by the IAF planes and for what reasons. If this facility had been extended to others beyond the three Ministers I have named, namely, the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, what were the compelling reasons for extending this facility to the other Ministers? That has to be explained by the Government.

Now, it is not only on the houses that the Ministers are spending money from the public exchequer. Even on renovations of their offices huge sums of money are being wasted just to satisfy the whims of a particular Minister here or a particular Minister there. I am told that a considerable amount of money running into five figures or even six figures—if I am not wrong—was spent in renovating the office at present occupied by the mighty Minister of External Affairs. I would like to know what amount of money was spent to satisfy the whims of Mr. Dinesh Singh. I am again told that an equal amount was spent in renovating the office of the mighty Goebbels of Indian politics, Mr.

Inder Gujral. One has only just to visit his office just to find out how much money

Bili 1969

[Shri M. P. Bhargava]

has been wasted from the public exchequer for renovating his office. These are some of the things which require deep probe. Is it the free will and the sweet whim of any particular Minister to spend as much money as he likes on himself, his office and his accommodation or are there certain rules and regulations which govern these things ?

This is a question which again has to be replied to by the Government. Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha unwittingly said on Friday that black is not a colour and black is colourless. That, I think gave out the secret of the Governments' functioning today. Black money is no concern of the Government. Black deeds can be indulged in. Blackmailing can be the order of the day and to anything black the Government will simply keep their eyes closed.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : It is colourless black.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : You may say that it is ^colourless, but black is definitely a colour. Nobody can say that it is not a colour. Black is the base of all colours and our Ministers say that black is not a colour. Therefore, anything can be black—black deeds, blackmailing, black money. It can happen with a vengeance. That is the order of the day.

श्री राजनारायण : उस पर कोई दूसरा रंग चढ़ता ही नहीं । सत्यनारायण सिंह जी ठीक कह रहे थे ।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : It seems to me that the letter 'G' is under favourable stars today. Although I do not believe in stars and one is the master of one's own destiny, you may call it a coincidence. Anything with 'G' is favoured since the quarrels started in the ruling party. The Government functions although it is in a minority, an unheard of thing in history. Without a coalition, without the support of the majority, the Government functions. That is the charisma of the ruling party. ...

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Communist Party.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Then again you may call it a coincidence.

Who are the beneficiaries of all these quarrels and who are having a bright time under the stars ? The first beneficiary was the President of India, Mr. Giri. It starts with 'G'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Do not discuss the President.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : No, no. I am just saying it. I am not saying anything derogatory. The second beneficiary, again, is the Chairman of this House, starting with 'G'. The third beneficiary is the Deputy Speaker of the Lok Sabha, starting with 'G'. It looks to me that the Government is encouraging anything beginning with 'G', whether it is gangsterism which is practised in abundance these days, whether it is groupism, which is the root cause of all the trouble, whether it is graft or whether it is greed. Everything with 'G' flourishes—gangsterism, groupism, graft and greed. That is the order of the Government today. It is a coincidence that even in the Opposition some people with their names beginning with 'G' flourish. Mr. Gupta is the Chief Minister of UP, in spite of his being in a minority as far as the ruling party is concerned. My friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy, resigned as Minister of State, but since he is with a 'G', he became the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. My friend Mr. Ganeshi Lai Chaudhary, is another whose name begins with 'G'. He became the Secretary of the Congress party in Parliament Organisation.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : What about Mr. Bhupesh Gupta ?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Then you have reminded me about Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. His name also starts with 'G'. He is the strongest man of the Government today. Nothing can happen, unless Shri Bhupesh Gupta has been consulted and his masters have okayed it. Unless his masters in Russia have okayed it, nothing can happen in this Government. That is the mighty power of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He is under bright stars, again with a 'G'. The irony of it is we all profess the name of the Father of the Nation, who, again, happened to begin with 'G', Gandhiji, and do everything against what he taught. We do everything and show by our action that we do not believe in him and all this is happening in the Gandhi Centenary year. Make hay while the sun shines. While the Gandhi

Centenary is being celebrated, forget the country. The country has become a secondary thing. The politicians are fighting like cats and dogs and then they talk of projecting our image. They should be ashamed of this, that they want to project our image. What they are doing has never happened in the history of the world and it shall never happen. Let us try coolly and calmly. Still it is not too late. Let this madness all over stop. Let sanity return and let us think of the country. Make it the primary object and everything else secondary. If we can do that we can still save the country and posterity and history will say that the leaders in India did not waste the opportunity which was offered to them. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have been treated to a series of interesting speeches on a subject-matter which certainly can be discussed seriously with a view to influencing Parliament to make certain changes in the hideous rules and regulations that obtain today with regard to the salaries and emoluments of the Ministers and members of the Council of Ministers. It is well known that we have been in this House pleading for economy on the score not so much because the money saved will be very great, but because the issue involves questions of public morality and public standards. Unfortunately we have not succeeded in persuading the powers that be, over the last sixteen, seventeen or eighteen years, to come to the conclusion that they must set an example by being members of the Council of Ministers, in plain living and, if possible, also in high thinking. High thinking; a matter of the intellect, culture, education and experience, but plain living, being a physical proposition, I believe, be easily enforced. That has not been done. Therefore, I agree with the criticisms that are being made with regard to the heavy expenditure that is being made on account of maintaining the Council of Ministers, the members of the Council of Ministers.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is unfortunate that some of my friends have brought in very narrow party politics over this matter. Well, I may start with my friend, Mr. Bhargava. He has given me a tribute, but it has taken him eighteen years to realise that I am so powerful when I am in the evening of my life and about to retire. My friend, Mr. Bhargava, should have realised if he

was so conscious about my powers about which he has made just an *ad hoc* discovery. . . . (Interruption). When I heard Mr. Bhargava, I felt it was the lamentations of a frustrated and oppressed soul, and I sympathise with my friend Mr. Bhargava because I have got affection for him and his frustration is understandable, and his lamentations do not cause me annoyance at all.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : That is because I have spent the best years of my life in the organisation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know which is the organisation and which is not. If organisation is to be designated with 'O' in brackets, then so many other things could be designated in this manner. That is for you to settle. Why drag me into the conflict of the organisation with bracketed 'O' and without bracketed 'O' ? But he has made certain criticisms, valid criticisms about expenditure.

Now my friend, Mr. Pande, made a very interesting speech and it was constructive, I tell you, because I do not allow political differences here to come in the way of appreciation. After all he had been associated with one of our stalwart members of the Council of Ministers, Shri Govind Ballabh Pant. We had shared our time in this House and I must say he was a man of simplicity. But I cannot say this thing, I am very sorry, about the son-in-law himself. But that is not a disqualification. Why must everyone imitate his father-in-law ? After all a son-in-law must be modern in everything. The only thing is that sometimes they should not be too modern in the matter of marriage. But he gave an interesting thing. He said that some Minister has spent Rs. 10 lakhs in the month of August presumably in connection with the presidential election. After all it is a serious matter. The position should be clarified. But then he made out that so many calls went out, he calculated. Well, as far as Mr. Giri's election is concerned, I think we cannot reckon it in terms of telephone bills but in terms of political standards, public standards, public morality, and that is what we want in the Presidential election* Mr. Giri could not be returned by telephone calls, Mr. Giri could not be placed in the Presidential palace on the basis of furtive or secret telephone calls. Mr. Giri won because of the massive support of the people in the country, all over India.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : It is not so. That was a victory ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please. You can speak when your turn comes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He is now the President of India. He is in his position because of his moral authority, because of his acceptance by the masses of the people, because of his acceptance by Members of Parliament and members of the State Legislatures. I cannot count in terms of telephone calls. Mr. Vice-Chairman, assuming for the sake of argument that so many calls went from Delhi to get Mr. Giri elected, do I understand that Mr. Sanjiva Reddy got 1 lakh votes only through incoming telephones? Surely telephone calls went out in his case also. Therefore, I should like to know how many telephone calls were made in the month of August by the Prime Minister, Home Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. Am I to understand that if the Prime Minister was making telephone calls worth Rs. 10 lakhs, her Deputy would be lagging behind? After all he is not a son-in-law. He would be making also telephone calls worth Rs. 8 lakhs proportionate to his position. Therefore, do not know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, but these are interesting facts ...

SHRI OM MEHTA : Just one clarification. I have checked that the Prime Minister's bill was Rs. 2,731.

श्री राजनारायण : प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर। श्रीमन् प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर। पहले हमें बतायें कि कैसे चेक कर लिया उन्होंने। श्री ओम् मेहता ने कहा कि उन्होंने चेक किया तो कहाँ से चेक कर लिया। श्री ओम् मेहता जो यहाँ बोल रहे हैं वह सदन को गुमराह कर रहे हैं और आप उनको एलाऊ कर रहे हैं।

श्रीमन्, मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर है। श्री ओम् मेहता ने जो यकायक खड़े हो कर कह दिया कि हमने चेक कर लिया और दो हजार कई सौ रुपये ही हैं तो वह कृपा कर के बतायें कि कहाँ चेक किया, उनका सोर्स क्या है। किस चीज को उन्होंने चेक किया।

श्री शीलभद्र घाजी : यह गलत-सलत बोलेंगे जरूर।

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sir, on a point of order. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has referred to the Deputy Prime Minister. Just one thing ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It is the point of order of Mr. Rajnarain. Mr. Mehta, have you anything to say?

SHRI OM MEHTA : This is my personal information that the bill is not more than that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, देखिये, दो वर्जन हैं। पहले उन्होंने कहा कि हमने चेक कर लिया कि इतना है और अब कहते हैं कि हमारी पर्सनल इंफार्मेशन है। तो यह असत्य हो गया। जो श्री ओम् मेहता कह रहे हैं वह असत्य हो गया। पहले उन्होंने कहा कि चेक

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All that I warned to say is ...

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आप पहले उनको बता दें कि जो उन्होंने कहा वह गलत हो गया। उन्होंने जो कहा कि हमने चेक कर लिया यह गलत हो गया।

sure, Mr. Vice Chairman, during the Presidential election ...

SHRI G. D. PANDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, my point of order remains. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said that the Deputy Prime Minister may have also made some calls. The Deputy Prime Minister resigned on the 18th of July.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The election started from July.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The real month is August. Therefore, Mr. Murarji Desai had no occasion to make that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Whether it is the hon. Prime Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister, they are not substantiated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All that I was saying is let us not suggest as if in the case of Mr. Giri it was all outgoing telephone calls and Mr. Sanjiva

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Reddy got i lakh votes through in-co ning telephone calls. There has been operation of th< telephone both ways. Tlow much each has spent or for whom they i ave spent, we cannot say.

TH-; VIC) -CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You come to the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am coming. It is ve y important, Ministers' expenditure. N lturally I know that Minist :rs are expensive. Let us find it out. After all we do net know. Mr. Ram Subhag Sin?h is a very lovable man but he is also a i;ilkaive man. I am sure !n; has been talking on the telephone all the time. AM I to understand ihat these telephone charges were not made ? Surely they wire made. Mr. Dinesh Singh may be i liking to othres> They may have bee i talking. But let us I know. This ca; be easily found out by checking up bills of the Government and the Ministers concerned. That is not the point. The only thing is let us not say something as if one side is guilty and the other is iot. Both sides are guilty if you find that way.

Now I find hat I am going through interesting, excit ng time. After the split in the Congress vvc find that lot of things are being said w lich were not said before. Now, may I as< in all humility why did not Mr. Asoka Metha resign from the Government in protest against the Rs. 16,000 spent on rim ? May I know why Dr. Ram Subha■ Singh did not quit the Government because Rs. 17,000 were spent on him, iccording to my friends there, and when in addition he was using a car which looked like a ship in the street? I would like to know why Mr. Desai did not re I ign from the Government when he was di awing the same amount as others. I say the going was good then. So, nothing is to be blamed. Now the going is nt good. We have become saints. AB Dr. Radhakrishan used to say, every sant has a past; every sinner has a future. I do hope that the sinners on this side will have some future. But as far as their past is concerned, it is well known. Therefore I think you are so. I can understand Mr. Rajnarain. He has never been a Minister and perhaps he will never be one, like me. I can understand Mr. C.D. Pande. Although he was in the very proximity of the high-powered position of Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant, heistheone son-in law who has been let down in the country. Can you deny it? How can I become equal to him? He is the one

son-in-law who was let down very badly when other sons-in-law have become prosperous.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Not let down. Willingly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : May I say that my friend is a saint then?

Therefore let us not go into this. These Congress Ministers have broken up into groups each trying to say things against the others. It helps the public because there is a saying that when thieves fall out with one another, honest men come into their own. Here to some extent we should welcome what is being revealed by both sides of the House by former Ministers because they enlighten us. It is entertaining; besides it is instructive also. But we must not overshoot the mark sometimes.

Coming to the Ministers, the Council of Ministers, this one is for 15 days. **They** want to stay longer in the house. (*Interruptions*) As you know, most of the Ministers under capitalism are not for the good of the people but are for the goods of the people and when they collect so many goods and store them in the house, it takes a little time to remove them. Fifteen days may not be enough. So, I do not know about that. But here this is a small thing. But the main thing is this. I do not mind the wives and the family members of the Ministers staying a little longer. Mr. Babubhai Chinai is a member of the House. And when Mr. S. K. Patil was out of the Ministry, Mr. Chinai's house at Akbar Road was placed at the disposal of Mr. S. K. Patil. He lived there. Is it not corruption?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What about Mr. Krishna Menon ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Krishna Menon? He lived in his own house.... (*Interruptions*). He paid a regular rent of Rs. 1,500. Mr. S. K. Patil, in the first instance, did not lived in his own house here.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA (Bihar) : No, no. He has no right to say **that**.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He **lived** in Mr. Chinai's house . . . (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Several thousands have not been paid **at all till** today by Mr. Krishna Menon.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhy Pradesh) Who told you that, Mr. Gupta? Questions have been asked. Mr. Krishna Menon did not pay rent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Find out then. It is wrong. Others did not pay rent.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : On a point of order. We have been observing a certain decorum in this House. We never discuss the conduct of the honourable Members of the other House. But it does happen that we discuss the conduct of the Ministers. They are exposed to the public view. But we never bring in individuals like this, particularly honourable Members who belong to the other House. It is never done.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am very glad that my friend has said it. So much I hear from him now. But when they were discussing about Members of this House, well, surely, I did not object to that. Surely, Shrimati Indira Gandhi is not a Member of this House a member of the Government. And Mr. S. K. Patil is a former Minister. We can discuss about former Ministers also. Why can't I discuss about a former Minister? In any case, I am discussed in the Lok Sabha; I will discuss others here. •

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is my fundamental right. I do not believe in that decorum, bogus decorum. When Mr. Bhargava said that I am guided by my masters in the Soviet Union, I did not protest against it. Was it a very decorous statement? I am not going to be cowed by this kind of thing. Everything shall be discussed. I say, go after all the Ministers, all of them, in power, out of power, in totality, they are building up a system of extravagance, ostentatious living and corrupt standing also, at some time. Find it out. I have not objection to that. And this should be done.

The trouble with my Congress friends sometimes is that when they leave the Ministry they become pious saints. When they are in the Ministry, they are for taking as much as they can. Who does not know that when Mr. Morarji Desai was living as Finance Minister in Willingdon Crescent, his furniture and other things cost more than Rs. 30,000 the scheduled charge? He overdrew and much more had to be given. Well, find out from your records. I am not saying this out of my hat. It is in the

records which will be available in the Department of CPVVD that Mr. Morarji Desai could not live with scale furniture etc., worth about Rs. 30,000 and that he needed more. I say, if any other body in power be exposed, he should also be included. I agree there. But do not try to make out that these who have left the Congress and put *tilak* on their foreheads have become angels and that the others have become villains. You have shared villainy together; you have shared corruption together; you have shared authoritarian power together. You have not listened to us. When we moved an amendment to this Bill, Mr. Mishra and Mr. Bhargava on that side, they did not vote with us. Today, they blame them for such an amendment. But why have this belated wisdom? Is it politically wise? Why is it partisan? Then why questions not of public morality be discussed? We are doing it with a cool mind without passion.

Coming to the Ministers question

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : You are defending the Government. Go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not. How am I defending the Government? If I do not

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What else are you doing?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not. My friend need not provoke me. I know when I will defend the Government. The moment you try to oust this Government by a combination here, no matter what happens, this Government shall be defended by us (*Interruptions*). But here I am not defending the Government. I charge the Government for all that has happened in regard to this matter.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, points have been raised; they should be seriously considered. Take the case of the houses of the Council of Ministers or others also—the Council of Junior Ministers. Why should they have such big houses? Is it not possible to accommodate them in smaller houses and save expenditure, more so in the interest of public morality and to set some standard? A Minister is not judged by the bigness of the lawn of his house or by how many times his Alsatian dogs bark.

SHRI A. D. MANI : One dog?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Many dogs because I know all right.

Bui, 1969

SHRIM. P. BHARGAVA : Alsation dog also protot. Do not forget it—they also protest.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Well particularly some hon. Members—if their Alsation dog? bite them, the dogs will die not the Members. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a very valid criticism. It is not a question of party thing. I think we should discuss this thing. What points my friends from this side have raised are very valid. This is what we have been saying for the last 16 years about the council of Ministers. Why should it be like this? So Rs. 30,000 was spent on furniture alone. And there are so many other things. It is possible for our friends in the Government to live in smaller houses. It is good sometimes and I am sure that by living there we can discharge our duty better. Take, for example, West Bengal. We are in the Government today. We are also in the Government at some places. Our Ministers are drawing Rs. 500 p. m. All of them are living in very small houses, one-roomed or two-roomed. I know of a Minister who had been living in the same house which we rented for the Communist Party in 1941 on a very small rent. Like that there are some; others also. Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee, for whom I have great respect, when he shifted to his little flat we met him. He had not much furniture and I sat on his own cot. So they are living like this. So also other Ministers belonging to the various parties are living in this manner. Are they inefficient, or are they not discharging their duty conscientiously? Surely, they are. The other day, a Minister, a member of my Party, has been sworn in, Mr. Kanhai Bhowmick. He was offered a big flat. He declined and instead has taken a flat in the Gariahat Housing Estate. It is a two-roomed flat for Rs. 70 or 80 p. m. He is living there. And I am sure he is a better Minister than any of the Ministers living in sprawling houses.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : On a point of order. May I know how did the Kerala Ministry then come down on grounds of corruption?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That we will discuss later. Presently we are discussing the Central expenditure.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : You have sat in the Opposition in Kerala along with them. Now you have broken away from them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You are saying these things, Mr. Mishra. You may claim to be the Shankaracharya of India, but I am a common man. Therefore, if I commit an error, correct me. Set standards here. Presently we are discussing the Centre. Therefore, let us discuss this. Today it suits you more to observe all this.

Sir, my friend was a Minister at one time. Surely he did not go on a hunger strike because he was getting too much money. That is not the point. The point is Central expenditure on this item at the moment. Scheduled expenditure on furniture was Rs. 30,000. If you take away some part from each of the Ministers you could build small mansions for your class IV employees. For them there is no accommodation. We are told that in Delhi there is no space and, therefore, they are put far away from their place of duty. The lawns of the Ministers' houses could be utilised for building accommodation for government employees who would be very near their offices and so on and they would be in a position to save a lot of money which they now spend on transport and also save a lot of time.

(Time bell rings)

Then, with regard to the cars of Ministers. You remember Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru once sent instructions saying that Ministers should use small cars. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru had very interesting ideas. He will issue instructions but would not bother whether they had been followed or not. Suddenly he issued instructions that Ministers should use small cars. After that he should have seen that his direction was carried out. At least in one Cabinet meeting he should have taken a roll call of people with big cars and so on. But he did not do so. Now we find some Minister using small cars but the other Ministers not so big are seen using huge cars,

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Which Minister uses a small car? It is a matter of public interest.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Small Ministers, small as they look, to make themselves big they must ride a big car. Well, that may be the reasons. These are psychological matters and we can discuss this matter. Sir, there are some Ministers to whom I would not like even to provide a cycle because their work is not worth it. Therefore, if you ask for my advice, I would say that some Ministers should go on a

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

scooter of their own. What is wrong in their going on their private scooters ? The point is not that. The point is huge cars and also their lecturing against ostentations living and then themselves rolling about in cars costing Rs. 1,25,000. I say you are insulting the common-sense of our people.

Then, you come to telephones and water charges. Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha once revealed in this House that his water bill came to about Rs. 6,000. But I do not mind that because this Government has committed so much sin that they required a lot of water to wash their sins. Therefore, we can under-tani their expenditure on water. Then electricity and other things are also spent magnanimously. There should be economy over these items. I find some Ministers are taking advantage of various other things. All that should be discussed. There should be a vigilance committee to look after all this. Well, if they spend much money, I thought we could as well name them here.

You know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when it was suggested in the original Bill in 195a that the Prime Minister should take Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 10,030 as salary, Pt. Nehru refused and said that he would take the same salary as any other Cabinet Minister plus, of course, the sumptuary allowance.

With regard to the sumptuary allowance, may I make a submission in good humour ?

[In the past Ministers used to give dinner to Members of Parliament and spent that sumptuary allowance over it. I do not know how many of you get dinner now out of that sumptuary allowance. But I may say to the credit of Mr. S. K. Patil that he used to throw huge parties but in those parties there were more of film stars than members of Parliament. I can name them. After all, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in that galaxy we could have a look at the whole number of film stars in the country. That was, therefore, good. Therefore, say this sumptuary business should also go into.

Finally, in this connection, Parliament should really think of appointing a Committee which would go into the question of revising the criteria, set standards, which should guide the Ministers' salaries and allowances. Only then we can arrive at constructive suggestions.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, finally, as far as M.P.s. are concerned, let us not plead if we are very economical, all examples

of simple living. Not at all. Compare our expenditure or our amenities with what is spent on a class III or IV employee. The contrast would be shocking, something which would put us to shame. We do not increase their salaries.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : What about class I officers ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know about class I officers. But, surely I.C.S. people are getting a lot of money Rs. 4,000 per month, going about in huge cars. This, again, is very bad. You should really exercise this kind of humility and economy from the point of view of not money only but from the point of view of public morality.

Finally, I would like to say about our income tax business. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the income-tax in our case should be deducted at source. Many of us do not like going to the income-tax authorities. We do not know our net income except when the return comes. Therefore, deduct income-tax at the source. Some of us were born not to earn any taxable income. By virtue of my being a Member of Parliament I am earning some taxable income. Why then should the income-tax not be deducted at the source ?

I have a letter from Mr. Sethi saying that the question will be decided and the Government is considering the same. How long will it take them to decide ? We should know how much exemption they will give from the salary. If it is Rs. 2,000 per year, then we go outside the category of taxable income. Let it be settled. Let them consider it. But the point is some of us are feeling very badly about it. Otherwise, some day my friend will say that Bhupesh Gupta has not submitted his income-tax return. I tell you my income-tax return will not be worth the paper on which it is written. I think this question should be considered.

Now Mr. Shah is here. He is sitting here as the Leader of the House. I hope he shares the sentiment of the House about reducing the ostentatious living- and setting an example before the country as far as ministerial living is concerned. The suggestion should be taken seriously. I think our Ministers will not be any the worse from the point of view of public efficiency if they live in smaller houses, spend a little less money, go about in smaller cars, and do not take sumptuary allowance which which we do not know how they spend.

SHRI BANJICA BEHARY DAS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there has been an interesting debate on this amending Bill. Many of the speakers have brought in individual Ministers into the whole picture and have spoken about their telephone bills or electricity bills or about the big cars they are enjoying. I am not going into the cases of individual Ministers.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THEHGARI) IN THE CHAIR]

But I am here to say that unless we, whether it be Ministers or Members of Parliament, set a standard, we would all of us gradually become the laughing stock of the whole country. I want to plead here—and I want to view the entire matter in an objective manner—that we should immediately set up a committee, not of this House but of some impartial persons including judges, to recommend to Parliament and the Assemblies in this country as to what should be the salary and what should be the amenities of the Ministers and Parliament or Assembly Members, because whenever a question of any facility to the Ministers comes, then all these scandals are raised here. And whenever any question of salary or allowance to Members of Parliament comes, always there is an artificial situation here in which some people support it and some people, even though they want it, oppose it. I want to plead here that it is high time that all these nasty dialogues that are going on either here or in the different legislatures of the country should end once and for all. And we should not decide how much we should get or how much the Ministers should get, but somebody else should decide how much the Ministers and the Members of Parliament and Assembly Members should get. Some of the Ministers are here and I think they must be feeling very bad when all these bad things are spoken against them. This is natural when they are functioning under the public gaze. What they do, how much money they draw, what their perquisites are, what their electricity bill is, what their telephone bill is, whether it is lightning call or ordinary, all these things are naturally discussed here and it is being discussed throughout the world. But what I want to plead here is that in Indian conditions, not only should we set certain standards about it, but this debate also should end for all time to come, not only in the interest of the country but in the interest of the Ministers themselves because every now and then they should not be brought in this manner. So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I expect that when the

Minister replies to the debate, he will come forward with some concrete suggestions. This is a question not only of Members of Parliament but Members of the various legislatures. I would suggest that the Government should recommend to the next Speakers' conference to set up a committee—if they want they can have the assistance of some judges also—so that the committee can decide what should be the salary of the Ministers, what should be the salary given to the Members of Parliament and Members of the Assemblies and what amenities or perquisites the Ministers should enjoy. Unless you do it, unless you entrust the matter to some other body, say, a body of the Speakers who have intimate connections with the Members of Parliament and Members of the Assemblies this washing of dirty linen will go on. You may be responsible for it or they may be responsible for it; or they may not be responsible today but they were responsible yesterday. So all this talk will continue and we will be functioning in an atmosphere which will be absolutely artificial.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want to say that it is a bad system to have perquisites and amenities, whether they are in connection with Ministers or in relation to Assembly Members, because it is another way of drawing more money from the Exchequer but telling the people that we are living on very meagre incomes. It is an artificial atmosphere and I can tell you that in most of the countries, particularly in the democratic countries of the world, the Ministers and Members of Parliament never enjoy any type of amenities or perquisites, excepting the salary which they draw and which everybody in the country knows. I think most of the Members must have seen the living conditions of some of the Ministers in other countries. I am not going into cases of individuals. But take the case of the Prime Minister of this country and the Prime Minister of the U.K. Most of the Members might have seen 10, Downing Street. Can any body tell me if they have seen more than one guard in front of 10, Downing Street to protect the Prime Minister of that country? But what is the contrast in this country? I am not saying that security arrangements for the Ministers or for the Prime Minister should not be made. But can you say that the Prime Minister of Britain is less secure by having only one policeman standing near the gate even though everybody can go to the gate, any visitor of the world, whether he comes from the Soviet Union or from India or from the American countries? The U.K. is

[Shri Banka Behary Das.]

an affluent country but the Prime Minister still lives in the same old house where the past Prime Ministers had been living 50 or 60 years ago. That is why I want to plead here that let us think in those terms, not in terms of peisons, whether it is Mrs. Indira Gandhi or somebody else because nobody knows in this changing world who would become the Prime Minister of the country after a decade. So I want the Speakers' conference to be approached by the Government of India to recommend to Parliament and to the Assemblies in this country how much salary and what other benefits the Minister* of this country, including the Prime Minister, and the Assembly Members and Parliament Members should get. Other-wise, whenever there is a little amendment about the salaries and allowances to the Minister or to the Members of Parliament and Members of the Assemblies, all these dirty linens will be washed, and those who have some experience about the functioning of the Government, some of the Members on this side, will be able to say what amenities the Ministers are getting and in which manner they are being misused.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, whatever might be the telephone bill of the Prime Minister, I am not concerned about it—it may be Rs. 2,000 or it may be much more—because I do not know how the accounting procedure has been done, or how the information has been given here. I knew these allegations come because these friends are in the Opposition. But is it not a fact that from 1947, since the day we started functioning in the Opposition, the entire Congress Party during the elections was misusing the telephones, was misusing the entire publicity machinery, was misusing the public relations department, for election purposes? And the same scene is being enacted here. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may be talking in a language which may seem as if he is defending the other side; I am not going to that aspect at all. I am only saying that whatever mistake has been committed, let us forget it and let us set a standard here. Now, are we prepared to do it just now? We know that telephones are being misused every now and then. They are being misused even now for the Bombay session. If you want instances, I can give; but I do not want to give. I know that even the telephones of the Gujarat Ministers in Ahmedabad must have been misused. So, I am not going to blame only you here. But there must be

an end to it. How long can we carry on this conflict throughout India and thereby tell the people of India that not only those who are in the treasury benches just now, but those who were in the treasury benches two or three years ago have also committed the same mistake, the same crime and all the politicians in this country are to be blamed for it? I know Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is leading a simple life; there is no doubt about it. But he should not think that by protecting the other side, the people of India will think that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta as a politician is of a different calibre and Mr. Gujral or Mr. K. K. Shah is of a different calibre. Because of the misdeeds of the Government, because of the misutilisation of the Government machinery for party purposes and election purposes since 1947, the people of India believe that all the politicians in this country who are in power are misusing the Government machinery and those who are not in power will do it if they come to power. Instead of thinking in terms of persons, now that the character of the Government is changing—somewhere the Congress is ruling and somewhere else the United Front is ruling, and some other parties in collaboration with this party may also rule—and when all the parties have been on the defensive, either as Ministers or as Assembly or Parliament Members, it is high time that all of us set a standard.

And the standards can be set and the laws can be framed only by the Government. So, I will plead with the Home Minister when he replies to the debate that he must come here with a categorical suggestion for all times to come. Let us end this debate that is going on everywhere, not only in the Parliament, but in the Assemblies also. And there is only one method of ending it. I am again making a suggestion. Is he prepared to set up a committee on which there are persons who are not Members of Parliament and who would decide for all times to come? Of course, situations may change. But the salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament must be decided once and for all. If you are not to entrust this matter to such a committee, I will suggest another thing. Every now and then a Speakers' Conference is being held. The Speaker of the Lok Sabha or the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha or the Speakers of the Legislative Assemblies are the proper persons who also know the conditions of the Members of Parliament or of the Assemblies what their amenities are what their salaries and allowances are and what amounts

the Ministers are getting what their standard of living is, keeping in view the all India standard, keeping in view the economic conditions in which millions of our people are living, etc. A certain formula can thus be evolved. Today I saw a news item in the press. Then was a report about the Bhootali rgam Committee on Direct Taxes in which he advocated that because of this complex method of calculation in India, the exemption limit for income-tax should be raised to Rs. 7,000 or Rs. 7,500. And I am happy for the news that the Government of India has rejected that proposal. What is the reason they have advanced? I am not objecting to their rejection because a very small percentage of people is covered in this poor country if you accept this exemption limit of Rs. 7,500. But the only reason the Government has given is that in India most of the people are very poor and their income is at the lowest level, and the exemption limit that has been fixed—Rs. 4,000 or whatever it might be—has some relation to it. If you raise the exemption limit to Rs. 7,500, then the proportionate relation or the margin between the lowest income and the highest income which is under the income-tax group will be large. When it comes to the question of determining or raising the salaries and allowances, how much benefit or what comforts Members of Parliament or of Assemblies should have, we should take into account the relation between the lowest income group and the highest income group in this country. (Time-bell rings) Millions of our people are living with scanty sums. That is why I say it is time these matters should be discussed in this way. (Time-bell rings) Sir, in the end I only want to say that because of the colonial and feudalistic traditions in our country, our perquisites and other benefits have something to do with our individual prestige. Of course, we know in this country where persons like Gandhi have been born, we have no privileges, perquisites have no relationship with the prestige and dignity that one enjoys in this process. But unfortunately after independence we have stooped down to such a low level that our perquisites and other benefits have some relation to the dignity and prestige that a man enjoys. The colonial and feudalistic tradition has gone deep to such an extent that even today in the rules and regulations of the Government of India we find the name of the Secretary of State in Council and even now, after 20 or 22 years of our independence, the Fundamental Rules also mention all those perquisites . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You ask whether they put a photograph of Queen Elizabeth for the photograph of Smt. Indira Gandhi.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : I do not know that. But our Fundamental Rules have never been touched during all these years. All those photographs of princes and queens might be there when naturally a fairly large number of rajas and maharajas are in the opposition parties also . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : When Mr. S. K. Patil was a Minister, he had the portrait of Eisenhower.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Were you going to his house also? Were you paying frequent visits to his bedroom?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, no I can tell you, Mr. Patil's bedroom accessible neither to you nor to me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Mr. Das, kindly wind up now.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Here in this country, Sir, because of this feudalistic attitude with which we have grown, certain amenities and perquisites are being given greater importance. In this connection I would like to draw your attention to all those rules and regulations of the Government servants in which still the name of the Secretary of State in Council continues to be mentioned. In the beginning of every session of Parliament, we, Members of Parliament, get summons from the Secretary of our Rajya Sabha wherein usually it is mentioned, "You, Shri Banka Behary Das, are summoned to attend Parliament," and so on so forth. Is it proper that when we profess a socialistic pattern of society, when we talk of austerity, when we talk of doing away with these colonial and feudalistic traditions, this procedure should still be continued?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think it should be worded like this : Give the House your company when it assembles!

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Whatever it is. You can say, "Under Rule so and so the President of India requests you to attend the Rajya Sabha which will meet on such and such a date..." or "... you are requested to attend the Rajya Sabha session on such and such a date..."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Please wind up.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Sir, I may be digressing a little but here in this country we are still functioning in an atmosphere which has so much relevance to the feudalistic or colonial atmosphere as a result of which all the rules and regulations that were created when the British were here, have not been changed to suit our present conditions. We still follow the same practice which they follow in England where they say, "The Monarch of England summons the Members of Parliament. . .". Even after 20 years of independence we have not changed this practice. When this new Government tries to change all these rules and regulations, I request it to make a departure from this procedure. I also request through you, Sir, the Chairman of our House to make a departure from the present procedure as regards the summoning of Members of Parliament to the Rajya Sabha sessions. At least from the next session in February if we meet at all again—I hope the summoning will be in the form of a letter...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Including the B.S.V.P.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Let us see how it comes out.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is moving closer to the Treasury Benches. Is he getting an invitation for the Bombay session ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am sitting happily by the side of your friend, Mr. Banka Behary Das.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I said you are moving close to the Treasury Benches.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : As long as he is on my side you need not fear, But if he goes further on that side I cannot help.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : He is attending the Bombay session. He has made the suggestion. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I can tell you that that is one place where I shall never go. I will retire from Parliament not from this place.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Spiritually Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is very much there. Only physically he is here. His mind is there and his whole support is there (Government side) . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, she may say anything she likes. But it is very difficult for us to find out where the lady is physically and where she is mentally.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : But where are you physically ? You are here, but your support is there, You are a pillar of support for the Government. You cannot deny it.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Prime Minister is dismissing her ministers just like musical chairs. One batch goes and another comes in. Then again it is thrown out. Of course, the Ministers are such that nobody sheds any tears when they are thrown out because they hardly represent anybody. So, whenever they go out, nobody sheds any tears for them. They are picked up from somewhere, some non-entities. Recently when our External Affairs Minister was in trouble, other Ministers were quite gleeful about it. If Mr. Goebbels is in trouble, the others are gleeful about it. Like that they are going on. So, considering the way they are being dismissed every now and then, one can expect that a Bill like this is very necessary because every now and then they will have to vacate their houses. One month's time should be there. As Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said, they are more concerned with the goods they can take than with the good of the people. So, when the goods are to be taken out of the house, it takes naturally a long time. The Ministers are acquisitive also. They want to acquire a lot of things. Not only they, but their PAs also acquire many things. They also want to acquire things like television sets, transistors, etc. Not only that. They even ask some Members of Parliament, "please give money for this purpose or for that purpose". God alone knows what that purpose is. Some of our Members were labouring hard to justify the Government. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was especially anxious to justify the Government. His entire scheme is always how to help the Government to stay in power. As regards the Communist Party, of course, it does not shed any tears when Khrushchev or Bulganin goes out or somebody else goes out. When

Stalin's dead body even was removed they did not shed tears though they bring directions from Russia and carry them out here. But they become absolutely worked up, particularly the CPI, about this Government that it should not be touched, it should not be toppled, otherwise, they will have a countrywide strike for the sake of this 'opposition' Government. This has to be kept up in power—an "opposition" Government. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta becomes very much worked up and his target remains the one who is likely to create difficulties for the Prime Minister. He does not function as a member of the Opposition. He is always worried as to how to safeguard the chair of the Prime Minister. So, his attack has to be taken with a very big bag of salt, if I may say so.

I will also say a few words about the Ministers and other things. Many of the Ministers often complain that they have no work to do, that they are not given any work. They are not entrusted with any work. We very often hear the quorum bell ringing because none of the Ministers is present here for the debate. Even when some Ministers are present when the debate takes place, they give either a wrong reply or a half reply or a quarter reply and try to get away thinking this is a battle of wits and don't realise that the debate in the House is meant for mutual consultation between the Government and the various parties or their representatives, for exchanging different views and opinions, for shifting and sorting Government policies and programmes on the basis for what the members of Parliament who are the representatives of the people, say here in the House.

This is a sovereign body. The Members of Parliament are representing the interests of the people at large. It is not only the Prime Minister who represents this country and the people. Everybody who comes here elected in this House or in the other House represents the interests of his State or his constituency and it is his sacred duty to prove worthy of the trust that is reposed in him by the people whom he represents. He or she has to put forth his or her views in the interests of his State or her State and the people in general. But the Government is not even aware of this particular thing, its obligations towards the Opposition people. It has taken such a long time

even to understand that they have an official opposition. They are not even aware of the fact that the official Opposition is part of the Government; they do not know their duties well, when the quorum bells ring, the Ministers are not there. On the other hand they are very dutiful during the off-Session period, you can see at least half a dozen of them or more sitting in the Central Hall day after day perhaps to pick up some intelligence for the Prime Minister; they want to hear what the Members are talking about and what their views are so that they can carry tales and inform the Prime Minister as to what is actually happening and what the people are thinking about the Government. They even do not go to their offices but they have so much time to spend in the Central Hall during the off-Session period. They have no time to sit in this House when the House is going on. They are also supposed to be very busy Ministers, but actually they are busy taking tea or spending time in one another's house intriguing extensively for the sake of the Prime Minister, I suppose.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : They are consolidating their own position also.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : They are doing a lot of intrigue work in which some of our Ministers are very much specialised. They find so much time to sit in the Central Hall but they do not find time to attend the House or be attentive here when the House is actually sitting.

Sir, I may also say that they talk about simplicity and so on. I think they have a large number of parties; they get their sumptuary allowances and so on and they hold parties mostly at night and do planning behind the scene. The Sumptuary allowance is waste. It is only for groupism. But on the surface of it they keep themselves very innocent-faced. About this particular thing the less said the better. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta talked about the allowances, etc. of members and so on. Why should he compare a Member of Parliament to a class III or a class IV employee? I have worked class IV employees for quite some years; we are also concerned about the poor people very much. The Prime Minister who is heading this feudal Government thinks only of herself; she is very proud of her feudal outlook and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is very proud of it, all the

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]

time defending this Government. They have got big contractors. Princes and big moneyed people, whereas they talk about the poor masses and the socialistic pattern of society. I do not see any poor people with them. They are mostly Princes and moneyed people who are with them. Why do they talk about the poor people and so on ? But a Member of Parliament has to pay everything himself.

Sir, they talk about the telephone bills of Ministers. I challenge that statement that the hon. friend over there made about the Prime Minister's telephone bill, that it was only Rs. 2 thousand. I challenge it because even their P. A's. and Private Secretaries' telephone bills are much more than that. They have got their P. As., their Private Secretaries and all sorts of paraphernalia. Their bills are much more than that. Not only that, but I shall go one step further. I would say that some of the work during the Presidential Election was carried on not only by the Ministers, the Prime Minister and the P. As and Private Secretaries and other staff of the Prime Minister, but many messages were conveyed by Shri Bhupesh Gupta, by his party members.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Gujral.

KUMARI SHANTA VASIST : We know Mr. Gujral very well. We know what Mr. Gujral does. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta conveyed messages to different people. Messages were conveyed to the people from Punjab asking whether the Akalis were going to help and saying that the Prime Minister has extended some kind of help to the Akali Party in Punjab. They are talking about the Swatantra Party, the Syndicate, their alliance. But what about their own agreement and alliance with the Communist Party of India ? What about their taking messages to a large number of people in the opposition parties? What about the Prime Minister's contact with the DMK, with the Rao Birendra Singh Ministry, with the Gurnam Singh Ministry, with the Ajoy Mukherjee Ministry and with other opposition leaders for the last so many years ? She did everything to undermine the Congress Organisation- Shri Bhupesh Gupta now talks of the Jan Sangh alliance. Our friend, Mr. Bhandari, is sitting here. Except 'Namastay' we have nothing to do with them. We may have fought with them.

In fact I have carried on a fight with the Jan Sangh- Till recently my charge against the Prime Minister in Delhi was that they were in league with the Jan Sangh people. It is the CPI that is in league with the Prime Minister. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is the barometer of this House to find out who is the target of the Prime Minister. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's guns will fire against those persons who become the targets of the Prime Minister. That is what he does. His Party has become a vested interest in the country it is not an independent party with any independent programmes. It has become a vested interest supporting the Government. Even in the New Delhi Municipal Committee through their nominated people. . . .

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आपकी तरह ***
नहीं हैं कि इधर से जा कर उधर बैठे ।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : माननीय
सदस्या क्या इसलिये नाराज हैं कि उनको
संरक्षण नहीं मिल रहा है श्री भूपेश गुप्ता का ।

श्री राजनारायण : बैठिये ।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) :
बहुत में जोश आया ।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : मैं उनसे यह
पूछना चाहती हूँ कि आपको कहां से यह सारी
जानकारी मिली ।

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHHT : Even now they are in league with the Jan Sangh. So they have no business to talk like that. We used to complain about it; they are favourites of the Prime Minister. I had said about it particularly from that side of the House but nothing was happening. Therefore some of the statements of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta have no justification and they do not go very far. He is the pillar of strength of this feudal Government. He cannot get away from this charge, because he has got instructions from Russia to keep this lady in power and he does it. He says that in so many words; there is nothing secret about it.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : यह वेशमी की
आवाज है ।

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : आप चुप रहिये ।

***Expunged as ordered by the Chair,

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : यह सैलरी बिल के ऊपर, अध्यक्ष महोदय, भाषण हो रहा है।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह बंडारी : जैसा आप बोलती हैं वैसे वह भी बोलती रही हैं, उसमें क्या बात है ?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : It is easy for you to say that. You have to give excuses. I know that you are very much ignorant about all these things. But naturally you will have to give certain excuses.

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : आप समझदार तो हैं लेकिन आप लोगों के पास अक्ल का अजीर्ण है।

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : क्या बोल रही हैं आप ?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : बिना अक्ल के बात करती हैं ? क्यों इस तरह की बातें करते हैं।

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : आप बैठिये।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : चेयर को बिठलाने का हक है। आप किसी को आर्डर नहीं कर सकती हैं बैठने के लिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Order, order. No interruptions please.

श्री राजनारायण : आपका समय बढ़ गया है।

UMARI SHANTA VASISHT : I am not speaking myself. The Chair has allowed me to speak and, therefore, I am speaking. Therefore, they have been giving the messages on behalf of the Prime Minister and taking the messages from the Prime Minister for various parties and we cannot say that this is happening or that is happening. Then as far as the luxurious living and telephones are concerned, I think that some of the P.As, of the Ministers suggest 10 that they should occupy the Tin Murti House. I cannot understand why the P. As. and other people do this propaganda. They see which

house they want, which palaces are convenient for their own living. They approach Members of Parliament and say, "Please tell them to occupy such and such a house" as if it is the Members of Parliament who are demanding which house should be occupied by which Minister. That, I think, is a very dirty underhand way in which they are functioning and that should not be there. Then, as far as Bhupeshji's example of simplicity is concerned, they are trying to stab the CP(M) in Bengal and their Ministry in Kerala has gone down on corruption charges. Then they talk about Mr. Jyoti Basu's simplicity of having one room or so. If he is such a simple man and a good man, why should he attack the CP (M) members ? I would like to know that. Why do they kill a large numbers of members of the CP(M) and others ? Why do they kill them and exterminate them physically ? If the CP(M) people are so good, so simple, that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has all admiration for them I fail to understand why they should kill such people CP(M) then. If they are such a good people, they should at least allow them to live in peace. I do not understand this sort of thing. I also want to know when Mr. Bhupesh Gupta compares Members of Parliament with Class III and Class IV employees, why he does not compare them with Class I. Number two. When he goes abroad, once or twice or thrice a year, say, to Russia and other places, who gives him all the foreign exchange ? Where does he get all the money from ?

K

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। क्या इस विधेयक के संबंध में श्री भूपेश गुप्त के ऊपर आज चर्चा हो रही है या मंत्रियों की सैलरी के ऊपर बहस हो रही है।

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : आपको उनकी बड़ी चिंता हुई है आज।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : हमें दुख यह है कि आप आज नाराज हो गई हैं। पहले तो बहुत खुश थीं।

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : जो बातें मैं आज कह रही हूँ वह मैं भूपेश गुप्त जी के बारे में पहले भी कई बार कह चुकी हूँ। मैं कहना चाहती हूँ वह आज सरकार को क्यों सपोर्ट करते हैं।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : हां, आपने चुपके चुपके कभी कान में कहा होगा।

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : मैंने सबके कान में कहा। आपकी दिलचस्पी पोलिटिक्स में कम होती है और लीडरों को सपोर्ट करने की, खुश करने की आपकी आइडियॉलॉजी मालूम होती है।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : मुश्किल यह है कि राजनीति में आपकी दिलचस्पी होते हुए आपको किसी व्यक्ति विशेष के साथ कोई उलाहना नहीं होना चाहिये।

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : व्यक्ति विशेष से मतलब है जो इस सरकार को चलाने वाले हैं। श्री भूपेश गुप्त बहुत ज्यादा इन्टरेस्टेड हैं आपकी सरकार चलाने में। इसलिये मैं उस व्यक्ति विशेष में इन्टरेस्ट लूगी जिसको हम एक्सपोज़ करेंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, ज़रा आपको समझा दीजिए कि भूपेश गुप्त ने जिन बातों का रेफरेंस किया उसका वह जबाब दे रही हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Now you will kindly wind up.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : Sir, they have been interrupting me so much that I have to reply to them because I want to know how he gets all the foreign exchange to go to Russia to spend months and months there. We don't know what all he does there. We want to know how many members have been sent to Russia, and other countries by the Government, how much money was given to them, whether all this patronage has been distributed for certain political purposes and whether this is a correct use of the patronage vested in the hands of the Government and the Ministers, the way they have been forming committees, the way these people are misusing the Governmental power to send people abroad— even recently hundreds of members were sent out. We should know these things. Were they sent out to clear the atmosphere in the air there? Will it what purpose were they all sent, what mission

were they fulfilling when they had gone there? Parties are held in the Ministers' houses where perhaps their sumptuary allowance is spent for what purpose?— Do certain members go there and certain other members never go there at all for years and years? That I think is a gross waste of public money being done by the Ministers. It is a gross waste of public money when they have all this paraphernalia. It is a gross waste of public money when they have a large number of private secretaries and others who are mostly misusing their powers. Some of the P. As. of some Ministers all the time sit in the Central Hall where they have no business to do. None of our friends and relations can come to the Central Hall when the Parliament is in session. None of the officers can come to the Central Hall except sometimes the staff of the Parliament Secretariat who come to the Central Hall to have a cup of tea. But one particular Secretary of a very high Minister in the Government of India is there all the time. And what do the Members do? The Members hang on to that very silly sort of a clerk or a P.A. who is there. And Ministers also go round him like a little something. That P.A. is there all the time in the Central Hall and he exercises all the authority on behalf of that very great Minister and even our Ministers and Deputy Ministers run after that fellow.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Who is that fellow?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : Somebody whom everybody knows. It is very much against the dignity of the Parliament, the ignity and the sanctity of the Parliament, House, the dignity of Members of Parliament, and particularly of the Ministers and Deputy Ministers, that they hang on to a very-undesirable Private Secretary or a P.A. or somebody who is mostly in the clerical cadre and who is there all the time in the Central Hall and the Ministers, do *Patikrama* around him. It is very much beneath the dignity of Ministers, beneath the dignity of Members of Parliament, beneath the dignity of even that Minister. Though that person is a very big person, it is beneath his dignity to allow his or her P.A. hang on there where he has no work. He is there from morning till evening. The expenditure on these P. As. and Private Secretaries is a gross waste of public money. All the money that is spent on this paraphernalia is not

justified. If they believe in austerity, they should change their entire way of life and they should not use their staff and their facilities for all sorts of gross misuse and I disapprove of such a Bill totally. Thank you.

**REFERENCE TO ADMISSION OF
PERSONAL ASSISTANTS TO THE
CENTRAL HALL OF PARLIAMENT**

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, आन् प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर। हमारा प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर यह है, जैसा कि शांता वशिष्ठ जी ने अभी कहा है कि किसी मिनिस्टर का एक पी० ए० सेन्ट्रल हाल में बैठा रहता है। हमको बर्मा जी ने यह बताया कि कोई कपूर है, प्राइम मिनिस्टर का पी० ए०। तो आखिर यहां क्या व्यवस्था है। उनके सेन्ट्रल हाल में आने की व्यवस्था क्या है, क्योंकि मैं जानता हूं कि हमारा भी एक छोटा सा सेक्रेटरी है। आज ही हुआ, कि उसको हमने कहा कि सौ रुपये के नोट की बाबत हमने फायनेन्स मिनिस्टर को बताया कि उसका नम्बर उड़ गया था और उन्होंने हमको कागज में लिखकर भेजा था कि उस फार्म को भर कर नोट को बदलने के लिये लिखा जाय तो रुपया मिल जायेगा। उसको दिलवाने के लिये हमने फोन किया था कि कागज ले आओ। लेकिन हमारे सेक्रेटरी को वहां जाने नहीं दिया। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिवा का कोई पी० ए० श्री कपूर है तो उनको सेन्ट्रल हाल में जाने की ताकत कैसे मिली हुई है। सेन्ट्रल हाल का प्रबन्ध दोनों सचिवालयों के अंतर्गत आता है, हमारा सेक्रेटरियेट भी वहां जाने के लिये पास देता है दूसरा भी देता है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या हमारे सेक्रेटरी ने दिया है या हमारे चेयरमैन की आज्ञा से उनका पास मिलता है या लोक सभा के कार्यालय से मिलता है, कैसे मिलता है। हम लोगों के वास्ते क्यों नहीं मिलता।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी) : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, इसमें क्या होगा, आपकी कोई व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। अब हमारा कोई सेक्रेटरी आया तो यहां कोई ताकत नहीं है जो कि उसे सेन्ट्रल हाल में जाने से रोक सके, क्योंकि यह कपूर कोई विधान सभा का मेम्बर नहीं है।

**REFERENCE TO CONSTRUCTION
OF A BUILDING IN KERALA BY THE
U.S.S.R— contd.**

5 P-M.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Sir, before you call upon the Minister, in the other House this matter has already been raised. (Interruptions) It is a very important thing. The External Affairs Minister here has probably not known about one of the embassies starting the construction of a building in Trivandrum. (Interruptions) It has been raised in the other House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : You can do it after he replies to the debate.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : No Sir, The point is this; a point which has been raised in the other House should not be ignored here. (Interruptions) For some reason if it is ignored here, nevertheless a statement would be made by the Government in the other House in reply to this point raised there. It is a very important matter, Sir; a particular embassy, the Russian Embassy had been constructing a building—it collapsed subsequently because of some defect in construction—and that was without the permission of the External Affairs Ministry; that was without the knowledge of the External Affairs Ministry. (Interruptions) They were constructing a particular building with the consent of a State Government. How is it permissible that a particular embassy could come in direct contact with a State Government and obtain its permission for constructing a building. And this building collapsed and thirteen people have died. So, Sir, would you kindly direct that the Government should make a statement here in this House?

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Tamil Nadu) : On a point of order, Mr. Vice-Chairman. How can you allow this matter to be raised before the Minister replies to the debate? (Interruptions).