

**THE SALARY, ALLOWANCES AND PENSION OF MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2004—CONTD**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Now we shall take up the Salary, Allowances Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 2004 moved by Shri Lalit Suri on 29th July, 2005. I think Dr. Gill had not concluded his speech.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, before Dr. Gill speaks, can I make one submission? Last Friday we had discussion on a Private Member's Bill in which Mr. Jothi had raised an issue of profound national significance. This was about loss of Lok Sabha seats in Tamil Nadu and Kerala on account of Family Planning. Sir, we have given notice for a Short-Duration Discussion. I would request that this may be taken up on priority basis because, I think, the issue is very important.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): I will speak to the Chairman about it. Thank you. Mr. Secretary-General, you note it so that we can request the hon. Chairman. Yes, Dr. Gill.

DR. M.S. GILL (Punjab): Thank you, Sir. This matter about the working conditions really in totality of the hon. Members of Parliament is a matter of great importance. I say this not because I am sitting here as one of you today, I felt it in my former position for long years, linked very much to the working of our Indian democracy. I wrote about it in the *Outlook* of 10th September, 2001—Mr. Narayansamy has a copy of it, it can go on record if it allowed—after you made a nominal increase of a few thousand rupees for the hon. Members in that year. Sir, I think that India may be called a developing country in terms of economic factors. But I do believe it is a very developed country, in democracy and democratic working. A billion people, 680 million voters, we have a robust, effective parliamentary democracy, and the result of our endeavours, you can see in every election, when we overthrow great parties and great men everywhere, and we keep changing the Governments. It is for the good of this country and it is an example to everybody. The British have just voted. They voted with *parchis*. You voted—68 crore people—electronically without a flaw. There is much to be proud of. So, I call it a developed democracy, not a developing one. But we must also realise, a billion people spread over a sub-continent

from forests of Assam and Arunachal, down to the deserts of Rajasthan and Barmer, how do you function? The parliamentary constituencies have an on average 2 million people, spread over at least a couple of 100 kms. We are not talking of Chandni Chowk for my friend Mr. Goel or Mr. Kapil Sibal. We are talking of India and India is beyond Delhi. I am talking of parties, I am talking of political workers, they have to trudge this dusty road of great distances, to contact voters and they do a great deal of political work. They educate people on democracy, and on the economic plans of all parties. They are often accused—of all sorts of misdoings. If one does something they are coloured with the same brush. I have been seeing it. You know I come from a different background, but I never sympathise with the attitude of the Indian elite, or the Indian Press. I have to say it—and I used to say it then in my former job—that when you talk of corruption, for example, don't forget the lakhs and lakhs of political workers of all the political parties from the Marxist to the BJP, and everybody in between, who trudge the dusty roads of India for decades, and never got to a Zilla Parishad. They are doing what Nehru wanted to do in terms of democracy, promoting it, in carrying it to the voters and explaining it. That is the situation. Now how to carry out this job? Populism is getting close to the masses. I know in Punjab, it started with Pratap Singh Kairon. Today, everywhere in India, those who are down there in politics, know how much service they have to give to the people. Frankly, they do not have time for their families or anything else. Voters will land up in vast numbers from the countryside in Delhi. MP's have to give them *chai paani* and you have to give them a room. They have to even sometimes buy them—a ticket back to Bihar. I know it is true. Where are they going to take it from? If they have to go and check things, if they have to go and do things, how do they do it? Transport, oil and everything, you know the cost? About their projects and MPLADS, with great respect, I do not agree with the hon. Speaker, that MPLADS should be taken away from the MPs and it is all bad. There are flaws there, as these are flaws in all development spending. Improve them. They have to go and check these things and MPLADS is something they do, and a lot of them endeavour to do it to the best of their ability. But how is all this to be done? For example, what do you give them? I have heard, I do not want to go into the details, a salary less than a clerk's in the Government of India. Is this the honour you pay these 800 people, or are they less than everybody

else in this country? Then, coming to transport, I think you give a lakh of rupees as loan. It does not buy a decent bicycle. Why can't you give them adequate loans? One thing I am glad about is that so far in this country not full of people of achievement and resources, such as my friend Lalit Suri or Vijay Mallya or even Vijay Dardaji.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Jaitam Ramesh also.

DR. M.S. GILL: जय राम रमेश क्या आप भी हो? बता दो, बता दो। A vast majority of them, you look at any party, Sir, they are people who have come from the soil of India. They are people with no great riches, they are people, who have to find the wherewithal to discharge their duties. There are people who might come to Parliament, for one term or may be two, and never come back. When I first joined the Rajya Sabha, I walked in and an old gentleman, former retired Member from somewhere, handed me petition. He was handing it to everybody. What was he saying? 'We have no money to survive on. The pension is now Rs. 3000.' I do not know how Members can accept this kind of pension. It is not even respectable, I won't say the other word. it is not even respect and this is the situation these people are facing. I have studied this business in America long years, ago and I have seen it in England recently. You need to give them the basic requirements for discharging their democratic and Constitutional duties. That is how I would put it. First the economic aspect. Then, the salary, the resources with it, the transport and a pension later not for 2 years or 3 years but for life to him and to his wife. A reasonable pension that a clerk gets, at least, be given. You can decide what you are going to give ultimately.

Then, I talk about housing. I came and saw here. Now, you have flats. But, India has this peculiar *gaushala* mentality that once you occupy one, you never leave it. So, soon there are no flats with the Government, to allot to the new Members. All right. Then what happens? The Members are told, 'go to your Bhawan—Punjab Bhavan—take a tiny room of 10 feet by 15 feet, and live there for ever and ever.' Sir, I cannot live there for a day. How can you live there? How can you live there and discharge normal Parliamentary functions? Do they have no family? Do they have no visitors or no privacy? They are just supposed to stay there. Others, who are more equal—if I can use that term—they will take not only a house, but a big bungalow. They are first-timers!

You see them and I see them. Forget about that. What I say is: it is a condition of your appointment or election to Parliament that you should get an accommodation. Then, everybody should get one from the day he comes here. If he does not get it, pay him equivalent to rent a house. But, don't say, 'you go to a room while others have got what they have got.' How can he function in that? He has to have an office. He has visitors. Now, I have seen America and I have seen England. Even in England, with less resources, they are providing all the facilities. At both places and elsewhere in Europe, and elsewhere else--they have office blocks. In America, named after a great Speaker, Sam Rayburn, there is a Rayburn Building. There is another building. And every Senator Representative gets a set of rooms for his office. If it is Kennedy Building, he gets a number of rooms, because his dak and mail is vast and visitors are more. If he is a junior Member, he will get something less--according to his requirement. They get staff. Their political entrants come from Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard and Yale. Boys and girls, brightest graduates and law graduates, join these Senators, work for them, and then they move on, ultimately into tickets like Garry Hart if you recall him. He might have become the President. Even Clinton and all of them did this. They have a library for Congress which I have studied. If Kennedy wants to speak on the Indian Cooperative Movement, his staff man goes to the library and says, 'we want to speak on the Indian Agriculture and Credit Movement.'

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Mr. Gill, sorry to interrupt you. You see, the time allotted for this Bill is two hours and the time left is only four minutes.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: वे अच्छे फार्म में हैं, उनको बोलने दिया जाए। टाइम थोड़ा रिलैक्स कर दीजिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Just one minute ...*(Interruptions)*...The time allotted for this discussion is two hours, and we had about four minutes, when we started discussion today, and there are ten more speakers. Now, it is a matter for the House to decide. Mr. Sharad Joshi is sitting there for his next Bill. We can, certainly, extend the time. There is no difficulty. But, I would only request all the members to have some control over time.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कई ऐसे बिल यहां चले हैं, जो दो-दो, तीन-तीन दिनों तक चले हैं। इसको आगे चलना चाहिए। यह अच्छा टॉपिक है, यह एम्प्रीज़ की सैलेरीज़ और सुविधाओं से संबंधित है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): I have no doubt about it. I have no problem if everybody wants to speak. I am only requesting you to have some regard for time. Okay. Please, carry on.

DR. M.S. GILL: I can squeeze it also. They have a building. Even the British, with not enough economic resources, spent and built a brand new building next to Parliament. I went and saw there. There, their members get a set of rooms and offices with all facilities. They get staff. Those people go and get the information as needed. And it is not a 'lazy library' or with incompetent librarians. They really give you the material. Then these intellectuals prepare speeches. The Senator studies it, modifies it, and comes and gives his speech. And you wonder, 'what a great Senator.' I see the law making in India. Sir, you are an expert. In my judgement, over the last 20 years or more, it is bad. Why do I say this? Those who were properly trained up to Independence by those men and all the Menons and others who could do great drafting have gone. Now, in the bureaucracy of today and in the Law Ministry there is neither application, nor knowledge nor any interest. In the House there is never any debate on amendments, or changes accepted by the Minister, which used to happen with Nath Pai, and people like that. I remember reading about it.

अब तो खत्म हो गया है। So, by voice vote you pass twenty Bills, after twenty days of dispute. And then when you pass the bills as drafted by an Under Secretary, without discussion people get bad law. It takes a long time to correct a bad law. Even Ministers cannot do it. Therefore, MPs' need assistance I have a proposal. I have a dream. We should immediately sanction Rs.40-50 crores, and next to Parliament, have two buildings. One called the Mavalankar building for the first Indian Speaker, and second called the Radhakrishnan building, for the first Vice-President here, and give them offices in there where they can sit and do things. Give common facilities, even canteens and other things. It is not a big expenditure for democracy. When the Press and everybody says, "Oh, Rs.200 crores on Parliament! It is a waste. Oh, they get so many facilities. They get 30 air tickets." I don't use my air tickets.

Where am I to going to go in India? I go only occasionally. But those who come from Arunachal Pradesh, and those who come from Assam, have to go every month. And the Press should know that. Why should not they go? How will India link and connect? I am lucky. I come from Punjab, which is 150 miles from here. But, what about Members coming from Kerala? Even by plane you break your back coming here. I know that. And, yet, they have to come up and down. Therefore, give them offices. Give them housing. Give them a reasonable, sensible amount of money. They won't get rich out of it, no matter what you give. But, don't give them poverty. And don't be lacking in confidence. I say this to both Houses. They are lacking in confidence because they fear criticism will criticise us. We will give Rs.2000. I was reading an article. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, at that time, defended it. I had written in that article, what if you give Rs.2000 or Rs.3000 more to each? It is five years ago. We should not do this. It is not that we are making these people rich. I also see the elite classes of India are growing every day. And the rural people are left out. They are not even written about by the Press. It is not a worthwhile story any longer to write about rural India or poor India. There are other stories to write; page 3, page 5 and page 10. In this situation, MPs are the people who bring you the news of India. I am glad that most of them are not, as I said, like my friend Shri Lalit Suri. I admire Lalitji, he has done a lot of work. But I would hate to see a Parliament only of the rich. When I stand out in the porch, what do I see? There are Mercedes cars coming. There are Lexus cars coming. But, thank God, not for everybody. I see others also, who are waiting for that wagon which takes them and drops them somewhere. How can they function even in Delhi if they do not have their own transport? They have to go to this meeting, that meeting, this seminar, or call on their party leaders, What are they going to do? I don't know what they do? When I look at them, and I look at how they are doing it...(Interruptions)... Please, please. I am talking for you now, Jairamji, ...(Interruptions)... जय राम जी को मैंने मना लिया है (Interruptions) He is with me now. ...(Interruptions)... No; no. I am joking. ...(Interruptions)... I am withdrawing it (Interruptions)

मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आज़मी (मध्य प्रदेश): सर, सारी दुनिया जय राम कहती है, फिर भी मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है।

[मौलाना عبید اللہ خان اعظمی : سراسری دنیا ہے رام کہتی ہے، مگر بھی ماننے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہے۔]

PROF. P.J. KURIAN (Kerala): A Member is not supposed to influence other members.

DR. M.S. GILL: I don't want to go into the details. You know more than I do. The substance of my plea to you is, don't be embarrassed. I do not also, incidentally, agree with what I have read. Let us not do it ourselves. They will accuse us and, therefore, we should be frightened men. Let us now appoint a Committee with some kind of bureaucrats and economists on it, as if economists know everything in this world. I don't believe it. Let us not do that. I believe a party.... (Interruptions)... I believe the Vice-President; the Chairman of this House, the head of the Lok Sabha with the senior Members; I and India and people can trust them, and don't worry about the rest of them. Consider, in your cool mind, give them all the conditions which make them able to work here and to deliver what they are elected for. Thank you.

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I have only one question to put. Instead of discussing this here, we can have a discussion among the leaders of the political parties. We can come to a consensus and find out a viable solution to this problem. This is not the matter of pension or advance for vehicles only. There are so many other problems among the Members here. We can cover both, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. Instead of discussing it publicly, we can discuss this among ourselves.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Let us see.

श्री कृपाल परमार (हिमाचल प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज से 5 वर्ष पूर्व मैं अपने जीवन का पहला चुनाव लड़कर भारत के सर्वोच्च सदन में आया था। उस वक्त सांसद की तनख्वाह 4 हजार रुपए महीना था। जैसा कि माननीय गिल साहब ने कहा मुश्किल से दो-चार फीसदी लोग ऐसे होंगे जिन के पास अपार दौलत है और वह सांसद के नाते खर्चे के अलावा समाज का और भी खर्च वहन कर सकते हैं लेकिन मान्यवर, जो लोग गांवों में काम करते हैं, सामाजिक और राजनीतिक काम करते-करते देश में सर्वोच्च सदन में पहुंचते हैं, उन के पास आवश्यक सारी सुविधाएं नहीं होतीं जो एक सांसद के पास होनी चाहिए।

मान्यवर, जिस दिन ललित सूरी जी ने इस विधेयक को यहां पर प्रस्तुत किया था, मैं उस दिन मणिपुर के दौरे पर रहने के कारण सदन में उपस्थित नहीं था, लेकिन मुझे जानकारी मिली है कि इस विधेयक के पक्ष और विपक्ष में लोगों ने चर्चा में हिस्सा लिया। मान्यवर, एक कहावत है, "जा के पांव न पड़ी बिवाई, वो क्या जाने पीर परायी।" मान्यवर, जिन लोगों ने दिल्ली से बाहर रहकर राजनीति का स्वाद नहीं चखा, उन्हें भारत के गांवों में क्या-क्या घटित हो रहा है और सांसदों को किन-किन मुसीबतों का सामना करना पड़ता है, उसके बारे में जानकारी नहीं हो सकती। मान्यवर, 4 हजार रुपए के साथ वाहन के लिए कर्जे के रूप में 1 लाख रुपया मिलता है। जब मैंने पता किया कि 12 या साढ़े 12 परसेंट सालाना ब्याज पर बाजार से कौन सी गाड़ी खरीदी जा सकती है, तो पता चला कि 1 लाख रुपए में एक ऑटो-रिक्शा खरीदा जा सकता है। अब अगर ऑटो-रिक्शा से मुझे अपने प्रदेश से सदन में उपस्थित होने आना हो तो तीन दिन का समय लगेगा।

मान्यवर, जब एन०डी०ए० की सरकार ने सांसदों के वेतन-भत्ते बढ़ाने का बिल पास किया तो मीडिया में ऐसे वह खबर छपी कि जिस से लगा कि सांसदों ने पूरे हिंदुस्तान के खजाने को लूट लिया। मीडिया में छपा कि तीन गुना बढ़ोत्तरी, 4 हजार से 12 हजार रुपए, लेकिन यह आज सरकारी दफ्तर में काम करने वाले किसी भी चपरासी की तनख्वाह से कम है। पेंशन 3 हजार रुपए और जैसे कि गिल साहब कह रहे थे कि इसे 3 हजार रुपए पेंशन न कहकर, अगर मानदेय भी कहा जाय तो यह मानदेय, अपमानदेय ज्यादा लगता है।

मान्यवर, ललित सूरी जी का मैं धन्यवाद करता हूं जिन्होंने इस विधेयक के माध्यम से इस सदन का और देश का ध्यान सांसदों की इस मुश्किल की तरफ आकर्षित करने का मौका दिया। मुझे याद है कि पिछले शुक्रवार को डा० टी० सुब्बारामी रेड्डी एक प्राइवेट मेंबर रेजोल्यूशन लेकर आए थे, जिस विषय का उन के जीवन में अभाव नहीं रहा है। ललित सूरी जी पर लक्ष्मी जी की कृपा है इस के बावजूद सांसदों की मुश्किलों को समझते हुए वे इस विधेयक को लेकर आए, इस के लिए मैं उन का धन्यवाद करता हूं। साथ ही साथ यह सदन उस दिन का इन्तजार कर रहा है, जब हमारे साथी, श्री विजय मल्लया जी, नशा-बन्दी पर विधेयक लेकर इस सदन में उपस्थित होंगे।

मान्यवर, मैं दो-तीन सजेशंस के साथ अपनी वाणी को विराम दूंगा। एक तो यह है कि कर्णाटक की सरकार ने अपने सांसदों को वाहन की व्यवस्था करके दी है, उसके लिए तेल, उसके ड्राईवर की व्यवस्था करके दी है और एक क्लर्क तथा एक अटेंडेंट उनको दिया है। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि कर्णाटक सरकार के पैटर्न पर वाहन, ड्राईवर, एक सेक्रेटेरियल स्टाफ और एक अटेंडेंट एक सांसद को अवश्य मिलना चाहिए।

3.00 P.M.

जहां तक पेंशन का प्रश्न है, तो बार-बार बिल लाने के बजाए कोई ऐसा सिस्टम लाया जाए, जिससे इसको प्राईस-इन्डेक्स के साथ जोड़कर तनखाह और पेंशन को ऑटोमैटिकली बढ़ाने का प्रावधान हो। जिस तरीके से इम्प्लाइज़ के लिए बेसिक सैलरी को पेंशन के आधार के रूप में लिया जाता है, अगर वैसा ही प्रावधान सांसदों के पेंशन में भी किया जाए तो आने वाले समय में इस मुश्किल से छुटकारा मिल जाएगा। मैं यह विधेयक लाने के लिए श्री ललित सूरी जी का धन्यवाद करते हुए अपनी वाणी को विराम देता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Shri Dipankar Mukherjee.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Comrade will oppose it.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, before we start it, we are stopped. When something is being brought by the Government regarding the issue of salary and allowances, it had been our experience, time and again, that whenever we start speaking, someone like Mr. Narayanasamy will hoot us down or something like that. But in this case, it has been just the opposite. As a matter of fact, I had to intervene in this Bill. One of my colleagues spoke on it last time. All of a sudden, I saw, Sir, to my great surprise that this Bill has attracted a lot of attention. Many Private Members' Bills or Resolutions are discussed in this House. Last week also, there was a discussion on a Private Member's Resolution '*Roti, Kapda and Makaan*'. I must share with the House one thing. I got a telephone call from some media person. I learnt last Friday, it was the Private Member's Resolution Day, and not the Private Member's Bill day. Before that, it was discussed. But on the Resolution's Day, someone from the media rang me asking me for participating in a discussion on this Bill which is going to be passed, or, something like that was stated on the next day. I said, "How is it? There is no Government Bill like that. What are you talking about?" Then, I could understand what they were talking about was a Private Member's Bill, and that was not to be discussed on that Friday also. So, it had nothing to do with the subject. I am sure, there was lot of discussions in the media. It had nothing with the ins and outs of the subject, its merits or demerits. It was the subject itself which became an attraction for media for some reasons, and that is why I found, last week, there were a lot of programmes on this also. If you ask me why

this has become a marketable news item, I would say it is probably because whether it is right or wrong, people's perception about people's representatives is at such a level that media feels that 'politics' is a dirty word. I am not afraid of media or I am not very much enamoured by it. But the point is that people's perception about us, about the politicians as a whole is such that the moment you give this subject to them, it will be something to be ridiculed, something to be said. एम पी लोगों के पास तो पैसा है। MPs have a different meaning, and that is why this subject was picked up. It was not picked up because of its importance. Because if you see from the point of view of importance, the Private Member's Resolution on '*Roti, Kapda and Makan*' was a very important one. Or for that matter, the third Bill in today's Agenda Papers, under the heading "Bills for consideration and passing", i.e., Shri V. Narayanasamy's Bill regarding the State Funding of Elections to Lok Sabha and Legislative Assemblies Bill, 2004 is very important. But I am sure, this will not attract the media's attention because it actually goes into the depth of this. Today, what we are discussing is an important Bill. Whether you like it or not, whether he is correct or not, whether we had been wrong all through, we are the people's elected representatives. It is the people's perception. I am not talking about media perception. It is equally elitist as the surrounding is. But it is the people's perception. Unless the people's perception changes about us, to talk about this would be only giving them the food to make more negative responses regarding the politics and the politicians. Who are responsible for this? I am sorry to say, this is done to belittle politics as a whole. What you call, the way the word 'politics' is being used is responsible for this. Those who are coming in politics from different professions or business or anywhere else, the way they talk about politics are all responsible for it. They say economics should not be politicised. They say, in students' activities, there should not be any politics; in trade union activities there should not be any politics. So, where should there be politics? They say, in professional universities, there should not be any politics. It is as if 'politics' is a dirty word. If 'politics' were considered a dirty word, definitely anything about politicians would also be treated as dirty. They would say, "The dirty fellows are asking for more emoluments." This is the perception.

I am sure that people like Dr. Gill will agree with me that if this perception about 'politics' is not made clear, then, people's perception

will be taken to be that standard; if you went anywhere and asked people "सेलरी बढ़नी चाहिए?" उन्होंने कह दिया - "बहुत मिलता है, और क्या चाहिए?" If that is the perception, then, any Resolution, whether right or wrong, that we pass here, will not be accepted. That is why I say that the situation, so far as this part is concerned, is such that this point cannot be decided upon. This cannot be considered as employment. I don't believe it is an employment. It is not an employment and it cannot be treated as an employment as that of Secretaries, and others; Secretaries do not decide their own salaries. Someone has to decide. Now, who will decide that? I am not talking about the bureaucrats. Again, you say it is the people. How do you say it is the people? If people's perception about you is bad, or good, and if people feel that their representatives should get more money, then you would get their response. But if you insulate it from the people and if you discuss this in isolation, I don't think it is proper. It is only going to be another television channel's programme, which would be juicy, which would be marketable, which would be market-friendly. Politicians are not treated as market-friendly; Politicians are treated as people with whom anything can be associated or connected. You can link anything with them. That is why, I feel, Sir, that though the hon. Member's intention might be good, the timing is not so good. It has not brought to fore the problems of politicians, the salaries and allowances of MPs. It has given the impression as if "here is another effort by politicians." so, if you have maligned politics and you say that salaries of MPs should be enhanced, nobody would accept it.

You should talk about politics, what politics is about, what ideology is about. I was thinking about it, Sir. Nowadays, if you have any problem, before you make your opinion, things are already classified as good and bad; perceptions are created. Ideological things don't happen anymore.

One should go through the bunch of the 'Letters of Nehru', which attracted me the most. I have read those letters. In 1936, twelve Members of the Working Committee had resigned *en masse* because Jawaharlal Nehru was talking about socialism, which was thought of as something new, which was not acceptable to them. Gandhiji had to intervene. He wrote those letters. Today, even if a murmur of voice is heard about something, that somebody said this or that, it is taken to be the whole

perception. They say, 'there is a big difference. The Left is derailing UPA's economic policies; Right is derailing this', and so on. It is as if politics is all about ideological perceptions and ideological practices.

In the 1930s, 40s and 50s, Namboodripad had written letters to Jawaharlal Nehru; Jaiprakash had written letters to Jawaharlal Nehru. Ideological perceptions were not available in a marketable form. Today, one must feel that our economics is based on politics and politics is based on ideology. I am not subscribing to Shri Kripal's ideology. Shri Kripal may not be subscribing to my ideology. If you say that politics has got nothing to do with ideology, if politics is treated as something like a balance sheet, and if it is the perception that the input of the MPs should be quantified, then, I think this discussion is not worth it.

If we really feel that people's perception is to be changed, then, people's perception about politics needs to be changed, so that people are encouraged to join politics. Now, we are not advertising posts of MPs. Everyone has got equal opportunity to contest for the post of an MP. There are many people who are much more brilliant than me. Let them come and have more salaries, which they feel they are eligible for. I have come because I represent people as in a democracy. It is not a party-less democracy; it is party-based democracy and a party has to have its own ideology, it has to have its manifesto, it has to have certain representatives, certain perceptions, which are acceptable to the people. Based on that, the salaries and allowances have to be decided. If people feel that they need to have some sort of a Commission, they may do so. But, MPs cannot decide about their own salaries. That is the first point I wished to make.

Secondly, I fully agree with the point made by Dr. Gill and others that in the case of a Secretary, the money is paid directly to whosoever is the Secretary. Now, I come to research work. People like Mr. Gill will not come; some fellows like us, who do not understand, come in Parliament, and require inputs. We require inputs not in monetary terms, but that input has to come in an institutionalised form as in the British Parliament. In British Parliament, Research Assistants are paid by the Government, not by the MPs. They are paid by the Government. Like the funding of the elections, this research facility, research input should be funded, but not through the MP. This perception should be there. In

Standing Committees itself, why are we going for research? From my experience of seven years in Standing Committee, I can say—from the Chair also you can intervene, Sir—where are the inputs. How many people are there? One or two gentlemen are working in three Committees. Yes, Bills ought to be analysed, and they are now being sent to the Standing Committees. But in Standing Committee itself, if you forget about anything, many inputs can be given, if you have got a Research Unit. In our Standing Committees, we do not have even a Research Cell. Right. now, from this House, I will request you to kindly see to it that in every Standing Committee, there is a Research Cell. When a specialised Bill on a specialised subject comes, Research Assistants should be appointed on temporary or permanent basis. Many times they feel that they really cannot understand many things. At least, for the time being, for that Bill, they should be given freedom to get some experts on the subject to help these Committees. These are the helps which are required. In spite of this intention, the way this Bill has been created is all negative. Can you show me a positive response to this Bill? You forget about the media. They are taking advantage of the positions there. If there has been no positive response, then I will request Mr. Suri to clarify this that, yes, our main effort will be to cleanse this atmosphere, the wrong conceptions, and misperceptions—a global atmosphere, knowingly again created by the media — to create an apolitical atmosphere. Politics is bad. Depoliticise the whole situation. The organisation has got no meaning and the individual is the only point. This lack of organisation and lack of motivation for depoliticisation; and whatever Uncle Sam says, we have to accept it as ours, more or less as a guideline, that perception, that scenario or that sort of atmosphere must change before we discuss this dispassionately. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Thank you, Mr. Mukherjee. It is a very interesting perception. I am glad that there are, at least, two views there. Now, the debate is possible because if everybody goes to say the same thing, then there is hardly any debate. Now, may I call upon Mr. Kurian?

PROF. P.J KURIAN: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I am very happy that you are glad to hear different views. So, I will also try to give a different view. Sir, usually on many things I disagree with the Left. But

on one point I am going to agree with the Left, that is, on perception. Mr. Mukherjee spoke about perception. Unfortunately, the perception in the country, among the majority, which I feel mostly is created by the media that politicians are all bad and politicians are all corrupt. I do now know how such a feeling has been spread by the media. The fact of the matter is that politicians are from among the people. They are not coming from elsewhere. Whatever it may be, bad or good, they are from among the people also. There is a saying that in a democracy, a people will get the Government it deserve. So, we are from the people. They may be good or bad. But to say that politicians alone are bad and all others are not, I think, is a total distortion of facts. Bureaucracy — I don't want to say, but anything can happen in bureaucracy - Neither the media nor the politicians, who want to oppose, will criticise them. In every section of society, there is degeneration. We remember that at the time of independence struggle, all our leaders jumped into the struggle without hoping for anything. They were willing to sacrifice their lives for the country. They never thought that they could become MPs; they could become Ministers. Sir, I have read history, though I am not a student of history. I also read something about freedom struggle. Most of our leaders did not even believe that in 1947, we were going to get freedom. Knowing this fact they were fighting the British Empire, an Empire where the sun never set. They were going before the guns without any arms. Knowing that they might not be able to come back in the evening if they went out in the morning, they jumped into the freedom struggle and they got us freedom. Sir, those were the days when there were leaders of ideology, of purity in public life, probity in public life. Now, those days are gone. It is a fact. There is degeneration in the society at all levels, in all sections, and that is reflected in politics also. But, to say that politicians are worse than any other section of the society, I feel, is not correct. In politics also, there are good people and there are bad people. Today, I remember, when I was sitting here, my good friend, Dr. Faguni Ram, came to Shri A.K. Antony who was also sitting left to me. Dr. Faguni Ram came and told something in Shri Antony's ear. I tried to overhear that. It may be a wrong thing, Mr. Ram was telling about Gandhiji...(*Interruptions*). Yes, I did something wrong. I am saying it honestly. But, Mr. Ram was telling Mr. Antony, — Well, Mr. Antony is not here. So, I am saying that. — "You are like Gandhiji."

Mr. Ram, did you say like that?

डा० फागुनी राम (बिहार): मैं जब केरल गया था, जब वहां के ग्रामीण इलाके में गया, उस समय मैंने जब एंटोनी जी के बारे में उनसे पूछा तो लोगों ने कहा कि यह तो केरल के गांधी हैं इतने सिम्पल हैं, इतने साधारण हैं, इतने मिलनसार हैं और आचार-विचार व व्यवहार में बहुत की सामान्य तरीके से रहते हैं। वह तो केरल के गांधी हैं।

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Sir, I overheard this I felt proud.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Remember, reputation always precedes you.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: What I am saying is that only politics has produced him, not religion; politics has produced Shri A.K. Antony. And, I would say that politics has produced Mahatma Gandhi also. Mahatma Gandhiji was a strong believer of religion, a strong believer of God who prayed. Equally, he was secular, but Gandhiji became Gandhiji through politics, when he fought the British. By name, he is Antony; his name may be Antony, but he does not belong to, he does not believe in any religion for that matter, as far as I know him. Politics brought him. I can quote so many such names. Only politics can produce them, not, I would say, any other field. (*Interruptions*) I know. I am not blaming anybody. The point I am trying to make is that this condemnation of politicians and politics is not in conformity with the facts as in country. I would say that media to which everybody will look up, everybody is afraid of criticising it.

Sir, everybody rejoices in seeing a headline. Well, I have seen even MPs going after them even the Ministers going after them, and, media has created most of this. Sir, lots of good speeches are made in this House. Members will make lot of good speeches. Do you see anything in the media? Well, I am surprised, Sir, the other day, on the Citizenship (Amendment) Bill, I made a speech and spoke for about 45 minutes...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Nobody reported it. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Kurian, this is an occupational hazard in this House... (*Interruptions*)...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Whatever the Vice Chairman says, I accept that. What I am saying is that during my speech, one of the hon. Members made a comment and I quipped something. That came in the media. That alone was there, and, not the speech or the contents of

the speech. The speech was appreciated by all. You also supported me.. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: And also people from Kerala.. *(Interruptions)* ...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Yes, people from Kerala; Mr. Gill supported me. But the Press did not publish that. The Press published only my quipping, my reaction to hon. Member that he said something and I reacted, and, there is a news in that. So, the situation is that all what is bad will be projected and what is good is not projected, what is good is forgotten. This is the reason why the perception of the people has reached this level.

Sir, the perception of the people is that the politicians are corrupt. Sir, I can challenge, if you conduct a study or if anybody can conduct a study on 100 politicians and 100 bureaucrats of the top level, or, 100 other—Sir, I will not say 'Advocates' since you are sitting in the Chair.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): No, no. Go ahead. Please go ahead ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: I will say, Industrialists ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir): You can say Judges...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: I will not say Judges. Sir, Mr. Jairam wants me to say about Judges which I will not say. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will say, Professors.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Some Judges have gone wrong. It is on record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Mr. Kurian, please make your point. You have been going on very nicely. But make your points one after the other. ...*(Interruptions)*. No, no, I am not stopping you but you please make your point.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Sir, if such a study is conducted, I am sure that the perception that politicians are more corrupt will be corrected and rectified. But nobody is making such a scientific study and without making such a study, sweeping remarks are being made. Sir, yet

perception is very important. Perception may be wrong but it became important. I contested a number of elections in Lok Sabha. I know when people contest election, there will be spread wrong perceptions and people will vote on the basis of wrong perception. But even if the perception is wrong, there will be the result. Sir, I remember the elections in 1989 when late Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister of our country. We went for election and many people voted on a wrong perception, for which my friends from the left contributed because they also alleged that Rajiv Gandhi has received bribes from the Bofors company and they spread that like anything, media carried that and some of the poor people, innocent people believed that and voted against us, and, we lost the election. See, how important is the perception. Today, even after 20 years, nothing could be proved against Rajiv Ji. It is proved, beyond doubt, that Rajiv Gandhi was innocent. Kindly go back to 1989 and get voting again. That is not possible. So, wrong perception can lead to wrong results. Which can not be rectified. Therefore, perception cannot be ignored. Here, the fact of the matter is one thing and the perception is a different thing. Because people think that politicians are corrupt, that perception will remain there until we correct it.

My third point is also with regard to another perception. Most of the people believe that MPs are very rich people. I do not know why they believe that. It is again a wrong perception. Maybe, some MPs come in big cars. Mr. Gill was saying that some are coming in foreign cars. Maybe, because of that, people think that MPs are rich people. But, what is the fact of the matter? In Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, a majority of the MPs don't even own a car. Most of the them come by the vehicle which is provided by the Secretariat. I come to Rajya Sabha by the vehicle which is provided by the Secretariat. For going elsewhere, I use taxi or some friends car. I remember, the other day, the Chairman of this House, invited us for a dinner. I had no car of my own. I had to go by a friend's car Maruti-800. And, because I was going in an old Maruti-800, policemen stopped me. It was not their fault. They thought that somebody coming in that car would not be an MP. Then, I explained to them that I am an MP and I am going to the dinner. I had to explain. Then only, they permitted me. See, perception of the policemen was also wrong. The fact is that most of the MPs don't have even a car. Therefore, fact is on one side and perception is on the other—When we

talk of an MP, I would say, he should be able to function effectively. Are the facilities which are given to him, enough to make him function effectively as an MP? I would say, they are not enough. I will tell you my own case. We are given Rs. 10,000 for secretarial assistance. Sir, I have a computer. I did not get a computer from here. I have an old computer. So, to have a person to work on the computer, these Rs. 10,000 are not enough. You will not get an educated person for this amount. Then, what about the other staff? From where will an MP get secretarial assistance? I read in the guidelines that we can go to the typing pool and get our work done. Luckily, many people don't go there. Suppose, 10 people go there together, it would not be possible for them to get their work done. Sir, we are electing MPs, but we are not providing them adequate facilities for proper functioning. So, my point here is, motto should be that an MP should function effectively. But, how can it be possible? That is why, Sir, let us come to a compromise. Instead of increasing salary, allowances or other monetary benefits, I would say give them facilities. Now, what are those facilities which should be given to them? The Kerala Assembly would be a good example. There, each MLA can select a Government employee, a stenographer or a person who is well versed in computer, from the Government staff, and the Government will pay him. He will work as PA. Should we not be allowed to select like this? Each Member of Parliament should be allowed to select a person from the Government Officers, Government Staff, not below the rank of Upper Division Clerk, or of high level. He can be a Computer Operator, who is well educated, who can help Members of Parliament in their work. A Member of Parliament should be allowed to select a person from the Government Staff, so that he can get all secretarial and personal assistance through him. That is one suggestion.

My good friend, Jairam Ramesh, is asking me how many Members of Parliament are using computers. In asking this question, he is rather supporting me. He does not know perhaps that. He is well-versed in computers; he is an economist and well educated; and, maybe, he has had his education in foreign countries. But, we, the representatives of the people, do not have computer training. We are very ordinary people. We do not know how to use a computer. That is what I am saying. How can they use computers? They should be helped. You don't need it. But I need it. You don't need it. Here is a problem in this House itself.

Some Members can afford to have computer operators. They are very rich people. So, they don't need it. (*Time bell*) But a majority of people need it. I am saying that you don't give any additional monetary benefits. But for operating the computer, each Member of Parliament should get a computer operator.

This is a computer age. We are in the computer age. If one is not able to use computer, if one is not able to use e-mail facility, then he is considered as an inefficient person. You know everything, Sir. So, what I am saying is that each Member of Parliament should be able to make use of a computer. How can each Member of parliament make use of a computer? He should be provided not only with a computer but also with a person who can operate the computer very well — a person knowing IT. That person can be selected from the Government staff. There will not be any additional expenditure. There are thousands of people in the Government staff doing no work, wasting their time because of over-staff. There are a number of such corporations. How many Members of Parliament are here in both the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha? Together, there will be 800 Members. Only 800 persons need to be absorbed from such a sea of staff of the Government of India. I request that this suggestion of mine should be accepted. That will not change the perception.

Sir, my second point is about vehicle. I know half a dozen MPs who don't have a car. They take taxies. I also use taxi many a time. What is the loan amount given today, and what are the interest charges? That should be changed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Please, conclude. There are so many Members.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Sir, I will. I thought I had more time. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): There are so many of us who also want to express their views.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Sir, my second point is about vehicle. I would only say that this loan should be interest free and the loan should be adequate to buy, not a big car, a Maruti-800. It will do. Members of Parliament themselves can drive. The loan should be enough to buy a

Maruti-800 and the loan should be interest free, so that Members of Parliament..(*Interruptions*).. Anybody can learn that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Please, go on.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: My third point is a very important one. Why are general politicians corrupt? It is because of our election system. I am not talking about the Rajya Sabha. But, unfortunately, now I have to say about the Rajya Sabha also. But, let me say, in the election system, enormous expenditure is incurred to elect people's representatives over the years. For every constituency, I am talking about Lok Sabha and Assembly elections, lakhs and lakhs of rupees are incurred. There are some constituencies in Lok Sabha where more than one crore of rupees are spent. Something has to be done. Therefore, along with this, the question....(*Interruptions*).... In that case, in advance, I support that Bill...(*Interruptions*).... Sir, State funding of elections should be considered. That is my third request. Sir, since you said that there are other speakers, with these words, with a special request to the hon. Minister to consider my suggestions, I conclude by saying I support the Bill. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. Knowing fully well that the time is limited, briefly I would like to give this information to this august House that how this Parliamentary system started. It was never a full-time job. People coming from different vocations either doctors, lawyers or businessmen decided to serve the country. And that is why this system started that elected people will serve the country....(*Interruptions*)... I said businessmen, all kinds of people from all walks of life. But the Parliament will sit only in the evenings, from 6 to 10 o'clock. They will do their vocation during the day time and then, they will sit in the evenings and if they do that, they will not depend on anybody else. Now, I am not going into details. All over the world, despite this system, which started a few hundred years ago, slowly, it came to the point that the population has increased, the demands on the politicians have increased and now, it is not a full-time job, but it is three times the full-time job. Somebody operates eight hours a day, but a politician has to work 24 hours a day. And that 24 hours a day and seven days a week not only when he is an MP or not only when he is an MLA, but he has to work even when he is not an MP or an MLA, just because he is a public man, because he is working

for the party, because he is a social worker, he has to work 24 hours. He has to work for his own survival; otherwise, people will forget him. And you can't tell the world that I am not available. Sir, with this kind of a situation, when you have to work 24 hours a day, competition is so much. An MP represents not two million, not three million, but in some constituencies four or five million people while his counterpart in the UK represents about 75,000 people only. The work to be done by the MPs and the expectations by the people are colossal. With this situation, we must consider what is the fate of MPs. We are sitting here; we are talking about ourselves. You have brought forward this Bill. Prof. Kurian just now mentioned about perception. I fully agree that in business, politics and in any walk of life, even my friends, or everybody's family, wife's perception about the husband — it is the only perception. The reality is far away from perception. But, perception matters, there is no doubt about it. But, who is responsible for this kind of perception? You and I, because we ourselves talk very poorly about each other, either within party or outside the party. Such are harsh things and if you do that, naturally, perception will be bad. All my colleagues are sitting here. People talk about corruption. You have also mentioned about it. I would like to submit one thing. This is my third term. MPs have no powers. What power an MP has? By my letter, can Indian Airlines issue a ticket or can the Indian Railways issue a ticket? They will not. There is a quota. I can request that please give this ticket against payment to an individual in an emergency. That is the only power I have got, and that power is only a request. The clerk over there has a power to decide whether he will accept my request or not. I cannot understand how an MP can be corrupt? If you have no powers, you cannot be corrupt. Corruption comes out of power. When there is no power, there can be no corruption. Of course, the media will talk about it. I know a bad fish spoils the entire pond. But it also does not mean that we have to behave like indelphic. We need not be defensive. We have to be courageous to say that all this perception, either with the masses or with the media, is absolutely wrong. In one voice, we have to talk about it. I will not talk about any individual either in that House or in this House. It is not a crime to use a big car; it is not a crime to travel by air or by AC first class. If your family provides for it, what is wrong in it? People like you, Sir, you have joined politics, in whatever form you have come to this House, I am sure, you are losing crores of rupees just

because you decided to serve the country. But you have come at this age when probably, you can afford it. Twenty years before or thirty years before, you also wanted to live and establish yourself. So, it is no more a situation where only 50 above or 60 above are joining the politics. Politics is joined at the college level. They are yet to establish themselves. Who will look after them? They are all human beings. They also need to eat, they also need a house and they also need medicines. But who will do all these things? Therefore, Sir, without going into too much details, this is the only background which I wanted to mention. I support this Bill very strongly. I am not fearful. I do not want to defend, but there is a provision on this. It is very embarrassing. I, as an MP, want to say, I want more, and the Bill should be passed in this House that an M.P. should get more money. It is very embarrassing. It is for this reason that in many countries, there is a system that if any emoluments or salaries or benefits are increased, they are valid for the next set of MPs in the next election. So, if the Lok Sabha passes a Bill today, it will not be applicable to the present set of MPs. It will be applicable to the MPs in the coming elections or after the new Lok Sabha is constituted. In that case, nobody can say that we are biased about it, or we can have a separate panel, a group of people, Justices, Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Speaker, Lok Sabha or eminent citizens, to take a decision what kind of emoluments are required by the MPs. When I say about the requirement, I will request that if you want this perception to be changed, let them also lead a dignified life. You want to give them a 3-bedroom house with one-and-a-half acre of plot, and you want to tell them that you clean it yourself; you want to tell them that you keep this garden like a jungle, you want to tell them that you provide for your own security. Is it possible for an MP to do all that? In the houses in the North Avenue or in the South Avenue, these are the minimum requirements which have to be arranged by anybody. A member of Parliament is not forbidden to have his wife. He is not forbidden to have sons or daughters. They have also to live. They can also have sons or daughters who are going to school or college. They have to pay for their fees and food. I want to ask: Can anybody on earth say that the amount an MP gets is sufficient for him to live a decent life? Is it in any way possible? Forget about decent life. Is it possible to meet the minimum needs of his life? Suppose he goes to somewhere. Suppose I go to Bombay. I take the ticket, probably, out of the emoluments or the

provisions that the Parliament gives. Where do I stay? I go to the guesthouse of an industrialist. He would say, "okay, you use it". If I use his guesthouse, a question is being asked, "What is behind it? " If I ask him to send a car, a question is being asked, "How are you using his car? " If he takes me out for dinner, that will also be questioned. What do I do? You expect an MP to land in Bombay airport, get on a public bus, take four hours to reach Nariman Point, complete his work and come back to the airport. These are all impractical things. I would rather say that every facility required by the MPs should really be provided, at least, in kind. There should be complete security; his complete power requirement should be met; his complete transport requirement should be met. I am not going into the details of the transport requirement and all that. Somebody said that he came by bus. There are one thousand people sitting at my residence. There are hundreds of people sitting to meet me. When the bus comes, will you leave them and just go away immediately? When you are ready, the bus will take 10 or 15 minutes to come. Can MPs spend 10 or 15 minutes just waiting for the bus to come? Is it not a colossal waste of time for an important member of the society, who happens to be a Member of Parliament? All these things, including security, should be provided.

Just now I saw a circular saying that when we leave our home, we should inform the police so that they can look after the house and no theft takes place. When I am sitting at home, what is the security? All kinds of people come to our houses. Why should not proper security be provided? Everybody knows that we have surplus staff either in the PSUs or in different Government Departments. We say, "Reduce them". We can't reduce them. We can't retrench them. What did the earlier Government do in the Indian Airlines? They had a lot of staff. The then Minister said that the best way to use them was, at least, to look after the MPs when they go to the airport. So, the surplus staff was being used to escort the MPs to the aircraft. Likewise, why don't we use the staff, which is already surplus, which is already available? Similarly, whenever any MP goes to any part of the country, it is the bounden duty of the State Governments to provide him conveyance, to provide for his stay, etc., because he represents the country. Then only he will be able to successfully do his work. Then only, if there is any perception that the MPs are corrupt, that will change. So, these are the minimum requirements which have to be provided. Thank you.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं दृढ़ता के साथ इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। 2004 में यह गैर-सरकारी विधेयक लाया गया। श्री ललित सूरी जी को मैं इस विधेयक को लाने के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ। मैं उन्हें इसलिए धन्यवाद नहीं देता हूँ कि उन्होंने यह विधेयक लाया है, बल्कि इसलिए कि उनकी पृष्ठभूमि जैसी है, उसमें संसद सदस्यों के वेतन या भत्ते या सुविधा के बारे में अपनी पृष्ठभूमि के चलते इन्हें चिन्ता नहीं होनी चाहिए, लेकिन एक सांसद के रूप में क्या परेशानी है; सांसदों की क्या समस्या है, इसे ध्यान में रखकर इन्होंने यह विधेयक लाया है। गिल साहब ने बहुत अच्छे तरीके से अपनी बात रखी है। गिल साहब की पृष्ठभूमि हम लोगों, राजनीतिकर्मियों की जैसी नहीं है। वे एक ब्यूरोक्रेट रहे हैं इस हैसियत से जितनी बातें उन्होंने रखी हैं, उसका एहसास उनको नहीं होना चाहिए था, लेकिन एक सांसद के रूप में और सांसद की परेशानी के रूप में जो बदलता हुआ सामाजिक और आर्थिक परिवेश है, उसमें इन्होंने जो बातें रखीं, इसके लिए मैं उन्हें धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

महोदय, संसद सदस्यों को लोक-सेवक घोषित किया गया है। जब हमें लोक-सेवक घोषित किया गया है, तो हमारे पास जो सम्पत्ति है, हमें उसका ब्यौरा देना है, हमारे पास जो दायित्व है, हमें उसका ब्यौरा देना है जो लोक-सेवक हैं, समय-समय पर उनकी जो सुविधा होती है, वेतन होता है, जिस तरह से महंगाई बढ़ती है, जिस तरह से मुद्रा-स्फीति होती है, उसमें उनके जो वेतन बढ़ते हैं, इसके लिए वेतन निर्धारण आयोग बैठता है। लेकिन जब सांसदों की बात आती है, तो लोग बहुत भयभीत हो जाते हैं। वे लोक छवि को लेकर भयभीत हो जाते हैं। वे भयभीत हो जाते हैं कि स्पीडिया हमें क्या कहेगा?

एक बात और आती है कि इसके लिए आयोग बैठया जाए। मैं इसका इसलिए विरोध करता हूँ कि आयोग संसद सदस्यों के वेतन का निर्धारण नहीं करेगा। हमने लोकतंत्र को स्वीकार किया है, लोकतंत्र में संसदीय प्रणाली को स्वीकार किया है। संसदीय प्रणाली में हमें रेसपांसिबल माना गया है कि जब हम लोकतंत्र का संचालन करेंगे, संसदीय प्रणाली का संचालन करेंगे, तो अपने वेतन के बारे में, अपनी सुविधा के बारे में भी समय-समय पर जो परिस्थिति बदलेगी, जो आर्थिक पृष्ठभूमि बदलेगी और जो मुद्रा-स्फीति होगी, उसमें भी संसद सदस्य अपने वेतन-भत्ते का निर्धारण कर सकता है। यह संवैधानिक व्यवस्था है, लेकिन संवैधानिक व्यवस्था में जो अधिकार दिया गया है, उसमें एक बात उठती है कि इसका निर्धारण आयोग करे। आयोग में कौन बैठेंगे? आयोग में बैठेंगे-नौकरशाह। आयोग में कौन बैठेंगे? आयोग में बैठेंगे-न्यायाधीश। ये बैठ कर तय करेंगे कि हमें कितना वेतन चाहिए, कितना भत्ता चाहिए, कितनी सुविधा चाहिए। यही बात हमारे वामपंथी साथी कह रहे थे। हमारी क्या परेशानी है? हमें अपने क्षेत्रों में जाना पड़ता है, तो हमें क्या दिक्कत होती है। एक दिन में हमारे पास कितने तरह के लोग आते हैं। हमें बीमार लोगों की मदद करनी पड़ती है। लोगों को 100 कप चाय पिलानी पड़ती है, समय-समय पर आर्थिक सहयोग करना पड़ता है। आयोग में बैठने वाले लोग इसका निबटारा नहीं कर सकते

हैं, निर्णय नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए यह जो विधेयक लाया गया है, परिस्थिति बदल चुकी है। बहुत दिन पहले यह वेतन बढ़ा, लेकिन लोक-लाज से, इस डर से कि हमारी लोक छवि नष्ट हो जाएगी और मीडिया हमारे खिलाफ बहुत दुष्प्रचार करेगा, इसलिए हमें संसद सदस्यों के वेतन-भत्ते पर नहीं बोलना चाहिए। यही कुछ लोगों का तर्क है। यह तर्क नहीं, बल्कि कुतर्क है। मीडिया तो इसके खिलाफ रहता ही है।

जैसाकि कुरियन साहब ने कहा है, मैं भ्रष्टाचार की चर्चा नहीं करूंगा, उसके परसेप्शन की चर्चा, अवधारणा की चर्चा मैं नहीं करूंगा, जिस अवधारणा के बारे में कहा जाता है कि पोलिटिशियन करप्ट हैं। यही बात कही जाती है।

गिल साहब ने इंग्लैंड के बारे में उदाहरण दिया। इंग्लैंड के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि यह लोकतंत्र की जननी है। लेकिन इंग्लैंड के बारे में जब कहा जाता है कि जो कॉमन लोग हैं, जो कॉमन पीपुल हैं, वे किसे हेट करते हैं, तो यह कहा जाता है कि वे डबल पी को हेट करते हैं—पुलिस एंड पोलिटिशियन को। यह इंग्लैंड में एक कहावत है। लेकिन हम गर्व से मानते हैं कि हमने इंग्लैंड से लोकतंत्र की परंपरा का अनुसरण किया है, वहीं से हमने लोकतंत्र लिया है। महोदय, इसलिए हमें दृढ़ता से इसका सामना करना होगा। मीडिया तो हमारे खिलाफ दुष्प्रचार करेगा, मीडिया ऐसा करेगा। लेकिन जो परिस्थिति बदल गई है, जो आर्थिक और सामाजिक परिवेश पैदा हो गया है, जो महंगाई हो गई है, उसमें संसद सदस्यों का वेतन बढ़े और युक्तिसंगत बढ़े। कितना बढ़े, क्या बढ़े, मैं इसके बारे में नहीं कहूंगा। यह युक्तिसंगत बढ़े और इसका निबटारा होना चाहिए। दूसरी बात कहकर बैठना चाहूंगा कि गाड़ी के बारे में बहुत सारे माननीय सदस्यों ने बातें कही हैं। महोदय, मैं बिहार से आता हूँ जहाँ विधायकों के लिए 3 लाख रुपए का लोन गाड़ी के लिए निर्धारित है और उस पर 1 परसेंट ब्याज देना पड़ता है। मैंने 3 लाख रुपया लिया था और उस पर 1 प्रतिशत के हिसाब से ब्याज दिया। अब झारखंड बिहार से अलग है, वहाँ यह सुविधा ज़्यादा बढ़ी हुई मिलती है। वहाँ इसे 5 लाख रुपए कर दिये गए हैं, लेकिन यहाँ संसद सदस्यों के लिए 1 लाख रुपए का प्रावधान रखा गया है। अभी हमारे भारतीय जनता पार्टी के साथी ने ठीक ही कहा कि अब तो एक लाख रुपए में कोई टैपों भी नहीं खरीद सकता जिससे कि माननीय सदस्य पार्लियामेंट आ सके। इसलिए इस राशि को बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए और 9 प्रतिशत या 12 प्रतिशत सूद तो बिल्कुल अनर्थ है, यह उचित नहीं है। इसलिए यह जो विधेयक लाया गया है, मैं इस का पुरजोर समर्थन करता हूँ।

डा० फागुनी राम: महोदय, आप ने बोलने का मौका दिया, मैं आप के प्रति आभार व्यक्त करता हूँ। एक कहावत है, “भूखे भजन न होए गोपाला, लेहु तू अपनी कंठीमाला।” सन्यासी, जो संसार

4.00 P.M.

से अलग हो जाते हैं, वह भी भगवान से कहते हैं कि अगर हम भूखे हैं तो तुम्हारा भजन नहीं करेंगे, तुम्हारे नाम की यह कंठीमाला वापिस लो जबकि हम लोग तो संसद के सदस्य हैं।

सर, यहां दो महत्वपूर्ण उदाहरण डेमोक्रेसी के दिए गए। हिंदुस्तान संसार में सब से बड़ी डेमोक्रेसी है। हमारी डेमोक्रेसी एक चमकता हुआ सितारा है। यह वह डेमोक्रेसी है जिस में एक मालिक को भी वोट देने का अधिकार है और उसके पहरेदार को भी वोट देने का अधिकार है। यहां जमींदार भी आते हैं, रजवाड़े भी आते हैं और बनिहार के लोग भी यहां आते हैं। यह इंडियन डेमोक्रेसी की विशेषता है। सर, मैं सूरी साहब का आभार व्यक्त करता हूं और दो कारणों से व्यक्त करता हूं। एक तो सूरी साहब सर्वगुण संपन्न हैं जिन्हें साधारण वेतन, भत्ते की याद आयी। उन की याद में गरीब की स्मृति आयी। अगर ऐसे बड़े लोगों के ध्यान में गरीबी आ जाय तो हम गरीबों का बड़ा उद्धार हो जाये। हम लोग चाहते हैं कि ऐसा हो जाए।

सर, यह संसद हिंदुस्तान का सब से बड़ा मंदिर है और यह सब से बड़ा सदन है। हिंदुस्तान में अनेक स्टेट्स हैं जहां की लेजिस्लेटिव एसेंबलीज और काउंसिल्स को अपने वेतन-भत्ते निर्धारित करने का अधिकार है। वे लोग अपने वेतन, भत्ते, पेंशन निर्धारित करते हैं। कुछ ऐसे स्टेट्स हैं जहां के माननीय सदस्य को इस सर्वोच्च सदन के एम्पली से एक नहीं अनेक गुना ज्यादा पेंशन, भत्ता और सुविधा मिलती है। हम लोग ट्रेन में आते हैं तो देखते हैं कि एक्स एम्पली को भी बड़ी आसानी से वे लोग साइड वाली बर्थ दे देते हैं और कहते हैं कि आप साइड वाली बर्थ ले लीजिए। अब आप झारखंड में देखें, वहां एक्स एम्पली 50 हजार रुपया एअर ट्रेवल पर खर्च कर सकता है। जैसे हम लोग नाम देते हैं और टिकट आ जाता है, वैसे झारखंड में एक्स एम्पली लोग देते हैं और उन को 50 हजार रुपए लिमिट तक का हवाई जहाज का टिकट मिल जाता है। यह आप देखिए, कहने के लिए तो वे स्टेट के एक्स एम्पली हैं। ऐसी हमारे यहां अनेक स्टेट्स हैं और उन स्टेट्स की सरपरस्त यह संसद है। अब अगर स्टेट से भी हम को कम मिलता है तो यह थोड़ी विचारणीय बात है।

हमारे सरकारी सेवक हैं और कई स्टेट्स हैं जहां सेक्रेटरी रैंक के ऑफिसर हैं, कैबिनेट स्टेट्स के लोग हैं, लेकिन हमारा एक प्रिविलेज है और बड़े लोग भी साधारण एम्पली को नमस्कार करते हैं, बड़े आदर के साथ बैठते हैं। लेकिन जब हम वेतन, भत्ते व पेंशन के बारे में सोचते हैं तो हमारी तुलना उन के सब से छोटे कर्मचारी से भी नहीं हो पाती है। तो यह एक बड़ा विरोधाभास है। कहां हमारा सम्मान और हमारा जीविकोपार्जन? इन दोनों में बहुत बड़ा अन्तर है। हुजूर, कोई भी एम्पली, जैसा मैंने अभी कहा कि एक गरीब भी एम्पली हो जाता है, मैं भी उनमें से एक हूं। यह नेहरू परिवार की कृपा है। हमारे दादा शूट एट साईट में मारे गए थे। आज हमारे जैसा साधारण लड़का आप जैसे बड़े लोगों के समक्ष है। हम भी आप जैसे सर्वगुण-सम्पन्न लोगों के समक्ष एक माननीय सदस्य कहे जाते हैं। यह डेमोक्रेसी की, कांग्रेस की, संविधान-निर्माताओं की विशेषता है।

जब लोग एक्स एम्पी हो जाते हैं और जो साधारण परिवार से या गरीब परिवार से होते हैं, तो कोई उनकी तरफ जाकर नहीं देखता कि उनकी क्या स्थिति है। मैं बहुत ईमानदारी से कह रहा हूँ कि क्या उनके पास इतनी शक्ति रहती है कि वे दिल्ली आ सकें? वेस्टर्न कोर्ट का किराया 300-400 रुपए पर डे हो गया है। अगर कोई एम्पी वहां 8 दिन भी रहता है या कोई एक्स एम्पी वहां 10 दिनों भी रह जाते हैं तो उनके $10 \times 300 = 3000$ रुपए खर्च हो जाते हैं। जो मिनिमम पेंशन पर हैं, उनका पैसा तो केवल उनके वेस्टर्न कोर्ट के किराए पर खर्च हो जाता है। वह पेंशन में 3000 रुपए लेकर अपना खर्च कैसे चलाएंगे? कैसे क्या करेंगे? हमें यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है।

यहां हम सब लोग समान हैं। यह डेमोक्रेसी है, यह धर्म-सभा है, यह धर्म-संसद है, जहां राजा और प्रजा समान है। यहां न तो कोई छोटा है और न ही कोई बड़ा है। हम सब लोग गौरव से लिखते हैं—“माननीय सदस्य, राज्य सभा”। लेकिन, इसके बाद हम जब घर जाते हैं या गरीब सांसद जब घर जाते हैं, तब उन्हें याद आती है कि हम संसद सदस्य कैसे हैं? यह कल्पना किया जाए। मैं एक शब्द-चरित्र प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूँ। अगर एक एक्स एम्पी या एम्पी की लड़की की शादी हो तो जब खर्च करने के लिए सोचने-विचारने बैठता है, तो उसको संसद सदस्य की प्रतिष्ठा याद आती है। संसद सदस्य का स्टेटस याद आता है। संसद सदस्य जैसे अपनी बेटियों की शादी करते हैं, वह सब याद आता है। बड़े लोग जैसे अपनी बेटियों की शादी करते हैं, वह सब याद आता है। लेकिन, जब वह अपनी आर्थिक स्थिति के बारे में सोचता है, तो उसकी आंखों में आंसू आ जाते हैं कि वह इतना भी समर्थ नहीं है कि अपनी मिनिमम प्रतिष्ठा के अनुरूप भी अपनी बेटी की शादी कर सके। हर कोई चाहता है कि उसकी बेटी की शादी अच्छी जगह में की जाए और अच्छे ढंग से की जाए।

मैंने डेमोक्रेसी की बहुत बड़ाई की, कांग्रेस की बड़ाई की, कांग्रेस के नेताओं की बड़ाई की, जिनकी वजह से हम लोग यहां हैं। लेकिन, हम ऐसे लोगों को भी जानते हैं, जो यहां नहीं हैं, मैं उनका नाम नहीं लूंगा। ऐसे एम्पी, जो किसी स्टेट के चीफ मिनिस्टर रहे, जो किसी स्टेट के मिनिस्टर और 10-10, 15-15 सालों तक एम्एलए रहे, लेकिन जब वे एम्एलए या एम्पी नहीं रहे या चीफ मिनिस्टर नहीं रहे, तो उनको खाने के लाले भी पड़ गए। ऐसी भी स्थिति आई कि उनके मरणोपरान्त उनके पास कफन के कपड़े तक का पैसा नहीं था, जिससे कि उन्हें उनके पैसों से जलाया जा सके। वहां के हमदर्द लोगों ने चंदा इकट्ठा करके कफन का पैसा लाया और उनको जलाया। जिस प्रकार गांधी जी के श्राद्ध के रूप में हर जगह चंदा इकट्ठा करके खिचड़ी बांटी गई थी, वैसे ही उनका श्राद्ध किया गया।

महोदय, यह भी देखा जाए कि एम्पी ऐसे भी होते हैं। एक एम्पी होने के बाद उसका स्टेटस बढ़ जाता है, सामाजिक प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ जाती है। हम अपने को बढ़ायेँ चाहे नहीं बढ़ायेँ,

लेकिन लोग समझते हैं कि यह एम्पी रहा है, यह मिनिस्टर रहा है, यह एक एम्पल रहा है। परन्तु जब वह चलता है तो उसका एक मोटरसाईकिल खरीदने तक का सामर्थ्य नहीं होता, उसका रिक्शा पर बढ़ने तक का सामर्थ्य नहीं होता। उसके पास किसी होटल में नाश्ता करने का सामर्थ्य नहीं होता। वह अच्छी तरह से नाश्ता नहीं कर सकता है। बस की बात तो छोड़िए, न वह किराए पर जा सकता है, न स्कूटर खरीद सकता है और न साईकिल से जा सकता है। वह बेचारा क्या करे? थका-हारा, भूख का मारा, गरीबी का मारा, पथ पर पैदल चलता जाता है। चाहे लोग उन्हें देख कर हँसें या वह खुद अपनी हालत पर रोए।

महोदय, मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इतनी बात तो जरूर है कि हम लोग संसद के सदस्य हैं। हमको भी यह अच्छा नहीं लगता है कि हम भी अपना वेतन और पेंशन-भत्ता बढ़ाने की मांग करें। लेकिन, इतनी बात तो होनी चाहिए कि जैसे हम लोग किसी ऑफिस में जाते हैं तो हम लोगों को प्रिविलेज है कि बड़े-से-बड़े पदाधिकारी हम लोगों में से किसी को भी, चाहे वह गरीब हो या अमीर हो, सदस्य रहे हों या एक्स-एम्पी हों या सिटिंग मैम्बर हो, उनको रिसीव करके आदर के साथ बैठते हैं। लेकिन जब पेंशन पाते हैं और घर आते हैं, तो याद पड़ता है कि पद एक चीज है, परन्तु सबसे बड़ी और स्थाई चीज उसकी गरीबी है, जो उसका अपना आधार है। जो उसका अपना आधार है, वही आधार है। इसके बारे में सोचना जाना चाहिए। मैं यह नहीं कहूँगा कि साहब, कितना दें या कितना मिले। मैं यह भी नहीं कहूँगा कि क्या मिले या क्या न मिले, लेकिन इतना जरूर कहूँगा कि एक पूर्व सांसद की जो प्रतिष्ठा बन जाती है, उसके रहने-सहने, चलने-फिरने, खाने-पीने, रोटी, कपड़ा, मकान, परिवहन की व्यवस्था के लिए जो खर्चा होता है, जो धोया हुआ कपड़ा, साफ कपड़ा, अच्छी तरह चलने के लिए पैर में अच्छे जूते हों, उसके अनुरूप उसे अपनी सामाजिक प्रतिष्ठा बनाए रखने के लिए इतना मिनिमम साधन तो मिल ही जाना चाहिए। यह एक वरदान होगा। जैसे डेमोक्रेसी में वरदान है कि कुछ लोग यहां आते हैं, उसी तरह से उनके लिए यह भी एक वरदान होगा कि उनको अपने जीवन-पर्यंत किसी पर निर्भर नहीं करना पड़ेगा। मेरा यही आग्रह होगा कि वे अपना जीवन अपने आप पाल ले, इतना तो उनको मिलना ही चाहिए।

महोदय, मैं ललित सूरी जी के प्रति आभार व्यक्त करता हूँ कि उन्हें गरीबी याद आई और वे इस बिल को सदन में लाए। मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। अंत में एक कवि की बात कहते हुए अपनी बात खत्म करूँगा—

साईं इतना दीजिए, जामे कुटुम्ब समाए।

मैं भी भूखा न रहूँ, साधू न भूखा जाए।

हम समझते हैं कि इसी भाव से इस बिल पर विचार किया जाना चाहिए। इसी के साथ ही हम आपके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करते हैं। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you have done us proud at the apex court and you have done us proud here as a participant in the debates and you have enlightened our mind. It is my privilege that you will be in the Chair because my case is that I want to convert you and Mr. Jairam Ramesh to consider in due course of time as to what has been said by Mr. Suri and others. I had no intention of speaking on this. But, Mr. Jairam Ramesh the intellectual in his own right provoked me to say something. Today, when I rise at the fog end of the day, I am telling you that I am not going to repeat what other Members have said. Many opinions were expressed, may be by way of analysis, some suggestions will be close to what has been suggested. But, these are fresh things in my mind. These are minor amendments by Mr. Suri, and I readily accept these suggestions. But, these are minor suggestions. Actually, there is a situation in my mind that people like you cannot be readily invited to support an argument. It will take some time. But, today, I start with you and with Mr. Jairam Ramesh. I agree with Mr. Jairam Ramesh on one thing. Initially, I thought that he was playing to the gallery. Many of us are so afraid of journalists. The case has not been explained to the journalists. We must sit in a press conference with the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Mr. Suresh Pachouri, with you people, Mr. Jairam Ramesh and myself and we explain to the community of journalists that Mr. Jairam Ramesh played to the gallery, but he raised a very important point. I will wait for a day, when we have decided that we are not increasing our perks and salaries. So, there has to be a system in the Ministry of Finance in this regard. We must ask for a qualitatively different amendment so that others do it, as far as monetary increments are concerned. Sometimes, it is not acceptable to persons like me that we should say, 'give us this pension and give us this salary'. This is not good. So, some mechanism has to be asked for in this regard. But, as for privileges and facilities, I have some ideas. Mr. Jairam Ramesh represented a different school of thought. And, you, not only as a learned jurist but also as a person with vast knowledge because I saw the other day when you quoted Shakespeare and Lord Keynes. See, Lord Keynes was in his own time the top-most economist in the world, and you quoted him extensively. What you talked about Keynes showed that you have knowledge of Economics also. I salute you.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, some extra time should be given to Prof. Soz.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: No, no. Since Jairam Ramesh gave a short shrift to what was being asked, therefore. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I object to the words 'playing to the gallery'.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: No, no. When you said that it is not needed, I said that it was like playing to the gallery. When you said we should not be increasing it, at that time I thought it was a very serious suggestion. Yes, the price index should be kept in view, some institutionalisation. You think you are an economist, you think who should do it. But, let me tell you, my case is that Indian Parliamentarians are the lowest paid in the world. I can give one or two examples. I have not applied my mind fully on it, and I can give so many examples in future debates. There were so many delegations here. The U.S. delegation came here and I calculated; the European Union delegation came here. Recently, there was a Malaysian delegation and we were sitting and all of a sudden we discussed the facilities of MPs. An MP in Malaysia gets 15,000 Ringets per month, in cash, and when I calculated, I found that we are getting less than one-third of a Malaysian Member of Parliament. As compared to Pakistan, we are very low. In fact, there was a social gathering. This is my argument before the House. We must become very serious about it because the dignity of the Members of Parliament, because of so many things, is impaired.

My brother, Shri Faguni Ram was saying that they become paupers. He was saying that some MP was living like that. I will give an example, although this is not my theme. Choudhary Mohammed Shefia of Jammu was very critically ill. He was an ex-MP at that time. I was told that he had no money even to buy medicines. So, when I reached that place somebody was attending on him. We had to raise a donation for him. It is painful for the mind and heart to say that I offered some money immediately and we did something and then asked the Jammu and Kashmir Resident Commissioner. Unfortunately, he died after 4-5 days. He had no bank balance, no home of his own, nothing. No money even for medicines! It is on record. There are other kinds of people, saints like Hazarat Mohani. That is a different category. In fact, we did not know then what this Parliament was. I think, we must have such models before us. Hazarat Mohani was not only a poet but was a great freedom fighter too. He would not draw pay as an MP. He lived in a mosque, in a small room. Jawaharlal Nehru went to meet him with a cheque of

Rs. 20,000 to offer to Hazarat Mohani. It is on record. But he refused. He said, "I was fighting a battle against the British but never did I think that I would become a Member of Parliament and there would be a pay." That cheque was re-deposited. But that was Hazarat Mohani.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is said in Urdu, *इस्तेगनम*। You are so great; you may have a lot of money but you want to be poor. There is a choice. He opted for that because he was a freedom fighter of a different category. He died without any property but he was of a different kind. But, an average MP would like to live in dignity and die in peace.

Sir, we are the lowest paid. Let us go into the question whether we are the lowest paid or not. But I do not emphasize it so much when I say that we are the lowest paid because I have something else in mind to say, of facilities that a legislator should get. We are not getting those facilities. It is a miserable life for those who want to read and write, who want to contribute to the debates, who want to be some kind of good legislators. The U.S. legislator—this is what I wanted to say when I said Jairam Ramesh played to the gallery; it is not a derogatory phrase....

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: I too had opposed it. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: The Left has been playing to the gallery all the time. But I am telling this House, to those whosoever is present here: Let us join and attend a press conference and enlighten the mind of every journalist. Then we will win the battle. Sir, there was a delegation of US Senators and on the conclusion of the discussion, they said, "How do you legislate, how do you do it?" — The House of Representatives or in the Senate they have roughly 30 members staff. There is a full-fledged lawyer or an advocate or a jurist helping a Member of Parliament. He gives an idea and the rest of the work is done by somebody. When he goes to Parliament, he has everything ready before. Here an MP has to struggle all by himself. In fact, they did ask, "How do you manage your business, how do you go to the Parliament?" I said casually, "We go unprepared and whatever we know, we say while debating in the Parliament." So, we must know how many people help a Legislator in America so that he or she goes prepared to the Senate or the House of Representatives. We must have some staff and not the way—that the MPs may not do that — that we have Rs. 10,000 to recruit a person. Somebody was suggesting about computer. You see, it has to be a

regular programme. There has to be some assistance. Give us three or four people and compare us with the American legislators. India is a very important country. We are legislators; they are legislators. As for our democracy, I think when I speak here I say we are compared to American democracy. In fact, they failed even to count votes at some point of time and there was a dispute as to who will be the President of that country. We have tested, time-tested institution of Election Commission. Our democracy has become mature enough and we have to legislate for a billion people. We have to become an example for the developing world particularly in Asia. I cannot take time of the House to tell you how Asian countries are now looking at us as compared to China. A majority of them is looking at India for leadership. That is the role of a legislator. Give us assistance; give us help. somebody should work for us. ...*(Interruptions)*... But, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you tell me where do we sit in the Parliament to read and write. There are no cubicles for us to read, write, and telephone. There is no telephone available to us. There is one telephone. As soon as this House completes its Business, the House will adjourn and then the doors and windows will get closed and all these telephones will be lost to us. Where do we go for a telephone? One single telephone, which I tried to make two — as he took notice and he placed two — in the Ground Floor Library, we cannot sit. Telephone is a private situation. Before MPs there are journalists and other kinds of people. I do not grudge. There must be facilities for journalists who help us to publicise our debates. I do not grudge journalists who are coming to our room for taking meals alongside. We do not grudge that because they also deserve respect. But give MPs facilities. We must be able to use a telephone. In the Annexe, there is no telephone facility for us. I have been fighting a battle for a single telephone. They put a zero. All right. But there is no telephone facility; there is no cubicle. If you get a guest, where do you sit with the guest? He is a very important person or she is a very important person if he or she comes to meet you because you are a Legislator, you are a Member of Parliament, you cannot sit anywhere. Tell me. They ask for increase in the wages of MPs. I ask for facilities. We go to the Notice Office, sit all the time with the officer and sometimes we do not allow him to work. This is what we do.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Will you take more time?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: We do not have even a place where ...*(Interruptions)*... I will tell you how it happens. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I had a plastic handbag, a little bigger than this. I wanted to keep that in the pigeonhole. Nobody uses these pigeonholes. I am one of a few Members who use these pigeonholes. I had to go to meet the Prime Minister and I had to keep this handbag, which is bigger than this. I tried to keep in the pigeonhole, but it could not be placed there. I was puzzled and then I went to the Typing Pool and gave it to the person who often types my papers. Later in the day, I tell you honestly, Sir, I had forgotten where I had kept my bag. Then, I had to think of getting a smaller bag so that I can place it in the pigeonhole. That is the tragedy of Members of Parliament. We must know what is happening in other parts of the world. Is it a fact or not? Can anybody do a rebuttal and tell me? In fact, I had totally forgotten and that fellow from the type-pool came in the PC lobby searching for me that I had forgotten that handbag there.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You want a separate office for a Member of Parliament?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: There has to be an office or some place where you can invite a friend, order a cup of tea, sit there, write your notes, prepare for the Parliament. I told the Americans I go to Parliament unprepared. Let me tell you the life of an MP. Only five to six days ago, after the close of the House I went to my home. In fact, I was exercising my mind that I must immediately ask my servant to give me coffee. But when I entered there was a heart patient from Srinagar. And, lo and behold, I could not order my cup of coffee, I had to go in my own car to the All India Institute, fight a battle till I found a bed after three hours. There is no mistake on the part of the doctors. They showed courtesy. I think MPs get courtesy which they deserve. I wanted to be in the queue but they showed courtesy but it took me three hours. I came to my home at 10 O' clock. I had not taken that cup of tea or coffee. This cannot happen to an average Member of Parliament in UK. This cannot be done and this will never be done in America. They put their own parents in the old-age homes. We are a different country. हमारी मर्यादा अलग चीज की है, हमारी सभ्यता अलग चीज की है इसलिए शायद हमारा कंस्टीट्यूशन भी हमारे हाल के मुताबिक बनाया गया है। I could not take coffee while the patient

was waiting. This is an MP's plight. We had the Western Court where sometimes we could keep guests. It is a guest accommodation. But I request you, I beg of you and my brother Mr. Jairam Ramesh, accompany me to the Western Court. A doctor who had a sister had to be admitted. I got them room allotted and you would see how dirty that place is. Built in English time, they charge some money but it is not a room where any civilised person can live. I have often been saying, 'why don't you demolish and raise some floors to that,' I am inviting you because you have to see and realise it. It is insulting to keep a guest there. The staff there should be transferred. They should be * from Delhi. You cannot get a tumbler of water for your guest.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Don't use the word, * and all that.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: They are not doing their duty.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Mr. Soz, kindly wind up. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: They are also saying that MPs are not doing their duty. It is not correct to say that they are not doing their duty. They are also working for something. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: You also come with me and I will show you what is happening in the Western Court. I don't want to use this word although it is not unparliamentary. That should be expunged. But I say you can take them for trying somewhere else and you can build that hostel in a better way. Why don't you visit it? I was only stressing, Sir, that the legislators have to have some facilities. I do not pray very strongly for a raise in monetary emoluments but the facilities are so many, I could go on and go on but this is the fag end. For instance, in MPLADS there is no assessment, which MP is doing, good work or if somebody is doing good work it goes waste. There is no assessment. There is no feedback which is dependable. For instance, I would say, MPLADS money is in the bank and it earns some interest. Out of that interest or from somewhere, there should be a laptop available to the MPs who want to work. Even a camera can be given where he can just shoot the site where he wants to make an improvement. In fact, I was already in the Privilege Motion. I was bracketed with those people including you, at one point of time. Thirteen people or more had been

*Not recorded

bracketed with MPs who had not spent a penny. I moved a Privilege Motion against that journalist and against that paper. That is a separate question. My point is, earlier I had opposed the MPLAD Scheme. Today, my case is: Please have a mechanism to understand how money is being allocated by the Deputy Commissioner and help the Members of Parliament to record things on the computer. It should be possible from that little money that accrued to MPLADS funds through interest. That is the facility that the Members of Parliament should have. You help us. We are, basically, Members of Parliament. We are, basically, legislators. Help us, through facilities, to become legislators and help us to contribute to the might of the nation. Thank you.

मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आजमी: शुक्रिया सदर मोहतरम। प्रोफेसर सोज साहब की पुरसोज तकरीर के बाद, जो बहुत ही दिल की अथाह गहराइयों से मसायल के हल को तलाश करने के लिए आपसे निवेदन कर रहे थे। मैं ललित सूरी साहब के इस प्राईवेट मेम्बर बिल का समर्थन और खैरमकदम करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

सर, जरूरत पर बहस आगे बढ़ायें, तो बगावत है, हंसाएं तो बगावत है, रूलाएं तो बगावत है। मेम्बरान-ए-पार्लियामेंट की जरूरतें, उनकी तनख्वाह का बढ़ाया जाना, उनके अलाउंस को और ज्यादा किया जाना और उनको प्राईवेट कार के लिए लोन का दिया जाना, इन तमाम तर चीजों पर हमारे साथियों ने बहुत तफसील से बात की है और जरूरत ईजाद की मां होती है जिसके तहत इस हाउस में यह आवाज उठी है। सर, हर काम के दो पहलू होते हैं या तो उससे अच्छाई निकल कर सामने आती है या बुराई निकलकर आती है, मगर काम को नहीं रोका जा सकता। कोशिश यह करनी चाहिए कि काम के पेट से अच्छाइयां पैदा हों, अच्छे संकेत जायें और लोगों को अच्छा पैगाम और मैसेज मिले। पूरे मुल्क से तकरीबन आठ, साढ़े आठ सौ मेम्बरान-ए-पार्लियामेंट हिन्दुस्तान की तामीर और तरक्की पर, हिन्दुस्तान की आवाम की तामीर और तरक्की पर, उनकी बेरोजगारी के ख़ात्मे के लिए, उनकी तालीम के लिए, उनकी अच्छी सेहत के लिए, अच्छे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को हिन्दुस्तान में कायम रखने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की दाखिला और ख़ारिजा पालिसी को नेकनाम बनाकर बाम-ए-उरूज तक पहुंचाने के लिए, इस हाउस में तशरीफ लाते हैं, बहस करते हैं, मेहनत करते हैं और इससे हिन्दुस्तान की एक तस्वीर बनती है। मुल्क का कोई ऐसा मसला नहीं है, जिस मसले पर हमारी मुअज्जिज पार्लियामेंट में बहस न होती हो, अपोजीशन भी और हुकूमत भी, दोनों के मुख्तलिफ विचार हो सकते हैं, मुख्तलिफ तरीक-ए-कार हो सकते हैं, मगर मकसद दोनों का एक है। मकसद यह है कि हमारे मुल्क को बड़प्पन मिले, हिन्दुस्तान बुलंदी की चोटी पर पहुंचे और सारी दुनिया के तरक्कीयाफ़्त मुमालिक के मुकाबले में हिन्दुस्तान का एक अनोखा और इनफरादी मुकाम बने

और हम फक्र के साथ कह सकें, “सारे जहाँ से अच्छा, हिन्दोस्तां हमारा, हम बुलबले हैं इसकी, ये गुलसितां हमारा”। आज इस मुल्क को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए, हमारे ये दोनों मुअज्जिज हाउस जिसे हम अपर हाउस और लॉअर हाउस के नाम से याद करते हैं, इनमें बैठने वाले पब्लिक के नुमाइंदा अफराद मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट की हैसियत से आते हैं और वे पब्लिक के माफी ज़मीर को अदा करते हुए, हिन्दुस्तान की तामीर और तरक्की की राहें इस्त्वार करते हैं। इन हज़रात को कौन सी सहूलियत मिलनी चाहिए और कौन सी सहूलियत नहीं मिलनी चाहिए। जो लोग तनकीद करते हैं, टिप्पणी करते हैं और यह कहते हैं कि इन्हें सहूलियतें नहीं मिलनी चाहिए, उनसे मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वे अपने सीने पर भी हाथ रखकर सोचें कि क्या बगैर किसी सहूलियत के इतने बड़े मुल्क की तामीर-ओ-तरक्की का काम अधूरा नहीं रह जाएगा? एक आदमी यहां पैसा लेने के लिए नहीं आ रहा है, तनख्वाह लेना उसका असल मकसद नहीं है, बल्कि उसकी उन ज़रूरियात का पूरा किया जाना उसका असल मकसद है, जिन ज़रूरियात को अगर यहां पूरा कर दिया गया तो आसानी के साथ वह मुल्क को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए अपने दिल-दिमाग का इस्तेमाल कर सकता है। मैं ईरान के एक बादशाह की कहानी पढ़ रहा था, जिसमें उन्होंने अपनी फौज के एक माहिर ईमानदार मुंशी से यह कहा था कि तुम रूट तय करो कि फौज को किस साइड से मार्च करना चाहिए और दुश्मनों पर हमे फतेहयाबी कैसे मिलेगी। वह पूरी प्लानिंग कर रहे थे, लिख रहे थे, उसी आलम में उनका एक नन्हा सा बच्चा घर से बाहर आया और उसने कहा कि बाबा, घर में आट नहीं है। यह कहकर वह बच्चा चला गया और जब यह एक्शन प्लान बादशाह-ए-वक्त के सामने लाया गया और बादशाह-ए-वक्त इस एक्शन प्लान को पढ़कर बहुत खुश हो रहा था कि हमारे काबिल फौजी माहिर ने इतना अच्छा एक्शन प्लान बनाया है, जिसके ज़रिए हमें अपने दुश्मनों को दबोचने में आसानी होगी। पढ़ते-पढ़ते बादशाह-ए-वक्त एक जगह रुक गया क्योंकि उस एक्शन प्लान में एक जगह यह भी लिखा हुआ था कि बाबा, घर में आट नहीं है। बादशाह परेशान हो गया कि आखिर इस फौजी मूवमेंट के एक्शन प्लान में यह कौन सा एक्शन है कि बाबा, घर में आट नहीं है। अज़ यह करना चाहता हूँ कि सहूलियात अगर नहीं होती है, काम बढ़ा होता है, जिम्मेदारियां बढ़ी होती हैं तो कभी-कभी आदमी खुदगज़ियों का शिकार होकर अपनी जिम्मेदारियों से सुबकदोष होने के बजाय अपनी जिम्मेदारियों से मुनहरिफ हो जाता है और इसका नुकसान मुल्क को होता है, आवाम को होता है और देश की तामीर-ओ-तरक्की को होता है। अपने साथियों की तरह मैं फिर इस बात को दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि कोई आदमी तनख्वाह नहीं बढ़वाना चाहता बल्कि उन तमामतर सहूलियतों को जरूर चाहता है जिन सहूलियतों के ज़रिए मुल्क के आवाम के लिए सहूलियत पैदा की जाए। वे सारी बातें यहां आ चुकी हैं जिन्हें मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता। सौ आदमी अगर एक एमपी से मिलने आते हैं, उसका अखलाकी फर्ज़ है कि एक गिलास पानी उन्हें पिलाए, एक कप चाय उन्हें पिलाए। हर इंसान का अखलाकी फर्ज़ होता है, उसके दरवाजे

पर जब लोग जाते हैं तो वह कोशिश करता है कि आने वाले की मेहमान-नवाजी की जाए और अच्छे मेज़बान के रूप में उसको याद किया जाए, अच्छे अखलाकमंद आदमी की हैसियत से उसको पहचाना जाए। फिर यहां जो आवाम के नुमाइंदे हैं, जिनकी ज़िम्मेदारियां तो इस सिलसिले में और भी बढ़ जाती हैं। वे लोग, जो लोक सभा में चुनकर आते हैं, उनकी ज़िम्मेदारियां, मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे मुकाबले में बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ जाती हैं क्योंकि लोग अपनी ज़रूरतों के पेश-ए-नज़र एमपीज़ के पास आते हैं। इसके अलावा जो धारणा बनी हुई है कि एमपी बहुत दौलतमंद होता है, उस धारणा को तो उसी दिन रिजेक्ट कर दिया जाता है, जिस दिन वह चुनकर आता है। किस मुसीबत के साथ वह चुन करके आता है, कितने सहयोग के साथ उसको चुना जाता है, पार्टी जो पैसे उसको इलैक्शन में जीतने के लिए देती है, वह तो एक अलग सी बात है, उसके दोस्त-अहबाब चंदा करके उसको जितवाने में जिस तरह उसकी मदद करते हैं, ये सारी चीजें खुद बतलाती हैं कि वे एक ऐसे आदमी को रुपया-पैसा लगाकर, त्याग और कुर्बानी के ज़रिए संसद और पार्लियामेंट में भेज रहे हैं जो आदमी वहां जाकर उनके इलाके की तामीर और तरक्की में भरपूर हिस्सा लेगा और हिन्दुस्तान की दाखिली और खारिजा पॉलिसी को इतना मजबूत बनाएगा कि सारी दुनिया जब हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ देखे तो हिन्दुस्तान में बैठने वाले मੈबरान-ए-पार्लियामेंट की वह सराहना भी करे कि उनके दिलो-दिमाग में और उनको सरकार की तरफ से दी गयी सहूलियत के पेशे-नज़र इतने बड़े करानामें उन्होंने अंजाम दिए हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया के तरक्की-याफ़्ता मुल्कों के मुकाबले में शान और फख के साथ खड़ा हुआ है। कंप्यूटर की बात, जानकारी की बात - जब तक जानकारी नहीं होगी, यहां बोला क्या जाएगा और सच्ची बात यह है कि यह दौर इतना ज्यादा तरक्की-याफ़्ता हो चुका है कि जो लोग पिछले ज़माने के लोग हैं, जो पचास साल पहले होश रखते थे, आज के दिन कंप्यूटर की भाषा को समझना उनके लिए कितना मुश्किल काम है, यह आपसे छुपा हुआ नहीं है। हम लोग भी कंप्यूटर की जुबान नहीं जानते। इस हाउस में खड़े होकर अपने देश के लिए कुछ कर गुज़रने की दिल में ख्वाहिश ज़रूर रखते हैं। कंप्यूटर ने बहुत सारी मुसीबतों को हल कर दिया है, मगर कंप्यूटर के ज़रिए अपने प्रॉब्लम्स को हल करने के लिए हमें एक हैंड की ज़रूरत होगी, एक दिमाग की ज़रूरत होगी और मैं समझता हूं कि मुल्क की तरक्की और खुशहाली के लिए, इस मुल्क के एमपीज़ और देश के नुमाइंदों को, वे सारी सहूलियतें ज़रूर दी जानी चाहिए, जिनके ज़रिए इनका फायदा कम और मुल्क का फायदा ज्यादा हो। ललित सूरि साहब को मैं फिर एक मर्तबा मुबारकबाद देता हूं कि इल तमामतर मसायल को सामने रखते हुए वे यह बिल लाए हैं और मैं गर्वनमेंट से भी यह गुज़ारिश करूंगा कि इसको कद्र की निगाह से देखा जाना चाहिए। टीका-टिप्पणी की बात होती है, कोई ऐसा काम नहीं होता जिस पर टीका-टिप्पणी न हो। अच्छे काम पर टीका-टिप्पणी होती है, बुरे काम की भी लोग निंदा करते हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि यह कहीं से कोई बुरा काम नहीं है, जिसकी निंदा की जाए। रह गई बात इस बात की कि इसके

ज़रिए लोग अमीर बनना चाहते हैं या इसके ज़रिए बहुत पैसा इनको मिल जाएगा, यह बात न अक्ल में आने वाली है, न इल्म में आने वाली है। आपका बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया जो आपने मुझे वक्त दिया, मैं उनकी भरपूर ताईद करते हुए अपनी बात को खत्म करता हूँ, जय हिन्द।

† [مولانا عبید اللہ خان اعظمی ”مدھیہ پرویش“ : شکر یہ صدر محترم! پروفیسر سوز صاحب کی

پرسوز تقریر کے بعد، جو بہت ہی دل کی اتھاہ گہرائیوں سے مسائل کے حل کو تلاش کرنے کے لئے آپ سے نویدن کر رہے تھے۔ میں اہلّت سوری صاحب کے اس پرائیویٹ ممبر بل کا سر قہن اور خیر مقدم کرنے کے لئے کھڑا ہوا ہوں۔

سر، ضرورت پر بحث آگے بڑھائیں، تو بغاوت ہے، ہنسائیں تو بغاوت ہے، رلائیں تو بغاوت ہے۔ ممبران پارلیمنٹ کی ضرورتیں، ان کی تنخواہ کا بڑھایا جانا، ان کے الاؤنس کو اور زیادہ کیا جانا اور ان کو پرائیویٹ کار کے لئے لون کا دیا جانا، ان تمام چیزوں پر ہمارے ساتھیوں نے بہت تفصیل سے بات کی ہے اور ضرورت ایجاد کی ماں ہوتی ہے جس کے تحت اس ہاؤس میں یہ آواز اٹھی ہے۔ سر، ہر کام کے دو پہلو ہوتے ہیں یا تو اس سے اچھائی نکل کر سامنے آتی ہے یا برائی نکل کر آتی ہے، مگر کام کو روکا نہیں جاسکتا۔ کوشش یہ کرنی چاہئے کہ کام جیسے پیٹ سے اچھائیاں پیدا ہوں، اچھے سنگیت جائیں اور لوگوں کو اچھے پیغام اور مسیج ملے۔ پورے ملک سے تقریباً آٹھ، ساڑھے آٹھ سو ممبران پارلیمنٹ ہندوستان کی تعمیر اور ترقی پر، ہندوستان کی عوام کی تعمیر اور ترقی پر، ان کی بے روزگاری کے خاتمے کے لئے، ان کی تعلیم کے لئے، ان کی اچھی صحت کے لئے، اچھے ایڈنٹریشن کو ہندوستان میں قائم رکھنے کے لئے، ہندوستان کی داخلہ اور خارجہ پالیسی کو نیک نام بنا کر باقاعدہ عروج تک پہنچانے کے لئے، اس ہاؤس میں تشریف لاتے ہیں، بحث کرتے ہیں، محنت کرتے ہیں اور اس سے ہندوستان کی ہلکیہ تصویر بنتی ہے۔ ملک کا کوئی ایسا مسئلہ نہیں ہے، جس

مسئلے پر ہماری معزز پارلیمنٹ میں بحث نہ ہوتی ہو، اپوزیشن بھی اور حکومت بھی، دونوں کے مختلف وچار ہو سکتے ہیں، مختلف طریق کار ہو سکتے ہیں، مگر مقصد دونوں کا ایک ہے۔ مقصد یہ ہے کہ ہمارے ملک کو

برکین پوتھی، ہندوستان بلندی کی چوٹی پر پہنچے اور ساری دنیا کے ترقی یافتہ ممالک کے مقابلے میں ہندوستان کا ایک انوکھا اور انفرادی مقام بنے اور ہم فخر کے ساتھ کہہ سکیں۔

سارے جہاں سے اچھا، ہندوستان ہمارا

ہم بلبلیں ہیں اس کی یہ گلستاں ہمارا

آج اس ملک کو آگے بڑھانے کے لئے، ہمارے یہ دونوں معزز ہاؤس جسے ہم اپر ہاؤس اور لوور ہاؤس کے نام سے یاد کرتے ہیں، ان میں بیٹھنے والے پبلک کے نمائندہ افراد ممبر پارلیمنٹ کی حیثیت سے آتے ہیں اور وہ پبلک کے مافی الضمیر کو ادا کرتے ہوئے، ہندوستان کی تعمیر اور ترقی کی راہیں استوار کرتے ہیں۔ ان حضرات کو کون سی سہولیت ملنی چاہئے اور کون سی سہولیت نہیں ملنی چاہئے۔

جو لوگ تنقید کرتے ہیں، پٹنی کرتے ہیں اور یہ کہتے ہیں کہ انہیں سہولتیں نہیں ملنی چاہئیں، ان سے میں یہ پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ اپنے سینے پر بھی ہاتھ رکھ کر سوچیں کہ کیا بغیر کسی سہولت کے اتنے بڑے ملک کی تعمیر و ترقی کا کام ادھورا نہیں رہ جائیگا؟ ایک آدمی یہاں بیسہ لینے کے لئے نہیں آ رہا ہے۔ تنخواہ لینا اس کا اصل مقصد نہیں ہے بلکہ اس کی ان ضروریات کا پورا کیا جانا اس کا اصل مقصد ہے جن ضروریات کو اگر یہاں پورا کر دیا گیا تو آسانی کے ساتھ وہ ملک کو آگے بڑھانے کے لئے اپنے دل و دماغ کا استعمال کر سکتا ہے۔ میں ایران کے ایک بادشاہ کی کہانی پڑھ رہا تھا جس میں انہوں نے اپنی فوج کے ایک ماہر ایماندار فشی سے یہ کہا تھا کہ تم روٹ طے کرو کہ فوج کو کس سائیڈ سے مارچ کرنا چاہئے اور دشمنوں پر ہمیں فتح یا بی کیسے ملے گی۔ وہ پوری پلاننگ کر رہے تھے، لکھ رہے تھے، اسی عالم میں ان کا ایک ننھا سا بچہ گھر سے باہر آیا اور اس نے کہا کہ بابا، گھر میں آنا نہیں ہے۔ یہ کہہ کر وہ بچہ چلا گیا اور جب یہ ایکشن پلان بادشاہ وقت کے سامنے لایا گیا اور بادشاہ وقت اس ایکشن پلان کو پڑھ کر بہت خوش ہو رہا تھا کہ ہمارے قابل فوجی ماہر نے اتنا اچھا ایکشن پلان بنایا ہے جس کے ذریعے ہمیں اپنے دشمنوں کو دبوچنے میں آسانی ہوگی۔ پڑھتے

پڑھتے بادشاہ وقت ایک جگہ رک گیا کیونکہ اس ایکشن پلان میں ایک جگہ یہ بھی لکھا ہوا تھا کہ بابا، گھر میں آئیں۔ بادشاہ پریشان ہو گیا کہ آخر اس فوجی مودمنٹ کے ایکشن پلان میں یہ کون سا ایکشن ہے کہ بابا، گھر میں آئیں۔ عرض یہ کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ سہولیات اگر نہیں ہوتی ہیں، کام بڑا ہوتا ہے، ذمہ داریاں بڑی ہوتی ہیں تو کبھی کبھی آدمی خود غرضیوں کا شکار ہو کر اپنی ذمہ داریوں سے سبک دوش ہونے کے بجائے اپنی ذمہ داریوں سے مخرف ہو جاتا ہے اور اس کا نقصان ملک کو ہوتا ہے، عوام کو ہوتا ہے اور دیش کی تعمیر و ترقی کو ہوتا ہے۔ اپنے ساتھیوں کی طرح میں پھر اس بات کو ذرا ناچاہتا ہوں کہ کوئی آدمی تنخواہ نہیں بڑھوانا چاہتا بلکہ ان تمام تر سہولتوں کو ضرور چاہتا ہے، جن سہولتوں کے ذریعے ملک کے عوام کے لئے سہولیت پیدا کی جائیں۔ وہ ساری باتیں یہاں آچکی ہیں جنہیں میں دہرانا نہیں چاہتا۔ سو آدمی اگر ایک ایم پی سے ملنے آتے ہیں، اس کا اخلاقی فرض ہے کہ ایک گلاس پانی انہیں پلائے، ایک کپ چائے انہیں پلائے۔ ہر انسان کا اخلاقی فرض ہوتا ہے، اس کے دروازے پر جب لوگ جاتے ہیں تو وہ کوشش کرتا ہے کہ آنے والے کی مہمان نوازی کی جائے اور اچھے میزبان کے روپ میں اس کو یاد کیا جائے، اچھے اخلاق مند آدمی کی حیثیت سے اس کو پہچانا جائے۔ پھر یہاں جو عوام کے نمائندے ہیں، ان کی ذمہ داریاں تو اس سلسلے میں اور بھی بڑھ جاتی ہیں۔ وہ لوگ جو لوگ سبھا کھن چن کر آتے ہیں، ان کی ذمہ داریاں، میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے مقابلے میں بہت زیادہ بڑھ جاتی ہیں کیوں کہ لوگ اپنی ضرورتوں کے پیش نظر ایم پیز کے پاس آتے ہیں اور وہ جو دھارنا بنی ہوئی ہے کہ ایم پی بہت دولت مند ہوتا ہے، اس دھارنا کو تو اسی دن ریٹیکٹ کر دیا جاتا ہے، جس دن وہ چن کر آتا ہے۔ کس مصیبت کے ساتھ وہ چن کر آتا ہے، کتنے سہیوگ کے ساتھ اس کو چنا جاتا ہے، پارٹی جو پیسے اس کو ایکشن میں جیتنے کے لئے دیتی ہے، وہ تو ایک الگ سی بات ہے اس کے دوست احباب چندا کر کے اس کو جتوانے میں جس طرح اس کی مدد کرتے ہیں، یہ ساری چیزیں خود بتلاتی ہیں کہ وہ ایک ایسے آدمی کو روپے پیسے لگا کر، تیاگ اور قربانی کے ذریعے سند اور پارلیمنٹ میں بھیج رہے ہیں جو آدمی وہاں جا کر ان کے علاقے کی تعمیر اور ترقی میں بھرپور حصہ لے گا اور ہندوستان کی داخلی اور خارجہ پالیسی کو اتنا مضبوط بنائے گا کہ

ساری دنیا جب ہندوستان کی طرف دیکھے تو ہندوستان میں بیٹھنے والے نمبر ان پارلیمنٹ کی وہ سرانہا بھی کرے کہ ان کے دل و دماغ بھی اور ان کو سرکار کی طرف سے دی گئی سہولیات کے پیش نظر اتنے بڑے کارنامے انہوں نے انجام دئے ہیں کہ ہندوستان دنیا کے ترقی یافتہ ملکوں کے مقابلے میں شان اور فخر کے ساتھ کھڑا ہوا ہے۔ کمپیوٹر کی بات، جانکاری کی بات، جب تک جانکاری نہیں ہوگی، یہاں بولا کیا جائے گا

اور سچی بات یہ ہے کہ یہ دور اتنا زیادہ ترقی یافتہ ہو چکا ہے کہ جو لوگ پچھلے زمانے کے لوگ ہیں، جو پچاس سال پہلے ہوش رکھتے تھے، آج کے دن کمپیوٹر کی بھاشا کو سمجھنا ان کے لئے کتنا مشکل کام ہے، یہ آپ سے چھپا ہوا نہیں ہے۔ ہم لوگ بھی کمپیوٹر کی زبان نہیں جانتے۔ اس ہاؤس میں کھڑے ہو کر اپنے دلش کے لئے کچھ کر گزرنے کی دل میں خواہش ضرور رکھتے ہیں۔ کمپیوٹر نے بہت ساری مصیبتوں کو حل کر دیا ہے، مگر کمپیوٹر کے ذریعے اپنے پرائیلس کو حل کرنے کے لئے ہمیں ایک ہینڈ کی ضرورت ہوگی، ایک دماغ کی ضرورت ہوگی اور میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ملک کی ترقی اور خوشحالی کے لئے، اس ملک کے ایم۔ پی۔ اور دلش کے نمائندوں کو، وہ ساری سہولتیں ضروری جانی چاہئیں، جن کے ذریعے ان کا فائدہ کم اور ملک کا فائدہ زیادہ ہو۔ للٹ سوری صاحب کو میں پھر ایک مرتبہ مبارکباد دیتا ہوں کہ ان تمام تر مسائل کو سامنے رکھتے ہوئے وہ یہ بل لائے ہیں اور میں گورنمنٹ سے بھی یہ گزارش کروں گا کہ اس کو قدر کی نگاہ سے دیکھا جانا چاہئے۔ ٹیکا چنی کی بات تو ہوتی ہے، کوئی ایسا کام نہیں ہوتا جس پر ٹیکا چنی نہ ہو۔ اچھے کام پر ٹیکا چنی ہوتی ہے، برے کام کی بھی لوگ ^{سند} ~~سند~~ کرتے ہیں۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ کہیں سے کوئی برا کام نہیں ہے، جس کی ^{سند} ~~سند~~ کی جائے۔ رہ گئی بات اس بات کی کہ اس کے ذریعے لوگ امیر بننا چاہتے ہیں یا اس کے ذریعے بہت پیسہ ان کو مل جائے گا، یہ بات نہ عقل میں آنے والی ہے، نہ علم میں آنے والی ہے۔ آپ کا بہت بہت شکریہ جو آپ نے مجھے وقت دیا، میں ان کی بھرپور تائید کرتے ہوئے اپنی بات کو ختم کرتا ہوں، جے ہند۔

”ختم شد“

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am standing today before the House after seeing the TV programme the other day. At the conclusion of the debate there, when the anchor put the question, then one boy stated, 'These Parliament Members are begging, give them.' That was the statement made by one boy in the debate. Sir, after seeing that, I was subjected to mental agony. It was painful and it was intimidating also. So far as the salary was concerned, there never used to be any debate in the House. Sometimes, our friends from the Left Party used to make a statement that they opposed; we never used to discuss. Sir, before starting, I am just bringing to your notice what the Members of Parliament of Australia are getting. They are getting \$90,000 per annum. If we calculate it at the rate of Rs. 45 per dollar, it will come to Rs. 40,50,000/- per annum — more than Rs. 3 lakh. So far as the United Kingdom is concerned, they are getting \$85,983. In Canada, they are getting \$68,200 per annum. If we take into consideration Rs. 45 per dollar, it will run into lakhs. And, what are we getting here? We are getting only Rs. 12,000/-. I thank Mr. Suri, I do not know whether he is a self-made man. He has taken into consideration the plight of the spouse after the retirement or after the death. I don't know whether he has faced any difficulty in his younger age. But what is happening in other countries? If you take into consideration these figures, what are we getting? Only Rs. 12,000/-! When I entered after the sixth term, I got Rs. 12,000/- salary after putting in 27 years of service in the Parliament. Is any officer getting this much? Even a *chaprasi* will be getting more than that. But we are not begging. We never ask anything for service to the people. When I started my practice in 1960, I was getting this amount per day. I am not from a rich family. When I used to go to school, I had only trousers, no shirt even. There were no two meals. When I completed my law, there was no money for me. I used to take water from the public pipe. And you may not believe, Sir, I did not have the money, I came from a very poor family, I used to live on one plantain per day. I had nothing. I became a lawyer. I had a roaring practice. I had a car. I had everything. I remained the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance for six years and one month. That is a record. I did not take a glass of water from any person. I did not make even a single pie. And, Mr. V.P. Singh is on record stating, "I come from a rich family, but Poojary comes from a poor family". But I remained honest. It is not a big thing. Poojary

remained honest, it is not a big thing. He made a statement in Madras. He was my senior. My submission before the House is this. I want to know how many representatives of the people here belong to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. What is the percentage of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Members? How many Members are here from the Backward Classes and poor families? Only the rich people have to come here! Poor people cannot enter here. Only the poor people can understand the plight of the poor people, and not the rich people. Sir, you may not believe it, for six years, while the Finance Ministers were presenting the Budget, I was sitting by the side of all the three Finance Ministers. One was Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, and the then Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi who was the Finance Minister for some months and Shri N.D. Tiwari. Even Dr. Manmohan Singh was working with me as the Finance Secretary and as the Governor of the Reserve Bank of India. When I was looking after the Reserve Bank of India, he was the Governor. He knows it. But here what is happening? We all are being called corrupt, including you. That is the perception, We don't have the courage to face it, Are we going by this perception? The Parliament is a supreme body. We are law-makers. But in spite of that, the perception that is going on is that we are begging. We have to look after these people, the Government employees. We are looking after even the judiciary. Their salaries are decided here. We are belittling ourselves. I am sorry to say this. Nobody could be blamed. Yes; Press is giving something. They are also doing business. who will read the newspaper, if they go on writing about developmental activities? Nobody will read the newspapers. If some girl's modesty is outraged, they will publish it as headlines. People will read it. In the morning, before taking their breakfast, the people first read newspapers. They have to do their business. Sir, when we used to present the Budget, if it was for the poor people, there used to be an editorial saying that it was a populist Budget, it was not a good Budget. If it is giving any relief to rich people, the industrialists, they used to say it is a very good Budget, a growth-oriented Budget. We have seen all these things. If you are talking about a poor man, they would say, you don't know anything about the economy. You know economy only, if you do good things for the rich class. That is the perception. I always admire the Left Parties. They are honest people. They are for the poor people. Sir, some people are here. Bachelors are there. They need not have the responsibility of

looking after two or three children. They come here after putting in many years of service in the villages, and they are getting only Rs. 12,000. Will that be sufficient? I am putting this question to all the hon. Members of Parliament. Let them put their hands on their chests and say that it is sufficient. Nobody would say that. I do not think, Sir, that you would also say that, being a lawyer yourself. When you appeared before the Supreme Court, whether there was an argument or not, you would be getting Rs. one lakh.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, let him not throw a challenge like this. I have high regards for him. Please, don't throw such challenges. We had the time and we said all this when the Bill had come. We feel that it is enough. He knows that I have high regards for him. He may have his own ideas. But if you are making a comparison, today, the situation is such that even 40 rupees per day is being paid as minimum wages. It was more during his time. Today, the minimum wages being paid is as low as Rs. 40 in violation of all labour laws. That is the situation.

You are correct, Sir, in your time, the minimum wages being paid were higher. You would be surprised to know, Sir, in Karnataka and other States, which I can cite, the minimum wages are not being paid as per labour laws; Rs. 40 is being paid as minimum wages.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: I accept that.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: There are lots of such people. Things have changed. Some of the points you have said are absolutely correct. But we will not accept all that you say. You may have passed through those days, but let us not generalise things; let us not have any challenges. Let us not do that.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: I am not generalising. I am not throwing challenges...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: For some people, it may not be enough. But it is a specific thing. You cannot generalise. For somebody, Rs. 12,000 may not be enough, for somebody else, Rs. 12 lakhs may not be enough. But it is also a fact that this has attracted the media. I can tell that to you, Sir. I have regard for you. I am telling you, Sir, that in tomorrow's newspaper, you would only find this. Your other views won't find mention. If you say that something needs to be done for the poor, it

[12 August, 2005]

RAJYA SABHA

would be called a populist move; if you do something for the corporate, you would be given some title like 'the dream man', or some such thing.

Keeping that in view, our apprehension is that apart from the discussion here, even if it is discussed outside the Parliament, tomorrow the focus of the whole thing would be on the common man. We cannot reach each and every common man. The news would go, whether right or wrong, in the media. The whole gist would be -- it would be a juice to those people -- Parliament spent four hours discussing the salaries, size and all that. So, it will not enhance the image; it will not help. Therefore, we have to convince the unconvinced, if not through the media, then through other means. Sir, I don't mean anything against you. My only submission is ...

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): Sir, I wish to say that this is an embarrassing debate, as we all listen to it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Yes, that point was made by Shri Jothi.

SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ: I personally feel that this is in bad taste.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I would like to have a minute. What has been said by Shri Kurian and what has been said just now by Shri Poojary, are all valid points. But the problem is, as Shri Dipankar Mukherjee has said, it is an ill-timed move.

Secondly, we should not ask for enhancement in salary for ourselves, and vote for ourselves. This is how I feel. I feel very reluctant to sit here; I feel very much embarrassed about it. I appeal to Shri Suri to leave the matter for the Government to decide. Shri Pachouri would look into this matter; he is a very seasoned Member.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: That is what I had said.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Everyone knows about the difficulties. Tomorrow morning, all newspapers would carry the news that they are discussing for their own selves.

SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I am sorry to interrupt. We need not berate ourselves so much. When a labourer is demanding through the trade union for more wages, why can't we? We are not labourers.

SHRI N. JOTHI: But we are public servants. We have to ask for the people, not for ..(interruptions)...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: We are not discussing that. We are discussing the magnitude of labour law violations. Please, find out the minimum wages being paid throughout the country; make an assessment in this Parliament whether minimum wages are being paid. How many hours have we discussed that? How many times have we discussed the same issue during the past six years? ...(interruptions)...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I would conclude in it in just one sentence. There is greatness in sufferings too; there is greatness in making sacrifices too. If a sacrifice has to be made for the country, we would continue doing that. Please, leave the discussion at this. We would appeal to the Treasury Benches to look into this matter. That is all that I wish to say.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, I would like to bring something to the notice of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Yes, please.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: In 1980, when I came to the Parliament, Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Please, do not mind, Mr. Poojary; just two minutes.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: We remember that we had a salary of Rs. 1500 and we had to pay for electricity and all the other things to keep up our images that we are the cream of the country. Sir, we went to her. The position was that MPs had given their garages to the *dhobiwalas* so that he could wash their clothes. Servants quarters were given to various people so that they could work as servants in the houses- he could be a cook or somebody else- because we really couldn't afford it. Let me tell you very frankly. As the situation changed since then, the uniform pay has gone up to Rs. 12,000, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, has the condition of the MPs changed? Everything has gone up. We are not shouting for ourselves. Today, we are here, we will not be here tomorrow, but do you want us to become servants of multinationals so that we will raise questions on their behalf and make money? I am telling you frankly because you better listen to honesty about it. If you want us to be honest, then for God's sake, try to give

us enough to be honest. Otherwise, tomorrow I will have to be a part of one of the multinationals, raise questions on their behalf and earn money so that I can sustain my position and status as a Member of Parliament of India. When you compare, I do not say take me to an American Senator, who can fly as many times anywhere in America. We get 16 tickets for one way going and one way coming, that is, 32 tickets. Also look at your pay and your constituents that come. You have to give them and feed them at times. All this, you must see. I request the media here, don't project us as siphoning the things, but project us as people who want to live decently for the nation. You could not project us before other parliamentarians of the country or outside—what would you tell them?—that we live on this thing, that we put some people in our garrages, that we have got servants in our household doing work because we are giving them quarters. I know some MPs and I swear it, Sir, where the houses are given on rent. The entire house is given on rent so that he can survive. With such a situation, I don't want to continue. Therefore, I beg of the Government, please look at it and sincerely look at it. Unless you want us to be corrupt, then, permit us to be corrupt and then don't call us corrupt. If you want us to be honest, and you want us to deliver goods for the country, then, please think of it very seriously so that MPs can live a decent life. Today, we are MPs, tomorrow we will not be MPs. So with that, I request the Government, through the Chair, to look at it and then see to it what is best in which MPs can be served.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): I am sure the Law Minister will come up with something next Thursday when this House adjourns. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, the poor are not only the corrupt. The biggest corruption in this country is by those who are rich, those who are paid well, those who evade income tax and those who do not pay the loans back. They are not poor, they are rich. It is wrong to say that those who are paid less are more corrupt than those who are paid more. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I entirely agree with the hon. Member, Dr. Farooq Abdullah. Let us not shy away from issues. Let us be practical. Since we are discussing the problems of Members of Parliament, the people should not demean us. It is not like that. Let us

not be afraid of the media. Media writes against the Members of Parliament, politicians. They are writing all sorts of things. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: We are afraid of those people who are not getting minimum wages. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let us discuss about that. ...*(Interruptions)*... We never discuss about it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NARAYANASAMY: We discuss the problems of the people everyday. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Shri Dipankar Mukherjee, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Shri Dipankar Mukherjee, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: I don't think that we do not think of them. But if you have to serve them, then, for God's sake, let us not forget that when you have to serve them, when you have to give the best service to those people for whom we are here, you must have enough to be able to sustain yourself and your family. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Those who are depriving them are very well paid. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: We will fight for them, and we will fight for minimum wages. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Let Mr. Poojary say. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: We are discussing about the poor men's problems in this House. It is not only the labour, the common man, but especially the industrial workers. We are discussing every issue in this House. It is not like that your section is raising and our section is not raising. ...*(Interruptions)*.... Since this issue is before the House, let us objectively discuss ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Just one minutes...*(Interruptions)*... The Law Minister is here. He has heard all sides of the House. The next Thursday, when he replies, he will certainly make a statement.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: We have got senior MPs, who know that there is a Committee meant for this purpose. Every now and then we

[12 August, 2005]

RAJYA SABHA

refer to matters of raising perks and salaries to the Committee, through that Committee to the Government, and Shri Suresh Pachouri is in charge.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): But, Mr. Law Minister, everybody wants his chance to speak. So, we will let everybody speak.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: We cannot restrict. It is Private Members Business.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): I agree, but still in a Private Members Business, everybody must have his chance to speak.

PROF. P.J KURIAN: Sir, my submission is only this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): You are speaking for the second time. Mr. Darda, you can catch your flight and come back on 26th because we will adjourn at 5 o'clock today ... (*Interruptions*)... I know, but what is to be done.

PROF. P. J. KURIAN: Sir, my submission is only this that this discussion should not be considered as a discussion for increase of emoluments, salaries or facilities. It should be only considered as a discussion to see as to how MPs can function more efficiently; This should be seen in that context.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Mr. Poojary, you have only five minutes.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): At the very outset, I submitted that I would not have stood up but for that television show. Everyday, write-ups are appearing in the newspapers. It is discussed throughout India and what is happening. Sir, we are not against the poor people. You know, what programmes Indiraji had brought. And, how, if at all today you are asking for the votes, it is in her name. And, somehow the people who did not toe the line during that period, left our Party also. Indiraji did not care for them. Our Party, the Indian National Congress, is for the poor people, farmers, and for the development of the nation, for everybody. Now, what I want to submit is... (*Interruptions*)... I have not said anything against you. On the contrary, I praised you. Now, the question is simple.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): I am afraid, you will have to resume on 26th because today there is a statement is to be made and then the House will adjourn. Mr. Darda, this discussion has not completed yet. It has not ended. You are still there. Major Roy is there and one or two other Members are also there who are still to speak. As you know, the House adjourns at 5 o'clock. Especially on Private Members day, we don't sit beyond that. Therefore, your opportunity to speak will be on the next occasion when this matter comes up. That, I am told, is on 26th August. Mr. Pachouri, would you like to lay the statement?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL PUBLIC, GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): It is up to you, Sir. If you order me to lay the statement, I am ready to lay the statement, otherwise I can read it also.

श्री वी. नारायणसामी: कौपी दे दीजिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): Is that sense of the House? Okay, please lay it on the Table.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Status of implementation of third report of the department-related parliamentary standing committee on agriculture

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Hon. Vice-Chairman, sir, as per you instructions, on behalf of Shri Sharad Powar, I beg to lay on the Table of this House a statement regarding the status of implementation of recommendations contained in the third Report of Standing Committee on Agriculture, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN): The House is adjourned till 11.00 a.m. on Tuesday, the 16th August, 2005.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 16th August, 2005