

[श्री राम गोपाल यादव]

बाद किसानों ने ठीक किया है, उसका मुआवजा उन्हें दिया जाये। धन्यवाद।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदय, मुझे एक मिनिट समर्थन करने का अवसर दें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह): नहीं आप केवल एक्सेसिप्ट कर दें।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: मान्यवर, श्री राम गोपाल जी ने जिस विषय का उल्लेख किया है, वह अत्यंत महत्वपूर्ण है और इसका स्त्रोत्र संबंध किसानों से है। इटावा जनपद में किसानों का धर्यकर रूप से उत्पीड़न किया जा रहा है। मैं विस्तार में नहीं जानना चाहता, इसलिए इनकी जो मांगें हैं, उन मांगों के संबंध में मेरा पूर्ण समर्थन है और आपके माध्यम से अनुरोध है कि सरकार इन्हें स्वीकार कर ले।

NEED TO FORMULATE A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND SETTING UP OF ETHICS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I rise with some diffidence to make my special mention. We have often in this House discussed questions of our privilege, breach of our privilege, but I feel that in a democracy there is no privilege which is greater than the privilege of a common citizen. Often now increasingly situations are arising where privileges of the common man, the common citizen of this country are being violated or breached by some of us, by Members of Parliament and I consider this to be a matter of great concern for myself, for this House and for all of us who are in public life.

Increasingly, Sir, you will notice that the favourite villain of the Indian screen today is the Indian politician and it is probably reflective of the state of affairs prevailing in our society that it should come to this pass. We stop trains where they are not scheduled to stop, we go and occupy berths which are not reserved for us, we beat up passengers if they try and assert their rights and those of us who are not even guilty have to face the embar-

rassment of being questioned on these issues when we travel in trains. They say, "What has taken over the Members of Parliament, is this the manner in which a Member of Parliament should behave?" Sir, I would not have taken the time of this House or your valuable time in raising this issue if I had my self not been confronted with such questions repeatedly, on a number of occasions in the past. Now, where does the citizen go if a Member of Parliament does not behave properly or misbehaves with him? What happens to his complaint? There is absolutely no mechanism to deal with such complaints. If we do not take cognizance of such complaints, we will be doing a long-term damage to Indian public life and to the institution of Indian Parliament.

I am, therefore, rising to suggest as I said 'with diffidence' and I do not know how it will be taken up, that we should put our heads together, all political leaders of various political parties, Members of Parliament, Speakers, Presiding officers, as we did some time ago, to evolve a code of conduct about how we are going to behave outside. This code of conduct must be prepared and evolved and we, all Members of Parliament, all members of State Legislatures, must start observing this code of conduct. And in order to implement this code of conduct I strongly suggest that we should have an Ethics Committee. There are other parliaments and legislatures in the world which have Ethics Committee. I am strongly suggesting that this House should make a beginning by constituting an Ethics Committee of the Rajya Sabha. Let us set a precedent where such complaints and complaints of any other nature of violation of code of conduct could be discussed and, if necessary, suitable admonishment even suitable punishment to the concerned Member of Parliament, be meted out by the Ethics Committee.

I think a time has come where we cannot sweep such issues and such incidents under the carpet, and we should sit up, take cognizance of this and do

something about it. I hope my voice will reach those quarters where it is supposed to and we shall apply ourselves seriously to this issue. Thank you.

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE NATIONAL HIGHWAYS (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1992

II. THE NATIONAL HIGHWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1992.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (RAJASTHAN): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"That this House disapproves of the National Highways (Amendment) Ordinance, 1992 (No. 19 of 1992), promulgated by the President on the 23rd October, 1992."

Sir, at the outset I want to put on record my strong objection to this Ordinance Raj which appears to have become a routine affair with this Government. My Resolution itself says that "This House disapproves of the National Highways (Amendment) Ordinance, 1992 (No. 19 of 1992), promulgated by the President on the 23rd October 1992." Sir, it is apparent that this is Ordinance No. 19 of this year.

Ever since Independence, I wish to bring to the notice of the Government, never has there been a year in which 19 Ordinance have been issued. Maybe in 1991, I do not know the figure. But, only after this Government has come, we are issuing Ordinances at this feverish pace.

This particular ordinance was issued on 23rd October, 1992. Parliament has met on 24th November, only one month after that. What was the urgency? There is a statement explaining the circumstances which had necessitated immediate legislation by the National Highways (Amendment) Ordinance promulgated on 23rd October, 1992. To my utter disappointment, this five-paragraph statement does not give us the circumstances which necessitated it. It gives the reasons why this Bill has come: the highways are in a

bad shape, money is required, resources crunch is there. Therefore, those are objects and reasons for the Bill. We are not discussing the merits. At least my Resolution is not on the merits and demerits of the Bill. We may all support the need to raise resources to maintain the highways better. The issue is, you must tell us why the ordinance had to be issued.

Sir, let me remind this Government: Mrs. Indira Gandhi was a very powerful Prime Minister. In her own regime, one Ordinance was issued for the nationalization of banks and there was a furore in Parliament as to why that Ordinance had to be issued when Parliament was going to meet in the next few days. She had a valid reason—that nationalization by itself was a thing which had to be done without notice. It was not advisable to bring a Bill before Parliament. She had to do it without giving notice. Now, these reasons do not apply to the kind of Ordinances that this Government has been issuing. They have issued an ordinance to create the SEBI—Securities and Exchange Board of India. Between the last session and this session, seven Ordinances have been issued, each one of them wholly unnecessary, wholly irrelevant. The urgency aspect is not there. There is one Ordinance on the Industrial Finance Corporation of India to convert it from a Corporation to a public company. Now, I don't understand what is the reason for an Ordinance in that case. In this case, it is even more so.

I thought the statement would tell us that urgently Government had to put a fee or octroi on a particular bridge or a particular bridge which was to be opened. Nothing of the sort is there the statement doesn't say anything. I would like to know from the Minister whether after the promulgation of the Ordinance, till today, if they have used these powers. If they have not used these powers between 23rd October and now, it proves my case that the Ordinance was wholly unnecessary. The very fact that you are issuing an Ordinance means you act on it. After