

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think the authorities in regard to Customs matters should have a very clear list of firms who are engaged in this business under these commodities. The list should be absolutely clear and the Government should find out from the list exactly which are the firms whose conduct had been in question. I say this because now I find that some of the departments do not keep proper record. I hope the Customs do especially when we know that malpractices will now take place. Of course under invoicing and over-invoicing will not stop and* they will also continue but I think in such matters when certain advantages are given following devaluation as follow-up measures, to cover up their difficulties, the Government should be particularly vigilant as how those who are affected by this behave.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : So far as vigilance is concerned, the advice of the hon. Member is well taken. We are already very alert. So far as the names are concerned, the purpose of this Bill is only restricted to goods under the bonded warehouses. Usually special care is taken when goods are taken and are under the custody of the Port authorities and in these matters there is very little chance of any malpractice but the general thing is because of the change in the rate, there may be large-scale adjustments taking place as a result of the rate of duty and exchange and various other things. The Government is already very alert and in that sense, the advice of the hon. Member is very well taken.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Now we go over to the next Bill.

THE ADVOCATES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF LAW (SHRI C. R. PAT-TABHI
RAMAN) : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Advocates Act, 1961, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this is a very simple measure and it has been necessitated by a judgment of the Madras High Court. If I may state the purpose of the Bill briefly, it is this. We had a term for the Bar Councils; we had a six-year term and a two-year rotation. What happened was that some of the Bar Councils were not formed, as a result of which elections could not be held. So, Sir, they had not been able to fill in the various vacancies. And then, with a view to getting over the difficulties, the Central Government issued the Advocates (Removal of Difficulties) No. 2 Order, 1963, under section 50 of the Act, and that Order provided for the continuance of the term of office of the elected members of the State Bar Councils constituted for the first time until their re-constitution in accordance with the provisions of the Act. Subsequently, by the Advocates (Amendment) Act, 1954 (Act 21 of 1964), the provisions of the above-mentioned Order were incorporated in section 54 of the Act with retrospective effect by inserting a proviso to that section. The first State Bar Council to be reconstituted was that of Madras; it was reconstituted on 4th November, 1963. Since then the various other State Bar Councils have been reconstituted. The term of office of the elected members of the reconstituted Bar Councils is provided for in section 8 of the Act. This section fixed the term of office of the elected members as six years. As I said in the beginning, it also enjoins that, as nearly as possible, one-third of the members shall retire, in the manner of the Rajya Sabha, by rotation every two years. It has since been ascertained that the aforesaid period of two years has already expired in the case of the State Bar Councils

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman] in Madras, Mysore, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Delhi, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Gujarat. In the case of West Bengal, Punjab, Bihar and other places this period is due to expire shortly. Regarding Kerala we have not got the information.

Meanwhile, some representations were received from the various Bar Councils to the effect that it was very expensive to have these elections every two years because the advocates were spread far and wide, all over the place, in various districts and other places. They also said that considerable work was involved in this, and so they said that it would be advantageous if a uniform four-year term was fixed. However, Sir, ultimately they agreed that the provision for amendment of section 8 could be made to have the retirement of one-half of the elected members every third year instead of the retirement of one-third every second year as at pie-sent, and accordingly the Bill sought to amend section 8 of the Act with retrospective effect, so that the persons due to retire at the end of the second year were permitted to continue for one more year.

There is also another aspect having a bearing on the issue raised, and that related to Bar Councils in respect of which the two-year period has already expired. The possibility of such Bar Councils holding elections to fill in the vacancies before the passing of the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1965, could not then be ruled out, Sir. To cover such contingencies, sub-clause (b) of clause 4 was included in the said Bill. However, though the Bill was passed by the Rajya Sabha in the last session, it could not be passed by the Lok Sabha for want of time.

In anticipation of the enactment of the said Bill, some Bar Councils did not take the necessary steps for holding elections with the result that a sort of void was created. In respect of the Madras State Bar Council, the date of retirement of one-third of the members

was 20th November, 1965. At this juncture, an advocate of the Madras High Court filed a writ petition in which he impugned the election rules framed by the Madras Bar Council as being *ultra vires* and unreasonable and prayed for the issue of a writ or direction forbidding the elections. The High Court granted an interim stay of the holding of the elections till the main petition was disposed of. Subsequently, the High Court, by its judgment dated 6th January, 1966, dismissed the said, petition holding that the impugned rules were reasonable and valid. It also directed the State Bar Council to hold the elections.

In the meantime, the Advocates (Removal of Difficulties) Order, 1966, was passed by the Central Government on 10th January, 1966 under section 59 of the Act in order to overcome certain difficulties, which had arisen on account of the fact that some of the State Bar Councils had not taken the necessary action under the Bar Council Rules for holding the elections. This was in view of the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1965, wherein it was proposed to extend the period of retirement from two to three years with retrospective effect. The real point was to make it a retrospective Act. In view of the aforesaid Order, the Secretary, Madras Bar Council, moved the High Court for further directions. In the meantime, there was another writ petition filed by Shri G. Vasantha Pal, another advocate of the Madras High Court, challenging the vires of the aforesaid Removal of Difficulties Order. Naturally, the said petition was opposed by the State Bar Council and by the Government of India. The High Court held that the aforesaid Order was *ultra vires* of the powers of the Central Government under section 59 of the Act on the ground that the powers under that section could be invoked only for the purpose of removing difficulties arising in giving effect to the provisions of the Act and not difficulties arising aliunde and that the difficulty sought to be removed was not one in the working of the Act. A direction was also given by the High Court to hold the election.

The situation created by the decision of the Madras High Court declaring the Removal of Difficulties Order issued on 10th January, 1966, *ultra vires*, and by the non-passage of the amending Bill which was pending in the Lok Sabha, unless remedied immediately, would have given rise to various difficulties. For example, Sir, unless the Bar Councils were there, there could be no disciplinary action. So many other things were also involved.

To remedy the situation we felt that promulgation of an Ordinance by the President was necessary. After a careful consideration of the matter it was felt that, the provisions of section 8 of the Act providing for the retirement of members by rotation did not serve any useful purpose and should be replaced by a simple provision laying a uniform term of four years. Today, actually we have got a Review Committee, the Advocates Act Review Committee, dealing with this matter and we are going to bring a comprehensive Act. This is only serving the purpose of elections having a uniform term of four years and also making it retrospective in the case of those members whose terms have already expired.

The new section 8 is a simple and straightforward one and so I am not taking more time of the House; it may be an insult to the House if I took more time. Therefore, Sir, I introduced the Bill.

Sir, I move.

The question was proposed,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, I would like to speak a few things on this. Now this is, on the face of it, very simple. You want to make the term a uniform one of four years instead of two, and retire two-thirds every two years, and also you want to give this law retrospective effect.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) in the Chair.]

I have nothing to say here against it. If L81RS /66—9

the Bar Councils in the country, the State Bar Councils and the All India Bar Council, think it a better arrangement, by all means have it; we have no quarrel with this. But since this is a Bill relating to the working of the Bar Councils, well, we should like to have a word or two on the subject. Here for example in the Statement of objects and Reasons attached to the Bill as it was introduced in the other House, something is stated. The question was mooted there in the other House also as to the working of the Bar Councils. We do not know how these Bar Councils are working. I would like the Government to prepare a comprehensive report of the working of the Advocates Act which is being amended here, with reference to the functioning of the Bar Councils that have come into existence under the law of Parliament. Mr. Vice-in, I think it is not fair for the Government to call upon us to amend things as they like, without telling us exactly why or how things should be ■ ided Generally, of course, he has said how it is to be amended and why it is to be amended. That also has been indicated by him. But we do not know why this retirement was found inconvenient, apart from the reasons given here. The reason is that it is expensive and cumbersome. I do not say that that is invalid. But I should like to know why the Government started changing its mind. It is good that the decision is favourable and we have no objection. The Government's mind can change. But we are not clear how things are shaping there. Therefore, let me make one or two observations with regard to the Bar Councils.

The success of an institution does not depend on what kind of the so-called set-up you can have. You can make it possible for every member to continue for four years and then retire and then have an over-all election again. That is the arrangement proposed in the new measure. I do not wish to go into that now, but as I said before, if the Bar Councils want this kind of an arrangement then they can have it. But it is stated here in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that in some local Bar

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] Councils, certain things are there. Many things have been stated here. To that I will come later.

How is it that the Order or the Ordinance that they passed, their Order, i.e. The Advocates' Difficulties Removal Order, 1966 that the Government promulgated on 10th January, 1966 under section 59 of the Advocates Act, was found to be invalid and ultra vires of the Constitution by the Madras High Court. I should like to know why it was that Orders issued by the Government are so easily and readily found ultra vires? Who are in charge of the Law Department of the Government of India who formulate and draft such Orders, I should like to know, because we find that many of the Executive Orders are today held ultra vires of the Constitution and illegal, by the courts of our country. Recently Executive Orders were passed—I give it by way of example—and prosecutions were started by the Government of Bihar, under sections 107 and 117 of the C.P.C. But all those Executive Orders were found to be illegal and these actions also were found to be illegal. Of course, this has nothing to do with the Bill before us. But you see how the Executive is functioning. A large number of people, including legislators and others, were arrested in Bihar under Orders passed under the C.P.C. which have been held by the Patna High Court recently to be illegal orders. Here again we find that the Law Department of the Government of India issued a particular order on 10th January which did not stand the scrutiny of the High Court of Madras. I say that on such matters the Government should hold investigations to find out who are responsible for the error, why the mistake occurred. It is not good that these Orders should be held invalid. Still such Orders are passed. My fear is that Government passes many Orders which are illegal and invalid orders. Some are questioned in courts and they are set aside. Many others are not taken to a court of law to be challenged and so they continue as Government Orders having the force of law. So I would like to mention this fact here. I find

the Law Department of the Government of India needs a little overhauling in the sense that there must be people there who are very competent, people who are meticulous about the constitutional provisions, about the provisions in our Constitution according to the existing law and they should exercise much greater vigilance than they seem to do, in passing Orders. If you do not have such people there, where is the guarantee that certain Orders of the Home Ministry which are illegal are not passed as valid by this particular Department of the Government of India? Therefore, it seems we are not having a very fool-proof Law Department in our country which goes into these questions of Orders, Ordinances etc. with the utmost care.

Now with regard to these Bar Councils, I think there should be a kind of comprehensive amendment to the thing. Just now before I came here we were discussing the matter with Mr. Pathak and he was also thinking that there was need for a comprehensive amendment of the Advocates Act. I think the time has come when we should call for a thorough amendment of the Advocates Act in order to give it some new substance.

At the various Bars, the leaders of these Councils are the Advocate Generals and I understand, the Attorney-General in the case of the Supreme Court. I have no quarrel with that. But I think one should be clear that these Advocate-Generals in the States should not be allowed to have any private practice at all. I underline the words "no private practice at all". The Attorney-General and the Advocate Generals should be treated as a kind of public servants, acting on behalf of the Government and they should not be entitled to take any private brief even if the Government is not a party to it. Of course, when there is a case in which the Government is involved, the Advocate-General or for that matter, the Attorney-General, cannot appear against the Government. Normally they appear or are in a position to appear for the Government or the State. But the

arrangement that I want is that in no case the Advocate-General should appear on behalf of a private party, even if the litigation is between two private parties. That should be stopped. If necessary you can increase the emoluments of the Attorney-General and the Advocate-Generals a little. But certainly you should not allow them to go in for private practice when they become really the law officers, in a way, of the Government or of the State. This is a very-very bad practice.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : (Uttar Pradesh): If I may interrupt my hon. friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I would like to ask him what is his objection to their undertaking private casss. I know they cannot appear against the State. They cannot appear on behalf of a client against the State. But if they appear between two private parties, then what is his objection?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is a good question and it is exactly that point that I am going to deal with just now. Of course, they cannot appear against the State. As I said, they are really a kind of employee of the State or Government, or shall we say, they are a kind of officers of the State? I know that they cannot appear against the Government. The present arrangement is such that they can appear for private parties in any case in which two private parties are involved in either side. I think this practice is bad.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Why ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is bad because the Advocate-General or the Attorney-General carries with him, a certain weight of authority the weight of authority of the State.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHAI RAMAN : The Attorney-General cannot practice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : So also the Advocate-Generals at the State level should not be allowed to practise. Even the Attorney-General can take up a case, a private party's case from other

States. The Attorney-General is not precluded from having private practice as such. That is my Impression. For example if there is a private party's case from Bengal, he can take it up, as the State is not involved. But let us discuss the principle of it. The point that Pandi! Tankha has raised is why the Advocate-General should not be allowed private practice. My reasons are these. First of all, the Advocate-Generals or the Attorney-General, let us say the Advocate-General in this case, is a functionary of the State and he has great authority, legal authority which attaches to him because" he is an Advocate-General. As such his appearance on the side of a particular party brings a kind of weightage in favour of that party. It is not merely a question of legal acumen, which, of course, can be had from other lawyers also, perhaps. But what the other lawyers cannot give and which he alone can give is this weightage or advantage or enjoy that he happens to be recognised and appointed as the Law Officer, shall we say, as the Advocate-General of the Government of the State. That does weigh with—it may or it may not, but often it does—some persons. This factor does weigh with certain judges, certainly with the Judges in the lower cuts and district courts, and even in the High Courts it may weigh. That advantage no private party should get because that private party has not appointed him as the Advocate General of the country. That private party should not enjoy that weightage or advantage or enjoy the using of the Advocate-General's services simply because he can pay a very high fee. The other party is prejudiced by it. May be that the other party also is equally rich and can afford to get a still better lawyer. But the fact remains that in a particular case when the Advocate-General appears, that very fact puts the other party in a disadvantage. Prima facie that disadvantage should not be there.

Morally it is bad; legally it is not very fair to the other party. That is why I oppose it. Another factor you will take into account. For example, a very big lawyer when he becomes a

[Shri Bhupesh Gu

Judge he gives up his practice. May be when he was in the Bar he was earning Rs. 30,000. But the moment he becomes a Judge of a High Court he gets Rs. 3,500 or Rs. 4,000 and if you deduct the income-tax—though the lawyer friends may evade income-tax sometimes the Judges cannot because it is deducted at the source—he gets some Rs. 3,000 or so. He makes an enormous sacrifice financially speaking when he becomes a Judge. When his earning comes down from Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 3,000 he is making that sacrifice. When you become an Advocate General and when you are rewarded by the State for your legal learning, capabilities and forensic abilities, you should also be prepared to make the sacrifice, that is to say, you must not try to earn through private practice. But what happens? He uses his high office directly and indirectly to build up a private practice. It is a scandalous thing in our country that an Advocate General should be earning Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 40,000 a month. Why should it be so? Why should the Government be associated with this kind of thing when it itself preaches that disparities should be removed and so on? But then we have now a standard of behaviour in our country when you have an officer—Ganju or whatever his name is; yesterday we discussed about him—an Information Officer of our Embassy in the United States of America whom you are paying a monthly salary which in terms of rupees comes to Rs. 37,500 per month whereas (the President of India is supposed to get Rs. 10,000 a month. Such scandalous things happen in our country; I know but that does not mean that at the Bar Council—level or in the judiciary where justice is administered we should have that kind of arrangement.

The third point in this connection is this. Sometimes in civil matters and other things the parties appoint the Advocate General and get his legal advice just to persuade the Government. For example the opinion of the Advocate General sometimes is taken

to the Government Department concerned when it is dealing with the particular case involving that person and the Advocate General's opinion certainly weighs with the authorities—Secretary or Joint Secretary or Under Secretary whoever they may be—who are considering this case. I would not name anybody but I would like to give an example. I shall give you a case in point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : Order, Order. Is the hon. Member going to go over the whole range of the position of advocates and es? This is a very small amendment and I would ask the hon. Member to confine himself to the amendment and not traverse the entire range of the position of advocates and Judges.

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pradesh) : It is probably the habit of my friend to put the smallest idea in the largest amount of words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : And it is the practice of my friend to interrupt me needlessly. Therefore we are between these two practices.

Here I say .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : This is not the occasion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I know that what I am saying is .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : More or less irrele-

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But then such amending Bills we always take advantage of to express our general opinion with regard to the matter under discussion. That is why I am saying all these things. Nothing wrong there. I know this. Therefore bear with me. Otherwise is the use of my spying here? I can sit down and say, 'All right, you pass the Bill; I have nothing to say'.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Now, you say you lia"ve done this in their interests. I say you should provide us with information about the working of the Advocates Act especially with reference to the Council. My friend there does not see anything in what I speak. If he had said something, then perhaps I might have spoken a little less.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RL'THNASWAMY) : Give some time for other Members to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If he wants to speak I shall immediately sit down.

' SHRI SYED AHMAD : I do not want to speak.

•SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA ; You do not want ? That is the trouble. I do not think we are elected to the legislature only for interrupting.

SHRI SYED AHMAD : After my friend has spoken I do not think any other speech is necessary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Therefore I say, whatever you do, you do. As I said, I was giving that example when he interrupted me. I am very sorry that you broke my thread of argument. I was telling you how they go to the Advocate General, get a favourable opinion from him and then confront the Department with it saying, 'Look here, I have got the opinion of the Advocate General that my position is legally all right' and sometimes on the basis of this orders are passed in favour of the party concerned. It does happen; the hon. Minister should know it is happening in the country. For example, in the Aminchand Pyarelal matter that has come up, they can employ an Advocate General. If it is against the State they cannot do it but if it is between two parties they can certainly appoint say, the Advocate General of West Bengal—what is his name ? Chit Paul or so—get his opinion and get one's case pushed up. It is done like that. That is why I say the Advocate General

should not be allowed private practice at all, I say at all, at no time, in no circumstances. He becomes an officer of the Government and the State; the salary is given to him by the Government and he should be ready to live on it and the acknowledgement of his talent is in the fact that he has been appointed Advocate General. That should be the compensatory factor for him.

With regard to the other aspects of the Bar Council, I do not know how these elections and other things take place. I should like to see more and more young people being encouraged at the Bar Council at all levels. I do not see why necessarily the Advocate General or the Attorney General should be ex-officio leaders of the Bar Council; they need not be. The leaders of the Bar Council should be elected and everybody should be entitled to stand for election. By reason of holding an office of the Government you become the leader of the Bar Council. It is supposed to be an elected body and therefore this is not a good thing. The whole thing is wrong. If the Advocate General commands the confidence of his colleagues let him be elected. I have no objection to it. Or the Attorney General, if he commands the confidence of the majority of his brother-lawyers let him be elected but in no circumstance should the arrangement be such that by reason of his being Advocate General or Attorney General he heads the Bar Council. That arrangement is no good. That post should also be equally made an elective post in the sense that any member can get elected.

Then there is another point. When this Bill was discussed we made many suggestions. I do not know what has happened to our suggestions. As my friends says we are speaking all right. That is what we are here for. We made many suggestions with regard to the working of the Bar Councils. We do not know what has happened to those suggestions. The first suggestion is that the preposterous earnings of the lawyers at the top must be stopped, that is to say, Rs. 30,000, Rs. 40,000 and so

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.)

on. Such heavy earnings should be put a stop to by law; if not by law, by a code of conduct laid down by the Bar Councils themselves at the initiative of the Government. I think we cannot allow this kind of thing to go on. On the one hand we have some top lawyers earning Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 40,000 while at the other end we have got lawyers who do not earn enough to make both ends meet. That is very very unfair. Therefore I say that this should go. I think we can by a code of conduct stop such kind of disparities of income. This is a disgraceful thing that is going on in our country.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : May I interrupt my friend again ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You are. I think, one of them to some extent.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Take the lawyers who earn Rs. 30,000 or Rs. 40,000 or more. They pay more tax and so it is to the advantage of the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I wish they paid. Sir, you have been a Professor and you know this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : No I don't.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA ; I wish it were so. Mr. Tankha, you are only provoking me to say things which I do not want to. Some pay but with all respect others do not do so.

I tell you how.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : I am talking of the top men.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Top men are sometimes even more mischievous than men at the bottom. Now, I tell you frankly speaking, if you earn Rs. 20,000 or Rs. 30,000 per month, you come in the category of the highest slab of income.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY): This does not come

within the mischief of the amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No. I am not saying that. This point he raised and it is a very interesting point. It will come in the highest slab.

SHRI SYED AHMAD : Whatever be the Bill before the House, he wants to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All right. Now . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY): Will the hon. Member take much longer or a little longer ? Only two hours have been allotted for this Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There is no other speaker here. (*Interruption* . Let me finish that income-tax point.

SHRI SYED AHMAD: He will take all the two hours for himself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not mind, but let me finish that income-tax point, which he raised. Then, we break today and leave the rest for tomorrow. Now, Pandit Tankha asks: What about the top lawyers ? Do you believe that the top lawyers in the country can accumulate such wealth, build such big houses by paying income-tax at the rate of twelve annas per rupee at the highest slab ? Now, I cannot understand how it becomes possible for them to pay income-tax at the rate of twelve annas. Suppose they earn Rs. 1 lakh a year, they will have to pay about Rs. 77,000 or even more as income-tax. What is left would work out at Rs. 2,000 a month or Rs. 3,000 a month. You cannot build such fortunes, you cannot have so many big cars and you cannot have such big houses. Therefore, I do not know by what sort of magic they manage this kind of thing—some lawyers. Others, I know, are very honest, and so on. Therefore, do not go into the income-tax part of it. I am opposed to the fact that a lawyer in this country should be allowed to earn so much money.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : But how can you stop it under this amendment ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA ; Now, the Bar Council is there

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN : I was telling you that very soon we are bringing forward a comprehensive enactment and if I am straightway say so in answer to some of his points that this is only for the extension of their term. We are bringing forward a comprehensive enactment soon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The working of the Bar Council is very important. Do you not see that? Therefore, I am suggesting to you that the Bar Council should have this code of conduct. You do not know how to make irrelevant things relevant and relevant things irrelevant. Here you are dealing with the Bar Council and its composition. What is the purpose of having a Bar Council, if the code of conduct is not there? What is the purpose in having this kind of retirement after four years, so that their places get filled by others, unless we see that things are properly arranged? Therefore, I say that this should not be so. I think the Bar Council should introduce a system of collegium. I want to see collegium of lawyers in

our Bar Councils where these cases are pooled and distributed somewhat equitably among the lawyers according to their talent. That is how we should proceed, to have a democratic way of life in every walk of activity. Now, there are countries in the world where you have got the collegium, where the cases are pooled and then under certain arrangements, they are distributed among the various people. Nobody earns too much and nobody earns too little.

SHRI SYED AHMAD : Mr. Gupta may be asked to continue his speech on Monday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : You have agreed to finish in a minute or two.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Just as you like.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 26th August, 1966.