

**RESOLUTION RE. IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE
IN THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE
ON PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION**

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa):
Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:—

"This House is of opinion that the recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee on Prevention of Corruption (Santhanam Committee) for evolving a suitable machinery and procedure to prevent and deal with corruption at ministerial and political levels be implemented forthwith."

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

I have a very simple job when I move this Resolution. The Santhanam Committee's Report is before us. Very important persons of this country and associated with this Parliament were members of this Committee. They gave their recommendations after one and a half years of study, but I regret to say that the most important parts of the recommendations have not been accepted. Not only they have not been accepted, but from whatever statements the Home Minister has made on the floor of Parliament it seems they are not going to accept them. As you know, one of the many maladies that have raised their heads since independence, corruption is one of them, which has proved to be a cancer in the body-politic of this country. The Government have had reverses on many fronts, including military, economic and political, excepting a few cases of success here and there. But this demon of corruption has pervaded all sectors of life in this country and it is gradually eating into the foundations of our nascent democracy. Ours is a developing country and we have before us examples of a large number of countries in the world which have foundered on the rocks of corruption and have been eliminated from the world arena for all practical purposes. This realisation was to a great extent evident two or three years back here in India, but before that realisation bore any tangible fruit, it was buried again. That is why the most important recommendations made by the Santhanam Committee have been rejected by the Union Government. Let us consider the back-

ground, as to why this Committee was set up. Before giving the reasons, I want to draw your attention to a statement of Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, the Home Minister of India, on the 30th November, 1963, in which he said:

"In the Central sphere, within a period of two years if I fail to produce a striking impression and make a substantial difference in regard to prevalence of corruption, I would give up my present position and not regard myself worthy of holding such office."

The battle has to be fought at various levels, political, administrative, social and moral."

I am very happy that knowing full well the conditions in India, knowing full well the prevalence of corruption in all the sectors of life, whether economic, political or otherwise, Shri Nanda made this statement. This statement was made when the Santhanam Committee was already formed. You know the background when this Committee was formed. The Government gave an assurance in both Houses of Parliament that they realised the gravity of the situation in India and they were going to have a very high level committee. Though they did not have any concrete idea about that committee, they promised to set up this committee.

Before I deal with this matter, I want to travel back to the good old days when we had the first taste of democracy. I want to tell you what the great philosopher Plato, while defining the qualifications of a politician, said at that time: We need a doctor to treat a patient and that doctor has to be qualified. We need a teacher to teach our people and the teacher has to be a qualified one. We need the rulers, the politicians, who are to treat all the maladies of this country, who are to treat the social and economic maladies that prevail in a society. They should be better trained and more qualified, not only have qualifications based on knowledge but also have qualifications based on morality. Leave aside what Plato has said. Take the Indian tradition. Sir, you know that most of us in India have read Kautilya's 'Artha Sastra'. I need not dilate on it, but I want to impress upon you the few qualifications which Kautilya has laid down in his book about politicians and especially Ministers. You know that in Chapter Ten of Book I, Kautilya says ho w

to ascertain by temptations the purity or impurity in the character of Ministers. Though Kautilya belongs to the good old days, I still hold that the society is such, with all the virtues and vices, that whoever becomes the ruler has to fulfil certain qualifications. Otherwise, he is not fit to become the ruler or to guide the destinies of the country. Now, in the modern world when the problems are very complex, when the problems are manifold, when the State sector has widened, these qualifications are more important. In this connection, without quoting his words, I want to tell you about certain qualifications which Kautilya has adumbrated. The Minister should be above religious allurements, monetary allurements, love allurements and allurements under fear. These are the four qualifications that a Minister should have. Not only that Kautilya has also said that a Prime Minister should have all these four qualifications. The other Ministers can afford to have only one or two qualifications, but the Prime Minister of a country, even in those good old days, when the problems were simple, cannot be there, unless he or she passes these tests. With this background I want to put forward my arguments about conditions that prevail here. As you know, nowadays everywhere we talk of corruption. I want to refer you to the First Report of the U. P. Vigilance Commission, 1965-66. Therein they have said

"It is a well-known fact that the evil of corruption in administration is at its zenith and is telling adversely upon the welfare activities of the Government and the economy of our nation"

This is the background in which we are functioning. I would again quote John B. Monteiro who in his recent book "Corruption: Control of Maladministration"—a valuable book produced after a great deal of study and research—has said

"A conscious adoption of double standards as regards ministers and officials has helped the growth of corruption in Government. While there are elaborate rules to ensure probity among officials, there are hardly any for ministers."

I want to draw your attention to the statement of the Congress Chief, made on July 31, 1963. As you know, at that time,

Shri D. Sanjivayya was the Congress President. He said in a public statement, while addressing a meeting of the Congress Party workers:

"Congressmen who were paupers in 1947 are now millionaires and multimillionaires. They own palatial buildings and factories without having any ostensible sources of such income"

When I am quoting the Congress President, I am not going to accuse my Congress friends. I am only dealing with these facts against the background that these are the conditions that are prevailing in India. Which party is in power, is least important to me at this moment, whether it is the Congress Party or any other party. But we have to deal with the situation not only in the administrative field, not only in the social field, but also in the political field. We know that corruption has been the order of the day everywhere. But I am sorry to say that up till now nothing has been done to deal with corruption at political level. After Shri Nanda's announcement every section in India had some hope that now here is a Government which wanted to be very serious about eradication of corruption. But within these two or three years, when that campaign against corruption was gaining momentum, a counter movement against that was started in India. I still remember the very day when the great Bhubaneswar Congress Session was held. I had the opportunity of reporting that Congress Session as a working journalist. Shri Nanda at the Congress Socialist forum said, "I have promised, I have given an assurance to the nation that within two years I will eradicate corruption. Already about six months have passed. Now there is only a period of 1½ years and we will have to strive hard." That very evening, from the Congress platform the then Chief Minister, Shri B. Patnaik, gave a warning not to the nation, but to Shri Gulzarilal Nanda who was on the platform there—Pandit Nehru was also there and all the big leaders of the Congress were sitting on the rostrum. Anybody who had the opportunity of attending that session must be remembering that as I do—Mr. Patnaik warned him by saying that in the course of this campaign that Shri Nanda was going to have, he might get himself drowned. So, I want to place this fact before the House.

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

Then, on the one side, there was a tendency, there was a campaign, there was a crusade against corruption. On the other side, there was a campaign, there was crusade also, to nip in the bud that very movement that wanted to eliminate corruption from the political life of the country. And we know who won the first round of the battle, Shri Patnaik might have been defeated. But in the ultimate round, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, despite all his pious declarations and support of all the people of India who had given their blessings to him as far as this mission was concerned, was defeated and not defeated temporarily but I do not know for how many years he has been defeated. And you know what happened next. When this campaign was going on, when this crusade got momentum throughout India, forces started working against this campaign. And as you know, when the Serajuddin affair came to light, one of the Union Ministers had to go out. Not only one Union Minister, not only several high important officials but about five or six Ministers and ex-Ministers of Orissa were involved in the Serajuddin affair and all their names and whatever gifts they had got from Mr. Serajuddin were also mentioned there in his record. All the Ministers who were involved there had been completely set free, had been exonerated and the Congress High Command and the Cabinet Sub-Committee gave such an opinion in spite of the fact that their names were there in the records along with whatever gifts they had got. All were there including the present Chief Minister, the present Deputy Chief Minister of the State, the ex-Chief Minister of the State and others. Nothing happened and the entire issue was thrown to the winds. By that time, the whole counter movement against eradication of corruption had gained such a great momentum with the entire apparatus behind it in spite of the fact that all the crooks were in the dock. Mr. Serajuddin is still facing trial in Calcutta High Court. But all these politicians have become completely free.

You also know about another event during this period. I very much regret to say that it concerns my State, Orissa, in which two Ministers are also involved. I am not going into details of it because I was one of the signatories at that time in the memoran-

dum presented to the President and I know the memorandum sets out facts which cannot be controverted by anybody. I know that the memorandum contains extracts from the files of the Government or whatever has been admitted on the floor of the Assembly. The CBI which is primarily instituted to eradicate corruption from the administration, from the political life of the country, went into the matter. What is the net result? They produced a very big Report and that Report is still with me. The Home Minister has always promised before us that once a *prima facie* case is established, they will go in for a judicial enquiry. But what is the fate of the CBI Report? After that, a *prima facie* case was established. But the whole Orissa affair did not go to any judicial commission, it went again to the Cabinet Sub-Committee which, with all regret I have to say, represents the Congress High Command. From that Cabinet Sub-Committee's Report I only give an extract. It is mentioned there—

“However, the Sub-Committee felt, in the course of its examination of the material, that the manner in which Shri Patnaik and Shri Mitra, directly or otherwise, conducted Government transactions in which were also involved the interests of private concerns owned or controlled by them or by their relations, was definitely not in keeping with the normal standards of public conduct. The Sub-Committee desire to record their profound concern at the picture, emerging as a whole from the series of such individual transactions in many fields of activity of the State Government, of improper use of authority by leaders of the Government.”

And as you know, while this matter was being discussed in connection with another no-confidence motion, our Education Minister, Shri Chagla, had to say that both these leaders of Orissa was unworthy of holding high office. But what happened to them? They were only advised to step down though they were still continuing to be the real rulers of Orissa. I have nothing to add to it. You know very well, after Shrimati Indira Gandhi became the Prime Minister of this country, who in the first Chief Ministers' Conference that was held here in Delhi represented Orissa—it was not

the Chief Minister of Orissa, not the Food Minister of Orissa who was present here but it was this man who was asked to step down in the name of propriety.

Sir, after all this, it is only in the fitness of things that the Union Government, the Congress Government, should refer the entire matter to a judicial commission. But that was not done. But by then the counter movement against the movement for eradicating corruption had gained momentum. I need not add. Sir, you know that the little A.I.C.C. meeting that was held in Ranchi was widely publicised and you know how Mr. Kamaraj, the Congress President, had to face a very bad time there because of this incident of the C.B.I. against the Orissa Ministers. Though Mr. B. Patnaik and Mr. B. Mitra themselves welcomed this enquiry and wrote accordingly to the hon. Minister of Home...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Das, you may continue after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today has recommended allocation of time for Government business as follows:—

Government Business	Time Allotted
1. Consideration and return of the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1966.	2 days in addition to the time already taken.
2. Consideration and return of the Finance Bill, 1966.	7 hours
3. General Discussion on the Kerala Budget for 1966-67.	3 hours
4. Consideration and return of the Kerala Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1966.	

5. Consideration and return of the Produce Cess Bill, 1966. 1 hour
6. Consideration and passing of the Orissa Legislative Assembly (Extension of Duration) Bill, 1966. 2 hours
7. Consideration and passing of the Asian Development Bank Bill, 1966. 2 hrs.
8. Consideration and passing of the Constitution (19th Amendment) Bill, 1966. 1 day (May 17, 1966)
9. Discussion on the Resolution concurring in the recommendation of Lok Sabha for modification of the Kerala University (Amendment) Act, 1966. 1 hour
10. Consideration and passing of the Delhi Administration Bill, 1966. 2 hrs. 30 mts.

In order to be able to complete the business, the Committee further recommended: (i) that Friday, May 13, 1966, at present allotted for Private Members' Bills, be allotted for the transaction of Government Business, (ii) that the Rajya Sabha should also sit on Wednesday, May 18, 1966, and (iii) that the House might curtail or dispense with the lunch recess and sit beyond 5.00 p.m. as and when necessary.

The House will also sit on Monday, May 9, 1966, as already notified.

RESOLUTION RE. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION

—contd.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Madam Deputy Chairman, after defining the qualification of Ministers and rulers, as mentioned by Kautilya and Plato, I was speaking something about the present conditions in India. Against that background, I was referring to the Orissa affair. Orissa is not a lone case. As you know, Madam,