(vii) Need to impose prohibition in Andhra Pradesh and Compensate the State Government against the losses of revenue arising out of implementation of Prohibition

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE(Vijayawada): Sir, our Father of Nation had advocated for prohibition of alcoholic drinks as the intoxicants are partly responsible for the miserable conditions of the poor. Our Construction also envisaged that the Government will pursue it as one of the State policses and spelt out the same under Article 47. But several State Governments have not implemented this policy and have almost ignored it, while the sales-tax, which was initially introduced to bridge the deficit due to implementation of prohibition. is continuing even after lifting of prohibition. At the same time, the States are considering the State excise increase as a Kamadhenu as a result of which many poor people are not able to cross the poverty line. They cannot provide good education or medical facilities to the members of their families. Lakhs of women are fighting against the alcoholismin Andhra Pradesh for nearly two months. They demand from the State Government to prohibit sale of Arrack and other alcoholic products. All sections, including workers, selfemployed, trade, intelligentsia, have supported this demand. Almost all political parties have also supported this demand.

The Union Government should immediately consider it and take necessary steps to introduce prohibition in Andhra Pradesh and help the State Government by reimbursing 50 per cent of loss of State excise revenue due to implementation of prohibition.

14.33 hrs

ADVOCATE (AMENDMENT) BILL

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ):

Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Billfurther to amend the Advocates Act, 1961 be taken into consideration."

A similar Amendment Bill was in fact introduced in Lok Sabha in May, 1990. With the dissolution of Lok Sabha in March, 1991 the Bill lapsed. Therefore, I have come before this august House for consideration of this Bill again.

The Advocates Act, 1961 was enacted with a view to amending and consolidating the law relating to legal practitioners and providing for constitution of Bar Councils. It was amended from time to time, taking into account, among other things, the proposals made by the Bar Council of India. Recently. the Bar Council of India and certain other bodies and individuals have made a number of proposals for further amending the Act. Based on the experience gained in the administration of the Advocates Act, 1961 and keeping in view the various proposals received, it has become necessary to further amend the Act with a view to enabling the Bar Council of India and the Statethe Councils to function more effectively for the Sections 6 and 7 of the Advocates Act, 1961 spell out the functions of State Bar Councils and the Bar Council of India, respectively. Amendments to these sections have been proposed with a view to empowering the State Bar Councils to promote the growth of Bar Associations for purposes of implementing the welfare schemes for advocates and to visit and to inspect Universities on the directions of the Bar Council of India, and to constitute funds for establishing law libraries.

It was found that certain Bar Councils do not hold elections in time. In the absence of regular elections, the elected members of the Council continue to hold office for indefinite periods and courts have observed that non-holding of elections in time is an undemocratic practice. After consulting the Bar Council of India, it is now proposed to amend Section 8 to provide for automatic

[Sh. H.R. Bhardwaj]

cessation of membership of members of the State Bar Council in the event of non-holding of elections within the prescribed period of five years or an extended period of six months granted by the Bar Council of India. A Committee of three members is to be constituted for the purpose of holding the elections and to discharge the functions of the State Bar Council in the absence of the elected body. The Committee shall also hole the elections within a period of six months from the date of its constitution or an extended period granted by the Bar Council of India.

At present, Section 104 of the Act provides that the Bar Council of India shall meet at New Delhi and that a State Bar Council shall meet at its headquarters. Originally, there was no restriction with regard to the place of meeting of the Bar Council of India or of a State Bar Council. In 1974, Section 10A was inserted in order to cut down the expenditure on account of holding of the meetings outside the headquarters. It was found in practice that no savings in expenditure were made by holding the meetings at headquarters. It is proposed to amend Section 10A suitably so that the Bar Council of India and the State Bar Councils could meet outside the headquarters also.

Section 24 of the Act specifies the persons who may be admitted as advocates on a State roll. Under this Section, one of the conditions to be fulfilled for admission as an advocate is that he has paid an enrolment fee of Rs. 250/- to the State Bar Council. However, the enrolment fee payable by a persons which is a member of the Scheduled Castes or the Scheduled Tribes is kept at Rs 125/-. Section 46 of the Act requires that every State Bar Council shall, for each financial year, pay to the Bar Council of India a sum equivalent to twenty per cent of the total of the enrolment fees realised by it under the Act during that year. The Bar Council of India and the State Bar Councils represented that the expenses involved in the administration of the Bar Council of India and the State Bar Councils are growing every year and that it

has become necessary to revise the enrolment fee upwards from Rs. 250/- to Rs. 750/ - without disturbing the fee payable in case of persons belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Bar Council of India further suggested that there has been avoidable delay on the part of the State Bar Councils in transferring its part of the enrolment fees and that this has created hardship for them. It is proposed to omit Section 46 and amends Section 24 for providing that twenty per cent of the total of the enrolment fees be paid separately by the persons making payment at the time of his admission as an advocate on a State roll by way of bank draft drawn in favour of the Bar Council of India.

Section 24A of the Act prescribes disqualification for enrolment. The Bar Council of India has pointed out that, under the existing provision, a person who is removed or dismissed from employment or office under the State as defined in article 12 of the Constitution on charges involving moral turpitude has not been disqualified for enrolment, and that Section 24A be suitably amended for this purpose. It is proposed to amend the said Section accordingly.

Section 52 of the Act saves the power of the Supreme court to make rules under articles 145 of the Constitution for laying down conditions subject to which a senior advocate shall be entitled to practise in that court and for determining the persons who shall be entitled to act in that Court. The Supreme Court recently suggested that this Section be amended to empower that Court to make rules for determining persons who shall be entitled to plead before that Court.

The present Bill seeks to amend the Advocates Act, 1961 to give effect to the above subjects.

Hence, the Bill is before the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the

Advocates Act, 1961, be taken into consideration."

Then there are amendments.

SHR! MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st March 1993." (1)

(Translation)

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAV (Jaipur): I beg to move:

"That Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 11th March, 1993" (2)

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th March, 1993." (3)

[Eng"-h]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The total time allotted is one hour, out of which Congress gets 26 minutes, BJP - 12 minutes, Janata Dal - 6 minutes; CPI(M) - 4; CPI - 1 minute, AIADMK - 1 minute; Teigu Desam1 minute; JMM-1 Minute; Janata Party - 1 minute, and all other small groups, all put together one minute.

So, it is upto us to stick to the limited time available.

I call Shri Lodha to initiate the debate.

[Translation]

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I, on the whole welcome the Advocates Amendment Bill. I would like the hon. Minister to committedly implement the freedom of Law, and the freedom of Judiciary, in the true spirit of this

While talking about Executive and Judiciary, we also talk about Advocates and while talking about Advocates if we do not include Judiciary in it, then will be incomplete. During the tenure of Shri V.P. Singh two Bills were mooted. One was about setting up a commission for appointing Judges, specially in High Courts and Supreme Court. Another was setting up a collegium and Tribunal for dealing in cases of nepotism and allegations regarding political appointments of Judges. But that Bill lapsed with the downfall of the V.P. Singh Government. These Bills were neither introduced nor there is any intention of introducing them. I would like the Hon. Minister to clarify while replying to the Debate whether he agrees to the proposal of collegium Tribunal Commission in principle regarding appointment of Judges and whether that Bill would be introduced in some form or other in this very session. The Bill is oscillating between Lok Sabna and Rajya Sabha. This is a very important Bill in the legal field for providing free legal aid to the poor. A Bill was passed regarding establishing Lok Adalats. but the Chief Justices had decided in a conference, which I had attended that the Bill advocates the supremacy of the Executive and Judges and Chief Justices do not have any right to exercise their power in order to provide free legal aid to the poor. It was thus an encroachment on their autonomy and sovereignty and therefore, it should be given a second thought. It is being considered. Most probably in Rajya Sabha it has already been considered or is being considered, but thas not yet come to the Lok Sabha so far. If a Pill regarding providing tree legal aid to the poor takes 5 to 7 years time in becoming a law, then what can be said about other things. It was first introduced in 1986, after that it was discussed in the conference in 1988 and today in 1992 it is yet to become a law. Can we hope that it will be passed in this session or next session without waiting for c 21st century.

Generally there is supremacy of Judiciary in the country in providing fair justice to the people, but with a view to remove corruption a Bill was introduced viz., the

# [Sh. Guman Mal Lodha]

Lokpal Bill, even that is gathering dust. Ifeel that today while passing this Bill we would like to know from the hon. Law Minister. Whether he will take some action about getting Lokpal Bill passed? Joint Parliamentary Committees are constituted for inquiring into Harshad Mehta affair, Bofors affair and other affairs of this sort. Some provisions should also be there in the Lokpal Bill in order to take legal action in corruption cases involving politicians, Chief Ministers, Ministers and even the Prime Minister. If it is essential. then the Prime Minister should also be brought into the dock. I would like to put these three Bills before you and would like the House to pass them. I wish that the hon. Minister of Law should consider this problem. The fee for new Advocates has been raised from Rs. 250 to Rs. 750. There is no objection to it in view of the price rise and devaluation of rupee, but with this I would like to say that this fee of Rs. 750, is misused by the members of Bar Council of India to undertake tours from Kanyakumari to Kashmir and organise meetings in five star hotels in other cities instead of Delhi. I have seen them organising meeting in Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and even Assam. I take this as a heavy burden on the earnings of the poor Advocates. There is no need of touring any other place, they can organise meetings in Delhi itself. I know that those Advocates who are elected to the Bar Council of India have a monthly income of not less than Rs. 50 thousand to Rs. 1 Lakh. When I went to Tamilnadu, I was told that some Advocates had to mortgage their gowns in order to earn their livelihood. I have also visited Calcutta and Bombay. Some member Advocates of the Association are very poor. For getting the work of oath Commissioner, they run like hawkers. Now-a-days the rate is Rs. 2 which was Re. 1 earlier. One gets only 10-12 annas out of it after joining the commission. This is the tragic story of lakhs of Advocates who have to struggle in the beginning. When, Technocrats, Doctors and Engineers go for a job, they get a salary, but when an Advocate goes to a court, he has to pay an enrolment fee of Rs. 750. I request you to

reconsider it. Young Advocates should be provided loans from banks to maintain their libraries. Loan without interest should also be provided to the Bar Council for a library. furniture and its own building. You should also provide grant for this purpose. The most important thing is about social welfare scheme. In every other organisation, be it a Government employee or the employees of corporation or Banks, everybody gets the facility of P.F., Pension and other such facilities, but there is no such arrangement for the Advocates. Wherever an effort was made in this direction it failed. The Bar Council had enabled the Advocates to some extent but how can it mobilise funds. Funds will have to be made available either by the public exchequer or given in the form of loan or grant in-aid either from the State or from the Centre. Therefore, I demand that the social welfare scheme for Advocates should be made effective and the Government should provide funds to the Bar Association or the Bar Council as grant-in-aid.

Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, Mr. Bhardwaj himself has been an advocate. Therefore, there is no need to explain the travails of an advocate to him. He knows how an advocate passes his initial five years with great difficulty. So, the hon. Minister should make an announcement in his reply in respect of the advocates. Section 30 of the advocate Act provides that an advocate can practice anywhere he likes. He can plead a case in any court whether it is a tribunal, an authority or any other forum. In the last few years some new legislations were enacted which prevent the advocates to continue the above practice. For example, they were not allowed to practise in family courts, Excise Commissioners, offices and other authorities whereas Provisions under section 30 were made in 1961. I would like to draw the special attention of the hon. Minister that the Government should implement the verdict of the Supreme Court rather than my explanation which is very brief. This verdict had been given in 1988 which directs that section 30 of the Advocate Act should be enforced. The provision is still in force since 1961, but it is ineffective even now. It should be implemented. It would be a very useful work. The Supreme Court writes in this regard:

[English]

"The Act was passed in 1961 and nearly 27 years have elapsed since it received the assent of the President of India. In several conferences and meetings of lawyers resolutions have been passed in the past requesting the Central Government to bring into force section 30 of It is not clear whether the the Act. Central Government has applied its mind at all to the question whether Section 30 of the Act should be brought into force. In these circumstances, we are of the view that the Central Government should be directed to consider within a reasonable time the question whether it should bring Section 30 of the Act into force or not. If on such consideration the Central Government feels that the prevailing circumstances are such that Sections 30 of the Act should not be brought into force immediately it is a different matter. But it cannot be allowed to leave the matter to lie overwithout applying its mind to the said question. Even though the power under Section 30 (sic Section 1(3) of the Act is discretionary, the Central Government should be called upon in this case to consider the question whether it should exercise the dsecration one way or the other having regard to the fact that more than a quarter of century has elapsed from the date on which the Act received the assent of the President of India. The learned Attorney General of India did not seriously dispute the jurisdiction of this Court to issue the writ in the manner indicated above.

We, therefore, issue a writ in the nature of mandamus to the Central Government to consider within a period of six months whether Section 30 of the Act should be brought into force or not. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of."

[Translation]

Sir, this verdict had been given on August 4. 1988. A mention to this effect has been made on Page 54 of the Supreme Court cases 1988. There are various such references in our mythology that Sursa's mouth had great elasticity. Has that period of six months elapsed or not? If the period has since been completed, what decision is being taken in this regard. This House and lakhs of advocates of this country would like to know from him about this. It is a life saving drug for them. They should be allowed to practise anywhere they liked so that citizens'right could be protected and justice is made available to them at a low cost. Will the Government make an announcement that section 30 of the Act would be implemented. It would be of no use to advocates if the Government passed this Act and made the new provisions ineffective as the section 30 has been kept in safe lockers. It should, therefore, be implemented. I would like to inform that the existing philosophy is very important. Appointments of lawyers are made throughout the country whether it is the case of appointment of the Attorney General, Advocate on Records. Civil lawyers or Departmental lawyers. I would like to request that a panel should be drawn for this purpose and the Chairman of the Bar Council should be made a member of the selection board. The hon. Minister should himself become a member. There should be no red-tapism, nepotism, no politics, no casteism and no regionalism. Suppose a particular Chief Minister or the Prime Minister comes from a southern state, the advocate panel is changed and only south Indians are taken as advocates. There is no difference between North and South. India is one from Kashmir to Kanyakumari. It should be done on the basis of merit. Appointments should be made by drawing panels for this purpose. The Government accepted the resignation of the Attorney General and appointed a new incumbent to the post. I congratulate the Government for this. This resignation should have been accepted much earlier. It would be better if I do not go into the details as to how the previous Attorney General created [Sh. Guman Mal Lodha]

a judiciary history. All the hon, ministers and the hon. Members of the House know about the details. Everybody knows as to how evidences had been collected, records were found. Who were the people involved in the case and who provided protection. Whatever may be its process and facts known or unknown, direct or indirect, the name of the highest judicial officer, the Attorney General had been linked with it. Persons like Stabled had given new dimensions to this office. In pursuance of the same ideology the Speaker of Lok Sabha appointed a Commission to enquire into the conduct of a Judge. The Attorney General opined that Speaker orders have since lapsed with the dissolution of the House. Therefore, enquiry should not be held. But the Supreme Court made a judicial review and directed that the orders of the Speaker do not lapse. Therefore, an enquiry into the conduct of Shri Ramaswamy should be held. So the enquiry was held. But many obstructions were caused in the way of the enquir. My submission is that the post of Attorney-General is very respectable and dignified one and that is what the framers of constitution wrote. The Constitution has granted him the right of audience. It can tender advice to the House and point out its acts of omission and commission. We feel very disgraced for such deeds. But I would ike to congratulate the Government for the appointment of the new incumbent to the post. We have great expectations from him. A dispute is currently going on in the country. In this case the Judges of Supreme Court take advice from the Attorney General of india. In fact they should, because the Attorney General is a very dignified officer and impartial person who decides the matters in their true lawful spirit. But it should not be there that orders of the Supreme Court should be obtained through him. Supreme Court should not be made the Political Affairs Committee of the Cabinet, whatever may be its verdict. The Attorney-General should not act as the Home Minister He is free to give his opinion whatever he likes. I would like to submit that I have very cordial relations obtain with Shri

Bhardwaj. My submission to him is that he should take special measures for setting up of Lok Adalats. The poor people of our country spend as may as 30 to 40 years in the corridors of judiciary, produce witnesses and appear for cross examination of evidences. They make appeals. In this way litigations run for 50-60 years.

#### 15.00 hrs

I have written a book titled, 'Law, Judiciary-Fuel, Flames And Fire'- in which an example has been cited that a case lingered on in courts in India for 762 years. I have picked it up from Guiness Book of Records. One can imagine as to how a poor and innocent person can tight a case for 762 years. His many generations would have been perished in this process. From which source he would have arranged money, how he would have spared time and what profit he would have derived? Therefore, I want that all the things such as second appeal, special leave petition etc. should be simplified. We want clear and true justice and not technical justice. We do not want the justice of Lord Clive, Dalhousie and Macauley, that judicial system should be done away with. We in India want easy swift and inexpensive and substantial justice. We should not go into the technicalities. A special cmpaign should be launched to bring an end to all these technicalities. All the technicalities in our procedure should be brought to an end and arrangements should be made to provide justice swiftly.

Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister that when I became the Chief Justice, 50.60 people including a husband and a wife came to me. There were tears in the eyes of the lady and she was having a packet sweets in herhands. I asked her that on one hand she had brought tweets and on the other hand she was weeping, what was all that? She replied that I might have forgotten, she was the mother of Kaml, who was set on fire by her son-in-law. He did so because we could not fulfil his demand for more dowry. They knocked the doors of every court including High Court. They also

approached the hon. Chief Minister and the S.P. They all said that she had committed suicide, but the parents of the girl said that I had very kindly ordered on their appeal that the CB.I. enquiry be conducted into it. After the investigations, the C.BI. had held that she was killed by poisoning. As soon as I came to know that she was poisoned. I had put that rascal behind the bars. Today he is languishing in the jail. I have done such a remarkable work that none in future will dare to indulge in such a herious crime against the girls like Kamla. Nobody will dare to ill treat or kill the girl for dowry. During my tenure, I had ordered or an enquiry without caring for the system. Therefore, my submission is that law should be ended in such a way that the common men may come to know about the severe punishment that is given for injustice and crime committed against the women. Such a provision will create a sense of fear among other people also.

In the last, I would like to say one thing more and conclude. The age limit for the advocates should be fixed. At present the situation is that when a person retires, he goes straight to the Supreme Court for practice. Similarly, other officers also start practice in the High Court after retirement. But there are young advocates who have been trying for the last 10 to 15 years to come to the fore front. Suppose, if I go somewhere and start practice as a retired Chief Justice, then it will cause a setback to their aspirations. So, the age limit would be fixed at 50 years and none beyond the age of 50 years should be allowed to practice in the court,. He should be restricted to do the practice or give his council only in the chamber and he should not be allowed to go to the court for practice. The maximum age limit should be fixed at 50 years.

Alongwith it, I would like to submit one more thing regarding the court fee. I consider it as a black spot on our judicial system. The poor people of this country always suffer due to the court fee. So far as my knowledge goes each and every commission has suggested to abolish the court fee. Justice should not be weighed in the gold or silver

scale otherwise the one who is rich or affluent will only get the justice and the poor will be deprived of it. Such a thing should not happen during the term of present Minister, Sir. Therefore, the court fee should be abolished. If it is not possible to abolish it all of a sudden then charging of it should be stopped at least in some special cases. The vicious circle does not permit to do any thing. Helpless women, mothers and girls who are subjected to the henious crimes in the society can not knock the doors of the court, because the court fee comes in their way.

I would like to submit one thing more that it should be laid down as an essential qualification that only those persons who have served for at least three years in Lok Adalats or in Legal Aid Cell will be appointed as judges, in the High Courts in the Supreme Court. As you have done in the case of doctors that they should have worked in a rural area for a particular fide period, the same condition should be laid down for the advocates as well. But it has been seen that Government appoints those persons as judges who have never worked in the social field and who have never worked for the poor. I would also like to say that special attention should be paid to the Schedule Castes and Scheduled Tribes, while making appointments of judges to the Supreme Court, High Courts or any other place. I would like to cite an example. Mr. Meena. who was a member of the Bar council of the High Court and who used to deal in the criminal cases was not recommended for appointment to the post of a judge. Yet, I wrote a letter to Shri Goswamiji, who was Chief Justice at that time regarding appointing him as a judge. Today, I would like to congratulate his soul as he has since passed away, for appointing Mr. Meena as a judge on my recommendation. Today, Mr. Meena is functioning better than other judges of the Rajasthan High Court.

Therefore, if you want to do a thing, then do not go into the technicalities, that the case should be first recommended by the Chief Justice, then by the Chief Minister and then

[Sh. Guman Mal Lodha]

by the people surrounding the Chief Justice and the Chief Minister

We want that during your tenure some such revolutionary steps should be taken and such an atmosphere should be created. that the people may say that Mr. Bhardwaj is the Messiah of the poor.

# [English]

463

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1992, moved by Shri H.R. Bhardwai. It is to amend that Advocates Act, 1961. In fact, it is a non-controversial Bill. Shri Guman Mal Lodhi has taken this opportunity of speaking on several subjects connected and unconnected with this Bill. He has also travelled through a very large field-from the appointment of Advocate-General to the impeachment of the Supreme Court Judge and his own experience as the Chief Justice of the State.

Now, as far as I can see, as I have said, it is a very non-controversial Bill, providing only a few more functions for the State Bar Councils and the Bar Council of India. These are the suggestions of the Bar Councils themselves. That is why thisprovision is more non-controversial, and perhaps some of the suggestions have emanated from the Supreme Court. Now, it merely adds to two functions of the State Bar Councils. One function is to implement the welfare schemes. But on this, while dealing with this clause, I do not understand, why these words are used to promote the growth of Bar associations for the purpose of effective implementation of the welfare schemes. I think some clumsy drafting has been made. What is meant is that the welfare schemes should be implemented and that should be one of the functions of the State Bar Councils.

Another function that is added as far as State Bar Council is concerned, is to inspect the universities which impart the legal education to the students. Now, as far as the Bar Council of India is concerned, one more function has been added namely to cause inspection of the universities through the State Bar Council.

Now as far as raising of funds is concerned, the Bar Council and the State Bar Council have been now empowered to set up funds for establishing law libraries. It is a very laudable object and that was necessary for a long time. Then, wherever the elections were avoided by the State Bar Councils, the provision is now made and the Bar Council has been now empowered to set up a Special Committee to take charge in such cases and also to conduct elections.

As far as the place of holding the meetings is concerned, they can now hold the same at different places outside the State headquarters. To a certain extent, I agree with the earlier speaker that it is possible that this provision might be misused and large funds may be spent under the quise of holding meetings at various places in the State or throughout India. So, some check will have to be there as far as this provision is concerned.

The Bill raises the fee from Rs. 250 to Rs.750 but, at the same time, the exemption to Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe advocates has been retained as it is.

Then, the disqualification for enrolment of advocates has been added. Those who have been convicted for offences involving moral turpitude cannot enrol themselves as advocates. Supreme Court also has been given power to frame rules for advocates who want to plead in the Supreme Court. Up-till now they had only limited power for advocates who were acting in the Supreme Court.

As I have said, this Bill is not only noncontroversial but also a welcome one. This was long overdue and these suggestions have come from the Bar Council, the Supreme Court and several other institutions which are connected with these provisions. 465

I would like to take this opportunity to emphasise one or two points. First of all, I agree with Lodhaii that more attention should be given to the welfare schemes of advocates. Our people have got very wrong notions about the profession of advocates. They feel that they are a very well-to-do class. As the Supreme Court has said with regard to OBCs. that there is layer of cream', similarly, there is layer of cream in this profession also but a large number of people in this profession are struggling. So, various beneficial or social schemes may be introduced by way of legislation, particularly. as Lodhaii has said, for their housing. Of course, for those advocates who are disabled and poor, provision has been made, but for several advocates, for those who cannot practise at the older age, some social schemes will have to be introduced.

Another very serious thing which I want to place before this House and before the Law Minister is that now there is a growing tendency among the advocates of boycotting the courts for some or the other reason. This tendency may have to be curbed. They use the word 'boycotting the court' as our workers use the word 'strike'. When courts are boycotted, the class which suffers is the litigants. Already there are heavy arrears in every court and they are further piled up by resorting to this weapon of boycotting. Many times this boycott is on flimsy grounds. Supposing the list of holidays is declared. then they will say that such day is not declared as a holiday, or sometimes the list of holidays for one court is different from the list of holidays of the higher court. So, the advocates will boycott saying that we must have the same holidays, same vacations. If the Presiding Officer or the Judge is not of their liking, then also they will boycott the court. Some times this boycott is justifiable but many times it is on flimsy grounds. This wastes the time of the courts and the litigants suffer. For example, in the Bombay High Court, some time ago, three to four judges were boycoited. They were not given any work. They were just drawing salary. The work was being piled and nothing was done What I submit is that in such cases the Bar Council should be given this function of interfering in such cases. What happens today is that nobody interferes. The Chief Justice does not want to take that unpleasant task. As this is not covered by any industrial law or labour law, therefore even the Government does not interfere. The fun is just watched. Nobody can interven in what is going on and can stop this matter.

Therefore, the Bar Council should be empowered to intervene in the matter or to negotiate or take such firm action or pass any resolution at least condemning these unjustified boycotts. If there is any justifiable cause, they should be given this enabling power to intervene in the matter. I may go further and say that further teeth must be provided to the Bar Councils. They have got functions. But they have got very limited funds. As far as 'teeth' are concerned, they have not got much powers to take action.

Therefore, the Government may consider giving further and sharper teeth to the Bar Councils -either State Bar Councils or the Bar Council of India. If that is done, I think, much work can be done and, perhaps, that will help in removing the arrears of cases which are pending and which are piling in all the High courts and even in the lower courts as far as the States are concerned.

With these words I welcome this measure and suggest that the suggestions of the Bar may be considered by the Government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Next speaker is Shri Mohan Singh. Shri R. Naidu Ramasamy who is at serial number five, made a request to be allowed to speak as he has some work in his constituency where floods are there. Shri Mohan Singh, if you accomodate, Shri Ramasamy can speak for five minutes.

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): I have no objection.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Shri Ramasamy may speak now.

Bill

SHRI R. NAIDU RAMASAMY (Perivakulam): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Ithank you very much for providing me an opportunity to speak on the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1992, on behalf of All India Anna D.M.K. All the provisions in the Bill should be welcomed by the whole House. The provision that those persons who have been dismissed or removed from employment or office under the State, on charges involving moral turpitude should not be enrolled as advocate, is a very good provision. But at the same time this provision should not apply to those who sue the Government and the Government loses the case. In such a case. the persons should be allowed to be enrolled as advocates. An amendment appears to be necessary.

I also welcome the amendment providing for the Bar Council of India and the State Bar Councils to meet at places other than their headquarters. This would ensure the uniformity of legal practice and also give the protession a global touch.

But you know that the legal profession is ridden with many ills. For example, studying law is not only for practising law but also for creating an awareness about the requirement of following the law and obeying the rules of law. This is somehow being lost. Many of the young people who study law, practise as juniors without proper monetary support. I, therefore, suggest to the Government to provide a minimum sustenance dole to all advocates practising as juniors for a term of two years.

Many of the lawyers who are practicing as advocates are fleecing their clients since there is no maximum fee prescribed unde law. This should be done so that legal advice to the clients is not made a mere matter of trade and commerce. By law, one must fix a maximum fee chargeable from clients for category-wise suits. This would enable the clients to file suits without the fear of being milked by the lawyers. The rule of law in the country is first administered through lawyers and then only through the judgements of courts. This would also curb the tendency of

justice being sold through lawyers influencing courts by their clout.

I also request the Government to honourably pay an *ex gratia* non-practising allowance to all those who wish to retire from practising law by putting an application for withdrawal of enrolment at the Bar. This may be paid to them for two years from 58 years to 60 years. The beneficiaries should not be allowed to resume practice.

A statutory requirement should also be there to provide lawyers at Government cost to all labourers in the country who wish to fight against the injustice of the management. I would like the Government to enact the Bill on labour participation in the management and link this matter with the measure. I also like the Government to provide lawyers at Government cost to all those women who like to fight the evils of dowry system and male harassment. And also before filing the suit in the court, it has to be decided on all matters except criminal proceedings. If the matter is decided by Lok Adalat, then it is not necessary to place it before the court. Only after finding out from the Lok Adalat in all disputes we have to allow it to file before the court. This will reduce the number of litigations.

#### [Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, there is nothing to welcome and nothing to protest against in this Amendment Bill. The hon. Minister has brought forward this Amendment Bill only to spoil two valuable hours for some un-necessary issues. The provisions of rulings was already there which alone could do. If only the fees of the lawyers have to be raised then a permanent provision may be made in the rules of the Bar Council that whenever required according to the time and situation the Bar Association may raise or lower down the fees for the enrolment of the lawyers. I hold that a regular amendment in the Act for this is not proper.

The second amendment brought for-

ward by the Government is that the meeting of the Bar Council can be held anywhere instead of only at the head-quarters. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I can very well understand the motive behind it. If this Amendment Bill is passed, the meeting of the Bar Council of any State will not be held in the Central place. For example, the members instead of holding the meeting in Lucknow or Allahabad, can hold the meeting in some aeroplane itself in Andman. Its adverse effects will follow in future. The Bar Council which is at present not able to discharge it's responsibilities for the paucity of funds, will require more money to spend over the meetings to be held at out stations. I think that this has not been done much sensibly.

Besides, there is an additional provisions that the members of the Bar-Council may supervise the library of the university. The members of the Bar-Council will supervise whether proper arrangement of books for the students of L.L.B. has been made in the library or not. Ithink that this is almost like raising a fingure to the wide set-up of the universities and to the level of teaching-learning process. I think it is not something very proper to do any amendment in the present Act.

I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the 3 or 4 points in this Advocates Act which really requires amendments. The right of maintaining discipline has been provided to the Bar Council under section 35 of the Advocates Act 1961. But with deep anguish I would like to submit that at the lower levels, particularly at district levels the relationship between the Bench and the Bar is very incordial. I, however, agree that it is not so in the High Courts and the Supreme Court. We often read in the Newspapers and it has also been found by personal experiences that the behaviour of the lawyers practising in lower courts is regularly deteriorating in relation to the Bench. There are incidents of misbehaviour with the district judges, C.G.M.S. with judicials. The Bar-Council has been a total failure in maintaining discipline. I would, therefore, like to suggest that the right of maintaining discipline should now no more rest with the Bar Council. It is good if a separate tribunal is made for that, because it would be a great problem for the lawyers to work in the face of growing indiscipline on the part of the judicial Magistrate and District Magistrates.

Similarly. I have to make a second suggestion about which Shri Lodhaii has already given a hint. It is really a very good suggestion. It is generally observed that when a person retires after serving on a very top post, say, as an income tax officer, he then wears the gown and starts practicing in the very same court from where he retires. Similarly, when a Sales Tax Commissioner retire from service, he starts practice in the very same office. As a mater or fact, what they do is more pairvi than legal practice. They are thus abusing the responsibilities of lawvers. I would like to submit that rules should be made to restrain those retired officers from practicing in the courts of the same department and particularly in the cases of economic offences. Such amendments are really required in the Advocates Act.

The third thing which was also hinted to by Shri Lodhaii and by other hon. Members is that the economic condition of the lawyers practicing in the lower courts is constantly deteriorating. At times, the lawyers die prematurely, in the age of 45-46 or 48 years. Then there is nobody to look after their family. There is, however, a rule under the provision of which the Bar Council may run a welfare scheme. There is a provision under section 2 of the rule that the Bar Council may make welfare programmes. The Bar Council has, however, been unable to bring forth some comprehensive and worthwhile schemes for the lawyers. I would like to plead that there should be a compulsory insurance scheme for them. It is the responsibility of the Government that after the deaths of a lawyer it should provide protection and support his family. There should be arrangement of special funds for that purpose. I would be pleased if there is such an amendment in the Advocates Act. The hon. Minister is, however, more interested in bringing facial amendments in the Act on the floor of

[Sh. Mohan Singh]

the House rather than bringing fundamental changes. I know that on the basis of the majority votes this Bill will be passed. Anyway. I do not intend to object it, but I would also like to submit that a parliamentary committee should be made to bring a fundamental change in the Advocate's Act. The Government has made a provision according to which those will be a senior advocate and a junior advocate. When two advocates are of same age group and if they are enrolled on the same date then the seniority would be decided on the basis of the seniority of age. Such is the rule of the Government, but I think, this is not a proper rule. There should be an amendment that when two senior advocates are enrolled on the same date then the seniority would be decided on the basis of practicing age of the advocate. According to me this will be a proper amendment. I hope that keeping my suggestions in view the hon. Minister will form a parliamentary committee with a view to bring a fundamental change in the Advocate's Act- 1961 and after forming the Committee he can invite more suggestions to produce the draft for a large scale amendments in the Act on the floor of the House, only then it will be proper. Small and large change in the present legal system. With these suggestions, I extend my thanks to you and to the hon. Mir ister and Lagain men the amendments moved by me.

### [English]

SHRI M. RAMANNA RAI (Kasaragod): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I welcome the proposed amendment. It is said that the Advocate profession is a noble profession. In the Statement, the purpose of this amendment is clearly stated. The main purpose is to implement welfare schemes for Advocates. That is absolutely necessary, Of course, there are Advocates who are very influential and very rich, but some Advocates are very poor also.

Nobody is expressing concern about the poor advocates, who are generally called

as Sunday Lawyers. Sunday Lawyers means, they wear black coat and gown but with no brief. Every day they would dress up at about 10 am. to go to court and return without earning any income. Such lawyers require welfare scheme.

#### 15.31 hrs

### [SHRI TARA SINGH in the Chair]

So, the amendment to that extent is welcome.

New amendment, i.e. clause 24 (c) is really necessary. But my doubt is, after clause (b), it is said, the following clause shall be inserted namely:

2 "If he is removed or dismissed from employment or office under the State on any charge involving moral turpitude."

If he is dismissed, of course, he cannot appear before the court etc. But the original section is like this.

If he is convicted of an offence under the provisions of the Untouchability Act, he would be disqualified." Provided that the disqualification for enrolment shall cease to have effect after a period of two years has elapsed since his release".

Now amended section (c) also comes after (b). I want to know, whether this is applicable to the persons dismissed from the service also on the ground of moral turpitude that they are barred only for two years only and thereafter there is no bar. If that is the implication, then naturally, the amendment is not justified. It is because, if a person is dismissed from the service for moral turpitude, after the lapse of two years, he is eligible to enrol as advocate. It means, this noble profession will be dubbed as an immoral profession. I want the Minister to clarify whether the restriction in the bar is only for two years or permanent. If the person is dismissed from the service on the ground of moral turpitude and if the bar is

only for two years, there would not be any meaning at all. I request the Minister to explain that aspect.

About the other provisions intended to be made applicable by way of this Amending Bill, I have no objection. I agree with all the provisions except clause 24 (c), which the hon. Minister may clarify the position.

# [Translation]

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI (Saidpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to thank you for providing me an opportunity to express my views. The motive behind bringing forth the Advocate Amendment Bill-1992 is broadly to implement the welfare schames meant for the advocates as also to make the concerned organisations viable to solve the financial problems of the Indian Bar Council and the State Bar Council is also one of its main objectives.

Sir, there is a provision in the Bill according to which all the advocates, with the only exception of the advocates of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes will have to pay Rs. 750/- in view of Rs. 250/- as their fee. I welcome it. The hon. Minister deserves to be congratulated for giving exemption to people of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. It is good that the Government paid attention to it. I think that the profession of advocates is very important in the world. India holds second position, next to America. But I regret to say that some people have monopoly over the profession. The number of advocates from rural areas is negligible. If at all, they come, no incentives are given to them. Same is the condition of the advocates of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. If they come to this profession, they do not get adequate protection. h would have been better if the provision to provide security to the advocates of rural areas and also to those belonging to Scheduled Castes and Schedule Tribes had been made.

I have observed, others have also observed that most of the cases are filed by people hailing from rural areas. If the hon. Minister gets a survey conducted, he would realise how the clients from rural areas find themselves in trouble when they have to engage advocates in cities. Almost the same situation prevails in every village today. Our rural clients are confused as to who should be their advocate to fight their case. They feel that their cases are not fought properly.

Judges of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are appointed under reserved quota. I want the Government to provide the same facility to the advocates of rural areas and give production to them.

Secondly, it has been seen that some senior advocates have established complete monopoly in courts, they have complete hold over their junior advocates. This fact should have been taken into account in the Bill.

Another important thing is that when advocates are appointed as DGC or AGC, the Government exercises partially in making these appointments. I would like the hon. Minister to keep these factors in view. As many of the other hon. Members have suggested that a panel should be formed to make these appointments, which should keep the capability and also the capacity of the advocates in view while appointing them. whereas at present, these factors are given no consideration. Sir, at present, about two crores of the cases are pending in courts. The reason - so far as I think - is the appointment of incapable advocates and if the present trend continues, capable advocates would not be appointed and the number of pending cases would go on increasing. It capable \*advocates were appointed, there would have been no pending cases.

Shri Lodha is a very senior and experienced Member. He has drawn the attention of the Members to the open misuse of crores of rupees of a fund. Meetings are held at other places. If these meetings are held at the Centre or in States, this fund can be utilized. The money of this fund should be utilized to set up libraries and to provide

[Sh. Rajnath Sonkar Shastri]

financial assistance to advocates to purchase books. As other Members have already pointed out that the fund should be utilized for providing financial assistance to the families of advocates when they grow old. Sometimes the advocate is so much dedicated to his work that he does not pay attention to his family which ultimately grows financially weak. In such a crisis, his family should be given assistance.

Sir, lastly I would like to submit that when the cases are filed in courts, the advocates enclose power of attorney with the case file, thus getting complete authority to fight the case on behalf of their clients, but this creates many difficulties for clients. Therefore, we should think over the working procedure in courts also. When advocate gets authority to fight legal matters, he charges his fee. But most of the time, there is strike in courts, as a result of which the time of hearing is fixed on a later date. The client is so much fed up with this practice that he returns to his native place. Therefore, ban should be imposed on holding strikes there. It would have been better if this matter would have been included in this Bill. The advocates should not charge fee for the day when the court is closed and no work is done. but they do take fee for that day. This practice should be checked.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, strikes were called 100 times in one year in Banaras and no work was done. Therefore, it should have been considered through this Bill as to which rules should govern, strikes so that strikes are not called every now and then. Often, the advocate goes on strike.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This has been happening particularly for the last 3-4 years.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Even Mr. Chairman has also supported it.

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI: Sir, before I conclude, I would like to submit that the motive of this Bill is good and not only

attention should be paid to the aspects I have mentioned, but the Bill should be amended as well. (Interruptions)..... I am telling the Members that they should not interrupt when I speak. Because in that case one finds it difficult to say what he wants. I have said that since you have interrupted while I was speaking, I will also do the same when you speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please exchange these sweet words outside the House and not here.

[English]

SHRI KODIKKUNIL SURESH (Adoor): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the provisions contained in the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1992 so ably presented by the hon. Minister.

The aim and object of this Bill is to promote the growth of Bar Associations for the purpose of effective implementation of the welfare schemes referred to in Section 7.

The function of the Bar Council shall be to recognise universities whose degree in law shall be a qualification for enrolment as an advocate and for that purpose to visit and inspect universities. I am sorry to state that the visit is not being done frequently. Lagree with the objects and reasons specified in the Bill. I would urge upon the Government to issue directions to the Bar Councils of the States to fix up the fees to be charged by the advocates for conducting the cases as, in the absence of the same, the advocates are likely to take advantage of the loopholes of the Bill and charge unreasonable fees from the litigant people. I shall be happy if the Minister brings forward an amendment to the relevant section:

'An advocate enrolled in the light of the provisions contained in the Bill should subscribe to the oath and unequivocally state that he will not charge for conducting the cases of the litigants more than what is reasonably fair.'

With these few words, I support the Bill.

[Translation]

SHRIGEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, so many things were said, because it was essential to comment on the Bill. I would like to draw the attention of the House to a sentence i.e. the Amendment you have proposed to Section 24 (A) and say few words on it.

[English]

It is: "Dismissed or removed from employment or office."

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is my suggestion that the Government should incorporate one more word in the proposed amendment and i.e.

[English]

"or resigns"

[Translation] .

Let the other words remain as it is. suggestion is being made because in this country big shots are never dismissed. They just resign, as the Government should have dismissed the former Attorney-General. Had a commoner, prosecuted in a lower court committed the sins Shri Ramaswamy had committed then, I am sure the Law Minster would also agree with me that the commoner would not only have been dismissed from service, but criminal cases would also have been instituted against him. Since the Attorney-General happened to be a big shot, he is free to commit any sin and when his sinful deeds reached their extremity, he walks off cooly and honourably, after tendering his resignation. Now, that you propose to amend it, let it be amended that

[English]

"Dismissed or removed or resigned from

employment or office under the State on any charge involving moral turpitude."

[Translation] •

Mr. Chairman, Sir, when you are talking about law, I would say that in this country. law is implemented in a different way for the rich and the poor. As long as this situation or condition prevails, it is useless to talk of highsounding terms like Justice, Law, Lok Adalat etc etc, Therefore, while making a suggestion for improvement in the proposed amendment in the existing law, I would like to add that the attitude adopted by the Government with regard to the Attorney General was totally incorrect. I had written a letter to the Prime Minister on September 19, mentioning each and every activity of the former Attorney-General including the manner in which he got opened a special account and. got a clean loan from the Standard (Standard Chartered) Bank. I even mentioned the account number in the letter. In the letter 1 also mentioned that while being the Attorney General, how the Attorney-General on a brief from the Ministry of Finance, demanded in his capacity as the representative of the Union Government and its highest legal officer that the department responsible for checking incomplete offences, which comes under the Finance Minister and which seized shares worth hundreds of crores of rupees belonging to many people from Bombay involved in the securities scam, should return them to their rightful owners and thus your Attorney-General oversaw the task of returning shares worth crores of rupees to those people. An account was opened, that Account was take. So was the loan. Why an Attorney-General, who had given a written statement to the effect that he had an income of Rs. 1.8 crore, last year, would take a loan of Rupees 15 lakh? That amount of Fifteen Lakh rupees was a bribe. At that time, nobody imagined even in their wildest dreams that this will be exposed, that Rs. 15 lakh overdraft account will be exposed. Money was being misappropriated. Real state deals were being struck. When the scam got exposed, everything got revealed and when there was no option left, it was made out that

### [Sh. George Fernandes]

the account was a clean loan. It is for this reason that I wrote to the Prime Minister asking him to get a probe ordered into this account including the manner in which he secured a loan, and also how being the country's Attorney-General, he took loan from a Bank, which has been identified as Number One Offender in the securities scam. Of all the banks, if Citi Bank is considered the number one offender then Stanchert certainly occupies the second position, for bungling involved in it is to the tune of Rs. 1,000 crore. Not only that it didn't bringing in the foreign capital as stipulated, but it is violating all laws of the country and the Reserve Bank of India and even after its exposure, our Attorney-General, performs the task of advising it.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, on 29th and 30th June, the Attorney-General visited Pune and statueed at the Five Star 'Blue Diamond' hotel, arranged by Standard officials and consultations with the offenders for two consecutive days went on, at a time, when the Joint Parliamentary Committee is holding its sittings, C.B.I. and I.B. are conducting inquiries and many other inquiries are being held, the Attorney-General of the country enjoys an all-expenses paid treat, arranged by Stanchart at Pune and advices the offenders against that very Government, which pays him his salary.

What's more, the Attorney-General goes all the way to London to meet the Chief Executive of the Stanchart and when the latter comes to the country to tender evidence, he goes to the residence of the Attorney-General on the eve of the sitting and takes counsel, on the basis of which he tenders evidence and our Attorney-General sits pretty in his office, scot-free. There is a Bombay-based woman journalist by name Ms. Gauri Gurumurthi. She made a through investigation into the whole matter and pursued the Attorney-General and when in order to confirm her findings, she sent a questionnaire to him, to which he made a written reply that all the matters raised were incorrect, although it came and later that her each and every finding was true, and on the other hand is the reply of the Attorney-General stating that they were all incorrect. Further, in the first week of September, he told the Lady journalist that the issue was a North versus South one and because the lady Ms. Gauri Gurumurthy happened to be from the South, the Attorney-General, in the first week of September, told her that she is also from South and she should be aware that the North Indians are always on their toes to ruin South Indians and this very charge, he levelled publicily, few days later and still continued to remain as the Attorney-General. Yet the Law Minister, who has been praised so lavishly by my friend Shri Guman Mal Lodha, did not take any action?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COM-PANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): We have already taken action.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What did you do?

SHRIH.R. BHARDWAJ: He is no more the Attorney-General.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Well. he did move out, when he was left with no option. Therefore, I would like to submit before you that I did not want to comment on this particular Bill, Mohan Singh, had to speak, so he spoke and Guman Mal ji also spoke out his mind, but Mr. Chairman, Sir. I have risen because the discussion on this Amendment Bill provided me an opportunity to raise this question in the House and also make a request to the Law Minister. If the hon. Minister desires, I am prepared to give him a copy of my letter to the Prime Minister. Certainly the Prime Minister must have passed it on to him. He must be having a copy of it.

[English]

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: We are fully aware of what you have said.

[Translation]

481

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: So, today, my first suggestion is that the Government should incorporate the word I have suggested in the Amendment, in the proper way and secondly the Government should not allow a man to go scot free just because he tendered his resignation. Rather, it should take steps to file cases against him in consultation with the Law Ministry, the Home Ministry and the Finance Ministry. Thank you.

SHRIVIJAY KUMAR YADAV (Nalanda): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this amendment in the Advocates Act is being brought with certain objects and reasons and these are mentioned herein. These objects include as to how to strengthen the legal profession and make the welfare scheme more effective.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the common man is losing faith in the present judicial set up. Generally, people think that justice sells, breeds corruption and its standard is going downwards. That is why it became imperative for the Minister of Law to bring an amendment to the Advocates Act. He has also suggested to entrust some duties to Bar Council and State Bar-Councils. But whether the Central Government is going to shoulder some responsibility in this regard or not?

The present position of the Advocates specially of the young ones is such that they are launching agitation in every state of the country. They want to make their profession more dignified. They want to put more labour and need assistance in order to make this profession more attractive. The Central Government spends Rs. 1 croro on an employee during his service period. Due to unemployment even educated persons are unable to get a service these days. They decide to adopt legal profession but as they are financially weak, they do not have either legal books or an office where they may contact their clients, discuss legal questions and prepare for their profession. As a result of which during the initial period of their practice they are bound to live a hard pressed life.

#### 16,00 hrs

Mr. Bhardwaj is the Law Minister I am here since 1980 and I have requested all the Law Ministers, who have come during this period that the centre should take some responsibility in this regard. If the matters regarding their funning up, helping to maintain their libraries, constructing their own chambers and to provide pension in the event of their premature death are only left with Bar-Council and State Bar-Councils, then one cannot expect their smooth and satisfied implementation.

In this amendment you have raised the fee from Rs. 250 to 750, but exempted SC/ST from it, it is very good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time do you need more to speak?

SHRI VIJAY KUMAR YADAV: I would take just 3-4 minutes time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue tomorrow.

16.01 hrs

**DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193** 

Situation Affecting Agriculture and Farmers Interests Due To Increase The Prices of Fertilizers and Wheat Import CONTD.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up further discussion regarding the serious situation affecting agriculture and farmers interests due to increase in the prices of fertilizers and import of wheat.

Shri V P Singh.