

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,

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

there are certain allegations—Members of Parliament and the Assembly also have made allegations—against the Chief Minister of Bihar and many Members have represented before the President of India. Similar allegations have been advanced against the Chief Minister of Mysore. You know that about 4) Members of Parliament and Assembly from Mysore have already represented to the President of India requesting for the institution of a judicial enquiry. Not only that, in both the States even prominent Congressmen have come out with open statements alleging charges of corruption against the Chief Ministers. I am happy to say that today the Supreme Court of India has allowed the appeal of the Jammu and Kashmir Government about the appointment of an Enquiry Commission against the ex-Prime Minister of that State. From this you can know, Madam, that we are passing through a stage when the entire political atmosphere of the country has been vitiated.

Madam, not only public men but men in the administration and men in the public, everybody has started suspecting that in India politicians are not behaving properly and, therefore, are not fit to govern this country.

Madam, let nobody think that after Mr. B. Patnaik and Mr. B. Mitra stepped down from the high office, the corruption to a great extent has been checked. I can give you the recent reports. In the month of December, three business houses in Calcutta were raided, and in one of the houses situated in Lord Sinha Road, No. 3, which is supposed to belong to one, Mr. S. L. Kapoor, over 40 lakhs of hundies of unaccounted money and other incriminating documents have been found. Madam, I may inform you that in the documents, which are already in the possession of the Finance Ministry since December last, there are certain letters exchanged between that business magnate and Mr. B. Patnaik. During June last, Mr. S. L. Kapoor addressed certain letters to Mr. B. Patnaik, who is a partner in some of the firms, about secret transactions of shares which stand in the name of Mr. Kapoor with the connivance of Mr. B. Patnaik. Copies of those letters are with us. Those letters are with the Finance Ministry up till now. I know that had it been in the case of some other

firm, something wonderful would have happened. I think Mr. Kapoor might have been in the jail and a similar thing might have happened to Mr. B. Patnaik. But because high politicians are involved, because members of the Congress Working Committee are involved, therefore, everything has been suppressed, and I doubt whether the people holding those portfolios will be able to trace those corrupt practices.

Madam, yesterday in reply to a question in the Lok Sabha, the Minister said that the enquiry in respect of income-tax evasions by Mr. B. Patnaik is still continuing. You know, Madam, that about two years back the same Mr. B. Patnaik stated in a public meeting—it has been reported everywhere—that in 1947-48 he was just a pauper. Now within this period he has been able to be the owner of assets amounting to about Rs. 10 to 12 crores. Now the enquiry has been going on about his income-tax. Up till now nothing has been done about it.

Madam, I want to impress upon you that because business magnates, about whom we talk so much, were the rulers of Orissa and are still the virtual rulers of that State, lakhs and lakhs of rupees of taxes are being evaded. It has been replied in the Orissa Assembly recently that the same Mr. B. Patnaik, who is an owner of mines since 1952, is not paying royalties worth 5½ lakhs of rupees. It is not a matter of two or three years; he is accumulating money since 1952 and nothing has happened to him. We have the Serajuddin scandal, about which you hear so much, about whom the Minister has admitted in the Orissa Legislature that since 1952 about 15½ lakhs of rupees worth of royalties are pending against him, and you will be astonished to know that during the last December the Minister of Mines here intervened in the matter—not in favour of the Orissa Government, not in favour of the people of Orissa, but in favour of Serajuddin, though in similar circumstances others have been denied the benefit.

Madam, I want to impress upon you that in spite of the fact that the two ex-Chief Ministers have been asked to resign from their high offices, they still continue to be the rulers of Orissa. And these scandals are going on. You know, Madam, that there is a vigorous attempt in India on behalf of the ex-Prime Minister of Jammu

and Kashmir and the Chief Minister of Orissa to come back to power. Why is it happening? Now everybody is hankering after power. Naturally, everybody is trying to come back to power to utilise the Government machinery for his own purpose and business. But shall we sit and wait to see that India goes the way China went under the leadership of Chiang-Kai-Shek? Shall we sit and wait to see that India goes the way that Ghana went under the leadership of President Nkrumah? Shall we wait and see that India goes the way that Indonesia went under Seokarno? Madam, I want to impress this fact only to show that we are passing through a crisis. If you want the roots of democracy to be strengthened, you have to see that corruption is eliminated not only from the field of administration but also from the field of politics.

Many Government officers complain that we have accepted the Santhanam Committee report so far as Government officials are concerned. It is because they are subordinate to us but we refuse to accept it so far as Ministers are concerned.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Das, your time is running out. You have only two minutes more.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS:** The Santhanam Committee report says:

"There is a widespread impression that failure of integrity is not uncommon among Ministers and that some members who have held office during the last 16 years have enriched themselves illegitimately, obtained good jobs for their sons and relations through nepotism, and have reaped other advantages inconsistent with any notion of purity in public life."

So, Madam, I want to impress upon you that we are following different standards. I want to quote Mr. Setalvad who is now a Member of this House. While addressing a meeting held under the auspices of the Servants of the People Society on November, 28, 1965, he observed:

"While small officials were awarded severe penalties for being corrupt, Ministers charged with the same offence escaped punishment."

Madam, I want to impress upon you that there is a difference between Government officials and Ministers and politicians and that difference is to be emphasised to this extent that more rigid standards should be there for Ministers and politicians. Officers can afford to be corrupt; that may not do much harm to the society, though corruption should be eliminated from every walk of life; but once a Minister goes corrupt, the entire society becomes vitiated and the entire Administration becomes corrupt and you know what is the result. You know what happened in China. While moving this Resolution, I want to impress upon you that there might be some difference of opinion about the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee that once a *prima facie* case is established by a Panel of Judges, it should go before a judicial Inquiry Commission. You can have some Anti-Corruption Commission which will not be under the Home Ministry or any other Ministry but will be under the Supreme Court or the High Courts, so that the little faith that we have in the judicial system can be maintained.

In the end I submit, Madam, that we should not have a different yardstick for Ministers and officers; we should have one yardstick. I am not excluding Members of Parliament or Assembly Members when I speak of Ministers. We should also be open to all sorts of enquiry. I still emphasise that every Assembly Member and every Parliament Member should submit his return of assets not to the Ministers or to the Chief Ministers but to the Anti-Corruption Commission which will be absolutely free and which will be under the Supreme Court of India.

In the end, Madam, while moving this Resolution I would request my friends not to look at this question from any parochial point of view or from any partisan point of view, because it is a problem which is corroding the very social fabric of this country and only by setting up certain standards we cannot only purify the political atmosphere of the country but also the Administration in all walks of life. Thank you, Madam.

*The question was proposed.*