[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

que and other things separately because we can concentrate on one issue rather than getting mixed up with other issues. At that time it seemed that he agreed and he said that a statement shall be made about this. Naturally after this talk with him we gave a motion saying that the statement on the Commonwealth Conference be taken into consideration. I think that is a good arrangement and I can point out one thing. Once the previous Prime Minister said in this House that in foreign affairs matters it is better to separate the subjects and take up that which is very urgent and discuss it separately. It is all there in the proceedings.

In this connection time for another business must be provided. We all demanded a discussion on the Report of the Das Commission with regard to the affairs of Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, former Chief Minister of Punjab. Now it should be discussed in this session. It was after the Parliament had been seized of the matter that the Commission was appointed by the Central Government under the Commissions of Inquiry Act and this Report is there before us and we should discuss it. Similar Reports of Commissions appointed under the Commissions of Inquiry Act have been discussed in this House and in the other House and I do not see, apart from other things, why the Das Commission Report could not be discussed in this House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What have you to say about this?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have a submission to make. I agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta when he demands that a separate discussion should be held on the Commonwealth Conference business. Particularly it has gained special significance because an unprecedented precedent has taken place in the sense that our relations with reference to Pakistan have been mentioned in the communique for the first time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Secondly, the Das Commission Report should also be discussed, as also the Santhanam Committee Report because we have been hearing charges against Chief Ministers of other States and similar Commissions will have to be appointed. It is absolutely necessary that time should be found for discussing the Das Commission Report along with the Santhanam Committee Report.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I do not know, Madam, of the talk which my hon. friend has referred to and which he says he had with the External Affairs Minister. I would make enquiries; I am not in a position to say anything about all those discussions for which time has been demanded. I would just consult my colleagues and then I would be able to tell what their reactions are.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhargava will continue after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at ten minutes past one of the clock

---

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, the DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964—*continued.*

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very thankful to the hon. Members who have taken part in the discussion of the Bill under consideration. I may tell Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that this is not a new question which has come up today. In 1952 a committee was appointed. It recommended certain

things That committee had invited suggestions from almost all the Parliament Members at that time and I may tell Mr Bhupesh Gupta that most of the Members at that time expressed the opinion that the salary should be Rs 500 and the daily allowance should be Rs 20 That was the view of most of the Members The committee, in their judgment, recommended Rs 300 as salary and Rs 20 as daily allowance The two Houses were pleased to agree to Rs 400 as salary and Rs 21 as daily allowance That was in 1952 While moving this Bill for consideration I threw out a challenge which has not been replied to by any of the Members who have taken part in this debate My challenge is a simple one The two Houses agreed in 1954 after taking everything into consideration, that the salary should be Rs 400 and the allowance should be Rs 21 I have said that if any member from this hon House is prepared to get up and say that there has been no increase in the cost of living in 1964, compared to 1954 I would withdraw the Bill now and here That challenge stands The hon Member

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Do I understand that you are linking it with the cost of living?

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Mr Bhupesh Gupta took more than two hours of the time of this august House His arguments today are almost the same as in 1954 I went through his speech in 1954, when he was not the leader of his group, but he was one of the Members If hon Members will read his speech at that time and his speech today, they will come to only one conclusion and that is Mr Bhupesh Gupta is opposing the Bill for the sake of opposing it only

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN What did he say in 1954?

SHRI M P BHARGAVA The same arguments were given There is nothing new

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA In 1964 you were a Congressman and in 1964 also you are a Congressman

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Yes, I hope to remain so throughout my life

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I hope to give you the same argument throughout my life

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Then, we will both be here

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN He is very consistent

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Now, the points raised by Mr Bhupesh Gupta are not very relevant to the Bill under consideration I give certain figures about allowances and salaries drawn by Members of Parliament in other countries and he refuted that these were not relevant points He said that it should be relevant to the national income of the countries quoted I concede it As far as America, Canada and other well-to-do countries are concerned, I shall not make any comparisons because they are very wealthy countries Their national income is enormous and if they pay fabulous sums to their Members of Parliament, I have no right to compare their salaries and allowances with the salaries and allowances given to Indian Parliament Members What I was trying to compare was the salaries and allowances paid to Members of Parliament of such countries which can be compared to India, as far as national income and other points are concerned And there we find that we are one of the most ill-paid Members of Parliament in the world today Now, as I said, I had viewed this from a particular angle and since no arguments have been advanced to meet that particular angle, I need not reply much to what Mr Bhupesh Gupta has said

[Shri M P Bhargava]

Then, Mr Bhupesh Gupta raised a funny argument that Members took tea Members get ice-cream Members get ghee Members get this and that He made out a case as if these were being given free, free distribution to Members of Parliament Well, every one knows that this is not the position Certain facilities are made available to Members of Parliament Tea is available Ghee is available But all of them have to be paid for Now, Mr Bhupesh Gupta is prepared to concede more amenities to Members of Parliament in kind, but not in cash That is a very peculiar argument and approach If we had brought forward a Bill saying that a house allowance should be given to Members of Parliament, he would have agreed to it If we had said that secretarial assistance should be given to Members of Parliament, he would have agreed to it If we had said that free telephone connections should be given to Members of Parliament for whatever local calls they make, he would have agreed All these when put in terms of cash mean money I take the direct line, increase the salary and increase the daily allowance I open myself to taxation, increased taxation on Rs 500 per month I do not want the back-door method of increasing all the allowances and yet say "I oppose every move for increasing the salary or increasing the allowance" We must be here prepared to face facts as they stand and not try to mince matters for cheap gallery popularity It is gallery popularity and nothing else which has forced Mr Bhupesh Gupta to take the line of argument which he has taken.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Election tactics

SHRI M P BHARGAVA You may call it any tactics I will call it delaying tactics and nothing else because he knows that the Bill is going to be passed He could only stand in the way of the Bill for some time to come, not for all time

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do you know that it is going to be passed?

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Today in spite of all his tactics, the Bill may be passed—and he may simply be a spectator to the whole show

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA No, I will never be a spectator

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Then, Mr Abid Ali raised certain points and entered into arguments which did no credit either to himself or the Party on whose behalf he was speaking He brought all sorts of irrelevant things into the discussion and tried to create some heat which was not necessary Here, Members of Parliament are discussing their own matters They should do it soberly They should do it gracefully and without any heat being produced He should have spoken on the merits or demerits of the Bill rather than take the line which he had taken

Now, my sister, Shrimati Sarla Bhadauria, spoke on behalf of her Party, again, without giving any solid arguments as to why she was opposing the Bill Probably she was asked by her Party to oppose the Bill and, therefore, she had to do it.

My friend, Shri Gaikwad, is not here I thought he was taking interest in the Bill and would be here to listen to the reply to what he had said He was talking of the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi. He wanted to put us in the position that we have forgotten Mahatma Gandhi and that he is the custodian of all that Mahatma Gandhi has said If he wants that whatever Mahatma Gandhi said has to be implemented, I will be the first man to go all along in his line of approach Let the salaries of everybody in the country, from the top to to the bottom, be not more than Rs 500, as was suggested by the

Father of the Nation, and if that proposition is accepted, there would have been no occasion for this Bill to be discussed here.

My friend, Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy, took another line of approach, and I would call it a very sensible line of approach, and that was, let us all try to bring down the cost of living on a scientific basis This is a principle about which no sane person will have any disagreement If he has any concrete suggestions in that respect, let him come and discuss with us, with the Government in power today Let him give all the suggestions and the Government will be very happy to implement them After all what we want is that somehow this rising trend of prices should be checked, and if he has any concrete suggestions, they are most welcome I will be the first person to go with him to the Prime Minister to the Food Minister, to the Planning Commission members, to the Finance Minister, to whomsoever he likes with his concrete suggestions and plead for them It is no use propounding certain things without concrete suggestions Let him have some concrete suggestions and we will be prepared, we are in fact looking forward for such proposals which will prevent the rise of prices This is a menace which has to be met and if my friend, Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy, has any suggestions, I would welcome them most and support them wholeheartedly

As I have said in my opening remarks, the Government's position is absolutely neutral in this matter, and that has been reiterated in his intervention by the hon Minister of Parliamentary Affairs I have simply to plead with the hon Members to listen to the amendments, make up their own mind and vote for whatever they think should be adopted and reject all that they think are unnecessary

With these words, I commend the Bill to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Madam, I have a question to ask The question is, now he said many things about me

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Please put the question quickly and briefly

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Briefly I cannot assure you much as I would like to

AN HON MEMBER He will make another speech

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN He is only putting a question

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA You see I am a very slow-witted person Has the hon Member any information about the meeting that took place between the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and the leaders of the various groups and parties? I want to know whether subsequent to this meeting the hon Mover of this Bill had any consultation with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and I should also like to know exactly how he came to pilot this Bill

SHRI A D MANI (Madhya Pradesh) On a point of order Madam

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Please let him finish

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA No no I cannot finish There is a point of order

SHRI A D MANI Madam any Member can rise on a point of order or put a question to a Member only out of matters arising out of his speech My hon friend there has not made any reference to the informal meeting that was held He was speaking on the principles of the Bill and why he felt that the Bill should be accepted by the House It is not fair, Madam, that this kind of dialogue and cross-examination should develop among Members which would interfere with the free flow of debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I object to that point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please finish what you were saying. I will permit you to finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All points of order and other things should be deducted from my time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Put the question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The question is this. We are naturally interested in it, just as when we asked the Minister as to how he came to formulate this Bill; it seems that the hon. Member is piloting the Bill which had been given to him. We should like to know exactly how he came across this Bill and how he took upon himself this rather difficult responsibility of piloting this particular Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is irrelevant and there is no need for an answer. The question is:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of section 3

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

> "That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I want to speak on the clause.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But I have put it. Why did you not stand up? (*Interruption.*) All right, let him have it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She has forgiven me. Why are you annoyed?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam, he did not get up in time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, it looks as though you have nothing to say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am extremely thankful to the hon. Member who advised me to get up in time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please begin.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will begin exactly when I like.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not proper to say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have begun.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But on the clause.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It seems, Madam—I do not make any reflection on you—we seem to be in a great hurry.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam, in the absence of an amendment may I know on what basis the hon. Member is speaking?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The rules say that you can speak on the clause. It seems that the hon. Member is obstructing me. Clause 2 says:

> 'In section 3 of the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act),—
>
> (1) for the words "four hundred rupees", the words "five hundred rupees" shall be substituted, and".

That is a very material clause, therefore I have got up—

> "(2) for the words "twenty-one rupees", the words "thirty-one rupees" shall be substituted.'

This is a very important clause, I said. Why, it is the substantive part of it. Now I have calculated for the benefit of the House and, as you know, we generally meet for about 100 to 120 days in a year, we are talking about the Rajya Sabha Members, this House. Sometimes it is less than 110, sometimes it is more. On an average we meet for 110 days. What does it come to? How much do we get? The calculation that I have made here is that we get first of all as salary Rs. 4800 at the rate of Rs. 400 per month. Then we get at the rate of Rs. 21 per day. That comes to, if you take that into account, Rs. 2310, I mean for the Rajya Sabha Members. Therefore, together we get in daily allowance and salary—not counting certain other advantages like travel and other things—Rs. 7110, assuming that the House sits during the year for 110 days. Now the suggestion has been made here in this particular clause to raise the allowance by Rs. 10 per day and the salary by Rs. 100 per month. In the case of salary the increase is 25 per cent. and in the case of the allowance the increase is of the order of 33·3 per cent., one-third, it is very clear. It is pure arithmetic and nothing else is needed. We do not require the wisdom of our Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to understand this thing.

Now, here what do we come to then? If you see the increment that comes to us or whatever comes to us, it seems that we are increasing our emoluments under this Bill by 34 per cent. By 34 per cent. we are increasing them. Reference has been made to the rise in the cost of production. But the hon. Member who piloted this Bill did not make out exactly what has been the rise in the cost of production and how the cost of living has affected us, he has not explained that part. But it does stand today that we have tampered with the Report of the Bonus Commission, even denying the working people the benefits proposed to be given them under the Report of a tripartite body like the Bonus Commission. When we are not agreeing to go into the question of the Third Pay Commission, when we are denying the working people's demand for linking the dearness allowance to the wages and for a rise in their average income, well, we, Members of Parliament here armed with the authority and sovereignty of the country assigned to this post by the people, take upon ourselves the responsibility of increasing our own emoluments in this manner to the extent of 34 per cent. Is it morality? Is it social ethics? Is it justice? Is that how we view the problems of life and living of the people? Is that how we should project ourselves to the life of the nation when the sovereign people are standing in the streets, when workers are denied their wages and the peasants are denied their dues, when employees of grade III and grade IV are not getting a fair deal and find it impossible to make both ends meet? We, august Members of this august House, declare to the world that our cost of living has gone up and we, by one stroke of pen, increase our earnings by 34 per cent. And at four of the clock the statement will be made on the Bonus Commission here.

I should like, Madam Deputy Chairman, to read out from the proceedings of the House. I took down when the honourable Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was speaking this morning on the subject. He came here and sanctimoniously, if I may use the expression, pleaded neutrality like the tiger pleading "I am a vegetarian". And what did he say? I took it down word for word. You can check it. He said,"—

> "I do not know, Madam, of the talk which my hon. friend has referred to . . .".

I leave it, and certain remarks he made about us and other parties. Then he went on:

> "So far as the merits of this Bill are concerned, I do not want to say anything because it is already before the House."

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

I agree. Then:

"I said in the other House and I repeat it again on behalf of the Government that we will leave it entirely to the Members. Let them decide as they like and whatever is decided by them will be implemented by Government."

Then he goes on:

"I would like to say that the Members are quite intelligent and they understand the situation in which the Members are functioning here. Members have to, most of them maintain two establishments and things like that are there. It is for them to decide and whatever decisions they would take, the Government would implement them."

This is what he has said. I will have some comments to make on this. What did the Mover of the Bill say? The mover of the Bill did not plead neutrality. He came to get this Bill passed by this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Naturally.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Moving the Bill on the 8th of May in this House, Mr. Bhargava said:

"If a Member comes from the rural areas, if he has to keep a house there, then he has got to keep in contact with the district headquarters as otherwise they would become ineffective. They have therefore to have one establishment in their native places, one in the district headquarters and the third at Delhi. This way you get two certainly and three probably in the case of some Members."

That is the argument about two establishments originating from Mr. Bhargava in this House.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): He said three. His argument was, three.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to it. Three in the case of this argument in this House. He went one ahead of you. Naturally you are quite right. But essentially, in substance, the argument is the same. The establishment of two establishments . . .

श्री तारकेश्वर पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हू । आप इस प्रपंच को क्या समझते है कि परिवार कैसे चलाया जाता है । आप अविवाहित है । अभी आप तीन ही इस्टैबलिशमेंट्स के फेर में है, यहां बन्दानवाज चार इस्टैबलिशमेंट करना पड़ता है । न मालूम क्यों आप इतना टंटा बढ़ा रहे है ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a very relevant question. I do not know how many children he has got.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: How many does the hon. Member have?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have adopted all hon. Members as my children. I understand it, Madam. I fully sympathise, despite family planning, with those gentlemen who want to take the name of children. I am getting a little . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, may I remind you that the time-limit given to this Bill is 2½ hours? And we have not got time. So, you will speak on the clause really. I request you to be brief.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Time is there and I hope that it will not end.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are other clauses also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, other clauses. Points of order I will raise later on. Now here I accept your suggestion on the clause. Therefore, I speak on the clause. Two-establishment argument was given. He said, three. And what did Mr. Satya

Narayan Sinha say in this connection? He said, "I am neutral ' Then what neutrality? Some day I will find that the tiger speaks about neutrality Now, what has he said here?—"I would like to say that the Members are quite intelligent" A little bit of flattery I think we are past that stage when

SHRI ARJUN ARORA He included you also

AN HON. MEMBER No, no

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA We are intelligent Mr Satya Narayan Sinha need not tell us The whole country knows it Why should he suddenly say so? Why should he bring that in this argument? I would not like it to be said that we are increasing our emoluments because we are intelligent people, as if those who are opposing are not very intelligent people

SHRI ARJUN ARORA He did not say so but if the cap fits you, you can wear it

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA That is right We shall see the quantum of intelligence later Then he said

> "They understand the situation in which the Members are functioning here" . . .

One would have thought that the hon Minister who was speaking for the Government would deal with the situation objectively, not merely from the point of view of personal gains and advantages but from the point of view of the society and the country at large And then what did he say

> "Members have to most of them maintain two establishments and things like that are there '

Well, is this all? Madam, Deputy Chairman, is the situation such as the Members will have to remember as to how many establishments they will have to keep or is the situation such as when dealing with these questions like this Members have to bear in mind not only their personal problems, important as they are, pressing as they are, but social questions, ethical questions, bigger considerations also? Am I to be guided only by the fact as to how many establishments I will have to keep when functioning as a Member of Parliament? Or am I to remember also the fact that I represent the teeming millions of the country here, no matter which part I belong to—collectively we do—and our people are suffering, our people are starving, our people are asking for a bare rise in the dearness allowance and the linking of the dearness allowance with the wages? Are those not the components of the situation? Are these to be brushed aside? Then, what will the people think about us? It is doing just like the petty money-lender who does not see any interest beyond beyond the interest of his money We are social workers You are there, we are there, despite political differences You hve certain ideals to uphold, we too have certain ideals to uphold Some of the ideals are in the Five Year Plans and other sentiments had been expressed by the late Prime Minister Why must we forswear those pledges today? Gandhiji spoke of Rs 500 and so on It is true that the cost of living then was less But it symbolises the spirit of the nation

It represented certain ideals

Our country is glorious not be-
3 P.M cause we are an affluent country

Our country is glorious and still living in this world with honour and dignity because we have certain precious heritage of social values and so on What has happened to them? I should have expected from the Treasury Benches some reaction When Mr Satya Narayan Sinha was speaking, and after speaking, he could have advised the hon Members that they should bear in mind the bigger social questions and so on But that advice was not given I proclaim his neutrality was a farce I repeat it I charge the hon Minister of speaking in the name of neutrality but canvassing for increase in the salary and allowances

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

And that is why he said such things. His words are here. Let him deny this thing. Who will speak of neutrality in this manner? He should have said, "I have nothing to say on the Bill. And if he had embarked upon telling Members of Parliament as to what they should bear in mind, he should have pointed out all aspects of the matter, personal, family, social, national and so on. He should have approached the problem from the larger interests of the people and not from the interests of a few persons here only, hon. Members as they are. Therefore, I say that Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha entered into this Bill not only not by the back door but by a window which we have kept open inadvertently. This is our contention. He has entered by the window and that is why he spoke like this.

Madam, when the late Prime Minister was getting in, he consulted him. I also know what the late Prime Minister meant about it His idea was unless there was unanimity in the matter, the salaries should not be increased. That was his position. And that is why when Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha went to our late lamented Prime Minister, guided as he was by high social ideals, while the latter told him that he could not do anything in the matter because the Members did not agree on that, the matter should have been dropped there as far as the Government is concerned. Today Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha spoke in this House to put a different meaning . . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: So far as the Government is concerned, it has been dropped.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No. I am telling you what he said then. He said, "Leave it to the Members of the House."

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh): He was not opposing it either.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, if the Prime Minister had been asked he would have given a definite reply. Suppose, theoretically speaking, I had an occasion to be present by invitation in a meeting of the Congress Parliamentary Party and the Prime Minister was there and he had asked for our opinion, and suppose we had said, "We, Mr. Prime Minister, are opposed to this Bill because of bigger considerations, knowing the difficulties of hon. Members of Parliament.", would he have then said, "No. I leave it to the Members of Parliament". We would have sought counsel from him, we would have sought advice from him, we would have sought guidance from him as to what happens in such a situation, when there is a conflict among the Members of Parliament crossing party barriers and when there is controversy in the country especially in the context of the critical economic situation, I have no doubt in my mind, Madam Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister would have advised, "Let us not proceed with it, let us wait for a better opportunity". Madam, when the nation is standing in the queue, starving, hungry, asking for food, for a fair deal in life, is it at all proper for Members of Parliament to appropriate to themselves an increase of 34 per cent. on their emoluments, while denying to the people what they are asking for? That would have been the advice, I think that would be what you call the Nehru tradition.

We hear speeches on Nehru tradition. Let us not kill the Nehru tradition by this Salary Bill. The Salary Bill is a challange to whatever is good in the Nehru tradition. We had our Prime Minister and we are proud of him. We still have one. Madam, when the question arose about the salary of the Prime Minister being increased on the analogy of the British Prime Minister to a higher grade than what the Cabinet Members and others got, there the Prime Minister and, "I shall not take anything more than Rs. 2,250 which my Cabinet colleagues draw." We knew that he was being over-generous in this matter. Perhaps many people thought that the Prime

Minister should have taken a little more. And he would have been a little more justified. But look at the standard he set. Has it brought credit to our country or not? Has it given a better account of the Prime Minister or not? Has it made our Parliament worthy of the great and mighty traditions that we have inherited from the freedom struggle or not?

It is no use, Madam Deputy Chairman, to uphold the ideals of Gautama Buddha, and then in the midst of crisis, scarcity, shortage and suffering, sit in the seats of power and seek certain increments in salaries in this manner? Therefore, I say it is morally repugnant, it is socially most unjust, it is politically provocative, it is economically insulting for the Members of Parliament to increase their salaries in this manner.

Madam, I do not see from any party angle. I know there are many people over there guided by good sense. Here there is no party at all. Therefore, Madam, I appeal to them, let this freedom of speech be exercised, let the intelligence of the Members of Parliament be matched by their sense of love for the people and patriotism in this respect, let their intelligence be not utilised in order to get it passed quickly, let their intelligence be demonstrated before the country and the people in a manner that the people will have confidence in the Members of Parliament. Let them feel the intelligence of the Members of Parliament and realise that they are not divorced from the life of the nation, that they are not bereft of social and moral values.

Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha said that we are intelligent people. Yes, we are intelligent people. That is why we want this measure to be buried here. I tell you when this Bill was introduced in the other House and passed, and when I opposed it here, I received letters of congratulations from all parts of the country. Most of the newspapers wrote editorials supporting the position we took and condemning the attempt at increasing the salaries and emoluments in this manner. Public opinion has been pronouncedly, powerfully expressed on such matters. What more do I need? Must we be guided by the signatures of 300 Members? And even that is not the majority. In the two Houses we have more than 700 Members. If 300 Members have signed for different reasons, 400 did not sign, please remember. Yet if they felt the matter was so urgent, that they must get extra salary, it was open to them to lend their signatures or write another memorandum and submit it to the Government. They did not do that. Madam, without any disrespect to the 300 Members of Parliament who signed it, it is all to the glory of the Members who did not sign it. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, I think it is shocking, today when mothers are selling their children, when the starving mothers are throwing their children in the Ganges in Bengal because they cannot afford a morsel of food to save the life of their child, at that time instead of extending our hands, to the starving mother on the point of throwing the child into the Ganges, we are extending our hands to the Exchequer in order to appropriate to ourselves an additional salary of Rs. 110 or more and daily allowance. Therefore, I would appeal to the House—I would speak again—I appeal to you, hon. Members, do not accept this thing. Nothing will be lost. Many of you may suffer, I agree, because of your difficulties. I sympathise with you. But let us suffer with the people. Let us in this sorrow and agony not have this additional advantages. Hence I say I oppose this Bill, this particular clause thoroughly. If this clause we oppose, the Bill is dead and we shall all celebrate it and I am prepared to treat you to any kind of celebrations.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta

[Shri M P Bhargava]

has again made a very eloquent speech, but I am sorry to say, he has not grasped what I said about the conditions of the Members of Parliament in my opening remarks and why it was essential to increase the salary and D A I am sorry to say again that Mr Bhupesh Gupta thinks that he is the only champion of the poor man and we have nothing to do with the poor man

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA No I never think so

SHRI M P BHARGAVA I may say that if he has followed the proceedings of this House, most of the Members have been trying every day to improve the conditions of the poor man Only yesteday I pleaded with the Health Ministry for giving the benefits of the C H S to the pensioners The other day I pleaded for giving more pension to the pensioners As and when these things come, we do plead for them It cannot be the monopoly of Shri Bhupesh Gupta only It is unfortunate that Mr Gupta had chosen to refer to the late lamented Prime Minister our beloved Jawaharlal Nehru If Jawaharlal Nehru, I have no hesitation in saying, had expressed his view that he was opposed to this Bill no Congress Member could have dared to move in this matter Jawaharlal Nehru was the Government, Jawaharlal Nehru was the organisation Every Congress Member would have sacrificed his blood to fulfil the wishes of Jawaharlal Nehru, what to talk of this rise in the salary He has misrepresented Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru When the question was brought to Mr Jawaharlal Nehru, he simply said: 'I do not want to take a decision It is a matter about Members of Parliament and it will be graceful if the decision is left to them' That is the position Kindly do not misrepresent our beloved leader for whom we have the highest regard to-day and will have for all times to come

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA All of us have

SHRI M P BHARGAVA If he had indicated in the slightest that he was opposed to this provision of the Bill, I would have been the last person to take any interest whatsoever in this Bill

As far as public opinion is concerned, the House very well knows what a great amendment-writer Shri Bhupesh Gupta is He can, on a subject like this, move as many as 86 amendments, sometimes more What was he doing if he was opposed to this Bill? Why did he not move that this Bill be sent for circulation for public opinion? If he had moved that motion and if we had opposed it, we would have been in the wrong but Mr Gupta sat quitely all this time Not a single amendment has come from his camp Did his camp stop to write or what was it which prevented him from sending the amendments? As I have spoken several times before this august House it is again a case of double-mind of which I charge Mr Gupta off and on He says something, he tries to think otherwise He wants to oppose this Bill and show to the public that he is the sole monopoly preserver of all their rights and in his heart of hearts he wants or thinks that if the Bill is passed, he shall also take the money This is the position to which Mr Gupta has reduced himself I did not want to refer to an unpleasant thing but he is forcing me to do it We, who are Members of Parliament, cannot afford the luxury of flying to Moscow for treatment in Moscow I did not want to refer to it but it is Mr Gupta who has compelled me to do it and I hope he will excuse me

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill

Clause 3—Amendment of section 5

SHRI M P BHARGAVA I move

3 'That at page 2, lines 4 to 7, the words 'to a member whose usual place of residence is more than seven hundred kilometres by rail or road from the place where the session of the House of Parliament or the sitting of the Committee is being held" be deleted'

It is a very simple amendment That House has recommended to us a clause which smacks of discrimination and I want to put that discrimination out of the picture What they have recommended is that if the Houses meet for more than 75 days the Members may be allowed two air-journeys in-between and if it is for less than 75 days, one air-journey for such Members who live more than 700 kilometres from Delhi There are several places which are not 700 kilometres from Delhi but to reach those places it takes more time than to reach 700 kilometres I will cite the instance of Jodhpur From Jodhpur to Delhi it takes fifteen hours while the distance, as the crow flies, is only about 350 kilometres So those people will be denied the privilege of having an air trip in-between The clause will read as follows after deleting the words I have mentioned

"Provided further that nothing in the first proviso shall apply if the member visits his usual place of residence performing the journey by air not more than twice during a session or sitting lasting more than seventy-five days, or not more than once, in any other case"

What I thought were redundant words and smelt of discrimination between Members and Member I am seeking to delete I hope the House will agree to this amendment

The question was proposed.

SHRI B K P SINHA I am opposed to this deletion This deletion is supported on the ground that discrimination is sought to be made between Member and Member It is not a discrimination between Member and Member but it is a discrimination based on certain appreciable standards that are laid down That in my opinion is a very proper discrimination This was put into the Bill after proper consideration because if those wards are deleted, then all Members who are coming from shorter distances will have to be covered There are plane services to Agra and Jaipur and to Lucknow which are very near places and the traffic position, so far as the I A C is concerned, is not very easy even now Therefore it was in consideration of these things that the clause was put as it was It makes no discrimination between Member and Member

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Why do you grudge it?

SHRI B K P SINHA Therefore I feel that there is no case for the deletion The clause should stand as it is.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN I feel that in the present circumstances our Air-Lines are not paying, specially the I A C In view of this difficulty, I would like the whole clause to be dropped

SHRI M P BHARGAVA I have no objection to the whole clause being dropped

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN I shall put the amendment to vote.

The question is

3 'That at page 2, lines 4 to 7, the words 'to a member whose usual place of residence is more than seven hundred kilometres by rail or road from the place where the session of the House of Parliament or the sitting of the Committee is being held" be deleted'

The motion was adopted

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall take up clause 4.

Clause 4—Special provision in regard to Salaries and Allowances

There is one amendment in the name of Shri Bhargava.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before you begin, I must bring to your notice that amendment No. 4 is a negative one. You can speak on it but it will not be put to the vote.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You did not know even that.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: What is negative about it?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendment is negative.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: What is negative about it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We seek your permission in this House, and here it involves the rights of this House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Bhargava speak first.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I had proposed to move amendment No. 4 which was declared as out of order being a negative amendment, but the reason for my recommending the deletion of clause 4 is simple. It is redundant; it is not necessary; it is everybody's right to draw the increased salary and allowances, or refuse to draw. And when it is within one's right we do not put in the clauses of Bills such things which are not necessary, and therefore I feel that this clause 4 has been put in unnecessarily; it is not necessary to have such a clause in an enactment which is going to have the President's assent and become law thereafter. Therefore I recommend to the House that this clause 4 be deleted.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): I am not in favour of the amendment which Mr. Bhargava has suggested. I think that Members should have the right to write to the Speaker that he does not want to have the benefit of the increase. And if he is not given that right, then his income-tax slab may go up; the income-tax authorities will not take into account the fact that he has given up voluntarily the salary or emoluments to which he is entitled under the Bill. I therefore think that in the interests of this Bill this clause should stand.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I seek only one clarification from the hon. mover. He said that even now the Members have the right not to draw the full salary prescribed by the Act. May I know what is the law or what is the Executive Order that sanctions that?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have serious objections to a certain formulation in this clause. As you know, I have very great regard for Lok Sabha—we stand for abolition of the Upper Houses; I tell you frankly—and my abolition also in the bargain. But that is not the point here. Still, with all the respect for Lok Sabha that I have—it is a directly elected body and it should be strengthened—the hon. Members there have done something which I cannot understand. The Bill is about Parliament but they forgot the Chairman, and, Madam, I have to be vigilant, it seems, to defend our Chairman from the unfortunate aggression from another quarter, he is abolished. Here you see, it is 'Any member', which means any Member of Parliament. Here it says:

"Any member, who communicates in writing to the Speaker . . " Why should I write to the Speaker?

SHRI P N SAPRU He is in charge of the whole

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I have a Chairman in this House and I do not think that under the Constitution he Speaker has any extra-territorial jurisdiction so to say, that is to say, his jurisdiction does not extend to our House, it ends in the Central Hall perhaps And now here you see and I am surprised But the question is why such a thing happened The hon Members of Lok Sabha are certainly very useful people All of them may not be young, but certainly they look young, you will not deny it, at least they pretend to be young and now they claim themselves to be vigilant I understand very vigilant people, the eyes of the nation, the ears of the nation I fully share that sentiment After all, aged people should not be the eyes of the nation and a person like me should not be here in the nation also, certainly But here this is the position, here, when they passed this Bill, they forgot the Constitution, they forgot propriety, they forgot the fact that across the Central Hall there was another institution called the Rajya Sabha which has got its own presiding officer called the Chairman, with the same dignity, who occupies a certain very high order of precedence in our Constitution Clean forgotten Why? They were in a hurry to get the cash, and you will always see that when people are in a hurry to get the cash, they commit some obvious errors, which intelligent people do not commit usually Therefore what I say is this, Madam I will be introducing a little humour, if you like Here I find that our intelligent people, what shall we say, I would not say bad things here I find that the prospect of an immediate increment had the better of the intelligence of the Members of the Lok Sabha it seems Otherwise, I cannot comprehend how such people can make such an obvious error

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): That is why the Rajya Sabha is necessary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA It is true we are making the correction here But the Rajya Sabha is not necessary to correct the Lok Sabha in this manner That is not the question, but you must draw the correct lesson, people who are directly elected, who represent the constituencies—they have to work under the direct impact of popular mind—here they permitted themselves to be so carried away with the prospect of a sudden increment of salary that they forgot even a simple thing as this, they did not even remember us, what these Rajya Sabha people are Well, therefore you see, if you pass it hurriedly and if you allow these things to be passed—the proposed amendment cannot be moved because it is a negative amendment—if you allow the clause to be passed as it is, then what it means? It goes through, they can make it law, and I shall be compelled to go, if I want to make a surrender, or if anybody here wants to make a surrender he will be compelled to go, not to the Chairman but to the Speaker Otherwise the surrender does not take place This is the position Now you may say Why not leave it to the Lok Sabha? They may amend it if not here But why should leave it to the Lok Sabha and why must I pass it here? Theoretically speaking I take it that the Lok Sabha will make the necessary correction, because I have very great regard for the friends in the Lok Sabha, to some of them very great regard But why should I not stand up against it now? To me it is a question of dignity and honour Whatever you do with regard to this Bill, it is a question of dignity and honour as far as the House is concerned. This Bill shall not pass this House without this particular clause being altered, at least this portion "to the Speaker" it should be "Speaker and Chairman" if you like that way Madam Deputy Chairman, you have always the right to allow

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

us to move an amendment here and the technical rule does not come in the way In fact we can hold it up personally I should like it to be held over till the next Session

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN Even without any amendment you can vote against clause 4 standing part of the Bill

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA No then that clause is deleted it is disallowed I have always very great faith in him Have I not displayed it many times before? It is quite right, therefore the voice should be raised very powerfully against this particular clause because of this reason, it should be negative as a clause Personally I am not at all for this Bill, I am opposed to the Bill but if you want it that way, have it that way if you like, but we cannot accept "Speaker" alone in the clause I very much regret to say, Madam Deputy Chairman I have very great respect for Mr Bhargava, but he accused me of going to Moscow What is wrong there? Well, I went to Moscow And if they treat me there, shall I say "I shall go on hunger strike if you treat me?" But what about hon Member of this House? What has happened to an hon Member of this House Mr Bhargava? He was given a baby and he does not look at it very much and drops it down in this House Before bringing it here well, he should have been vigilant and sponsored the Bill with certain amendments himself or talked to the Lok Sabha people when the matter was discussed there

SHRI M P BHARGAVA. That is what I am doing now

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Anyway, Mr Bhargava, you did not even express about it My regret is that when you spoke, you Mr Bhargava remembered Bhupesh Gupta's going to Moscow, but you never remembered that the right and dignity and honour of this House had been bartered away in this Bill

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Please read my speech, my opening speech, I have said something for the deletion of clause 4

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA You should have said

SHRI M P BHARGAVA I have said

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA No you never said

SHRI M P BHARGAVA I have said as much as you

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. I agree Generally you are But the problem again is this Here is a question of money

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr Gupta, you should address the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Therefore, Madam, I think if you cannot do anything more technically, this course can be taken The Lok Sabha has done it I am very sorry that the Bill should have come from the Lok Sabha in this form That is all I can say I would have given greater credit to the intelligence of people and they should have displayed greater vigilance and greater concern to the Constitution and to propriety and to Parliament consisting of two Houses Madam Deputy Chairman I do not wish to say anything more Whatever you do regard to this save our Chairman, if nothing else

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr Mulka Govinda Reddy

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY Madam, I support the amendment moved by Mr Bhargava with regard to the deletion of clause 4 It is discriminatory Without this clause if any Member wants to surrender his salary he can do it There was absolutely no need for the Lok Sabha to have introduced this clause It is also discriminatory in the sense that it affects the privilege of a Member

to surrender his salary or allowance. If the Member belongs to the other House, to the Lok Sabha, he will have to write to the Speaker. If the clause had said that if any Member wishes to surrender his salary, he should write to the Speaker or the Chairman of the House concerned, that would have made some sense. But even without any such clause, any Member has the right to surrender his salary. So this clause is really redundant and it should be deleted I agree ent rely with the hon. Member who had given notice of the amendment to delete the clause.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhargava. I have ruled that the amendment is a negative one. You can speak on the clause.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I am speaking on clause 4. Madam, in moving the motion for the consideration of this Bill I had brought in this matter specifically and said that two courses were open to us, to rectify the mistake which has happened in the Lok Sabha. One course is for us to say that we delete clause 4. The other course is, if we do not want to delete the clause, then we will have to add the words "Chairman" after the word "Speaker" in the clause. I had made this very clear in my speech and I am sorry to find that Mr. Gupta did not go through the report of my speech. I am very glad to see that at least on one point Mr. Gupta and I agree.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: That is very strange indeed.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: As far as the dignity of this House is concerned, Mr. Gupta and I agree. I am also thankful to Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy for giving me his support. I do concede that the amendment is out of order because it is a negative one. But this does not prevent us from voting down the clause itself and that is what I would commend to the House, that the clause, when it is voted upon, may be voted down.

686 RS—6.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was negatived.

Clause 4 was deleted from the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title and commencement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two amendments proposed to clause 1, one standing in the name of Mr. A. D. Mani and the other in the name of Shri M. P. Bhargava. I see that Mr. Mani is not here.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

2. 'That at page 1, for line 5, the following be substituted, namely:—

"(2) It shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of June, 1964".'

Madam Deputy Chairman, my amendment is a very simple one.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: This House was considering this Bill on 8th May 1964 and if some unfortunate things had not happened, the Bill would have been long ago passed by this House. Since we were discussing it on the 8th of May, I had given notice of this amendment that it should be operative from the 1st June, 1964. I am doing nothing new now. This amendment was given notice of on the 8th May and it stands and I have only reiterated it in the present session of Parliament. I hope the House will agree to this amendment and make the measure effective form the 1st June, 1964.

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I oppose this amendment. Here again, you see, my hon. friend wants the Bill to take effect from the 1st June, that it should have retrospective effect. He is not satisfied

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

with this 34 per cent. increase but he must get it from the 1st of June. I am thankful to him that he has not put it as 1952, ever since he came here. At least that much concession he has shown. But I say this is wrong in principle. He said the Bill could not be passed in May. What could I do if it was not passed in May? Some people may expect a baby by some date and the baby may comes on a later date. When the baby comes on a later date, would you say, "No, it has been born on the day it was expected to be born?" Certainly not. The baby is born exactly on the date it is actually born.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You being a bachelor, you are making observations about the birth of babies?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are thoroughly irrelevant. What has being a bachelor got to do with it?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: What do you know about the birth of a baby, unless it is an illegitimate baby?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You will continue, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Does bachelor mean that he has not been born? I have been born, I think. Anyhow, this is the position and therefore, this is wrong. But there again you see, Mr. Bhargava should get at the cash, whatever we may say. You see, he is so excited over it. Thank God the treasury is not there in the gallery, otherwise he would have gone to the gallery to take it away. Personally I would have killed to put the date some time in 1970. but since I have not moved any amendment, I cannot have it that way now. But I am opposed to this. Otherwise people will think that no discussion had any value and meaning. Now will you give increments to the workers and to the government employees with retrospective effect?

AN HON. MEMBER: Certainly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You don't do it generally. You may give a tiny increment and then agree to give it retrospective effect. But you see here how much they will be getting. Every month so much money they will be getting. Therefore, I say I am opposed to this amendment. The clause here says that it shall come into force "immediately". The word "immediately" is very important. It cannot come into force immediately. It can come into force only after the Lok Sabha passes it and the President's assent is given to it. All these factors are there. Now the country should be given an opportunity to go to the President and tell him he should not give his assent to this Bill. Suppose the Lok Sabha passes it in the form you have done. We should be in a position to go to the President and express our feelings and request him to withhold his assent. We have seen what happened when the Kerala Assembly passed an agrarian measure giving some benefits to the workers. The Congress Party then led a deputation to the President and prevented sanction being given to it. So we should like to do the same thing now and we would like to follow the example of the Congress and go to the President and ask him not to give his assent to this Bill. And unless the President gives his assent, the Bill cannot come into force immediately. So the question of giving it immediate effect does not arise at all. I do not see Mr. Mani here. He is a clever man. He was here all the time, but he has left.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: He has got to attend a meeting.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry. But he is so careful about it because he is a staunch supporter of the Government. I say, keep it as it is, but let the matter be debated in the country as to what should be done. And let the Lok Sabha also be given a chance to reflect on the time when it should come into effect. That is all I have to say.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, so far as this Bill is concerned I have already expressed my views but when we want to have this Bill passed, let us not go against the normal procedure that is being followed in this House. Simply because this Bill relates to our own emoluments we have to be still more careful. We have to see to the sentiment of the people and we have to see the present conditions. We have to see that we have declared an emergency. In view of that, I would only say that if it at all has to come, let it come in the normal way. Whenever a Bill officially receives the assent of the President, then only it becomes an Act and operative. So, let there be no exception regarding this Bill, I plead through you.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I oppose both the amendments because according to the Rules I understand that even Mr. Mani's amendment has to be voted upon.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani's amendment has not been moved at all.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Anyway, if it has not to be voted upon, I do not press but then I share the feelings of both the previous speakers about the amendment moved by Mr. Bhargava. It is unusual for a Bill of this nature which imposes a burden on the Consolidated Fund of India to be made retrospective. The hon. Mover may have tried to make it prospective at the stage he put this amendment, he did this sometime in May and so he had fixed the 1st of June but then, after May, because of the lapse of time, the situation has entirely changed. Therefore, in my opinion it would be extremely improper for the reasons advanced by the previous speakers to make its provision retrospective. Moreover, I feel that so many anomalies would arise. Only yesterday the Chairman announced that one hon. Member of this House had resigned his seat from the 15th September, 1964. What would happen in the case of such a Member? He is sitting at his home. Very nearly seven hundred and fifty accounts will have to be reopened for the last four months and back moneys will have to be paid. A cheque will have to be sent to the hon. Member who retired on the 15th September. Of course, there is no harm and it is physically not impossible but between June and now I understand some hon. Members have become physically incapable of accepting cheques because they are no more in this world. What would happen in such cases if this amendment is accepted? Therefore, I feel that there are weighty reasons why this amendment should not be accepted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Their children will claim this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

2. "That at page 1, for line 5, the following be substituted, namely:—

"(2) It shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of June, 1964".

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Motion was adopted.

Clause 1, *as amended, was added to the Bill.*

The Enacting Formula and the Title

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I do not want to take much time. I should have liked Mr. Bhargava to consider, even at this stage, to amend the Enacting Formula which should read somewhat like this: Salaries and Allowances (Self-appropriation) of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill. That would be appropriate, self-appropriation. I would not like to call it "misappropriation". I call it "self-appropriation" because we should call a spade a spade.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN: The hon. Member has not given any notice of an amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not good, proper. Why can't we tell the public that we have done it and give the correct title instead of trying to take cover under this name as if 34 per cent. is nothing?

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Have you given notice of an amendment?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The mover can always consider this.

SHRI JOSHEP MATHEN (Kerala): Fifty per cent. of his speech is irrelevant . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Could you imagine a more relevant remark?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Gupta's logic is wrong. The original Bill is named as "The Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill." This is only an amendment and so we cannot change the name of the Act as suggested by Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have got this here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not see why we cannot rename it? Sometimes some children take the father's name or the mother's.

(SHRI *Lokanath Misra stood up*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have allowed him to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is there? I will speak on the Third reading.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

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

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam, I move:

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

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you realise the amount of time you have taken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope you realise the importance of the matter and you do certainly realise.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you will be brief and not repeat what you have said before.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Life is a repetition, Madam Deputy Chairman. We are repeating, salaries and allowances here. All that is repetition here. They are not giving away; they are taking away more. Now Madam, I know the anxiety of some hon. Members. They are very anxious as if they want to catch a train. I have never seen people wanting to catch their trains to be so anxious about the departure as some hon. Members are in wanting to get this Bill passed quickly.

Madam, I oppose this Bill and our opposition shall continue in principle and I shall voice it till the end of the debate.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I hope not in practice. Your opposition will not continue in practice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know what you will continue. That we shall see later but let us see what we are doing. You can get up, Mr. Arjun Arora; you have not made up your mind. After all, he is a progressive man and I should have liked to hear him on this subject I must congfatulate hon. Mover for the

manner in which he moved it although the substance of it was very bad. His usual affability in this matter was not lost and he spoke with good humour, wrong statistics and plenty of distortions. That does not matter but none the less the humour was there and you will have noted that he was trying to give figures of what the other Members of Parliament in other countries were getting. He was intelligent enough not to give the figures of national income in these countries and the relation of the salary of Members of Parliament with the salaries of other Government servants, the *per capita* income of the people there. Now here I do not want to go into details. I say why I oppose this Bill. I oppose not because I do not have sympathy for some hon. Members opposite. Perhaps Members have difficulties, perhaps some hon. Members have eleven children and two houses. I can well understand their difficulties especially with children ill-educated or not properly educated. Difficulties are there and I well understand their difficulties; I understand the difficulties that they have in that they have to pay high prices, because of their Government, prices which they had never dreamt off. House rents are increasing, prices of commodities are going up and so when hon. Members opposite say that the salaries should be increased, I admit this that there is no motive. I do not impute motives, I will say this thing. I say this thing lest I be misunderstood.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): Will the hon. Member agree to the payment of salary on the basis of the numbers in a family, those having more getting more and those who have no family getting only a hundred rupees?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is a matter about which you can consult the Family Planning Commission and the Planning Commission.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: What would be the line of the Communist regime?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know the Working Committee line on family planning but I have some idea of the Planning Commission's attitude. But it seems that some of the members who preach family planning produce the greatest number and create a population problem.

Therefore I say—please understand this—I was not imputing any motive because many hon. Members from both Houses talked to me on the subject. I want to understand their point of view and I do say that I sympathise with their worries and anxieties but when you are public men, placed in such a situation as Parliament Members, you have to face certain difficulties and that is our training in the national struggle. When we came to the Congress movement we were at once asked to live a simple and modest life. Plain living and high thinking was the great glorious motto given to the nation by Mahatma Gandhi and those who came from the very well-to-do classes knew that. . . .

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: I wish the hon. Member had remembered and acted upon all that Mahatma Gandhi has said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am thankful to the hon. Member. Madam Deputy Chairman, I have to remember all the more when the hon. Member is forgetting what Mahatma Gandhi said.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: The hon. Member who does not believe in that ideology should not quote Mahatma Gandhi. That is not proper. He can quote Lenin or Mao Tse-Tung but not Mahatma Gandhi.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now now, Mao Tse-Tung has come; Lenin has come; I do not know what else will come.

SHRI M. P SHUKLA: We do not want a lesson from you on the ideals and principles of Mahatma Gandhi. You can teach us if you like on the ideology of your own teachers and *gurus* like Mao Tse-Tung, Lenin or Stalin but not of Mahatma Gandhi. We can do that better.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not understand why he is raising this question. But I see this thing; the moment it is a question of money and a Bill for getting money, a loss of balance takes place there.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: Because we do not get Red money from outside.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That has also added to the loss.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): The hon. Member is off the balance.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: We do not get money from outside.

(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: These interruptions cannot go on like this. I won't allow anyone to interrupt any more. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, will you have your say and be brief?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But, Madam, I am not allowed to have my say.

(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, please continue your speech. Don't look there; you should address the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am fond of hon. Members there. I get inspiration by looking at them. Anyway, I shall now look at the Chair.

Now the position is, we are opposed to this because it goes against the moral, political and social principles. That is our main theme.

AN HON. MEMBER: Madam Deputy Chairman, he is again looking that side.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They are attractive; what can I do? Now, it is no reflection on the Chair, I can tell you.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, that is why we are opposed to it and we made out a case that whatever is given is not so bad; it is on the average Rs. 800 or Rs. 850 in the case of the Lok Sabha and Rs. 700 in the case of the Rajya Sabha *plus* certain amenities and concessions. It is not so bad. That is what we wanted to impress upon the House but our arguments have not been accepted, for what reasons, I do not know.

Madam, the Lok Sabha passed it so very quickly. It is difficult for us to get an adjournment motion admitted at the other place but when it comes to the question of salaries, you see how quickly it was passed. It was passed with the speed of a jet aeroplane as it were. In one hour, I think, it was passed and there were 500 Members. At least we can say that we have given more time and thought to it.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: We have fully discussed it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: At least we can say we have done some justice to it; we have given some thought and reflection to the matter. Even if there has been a controversy, this House can claim that we were engaged in a controversy, thoroughly debated it, gave arguments for and against and fought out the battle whereas what happened in the other House we all know. Therefore the whole thing has been hurriedly done. Since that time many papers have commented on this. But can it be pointed out by anybody in this House or in the other House that even one single paper in the country has supported this? There are so many

newspapers and journals, about four thousand of them. I should like one single newspaper or journal in the country to be cited which has supported the proposition which is before the House. Madam, the Bill stands rejected by the public. The hon. Member asked me why I did not move an amendment for getting it circulated for eliciting public opinion. Normally, that suggestion would be valued but here the public opinion had been expressed categorically and clearly even when the matter was being discussed in the other House and more especially when the matter came to this House. What is there to be sounded? As far as public opinion is concerned, public opinion is writ large in the faces of the people, writ large in the newspaper editorials and columns, writ large in the life of the nation, if you like it that way. And so there is no need to ascertain public opinion over this matter; it is so obvious. If ever there was an expression of public opinion on an issue, it has been on this and public opinion is clearly against it. Yet we are defying public opinion; we are brushing aside the feelings of the people. And imagine what they will feel at four o'clock when there will be a report on the Bonus Commission. We shall see how the hon. Minister justifies their attitude when it comes to the question of giving something to the working people. Therefore do not bring in the question of public opinion at all. Public opinion stands four square against this Bill. I have been accused that I did not move any amendment. But what can I amend? There is nothing to amend. You could not even amend clause 4 except to delete it. I want the entire Bill to be deleted and therefore there is no question of any amendment. The question of amendment comes only when you are generally in favour of the principle of the Bill but I am against the very principle of the Bill.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): May I ask the hon. Member one question? In almost all major issues Mr. Gupta has invariably held the view that the Indian Press by and large controlled by monopolies does not and cannot possibly reflect the authentic views of the people. How is it in this particular case—I am not talking about the merits of the case—on this particular issue the entire Indian Press is supposed to be reflecting the considered and collective will of the nation and the people? How does it suddenly become his Bible?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad at this interruption. I say, even *the monopolies blush at this Bill.* That is all I can say. Even the monopolists who are shameless are ashamed of this Bill. Therefore they dare not advise their editors to support this Bill. How such an esteemed and learned person could not understand this simple point is beyond me. As far as unity is concerned—how the entire Press is united on this—that is also very simple. When the monopolists blush or shy away from the scene and when the people are roaring against the Bill, it is the people who decisively win and the people have won just as on the Kashmir question monopolists dare not come out with what is in their mind because of fear of public opinion. There are many other matters in which the monopolists do not come out. So it was in this matter also and public opinion has got the better of the situation. My regret is when the monopolists are blushing, shying away, and feeling ashamed, hon. Members opposite have not reciprocated this feeling by a comparable gesture. It is my complaint. Madam Deputy Chairman, we are opposed to this Bill.

Now I shall speak after the statement is made at four o'clock.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You finish your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will take some time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister is prepared to wait a little. You finish it.

4 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It will be very good if I speak after the statement on the Bonus Commission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, at 4 o'clock you said. The Business Advisory Committee and you said that the statement would be made at 4 o'clock. Let it be made.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is left to the discretion of the Chair. He is willing to wait. You will finish your speech in the next five minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, the danger is that if he does not make the statement, then perhaps we shall be held guilty of evading the situation, because it causes embarrassment to us. The statement on the Bonus Commission would exactly show . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you want to waste the time of the House? Please come to your point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But let him make the statement. I am not in a hurry. I am prepared to wait. Let him make the statement. I want to speak, but let him make the statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please continue your speech now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, therefore, Madam, you need not have waived that rule. Here sits the gentleman of the Bonus Commission, who is holding the Bonus Commission Report. If he had made the statement, it would have shown the contrast between your approach with regard to ourselves and approach with regard to workers and employees. I am very glad that he has been saved and spared this embarrassment for some reason or other, but I say that this Bill stands condemned, condemned by public opinion. And I would appeal, even if we are passing it, to our colleagues and friends in Lok Sabha not to pass it. It is for them to reflect over this matter. If we can reach out to their hearts and minds—addressing from here they will not listen to us but certainly when they read the proceedings—they will understand that they would be well advised in this matter to withhold the endorsement of this Bill. They will have to go through it again because we have amended it. Now, from the beginning to end I have been saying that we should not pass this measure. Shri Shastri has written a letter to the Cheif Ministers saying that there should be cut in Government's expenditure and many advices have been given. He has also written to me on the need for cutting Government expenditure, especially non-productive expenditure, non-development expenditure. Here, we are adding to non-productive and non-development expenditure. This provision here means our participation in Parliament. I assure you that we shall participate as effectively, perhaps by putting more supplementaries, if this Bill is not there at all. We shall be more productive that way without this Bill. Now, the Prime Minister has written, on the one hand, to the Cheif Ministers to cut expenditure, advising the country and showing concern about non-developmental expenditure. Here precisely when it comes to the question of Members of Parliament, their own earning which is a non-developmental expenditure, we are placed in such a situation that we are adding to it. Maybe, the addition is small, but its magnitude and dimension should not be underestimated. Whatever we are preaching outside about restrictions and curb on non-developmental expenditure, we will be making a mockery of it by our behaviour and performance here in the matter of this Bill when it becomes the law of the land and brings in more money under non-development and overhead charges in the administration of Members of Parliament. What we are promising to the ear of the nation is one thing and breaking the same at their heart is another. I would not like what we

promise to the ear to be broken at the heart of the nation. The nation is being told to cut all expenditure where planning or development is not involved. Companies are told, workers are told, factory men are told, employers and businessmen are told. Everybody is told to cut expenditure. Here 700 hon. Members in this House and the other House together are told by some people here to increase the non-development expenditure. What else could be a greater irony, a greater sorrow in this matter? I regret that we have been placed in such a position. I have been here for twelve years and I share many sentiments with many Members opposite. I know that many of them do not like this Bill, but perhaps it will be passed here and it will be passed in the other House. I say that it is most unfortunate that of all time in the year of Grace 1964, one of the most critical year economically in our post-independence era, when people are suffering, we are passing this Bill, before we have given a fair deal to others. I could have understood it if this Parliament had increased the salaries and wages of the workers, peasants, employees and so on. Having done it, if it had come to us as the last persons, it would have been. Now, we want to give a little more to ourselves in view of the rise in the cost of living. It would have been appreciated. Your position would not have been misunderstood. But we are placing ourselves, as it were, before the interests of the nation. We are placing ourselves before the interests of the multitude of the people, to whom we owe allegiance, who have sent us here, to whose loyalty we all owe allegiance and so on. That is not good. Therefore, I say we are departing clearly and surely from a high ideal set before the nation, some principle which we have cherished in this House. I need not take the name of our late lamented Prime Minister. It is Shri Satya Narayan Sinha who brought it in. I do maintain that we did not belong to his Party. We sat in the Opposition. But his lustre also affected us and we liked many of the things in him despite our serious political differences. One of the things we like in such matters relates to questions of public morality. I do maintain, I claim that the Prime Minister was not a private possesion of the Congress Party or a precious heritage in the AICC's possession. He was a possession of the nation, a heritage of the nation, if you like it that way. We share it with you. Maybe, we have not always understood that heritage as best as we should. Maybe, you have not also understood that heritage as best as you should. But I tell you in all seriousness and all solemnity, today in such a condition of sorrow, suffering, agony and misery in the homes of millions, when we see outside the suffering humanity marching before our eyes, if the Prime Minister had been sitting in those very Benches which he had adorned for many years, if a request had been made from this side of the House to the leader of the nation to think over this matter, on a question of controversy—when public opinion is so agitated, he would have explained it in a different way. I have no doubt in my mind he would have said: "In view of these things, let us forget it for the present." He would not have offended good sentiments. He would have respected the sentiments of the masses. I have no doubt about it. He would have, with malice towards none and charity towards all, if I may quote the words of an American gentleman. . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Do not begin to quote American statesmen.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora, order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would never quote the present American leaders, but here I was quoting the 19th century American. . . .

(Time bell rings)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two and a half hours have been allotted

for this Bill. Time is running out. In 2½ hours we have to finish the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under which rule?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Business Advisory Committee has allotted 2½ hours to this Bill and time is running out. So, please finish your speech now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under which rule it has been laid down?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: The Business Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by the House. *You have approved it.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please continue and be brief.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here again I say I find discrimination, not by you, but we are making it ourselves, the Business Advisory Committee. Now, you have put in the List of Business that at 4 o'clock the Minister will make a statement. You have waived it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please now finish your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am speaking about the Business Advisory Committee. What shall I say? Yes, I know that many hon. Members do not like me to speak. I say it is an utter shame and dishonour, it is cowardice behind the back of the nation, that we are passing such a measure. We are letting down the people. We are insulting their intelligence in the name of ourselves being intelligent. I think it is an affront to the people that even before the debate on the food situation is over we are passing this Bill and we give to ourselves more money. And what else could be more dishonourable for us as public workers, I cannot understand. I am very sorry that we have lived here, after so many years, to pass this measure and that too at such a time. I hope that people will know how sometimes public men function when they are placed in high positions by their support and vote. This Bill may be passed in this House and the other House, but it shall not pass the code of popular morality. People shall resist it. People shall resist it not in any violent form, but by expressing their moral indignation, moral revulsion to a measure of this kind. This is all what I say. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:—

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

The motion was adopted.

STATEMENT *RE* THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BONUS COMMISSION

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA): Madam Deputy Chairman, with your permission I would like to make the following statement:

The decisions of the Central Government on the Bonus Commission were announced in a Government Resolution dated the 2nd September, 1964. Copies of the Resolution were also placed on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 8th September. As mentioned in the Resolution, Government had decided to accept the Commission's recommendations subject to the following:

(i) All direct taxes for the time being in force should be deducted as prior charges in the calculation of "available surplus" for purposes of bonus.

(ii) In addition, tax concessions given to industry to provide resources for future development should not be utilised for payment of larger bonuses to employees; on the other hand, it should be ensured by law if the existing tax law and regulations do not sufficiently safeguard this, that amounts involved in such tax concessions are in fact used only for the purposes for which the tax concessions are given. Further, subsidies paid by Government to certain con-