

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI) : Sir, I am thankful to Mr. Mani for putting the question. We have not issued any instructions to any State, Madhya Pradesh or others. It is for the State concerned to take action whenever they find it necessary. It is not for us at all to tell them.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Sir, an assurance was given on the floor of the House that the Defence of India Rules will not be misused.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: But by whom?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: By the Home Minister. Let him find out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word "misuse" contains the reply. It contains the views of the Government of India.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE-. Let him make enquiries and find out whether action has been taken properly or not.

THE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND STATE LEGISLATURES (IMMUNITY FROM DETENTION) BILL, 1964

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for immunity to Members of Parliament and State Legislatures from detention without trial.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964 (to amend article 143)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I move;

"That leave 'be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964 (to amend article 291)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I move;

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Gaikwad had not finished his speech and he might do so now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I rise on a point of order . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, no point of order can arise When a Member is rising to speak. It must be in relation to something he said. He cannot rise on a

point of order on an old Bill when a Member is continuing his speech overnight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have participated in the discussions, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right. I will participate more.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD (Maharashtra) : Sir, while opposing the Bill last time I was explaining the relation between the Members of Parliament and the public whom they represent. I must admit that human nature is such that it is selfish. So every man will think that his income should be increased.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I have also got two minds. One mind says that when my income is to be increased, why should I oppose this? Not only that but many friends of mine have also suggested that I should not oppose this Bill but I must tell them that I have another mind and that tells me whether we have a moral right, when we are the representatives of the people and when we are the legislators sitting here, to increase our own income and not look to the welfare and increase in the income of the people whom we represent. So my mind tells me that it is no use supporting this Bill and I must oppose this Bill because it is not in the interest of the public. It will be in the interest of a few Members who are sitting here in the Parliament but you will find that there are more than 80 per cent, of the people who are suffering under the heavy prices . . .

SHRI G. M. MIR (Jammu and Kashmir): It is for all.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: That is what I am telling. You know that the increase in the prices has caused this Bill to be moved. This increase in the prices is not only for Members of Parliament but it is for all. All the

people are facing the same difficulty. Then why only the Members of Parliament should grumble and come forward and say that their salaries and daily allowances should be increased? That will not be proper morally and legally too. You know that the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, had taught the people here in India to lead very simple lives and to have high thinking. I want to ask the Members of this House, "Will it not be possible for you to lead a simple life within the amount you are getting to-day?" I find many of our friends—I do not call it a luxurious life—sit in the Central Hall taking tea, coffee, etc, I have nothing to say about that but when Members come from their houses, they must have taken something. When you say that you should lead a simple life, you must be in a position to adjust within the pay and allowances that are paid. So I would request particularly my Congress friends to implement the advice given by Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, for whom they have the highest regard.

Secondly, you know that many Members are not very poor people. Many of them are eminent doctors and they are practising as well. Some of them are advocates and are having their practice too. Some of them are big landlords, whose income will be more than some lakhs. Some of them are business people, some are Rajas and Maharajas and ex-Maharajas too and some are capitalists.

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa): There is an option in the Bill not to accept the increase.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Not all of them are of that category but some are. I know there are some poor people like me in this House. If you want to know what I am . . .

SHRI G. M. MIR: Why are you opposing then?

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: I am opposing only for the sake of the people, not for myself because when you

Shri B. K. Gaikwad

come here and sit in the Parliament! When everything is in your hands, you have no right to increase your own pay and not consider the demands and necessities of the other people in the country. Charity begins at home—you should not forget that. I must tell this House that this is the position. Particularly those who come from poor families like myself, should be very simple. We must lead our lives in a simple way. Why? It is because when we come and sit in the Parliament we get this pay and daily allowance but when we go, when we retire or when we are not selected or elected, naturally, what is the position? Habits are easy to make but hard to break. It we have a particular habit of enjoying life and then when a Member coming from a poor family is not elected to this or the other House by which he could get some income, naturally he will go on exploiting the poor masses. That is my bitter experience.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): I rise on a point of order. This is a serious reflection on Members of Parliament. Members of Parliament come here to serve their constituencies and to serve the country, not to enjoy themselves. He says that Members come here to enjoy themselves, and this allowance is given for that. This is a pittance of an allowance if you compare it with what they are given elsewhere but even as it is, I have nothing to say on merits but we are given normal conveniences, the bare conveniences that are necessary to discharge our duties as Members of Parliament and no aspersion of this type should be made that Members come to enjoy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Service of the masses is the greatest enjoyment of life.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: I was explaining that we are here as representatives and in view of that I was telling this. One thing we should not forget and that is, this increase in the prices is the root cause of all this and if that is so, in my opinion the

only solution is that we should bring down the prices and bring down the prices of the essential commodities. That will help not only the Members of Parliament but it will help the whole country. I do not criticise the hon. Members who are Members of this House or that House. But my submission is this; due to this increase in prices this problem has arisen, if that is so and we want to solve the problem we should do so not in the case of Members of Parliament alone but also in the case of all people who are living in this country, and as I said, if the difficult situation has arisen due to the increase in the prices of essential commodities, then Government should take care and see that the prices are reduced so that it may help all, not merely Members of Parliament, but all people. That I Government should do. Otherwise, Madam, what will happen? I have some experience in the line. If you just go thirty, forty years back, you will find that a peon was serving on fifteen rupees per month. Then, when the First World War broke out, the prices rose, and to mitigate the suffering arising out of it, he was given a dearness allowance of fifteen rupees, and he got in all something like thirty rupees. Same was the case with clerks and other people. Then what

happened? When the prices continued to remain high that dearness allowance was merged in the pay. Since then you will find that the same process is going on, and I do not know to what extent it will go. But we must see that this sort of tackling the problem is stopped. Now is the opportune time. Government should consider this matter seriously and see that the prices are brought down. This demand for more and more money should be stopped. And what will be the effect of this Bill? As soon as you get this Bill passed, then all people, persons employed in Government service and semi-Government service, they also will go on demanding an increase in their pay. Why should they not? When this salary is not sufficient for your maintenance, in the same way the pay that is being

given to the people who are serving in other departments, well, that is also not sufficient for their maintenance. Under the circumstances what will happen? I think Government may not be in a position to increase the salary of these people and so the Government servants will go on clamouring for it and then threaten that they will go on strike. And if such a thing develops it may not be possible to tackle it. So there will be no end to it, to this sort of demand for more pay and more dearness allowance. With the situation prevailing as it is, they will not be in a position to make both ends meet. So we must see that all people are satisfied, and they will be satisfied only with a lowering down of the prices of essential commodities. Thus it has become a vicious circle, Madam. When there is an increase in prices, then naturally we demand that our income, our salary or pay and dearness allowance should be increased. If that is done if the increase is given, immediately thereafter, the next day, you will find that the prices of essential commodities have increased further. Again these people will come forward and say that their pay, their salary or their income should be increased. What is this? So I request the Government sincerely and honestly that they should take note of the situation and see that this business of increasing the prices more and more should be stopped.

Madam, let me now turn to the Bill under discussion. There is a provision in clause 4 which reads:

"Any member, who communicates in writing to the Speaker his unwillingness to accept the increased salary and allowances, shall be entitled to the salary and allowances at the old rates as if the original section of the principal Act has not been amended by the said Act, 1964." SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): This is for your benefit.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Thank you very much. But if you just refer

to the legislation not only in India but throughout the world, this sort of legislation you will find nowhere in the world, that this is applicable to some people and inapplicable to some others.

SHRI N. PATRA: This is meant for people like you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When the question of suffering comes it applies to us and not to others.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Suppose Government is enunciating a law on prohibition, and suppose a drunkard comes, and says that it should not be applicable to him, and it is allowed, I do not know where the country will be going.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I support you in this.

SHRI N. PATRA: The analogy is inappropriate.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: There should be no such exemption or discrimination. I know. I think here we can propose a remedy if my hon. friend tries to understand it. I know that it has become very miserable for the ordinary man to lead his life. It is not particularly the case of the Members of Parliament. We should see what is the position there in the country. We cannot ignore those people. We represent them; we are here for them and not for ourselves. That is why I say that this sort of provision in legislation is a very strange thing. Of course there are amendments to the effect that this should be removed, and it should be removed. I do not know how it has come. I say that it should not be in the Indian legislation, this sort of provision. So I think the Government will take care to see that this provision is removed from the Bill. But in case this Bill is passed as it is, then let me make an announcement here and now. The mover had said: Is there anybody in this House who can accept my challenge, so to say, that he will not accept this increase in salary or this increase in daily

[Shri B. K. Gaikwad] allowance? I just want to tell him most humbly that there I am; I will not receive any increase in salary or daily allowance, but as to what to do with this, let me say. You know I am interested in the education of Jteokward Classes. I see that female education is most essential for the country. So I can request the House to make a provision—in case the Bill ig passed as it is—that the increase that comes to be allowed to Members tif Parliament and naturally to me— that that which i_s allowed to me iihould be directly given to the institution which is helping in the spread of education among girls belonging to the Backward Classes, namely to the girls' hostel named Ramabai Ambedkar Vidyarthini Vasatigraha, Nasik (Maharasnira State); the whole amount should oe handed over to that institution directly—I have no objection to it. My only request is that the i>on. Member_s should consider niv submissions and should not support this Hill. That is my humble request, and in case they do not do so, then naturally what I have stated should be done.

With these words, Madam, I oppose the Bill.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to oppose thi_s Bill that has been brought forward by an hon. Member cm the other side. The solution that lias been proposed in this Bill is not it radical solution. It is true that the i-ost of living has gone up; it is true that it ha_s become very difficult for Members of Parliament to maintain themselves in Delhi and also to main-lain a separate establishment in their particular States. But the solution (hat has been offered tor this high cost ')f living is not the proper solution (hat we can approve of. It is true that the prices of essential articles have gone up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. The Jcniater for Parliamentary Affairs is there. What is your opnion about this Bill?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, not now; let the Member continue.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar-Pradesh): He will intervene at the appropriate stage. You need not hurry up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We would like to know; we are under his charge.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. Member continue with his speech.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: As I said, the cost of living has gone up, the prices of all essential commodities have gone up beyond anybody's reach, but the solution for that is to bring dow_n the prices cf essential commodities, to bring down the cost of living that is now prevailing in the States. It is not as if the Member of Parliament alone has to suffer because of the spiral in prices. It is the ordinary man who is suffering most, the agricultural labourers, the poor j peasants, the small peasants in the villages, the small traders in the towns, the class IV officers of the Government of India and of the Statu Governments, the common worker in the factories, they all suffer. This is a problem that should be tackled on a more scientific basis. You must bring down the high cost of living that is now prevailing and you should do it by statutory measures if necessary, and there should be a ceiling put on incomes. Only then can the cost of living be brought down. There should be a ceiling on incomes to say that the income of no Indian should exceed Rs. 1,000 per month and the income of an ordinary man in any walk of life should not be less than Rs. 100 per month. If these limits *)^{re} there, then only can the cost of living be brought down and the solution that is now being sought for making amends for the high cosft of living will then be made applicable. If the cost o>f living can be brought down there is no need for increasing the salaries of the Members of Parliament, for increasing the daily allowance

oi Memoers 01 Parliament, it is true that Members of Parliament in other countries have got better emoluments and better facilities and better amenities. I agree that the Members of Parliament should be provided with more amenities. They should have some free secretarial staff available to them. They should have more facilities with regard to local calls that they are now being allowed. And they should have a minimum free accommodation. I can understand that these amenities should be provided for making the Members of Parliament devote more time for the work for which they have been elected to this august Parliament. Today the richer classes have become very rich and the unaccounted money for which no income-tax or any other tax has been paid, amounts to nearly Rs. 3000 crores. The prices also have gone up. The hoarders have not been tackled properly and commodities, particularly foodgrains, are not easily available and whatever is available is available only at an exorbitant cost. It is not proper to say that just because the prices have gone up the purchasing capacity of the ordinary citizen has also gone up. It is fantastic nonsense to say that the purchasing capacity of the ordinary man or of the common man has gone up. On the other hand, because of the fall in the value of the rupee, the purchasing capacity of the ordinary citizen in India has gone down. It has been pointed out by Shri Sriman Nsrayan, Member of the Planning Commission, that the value of the rupee today is only 17 paise. We have, therefore, to plan ahead to see that the value of the rupee is not 17 paise but full 100 paise and if that can be brought about, then prices will automatically come down and there will not be any need for the hon. Member, the mover of the Bill to bring before the House such a Bill asking for increase in emoluments of Members of Parliament. It is true that we have to put up with some hardships when we are the accredited representatives of the people of this country and we know that India is a backward country, that

it is a poor country, a country whose national income is not very big. It is not big enough to entitle Members of Parliament to draw more allowances and more salaries. We must compare ourselves with the ordinary man in our country, with our national income. We cannot! compare our salaries and allowances with the salaries and allowances and other facilities that are provided to the Members of Parliament in Canada or in America or in England. Whatever comparison we do, should be done with the background of the Indian situation. It would not be proper for us and I submit on the other hand that it would be highly improper and objectionable if we want to increase our emoluments, if we want to increase our salaries and if we want to increase our allowances in this condition. We have been seeing the hue and cry among the people, the many agitations that have taken place when the prices of all essential commodities have gone up and the living conditions of the ordinary people are so miserable. They are disgusted with the present regime and in order to bring home to the party in power, to the Government, their plight, many agitations have taken place. Many strikes have taken place in Bombay and other areas. Satyagraha has been resorted to in some parts of the country. Even today, in Uttar Pradesh, to protest against the high cost of living, to protest against the rising spiral of prices, more than 4,000 people have already gone to jail. When people are suffering in such a manner it will not be proper for us, sitting in this air-conditioned chamber, to allow ourselves to be a party to the passing of a Bill like the present one which is going to enhance the salaries and allowances of Members of Parliament. Therefore, I oppose this Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; The Minister
of Parliamentary Affairs.

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS
AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI
SATYA NARAYAN SMHA): Madam, I should
like to express my

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.] regret that I could not be present when this Bill was taken up last session in the month of May. I had, therefore, not the privilege of listening to the debates.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Let the Minister proceed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has started speaking on the Bill and therefore I rise on my point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): He has not said anything on the Bill. He has only just begun. us hear what he wants to say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My point of order relates to his intervention in this debate.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please listen to me.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Let us listen to the Minister first.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My point in order is this. The hon. Minister is not a Member of this House. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Bhupesh Gupta speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is not a Member of this House. That is number one. Please listen to me and my argument. You may not agree with me, that is a different matter. The second point is this. He is a Member of the Government and certainly he can speak. But here we are dealing with a non-official Bill sponsored by a non-official Member. Government intervention can certainly come, but then it can come only on behalf of the Government. Therefore, he cannot speak here at all in his individual capacity, because he is not a Member of this House, and he can only speak on this matter on behalf of the Government. So I would like to know in what capacity he proposes to speak here.

SUM SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: Madam, I propose to speak in no other capacity except as part of the Government. I have to make the Government's position clear on this point, particularly on this Bill. I think if the hon. Member had a little more patience he would have realised what I was going to say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In fact, I suggested it

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: As I said I could not have the privilege of listening to the debate which had taken place. I regret that today also I could not be here and I do not know how many hon. Members have taken part in this debate today. I could not have the benefit of listening to them also. But I have gone through the proceedings of the last debate and particularly the long speech of my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who becomes so impatient whenever I begin to speak. I was really amazed when he made some charge against the Government that we have practically got this Bill sponsored through backdoor methods. I repudiate and reject this charge and I would tell the hon. Member that we do not believe in backdoor methods. We always believe in the front door method and . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you have . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must listen to him. You have had your say. Let him have his say.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I say, Madam, we do not believe in backdoor methods.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then in which door?

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: We always believe in front door methods.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you have started through the window now.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: My hon. friend is perfectly right in making the observation last time that

I had consulted him, not him alone but along with him other leaders of groups in both Houses of Parliament. Madam, the representation was signed by about three hundred or more Members from both the Houses belonging to all the Parties excepting one or two, I do not remember. They made a representation that the emoluments of the Members should be increased. I was asked by the then Prime Minister to consult the leaders of the various groups to find out their reaction. In that context I had invited all those leaders and there I found that there was no complete unanimity on this point. When I reported this matter to the Prime Minister, naturally he said that when there was no unanimity Government should not bring forward any Bill but at the same time because a large number of Members of both the Houses, three hundred or more, had represented, we decided that this matter should be left entirely to the Members of both the Houses to decide and hence we got the sanction of the President so that this matter could be discussed. We could have kept quiet, not obtained the consent of the President in which no discussion could have taken place in this House or that. In that House I had made it perfectly clear that Government had not issued any kind of whip to the Members of the Congress Party and this was clear because some of our important Members in that House—I do not know about here because I was not present—spoke against this Bill. So, it is not that that Party alone is divided; our Party is also divided to a certain extent on this matter. The boot is on the other leg, if I could say so. It is not that he has issued any whip but he should accept it when I tell him that some Members of the hon. Member's Party, I do not know whether they are now in the Right or in the Left, came to me—

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is unfair. You should give the names.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: YOU have to swallow this.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: They said, "We feel that the emoluments should be increased but what could we do? Here is the decision of our Party." They are a disciplined people no doubt and they have to submit to it. Therefore, if there is any kind of whip, it is on the other side, not on this side.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a personal explanation, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta. I think you have explained enough.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is reflecting on the Party. I must state the correct position.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which Party?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whichever party' it be. He has said about the Communist Party. He asked us to give our opinion. We held a General Body meeting of the Party and unanimously decided—I was authorised to convey it—that we would oppose this.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I do not dispute it and in the House, I remember

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, he has stated what all YOU have stated.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I do not dispute that. In fact, I paid this compliment that his Party was a disciplined one.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Unanimously we decided to oppose this.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: So far as the merits of this Bill are concerned, I do not want to say anything because it is already before the House. I said in the other House and I repeat it again on behalf of the

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.]

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. 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 take, the Government would implement them.

I

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is canvassing.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: May I know the Opposition Party which supported this measure?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which Opposition Party?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I would like to know.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I do not know about this House but so far as the other House is concerned . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: When they came and discussed the matter with the Minister, which Party supported this proposition for an increase?

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I do not exactly remember but many of them supported. So far as my hon. friend is concerned, he said that he could not say anything, that he would consult his Party and after having consulted his Party he wrote to say that his Party was opposed to this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to know the name of the Party which wrote to say that it was in favour of this increase. The Swatantra, the P.S.P., the Jan Sangh and the Communist are the parties, and a few

others, which Party has supported this measure.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: The representation was received . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which Party supported you, after your consultations with them.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not finished. How do you know what he is going to say. Let him say it.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: If I remember correctly, in the discussions I had with them, Mr. Dwi-vedi, he is the leader of the P.S.P. or whatever it is, was very enthusiastic. If my hon. friend was there, he would remember it. I do not know whether he was there or not. The P.S.P., some independents and some others also. I do not know who from the Opposition here has supported.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister has misunderstood my question. He called a meeting which was attended by Mr. Ranga on behalf of the Swatantra Party, myself and Mr. Nambiar from the Communist Party and others were there. After the discussions, he wrote letters to us all asking for the formal opinion of the Party. We put it to our respective parties and sent him the reply. I would like to know which Party wrote to him subsequently saying that that Party was in support.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I have some vague recollection . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has the list.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: What happened in that meeting which I had called was that the Jan Sangh. I perfectly remember, supported this— whoever was present on behalf of the Jan Sangh. He said that his Party was in favour of it. The P.S.P. was also in favour and there were some independents. They all said that they were in favour of it. One Member

ilso, I do not know whether he is in the Right or in the Left, Mr. Nambiar, was absolutely clear and he- said that he wanted this increment. I think the hon. Member is still there. I hope he will not . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I was representing our Party. You know that our Party wrote to you saying that it was opposed to it. Mr. Nambiar never said . . .

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I have got the signatures of Shri Raghunath Singh, Shri Srikantan Nair, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, Shri G. S. Swell, Shri Krishnan, Shri Manoharan, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Onkar Lai, Shri Barua, Shri P. Kun-hambu . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He withdrew his signature.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I have got this document. Why are you getting excited?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not want any further comments on this. The Minister has explained fully everything.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: Mr. A. V. Raghavan, Syed Badruduzza.

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर (मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछ सकता हूँ कि जनसंघ का कौन लीडर वहाँ गया था जिसने कि यह राय दी ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has given all the names

SHRI G. K. KAPOOR: It is a question of prestige . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not satisfied.

(Another hon. Member stood up)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two Members cannot stand at the same time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He said that in the meeting of the Leaders . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. The other Member is on his feet.

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि जितने नाम आपने बोले हैं उनमें से जनसंघ का कौन सा लीडर है । जनसंघ का कौन सा लीडर है यह मैं मालूम करना चाहता हूँ ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The names have been given.

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : अभी मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा कि जनसंघ का एक लीडर गया था, हाउस के सामने उठेंगे यह कहा । तो वह कौन थे ।

श्री सत्य नारायण त्रिहः : मैं इस को साफ कर दूँ । यह एक डाक्यूमेंट है जिससे मैंने नाम पढ़े हैं, हमने जिन लीडर्स को बुलाया था उसका इसमें जिक्र नहीं है । जो ग्रुप के लीडर्स हैं उनसे मैं मिला था और उस वक्त वहाँ त्रिवेदी जी थे ।

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि त्रिवेदी जी ने जो कहा है उसको हाउस के सामने पढ़ा जाय ।

श्री सत्य नारायण त्रिहः : वह तो मीटिंग में बातें हुई थीं ।

1 P.M.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): We are not concerned with these private discussions. We have a Bill before us and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has made the position of Government perfectly clear. He has said that the Government is neutral in this matter and that Members are free to vote as we choose. I do not think the hon. Minister could have made a clearer statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhargava.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before you proceed, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has a statement to make.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA) : Madam, with your permission, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House during the week commencing 21st September 1964 will consist of:

- (1) Further discussion of the food situation.
- (2) Discussion on the present international situation and the policy of the Government India in relation thereto on a motion to be moved by the Minister of External Affairs.
- (3) Further consideration and passing of the Wakf (Amendment) Bill, 1964, as passed by Lok Sabha.
- (4) Consideration and passing of the following Bills, as passed by Lok Sabha:

The Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Amendment Bill, 1964.

The State Bank of India (Amendment) Bill, 1964.

The Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1964.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have a submission to make. We all demanded that there should be a separate discussion-

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What are you talking about now?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: About the business; * *

HON. MEMBERS: It is a reflection on the Chair.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I suggest that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should withdraw his remarks and apologise to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all. This gentleman here always gets up and shouts *(Interruptions.)* cannot shout like this. Madam, ask him to shut up. He is a police constable here of the Congress Party. All the time he has been doing it.

(Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Mr.

Bhupesh Gupta, when you use carelessly any words you must be very careful and the Chair is going to take notice of it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, * * *

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, on a point of order. My hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, while making some remarks has used very enable words against an hon. Member of the House. He said that he is a police constable here. I think it is very objectionable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said police constable of the Congress Party because all the time he disturbs me.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam, I support the point of order raised by my hon. friend there. I do not know whether my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, considers the language that he uses. The words he has used cast a reflection on the Chair. It is undignified for any Member of the House to use such words.

•••Expunged as ordered by the Chair.