

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, regarding the points which hon. Mr. Rajna-rain has raised, that is, Short Notice Question and Calling Attention Motion etc., the Government has nothing to say. It is between the hon. Member and the Chair and it is for the Chair to direct whatever he wishes about the time. I would not like to say anything on that matter at all.

So far as the suggestion of hon. Mr. B. K. P. Sinha is concerned, there will be one serious difficulty and it is this. It is likely that the whole of Saturday will be taken up for discussion on the Railway (Appropriation) Bills and it may not be possible to find any time to do anything else. You will kindly appreciate the difficulty. I do not know if hon. Members decide to pass the Railway (Appropriation) Bills within one hour or half a day, it is for them I am entirely in your hands. I would like to submit only this thing, that the Government has agreed to discuss the international situation although we are aware of the fact that the Foreign Minister is not here. But even then we agreed to discuss it because there was a desire from all sides of the House. Therefore, I think certain limitations will have to be kept, and if Members feel that after a month when we meet again in the next session, a discussion on this will be there, tomorrow will be sufficient for the essential features to come out. Therefore, we can take up the Railway Appropriation Bill on Saturday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): What the hon. Minister wants is an interchange of programme from Friday to Saturday and from Saturday to Friday. This simply is his request. So I would put before the House that the international situation be taken up tomorrow. The reply of the Minister may be on Saturday morning and thereafter we can take up the Railway Appropriation Bill.

PON MEMBERS: Yes.

THI; VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We will go back to the discussion on the Bill.

THE ANTI-CORRUPTION LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967—coritrt.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the amending Bill that we are considering now is a piece-meal Bill and, therefore, I am conscious of the limitation of the scope of discussion on this Bill. But the subject we are to discuss is so elaborate, is so allpervasive, that I may be inclined to go out of the way a little bit and I crave your indulgence for that.

Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it has been said: 'The law on the subject was made more stringent. Possession of pecuniary resources or property disproportionate to one's known sources of income was made by itself a substantive offence.' That relates to public servants. Sir, you know that when a particular Government servant is found possessing properties in excess of his reasonable income, he will come under the purview of this Act and the law will take its own course of action. Sir, had this been the only source of corruption—that certain Government employees indulge in corrupt practices and, therefore, the whole society is corrupt—then the matter would have been simple and this Act might have been sufficient to meet it. But most of the hon. Members, who have participated in this debate to-day, have amply made it clear that the source of corruption is not only the Government offices and the Government servants, but it lies elsewhere also. And the entire social fabric has been poisoned by corruption to-day, if I am permitted to say so. As such, I do not say for a single moment that our hon. Minister or our friends sitting opposite are not conscious of it. They know that corruption is going to poison the entire social fabric of our

And for the purpose of combating corruption, for the purpose of eradicating corruption, there might have been certain efforts too. There have been a plethora of committees. There have been many statements and many laws might have been also there. But in spite of these, what we have witnessed is that the laws enacted for this purpose could not reduce corruption to a considerable extent, not to speak of eradicating it; rather, if I am permitted to say, it has gone on increasing. Therefore, simply by adopting a piece-meal amendment of this nature, we cannot fight corruption, we cannot eradicate corruption, we cannot eliminate corruption. For that purpose, much more stringent actions are necessary. And my view is that a piece-meal treatment of corruption does not eradicate corruption, rather it breeds corruption. Unless you take a broader view of the thing, unless you attack corruption from all sides, a piece-meal treatment of this kind will only breed corruption. Therefore, however laudable may be the attempt, it is not going to fulfil the purposes for which the Anti-Corruption Act was passed. My humble submission to the Minister is that there have been the Santhanam Committee recommendations; there have been recommendations by the Administrative Reforms Commission. There might be many more recommendations from various sources, many more symposia and much more discussion on the subject. Will the hon. Minister be pleased to say in this House whether it is possible to have a consolidated Bill to launch an attack on corruption in various fields, in various spheres, so that corruption can be fought effectively and sincerely?

Coming to the provisions of the Bill itself, although our hon. Minister has announced at the outset that the Ministers are also included in the definition of 'public servant', neither an assurance in this House nor the proceedings of this House is the law of the land. Naturally, by a mere assurance given in this House, we cannot

bring Ministers under the purview of this Act. Therefore, he should do something more than a mere assurance.

It has been rightly pointed out by my friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra that there are public undertakings and autonomous bodies also in which there are possibilities of corruption. So, if you really want to eradicate corruption, something must be done regarding the management of those public undertakings and autonomous bodies. Of course, Mr. Lokanath Misra might have said that—I do not know—to discredit the public sector. But I am for the expansion of public sector. Therefore, the management of public undertakings and the management of autonomous bodies should be clean and free from corruption so that the desired results are achieved. So, it is not clear in this Bill whether anybody highly placed in the management of a public undertaking or an autonomous body will be brought within the purview of this Act, i.e. under the definition of 'public servant.'

Similarly, there are municipalities, there are zila parishads and there are corporations and I want the Act to extend to these bodies also, whatever may be the party in power. I do not say that only the Congress people are corrupt and the others are not corrupt. So I would like to know whether those bodies which are being run by ineffective persons will also come under the provisions of this Act. There is corruption there and there may be corruption and unless you fight corruption at that level also, we are not going to eradicate corruption from those public organisations. There is a great doubt among the people of this country regarding the *bona fides* of ourselves, those who are enacting Bills against corruption. Somebody may feel that those corrupt persons are here, who have practised this, are speaking against corruption that, certain people, whose *bona fides* are not accepted by the people outside, are speaking against corruption and passing laws against corruption. Therefore these do not produce the necessary impact

I Shri Chitta Basu.]

on the people to fight corruption. Unless the people are associated with thi? type of legislation for its implementation, no purpose can be served by merely passing a legislation in this House or that House or in other legislative bodies. Therefore if we are serious about our intention to fight corruption, then those who. are in the legislatures must remain above any kind of suspicion and this legislation should also include them. That is what I say.

In conclusion, I would once more request the Minister to bring a comprehensive legislation incorporating the recommendations of the Santha-nam Committee, incorporating the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission and also other suggestions given by other agencies so that our Government may make it clear to the people that the Government is serious to fight corruption from all sides.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi):
Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think if this Bill had been drafted properly in the first instance, it would not have come up for this amendment. That is a great mistake and it is so much waste of time and money for passing this Bill again. Had the draftsmen done a better job and had the scrutiny been better, it would not have come up today. Secondly, how many cases are really examined or investigated under this particular provision? I say this because very large number of people are there whose income is disproportionate to their resources but we do not always go in and find out how they acquired all that wealth and property. This is more rampant in this particular instance that people may have more money or property which are much more than the resources they may be able to command. If we- wanted to really attack this problem seriously on a large scale, it is very necessary that more use is made of this provision than it is being done. I do not think we really fully utilised this and the trend has been, in recent years, that the bureaucracy is likely

to accumulate more wealth through all sorts of means. There are various times and for every single thing, and I do not know, from so many levels also, whether the ordinary people want a tube-well connection or an electric connection or want even a case to be taken up in a court at a particular time, but money passes hands all the same. This trouble is so rampant and has increased a little bit in the last 2 years that even during the British times people were very much afraid of giving or taking money on such a large scale but gradually the people's fear has gone away and they take money or give money very freely and this is more widespread now than it was earlier, whatever the reason may be. Of course, I do not beliey* that there is as much corruption as the propaganda about it goes. The sound and noise about it is so much more than the actual corruption that may be there but I think for the ordinary people, they meet at every step and at every level there is a good deal of corruption and the Government is not doing anything to curb that.

I also feel that the bureaucracy has a very great weakness for such peor pie, who have also become very rich very soon and through means best known to them, not always very clean means either and our society has come to a stage where we accept people getting rich quickly and making money and through money making various contacts with Ministers and with officers and taking various advantages from them. Our society, has come to the stage that we do not condemn nor do we seem to reject this development in our social attitudes and we practically look upon them respectably. They have acquired also, because of the mass of wealth they possess or they have acquired, more social distinction an social acceptance and recognition in our society that we do ?»ot condemn that section of our people who have acquired wealth by very wrong means but we practically look

up to them because they are so well-off and they are so affluent. This is a sick thing in our society that is developing, this is a disease in our society that we allow people to get rich through all sorts of means and we also make them socially very high-up in our society. A new class has come up, that is of contractors. They hang on the Ministers, they hang on the officers and take various advantages and our society accepts them. There is *the* business class who are extremely rich and who have enough money to spend on all people, big and small and they do it and we do not seem to condemn it either, and we accept them and their position and our entire Cabinet goes to attend their functions, no matter what sort of work it is or how they have acquired their wealth or how much wasteful it may be. We are losing our conscience in these matters and we allow corruption to spread as much as it can and this is something which is going to damage our society, it has already damaged our society and it has damaged our social structure also. This is not something which is going to build up our country. This is going to partly disintegrate and destroy our country if the trend remains as it is to-day. I think all those people who are very honest, who are straightforward, who are clean in their working, when they see people getting rich overnight or the business people making money in 3 months or 3 years or 5 years, they get a tremendous amount of discouragement because they feel they are fools if they are not making money and others are doing so. The Government does not seem to or even the officers do not seem to either discourage it or disapprove of it or socially deny it recognition. Our establishments that operate in the country, whether it is the businessmen or even our Ministers, or the bureaucracy, they do not mentally revolt against it, they do not dislike it, they almost accept it and they enjoy it and they like it. They want all the advantages that people with the wealth can confer and they want to enjoy it. There are many people who are given A lot of money and facilities by the

business people and there are many people even on the staff of the Ministers who are paid very well by various people for various favours done to them by these people and the Minister* are either not conscious of it or they do not bother about it or they are so much impressed by their personal staff that they do not bother to discourage it or check it or ask how they acquire so much money.

SHIRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is x philosophical way of putting it.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Yo* do not worry about philosophy. It i< my language.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why do you not say in a simple language?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: I am putting it in as simple a language a* you can understand. It is a very bad thing if we are acquiring a reputation for licence-permit raj. I think the Government be very objective. If they were to benefit or help people, they will get certain blame for these things. Either they should be honest about their work also and do things or they should not make any pretence about honesty etc. when various business houses are working in their background or some of the rich people who put their people around the variou* people so that they can get not only information but they can get variou* advantages. Practically minute to minute information in the houses of the various Ministers remain with certain people who are put there by certain financial persons or business houses. I think this is a very gru* weakness in our society that people de not have even the tendency to discourage it or dislike it. Therefore I feel that the Government has to change its thinking radically and also it* operations. I think if they are really honest about it, they should do something about it or they should not try only to project their images in variou* ways without really being able to justify that image.

AN HON. MEMBER. Camouflage.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT. The question is, we are by and large, the people who rule this country, are those who are educated and who are well-to-do or who come from the well-to-do families by and large. Of course, bow ordinary people also come through education, etc. But even our high people or low people, Ministers or other big people, or business people or the bureaucracy, with whom is our identification? Our unconscious mind, with whom does it identify? Does it identify with a Birla or a Tata? Does it identify with the very rich people, or does it identify with the common people, or the ordinary people? Do we want in society our friends and comrades who are extremely rich, smooth operators and very well off people? Or do we want the people, who are our comrades but are ordinary people, even people who are poor or people who may be poor but honest? Or do we want the very rich and fashionable people but who may be quite dishonest and they make money through any means possible? Where is the identification of our Ministers and big people? Where is the identification of our bureaucracy? Where is the identification of the business community? Leave aside the business community; they are very »uch ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Ask Mr. Arjun Arora.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: You know better. The question is: Where is our unconscious identification? Do we identify with the very rich and fashionable people, or do we identify with the very poor people? Even if their clothes are dirty, and their homes modest but a bit dirty, probably not very ordinary people, still we feel for them and we feel with them. Or do we feel our comradeship to lie with the very well-to-do class, who dress up like us, who sit like us, who talk like us, see the same type of pictures or do the same type of discussion about news and such other things like us? Where is our

mental identification or alignment? I think our leadership is also greatly at fault in this respect, because they in their unconscious mind identify themselves with the very rich people. No matter how they have become rich but they are their friends; they are not discriminating about it. And when the identification of even the leadership is with the big people and in such a manner, how can you expect the ordinary people not to imitate them and make friends or identification or alignment or a sort of look-up to that type of life, that class of people who have this way of life? Therefore we have to radically do something about it, and if the Government fails, the whole social structure as well as the administrative and political structure will gradually totter. The more corrupt the people are, either business-people or officials or Ministers, the more comfortable they are. If they were very much influenced, they would get into so many difficulties. This is the difficulty in our society today that the more corrupt they are and the more accepting of corruption they are, the more comfortable and happy they are. Nothing seems to trouble them. Nothing seems to bother them. They are quite comfortable.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It is time to wind up.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: And this is a very unhealthy state of affairs because, ultimately, it is not going to build up their own position or the position of these officials who may continue a very corrupt career, and somewhere along the line they will get into difficulties. It is not good for our society, because the Ministers may also get into various difficulties.

Tenders do not need to be invited This is a new thing. Everything is a rush job and the contracts are all settled in their homes, and those very

contractors have to finance their elections as well as help them financially and with all sorts of things. And then word goes round, "Help this Minister and save him to get out of this difficulty." How can society function like this? How can Government function like this when a whole lot of people try to do a polish-up and a hush-hush job? I think rules should be followed. There should be strict rules about acceptance of gifts by them or by the family members of Ministers and officials, no gifts to any of these people who are there to discharge their public functions either as Ministers or as officials. If I get a lot of land or property transferred in the name of my brother even then I say, "I am very honest, I have nothing to do with my brother, a private person; he has nothing to do with that; he can take any amount of property, but I am perfectly honest." But that is not honesty and it does not carry conviction.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. F. BHARGAVA): It is time to wind up, Miss Vasisht.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Yes, I am winding up. Sir, I think this double standard must change, and we must review our attitude totally, we must revise our attitudes if we want to bring about any healthy trends in our society. I thank you very much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this is a piecemeal legislation to remedy some flaws which have been found. But we are discussing the major problem of corruption in the country. Now Mr. Raj-narain will be speaking more on this subject, because I believe he is more conversant with it, in a good way.

SHRI RAJNARAIN (Uttar Pradesh) : Yes, yes, in a good way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now he was asking me: What is the definition of corruption? My friend was asking

me. Now I cannot define corruption because it is very difficult to define it here, because it seems that under the Congress regime corruption has become the hall-mark of success, prosperity and well being in life. Therefore, how can you define something which has brought so much wealth, prosperity and well being to a small number of people? But only the other day, or today, I believe, even some papers have reported on the basis of the reports of the various committees appointed by the Government that corruption is going up in the country. And yet, we had a Home Minister some years ago who took a solemn vow that if he did not eliminate corruption within two years' time, he would resign.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): He has retired. He has gone out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just a minute. I know that. I am coming to that.

Corruption continued and he continued even with greater vigour putting people in the Opposition in detention without trial. But then he went down on the cow issue, not on the corruption issue. There may be linguistic similarity between cow and corruption, but they are two propositions poles apart. Mr. Nanda declared war on corruption but went down on cow issue. Well, I do not know; if the cow issue had not come, Mr. Nanda would have continued. I have no doubt in my mind because, one day, I reminded him, "Mr. Nanda, you may as well hang a calendar in your room so that you may sometimes look at it and see how the time was running out and your lease of life, according to your promise, was also coming to an end should you at all be true to your pledge of resigning in the event of corruption not being eliminated within two years' time."

Now as far as I am concerned, I have not the slightest faith in the present Congress regime; corruption is a built-in feature of the Congress

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

system of public administration; corruption has become a concomitant of the manner in which the Congress carries on the affairs of State. So long as they remain in power, corruption will not be eliminated. There may be shadow boxing with corruption. There may be hysterical postures and gestures in order to make it look as if they are great fighters against corruption. But corruption will continue all the same.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is no wonder that under the Congress regime, in recent years after the third General Elections five Chief Ministers fell on corruption charges not one but five—since 1962. There was Shri Pratap Singh Kairon of Punjab, then Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad of Jammu and Kashmir, then Sankar of Kerala and then that remarkable couple, Biren Mitra and Biju Patnaik of Orissa. Now this is a wonderful thing, in five years time five Chief Ministers fell on corruption charges. At least one of them had been subjected to open inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act and the report went against him, his family and against very many other people connected with him. I do not wish to take the name, but you will understand that I have in mind the Das Commission's Report. The observations in the Das Commission's Report are also very interesting. Mr. Das pointed out how there is corruption in high places.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, five went, but what about the others? There was Shri Nijalingappa, the Chief Minister of Mysore, who came under heavy charge.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore):
What was wrong with him?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And there was Shri K. B. Sahai of Bihar against whom also there were many charges. And then that Minister for the time being, Shri C. B. Gupta—well, he is always Minister for the

time being, you see—he was also the subject of serious charges. There are other Ministers also in the country who had been accused of corruption, malpractices, favouritism, not by the Opposition but by Congress members themselves. Now we have got a case still with us, the case of the illustrious Biju Patnaik. It would seem as if Biju Patnaik can never be caught. Yet we hear that during the last ten years his income-tax dues had accumulated to the extent of Rs. 3 crores and this very Government now reopens those cases against one who had been Chief Minister in their own Government. What does that show? It shows that either the Congress Government has reopened the cases absolutely unjustly which is very wrong as far as Biju Patnaik is concerned, or there are some very valid reasons for reopening the case. Since Mr. Patnaik has been discarded by the people I take it that the Central Government is likely to be more right in this matter and under the circumstances of the case it is clear that the Central Government is right. Therefore it follows that Mr. Patnaik was concealing his incomes, that he was not submitting proper income-tax returns to the authorities, one who has been a Chief Minister in the country, a very important man at one time in the Congress High Command. Only just before the last General Elections the Congress President put him in charge of the Orissa Congress elections, the General Elections there. And this letter of his was used by the same gentleman to get Shri Sadasiv Tripathy out. These are well known facts. I say if people who are accused of corruption in public life and openly are recruited for such purposes by people who are at the head of the ruling party in the country, do you expect corruption to be combated or eliminated? You cannot expect it. As far as West Bengal is concerned, everybody knows about it. Now the Government we find, we are told, we are not personally in the Government, but we are told by our friends and colleagues who are more closely in

touch with the affairs of the West Bengal State Government, that year after year corruption had taken place in the giving of permits, licences, contracts and so on, and that jobbery of every kind was indulged in by those Ministers. We are told that the Government of Orissa is now thinking of starting a public enquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act, but the Central Government would not even favour them with a copy of the C.B.I. Report. Well, is that how you are going to fight corruption? Certainly this is not the way to fight corruption. I need not go into all that because it is all well known.

The one reason more than any other why the Congress had been defeated in the last General Elections is this corruption. Nothing has hurt the people so much in the matter of public administration as this corruption. There are other and bigger issues like devaluation, prices, taxes and so on. But this issue dominated the elections, this issue of corruption. The Congress became the symbol of corruption. The electorate took the Congress as a symbol of corruption.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: So many of your leaders also were defeated, so many from the CPI, Swatantra and other parties. Were they all corrupted?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My hon. friend Shri Yajee is either on falsehood or is irrelevant. In the case of Dr. Lohia he was on falsehood and now he is irrelevant. The issue is you have lost. None of us lost. We have all gained in the last General Elections. Some of us have gained more and some have gained less, but we have all gained. The only party which has lost and lost heavily is the Congress Party. Therefore my hon. friend should realise that. Mr. Vice-Chairman, does he realise that the Congress lost in the last General Elections? If he does realise that then he should ask himself this question.

Why did the Congress lose the elections? I am not saying that very individual in the Congress is a bad man. There are many good people even in the Congress Party. I am not one of those who would tarnish ehre^y man in tihe iCongreas Party with the same brush. Not at all. There are good and honourable people even among Congressmen, even some Ministers. There are such people and there is no doubt about it at all. But the thing is you are running the administration in such a way that corruption has become a built-in feature and corruption at high places has become the source of corruption at the bottom also. That is why the people voted against the Congress. I hope Mr. Yajee will agree with me.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the main reason is this link-up between monopolistic capital and the politicians of the Congress Party. / This monopolistic growth in our economy is taking place through the malpractices on the part of those concerned and this is res-pon sible for corruption in high places But for this link-up between the men in high places and the monopolists there would not have been so much corruption. You blame a chowkidar here or a ticket collector there or some small Government employee. They are not really responsible for corruption. They are the unfortunate victims of the evil system which the Congress has created. The source of corruption, the fountain of corruption, has to be traced where it actually lies. It is to be found in high places. That is the main thing Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know what all things the Vivian Bose Commission revealed in its findings. You have seen in that Commission's report how the Dalmia Jain concerns had built up their multifarious connections with the administration resulting in the loss of crores of crores to the public exchequer and to the shareholders. We have got here other reports to show how corruption exists in such high places. But how do they tackle corruption? Here

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Shri Arjun Arora made certain charges of corruption. Those charges may be made rightly or wrongly, I am not going into that. But then this matter should have been discussed in Parliament. It was not discussed. Since then I have acquainted myself with the relevant documents. I find that as many as 90 items he had listed against one Minister. Is it not a matter which should be discussed in Parliament? Here an hon. Member had brought out so many things. If you want to fight corruption it is necessary that all such charges, no matter against whom, when they are brought up by a responsible Member of Parliament, should be publicly discussed on the floor of the House. Therefore I think when you do not discuss such things when serious charges are made by a Member of the ruling party and when they are even submitted to the Prime Minister, charges containing evidence, containing facts and figures, if there is no discussion of such things but there is hush hush, then I do not know what example you are setting before the nation. There are two things here. One is that the persons concerned may be found guilty. The other is that they may not be guilty. If they are not guilty then the person making the charges would be put to difficulty. The others will be vindicated. On the other hand, if the charges have substance and are true, then the matter should be pursued in order to find out all the ratifications and to punish the people concerned and plug the loopholes so that there is no repetition of the thing. But nothing of the kind we are doing. Mr. Vice-Chairman, therefore I say, let us start with the Ministers.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Gupta, you have taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Fifteen minutes only? One five?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is nothing much. Anyway, I am finishing.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, my hon. friend here suggested that Ministers should be included in this definition of "public servant". The Minister has given an assurance. But why not put it in the definition and say it in the clause that a member of a Council of Ministers will also be a public servant? Why not do it now instead of leaving it for interpretation by courts? As Shrimati Yashoda Reddy pointed out, one Full Bench may say that a Minister is included and another Full Bench may say that a Minister is not included. Therefore, why leave out Ministers here? As far as Ministers are concerned, I know there are some honourable people among them. But there are the others also. It is not as if they are all taking bribe. That is not the only way in which there is corruption. That is a very primitive way of looking at corruption. We are not living in the Moghul days that corruption is to be understood in terms "of bribe-giving and bribe-taking. Corruption may well be that the Minister's son is employed and given a very high salary out of all proportion to his qualifications, corruption may well be that the Minister's very close relatives are on the Board of Directors of companies; corruption may well be that Ministers' wives cease to be nurses, if they were nurses, and become Managing Directors of companies; corruption may well be that the Minister's wife suddenly comes within the category of low income group and is allotted houses meant for the low income group people as happened in Andhra Pradesh. These are corruption. Corruption may be that certain Ministers get certain favours in different other ways. These are all sources of corruption. I do not say that every

Minister is of that type; I do not say that every Minister takes bribe. That is not the way.

Today things are developing and you can benefit the Ministers' families. If the Minister is connected with any business, you can help the Minister's business. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Is it not a fact—it was reported in the newspapers also—that some sons of Ministers have become multimillionaires overnight in a matter of five years or ten years? These are stated facts and these have not been disputed. Now, tell me how one can become a multimillionaire if he pays income-tax properly because the income-tax at the highest level comes to about 75 per cent.. It is not possible for any Indian to become within ten years a multimillionaire when he did not have much funds in his possession. It is just not possible. Economists and other income-tax officials have pointed out that in the process of making big income if one pays his income-tax, he cannot become a multi-millionaire within ten years' time. Yet we find that some Ministers' sons are known to have amassed enormous fortunes and become multimillionaires. How is it possible? There should be an investigation into this. Here it is not a question of going to a court of law and settling the issue; this question should be settled in public life. In Parliament through discussion so that we come to a reasonable conclusion as to whether the wealth that a particular gentleman enjoys is warranted by his qualifications and whether it is possible to amass that wealth within the period it has been earned. We do not do such things at all. We just make charges and others listen to them. If you are strong you can ignore it but in public interest you must go into these cases because this demoralises. If somebody hears that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has become a millionaire in the course of his being a Member of Parliament within fifteen years' time, would it not demoralise the supporters of Mr. Bhupesh

Gupta? Would it not create confusion in public mind? Would it not put him under suspicion? Would it not become a matter of grave concern in the party to which he belongs? Certainly it will be. It applies to the Congress Party as well; even more so because they are the ruling party and they are in a position to distribute favours; they are in a position to distribute licences and so on. Take the case of these licences. Do I understand that Birlas got these licences without all kinds of corrupt practices? Surely the licences have been bought illegally; moneys have been paid for them. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will tell you how it is done.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I have allowed ten minutes to other speakers but you have taken nearly twenty.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing.

Take the case of the family of the Nawab of Rampur. It is a princely family, I am in possession of all the details. It has got heirloom, jewels and other things are there. I understand that about Rs. "3 crores worth of heirloom is there. According to my information which the Finance Minister knows also—because both of us have got the copies of the document and he is investigating into it—we are told that in collusion with some officials the things are being changed. Some of the things are being sold also. You cannot sell the heirloom unless you pay wealth tax on it since 1956 but it is happening now. The pearls and diamonds are being removed and replaced by other things. That is the position. Now I tell you that the Home Ministry is supposed not only to be told about that but the Home Ministry knows it is being done but yet it is not doing anything. Under the Agreement with the Princes, the Princes are only expected to inform the Home Ministry where the heirloom is kept. How it

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

is kept, whether any changes are taking place, whether the diamonds are being replaced by some other inferior quality stones, nothing of the kind is known. This is just one example I have given. I do not wish to say many more things. Everybody knows what has happened to the Nizam Trust; everybody knows that the Birla Trusts are sources of corruption with which many people are involved.

Before I sit down, I want to tell you one more thing. How is it that some of the I.C.S. officers immediately after their retirement get employment in the big business houses? Take the case of Mr. B. K. Kaul, rather Lieut-Gen. Kaul. According to his own admission, he never knew Mr. Teja. Suddenly Mr. Teja wrote to him a letter, according to him, giving him an appointment on a salary of Rs. 8^000 basic pay. Am I to believe it is like that? Therefore it is quite clear that when these officials, Secretaries, I.C.S. and I.A.S. officers— not all of them but some of them— are in office they are in collusion with the big business and after their retirement as a matter of routine they are given high employment. Where is your Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry? Where are the other big officials of the South and North Block? Some of them today are Managing Directors or Chairman of the Board of Directors. It follows therefore that they have been maintaining connection and it is a kind of quid pro quo for the services they rendered to the big business during their tenure of office. Secretaries of the Government of India and Joint Secretaries have been rewarded with such positions in companies, corporations and so on.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It is time to wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not wish to say anything more. As far as corruption is concerned, the Congress people are responsible for

it. And, Mr. Vice-Chairman, since I am on this subject, I still demand that Mr. Arjun Arora's letter should be discussed. I have gone through it and for the life of me I cannot bring myself to think that it has nothing to do with corruption, malpractice or integrity of character. Ninety items are mentioned in one case and six or seven major items are mentioned in another case. Mr. Arjun Arora seems to have submitted to the Prime Minister a questionnaire in which he has asked her to investigate many things. Shri Madhu Limaye has read this letter and we have taken pains to study it. I can tell you that *prima facie* there is a case for proper investigation by a competent investigating authority. If we do not even undertake such an investigation on the basis of so authenticated a document that has come from Mr. Arjun Arora, I think it is useless to tell the nation that this Congress Government is going to fight corruption. It is equally useless to amend the law because it will only look as if we want to put up a kind of false show while we intend to do nothing, but anyhow we intend to shield and maintain corruption in high places including the Central Cabinet of the Government of the Union of India.

DR. ANUP SINGH: May I ask the hon. Member whether he realises that his disclosure in Parliament that the Nawab of Rampur family is busy disposing of the heirloom under camouflage at a time when the Home Ministry is seized of the problem will encourage them to dispose of it much quicker than they would otherwise have done it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would not have said; I was keeping it. But I had a question replied to by the Finance Minister. It was a written question. There he said that he was investigating. At least the Rampur family knows that much. There is no doubt about it. I know they are taking steps. It is quite right

that they should have taken steps as i soon as the document reached them. | Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have got the | copy of the document with me. In the document they have detailed everything and it is dated some months ago. It had reached the Home Minister and some Members of Parliament; only some . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): ' That wiU do. Shri Gulam Nabi Untoo. One minute. Since hon. Members are very eager to have full time for the debate on international affairs tomorrow, I hope they will sit a little longer and finish the Bill today.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): There will not be more than three hours available.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You should be here when things are discussed.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: I said there will not be mor_e than three hours.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Absentee-Members cannot be helped.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: You must obey the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Untoo, you start.

SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Bill under discussion is the anti-corruption law.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Rampu_r document was dated the 27th.

SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO: The Bill under discussion is the anti-corruption law, to amend the Act of 1947. The amendment show_s that the

Government is serious to plug the holes of corruption possible anywhere under the Act. Corruption is a social evil and it has to be looked into as a socio-economic problem. Hon. Members who spoke in the House are of opinion that there cannot be two opinions about it that corruption is rampant, whether it be in the administration, whether it be in public life, whether it be in big business or whether it be among the contractors. When one traces out the history of corruption, one can reasonably locate it and find various factors responsible for it. One of the main factors responsible for corruption is the widening gap in the incomes of people who cannot afford to live within the limits they have been provided with. The society in which we live is a democratic socialistic society and we aspire to create such a society. Whejn we blame public servants and businessmen for corruption, we forget that in our society neither the businessman nor the public servant is answerable to the common man for corruption. In a democratic society the most responsible community before the public are the public men who enter public life, those who work in the various political parties. The nucleus of this democratic society is the number of people who have entered the various political parties as public men and it is entirely the responsibility of public *men*. They can give a check or brake to corruption which is prevalent in our society at present. To ' blame, the society for corruption is not the right course. It is not the right method of fighting out corruption. If we honestly believe that we should fight out corruption, we should not raise our fingers against public servants or big businessmen. Rather we should look into ourselves. By 'ourselves' I mean particularly those who have entered Legislatures, who have entered Parliament, to whichever party they may belong. Unless they are honest about it, unless they take a vow to live within the means they have been provided with and

[Shri Gulam Nabi Untoo.]

observe restraint and austerity in their public and private life, so as to enable them to feel just like the common man in the field or factory, it is not possible for them, those who are responsible for framing legislation or implementing legislation to really fight out corruption. We should look into our own life.

I feel that for the corruption which is prevalent at present, the most responsible community is those who are in the political parties. This particular community is responsible before the public. Unless they fight it out within their own circle, within their own public life and private life, it is not possible for them to know what actually the common man, the man in the street, the man in the field or factory feels about it. I think that to fight out corruption, the best course is that we should try to live within the means that we have been provided with. We should try to start an intensive movement to fight and expose those who are known as corrupt in public life. Till then we cannot succeed in fighting corruption. It has been rightly said by a great man that those who undertake such movements, wise, independent and clear-sighted men are very near to death. Men of broad knowledge, sharp discrimination and extensive capacity always endanger their lives because they reveal the evils of others. Unless we in public life are ready to undertake and bear this risk of exposing those who are in high office or expose those who live a comfortable life, a luxurious life, which is not available to the common man, it is not possible for us to stop corruption in our society. It is not the common man who is corrupt. The man responsible for corruption is the man who is answerable for the common man, i.e., the man who has entered public life. We should praise, we should give every protection and we should encourage those elements in political parties, to whichever party they may belong, to come

forward with graphic pictures or disclosures of certain big business or individuals who hold high offices. I feel that it is the only way we can fight corruption. We ourselves, who work in Legislatures and other forums and we who draw our remuneration from the public exchequer, should take a vow to fight corruption at every level, inside as well as outside Parliament.

Sir, in the situation in which we find ourselves the present law on anti-corruption is not sufficient to bring to book those who are really responsible for corruption, that is, those who are holding high offices as public men. Therefore, a comprehensive and exhaustive law should be brought in the House which can cover all those who draw from the public exchequer and work as public men, such as Members of the Legislatures and Parliament and those of the autonomous bodies, and they should also stand trial whenever they are charged or accused of any corrupt practices.

श्री राज नारायण : श्रीमन्, जब से . . .

श्री चन्द्र शेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, जरा एक निवेदन मैं राजनारायण जी से कर दूँ। राजनारायण जी हमारे . . .

श्री राजनारायण : आप निवेदन करेंगे तो मैं कुछ नहीं कहूँगा, आप मुझको सुनिए।

मैं इस विषय पर आने से पूर्व एक बात आपसे अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि सुबह हमने अपने राज्य सभा के सचिव के सम्बन्ध में कुछ बात कही थी, मगर जब उनसे बातचीत हुई तो हमको ऐसा लगा कि उन्होंने—डिपुटी चैयरमैन साहिब! यहाँ बंटी थीं—उन से पूरी बात जो उन्होंने बताई थी नहीं कही, तो अनजाने में हमने उन के बारे में कुछ बात कह दी थी, अगर आप चाहें तो उसको निकलवा दें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : रूल में भी आप गलत थे।

श्री राजनारायण : वह तो हमारा आपका इन्टरप्रिडेशन मित्र है, मगर हमने सचिव के बारे में . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : 188 रुज आप पढ़िए ।

श्री राजनारायण : वह खूब पढ़े हैं । हमने सचिव के बारे में जो बात कही थी उसको मैं चाहूंगा कि वहां से उसको निकलवा दीजिए ।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : आप आर्डर कर दीजिए कि सेक्रेटरी के बारे में जो है उसको प्रोसीडिंग्स में निकाल दिया जाय ।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिए हम कितने जस्ट हैं ।

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I have given the direction.

श्री राजनारायण : यह हमारे समय में से नहीं कटना चाहिए ।

जब से इस विधेयक पर चर्चा हो रही है तब से मैं बहुत ही परेशानी में पड़ गया हूं और अपने तमाम आस-पास के मित्रों से कह रहा हूं कि करप्शन की डेफिनीशन क्या है? मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जिन मंत्री महोदय ने यह भ्रष्टाचार निरोध का विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया हुआ है, 'भ्रष्टाचार क्या है', इस सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने जानकारी हासिल की है, या नहीं? बहुत दूर जाने के पहले हमारे हाथ में जो पत्र हैं उन्हीं को आपकी इजाजत से पढ़ दूंगा । यह हिन्दी अनुवाद है, अंग्रेजी का हमारे पास फाइल में है, निकाल कर दे देंगे । एक मित्र हैं और इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य हैं, जिनका नाम है श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा । श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा साहब ने एक पत्र लिखा है प्रधान मंत्री को । उसकी दूल् कापी हमारे पास मौजूद है । उसमें उन्होंने यह लिखा है—सत्य प्रतिलिपि—

"प्रिय श्रीमती गांधी,

मेरे पत्र दिनांक 5 जून, 1967 के सन्दर्भ में . . ."

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव): राजनारायण जी, आप उसका सम्बर्तन कह सकते हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : वही सम्बर्तन है, पूरा पढ़ने का समय आप कहां देंगे ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप इनको पढ़ने की इजाजत दें तो मुझे भी जो लिखित बयान लोहिया जी के खिलाफ चेयरमैन को दिया है उसे पढ़ने की इजाजत दीजिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : जो पत्र शीलभद्र याजी पढ़ना चाहते हैं उसको मंगा कर पढ़ दें, हम को क्या एतराज है । प्रिय श्रीमती गांधी जी को 16 जून, 1967 को जो पत्र श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने लिखा है उस में उन्होंने क्या क्या नहीं लिखा है । उन्होंने कहा है कि इसको इन्क्वायरी की जाय । ये 62 से संसद् के सदस्य हैं । इस प्रसंग में यह पूछा जाना उचित है कि श्री पन्त स्नातक कब हुए, उन्होंने विज्ञान में स्नातकोत्तर परीक्षा कब उत्तीर्ण की, उन्होंने कब और किसके यहां प्रथम नियुक्ति पाई, क्या उन्हें मुक्त प्रतियोगिता में नियुक्ति मिली अथवा अन्य प्रकार से । ये सारे के सारे 45 प्रश्न हैं ।

SHRI VIDYA CH ARAN SHUKLA: Sir, this is rather unfair on the part of the hon. Member to bring in any such letter which casts personal aspersion on any other Member of either this House or that House. According to the rules of procedure, proper notice should be given and then it should be brought forth. I personally feel that within the scope of the discussion on this amending Bill this would not come.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You should avoid reading out from the letter. If

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

you have to say anything, you can say in your own way. Please do not read the letter.

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है। तो मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जो पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर माननीय मंत्री ने उठाया था वह महत्वहीन है, उस पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। न तो यह प्रश्न किसी व्यक्ति के व्यक्तिगत जीवन से सम्बन्धित है, जितने प्रश्न श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने उठाए वे सब सार्वजनिक जीवन से सम्बन्धित हैं और पब्लिक कन्डक्ट किसी का डिस्कस किया जा सकता है मोशन पर और किसी विधेयक पर प्रासंगिक ढंग पर किया जा सकता है। उसी ढंग पर मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। उस पक्ष में यहाँ तक उन्होंने लिखा है कि कांग्रेस पार्लियामेंटरी पार्टी के मंत्री रहते हुए, यह बिड़ला की सर्विस में थे और कांग्रेस पार्लियामेंटरी पार्टी के मंत्री रहते हुए, बिड़ला से तन्खाह बराबर लिए हैं, संसद् के सदस्य रहते हुए लिये हैं। श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने यहाँ तक बताया है कि किस मौके पर कितनी निधि इनको दी गई। इसकी जांच करने से पता चल जायगा कि इनके साथ विशेष फेवर किया गया या नहीं, बहुत सारी की सारी बातें हैं। उस समय हम को याद नहीं पड़ा था। अंग्रेजी का पत्र मैं टेबिल पर रख रहा हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबोर प्रसाद भार्गव): टेबिल पर नहीं रख सकते।

श्री राजनारायण : श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने प्रधान मंत्री को सारे मामले दिए।

श्री अकबर अली खान (आन्ध्र प्रदेश): वह आपके यहाँ कैसे आया?

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे यहाँ कैसे आया इस से कोई मतलब नहीं। वह सही है या गलत, यह पूछा जा सकता है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I shall not allow it to be placed on the Table.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. I think you are right, to some extent you may be right. Then you should follow the other House. You should have a look at it. After that you decide. I hope you will follow the same thing, you will follow the same principle as the other House has followed, the Speaker. I have got here ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I am guided by the rules and decisions of this House. The Chair has given a ruling that such papers will not be placed on the Table of the House, and I adhere to that.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): You go through it ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why? On a point of order. Your ruling certainly is final. You have given the ruling. You have given the ruling that it should not be laid on the Table of the House, just as the Speaker of the other House gave the ruling. Fox the present I may not agree with it, but I submit, I request you to follow the other House now for a minute. You follow your principle, I am in entire agreement with you when you say you will go by the rules of this House, not the other House. I say follow the other House. What is that? When this has been cited in this manner, you have not allowed it to be laid on the Table of this House. You have a look at it yourself, that is to say, I would request you to ask for this, and I ask Mr. Rajnarain to give it to you; you have a look at it and see. (Interruption). I am submitting to your ruling. I am submitting fully, one hundred per cent, to your ruling. All I say is, a Judge can be asked to reconsider his judgment. I am not asking you to do it here and now. I am saying you ask for it, you take this letter, and then you see it.

Having gone through this letter which should be enlightening to you as it has been enlightening for many of us, you may consider as to whether the ruling that you have given calls for revision. This is all I am asking. You may reconsider. I am saying that after you have given a ruling that it should not be laid on the Table of the House, you maintain the ruling you have given. All I am saying, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is when things arise in this House, we quote May's Parliamentary Practice; we refer to the House of Commons. We are not guided by the House of Commons. But we do refer to them as representing certain conventions and usages in parliamentary practice. Now, if we can go ten thousand miles away to England, to Westminster to quote something from there, cannot we go across the Central Hall to quote something? I cannot understand it; I cannot simply understand it. Therefore .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: May I ask him one question. Moscow is nearer than London. Should we go and adopt the practices of the Moscow Communist Party (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Order please. Not too many Members at a time.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: My contention is this. I do not know what Mr. Rajnarain is reading from. He has got that letter or document, I do not know which. But whatever Mr. Arjun Arora has written, he has written to the Leader of the Congress Party. It is an internal matter between a member of the party and the leader of the party. I say that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will never like me to read a letter which he has written to Mr. Dange or to any other person of his own party. So, this question does not arise and I request you, Sir not to reconsider it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In the context of what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has submitted, I have also a submission to make. When our House takes a certain decision or when the Presiding Officer of our House takes a decision either to allow something to be laid on the Table of our House or not to be laid and when the other House takes a different decision, we are at a disadvantage. In the case of the CBI Report, I was prevented from placing it on the Table of the House while the other House allowed it to be placed on the Table of that House. Naturally, this discrimination or this difference should not be there between the two Houses (*Interruptions*) .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I am making a submission to the Chair. What is there to raise a point of order now?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Let us be brief.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: What I intend to say is that the Members of this House should also have the same facilities as the Members of the other House enjoy. Or else what happens is this. Even in spite of my thousand endeavours, when I failed to place a document on the Table of the House, somebody else places the same document on the Table of the other House. That is the difference. So, to minimise this difference, if something could be thought of, if there is some sort of arrangement, then it would be much better.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Please come to the point of order.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I am coming strictly to the point of order. You have given a ruling. Now, under the Rules of Procedure, the ruling of the Chair cannot be discussed. But under what rule of the Procedure are you allowing your own ruling to be discussed?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): They are making a suggestion.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: You have allowed that discussion which, I think, Sir, is out of order. You should not have allowed it. (*Interruptions*). I have every right to point out what the procedure is. In the form and garb of a submission, what they are doing is nothing but to discuss your ruling on this point.

One thing about what the hon. Member says about facilities. There is no question of facilities. All the Members enjoy the same facilities whether they are in that House or in this House. And we are not here discussing the facilities; we are discussing the procedure of our own House. We have our own procedure and the other House has its own procedure. It is not always necessary that the procedures of both the Houses should tally. (*Interruptions*) Yes, it is so. Refer to May's Parliamentary Practice. The procedures, the functioning, the working of the House of Commons is quite different from those of the House of Lords. (*Interruptions*). We are therefore perfectly justified in having two conventions and two procedures. It is for the other House to follow our procedure. I would ask: Why not the other House follow this procedure not to permit any irrelevant paper . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Sinha, let us confine ourselves to our House.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Quite right. That is what I want to say. What I submit is that we must stick to our own conventions and we should expect the other House to follow our convention and not permit

such papers to be laid on the Table. Let us not be guided by that very fact, that the other House has done it.

Then there is one more point. I would also submit . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I am afraid, under a point of order you are making a speech. What is the point of order? Let me understand it. This practice of raising points of order and making a speech must stop.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I am making a submission. The hon. Member should not be permitted to read out from such letters . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Well, I have already given a ruling that he shall not read.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, if a Member is prepared to authenticate a document . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That I shall not ruling and I do not want to hear anything on that. Mr. Rajnarain.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that ruling?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That I shall not allow any paper to be placed here.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: "Any paper to be placed here"—that is another thing. I am raising a question for your consideration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Niren Ghosh please resume your seat. You were not present in the House. This question has been raised a number of times. The Chair has given its ruling and I see no reason why that ruling should be revised.

Mr. Rajnarain, please continue your speech.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, I am making another point, not relating to this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): All that has been considered.

Mr. Rajnarain.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं यह समझ नहीं पाया, आपके प्रति तमाम सम्मान, आदर रखते हुए, मैं यह समझ नहीं पाया कि श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा का पत्र जो प्रधान मंत्री को लिखा गया था या जो नोट भेजा गया था उसको इस सदन में रखने से चेयरमैन ने कब मना किया, हम ने नहीं सुना था, यह सवाल पहले कभी भी नहीं उठा था; हाँ, प्रिविलेज का मोशन उठा था प्रिविलेज के सम्बन्ध में ...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : श्री राजनारायण, जो सवाल उठा था उस समय आप नहीं थे, पुराने रिकार्ड्स देखिये तब फिर इस तरह की बातें कीजिये। आप अपनी स्पीच शुरू कीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। जरा सुना जाय। यह प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। I can quote। मेरा यह है कि यह जवाब हमारे पास है जो हमारी प्रोसोर्डिन्स में है जो कि परसों की है :—

"Some time back, Shri Arjun Arora while addressing a meeting of the Congress Parliamentary Party, made a general statement to the effect that some Central Ministers -were in the pay of the Birlas. This statement naturally attracted the attention of the House."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): What are you reading from?

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे सदन में प्रधान मंत्री ने जो बयान पढ़ा था उस को पढ़ रहा हूँ।

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: What for?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Don't talk rub-bish.
308 RS—9.

"I requested Shri Arora to specify the allegations and the evidence bearing on them. He told me that the Ministers he had in mind were Shri Satya Narayan Sinha and Shri K. C. Pant. Subsequently, he sent me some notes concerning them."

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने प्रधान मंत्री को कुछ नोट्स भेजे, यह प्रधान मंत्री ने परसों यहाँ कहा। अब उस नोट की कापी हमारे पास है। हम बिल्कुल इनटाइटिल्ड हैं श्रीमन्, तमाम पार्लियामेंटरी प्रक्रिया के मुताबिक कि उस नोट्स को हम सदन की सेवा में रखें, सदन के सदस्यों से उन नोट्स के बारे में चर्चा करें क्योंकि हमारे दिमाग में यह आता है वह नोट पढ़ने पर कि आगे देखा जाय कि कितना अनर्थ हो रहा है और इसीलिये हम पूछते हैं कि कर्प्शन के माने क्या हैं, what is corruption? जिसकी जो ड्यूटी वह है उसे करना न चाहे तो क्या वह कर्प्शन नहीं है? आगे, श्रीमन्, यहाँ यह कहा गया है :

"... I have gone into this material in consultation with my colleagues, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the Minister of External Affairs. They have carefully examined the material made available to me together with the written statements of Shri Sinha and Shri Pant.

The Deputy Prime Minister, the Home Minister and Shri Chagla have come to the conclusion that the allegations made have not been substantiated. They are convinced ..."

Just see the fun—"they are convinced"—

"... that their examination of the material has revealed nothing relating to the conduct of Shri Sinha and Shri Pant which can be regarded as inconsistent with their integrity and honour as Ministers of Government. I am in entire agreement with this conclusion."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Rajnarainji, are you raising your point of order?

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा पॉइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह सूचित किया—उन्होंने पार्लियामेन्टरी कांग्रेस पार्टी की मीटिंग में कहा—कि अब इसका कोई अर्थ नहीं है, इस सदन की पजेशन में सारी चीजें आ चकी हैं; प्रधान मंत्री ने खुद कबूल किया है कि श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने उन के पास नोट भेजा है। अगर हमारे पास श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने जो नोट भेजा है उसकी प्रतियां उपलब्ध हैं और उस में प्रेवर चाजज हैं, करप्शन के चाजज हैं, अपने पद के दुरुपयोग के चाजज हैं तो क्या सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य अपने को उन चाजज के बारे में जानकारी से बंचित रखना चाहते हैं? ऐसा तरीका अस्वित्यार होगा तो यह जनतंत्रीय और संसदीय प्रथा की हत्या होगी संसदीय और जनतंत्रीय मर्यादाओं की तिलांजलि देना होगा। आप हम को मौका दें कि उन सारे चाजज को सदन के सामने रखें। जो तीन बड़े बड़े मंत्रियों ने जिन्होंने इन्वेस्टिगेशन किया कि पार्टी वह सही है या गलत है, उसके लिए सुबह हमारा विशेषाधिकार का पॉइंट था; वह श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा का पॉइंट नहीं था। हमारा पॉइंट था श्री मोरारजी देसाई, श्री चागला और होम मिनिस्टर के बारे में क्योंकि इन इन लोगों ने गलत बयानी की और श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा के लगाये गये आरोपों की जो उन्होंने छानबीन की उस के बारे में हमारा सवाल था। (Interruption) इसलिये, श्रीमन् मैं पूछता हूँ कि किसी मंत्री के बारे में निश्चित रूप से सदन के एक सम्मानित सदस्य द्वारा यह आरोप लगाना कि उनके लड़के ने एक कंपनी खोली और उस पर बिड़लाओं की एक लाबी है, श्री सिन्हा उस लाबी के सदस्य थे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Rajnarain, you are going on reading. I am asking you whether you have finished your point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : हां तो मैं यही पॉइंट आफ आर्डर कर रहा हूँ। कि क्या हमारा पॉइंट आफ आर्डर बैलिड नहीं है कि मैं आप से इजाजत ले लूँ और आप से कहूँ कि जो नोट प्रधान मंत्री को दिया गया था उस नोट में इतने गंभीर आरोप थे कि उन गंभीर आरोपों की चर्चा सदन में अगर नहीं वैध है, क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री के सामने उनकी चर्चा हो चुकी है इसलिये वह सार्वजनिक महत्व के होते हैं, वे किसी व्यक्ति के व्यक्तिगत जीवन से ही संबंधित नहीं हैं, तो क्या ऐसा करना जनतंत्रीय और संसदीय प्रथाओं की हत्या नहीं है ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : मैं पहले ही आप को कह चुका हूँ कि जो आपको जानकारी है वह कह सकते हैं लेकिन आप पत्र नहीं पढ़ेंगे। अब आप अपना भाषण जारी रखें।

श्री राजनारायण : अब हम अपनी स्पीच शुरू कर रहे हैं। इसके पहले मैं बोला नहीं। श्रीमन्, मैं कह रहा था कि हमें ऐसे तथ्य मिले हैं कि जिनमें बताया गया है कि ...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : दस मिनट हैं आप के बोलने के लिये।

श्री राजनारायण : सब को आपने पच्चीस मिनट दिया, श्री भूपेश गुप्त को दिया। उन्होंने कहा राजनारायण के पास ज्यादा मैटर है। तो उन से ज्यादा हमको दीजिए। तो उस में यहाँ तक गया है कि संचार मंत्री ने बिड़ला को जो प्रधान मंत्री और मुख्य मंत्रियों को टेलीफोन के संबंध में भी सुभाते है, वे सुभाते बिड़ला को दिये थे—यह क्या करप्शन नहीं है मैं जानना चाहता हूँ।

मुझे उसी नोट में यहाँ तक बताया गया है कि श्री बनमाली बाबू ने नट्स एंड बोल्ड्स के एक कारखाने की स्थापना की है। इस कारखाने के उत्पादन के मुख्य खरीददार बिड़ला लोग हैं। नमाली बाबू के अन्य

व्यावसायिक हित भी हैं। वे बिड़लाओं के हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स संस्थान के कलपुर्जे और अन्य आवश्यक सामान की पूर्ति करते हैं। ये श्री एस० एन० सिन्हा साहब के सगे बेटे हैं। क्या यह करप्शन के चार्ज नहीं हैं ?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: On a point of order, Sir. I would respectfully submit to the hon. Member not to bring these personal charges on Ministers^ without notice, in this debate I had submitted to you earlier also that in the scope of this Bill such personal charges cannot be made. It would be completely out of order to make such personal charges during this debate I would like to submit, through you, to the honourable Member to desist from it. He can find other opportunities. He can follow the Rules of Procedure and do according to it, if he likes. I do not object to his allegations. But he should do it according to the Rules which have been laid down for this purpose. I would like to have your clear directions on this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr Vice-Chairman, you have been long in this House. I can understand the discomfiture of the Government for their own reasons, that charges should not be made against Ministers. As you know, charges are made against Ministers. Things are said about Ministers^{so} long as the hon. Member believes that what he is saying is to the best of his knowledge correct. Parliamentary conventions and th? Rules of our House say that he can say such things. Only on the ground of irrelevency or On the ground of something coming within the mischief of the rules of the House you can disallow them. You can disallow them if they are defamatory. It is not a question of personal charges. We are discussing the Bill on anti-corruption. Others have spoken. We have spoken about other people also. Here if an hon. Member wants to say something about a Minister in order to substantiate his case, that there is

corruption in high places—he may or may not be correct—but certainly that does not violate Parliamentary rules. I do not know why the Government is so shy of facing charges.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: We are not shy at all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are more aggrieved. He says that he is making the statement on the basis of a document written to the Prime Minister which he believes to be true. Mr. Arjun Arora is sitting in this House. If he is stating something which is false, he can get up and say that he never sent such a letter to the Prime Minister. The fact that he does not object is a clear, convincing proof that what Mr. Rajnarain says as having been written by Mr. Arjun Arora is absolutely true.

Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, he is not only making charges. He is saying something on the basis of an evidence which can be attested here, right now. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you have said that this should not be laid on the Table of the House. We have submitted to your ruling. But is it like that that nobody can say anything against Ministers? You can say anything about others. We discussed Birlas and said so many things against them. But when it comes to Ministers we cannot say anything. I do not know what will happen to our Parliamentary Institution.

Sir, Ministers should be an open book. They should be open to public criticism more than anybody else in the country. They should give a lead. And it is not a private document. The very fact that the Prime Minister dealt with this document by way of answering questions in this House shows that this document comes within the competence of the rules of this House. It is not a private letter which is left within the domain of private relations. We brought this document within the scope of parliamentary interpellations by the Prime

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] Minister. She first referred the matter to a Cabinet Sub-committee. In that Sub-committee there was no other Member except Cabinet Members. Secondly, when she agreed, a Question was admitted. She answered the Question and she has made a statement. Now Mr. Rajnarain wants to say something. Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is not the way to fight corruption or to be vigilant against corruption. Then the Minister is not absolutely right on the point of procedure. I say he is doing a public duty. I am not concerned with privilege and other things. Mr. Rajnarain is very fond of privilege motions. I am not so fond of it. But certainly he can speak on the basis of some important document.

Not only that, he is reading something in Hindi quite clearly. He has translated this thing. He is making his speech and indicating to the House the relevant extracts of the document. I hope the House will kindly bear with him. Sir, the more you resist this thing, the more suspicion gathers in public mind.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am taking very serious exception to the hon. Minister's objection. We shall be reading this document, perhaps, in the newspapers. But, we Members are not given the opportunity of knowing about it in the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA); Mr. Bhupesh Gupta . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. A Member of the House has written the letter and the Prime Minister of the Government has spoken about it in this House. Is it not an irony if we have to read about this document in some newspapers? This is not a very healthy Parliamentary practice. They can give us an answer. They can tell us what the document is and what the reputation of this document is. Let there be a denial or contradiction of the document and let the people judge. That is how the Parliamentary institution functions.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am not disputing what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is saying. He is entitled to his opinion. I have only raised this point that if what the hon. Member, Mr. Rajnarain, is saying is tantamount to making charges against Ministers, and if you uphold this point, then there are procedures laid down for making these charges. We do not mind charges being made. Let them make charges if they so wish, but let them do so according to the procedures which are laid down. This is my only point. If what he is saying is tantamount to making charges against Ministers or any Member, then they should be made in the manner prescribed by the rules. This is the only thing I am submitting. I would like to have a clear direction from you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No . . .
(Interruption).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You continue your speech, Mr. Rajnarain.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं इस भ्रष्टाचार निरोधक विधेयक पर बोल रहा हूँ तो मैं समझता हूँ कि मेरा यह कर्तव्य प्रधान है कि आज भ्रष्टाचार किस तरह से हो रहा है और उसको रोकने के लिए यह विधेयक कितना असमर्थ है, इस बात को स्पष्ट ढंग से रखूँ। अगर मैं इसको स्पष्ट ढंग से नहीं रखता हूँ तो मैं अपने संसद सदस्य होने के नाते अपने कर्तव्य का पालन नहीं कर पा रहा हूँ। इसलिए मैं पुनः कहना चाहता हूँ आपके द्वारा कि श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी ने इस मुल्क की और इस कौम की बड़ी खिदमत की है जब कि उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री को अपना नोट दिया। मैं आपके द्वारा पूछना चाहता हूँ मंत्री जी से, जो कि इस बिल के संचालक हैं कि उनकी दृष्टि में इस तरह के करप्शन को रोकने के लिए क्या रास्ता है। एक व्यक्ति जो रूलिंग पार्टी कांग्रेस है, उसके पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड का सेक्रेटरी है, वही व्यक्ति डायरेक्टर है। पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड

का सेक्रेटरी रहते और संसद् सदस्य रहते हुए वह संसद् से तनखाह लेता है एक सदस्य के नाते और वहीं डायरेक्टरशिप की तनखाह लेता है साथ साथ । अगर अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी ने इसकी इन्क्वायरी या जांच करने के लिए कहा है कि उन्होंने दो तनखाह ली हैं—एक तो संसद् सदस्य की हैसियत से तनखाह ली है और दूसरी डायरेक्टर पद की तनखाह ली है या नहीं ? तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें क्या सफाई है और क्या तथ्य है । क्या यह कर्णन नहीं है ? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कर्णन है ।

पंडित श्याम सुन्दर नारायण तन्खा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : क्या आप यह बतलायेंगे कि ऐसा कौन सा कानून है . . .

श्री राजनारायण : आप बुजुर्ग हैं, आप बैठ जाइये । मैं आपकी बात समझ गया हूँ . . .

Mr. Vice-Chairman, are you allowing him?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): If you are yielding.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I am not yielding.

पंडित श्याम सुन्दर नारायण तन्खा : मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप यह एतराज उठा रहे हैं कि पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर होते हुए, मान लीजिये उन्होंने कोई सैलरी ग्रा की है, तो कानून में कहाँ मना लिखा हुआ है ?

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद (उत्तर प्रदेश) : राजनैतिक तौर पर मना है ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ अपने बुजुर्ग संसद् सदस्य से कि वह जो यह कहते हैं कि कानून की किस मोटी पोथी में इसको गुनाह माना गया है तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरी निगाह में यह एक राजनैतिक दुष्चरित्र है, राजनैतिक पाप और अपराध है । इस मुल्क का संसद् सदस्य होते हुए भी, पार्लियामेन्टरी बोर्ड का सेक्रेटरी होते हुए भी, रूलिंग

पार्टी का सेक्रेटरी होते हुए, किसी पूजीपति या किसी कंपनी का डायरेक्टर होकर और कोई तनखाह लेता है तो यह जवदस्त नैतिक अपराध है । यह अपराध भ्रष्टाचार है और इससे बढ़कर और कोई दूसरा अपराध नहीं है । (Interruption) श्री के० सी० पंत ने ऐसा किया । आगे से मेरा कहना है और रूलिंग पार्टी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह भ्रष्टाचार है या नहीं ? एक व्यक्ति जो डायरेक्टर है, दुनिया जानती है कि वह डायरेक्टर के पद पर है और डायरेक्टर के पद पर रहते हुए प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उसे अपनी कैबिनेट में लेने का निमन्त्रण दिया । क्यों दिया ? क्योंकि उसका बिड़ला से संबंध है । इसलिए मैंने कहा उस दिन कि यह सरकार "बिड़ला की अर्दली है, बिड़ला अम्पायर की अर्दली है ।" क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी में दूसरे लोग नहीं हैं ? श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी में दूसरे लोग नहीं हैं ? क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी को इस बात की जानकारी नहीं थी कि ये बिड़ला कंपनी के डायरेक्टर हैं और वहीं से तनखाह पा रहे हैं ? फिर बिड़ला कंपनी में डायरेक्टर रहते हुए उन्हें प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपनी कैबिनेट की सदस्यता स्वीकार करने के लिए यहां पर बुलवाया । यह एक प्वाइन्ट है और मजबूती से उठता है ।

شادی اے - ایم - طارق : اس سے
بھی پہلے ہوا -

†[श्री ए० एस० तारिक : इससे भी पहले हुआ ।]

श्री राजनारायण : हुआ होगा । मैं यह नहीं कहता कि कांग्रेस आज कर्ण है ।

From the very beginning the Congress is corrupt.

شادی اے - ایم - طارق : جب سے
آپ آئے -

†[श्री ए० एस० तारिक : जब से आप आये ।]

†[] Hindi transliteration.

श्री राजनारायण : जब से हमने छोड़ी है।

संसद्-कार्य तथा संचार विभागों में राज्य मंत्री (श्री आई० के० गुजराल) : मैं राजनारायण जी से एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। क्या आपको एक और बात मालूम है कि जिस चीज का आप इतना एतराज कर रहे हैं, इसी तरह का एक बिड़ला का मुलाजिम पंजाब गवर्नमेंट ने लिया है और आपकी पार्टी उसमें सहयोग कर रही है ?

श्री राजनारायण : अगर हमारी पार्टी ने लिया है, हमारे दल ने लिया है तो गलत किया है। हमारे गुजराल साहब को यह बात मालूम हो जानी चाहिये कि हमारी वह पार्टी है कि हमने श्री जैड० ए० अहमद साहब ने उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार को कह दिया है कि यदि कानों का लगान माफ नहीं किया जायेगा तो हम कांग्रेस पार्टी के कट मोशन में उनका साथ देंगे। हम एक उसूल के लिए हैं और एक सिद्धान्त के लिए हैं। मुझे अंग्रेजों ने नरुत ... (Interruptions).

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : अंग्रेजों के साथ पाजादी की लड़ाई के ठेकेदार आप ही नहीं थे, हमने भी अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ी। जो बात मैं कह रहा हूँ वह उतनी ही उसूल की है जितनी कि आप कह रहे हैं। तो फिर आप अपनी गवर्नमेंट से एतराज क्यों नहीं करते हैं कि इस तरह के आदमी को क्यों लिया गया है ?

श्री राजनारायण : करेंगे।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : कब करोगे ?

श्री राजनारायण : गुजराल साहब ने हमारे नालेज में आज यह बात ला दी है और अब हम उसके बारे में लिखेंगे। हम अपनी ही धुन में रहते हैं और कोई बतला देता है तो समझ में आ जाती है। तो हम गुजराल साहब से

सहमत हैं कि बिड़ला की नौकरी में रहते हुए किसी आदमी को कैबिनेट में लिया जाता है तो वह गलत काम है, चाहे वह काम कांग्रेस करे या चाहे और कोई पार्टी करे। श्रीमन्, तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री गुजराल इस बात को समझते हैं। उनको यह भी मालूम हो जाना चाहिये कि जब सन् 1954 में केरल में प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की सरकार थी तो जब वहाँ पर गोली चली थी और 4 आदमी मारे गये थे, तब हमारी पार्टी ने, डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने, उस समय के मुख्य मंत्री श्री थानू पिल्ले से कहा था कि तुमको इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये क्योंकि लोगों के ऊपर गोली चलाना नाजायज है। जनतंत्र में गोली नहीं चलने दी जायेगी जब तक कि जनता सशस्त्र विद्रोह न करे या जनता की ओर से हत्या न हो गई हो। यह ध्योरी हमने प्रफाउन्ड की तो मैं आपके जरिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि तमाम संसदीय और जनतंत्रीय परम्परा के अनुसार यह निश्चित मत है कि अगर भ्रष्टाचार को रोकना है तो आज हमारे मित श्री शुक्ल जी प्राइम मिनिस्टर के पास जायें और उनसे जाँकर कहें कि जिन-जिन लोगों का नाम श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने लिया है उनकी कैबिनेट से हटाया जाय।

मैं आगे कहना चाहता हूँ कि करप्शन के क्या माने हैं ? करप्शन का एक ही अर्थ होता है और मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो खाना हम 1947 से पहले खाते थे, जो कपड़ा हम पहनते थे, उस तरह का न तो अब अच्छा खाना मिलता है और न पहनने को कपड़ा ही मिलता है। यह हमारी आज हालत है। मुल्क के आजाद होने से पहले हमारी हालत अच्छी थी। आज कांग्रेस के राज्य में जितने लोग हैं, रूलिंग पार्टी में जितने लोग हैं वह इस कसौटी पर अपने को कसैं कि आजादी मिलने के बाद व डावर का बालामृत पीकर पहले दुबले पतले थे और अब मोटे हो गये या नहीं ? अगर मोटे हो गये, तो यह करप्शन है और करप्शन के

[شری اے - ایم - طارق]

دہی - ہی ۰۰ میڈیٹ تھا اور
تصویروں بھی واپس کرنا پڑیں - لہذا
واقعات کی پوری چھان بین کرنا
اس ہاؤس کے سمجھنے کے لئے بہت
ضروری ہے لیکن اگر ہر ایک بات کو
ہم کرپشن کہیں تو اس سے ہمارے
ملک کا وقار کم ہوتا ہے - مسٹر
وائس چیرمین اگر چاہیں تو میں
ان کے سامنے یا کسی کے سامنے ان
واقعات کی تائید کر سکتا ہوں اگر
ایسا کرنا ضروری ہو - مسٹر راج نرائن
ہمارے دوست ہیں اور اس ایوان کے
ذی عزت ممبر ہیں ان کو چاہیئے
کہ جو واقعات ہوں ان کو صحیح
کہیں اور اگر سارا صرف یہ کام ہو
کہ ہم گند چھانیں تو نہ وہ اپنی
خدمت کر رہے ہیں نہ قوم کی
دے ہیں اور نہ کسی کی کر رہے
ہیں یہ ممبری ان سے درخواست ہے -

†[پرو. ۵۰ ام. ۰ تاریک : میسٹر وائس
چیرمین میسٹر راجنارائن جسکی طرف
دھارا کر رہے ہیں اسکا باکھا یوں ہے کہ
جب شری لال بھادور شاستری ساہو امریکا
جا رہے تھے اسسے پہلے میں ایک باکھا کا پین
گواہ ہوں کہ اس زمانے میں 'نویارک ٹائمز'
میں سڑدی ارب پر ایک سبلیمنٹ نکلا
تھا اور انکے پاس میں وہ سبلیمنٹ لےکر
گیا تھا ۔ شاستری جی وہاں جانا چاہتے تھے
اور وہاں ایک سبلیمنٹ چھپانا چاہتے

† [] Hindi Transliteration.

تھے ۔ ہندرا جی کے بارے میں لیکن یہ کہنا
بیکول دوسٹ نہیں ہے کہ میسج گاندھی
کا اسسے تالک ہے ۔ میسج گاندھی تب پرائم
مینسٹر بھی نہیں تھے ۔ پیر جس وقت
شاستری جی کا دھانت دھیا اس وقت وہ
سبلیمنٹ 'نویارک ٹائمز' میں چھپ
کر تیار تھا اور اس سبلیمنٹ کو دس-
پندرہ دن رکنا پڑا ۔ اور وہاں ایڈیٹر
گیا تھا 'ہندوستان ٹائمز' کا اسکو
تنگد و تانیس "ہی" کا "شی" کرنا
پڑ گیا ۔ کیونکہ وہاں کئی جگہ "ہی" ہی
مینشٹ تھا اور تکیوں بھی واپس کرنا
پڑی ۔ لیہاذا باکھا کی پوری ترہ چھان بین
کرنا اس ہاؤس کے ممبروں کے لیے بھوت
جھری ہے لیکن اگر ہر ایک بات کو
ہم کرپشن کہیں تو اسسے ہمارے ملک
کا وکار کم ہوتا ہے ۔ میسٹر وائس
چیرمین اگر چاہیں تو میں انکے سامنے
یا کسی کے سامنے اس باکھا کی تائید
کر سکتا ہوں ۔ اگر ایسا کرنا جھری
ہو ۔ میسٹر راجنارائن ہمارے دوست
ہیں اور اس ایوان کے جی ڈجٹ ممبر ہیں ۔
انکو چاہیئے کہ جو باکھا ہوں انکو
سہی کہیں اور اگر ہمارا سرف یہ کام
ہو کہ ہم گند چھانیں تو نہ وہ اپنی بخدمت
کر رہے ہیں نہ قوم کی کر رہے ہیں نہ
کسی کی کر رہے ہیں ۔ یہ میری انسے دھواست
ہے]

وہسباکھ (شری سہابور پساد
بارگ) : دو مینٹ میں بتم کر دیجیے ۔

شری راج نارائن : شریمن، دیکھیے
ہمارا یہ سمی ن کاٹا جائے ۔

SHRI RAJINDER PRATAP SINHA:
Sir . . .

شری راجنارائن : تو پیر کیا میں
ڈلڈ کر بٹ جائے ؟

شری راجندر پساد سہ : ہاں، بٹ جائیے ۔

شری راجنارائن : بکھا، میں بٹ جاتا
ہوں، لیکن میرا یہ سمی ن کاٹا جائے ۔

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: About this matter, I would like to point out that whenever the high dignitaries of other countries visited our country, whether it was Mr. Kosygin that had come or Mr. Bulganin that had come or Mr. Khrushchev that had come or Mr. Eisenhower or the Queen who had come, or any dignitary of any other country, each time there was always a supplement. This is a very good time for the propaganda of that country's point of view in a visiting country. That is the usual practice of all countries. Whenever a dignitary visits those countries, they take the opportunity to bring out a special number of the important dailies. There is nothing wrong in it and that is done everywhere, in every country.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Nothing personal in it.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Nothing personal. That is done here also whenever there is a visiting dignitary, whether from the Communist world or from the non-Communist world. I do not know what wrong India has done or our Government has done if such a publicity was done at the time of the visit of our President or the Prime Minister. As a matter of fact if it was not done, I would have charged the Government of not having utilised the occasion for doing publicity for our country in the particular country visited. Whenever Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru visited the Soviet Union or America, a special, not only an edition of the paper, was brought out and special booklets were brought out which have been presented to us, to both the Governments of India and other countries. This is the usual practice. I do not know what is wrong about it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Wind up your speech now in two minutes. You have taken 20 minutes.

श्री राजनारायण : यानी 20 मिनट हम ही ने लिया है ।

मेरा निवेदन है यह कि मैं अपने मित्र तारिक साहब का बहुत हो शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि उन्होंने जिस को अपने दंग से सही जाना उसको यहाँ रखा । उनकी बात का अगर सही तरीके से विश्लेषण किया जाय . . . What is going on?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You are not in the Chair. You are to speak.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् मेरे बोलने में अगर किसी की हरकत बाधक हो तो उसको रोकने के लिए मैं जरूर कहूँगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : नहीं । आप मुझ से कहिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं, तो आप रोक दीजिये । अफ़्ग़ानि खान साहब भी तो बैठते हैं ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You can address the Chair.

श्री राजनारायण : तो तारिक साहब ने क्या सफाई के साथ कह दिया कि राजनारायण तुम केवल इन्दिरा जी के लिये क्यों कहते हो, लाल बहादुर जी ने भी वह हरकत की थी और उनका कहना है कि अगर इन्दिरा जी करप्ट हैं तो लाल बहादुर जी भी करप्ट थे । शाबाश । (interruption) मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ, श्री तारिक साहब ने यह कहा है । अगर मुझे खुशी है कि तारिक साहब ने जो अपनी सफाई दी हमें उसमें इस बात को उन्होंने कबूल लिया कि लालबहादुर जी के लिये जहाँ "ही" लगा था, जब प्रधान मंत्री होकर इन्दिरा जी गईं तो उसको "शी" बनाया गया । यानी प्रधान मंत्री की तारीफ़ में बिड़ला बन्धुओं की ओर से पूरा अंक 'न्यूयार्क टाइम्स' में निकला जिस पर चार लाख रुपया खर्च हुआ ।

شرعی اے - ایم - طارق : آپ نے
ہماری بات سمجھی نہیں ہے -

†[شری ۴۰ ۴۰۰ تاریک : آپ نے ہماری
بات سمجھی نہیں ہے]

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, यह फिर
हमको नहीं बोलने दे रहे हैं।

شرعی اے - ایم - طارق : ابھی یہاں

آئے تھے زکوسلاواکیہ پریزیڈنٹ اور منسٹر
اور وائس چیرمین صاحب آپ نے
خود دیکھا تھا کہ جتنے کنسرن ان
کے یہاں ہیں، آفیشل یا نان
آفیشل، انہوں نے وہ انڈین ایکسپریس،
اور وہ ٹائمز آف انڈیا،
سپلیمنٹ نکالا تھا

'We welcome the President of Cze-
choslovakia on behalf of these con-
cerns'.

جن کے پاس ایجنسی ہے - اسی طرح
سے اگر بولا جی امریکہ میں کوئی
کاروبار کرتے ہیں یا امریکہ میں ان
کا کوئی اثر و رسوخ ہے تو انہوں نے
یہ مذہبی پارک ٹائمز،
اگر خدا نخواستہ آپ بھی پرائم منسٹر
ہو گئے تو آپ کے لئے بھی کوئی نہ
کوئی پروپاگنڈا پتی تو کیا ہم خود
آپ کی خدمت کریں گے اور آپ کی
خدمت کریں گے آپ کیپرائیٹ مت -

†[شری ۴۰ ۴۰۰ تاریک : ابھی یہاں
آئے تھے]۔ چیکوسلاواکیہ کے پریسیڈنٹ اور
مینسٹر اور وائس چیرمین ساہب،
آپ نے خود دیکھا تھا کہ جتنے کنسرن
ان کے یہاں ہیں— آفیشیئل یا نان-آفیشی-

† [] Hindi transliteration.

شیل—انہوں نے 'انڈین ایکسپریس' اور
'ٹائمز آف انڈیا' میں سٹینٹ نکالا تھا
'We welcome the President of Cze-
choslovakia on behalf of these con-
cerns.'

اس کے پاس ایجنسی ہے۔ اسی طرح سے
اگر بیڈلا جی امریکا میں کوئی کاروبار
کرتے ہیں یا امریکا میں ان کا کوئی
کاروبار ہے تو انہوں نے یہ 'نیو یارک
ٹائمز' میں لکھا ہے۔ اگر خدا نخواستہ
آپ بھی پرائم منسٹر ہو گئے تو آپ کے
لیے بھی کوئی نہ کوئی پروجیکٹ تو
کیا ہم خود آپ کی خدمت کریں گے
اور آپ کی خدمت کریں گے آپ کی
خدمت کریں گے آپ کی خدمت کریں گے

श्री राजनारायण : और फिर जितनी
सफाई की उतनी ही हमारा मामला साफ
हो गया। मैं वहीं कह रहा हूँ कि बिड़ला साहब
ने चार लाख रुपया 'न्यूयार्क टाइम्स' में पूरक
अंक के निकलवाने में खर्च किया और वह
विज्ञापन के रेट से सारा पैसा दिया गया है।
उसमें लिखा है बिड़ला की ओर से।

एक माननीय सदस्य : छः लाख।

श्री राजनारायण : आप ने बढ़ा दिया तो
ठीक है। लेकिन क्या यह करप्शन है या नहीं।
तारिक साहब हमारी बात की तारीफ कर रहे
हैं तो यह जानते हुये प्रधान मंत्री इतनी इश्वरी
हो जाय कि इस सदन में यह कहने की हिम्मत
रखें कि राजनारायण जो कहता है वह रेकलेस
है अनट्रस्ट है, रेकलेस नहीं, अब तारिक
साहब ने यह सिद्ध कर दिया है कि राजनारायण
की जो बात थी वह सही थी और प्रधान मंत्री
का जो कुछ जवाब दिया हमारे बारे में वह
गलत था। तो क्यों न विशेषाधिकार की
अपीलना का प्रश्न उठाया जाय और मामले
की छानबीन हो।

आगे मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश की हालत आप जानते हैं कि कितने दिनों तक वहाँ श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन का मामला लटका रह गया और कितने दिनों तक अनेक मंत्रियों के मामले लटके रह गये। तो मेरा कहना है कि क्या यह विधेयक कहीं मंत्रियों के भ्रष्टाचार की पकड़ करता है। अगर यह मंत्रियों के भ्रष्टाचार को पकड़ नहीं करता है तो यह है क्या? मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री जी कोई ऐसा विधेयक लायें जिसमें 1947 के बाद से मंत्रियों के पूरे हिसाब किताब की जांच हो।

एक माननीय सदस्य : सेठों की भी जांच हो।

श्री राजनारायण : हाँ, इन्दिरा सेठ, बिड़ला सेठ, राजनैतिक पार्टियों के नेता सेठ, इन सब सेठों को ले लो और सब सेठों के सारे हिसाब-किताब की जांच की जाय और जायज तरीके से जितनी कमाई हो सकती है, अगर उससे अतिरिक्त कमाई हो तो सारी अतिरिक्त कमाई ले करके सार्वजनिक धन बनाया जाय। तो ऐसा विधेयक बनाया जाय कि जिन लोगों ने ज्यादा कमाई की है, जायज तरीके से जितनी कमाई हो सकती है, उससे अतिरिक्त की है, उन लोगों को किसी सार्वजनिक पद पर न रखा जाय, मंत्रिपद पर न रखा जाय और किसी नेता के पद पर न रखा जाय और और यह तमाम पार्टियों के लिये बना दिया जाय; मुझे इसमें गर्व होगा, मुझे यह स्वीकार होगा। (Time bell rings.)

बार-बार घंटी बज रही है और यह समझा जा रहा है कि मैं ही ज्यादा समय ले रहा हूँ। यह जानते हुए भी कि मैं सब से कम समय लेता हूँ, मैं बैठने के लिये तैयार हूँ पुनः यह कहते हुए कि छोटे घर मंत्री जी अच्छे तरीके से एक विधेयक यहाँ पर लायें जिस विधेयक के जरिये हर प्रकार का भ्रष्टाचार रोक जा सके।

इसी के साथ-साथ, श्रीमन्, मैं आज नन्दा जी की याद करना चाहता हूँ। नन्दा जी, जब साधु समाज के चेयरमैन थे तो नन्दा जी ने बार-बार कहा था—अनेक बार मेरा उनका पत्र व्यवहार भी हुआ था—कि चाहे कोई बिना नाम के भी हमारे पास भ्रष्टाचार के मामले भेज देगा तो भी मैं उसकी जांच कराऊंगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस विधेयक में कोई ऐसा भी प्रोवोजन है कि बिना नाम के भी किसी तरह के भ्रष्टाचार के मामले को मंत्री या किसी उच्चवाधिकारी के पास भेजा जाये जो उनके तह में काम करने वाले के विरुद्ध हों तो क्या उसकी इन्क्वायरी होगी, क्या उसकी इन्क्वायरी के लिए कोई व्यवस्था है ऐसे भ्रष्टाचारियों को पकड़ने का कोई रास्ता है? नहीं है इसलिए पुनः मैं इस विधेयक को वापस लेने का अनुरोध करता हूँ। इस समय समय नहीं रह गया है क्योंकि माननीय गुजराल साहब हम लोगों को मौका देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं कि हम बाकायदा विधेयक को पढ़ें। कानून की नजर में इस विधेयक पर चर्चा नहीं होनी चाहिए थी। मेरा प्रश्न है कि क्या यह भ्रष्टाचार है या नहीं कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी एक प्रोग्राम बनाए और उस प्रोग्राम को सरकारी पार्टी अपने सुभीते के लिए बदल दे?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : हाउस ने बदला है। आप बार-बार गलत बात कह रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् इसी सदन में मैंने कहा था कि मैं कल नहीं रह रहा हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आप नहीं रहेंगे तो क्या सदन का काम बन्द हो जायगा?

श्री राजनारायण : परसों में विदेश नीति की चर्चा में भाग लेने के लिए जाकर भी आता, यह मैंने सदन में सुबह कह दिया था। एकाएक मंत्री जी आकर कह देते हैं कि

[श्री राजनारायण]
 कल ले लिया जायगा विदेश नीति की चर्चा
 को और परसों चला जायगा जो कल होने
 वाला था। क्या यह भ्रष्टाचार है या नहीं।
 मेरी समझ में यह श्रुतः भ्रष्टाचार है। यह
 जानते हुए कि मैं नहीं कहूँगा—यब हमको
 अपना प्रोग्राम बदलना पड़ेगा, प्रोग्राम बदल
 कर यहाँ रहना पड़ेगा।

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP
 SINHA: He is bringing in personal affairs and
 wasting the time of the House.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Not personal affairs
 but parliamentary affairs.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.
 BHARGAVA): I won't allow you any further.
 Nothing more shall go on record. Mr. Niren
 Ghosh.

(Shri Rajnarain continued speaking)

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr.
 Vice-Chairman, Sir, the question has been
 raised: What is corruption? I would give an
 answer to: What is corruption? Corruption is
 the course of the Birla empire from Rs. 2
 lakhs to Rs. 300 crores. This is corruption;
 this is the definition of corruption. You
 wanted to know what is corruption. This is
 corruption. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it
 would be interesting to know the corrupt
 practices followed by the Birlas, how one of
 their brothers paid money to the British, ano-
 ther to Hindu Mahasabha, another to Pandit
 Madan Mohan Malaviya and still another, Mr.
 G. D. Birla himself, to Mahatma Gandhi.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Who was the forest
 contractor with the Left CPI? Who was he?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I won't answer
 you. I won't be detracted. I will answer you
 later on. (Interruptions). This is how he wants
 to have all those political contracts. Let us
 remember that Mahatma Gandhi's

candidate, Shri Prakasa, was defeated by Mr.
 G. D. Birla with the help of Pandit Madan
 Mohan Malaviya, and Mahatma Gandhi said,
 "My candidate has been defeated under the
 crushing weight of gold." This is
 corruption. Then, after Pandit Madan Mohan
 Malaviya became less and less popular and
 was more and more on the way out, he
 gathered himself round Gandhiji and tried
 through him to influence and to get all sorts of
 benefits for them. This is corruption. He ad-
 dressed himself to Sardar Vallabh-bhai
 Patel also. He gained many influences,
 many advantages and his empire began to
 expand. And after that Pandit Jawaharlal
 Nehru was a bit cold towards him. These
 Birlas have employed various means in order
 to get round Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and
 to get into his favours. Then they took to
 that strong clan of U.P., the Pant family. And
 may I say that the very admission by Shri K.
 C. Pant—whatever statement he has
 made on the floor of Parliament—
 revealed that he used to serve there. Now if a
 young man gets a salary out of all proportion
 to his technical knowledge and capacity, and if
 the Birlas admit that another 126 such
 young men belonging to different
 Ministers or being close relatives of high
 officials they employed. . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP
 SINHA: I would like to say that the hon.
 Member is not giving the latest move of the
 Birlas in Kerala.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Why does he not talk
 about it? We would also like to hear about his
 latest 'love' of Mr. Birla.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He was a
 Member of Parliament, and as a director,
 without attending the meetings of the board of
 directors, he used to be paid by the Birlas.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I won't be detracted
 by that question. I have

answered long ago here. It may be for another day; I am not going to lose my time.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Finish it. Thank you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Then, Sir, slide by side with the admission by Shri Pant on the floor of Parliament, is also Birla's admission before the Das Commission that he employed 126 other such young men at a fantastic salary—they were connected with different Ministers or belonged to high families. This is corruption pure and simple. And is it not morally proved? That he resigned after getting into the Cabinet is not the question, but morally it is proved that he got special favours from the Birlaj and, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you know that these obligations are repaid when Shri Pant gets into the Cabinet, whether he likes it or not, because he got undue favours from the Birlas while serving under them, he is bound to repay them. And is it not corruption? If it is not legally proved, it has been morally proved by the very statement made by Shri L. C. Pant on the floor of Parliament.

And as regards Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, I would say that he was associated with two trusts. Are not these trusts associated with the Birla scandal where they indulged in malpractices and took to subterfuges, > r/here they evaded paying tax all that? If that be so then, naturally, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha comes into the picture as being associated with those trusts and their malpractices. Also, whenever he goes to Jaipur State, he always stays in Birla's house. It is a fact that he is under the special favours of the Birlas and he is the special man of Birlas. That he is such a man, whether it can be legally proved or not, whether the document is there or not, the very fact that Shri Pant has made this admission, and these trusts are involved in this Birla scandal, proves that Shri Satya Narayan Sinha is also involved in the Birla Scandal and is

I their man in the Cabinet. Is it not I corruption, Sir? And I would also I like to say that in spite of the letter that Shri Arjun Arora has written to the Prime Minister, she says that she is satisfied with the judgment of her Cabinet colleagues and that everything is in order. It may be right for her, but it is not right for Parliament or the people of the country. They would never believe that, that that judgment is correct. They are under a cloud. Those Ministers are under a cloud. They cannot be acquitted of the suspicion by this one-sided judgment by certain Cabinet colleagues. It cannot be treated in that simple way. I would suggest: Why not, let the charges made by Shri Arjun ! Arora and written down in his notes or letters be sent to the Attorney-General of India, and his opinion obtained? Why is not this procedure followed I want to know. If this is not done, who would believe Shrimati Indira Gandhi's statement made in order just to pull out her party out of a delicate position of discomfiture? This is the interpretation. This is the interpretation that will be put by the people on these affairs. So I challenge the Government to send these documents and charges to the Attorney-General of India for his opinion and let us get a verdict from him. Otherwise, nobody will believe that Mr. L. C. Pant and Mr. Sinha are not Birla's men. This is morally proved ! also. Let the detailed documents be now gone into by the Attorney-General of India. The allegations have been made. I do not know if they are true or not. It is for the Government to say that. That the son of the Finance Minister got Rs. 1.80 lakhs is one of the allegations. It is for them to say if that is true or not. If it is, then is it not corruption? What else is it? I would say it is corruption. That is how corruption is ruling in the country. That is how you see corruption in high places.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to give another instance. There was a committee called the Khadiolkar Com-

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

mittee set up to go into the affairs of the steel concerns and the various steel organisations. That committee came across a C.B.I. report about the concern of Aminchand Pyarelal and the whole gamut of connections is referred to and written out there in that report. But that report has been suppressed by the Government. Are they fighting corruption or are they encouraging corruption by suppressing that report of the CBI? Because that report involves many persons in high places, therefore it is suppressed. I would like these charges to be made public on the floor of the House. I raised this matter on several occasions, but no clear-cut reply was given. Now they say that this case will be gone into. But who will believe them? The CBI report giving all the details of this case, they did not disclose. As I said, perhaps very many persons in high places and some Ministers even were involved and therefore this report has been suppressed. It has not seen the light of day. That is how the Government is prevaricating on this issue. Is this the way they are going to fight corruption?

While on this point, I would like to bring to your notice another thing. As far as the declaration of the assets of Ministers is concerned, the Prime Minister has informed us on the floor of the House that the Ministers, her colleagues, have declared their assets. But we wanted to know what are the assets that they have declared. We want it on the floor of the House. Let it be the property of Parliament. But this was not done. I say that the Ministers should publicly declare their assets, say every five years. Once during a specified interval of time this should be gone into publicly to see whether there is anyone in the Cabinet or any Minister who has utilised his position to increase his assets.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: But much of the invisible assets are in the names of their relations.

SHRI JNIKKN GHOSH: I know. That is how corruption has become a way of life. From the British they took it up and they have now nourished it and it has become what it is now. There are such invisible assets, we know. If there is a public enquiry, many of these invisible assets will also be found out. People will be prepared to come forward and give evidence if it is taken in confidence and if they are assured that no measures will be taken against them for giving this evidence about the invisible assets and other things. There is no provision in this Bill for this also. So I think that this Bill has been brought forward in a cavalierly fashion, as if to show that Government is keen on fighting corruption. It is not so. It is just a hoax. Unless proper measures are taken to check corruption of high levels, you cannot check corruption in society.

And then we are told that our people have become immoral and so what can be done? That is the argument that is being trotted out to whitewash their sins. I do not say that everybody is a sinner. But there are many sinners in high places. Take this question of contribution to political party funds. There was a meeting of industrialists called together by Mr. S. K. Patil and Mr. Atulya Ghosh in Bombay before the last General Elections, to collect funds. Then the electorate said, let us have a list of the candidates and then we will help them individually. And they did help them individually. They got their lobby. Is it corruption or not? Unless these things are brought out, there can be no fight against corruption. So I say again that this Bill has been brought forward in a cavalierly fashion and unless these things are dealt with there can be no end to corruption and nobody would believe that there is any intention of taking action against corruption, and so I say we are getting nowhere by this measure.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Arjun Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): I would like to speak tomorrow, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): No tomorrow. The Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Arora can give us his personal views.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, I am glad to note here that of all the hon. Members who took part in this debate, none has opposed the Bill which is before the House. I am, however, sorry that some of them have taken this opportunity to indulge in political propaganda and to say many general things about corruption. I would say that such general talk on corruption . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is not fair. Sir, we are accused of indulging in political propaganda.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: That is my opinion and I have expressed it. I am not yielding. I have very limited time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a point of order on which I am rising.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have had your say. Let him have his now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, you should protect us. We are accused of indulging in political propaganda.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): He has the right to express his opinion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have also the right to oppose it and we have the right to invite your attention to it, Sir. He said we have not produced anything concrete, or that we had been indulging in general talk and in political propaganda. When we wanted to Lay on the Table of the House concrete cases, concrete charges, you did not allow it. And

now we are accused of indulging in general talk and political propaganda.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: The hon. Member can take other opportunities for this. I have very little time and this is not the occasion for it. It has nothing to do with this Bill. This general talk on corruption causes much more harm than good. It does not do any good to anybody. I would request hon. Members and say that they should be very careful about these things. Again I would like to say that whenever we had got tangible facts about anybody, any political person or officer, we straightway took action. As Mr. Gupta himself said, in the last five years five Chief Ministers were toppled. They belonged to our Party. It is not a joke. It really proves our bona fides that we take these things seriously and whenever there was any chance or occasion to take any action against anybody who had indulged in malpractices, that action was taken. But if general charges are levelled and general remarks are made for political benefit or otherwise then they are not relevant and nothing can be done about these things.

Several questions were asked and I might take some time to answer those questions and to give certain clarifications. The hon. Member Shri Lokanath Misra asked about the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee. Sir, the Santhanam Committee made 137 recommendations and except eight, we have accepted all the recommendations of that committee. Eight recommendations are under the consideration of the Government. It is not that we are not attaching seriousness to these recommendations. In fact, in pursuance of this committee's recommendations a number of legislative measures have been undertaken and as soon as we take decisions on the other recommendations also, we will come forward with others and take consequential action on them also. So there need not be any apprehension in the mind of the

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla.] hon. Member that we are not taking action on the Report of the Santha-nam Committee.

Shri Lokanath Misra raised another very good point and that is about the coverage of this definition of "public servant and asked whether the employees of the public sector undertakings are included. In some public sector undertakings there may be some officers, chairman, secretary or others,...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I said of autonomous bodies.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: . . . who do not take any salary whatsoever from these public sector organisations. I would like to point out that under section 21 of the I.P.C., a person who is in service or pay of a corporation established by or under a Central or State Act is a public servant. So these persons come under the category of public servants as the term is used in this Bill. So I would say that even these people come under the purview of this Bill.

As far as the question of Ministers is concerned, I have tried to explain the position even in the beginning and said that they are also covered by the provisions of this Bill. The reason why such a thing is not included in the amending Bill is that this amending Bill is not making any tax-tual change in the original Act. So no such definition is called for here. The present position is that the Supreme Court judgement has declared that the term "public servant" includes Ministers. And that is the legal position today. If this legal position is changed either by a subsequent judgment of the Supreme Court or in any other way, I have already assured the House that the Government will definitely consider the question of bringing forward a suitable legislation to clarify the position. There will be no hesitation on our part to do whatever we say here.

But, as I said, the present legal position is this that in this Bill Ministers are included in the definition of "public servants" and that is why it has not been considered necessary either to amend the original Act or to take any further action until it becomes necessary. When it becomes necessary, we shall certainly consider taking necessary action in the matter.

Sir, some reference was made by one hon. Member about the retired Government servants. It was said that as a matter of course, high Government servants when] they retire find employment in one commercial undertaking or other. I want to inform the House that the Government has laid down very rigorous tests in this matter. If any public servant after retirement applies for permission to take up a job with any commercial concern, we thoroughly scrutinise his application. According to the rules, he cannot take up employment within two years of his retirement with any concern with which he might have had direct or indirect dealings. There are also a few other criteria that we have laid down and these criteria are rigorously implemented. And I can assure the House that no permission has been given to any officer whose application has violated any of the criteria laid down by the Government. If it is found that a Government servant has had no dealing during his official career with the proposed employer, then permission is given; otherwise permission is denied and this would prove that we are very careful as far as this point is concerned.

Some reference was made about the institutional arrangements to see that complaints regarding corruption are properly looked into. The House is aware that the recommendation of the Administrative Reforms Commission, where they have recommended the appointment of Lok Pal and Lok Ayukt has been accepted by us in principle.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think you would not make Mr. Biju Patnaik the Chairman of the Lok Ayukts.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: At least we would not do it. I do not know if your Government in Orissa would consider that.

Sir, we have referred this matter to the various State Governments and after we get their views about it we shall bring forward a suitable legislation before the House and we shall try to see that these institutional arrangements are made as quickly as possible.

Sir, Kumari Shanta Vasisht made certain general allegations about some personal staff of Ministers being involved here and there. I am very sorry that she chose to make such remarks here. As I said such general observations do not help anybody. They are very injurious; they help nobody and they help no cause. I would request her that if she has any knowledge of any such matter, she can bring it to our notice and we shall take appropriate action on those things.

Shri Rajnarain during his long speech made one point which, I think, I should reply and that was about anonymous complaints. As a matter of rule, we do not encourage anonymous complaints. We do not want to entertain complaints by those people who have no courage to indicate their names and addresses when they make complaints against other people. But in appropriate cases, when we find by the nature of the complaints that there is a possibility of finding out something or we find that it is likely to give some useful clue, then we do take action on those things.

Sir, these are the only points which I thought should be replied o and I would now request the House to pass this Bill.

908 RS—10.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the anti-corruption laws, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, now the Bill is going to be passed. As you know we have not opposed this Bill.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It is time now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is better to sit a little late and go into corruption.

Now, we have supported this measure. We have not been opposed to it but I regret that the hon. Minister took whatever we said as propaganda. I think it is an old, old story. Whenever we have brought before this House initially certain charges or made certain allegations relating to corruption we have at once been called propagandists but the fact remains that all these Ministerial cases of corruption were brought before Parliament or the Assemblies by the Opposition initially and the records of Parliament and of the State Legislatures would show that the Congress Party, the party in

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

power, opposed them. It is a well known fact that we took six to seven years to get the Kairon case referred to a Commission of Inquiry. I remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman—perhaps you also remember—that when we initially raised this matter in this House we used to be shouted down; we used to be attacked by massive opposition from the other side. Therefore I hope that the hon. Minister will not take credit for what we have done. The fact is, we have forced them to do so.

In this connection, before I sit down, I should like to make one or two observations by way of suggestions because the Bill is now going to be passed and implemented. First of all, the Santhanam Committee recommendations by themselves are not enough. I think the matter should be discussed again among the Opposition parties and the ruling party in the various States and at the Centre. We should seek the opinion of the other people and come to certain conclusions because it does appear that the recommendations had missed some of the things which need special attention. This is the first suggestion I would make.

Secondly, I think it is very, very essential that all the Ministers in all the States make public statements of their assets, theirs and their relatives', and lay them on the Table of the House. I am not saying that the Congress Ministers should only do so although the assets in their case will be much greater, but others also should do so. I think there should be a broad agreement among the parties in power that their Ministers should lay on the Table of the House a complete account of all the assets held by them, their wives, friends and close relatives.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Friends also?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This should be done. I think the Union Government should start it here and now. Declaring their assets to Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee or Mr. Namboodiri-pad or the Ministers here submitting their list of assets to the Prime Minister here will not do, because that will not induce confidence. The Congressmen will have doubts in our case and we will have doubts in their case. Therefore let there be a uniform rule and that rule is, we lay our cards on the table; all of us, no matter which party is in power where. That should be done.

In this connection I would also like to make another suggestion. I think those people who have been closely connected with big business for the time being at least, till we are out of the woods in this matter, should not be included in any Council of Ministers. That convention we can create. They may be perfectly honest men as far as their business and other things are concerned but somehow or other, Mr. Vice-Chairman, big business is under great suspicion. Dark clouds of suspicion hang over them and I think those who have been closely connected with such big business should themselves see that they do not get into the Council of Ministers and those who form the Ministries should also make it a point to see that they are not included. Now I know that even in the non-Congress Governments there are such people. I am not unconscious of that fact but let us create such a convention. It, of course, means a self-denying ordinance on the part of some of the parties, even on the part of individuals. I would appeal to this House and through this House to the people outside also. Why cannot we adopt such a self-denying ordinance in order to exclude people who have been closely connected with big business from entering the Council of Ministers? There are other people in every party who should be taken into the Council of Ministers.

Another suggestion I would like to make is whenever a charge against a Minister is brought by a person supposed to be responsible, whether he be a Member of Parliament or of a State Legislature, or some eminent man in public life or by a group of men, it should be subjected to a thorough enquiry by a body which commands the confidence of the public. If, for example, the charge of corruption against me is brought by the Congress, that should be investigated, not by the members of the Communist Party, but by the members or representatives of all parties. Therefore, in such cases when we bring forward charges against Congress Ministers or individuals, especially Ministers, it should be the duty of the Prime Minister to take counsel with the Opposition and constitute a special body consisting of all who should go through the papers and come to a conclusion whether there is a *prima facie* case for reference to certain other legal or other bodies for final disposal. That is how it should be treated. You will agree that we are passing through a situation when mutual confidence is at a heavy discount for whatever reason it may be. I am not saying that one party is at an advantageous position and another is at a disadvantageous position. I am saying, make it a uniform rule and why should we be afraid of it? If I were a Minister I should certainly say, not only Members of Parliament, but let the whole world put me under public scrutiny all the time. Watch every movement of mine, excepting certain very intimate movements in private life, if I have any.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Otherwise, all movements of my life may be subjected to public scrutiny. Why should it not be done? We must infuse confidence among those who fight against corruption. We should reorient the nation's outlook. We should rouse them with the spirit of 'Jehad' against corruption, not by

precept, but by healthy and creative examples and those examples must always be set at the highest level. Therefore, I say, let there be a discussion. Let the Prime Minister of the country call all the Chief Ministers and other party leaders and discuss as to what code of conduct we should evolve in this connection to tackle this problem. Otherwise, there will be mutual suspicion. There will be misunderstanding and what is more, corruption will not be checked.

As far as the officials are concerned, I should like to make a suggestion. I am not one of those who accuse the entire officialdom. I know there are many good persons. Let them be rewarded. I am talking from a positive angle. No matter whether they are in the South Block or North Block or in the Sachivalayas in the States or they are in the districts or they are District Magistrates or Development Officers in some other places, find out those who are honest, who have got drive and initiative and whose integrity is beyond question. Promote them. Reward them. List them in the Presidential Awards and so on. Give them honours and other things. Let them feel that the entire nation is watching their activity and they can expect reward and such acknowledgement. It may not be material reward, but certainly it will be a national sanction and national inspiration given to them for good work. This should be done. Therefore, I am not for witch-hunting. But there are corrupt officials also, people who are shady in their treatment and so on, people whose connections with big business are known. First of all, my suggestion is, let the Home Ministry and other people take us into confidence also. Draw up a list of such officers whose *bona fides* are in question. Remove them from high places. Transfer them to other positions for the time being. I am not asking for their suspension and so

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

on. And then replace them by people about whose integrity you have no doubt. This much you can do. Well, that will give a stimulus to fight against corruption. I think that can be easily done. Now, I can speak from the experience of the five or six Governments that are being run. Now, I have a little experience of it and it is very important. Much of the fight against corruption cannot proceed unless at the official level we put the right levers in the right place. Some of the officers need to be transferred, need to be removed from certain positions, while others need to be promoted. Will they do it? Here I find that there is a tendency in this Government at the Secretary level that they do not make any change. Some Ministers like their Secretaries more than the wives like their husbands. I do not know why. Now, they stick to them. I do not know whether it is because of some infatuation Or some incompetence on the part of the Ministers or some inferiority complex. I tell you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and through you the Government, unless this attitude is given up, we shall not be able to fight corruption. I have in my possession documents, including the Rampur Nawab document, where I find there are big connections between certain rich people and some high-ups in the Secretariat. The Government knows it. Maybe the Government is not convinced of what we say, but the fact that ten, twelve or fifteen Members of Parliament have been saying, this is enough ground for making certain changes. It is very essential. I know of very many cases. Therefore, this is very important. Unless this is done, you cannot fight it. I would ask them to seek the co-operation of the non-gazetted officers and other people in the administration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you are speaking on the Third Reading stage.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is a constructive suggestion and you like constructive suggestions, being a man of very wide interest, in such matters. Therefore, I say that you do this thing. I am saying it because some little thing we have come to know. So far we were strangers to Government. Now, we are not so strangers. I do not say we have become sufficiently familiar to say very many things authoritatively, but we have come to know of certain norms in the administration, where the trouble lies and we are trying to gather experience. I can tell you, it is very essential. I may tell you that our intelligence service should be utilised for tracking down corruption. The CBI is not enough. Why cannot we find out the names of those people who are indulging in corruption or seething in corruption in different ways? Just as you keep dossiers for political leaders, which should not be kept, you should keep dossiers for them. Mr. Jyoti Basu wanted to see his dossier. It had been removed. All our Ministers wanted to see their dossiers. These are not there. They have been removed by the Central Government. Now, if you can keep dossiers against Mr. Namboodiripad, Mr. Somnath Lahiri, Mr. Jyoti Basu and others, why on earth can you not keep dossiers about corrupt people? Have them. You know that these people have got to be constantly under watch. I am not asking for their head and I am not asking for any witch-hunting, but the vigilance should be there. And it should start from the Birla family dwellings, in big business, and so on. That is another suggestion that I should like to make. Have Vigilance.

As far as the Ministers are concerned, Ministers, in this connection, should not be so touchy, whenever we make corruption charges against them. Maybe we are wrong.

They feel sensitive like a newly-wed woman. Absolutely. I do not see why they should be so shy and sensitive, as you have seen, I believe, in your time and you have known how shy and sensitive the newly-wed woman is. They are like them. The moment you make a reference to a charge, they are like that. Maybe, we are not making it properly, maybe we are ill-informed. But why? Face it. Take the bull by the horns if you have the courage. If you have the integrity, let the charge be made against you. But they get upset. They become nervous. They say irrelevant things. That should not happen. I have seen in the past also some Ministers did that, others did not do so. Take, for example, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Certain charges had been made against him. He was not free from some of those charges and you know how he used to take it in a sportsmanlike manner, though his establishment was filled with corrupt people, notably by people like Mr. Mathai whom we had exposed. The Ministers should be very, very careful. I find Ministers going to the marriages of big people where you have got all kinds of illumination and lights. Fifty thousand rupees are spent on illumination. Why do the Ministers go there? Because the Ministers think it is not illuminated enough and they want to illuminate it further?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have to close now. You are taking more time in Third Reading.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am the only one. Therefore, I say that that should also stop.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is another thing. It is about the heads of public sector undertakings. Some are very good, I am not denying that, but others are hopelessly corrupt. I

know that in Durgapur and other places they misuse the properties of the public sector undertakings. They oppress the workers and they indulge in favouritism. The result is demoralisation, and that should not be done. I have known that in this election some Managers of public sector undertakings had been openly indulging even in electoral corruption. I will bring this up later on. That is another thing I should like to say.

I do not wish to say very much. I do not know whether the Government will do anything. I do not think this Government will do, but since the issues are being discussed, it must be known that corruption has got to be fought not by precept, not by meaningless legislation, but by deeds and example, and the body which should set the example before anybody else is the Council of Ministers and the top officials at all levels. I think therefore our Presiding Officers in Parliament and the Legislatures as a whole should give all opportunity for discussing corruption cases, specially when these cases involve Ministers, high officials, Members of Parliament, political leaders, and so on. Let us demonstrate here in this House and in the other House that we have put ourselves under our own searchlight of constant investigation, constant scrutiny, constant vigilance and merciless self-examination as to whether we are men of integrity and high public standards or we are vulnerable people susceptible to temptation of corruption. If we do this, we will have done a good job for the nation and we will have set a good example for others to follow.

Thank you.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, I rise to move:

"That the question be now put."

श्री राजनारायण : पहले आप बुलाने के लिये खड़े हुए थे। अगर आप नहीं चाहते हैं तो ठीक है कर लीजिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): A closure has been moved.

श्री राजनारायण : यह कोई तरीका है! आप बुलाना चाहते थे और मंत्री जी बैठ गये थे। उसके बाद इशारा होता है और क्लोजर मूव होता है।

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: We have moved a closure.

श्री राजनारायण : क्लोजर में भी समय इतना ही लग जायेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You take five minutes.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् हमारी बड़ी परेशानी है कि जब मैं खड़ा होता हूँ तो चेयर की तरफ से हमेशा यह कहा जाता है कि दो मिनट, पांच मिनट, फाम द बेरी विगनिंग। मुझको बड़ी परेशानी के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि जहाँ मैं खड़ा हुआ पता नहीं क्यों सरकारी पक्ष की कुर्सी हिलने लगती है या सरकारी पक्ष की धरती धंसने लगती है! कारण क्या है?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आपको खुद दृढ़ता चाहिये कि कारण क्या है।

श्री राजनारायण : कारण यह है कि कि मैं सत्य कहता हूँ और सत्य को लोग छिपाना चाहते हैं।

श्री शीतभद्र याजी : जो क्लोजर मूव किया है उस पर वोट ले लीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : ले लीजिये वोट। हमारा कुछ नहीं बिगड़ेगा। हमको क्लोजर की धमकी से डरवाना चाहते हैं।

मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि सचमुच अगर कर्प्शन को मिटाने की बात है तो कर्प्शन कैसे मिटेगा। इस सम्बन्ध में तो कुछ सुझाव भूपेश गुप्त जी ने दे दिये। मगर आज का जो विधेयक है इस विधेयक में कहीं हमको गन्ध नहीं मालूम होती है जिससे कर्प्शन मिटाया जा सके।

अभी हमको एक लिफाफा मिला है और उस लिफाफे को मैंने अभी खोला है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ सरकार से कि क्या यह कर्प्शन है या नहीं।

“श्री राजनारायण,

संसद सदस्य।

विषय : अलंकार हाउसिंग प्राइवेट लिमिटेड के सम्बन्ध में अल्प सूचना प्रश्न डी संख्या 28

महोदय,

उपरोक्त विषय पर अल्प सूचना प्रश्न जिसकी सूचना आपने 9-6-1967 को दी थी, के सन्दर्भ में मुझे आपको यह सूचित करने का निदेश हुआ है कि निर्माण, आवास और संभरण मंत्री, जिन्होंने गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय से प्रश्न के स्थानान्तरण को स्वीकार कर लिया था, अल्प सूचना पर इस प्रश्न का उत्तर देने के लिये सहमत नहीं हैं।”

श्रीमन्, इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने माननीय घर मंत्री से बातचीत की है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने वित्त मंत्री से बात की है। यह दिल्ली में एक अलंकार हाउसिंग प्रा० लि० कम्पनी है। इसके सारे नक्शे को लेकर के हमने चेयरमैन साहब को दिखाया था। यह कागज पर एक नक्शा बना रखा है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : किसने बनाया?

श्री राजनारायण : अलंकार हाउसिंग प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनी ने बनाया और यह दिल्ली में है। इसने कागज पर नक्शा

बना रहा है और तमाम लोगों के यहाँ नक्शा भेज देता है कि जिन लोगों को प्लॉट खरीदना हो वे इतने-इतने रुपये भेज दें। करोड़ों रुपये उसके पास आ चुके हैं मगर वह कहीं जमीन पर प्लॉट नहीं है। वह प्लॉट केवल कागज़ पर है। बार-बार हमने वित्त मंत्री से निवेदन किया। हमसे मंत्री जी ने यह भी कहा था कि हमने इसको भेज दिया घर मंत्री को। घर मंत्री के यहाँ सवाल भेजते हैं तो वह चला जाता है निर्माण, आवास और संभरण मंत्री के यहाँ। निर्माण, आवास मंत्री कहते हैं कि हमको पता नहीं है। हमारी अपनी जानकारी है कि मंत्रालय के बड़े-बड़े सेक्रेटरीज़ भी पैसा खा रहे हैं। हमारी अपनी जानकारी है कि पुलिस के बड़े-बड़े अफसरों को वह पैसा खिला रहा है। कागज़ पर प्लॉट बना कर वह तमाम लोगों के करोड़ों रुपये हड़प करके बैठा हुआ है और रोज यहाँ पर घूम रहा है, मगर उसको कोई पकड़ने वाला नहीं है। यह कर्प्शन है या नहीं? हम लगातार पीछे पड़े हैं और हमने हर विभाग का दरवाजा खटखटाया, मगर जवाब देने में बराबर टाल-मटोल हो रही है। क्या सचिवालय है, क्या मंत्रालय है, क्या कर्प्शन को मिटाने की इच्छा और इच्छा है, मेरी समझ में कोई बात नहीं आती है। श्रीमन्, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमने एक उदाहरण दे दिया, अभी-अभी क्योंकि हमको लिफाफा भिला था और यह बता दिया कि यह स्थिति है। हम लोग यों हैं यहाँ। हमें एक बुजुर्ग दोस्त कांग्रेस के मिले थे और वह हमसे कह रहे थे कि हमको कभी-कभी ऐसा लगता है कि राज्य सभा से इस्तीफा देकर चले। हम पहले से सोच रहे हैं कि यहाँ से क्या हम लोग कुछ सेवा कौम की कर पा रहे हैं। (Interruption.) यह तमाम हुल्लड़बाजी कर्प्शन है या नहीं, सत्य को छिपाना कर्प्शन है या नहीं।

फिर हमारा कहना है कि अगर मंत्री जी यही हों तो इस विधेयक से काम नहीं चलेगा। मैं बहुत अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री भूषण जी ने जो मुझाव दिये, उन मुझावों को मानिये। मेरी समझ में श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू अच्छे और सब कांग्रेस बुरी, वह भी कर्प्शन बढ़ाने का एक तरीका है। मेरी समझ में श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी अच्छी और सब बुरे, यह भी कर्प्शन को बढ़ाने का एक तरीका है। मेरी समझ में आर्थिक कर्प्शन, राजनैतिक कर्प्शन, यह तमाम प्रकार के कर्प्शन आज जुड़ते जा रहे हैं : इसका तरीका क्या होगा ? निर्दय बनो अपने लिये, निर्दय बनो समाज के लिये। फिर मैं तारीफ करना चाहता हूँ लेनिन की। लेनिन की जिन्दगी बचाने वाली एक महिला थी। जब रेवोल्यूशन हो गया और जिन लोगों ने बिट्टे किया था, धोखा दिया था रेवोल्यूशन को, उनको वह फांसी की सजा सुना रहा था, तो उस महिला ने कहा कि मेरा खत ले जाओ लेनिन के पास खत गया और उसने कहा था कि मैंने उसकी जिन्दगी बचाई है। लेनिन ने एक मिनट के लिये यहाँ पर पेंसिल लगाई और कहा कि नहीं, उसने बिट्टे किया है रेवोल्यूशन को, इसलिये उसको फांसी पर चढ़ा दो। जब इतने कठोर बनेंगे तब कर्प्शन मिटेगा। हम बन गए मंत्री, हम बन गए संसद्-सदस्य और हमारे घर पर मामा, नाना, फूफा, दामाद, बेटा सब भरे पड़े हैं, हम उनको कहीं तक खिलायेंगे। हमारे पास एक पैसा नहीं बचता कि हम किसी को खिला पाएं। यह भी कर्प्शन है। आज यहाँ पर कितने संसद्-सदस्य ऐसे हैं जो संसद् के सदस्य होने के नाते जो पैसा मिलता है उस पैसे से जितना लवाजमात जुटा रहा है उसका खर्चा करते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमको कोई जरूरत नहीं है कि हाईकोर्ट का कोई जो जज रहे, सर्विस से निकला हुआ कोई रहे। ढूँढ़ा जाय अपने

[श्री राजनारायण]

मुल्क में कि किनकी इन्स्टिटी है कि जिनके ऊपर शुक्ल का विश्वास हो, भूपेश गुप्त का विश्वास हो, हमारा भी विश्वास हो। कुछ लोग ऐसे मिल सकते हैं। कुछ राष्ट्रीय ख्याति प्राप्त लोगों को डूँडो और उनको एक इंडिपेंडेंट, स्वतंत्र आयोग की शक्ति दे दो, उसे सरकारी नियंत्रण से मुक्त रखो, उसका जितना खर्चा है वह सारा का सारा सरकार दे, लेकिन सरकार उस पर कोई अंकुश न रखे। जब तक कोई ऐसा आयोग नहीं बनेगा तब तक उसकी ईमानदारी, उसकी निष्पक्षता अक्षुण्ण नहीं रहेगी। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ऐसे आयोग को बनाए, जिसका जितना खर्चा लगे वह सरकार दे, मगर खर्चा देने मात्र से सरकार का किसी प्रकार का नियंत्रण उस आयोग पर न रहे, वह आयोग पूर्णतः स्वतंत्र रहे।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Why not begin from U. P.?

श्री राजनारायण : धरिया साहब कह रहे हैं। यू० पी० में विधेयक आ रहा है, समर्थन लाइक दिस, जो इससे बहुत ही इम्प्रूव्ड है। मैं अपना एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। इस देश में राष्ट्रीय ख्याति के कुछ लोगों का एक आयोग बनाया जाय जिसमें सभी राजनीतिक दलों का विश्वास हो और जिसके खर्चे के लिए सरकार व्यवस्था करे, मगर सरकार उसपर किसी प्रकार का अंकुश न रखे। वह आयोग अपने नियम अपने आप बना लेगा उनके लिये किसी हाई कोर्ट के पास या सरकार के पास जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। उस आयोग के विरुद्ध अपील कहीं भी नहीं हो सकती; हाई कोर्ट में भी नहीं, सुप्रीम कोर्ट में हो या वहाँ भी न हो। जहाँ तक भ्रष्टाचार के मामले हैं, उनके सम्बन्ध में उस आयोग का निर्णय अन्तिम माना जाय। इसकी अपील न हाई कोर्ट में हो, न सुप्रीम कोर्ट में हो। तब जाकर मैं समझता हूँ कि भ्रष्टाचार के मामले पर

रोक लगाई जा सकती है, वरना भ्रष्टाचार के मामले पर रोक नहीं लगाई जा सकती; भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ता जाएगा। ज्यों-ज्यों माननीय मंत्री इलाज डूँडते जाएंगे त्यों-त्यों इस तरह के इलाज से भ्रष्टाचार वृद्धि पर होता चला जायगा। इससे भ्रष्टाचार कम नहीं होगा। कहने के लिए, मंत्री जी जिसको पार्लियामेंट प्रचार कहते हैं वह हो जायगा कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने एक भ्रष्टाचार-निरोध विधेयक ला करके उसको कानून की शक्ति दे दी। इससे कुछ होने वाला नहीं है क्योंकि भ्रष्टाचारने मिटा की गुंजाइश इसमें नहीं है।

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, I only want to make a small observation about the observation made by Shri Bhupsh Gupta. None of the Ministers here are afraid of any charges that may be levelled against them; the only thing is that the charges must not be levelled in an unfair manner. There are ways; there are the rules provided for making charges and if those rules are followed, there would be no trouble about it. Every charge that they think *fit to bring up against any Minister or to level against any Minister can be made. There are rules which provide for such things. But our complaint is that these rules are never utilised by them. At any time and at any hour, without notice, somebody will get up and begin to say anything. But the Minister has no information even. Now the practice has extended even to Members of Parliament. An hon. Member will get up and level charges against another hon. Member in either this House or that House. This kind of thing really creates a situation which confuses public thinking.

I would only say that while we are making institutional arrangements to look into all the charges against public men or against public servants or the civil servants, this kind of

sense of responsibility must be shown by our colleagues here in Parliament that if they want to level any charges against any Ministers, they should utilise the rules of procedure that are prescribed by the House and then do that and nobody will have any objection. As hon. Members know, the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission, which have been accepted in principle by us, provide that a *Lokpal* will be appointed and he will be appointed in consultation with the Leaders of the Opposition, not by the Government itself. And he will have independent authority; he will be appointed under an Act of Parliament and he will have all that facilities to go into any charges against the Ministers. In the same manner, the *Lokayukt* will go into the charges against the civil servants. I hope the State Governments will give their reactions to this proposal of the

Central Government quickly so that we can take appropriate action in this matter.

Sir, I request the House now to pass this Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is;

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at six minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 23rd June, 1967.