

**STATEMENT RE BLANKING OFF
OF ALARM CHAINS IN TRAINS**

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHAM NATH): Madam Deputy Chairman, in the course of interpellations on the statement which the Minister of Railways made in the Lok Sabha on 26-4-1966 regarding fire in a coach of the Varanasi-Bombay Express near Ugrasenpur station of the Northern Railway on 25-4-1966, he had stated that a policy decision had now been taken that the blanking off of alarm chains must stop.

I might recall for the information of this House that it was as a result of a discussion in the Lok Sabha in 1961 on the subject of blanking off of alarm chains on trains that a review was made by the Railways and it was decided that blanking off should be restricted to the minimum number of trains. The alarm chains apparatus was accordingly restored in nearly 150 trains on Indian Railways. There was, however, a spurt in the incidence of unauthorised pulling of alarm chain adversely affecting punctuality of trains and as a result of a further review undertaken in 1962, alarm chain apparatus had to be blanked off on a number of trains.

As in the present incident, passengers could not stop the long-distance train when fire broke out in a coach, resulting in casualties, the Minister thought the Railways should put a stop to the system of blanking off of the alarm chain apparatus. Instructions have accordingly been issued that this practice should be discontinued forthwith in all non-suburban trains.

Hon. Members will, however, appreciate that conditions are different as far as suburban trains are concerned. Stations are situated close to each other and in case of any incidence of fire, etc., it cannot remain unnoticed for more than perhaps a few minutes. Railways now blank off the alarm chain apparatus in a number of suburban trains and I am afraid this practice will have to continue in the interest of smooth running of trains. On suburban sections, trains follow each other in quick succession and stopping of a train by unwarranted use of the alarm chain apparatus will immediately cause queuing up and dislocation of services. Also the punctuality of suburban trains will be severely affected, creating more problems.

I thought I should clarify in this House also what the Minister of Railways had in mind when he made the announcement on 26th April regarding discontinuance of the practice of blanking off of the alarm chain apparatus.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): May I know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that ticketless travelling and pulling of alarm chains have increased immensely during the last two years and that was the reason why it was considered necessary to blank off some of the alarm chains and whether it is considered necessary that some sort of committee should be appointed to go into this question of ticketless travelling and alarm chain pulling so that it may be in a position to suggest some ways and means of combating this problem?

SHRI SHAM NATH: Madam, it is a fact that the incidence of alarm chain pulling has been going up very fast during the recent years on the Indian Railways and this fact is borne out by the figures. For instance, in 1960 there were 49,153 cases and out of these 39,751 cases were unjustified but in 1965 while the number of cases went up to 1,00,193 the number of unjustified cases was 90,553. That means the percentage of unjustified cases to the total increased from 80.9 in 1960 to 90.4 in 1965. In the same way ticketless travelling has also increased during the last few years. I may mention for the information of the House that today a meeting of the National Railway Users' Consultative Committee was held and at this meeting it was decided that a committee be set up to go into the question of ticketless travelling and unauthorised pulling of alarm chains.

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

श्रीमती ताराबाई साठे (महाराष्ट्र) :
उपसभापति महोदया, माननीय सदस्य ने इस
सदन के सामने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है मैं उसका
विरोध करने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूँ। फिर भी
मैं माननीय सदस्य को धन्यवाद देती हूँ क्योंकि
इस पर बोलने का मुझे मौका मिला।

स्वातंत्र्य-पूर्व-कालीन परिस्थिति का पहले विचार करना चाहिए। आजादी से पहले एक बड़ा युद्ध हो गया था और देश में काफी पैसा बढ़ गया था जिसको हम लोग इनफ्लेशन कहते हैं; दारिद्र्य भी था, अज्ञान भी था, सारी चीजें मिलती नहीं थीं और अधिकांश चीजें परदेश से आती थीं। यहां सुई भी नहीं होती थी और अनाज, कपड़ा सभी परदेश से लाते थे। इस पार्श्वभूमि में हमें स्वराज्य मिला। हमारी कल्पना ऐसी थी कि जब स्वराज्य मिल जायेगा तब कुछ भी काम करना नहीं पड़ेगा और सब सुविधा हो जायेगी। हमारे नेताओं ने बताया "आराम हराम है"। तब भी हमें लगता रहा कि किसी को भी काम नहीं करना पड़ेगा, चाहे कामगार हो, चाहे कार्यकर्ता हो, चाहे नागरिक हो। यह गलत बात हम लोगों ने समझी और योजना भी बन गई। हम लोग उसके साथ जा नहीं सके और इसलिए योजना भी आगे गई नहीं और जितना प्रोडक्शन होना चाहिए था वह हुआ नहीं। लोगों के मन में ऐसा आ गया कि पैसा मिलना चाहिए और उसके लिए कष्ट ज्यादा नहीं उठाना चाहिए क्योंकि स्वराज्य मिल गया और इसलिए जो पहले हमारे नैतिक मूल्य थे वे बदलने लगे। उसके साथ दूसरी चीजें तो बढ़ी नहीं, नैतिक मूल्य बदलने लगे। इस परिस्थिति के साथ ही हमारा स्टैंडर्ड ऑफ लिविंग और जीवनमान बढ़ने लगा क्योंकि लोगों के हाथ में पैसा था और आहिस्ते-आहिस्ते देश में कुछ पैदा होने लगा। जीवनमान बदलने पर भी पैसा बिना कष्ट के मिले यह भावना रही। इसलिए कर्प्शन बीच में आ गया। मैं इसकी पार्श्वभूमि यही समझती हूं। यह भ्रष्टाचार इसलिए हुआ क्योंकि हर एक मुफ्त पैसा और कम कष्ट करके पैसा चाहता था। सुराज्य हम पहले भी चाहते थे, आज भी हमारा इरादा है। जितना हम लोग चाहते हैं उतना तो प्राप्त हुआ नहीं, कुछ न कुछ हुआ तो है ही। इस बारे में मैं समुद्र-मंथन की उपमा देना चाहती हूं। जब समुद्र-मंथन हुआ तो उसमें अमृत निकला, दूसरे

रत्न निकले, हलाहल भी निकला। हलाहल लेने के लिए किसी न किसी को आगे आना पड़ा। यह जो कर्प्शन है, भ्रष्टाचार है, यह एक प्रकार का हलाहल है और जब हम लोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा कोशिश करेंगे तभी यह भ्रष्टाचार जल्दी हटा सकेंगे। लोग बताते हैं कैसा राज चल रहा है। यह कहना ठीक नहीं है कि पियन से लेकर मिनिस्टर तक सब लोग कर्प्स हैं। ऐसा तो हो नहीं सकता। मैं समझती हूं कि कोई-कोई आदमी चाहे वह मिनिस्टर हो, चाहे पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर हो, चाहे वह कर्मचारी हो, चाहे वह सीधा-सादा नागरिक हो, यह उसका स्वभाव हो सकता है। ऐसा तो नहीं है कि सब लोग हराम का खाते हैं और सब लोग भ्रष्टाचार करते हैं। अगर सब लोग खराब होते तो यह संसार नहीं चल सकता था। इस दुनिया में ज्यादातर आदमी अच्छे होते हैं और इस देश में भी अच्छे ही हैं। यह समझकर हम सभी को भ्रष्टाचार हटाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए।

हम लोग क्या करते हैं? यहां भी मैंने कई दफे देखा और देखने के बाद दुख होता है। आज होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने, नन्दा जी ने बताया है कि हम कर्प्शन, भ्रष्टाचार दूर करने के लिए कोशिश करेंगे तो उसके लिए काम करना हमारा हर एक का कर्तव्य होना चाहिए। हम लोगों को सिर्फ उसकी हँसी नहीं करनी चाहिए। हँसी करने से देश का कुछ हित नहीं होगा और हँसी करने से कुछ भी फायदा नहीं होगा।

आपने देखा होगा कि हर तीन महीने के बाद हमें होम मिनिस्ट्री से एक रिपोर्ट मिलती है और उस रिपोर्ट में लिखा होता है कि कितने लोगों को सजा मिली, कितने लोगों के बारे में कम्प्लेंट आई थी, उसके लिए क्या किया गया, यह सब वे लोग हमें भेजते हैं और आप लोगों ने भी यह पढ़ा होगा। इसलिए कर्प्शन और भ्रष्टाचार की अतिशयोक्ति करने से कुछ फायदा नहीं होगा। उसे हटाने के लिए हमें कोशिश करनी चाहिए।

[श्रीमती ताराबाई साठे]

मुझे याद आता है कि परदेश में कई लोग कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत घास है, काफी जंगल हैं और काफी सांप हैं, काफी लोग मरते हैं, भूख से मरते हैं। ऐसा उसका वर्णन करते हैं। एक आदमी जो कहता है, उसकी प्रति-ध्वनि होती है। जो कुछ कहा जाय, समझबूझ कर कहा जाय। यह झूठ है कि सब ओर सांप हैं; सब ओर सांप नहीं होते हैं।

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल (गुजरात) : सब सामने की बेंच पर बैठ गए।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : साफ-साफ बोलिए।

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल : सब सांप सामने की बेंच पर बैठ गए।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप अपना दिल टटोलिए।

एक माननीय सदस्य : जिनको वहां जगह नहीं मिली ...

श्रीमती ताराबाई साठे : संथानम् कमेटी ने भी काफी कुछ किया है। उन्होंने तीन खास सिफारिशें की हैं। एक जिसके बारे में उन्होंने कहा था वह सेन्ट्रल विजिलेंस कमीशन तो हो गया है, हमें उसकी रिपोर्ट भी मिली है। दूसरी बात उन्होंने बताई थी डाइरेक्टोरेट जनरल आफ कम्प्लेंट्स एंड रिड्रेस, वह भी बन गया है। यह दोनों रिकमेंडेशन्स तो हो गई हैं। तीसरी जो है करप्शन इन पब्लिक लाइफ, इसके बारे में भी सरकार क्या कर रही है यह मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से मालूम करना चाहती हूं। पब्लिक लाइफ में कुछ कोड आफ कन्डक्ट बनना चाहिए। इतना हमें किसी को कोड आफ कन्डक्ट बताने की जरूरत नहीं है। हमें ईश्वर ने एक ऐसी शक्ति दे रखी है जिसे आत्मराम कहते हैं। हर एक आदमी जो कुछ करता है वह गलत है या सही है अपने से पूछे तो मालूम हो जाता है कि कौन-सी बात गलत है और कौन-सी ठीक कर रहा हूं। कोड आफ कन्डक्ट क्या है और इसके बारे में क्या कर रहे हैं, यह मैं जानना चाहती हूं।

रिपोर्ट से ऐसा मालूम होता है कि सैकड़ों लोगों से खत आए हैं सरकार के पास, किसी पर दस्तखत हैं, किसी पर नहीं हैं, फिर भी उन पर कार्यवाही होती है, सजा भी मिली है और इसके बारे में सरकार काम कर रही है। सब कुछ एक साथ तो नहीं हो सकता। इसलिए जो कुछ किया है जल्दी किया है। आप देखते हैं कि आप दूसरे डिपार्टमेंट्स को पत्र लिखते हैं, उनको कुछ रिप्रेजेंटेशन करते हैं, कितने महीने के बाद उसका उत्तर मिलता है। यह करप्शन और भ्रष्टाचार बहुत बड़ा कठिन प्रश्न है; सैकड़ों, करोड़ों लोगों को, न देने के लिए और न लेने के लिए समझाना है। जो कुछ यह होम मिनिस्ट्री कर रही है बहुत अच्छा कर रही है और हमें इसकी हंसी नहीं करनी है। जो काम हुआ है उसके लिए मैं उनको धन्यवाद देती हूं और इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करती हूं।

मैं यह बताना चाहती हूं कि यह सिर्फ कांग्रेस का काम नहीं है। कांग्रेस का तो है ही। यह जो 60-70 प्रतिशत कांग्रेसी है वे तो हैं ही, अपोजीशन वाले भी हैं। ये लोग भी प्रतिनिधि हैं, हम सब लोक प्रतिनिधि हैं। लोक प्रतिनिधि की बड़ी जिम्मेदारी होती है कि लोगों के पास जाकर उनको समझाएं। सब करप्ट हैं, सब भ्रष्टाचारी हैं, ऐसा कहने से हमारा कर्तव्य खत्म नहीं होता।

संथानम् कमेटी ने एम० पी० जे० के बारे में भी कुछ बताया है। मैं यहां उसे पढ़ती नहीं, कुछ कोट करना चाहती हूं :

"It is desirable that a code of conduct for legislators embodying these and other principles should be framed by a special committee of Parliament and the Legislatures nominated by the Speakers and Chairman."

And then the Report says:

"If a breach is established, action including termination of membership should be taken. Necessary sanctions for enforcing the code of conduct should also be brought into existence."

तो हम लोगों पर बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है। देखिए एक सीधी-सादी बात है। कई लोग सर्टिफिकेट लेने के लिए आते हैं। सर्टिफिकेट हम ऐसे ही दे देते हैं, सिर्फ दस्तखत कर देते हैं। जब हम सर्टिफिकेट देते हैं तो ठीक-ठीक देखना चाहिए। जब हम लोग इस तरह से दस्तखत कर देते हैं तो यह भी एक तरह का करप्शन है,

भ्रष्टाचार है। आजकल ऐसी एक 3 P.M. प्रथा हो रही है, लोग बताते हैं, कि पूरा होना चाहिये, कुछ न कुछ बज्रन डालना चाहिये नहीं तो नौकरी मिलती नहीं, नहीं तो कुछ काम होता नहीं। तो यह समझना चाहिये कि न सिर्फ पैसे का लेन-देन नहीं हो बल्कि हमारा यहां जो स्थान है उस स्थान का भी हम कभी दुरुपयोग न करें। तो यह हमारी बहुत बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है कि हम सब लोग प्रामाणिक रहें। मैं नहीं कहती कि सब लोग ऐसे नहीं हैं; हम तो ऐसा बताते हैं कि सब पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर जो यहां हैं वह बिल्कुल प्रामाणिक हैं लेकिन जब लोग गलत, झूठ बताते हैं तो हमें सोचना चाहिये कि ऐसा है या नहीं। लोग झूठ बताते होंगे तो उनको समझाना चाहिये कि ऐसी बात नहीं है और अगर वहीं कुछ हुआ हो तो हमें दुरुस्त करना चाहिये। हमारी जिम्मेदारी जो है उसे हमें जरूर निभाना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात जो मैं बताना चाहती हूं वह यह है कि संथानम् कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के पैरा-ग्राफ 108 में बताया है पोलिटिक्स पार्टीज के बारे में उसको मैं बताती हूं :

"A total ban on all donations by incorporated bodies to political parties and for political purposes will clear the atmosphere."

जब एलेक्शन के बारे में यहां आनरेबिल मेम्बर ने बिल रखा था तभी इस बात पर बहस हुई थी। यह बहुत सोचने का काम है और एलेक्शन कमीशन को भी इस पर विचार करना चाहिये और मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से भी ऐसी विनती करती हूं कि इसके बारे में भी बहुत कुछ देखना चाहिये। जब एलेक्शन का, चुनाव का खर्चा कम हो जायेगा तो फिर यह

M48RS/66-4

डोनेशन की बात भी कम हो जायेगी। तो हमें यह सोचना चाहिये कि चुनाव का खर्चा कम से कम कैसे हो। तो मैं सरकार से कहना चाहती हूं कि इन दोनों के बारे में उन्होंने क्या एक्शन लिया है यह मैं जानना चाहती हूं।

और दूसरी काफी बातें हैं। मुझे मालूम है कि यहां एक चर्चा हुई थी, स्टडी टीम जो सी० पी० डब्लू० डी० ने बनाई है उसकी भी बहुत चर्चा हुई थी। संथानम् कमेटी के बाद दो डिपार्टमेंट्स ने—कामर्स एंड इंडस्ट्री और हाउसिंग एंड वर्क्स ने, इन दोनों ने—यह कमेटी बनाई थी और वह कुछ न कुछ कर रहे हैं, अभी तक वह पूरा काम नहीं किया है और मेरे खयाल से अभी भी उसमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा सुधार होना चाहिये। इन्कम टैक्स के बारे में भी यह है कि वर्ष, वर्ष तक जो कुछ रिटर्न लोग देते हैं उसका फैसला नहीं होता, तीन-तीन, चार-चार और छः-छः वर्ष ऐसे ही पड़ा रहता है और लोगों को शायद ध्यान में भी नहीं रहता; इससे बहुत तंगी होती है। इसी तरह हमें बताया गया है कि वर्कर्स एंड हाउसिंग मिनिस्ट्री में ऐसा है कि कांट्रैक्टर्स को स्पीड मनी देना पड़ता है और ऐसा भी मालूम है कि सी० पी० डब्लू० डी० में दस-दस वर्ष तक लोगों के मामलों का फैसला नहीं हुआ। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि संथानम् कमेटी के बाद सी० पी० डब्लू० डी० ने क्या किया। तो यह कोशिश जरूर होनी चाहिये कि सब मामलों का फैसला जल्दी से जल्दी हो।

एक बात मैं यूनिवर्सिटीज के बारे में भी बताना चाहती हूं। आजकल ऐसा लोग बताते हैं, मुझे मालूम नहीं कि कितना सच है या नहीं कि हर एक यूनिवर्सिटी फर्स्ट क्लास निकालना चाहती है क्योंकि समझती है कि सेंटर में कोई नौकरी के लिये कम्पीटीशन होगा तो यह देखा जायेगा कि यह फर्स्ट क्लास आ गया है, इसको 80 परसेंट मार्क्स मिला है, डिस्टिक्शन मिला है जबकि दूसरे को 40 परसेंट या 50 परसेंट मिला है। तो यह यूनिवर्सिटीज को नहीं

[श्रीमती तारा बाई साठे]

करना चाहिये। जहाँ-जहाँ ऐसी कोई कम्पि-टीशन हो, यू० पी० एस० सी० की, और और कहीं की, तो ज्यादा से ज्यादा कर के इनका इम्तिहान लेना चाहिये और यूनिवर्सिटीज जब भी ऐसा करती हो तो...

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): This Resolution is about corruption among Ministers, corruption in the Ministerial and political levels and not about universities.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Sathe, your time is over.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE: But it is a recommendation of the Santhanam Committee, is it not?

नौकरों और कर्मचारियों के बारे में संथानम् कमेटी ने बताया है कि आर्टिकल 311 के बारे में कुछ फर्क करना है। कोर्ट से भी इन लोगों की कई दफा जीत होती है। मुझे ऐसा मालूम है कि गवर्नमेंट ने यह कहा कि इन्होंने कुछ लिया था, यह करप्ट है, इसमें भ्रष्टाचार हुआ है तो फिर कोर्ट में जाने के बाद 10 वर्ष में फैसला हुआ और 10 वर्ष के बाद सब की सब तनख्वाह वगैरह गवर्नमेंट को देनी पड़ी। तो कानून के बारे में भी कुछ सोचना होगा। किसी को कहते हैं कि उसने भ्रष्टाचार किया तो कहने से कुछ होता नहीं उसको सिद्ध करना पड़ता है, यह लोकशाही है और कानून के अनुसार हमें चलना है।

उपसभापति : आपके 15 मिनट हो गये।

श्रीमती ताराबाई साठे : तो लेने वाले और देने वाले दोनों की बहुत जिम्मेदारी होती है क्योंकि ताली एक हाथ से बजती नहीं, यही संथानम् कमेटी ने बताया है और हमें भी यह मालूम है। स्वार्थ से परमार्थ ज्यादा से ज्यादा करेंगे तो करप्शन हमारे यहां से निकल जायेगा। हमारी सब की जो जिम्मेदारी है उसको जरूर पूरा करें, इतना ही मैं बताना चाहती हूँ। फिर भी यह प्रस्ताव जो रखा है उसका विरोध करते हुये इतना बताना चाहती हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट ने जो किया है उसकी

हैंसी न कर के हर एक आदमी को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहायता देनी चाहिये। आपने जो मुझे टाइम दिया उसके लिये मैं धन्यवाद देती हूँ।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, the question of corruption in high places has been engaging the attention of this House for several years and this House appointed a Committee to go into the matter. The recommendations of the Committee are before us. It is not possible to understand why in implementation of the recommendations the Government sought to apply them only to the smaller officials leaving aside the persons who were charged much more than any body else repeatedly in this House. I do not know whether that is based on the principles of Sadachar or of the Bharat Sewak Samaj, particularly when charges have been made and proved against Ministers of the Congress Government. In this very House, Madam, I supported the plea for an inquiry into the affairs of the late Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon and very reluctantly the Prime Minister agreed to an inquiry. While ordering the inquiry he gave a certificate to late Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon who was the Chief Minister of Punjab. It is unfortunate that he died in such tragic circumstances; I am sorry about it but, Madam, the fact remains that the inquiry was conducted and even though he was in office, the charges against him were proved. Then, after that...

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: One swallow does not make a summer.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is not one; there is one swallow after another repeatedly; there are a series of them. The next was about the Chief Minister of Orissa.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is an old story.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is not an old story, my friend. Till the last election efforts were being made to try and hush it up. That has become the pattern of the day. Today he is out of the Ministry but does he not control the Ministry still?

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: 100 per cent.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: What action has been taken against him to deprive him of his ill-gotten wealth? Has Government taken any steps? He misused his office

to amass wealth for himself, his wife, his colleague and his colleague's wife. Has the Government done anything to deprive him of his ill-gotten gains which he continues to keep? Why do you discriminate between one citizen and another? If a citizen went out and stole some money, do you allow him to keep it? He has to pay the price; he has to pay whatever court awards and if the money is found on him he has to give it back. In this case why does everyone shut his eyes about it under the great misleading name of Sadachar?

Madam, there is also another instance where responsible persons, leading members of the Opposition of a State very near to Delhi, the State of Rajasthan, have brought forward charges. The leader of the PSP the leader of the Swatantra Party and seventeen others have given a signed memorandum pointing out very serious charges. I do not know how under Sadachar quietly a certificate of good conduct is given, whether anyone has enquired into that and the gentleman still continues in that position. What are the charges?

"Shri Sukhadia has almost devoured 13V bighas of agricultural land situated in Udaipur city at a very prominent site. He, by resorting to intimidation and inducement has got a big chunk of land from one Shri Navneetlal Paneri, a clerk in Rajasthan Government service and an ex-petty Muafidar and others.

"Shri Sukhadia by misusing his office as Minister endeavoured to compensate Mr. Paneri by a larger amount of compensation and rehabilitation grant and thus put the public exchequer to loss for putting obligation on Mr. Paneri and induced him to part with the agricultural land mentioned above in favour of Mr. Sukhadia for a very meagre sum."

There is another charge. "Shri Sukhadia managed to get big tracts of land, valued over lakhs, allotted in favour of his relations, some of whom were even minor, in Bundi district of Rajasthan State. In fact, Shri Sukhadia is the 'Benami owner' of these lands and has been profited along with his relations. These lands should have been allotted to the landless agriculturists of the area, who had even applied for the same, but were not given. This ..."

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Who framed these charges?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I shall be very happy to put this on the Table as soon as I have finished with it.

SHRI DEVI SINGH (Rajasthan): It must be put.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: "These tracts of lands are being cultivated by a wealthy friend of Shri Sukhadia, Nathulal Ramniwas Poddar and the income goes to Shri Sukhadia and his relations. None of the allottees has ever cultivated these lands. When confronted in Vidhan Sabha in this matter, Shri Sukhadia could not have audacity to defend the allotments and instead attempts to tamper with revenue records have been made."

Then, of course, there is something still further, viz., the Panarwa jungle affairs. "Panarwa forest is rich in forest wealth and is situated in Udaipur division. Since Shri Sukhadia came into power, he has systematically carried out 'rape' of this forest area through one Shri Gulam Abbas, a very close friend of Shri Sukhadia and a partner of Shri Sukhadia's brother-in-law Deenabhai. As the Panarwa forest affair is an unparalleled one in the history of corruption and favouritism, we deem it necessary to put in short the same. Around the year 1944, this forest was leased out for Rs. 7,99,110 for five years. Around 1949, Shri Gulam Abbas was the lessee of the forest. One Mr. Gopinath Rao Pillai, the forest officer of Udaipur division, had clearly stated that the forest should be taken from Shri Gulam Abbas, be divided into small tracts (it is in 400 sq. miles) and these may be auctioned. This arrangement would yield more revenue and more production. But the advice was deliberately brushed aside by Shri Sukhadia. In 1954, this forest was again given to the same Gulam Abbas for 3 years on nominal lease money and strangely enough no agreement came to be put in black and white. The order of the Chief Secretary was very explicit that Mr. Gulam Abbas was to enter into agreement with the Chief Conservator of Forests before 15-4-54 failing which the forest was to be auctioned. The extension by three years was done at the instance of Shri Sukhadia, the Chief Minister and the Chief Secretary's orders were put into cold storage. In the year 1957, the

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.] Panarwa forest was again handed over to Mr. Gulam Abbas and no auction was held. This time the lease was sanctioned for Rs. 18,000 per year."

This is not all. There are Mr. Sukha-dia's relatives in the Services. One Mr. Munnalal Goyal of the Rajasthan Administrative Service, who happens to be Mr-Sukhadia's son-in-law, has been appointed as Head of Department, although he is still in the junior cadre of the State Civil Service and has had only ten years' service. Generally Heads of Departments are only IAS officers, officers in the cadre of the State Civil Service. Mr. Goyal was also sent to America at Government expense to organise the Rajasthan stall at an exhibition.

Similarly, Mr. Munnalal Arya, a brother-in-law of Shri Sukhadia, who was only a clerk some years ago, was given rapid promotions and is now an Assistant Commissioner of Excise, having superseded several of his colleagues. Mr. Munnalal is a non-matric and in some cases special posts were created to accommodate him. Both Mr. Munnalal Arya and Mr. Munnalal Goyal have large houses in Jaipur, which officers of their salary can ill-afford to keep.

Then, of course, there is the case of one Capt. Haqiqatullah, who contested against Mr. Sukhadia in the last general election, how cleverly a suit that was filed against him was manoeuvred to be withdrawn, how cleverly the matter was misrepresented before the court and the election petition has not come up for hearing yet. This is how things go on.

So, corruption is the order of the day. What is the use of making reports like what Mr. Santhanam has done. Where is it possible to find a State where corruption does not exist? These are things that come to light and apart from corruption so many other things happen, which perhaps may not come strictly within the four corners of the Santhanam Committee Report. In the great State of Uttar Pradesh, what happens? Only recently before the Rajya Sabha election, the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, said that with great regret she had to say that a lot of money was flowing in at the time of the election. This is the admission of the Chief Minister . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Swatantra Party.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: No Congress Party. And when I gave a Calling Attention Notice I was told that it could not be admitted. I say I would like to give a Calling Attention Notice to set aside the whole election, because on the evidence of the Chief Minister herself, her public statement, a lot of money has flowed into this election. The Swatantra Party was not present in that election. My friend, you are misleading. The boot is in the other leg. All the corruption, all the money is there. The real trouble is that the Congress Party wants more and more money for elections. They have made elections more and more expensive and to get money they have to do this. Have I not referred to in this House and have not others referred to the Mundhra deal and have I not pointed out the reverse-Mundhra deal, why you got money from a certain person? All charges were made. He was deprived of everything, whether he was right or wrong. Those companies, which were taken away from Mr. Mundhra, were handed over to another person in a big group and what is the result? An ex-Deputy Minister, defeated Deputy Minister, was made Chairman. When too much criticism was levelled in this House—he is not Chairman of the group—he was made Chairman of a small company of that group. And what is his remuneration please?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Which is that group?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The BIC group in Kanpur. A former Governor of Bombay, Shri Sri Prakasa, and an old, veteran Congressman, I am sure, does not fit into this crowd of corrupt Ministers. But he has been given a berth, for which the company spends Rs. 20,000 a month. Even the President of India does not enjoy it. He is the Chairman of the company and the company is spending Rs. 20,000 a month on him; and on Mr. Satish Chandra, who was a Deputy Minister and who is the Chairman of another company, Rs. 20,000 are being spent. Examine the books of that company. These companies have been there. This is an associate of that company, associate of that very group. This is how corruption is rampant and is

going on. Therefore, this little enquiry or this Report is not enough. What is needed is to change the outlook. It was under the Nehru regime that corruption was connived at, beginning with smaller things and then rising up to Pratap Singh Kairon and Biju Patnaik. That is why we are in this trouble. If corruption had been put down with a firm hand right from the beginning wherever there was the slightest suspicion of corruption and if the man had been put out of office, things would not have come to this position.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): Corruption is a normal thing now.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes, corruption is a normal thing now. It begins with small things and with smaller people. I cannot blame them so much, the smaller Government officers, when the cost of living is going up. I can understand the position of a man who has got four or five children. Look at the way in which the living cost goes up in Delhi and the high cost of education. What is the cost of educating four or five children? How can even an officer do it? Then what about the cost of entertainment in Delhi? How can an ordinary man do it? You look at everything from a reverse gear. Why is it so? It is because we have got a group of Ministers who get everything in perquisites. It is not perquisites; I suppose you understand what perquisites mean—free house, free telephone, free water, free car, free everything.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. S. NASKAR): Is that corruption?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: No, it is not corruption, it is only benefit.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is extra.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is only benefit. But I say that is not a right way of doing things; the right way is to say: Here you are a Minister of this Government, you must live in proper style, you must be paid for it properly. You pay him Rs. 10,000. I am not objecting to it. Honestly pay him his salary, make him live honestly, honestly make him pay his taxes, but not in this indirect manner where you say that you do not give him anything | M48RS/66—5

but you give him everything under the sun. That is the basis of all these things and that is why that needs to be corrected. It is not the Santhanam Committee's Report alone that is going to set things right; the whole outlook needs to be changed. The recommendations of the Santhanam Committee are there; if you implement them, well and good. But it will be only up to a point. But if you try to cover them up with wrong names like *sadachar* and all that, it is nonsense and it is not going to . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): It is a wrong name.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes, it is a wrong name. Sri Nanda said that it was *sadachar*, that if he could not wipe it out in two years, he would go. Where has he gone? Instead, he is fighting for numbers, whether it should be No. 1 or No. 2 in the Cabinet. Where has the country gone?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : You want a *Sadachar* Committee. You represent vested interests.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: That is where you have got into, my friend, and you are under that very banner, not I.

I do not believe in this. I believe in honestly paying a man well for what he is worth at the proper value. When you do not pay a man well, he is tempted to do this sort of thing. Therefore what is necessary is to correct your outlook. You talk of Members of Parliament. There are enquiries made as to who is staying with them or who is not staying with them, whether Members of Parliament keep sub-tenants. But it is a shame that we have to admit that some of them do keep them, some Secretariat clerks are staying with them. Why? It is because you do not pay them enough to manage their existence. You should pay the Members well. You go round the world. Last year a big party of Congress men went all over the world. What did they see there? You should see that a Member of Parliament is able to live comfortably. Then he cannot come under any such influence, he would not be amenable to such influence. But you have *\$r'* everything in the wrong way. You v show that you follow simplir there is no simplicity. Eve' take advantage of somebo

[Shri Dahyabhai Patel.] quisites? That is (he real trouble. A real change in the outlook on this whole issue is necessary.

Therefore while I support my friend in his plea, I think what is before us is that the Santhanam Committee's Report does not go far enough. What is necessary is a radical change in the outlook, an outlook where you say that you will pay honestly for one's work, honest wages, honest market value. And if you do that, Delhi will be much better. Why? Look at Delhi. People talk of the Delhi Development Administration. Everybody knows who is responsible and who has got all the land deals and who wants to become the *Badshah* of Delhi. Another Congressman . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. There will be another chance.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Thank you, Madam.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam, no exception can be taken to the idea of this Resolution except perhaps for the last word 'forthwith'. No measure, no Resolution, can be implemented forthwith; no recommendation can be implemented by any Government forthwith.

Well, the hon. mover of this Resolution is young and I suppose he belongs to a progressive group. But still he has drawn in support of his Resolution from Chanakya's philosophy. I do not think he is quite up to date. Chanakya's ideas are outmoded. Today even he will not appreciate what Chanakya has said. Chanakya has said—a ruler must be ruthless, a minister must be ruthless, an administrator must be ruthless, and I do not think any Member in this House would lend support to such an idea as that. So, I am sorry that he has quoted an outmoded political philosophy which nobody in the world today, not even the socialist or communist world, would support.

This Resolution has no place today. I do not think the hon. mover is ahead of the events. Government has taken steps immediately after the Santhanam Committee's Report was received and considered by it. I will give instances as to how the Government has sincerely tried to implement its recommendations. In fact, I do admit that our Government is slow to wake up to the needs of the times. I make no

secret of it. But still in this case the Government has, with all the expedition, taken steps to implement the recommendations of the Committee as far as it lies in the power of the Government to do it.

The problem of corruption is a colossal one, as everyone would admit. It has big roots in our society and as the hon. mover has quoted, from the Home Minister's statement, it not only comprises the field of administration, not only the field of politics, but it goes on to social and ethical fields too.

Now, as far as the Government is concerned, the responsibility of the Government in implementing the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee's Report falls into two spheres. One is administration. Certainly, whatever is wrong in the administration, the Government could correct it, they could root out corruption in administration. It is all right. The Government should own responsibility for that. And, further, when cases of corruption come to their notice, it is the duty of the Government to devise a machinery and see that that machinery acts and goes into those cases of corruption. These are the only two things in which the Government has a direct responsibility. In the matter of politics, if the Government enters into the political sphere, not only will it not succeed, but it will fail. What has Shri Nanda done? Nandaji is a very sincere soul. I do not think that even the Opposition Members can take exception to this statement. He has very sincerely tried to root out corruption. But as far as his responsibility is concerned, it will be only in the field of administration and there we should assess Nandaji's achievement. If they go into the achievements of Nandaji in the political, social and other fields, I do not think they would be right. Nandaji has tried to see that something is done there also. But I am afraid he has lost the battle there as anybody is bound to lose his battle when he enters the political field.

Now, as far as administration is concerned, there is one good recommendation of the Committee for which we are all thankful to Shri Santhanam and his Committee and that is that there are certain places in the administration where delays occur, where there are bottlenecks and where the administra

tive action cannot become speedy. Now, it must be said to the credit of the Home Minister that he took immediate action and appointed several study teams in order to see that the administrative machinery was reviewed and any faults in the administrative machinery, any lacunae and wherever either the rules or the procedures came in the way, wherever the bottlenecks lay, all those could be remedied. I happen to speak with knowledge because I have had the honour of presiding over a study team in this regard, which was appointed to review the procedures and administration of the C.P.W.D., and I must say to the credit of the Government that the Government not only cooperated in the enquiry of this team but the Government accepted with immediate effect all the recommendations made by this team except about seven recommendations. And in fact, today the C.P.W.D., the Department itself and all those connected with the Department are very thankful for the recommendations. I say this without any sense of pride or vanity. AH that is due to the immediate and effective action that the Government have taken. In fact, I never dreamt that the Government would go to the length of accepting so many recommendations which involved financial commitments as well and so many other administrative revolutionary changes. But the Government did accept them. And that is one proof which I am giving to this House to show the sincerity of the Government in accepting the recommendations made by the Santhanam Committee.

There is also the study team which was appointed to go into the question of issuing licences of which Mr. Mathur was the Chairman. That also made very revolutionary recommendations and the Government has accepted most of the recommendations. I do not know how many recommendations were not accepted. I was told that most of the recommendations were accepted. That is also a proof of the sincerity of the Government in accepting these recommendations of the Santhanam Committee. So, this Resolution has no place.

Now, where the Opposition Members have waxed eloquent is about the field of politics.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Corruption at the political level, not politics.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, I mean that, corruption at the political level.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Then say what you mean.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I did not want to repeat so many words. My friend has taken some time of mine in saying "corruption at the political level". While politics is above corruption, in no country could politics be . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
It was the belief of Mahatma Gandhi.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: All of us cannot be Mahatma Gandhis. I can visualise of only one Mahatma Gandhi. I do not think there can be many Mahatma Gandhis in all ages to come. If Mahatma Gandhis were there, then we would not have had all this talk about corruption. In fact, in politics we cannot bring in Mahatma Gandhi. I am speaking from experience. I am one who tried to be a moralist all my life. But now, at the fag end of my life, I have come to this reality that life is one of compromises. One cannot insist upon very strict standards. I have insisted upon rigid standards and, therefore, I have lost many opportunities to serve the country. I am speaking from experience. So in politics one cannot adopt rigid standards. If today the Congress Party is collecting funds, it is not the only party that commits that sin, if it can be called a sin. Other parties too are doing the same thing. Why shout against Congress alone? Are not other parties seeking favours of the Government? I see here people who criticise the Government for offering favours. When a person becomes a Chief Minister, he is obliged to some individuals and maybe he might confer some patronage on those supporters of his. But there is way of conferring patronage. One is by doing it straightway, without going out of the way. It is objectionable when it is done in an unlawful manner. We know people who condemn patronage being conferred. They are right when the Minister goes out of the way. But suppose there are two claimants, A and B with similar qualifications and if I prefer A to B, there is nothing wrong in it. That is politics. That is the kind of patronage which people who occupy important, responsible positions today exercise. There may be cases, and there are cases which have been

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] quoted, cases which are in dispute and cases which have been referred to the C.I.D. There are cases which nobody can support. I do not think anybody on this side would support a Minister to be corrupt or a political leader to be corrupt. There are cases which a big party like the Congress is trying its best to inquire into. But here it is something where we should not make the Government responsible. That is my humble submission. Government can restrict itself in the matter of corruption only in the field of administration.

The second field with which the Government is concerned, to which they owe a responsibility, is that they have to take action when cases come to their notice. It must be said to the credit of the Home Minister that he has taken very serious steps to see that not only there is the Central Vigilance Commission but all the States appoint a Vigilance Commission each. Today the Vigilance Commission functions in almost all the States. I do not know of any State where a Vigilance Commission is not functioning. Wherever there is found a concrete proof, some conceivable proof against either an official or a person enjoying a semiofficial status, the Vigilance Commission comes to function. When some accusations are made, the cases are referred to the Vigilance Commission. Everyday, I think, in newspapers we see cases resulting in convictions or dismissal. So the Vigilance Commissions are active. So as far as the responsibility of the Home Ministry in the matter of implementing the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee is concerned, the Government is fully alive to the situation and has taken steps to implement them. Nobody can accuse the Government of any lapse in this regard.

In the political field, all of us have some responsibility. In the social and ethical fields, certainly all of us have responsibility if we want to cleanse our public life. What can the Home Minister alone do? The Home Minister has tried to take action against some political leaders. But there may be forces at work where the Home Minister's hands may be tied up. The Government authority does not project into the political field.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: We want to strengthen his hands through this Resolution. That is the idea.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You have your good intentions in strengthening his hands. But when you try to take him beyond his field, where he cannot act, there you would be wrong. That is my submission. Therefore, as far as this Resolution is concerned, I do not think we can blame the Government. The Government has done full justice to the Santhanam Committee recommendations and has taken all steps to implement the

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) : भ्रष्टाचार की अगर किसी भी कमीशन के जरिए हिन्दुस्तान में अच्छी तरह से तहकीकात की जाय तो मेरा यह ख्याल है कि आज जो सरकारी पक्ष में मंत्री बैठे हैं उनमें से करीब-करीब 80 प्रतिशत तो जेल में होंगे।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : बहुत गलत बात है।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : इसलिए जब इसके बारे में हम सोचते हैं तो यह लाजिमी है कि एक बात यह कहें कि गृह-मंत्री ने बहुत कोशिश की और उन्होंने बयानात भी दिए। दो साल पहले उन्होंने यह कहा था कि अगर भ्रष्टाचार हिन्दुस्तान से खत्म नहीं कर सके तो वे इस्तीफा दे देंगे। खैर, हिन्दुस्तान में एक परम्परा चल पड़ी है कि एक बात कह दो और दूसरे दिन उसको भूल जाओ। पता नहीं हिन्दुस्तान में कितने ऐसे लम्बे चौड़े बयानात हुए हैं कि मैं यह कर दूंगा, वह कर दूंगा और दस-पन्द्रह दिन के बाद बिलकुल उससे उलटा काम होता है और वही आदमी करता है जो बयान देता है। मैं यह नहीं जानता कि गृह-मंत्री के मन में क्या रहा हो, कितनी दृढ़ता से वह इस पर काम करना चाहते रहे हों, लेकिन नतीजा साफ है कि हमारे सामने आज जो परिस्थिति है वह दो या तीन साल पहले की परिस्थिति से भी बदतर है। भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ता ही जा रहा है और कहीं इसकी रोक नहीं है। बहुत आसानी से लोग कह देते हैं कि देश की नैतिकता बिगड़ गई है, देश के लोगों का कैरेक्टर खराब हो गया है। मैं मानता हूँ कि देश की नैतिकता को बिगाड़ने की कोशिश हुई है और शायद उसका कुछ असर भी हो रहा है और मैं उसकी पूरी जिम्मेदारी सरकारी पक्ष पर डालना

चाहता हूँ और उनके नेताओं के ऊपर डालना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि जो विरोधी दल में बैठे हैं वे सब के सब दूध के धुले हुये हैं, उनमें से भी कुछ लोग ऐसे हो सकते हैं लेकिन सरकारी पक्ष की एक जिम्मेदारी है, वह देश का राज चलाती है, देश का हर कामकाज चलाती है, आज देश का नेतृत्व करती है और जब उनके ऊपर इस तरह की जिम्मेदारी है तो वह जो भी काम करते हैं उसका परिणाम सारे देश पर होता है, देश के लोगों पर होता है। तो मेरा तो यही कहना है कि सरकारी पक्ष का जो भी कामकाज हुआ है उसका परिणाम यही हुआ है कि देश में भ्रष्टाचार ऊपर से लेकर नीचे तक हर जगह घुसा हुआ है।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

अगर आप चपरासी के पास भी चले जाय तो भ्रष्टाचार करना पड़ेगा; कोई अफसर को देखना हो तो जब तक आप चपरासी को आठ आना या एक रुपया नहीं देंगे तब तक आपकी स्लिप भी वहां तक नहीं जा सकेगी, मंत्रियों की बात छोड़िये। तो मैं इसका एक ही नतीजा निकालता हूँ कि जब तक ऊपर के लोग अपना बर्ताव ठीक नहीं करते तब तक यह भ्रष्टाचार हिन्दुस्तान से हटना मुश्किल है।

ऊपर के लोगों की बात जब होती है तो हिन्दुस्तान में जगह-जगह प्रान्तों में जो चल रहा है उसके बारे में मैं कहना चाहूंगा। एक-एक प्रान्त को लीजिये। राजस्थान को लीजिये। सुखाड़िया के मंत्रीवर्ग के ऊपर सारे अपोजीशन ने एक मेमोरैंडम भेजा, बहुत उन्होंने कोशिश की लेकिन कांग्रेस पार्टी के कुछ उच्च वर्ग के लोग बैठ कर यह तय करते हैं कि उसमें कोई तथ्य नहीं है। बिहार में श्री के० बी० सहाय के मंत्रीवर्ग के ऊपर आरोप लगाये गये, एक मेमोरैंडम दिया गया, प्रेसिडेंट को दिया गया, और उसका भी नतीजा यही हुआ कि कुछ दिनों के बाद यह कहा गया कि उसमें भी कुछ तथ्य नहीं है। फिर मैसूर को लें। मैसूर के 22 अपोजीशन के एम० एल० एज० ने, तीन मैसूर के एम० पीज० ने और मैसूर कांग्रेस के

भी कुछ लोगों ने करप्शन के चार्जज मैसूर के चीफ मिनिस्टर के ऊपर और उनके अन्य साथियों के ऊपर लगाये, वह मेमोरैंडम प्रेसिडेंट को दिया गया, प्रधान मंत्री को दिया गया, गृह मंत्रालय को दिया गया 1964 ई० में और उनको भी यही कहा गया कि इसमें भी कोई तथ्य नहीं है। इन सब मेमोरैंडम में क्या लिखा गया? उनमें चार्जज हैं, डेफिनिट चार्जज हैं और उसके कई सबूत भी हैं लेकिन फिर भी यह कहा जाता है कि उसमें कोई तथ्य नहीं है, इसमें कुछ होने को नहीं है। उड़ीसा का मामला तो आपके सामने है कि सेंट्रल ब्यूरो आफ इन्वेस्टिगेशन का सारा इन्वेस्टिगेशन हुआ और उसमें सिर्फ यह होता है कि वहां के जो मुख्य मंत्री हैं वह अपने आप को अलग कर लेते हैं मुख्य मंत्री पद से और उन्हीं के एक आदमी को बिठा दिया जाता है और फिर सारा मामला साफ। तो हिन्दुस्तान में बड़ी आसानी से यह चीज की जा सकती है कि कोई आदमी मुख्य मंत्री बन जाय, करोड़ों रुपया कमा ले, फिर जब उस के बारे में कोई हल्ला मचे तो अपना इस्तीफा दे कर घर में बैठ जाय और करोड़ों रुपया पास में रहे। तो हिन्दुस्तान में यह एक भ्रष्टाचार की परम्परा चली है, यह बड़े जोरों से चली है और मैं यह चाहूंगा कि जितने भी मंत्री लोग हैं उनके ऊपर एक इन्क्वायरी हो कि जो उनके असेट्स रहे हैं, जब वह एम० एल० ए० बनते हैं या कांग्रेस की ओर से किसी भी लेजिस्लेचर या पार्लियामेंट में आते हैं उस वक्त के असेट्स और आज के असेट्स की तहकीकात हो तो फिर पता लगेगा कि किसने कितना-कितना पैसा बनाया है और मेरा दावा है कि कांग्रेस के जो बड़े-बड़े नेता लोग हैं उनके पास ऐसा पैसा मिलेगा जो उनके पास कभी नहीं था, राजनैतिक नेतृत्व की वजह से उनको यह पैसा बनाने का मौका मिला है यह तो साफ है। यहां भी कुछ आरोप लगाया गया, वित्त मंत्री के ऊपर भी कुछ आरोप लगाया गया, उनका भी इस्तीफा हो गया और सारा मामला साफ हो गया। सिराजुद्दीन का मामला आया तो

[श्री गोडेमुराहरि]

सेंटर के एक मंत्री ने इस्तीफा दे दिया और सारा मामला साफ हो गया। यहां तो भ्रष्टाचार के बारे में कोई आरोप लगाओ तो फिर अपना इस्तीफा दे दिया लेकिन भ्रष्टाचार से जो मिलिकयत मिलती है वह अपने पास में ही रही। मैं आपके सामने इन सब का एक-एक उदाहरण नहीं देना चाहूंगा क्योंकि यह एक लम्बी चौड़ी कहानी है, इस सदन में और दूसरे सदन में और देश में भी काफी चर्चा होती रही है, होती है और होगी भी, लेकिन मुझे अफ-सोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इसका कोई परिणाम नहीं निकलता क्योंकि जो सरकार है और जो नेतृत्व वर्ग है उनके दिमाग में कोई चीज करने की क्षमता नहीं है, वह नहीं चाहते, क्योंकि यह सारा चक्कर इनका ही चलाया हुआ है भ्रष्टाचार का। कांग्रेस कैसे टिकी हुई है? वह टिकी हुई है क्योंकि आफिसर, कांग्रेस के मंत्री और बिग बिजनेस इन तीनों का एक कम्बाइन है देश में और यह कम्बाइन आज देश को चला रहा है। एक तरफ तो विरला साहब खड़े हैं दूसरी तरफ कांग्रेस का मंत्रिवर्ग खड़ा है और तीसरे जो आफिसर्स हैं उनको कभी धमकी दे कर कि तुमको यहां से ट्रांसफर कर देंगे, यह कर देंगे, वह कर देंगे या कुछ कर देंगे या कभी और तरह से कांग्रेस का मंत्रिवर्ग अपने कब्जे में रखे हैं और यह कम्बाइन ही आज हिन्दुस्तान का राज चला रहा है। तो इसलिये मेरा ख्याल है कि हम चाहे जितने भी कमीशन बिठायें, कोई परिणाम निकलने वाला नहीं है क्योंकि जो कुछ भी कमीशन होगा उसका सारा कामकाज ऐसे ही चलेगा क्योंकि सारा ढांचा इस पर ही बना है, भ्रष्टाचार के ऊपर है और कोई नतीजा निकलने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन फिर भी हमारे साथी श्री बांके बिहारी दास ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूं क्योंकि पता नहीं शायद उस कमीशन में कुछ ऐसे लोग बैठ जायं जिनके दिमाग में कुछ दूसरा करने की क्षमता हो और साथ ही वह कुछ ऐसी कार्यवाही करें जिससे कि सारी चीज का पता न चले लेकिन कम से कम उसकी पूछ

ही पकड़ पायें; अगर हाथी की पूछ भी पकड़ लेते हैं तो मुझे संतोष होगा कि कम से कम पूछ तो पकड़ ली, हाथी का पकड़ना तो बाद में होगा और वह तब होगा जब कि यह सरकार हटेगी और दूसरी सरकार आयेगी, फिर पुरानी करतूतों के बारे में इन्वैयरी होगी, सारा मामला बाहर निकलेगा और फिर हिन्दुस्तान को पता चलेगा कि किस तरह से इस देश को तबाह किया गया है पिछले 20 सालों में कांग्रेस सरकार के भ्रष्टाचार से।

अब, गृह-मंत्री के बारे में मैं क्या कहूं। उनके हाथ में है यह सारी तहकीकात, लेकिन उनका हाथ भी मैं समझता हूं कि इतना साफ नहीं है। मैं तो सिर्फ श्री मेहता के बारे में कहना चाहूंगा। एक बिहार का इंजीनियर वहां से रिटायर होता है, पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन में बिठाया जाता है और उसका सारा जो कुछ भी होता है, वहां की इंजीनियरी से लेकर पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन की मेम्बरी तक, वह श्रीमान नन्दा के साथ जुड़ा रहता है। यह विचित्र बात है कि कोई भी मिनिस्टर अपनी मिनिस्ट्री से दूसरी मिनिस्ट्री में जाता है, कोई तरक्की कर लेता है, तो उसके साथ-साथ उसके अफसर भी तरक्की करते जाते हैं और उसी मिनिस्ट्री में लगे रहते हैं। मुझे कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि कुछ ऐसे अफसर लोगों को साथ रखते हैं और जो भी कुकर्म करते हैं उसमें ऐसा करते हैं कि उनकी मदद मिलती रहे। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि गृह मंत्री साहब ने कुकर्म के लिये मेहता साहब को वहां भेजा है लेकिन मेरा यह आरोप है कि मेहता साहब की इंजीनियरिंग के बारे में या और चीजों के बारे में जो रिपोर्टें रही हैं उससे तो उन्हें पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन में बैठने की कोई लियाकत नहीं है लेकिन फिर भी उनको बिठाया गया इसलिये कि वह कुछ रिश्तेदार होते हैं श्रीमान गृह-मंत्री के। और हवेलीराम का तो सुन लिया इस सदन में भी और बाहर भी।

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR : He is an astrologer.

SHRI G. MURAHARI : Astrologer pf the Home Minister.

तो उनका तो इतना प्रभाव हो जाता है कि हवेली राम के लड़के किसी फर्म में काम करते हैं तो उस फर्म के ऊपर अगर वित्त मंत्रालय की ओर से कोई रेड होता है तो गृह मंत्रालय के कुछ अफसरों का टेलिफोन जाता है कि यहां रेड न कराओ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : That has been denied in the House.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: I am making the allegation again because it has been published in the papers and it is there.

इसलिये मेरा तो कहना यह है कि सरकार जब तक खत्म नहीं होती तब तक इसमें कुछ होनेवाला नहीं है क्योंकि इनमें मैं किसी को नहीं देख रहा हूं जो कि भ्रष्टाचार के खिलाफ कुछ कर सकेंगे।

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री वी० सी० शुक्ल) : आठ महीने के अन्दर जनता से जा कर कहियेगा।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : जनता तो बहुत कहेगी, आठ महीने ठहर जाइये, इमरजेंसी और डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूल्स लागू कर के भी आप एलेक्शन लड़ेंगे लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी जनता आपको सबक सिखायेगी यह तो मैं कहने को तैयार हूं। आखिर, मध्य प्रदेश के बारे में क्या कहूं। एक अखबार में छपा था कि मध्य प्रदेश के एक मुख्य मंत्री साहब थे जो कि 85 लाख रुपया छोड़ गये। तो ताज्जुब होता है कि एक मिनिस्टर ने अपनी मिनिस्ट्री के दौरान में इतना पैसा बना लिया। एक अखबार में यह भी छपा था कि एक सेन्टर के डिप्टी मिनिस्टर मरने के बाद 2 करोड़ 80 लाख रुपया छोड़ गये हैं। अभी इस बारे में केस चल रहा है और वह सबज्युडिस है, इसलिए मैं इस बारे में ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहूंगा। जब यह सबज्युडिस का मामला खत्म हो जायेगा तब यह मामला सदन के सामने आयेगा। लेकिन इस बीच इस मामले को हशअप करने की कोशिश की जायेगी, फिर भी यह सब मामला सामने आने वाला है। इसलिए मेरा सिर्फ यही कहना है...

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to get two clarifications from the hon. Member. He referred to some ex-Chief Minister who, according to some newspaper report, left Rs. 85 lakhs. Does he not know that that news item in the newspaper was the subject matter of a criminal defamation case and the newspaper which published it had to admit before the court that the allegations were false and it tendered an unqualified apology before the court and published that apology in that newspaper once, twice or thrice? Then he referred to a Deputy Minister and the charges levelled against him. The person referred to was one of the saintliest men that I have come across in life. That charge was repudiated and the man who levelled that charge had to eat the humble pie. In spite of all this, I am surprised that such a charge should be made here.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: As far as the second thing is concerned, it is *sub judice* and I do not want to say anything more about it. I leave it at that.

मेरा तो सिर्फ यही कहना है कि जबतक ऊपर से इस भ्रष्टाचार का चक्र खत्म नहीं होता तबतक नीचे खत्म करने की कोशिश विफल होगी। इसीलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में इस चीज को खत्म करना है तो फिर प्राइम मिनिस्टर से लेकर नीचे तक जो भी हों, वे अपना चरित्र बदलें। लेकिन मैं ज्यादा आशा नहीं करता हूं कि वे लोग अपना चरित्र बदलेंगे क्योंकि जो एक बार इस भ्रष्टाचार का फल चख लेता है वह फिर उसको आसानी से नहीं छोड़ता है। लेकिन मैं इस ख्याल का हूं और यह आशा करता हूं कि अगले आठ महीने के बाद जनता इस सरकार को सबक सिखलायेगी और उसे खत्म करेगी और साथ ही साथ हिन्दुस्तान से भी इस भ्रष्टाचार को खत्म करने की कोशिश करेगी।

SHRI S. SUPAKAR (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is a healthy convention in parliamentary democracy that against those persons who are not present here to defend their own case there should not be levelled any charge. That is a very healthy convention having regard to the fact that in the Houses of Legislatures the members enjoy certain privileges and they can make statements which cannot go to a court of

[Shri S. Supakar.] law. Therefore, when we find that allegations are made against Ministers, political personages and others, about their character and there is an attempt made at character assassination, we have more pity than anger against the persons against whom such charges are levelled, especially when we find that such charges are levelled on the basis of newspaper reports which have been categorically denied inside Parliament by the Minister or by the person against whom such charges were levelled. Because the man is here, he does defend himself. Still we find our friends would take newspaper reports as gospel truth and consider the Ministers or their own colleagues somewhat in the position of liars. Sir, this is the state of affairs. We find that the hon. Member Shri Banka Behary Das has brought this Resolution before the House and we appreciate it and feel that it is a Resolution with very good intentions. But, at the same time, I am reminded of the proverb that the path to hell is paved with good intentions.

We find, Sir, that whenever the question of corruption comes up, Orissa and along with Orissa Mr. Biju Patnaik and Mr. Biren Mitra must come again and again like old King Charles head inside the House of Parliament. But then those persons are not here to defend themselves. When they were members of their Governments in the State, working as Chief Ministers, probably the Central Government had a duty to defend them through its Minister whenever such charges came up against them. But we find that the tale still continues and even after those people, Mr. Patnaik and Mr. Mitra, have left their offices, their subsequent conduct also is brought again and again before this House and the other. I do not know whether even in such cases where the people concerned are no longer holding office but are private individuals and some charges are brought against them, the Government is in a position to defend them or not. But I do submit, Sir, that especially in such a case where they are no longer holding any responsible position, it is rather unfortunate that without giving them any chance to defend themselves, when there is no possibility of their getting such a chance, such allegations should be made against them. I am making a distinction in this case on the propriety of making a charge against a person who is holding

office as Minister and running a Government and his subsequent conduct when he is no longer holding office but has become a private individual. During the past several years, I think, at least this House and the other have appreciated on the whole the conduct of Ministers and persons holding high positions in political life and when a serious charge was made against them and there was a semblance of truth in it and there was *a. prima facie* case, they have been asked to quit office and we have appreciated that. But when such charges are levelled again and again when there is no opportunity given to those persons to defend themselves, then it becomes rather painful.

Now I shall come to Chapter XI of the Santhanam Committee Report where this point about the conduct of Ministers, politicians and persons working in the public field is made the subject-matter of discussion. It has been stated here that if ten Members of Parliament make a certain allegation against a Minister at the Centre, then there should be an inquiry. Similarly in the case of a State Assembly if ten Members of that Assembly make an allegation against a State Minister, there should be an inquiry. But if we are so susceptible to believe as gospel truth publications in journals, though some of them may be of a rather yellow colour, then we have to think with dismay about the future of this country. And we also see the sight of people subscribing to such petitions without being 4 P.M. convinced, without any evidence before them and without their own conviction as to whether the report in the newspapers has any semblance of truth. Such petitions signed by ten Members of Parliament or ten Members of the Assembly, I would submit, Mr. Vice-Chairman, amount to nothing but character assassination because I am led to believe from the statements that are made in this House and also elsewhere that not all Members who subscribe to these petitions have made their own enquiry and satisfied their conscience that the allegations that they are making are true and they deserve the weight of a public inquiry. I am conscious of the fact that the allegations that were made against Mr. Biju Patnaik and Mr. Biren Mitra in the C.B.I. Report had an adverse effect on their political character. They had also something to say but it has not been published with the same fanfare as

the C.B.I. Report or the actions taken against them and that is probably the reason why in such cases the Government of India has not thought it proper to take any further action.

I agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Das, that there is corruption at all levels of society but I would not make a general and sweeping statement that all people who are working as Ministers or as politicians, as some people think and propagate, are necessarily corrupt. When such a propaganda is carried on, a general impression is created in the country. Everyone must admit, including my friends who was eloquent over the amount of corruption that is prevalent in the country, that it creates a very adverse effect on all the people who are working in the political field indiscriminately. That is to say, the average man in the street is led to believe that not merely members of the Congress, not merely Ministers, but also those in the Opposition must have been poisoned by the bane of corruption. Under such circumstances, can we expect, Sir, that honest people would like to come into politics and do we not want that people with better standards of morality, people more dignified, people who can deliver the goods, should come into the political sphere? But by this kind of propaganda such a climate is created—a climate surcharged with suspicions and allegations of corruption—in the country that nowadays really honest people would not come into politics. Do we want such a state of affairs in the country? We may discard those people against whom allegations have been made but should we also discard those people against whom unjust allegations have been made, whose characters have been assassinated and who have been practically driven out of the political field? This is the state of affairs we have in the country today and if we weigh the good intentions behind this Resolution of my hon. friend and counterweigh the amount of mud that is thrown at people, the amount of character that is assassinated, the state of helplessness of the people against whom wild charges are made, I think the adverse results will far outweigh the good intentions. We know, although there is a law of defamation, how difficult it is—with your knowledge of law you must be knowing, Sir—for a public man to establish the charge of defamation. Recently in Orissa there M48RS/66-6

has been an instance when Mr. Biren Mitra, against whom such allegations were made, brought a case against the defamers and won the case as a result of which the persons who defamed him and a newspaper were fined. But such cases are few and far between. Therefore, we must weigh the pros and cons of this Resolution and come to a definite conclusion as to whether the evils of passing such a Resolution will not outweigh the good. Therefore I oppose the Resolution.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the House will be extremely thankful to the hon. Shri Banka Behary Das for coming up with such a Resolution. Now, hon. Members from the other side, who tried to oppose this Resolution, were trying to argue that the Santhanam Committee Report was being implemented part by part and as such there is no need for a Resolution like this. If that were so, I also would have agreed that we could have waited; but unfortunately the fate of this particular recommendation of the Santhanam Committee is that it has already been kept in the cold storage. I can very well understand why the Home Ministry has done it. Supposing they were to implement this particular recommendation, then it would have created a very serious crisis within their party. For example, my hon. friend, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, today came out with a memorandum about the Chief Minister of Rajasthan with more than ten Members of the Assembly signing it and here sits my hon. friend, Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy, who has in his possession a memorandum signed by 36 M.L.As against the corruption of the Chief Minister of Mysore. The Orissa affair is so well known that I do not want to go into it. My hon. friend who was just now speaking was trying to argue that it was very unkind of us to again and again come out with charges against those two gentlemen in Orissa. He says that they are not now in office and he asks, 'Why do you bring in their name again and again?' It was only the other day we had to take note of the fact that, when the Chief Ministers' meeting was held, it was Shri Biju Patnaik, who represented Orissa.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: This is wrong. It has been clarified by the Prime Minister that he did not represent Orissa.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I raised the question and she answered it and she admitted that he was there.

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar): The Prime Minister said that he was not in the Chief Ministers' meeting.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: He attended the Chief Ministers' conference. The matter was accepted.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): The photograph was published, where the Chief Minister of Orissa attended that meeting.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I have got the verbatim proceedings here.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Unfortunately, in spite of all the agitations, in spite of the CBI report, in spite of his own admission that he has earned something like Rs. 10 crores, he holds such a vital position in the Congress politics of Orissa, that he could even attend a Chief Ministers' conference.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: That is wrong.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Therefore, we referred to him. So, there is the question of Orissa, the question of Rajasthan, the question of Mysore; the question of Punjab and I do not know which State is left.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Kerala.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Kerala you know. So if this particular recommendation of the Santhanam Committee is implemented, there will be no Chief Minister left. That will create a crisis.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Are you arguing that this recommendation should not be implemented?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am not arguing. I will come to certain other points. Now, some people say that we have been very uncharitable to make all these allegations against Ministers, etc. Now, you forget that on this Santhanam Committee most of the non-official members, excepting one, were Congressmen and after examining the whole thing they came to certain conclusions I will just quote what they have said:

"There is a large consensus of opinion that a new tradition of integrity can be established only if the example is set by those who have the ultimate responsibility for the governance of India, namely, the Ministers of the Central and State Governments. The problem is difficult and delicate. Ministers are necessarily the leaders of the political party which succeeds in obtaining a majority in elections based on adult suffrage. There is a widespread impression that failure of integrity is not uncommon among Ministers and that some Ministers 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."

This is not the finding of the Opposition Members. It is not the finding of my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee or my hon. friend, Mr. Dahayabhai Patel. Here is a committee of Congressmen. After examining the experiences of the last sixteen years, they have come to this conclusion. They have made a suggestion that if ten Members of an Assembly or of Parliament come forward with a charge, then it should go before a committee of enquiry. This is the recommendation. Now, what happened afterwards?

There was a little AICC meeting at Ranchi after the publication of this Report. This meeting was presided over by no less a person than Shri Atulya Ghosh. . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Bangeshwar.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Yes. In this meeting a number of Ministers and Chief Ministers participated. They made a recommendation that this recommendation of the Santhanam Committee was very inconvenient and as such a new procedure should be adopted. If there is a charge against the Chief Minister, the Prime Minister should enquire into it and if there is a charge against any other Minister, the Chief Minister of the State should enquire into it. This was the recommendation of this little AICC meeting and it did not stop there. This was in November, 1965. In January, the leader of the other House, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, who is also the

Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, in an open press statement denounced this particular recommendation of the Santhanam Committee.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJ-PYE (Nominated): What is the little AICC?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It is a little meeting of the Congress members, where the press was not permitted. So, my point is that the ruling party found that it was very inconvenient to implement this particular recommendation of the Santhanam Committee. They have decided to shelve it. This is the fact. So, do not come forward with other arguments. Do not tell us how the other recommendations are being implemented. On that also, I have something to say.

Now, before I come to how it is being implemented, what are the other recommendations? Is it only against Ministers? No. About legislators also they have made certain recommendations, about political parties also they have made certain recommendations and one of the most important recommendations that they have made is to see that donation by companies should be banned. Some other Members were saying that it is not only the Congress Party, but other parties also are getting it. All right, ban it. Let no party benefit by it. If you want to purify political life, you have to take certain definite steps.

There is another thing. What is the biggest corruption? The biggest corruption is through patronage and I was surprised to find Mr. Govinda Reddy saying, what is the harm in this patronage. This is only a normal thing. If 'A' is not to benefit, 'B' will get the benefit. Then, why not patronise 'A', who has done some good to me? That was the way in which he was arguing. I do not want to waste the time of the House in countering his argument. Patronage goes on not only by giving some concession to some people. The Government is also patronising certain things. Now, for example, in our State the Congress was faced with a very serious situation. When Sri Pattom Thanu Pillar was the Chief Minister, there was a quarrel between the PSP and the Congress and the Congress wanted to get the Chief Ministership. A very easy way was found. How? By corrupting the then Chief Minister, Sri Pattom Thanu Pillai,

by making him a Governor; he was removed. Is it not corruption?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Why did he accept it?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is another matter.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: How is it another matter?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Your time is up.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I will take only two minutes more. Then, something happened recently. The Congress is divided between Congress and Kerala Congress and in that division the leader of the Kerala Congress is Shri Mannath Padmanabhan. It looks very innocent. Recently an old man, a social worker—that was the outward show—was brought here. A reception was given to him and then the talk was started as to how the two wings of the Congress could come together.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is an honour.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Yes. Is it not corruption? *(Interruptions)* My God, then you do not understand what corruption is.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is not corruption ...

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: About giving favours, my friend was complaining yesterday. Many of the Members have been seduced to walk over to the other side. I do not mean any personal attack on any person. My point is that if such things happen, then some tradition should be there. If one man elected on the PSP ticket wants to join another party, the elementary thing that he should do is to see that he resigns his membership of that particular party and the office which he holds there and then walk over. When we had a majority and we had our administration in Kerala for some time, how much of pressure was put on some people to cross over to the other side. So, such practices should also stop. So, if you follow the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee together with certain other norms and conventions, you will be at least able to set an example to other administrative staff to go along the right lines. What are you doing? Priority has been given in this Report to ending

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.] corruption among Ministers. Anyone, who goes through this Report, will understand that priority is given to the question of ending corruption among the Ministers. You implement the other things except this thing and how can you get

SHRI ARJUN ARORA ^Will you concede that we have implemented J other things?

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA :;He has already done it.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: At least the Vigilance Commission ...

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Do not go back.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I do not think that everything has been done.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: The tripartite thing they have left out.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The most important recommendation has been left out and you are trying to implement certain other things. I have no time to deal with it, the way in which it is implemented. I am not going into it. My suggestion is that if you are really serious and earnest about at least reducing corruption, the first thing you have to do is to accept this recommendation of the Santha-nam Committee with regard to Ministers and political leaders. I hope that you are not treating it as a fight between the Opposition parties and the ruling party. This recommendation of the Committee consisting a majority members of the Congress side must be accepted. Do not fall a victim to the pressure of the Chief Ministers. The Chief Ministers are coming into the field not only on this issue, but on many other issues they are coming to the forefront. But I think en this if you are going to accept the recommendation of the Chief Ministers, you are going to be doomed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): The Deputy Minister will now intervene. But the debate will continue.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Sir, Members are aware that several steps have been taken by the Government to eradicate corruption in this country particularly after this Report was submitted by Shri Santha-nam. As the speaker preceding me has already said, almost all the recommenda-

tions of this Committee have been implemented by the Government, and a few of them, one or two, which have been left out, are still under their consideration. And the one main recommendation about which this debate is going on—I must say—even that recommendation has been implemented by the Government in its spirit, although not in the form in which it has been made. It is very obvious. Since the present Home Minister assumed office, you can see what has happened in the last three years. This kind of action was never taken in the last fifteen or sixteen years and in their anxiety to make this question political, to take political advantage of this question, they close their eyes to facts as to what hat been done. Any representation, whether signed by one man or by 100 men, does not alter the nature of the allegation. That does not alter the seriousness of the allegation. If the allegation is serious, if the allegation is borne out by proper enquiries, then the allegation is properly gone into and action is taken. I do not have to repeat all those allegations which are very well known to Members of this House. I would only say two or three things. During this debate—this little debate for two hours here—we have heard some very irresponsible allegations being made. This is the very reason why this recommendation would be ruinous not for us but for democracy, to implement. It appears that people, particularly members belonging to the SSP and some other parties like that, are extremely irresponsible in making allegations. Anything they hear anywhere and they come in the House and stand up and make allegations. Allegations which have been refuted, allegations which have been withdrawn, allegations which have been conclusively proved to be completely incorrect, are repeated day in and day out. Because of such Members, unfortunately, who are in the body politic of our country, this kind of thing cannot be implemented. Otherwise, if every other Member was as honest as Shri Govindan Nair or as Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, we could have done it; it could have been done. But everybody is not like them. And it is very obvious and every Member of this House will concede it that if 10 Members of Parliament or 10 members of any State Legislature could make any allegation and that would put a certain kind of machinery into motion automatically, the democratic functioning of this country will be impossi-

ble. Character assassination, which goes on day in and day out without any sense of responsibility, will become the order of the day. No citizen will ever be able to come to this Parliament or to the Government and conduct matters with a sense of fearlessness and sense of duty. So, Sir, it is no use saying that the Government is chary of accepting this recommendation. It is not so. It has shown that it will take action on any petition, any application, which has any semblance of truth in it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Not a single. . .

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Proper enquiries are made.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am sorry to interrupt. Since the death of Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri, not a single action has been taken against any Minister or Chief Minister.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: We cannot help if after his death no responsible allegations have been made. If allegations have not been made in a responsible manner, we cannot help it. But I can assure the hon. Member that if any valid allegations are made by any responsible set of people, they will be definitely gone into and whatever action is needed will definitely be taken.

Hon. Members should know that a code of conduct for the Ministers has been drawn up. That kind of code of conduct has also been accepted by all the State Governments and that is being implemented. If the hon. Members take the trouble of going through that code of conduct, they will find that it is a very vigorous code and if any Minister in this country, whether at the Centre or in the States, is found violating that code of conduct, he will not be in office the next day. This is certain and I would request hon. Members to point out any such instances where they think any Minister has violated that code of conduct.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Will you place that code of conduct on the Table of the House?

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: That has been laid here before and I would again lay it if you so desire.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The hon. Minister comes from Madhya Pradesh

where there is a Minister who has two wives. Is he in a position to deny this allegation.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Yes.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Why has he not been taken to task? Was that Minister who . . .

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: This is absolutely false; it has been found to be false by the MLAs themselves who made this allegation during the no-confidence debate in the Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha. Later on, they said that this allegation was not correct and they withdrew their allegation against that Minister.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody has withdrawn that allegation. The Minister himself in the Assembly admitted that he has two wives.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: This is a matter which is on record, about which my hon. friend should not dispute. This is a matter of record and the record can be verified.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): It is a question of fact.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Since you are from Madhya Pradesh, are you prepared to answer. . .

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Therefore . . .

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Let him go on.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: What do you say to concubines? One is a concubine and the other is the wife. Is that the interpretation?

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I hope you will not provoke me to say what happens in Kerala.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You need not answer that.

SHRI V- C. SHUKLA: Now, several cases have been mentioned here, allegations against the Chief Minister of Rajasthan, allegations against the Chief Minister of Mysore, allegations against the Chief Minister of such and such place. Those allegations were very carefully gone through ...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: By whom?

*recommendations made in the**on Prevention of Corruption*

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: By the Union Home Minister. (*Interruptions*) I do not yield, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He does not yield. You had your say. Let him have his say.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The late Prime Minister...

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I refuse to yield. Those allegations were very carefully examined and they were found to be absolutely false.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of order. I would like to know in what manner the Chief Ministers of the States are responsible to the Home Minister of India or to the Government of India. Their responsibility is to their legislatures and not to us.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: There is no point of order.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We have a federal system of Constitution and I cannot understand what authority except that of advice has Mr. Nanda over the Chief Ministers of States.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is a constitutional point, a point on which there can be two opinions. You can go on, Mr. Shukla.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: The whole difficulty is that the hon'ble Member cannot understand this; otherwise it would have been very easy to answer.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : You should support me.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Shukla, you should withdraw that remark. He is a very senior and respected Member. You cannot say that he cannot understand.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I only repeated his own words.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You must withdraw that. You should show respect to a senior Member.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I withdraw.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On a personal explanation, I am afraid the hon. Deputy

Minister has completely misunderstood the point which I made and it is surprising...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have heard you. Mr. Shukla, you can go on.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): On a point of order, Sir. The hon'ble Deputy Minister in the course of his speech has stated that he cannot countenance all the irresponsible allegations made by parties like the SSP. May I know, Sir, whether he is entitled to make such a sweeping allegation against a recognised political party. He can say about individuals. You cannot call a recognised political party an irresponsible party.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): There is no point of order. When the Deputy Minister said that, you ought to have raised objection. Now please sit down.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: That does not mean that it should continue to remain in the proceedings. It should be expunged. You are the custodian of the House. When he says something irresponsible, it is as much my responsibility as the responsibility of the Chair to check it. I draw your attention to the remark of the hon'ble Deputy Minister. That should be expunged from the proceedings.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: The hon'ble Members over there make more serious charges against our Party day in and day out. Now, why should they feel when some of the charges are returned to them. What I am saying is more right than the allegations made by them.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: I want him to prove that charge. He is insisting on that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You please sit down.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Because he is Deputy Minister, he is insisting on that. What is your ruling?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He says he will continue and he will repeat.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Where is the ruling?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): My ruling is that there is no point of order.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Thank you, Sir.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Sir, we are very anxious to properly process any allegations that are made here. And as the hon'ble Members will realise, the method that is followed to investigate into the charges that are made, would depend on the seriousness of the charges, on the kind of charges that have been made and the charges which have been made against a particular person. We have seen what kind of methods have been followed in different cases, while dealing with Mr. Kairon, while dealing with Mr. Fatnaik, while dealing with similar other cases. The late Prime Minister, while dealing with Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, laid down a certain principle which we have been following. We also wish to follow that principle in future. He said that the conclusion, that there is no case for enquiry, must be reached in such a manner as will carry conviction with the people and Parliament. Sir, this we want to do all the time. This need not necessarily mean that we will refer every complaint that is made to us to a Supreme Court Judge or to a High Court Judge. It would depend on the contents of that allegation, what kind of allegation has been made, what kind of people are making that allegation. That will determine the course of action that we have to take. *(Interruption)* I do not yield to anybody.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Dr. Sapru, let him finish.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I want a clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Is it a point of order?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: It is my allegation ...

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: He can have his turn later on. I would say that the hon'ble Members would do well to refer to the proceedings of this House as well as the other House to see what kind of sentiments have been expressed by Members while discussing the first report of the Central Vigilance Commission. Not only the Congress Members, but the Members belonging to the Opposition parties, responsible Opposition parties...

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: On a point of order. What does he mean by responsible parties?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He has not excluded anybody.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: When he says "responsible Opposition parties" it means some are responsible and some are irresponsible. Which are they?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He has not referred to any party.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: This is a very irresponsible attitude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Shukla, please avoid charges.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: The tone of the debate is such that it cannot be avoided.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): As a Minister you should avoid it.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I shall respect your wishes. I was saying about the opinions expressed by various Members in this House as well as in the other House about the crusade against corruption that was launched by the hon'ble Home Minister. Not only Members belonging to my Party but Members belonging to Opposition parties also praised him for the work that he has done and the progress that he has achieved.

Now, Sir, there are some interested factions in this country who want to run him down. I do not know what is their intention, why they want to run him down. All kinds of irresponsible allegations have been made, taking the name of some Engineer in Bihar. No reasonable man can say that these things have been properly made out. Still there are people who would go on harping on these things. I do not think I should take the time of the House in trying to clarify those matters again.

Mr. Govindan Nair was pleased to refer to donations to political parties by companies and other sources. Sir, he can afford to say that. All political parties in this country have not the dubious ways of getting money.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : All the Opposition parties have been asking for banning contributions from companies.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I am only expressing my opinion. Our ways of collecting political funds are clear and above board. There is nothing hidden from anybody. And if we collect money for our political purposes from various sources, we do not show any favour to anybody.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: The Mundhra deal has shown that.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Without going into the matter, I would appeal to the House that since this Resolution is ill-conceived, it must not be accepted.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset, I would like to point out that corruption in public life cannot be rooted out unless all good people including the leaders of the Opposition parties co-operate in this effort. Just now the hon. Member, the mover of the Resolution, stated that in a Memorandum submitted before the President a verbatim record from certain Government documents had been given. I would like to know how that verbatim record of the Government was obtained. Was it not corruption to get confidential documents from Government offices? Naturally you influence certain staff of the Government and get hold of certain documents by making payments.

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have restricted the time to five minutes.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: The leader of the Opposition just now stated that he will not mind if some petty officials of the Government are corrupt and earn money somehow or other as they cannot maintain themselves with their meagre salary and all that. Besides that, Sir, he also advocated that more allowances and salaries should be given to M.Ps. Otherwise, they also would become corrupt and they will let their houses to others. I think by making these suggestions we are becoming a party to corruption. He fails to understand that in this way he is going to encourage corruption. He says even the M.Ps. are not well paid, when each M.P.'s total earning comes to about Rs. 800 or Rs. 900 a month. His argument is that for maintaining standard of a I

gentleman, M.Ps. have to indulge in corrupt practices in some way and he tries to justify it. Coming to the Resolution, I would request the hon. Members to go through the Santhanam Committee Report thoroughly. He says if ten Members of a Legislature or Parliament send a Memorandum to the Chief Minister or the Prime Minister or the President, then an enquiry should be made: On page 108 of his Report, he further says :

"In the long run, the fight against corruption will succeed only to the extent to which a favourable social climate is created. When such a climate is created' and corruption becomes abhorrent to the minds of the public and the public servants and social controls become effective, other administrative, disciplinary and punitive measures may become unimportant and may be relaxed and reduced to a minimum. However, a change in social outlook and traditions is necessarily slow and the more immediate measures cannot be neglected in its favour." Shri Santhanam dealt with the question of corruption of Ministers etc. on the basis of item (vi) of the terms of reference of the Commission. And item (vi) of the terms of reference says:

"To suggest measures calculated to produce a social climate both amongst public servants and in the general public in which bribery and corruption may not flourish." In this connection I would like to make one submission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Mitra, I have limited the time to 5 minutes because there are some more Members who want to speak. I would like you to co-operate with me.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: I find that the time-limit starts with me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): It will be for all the rest who will follow.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: Why not extend it, Sir?

{Interruption}

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, the House may decide to sit till 5-30. No Member from the Jan Sangh has so far

spoken. Justice cannot be made to a subject like corruption within five minutes. When they have taken 18 years, how can we describe it within 5 minutes? (*Interruption*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Order, order.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: I am trying to make short, Sir

I would like to point out to the Member who has moved the Resolution that the Government has gone a step further. The suggestion in the Report was that if there is a complaint against any State Minister, then the Chief Minister would make an enquiry and if it is against a Central Minister, then the Prime Minister is to make an enquiry. He did not say anything about complaints against Chief Ministers. In the whole Report, the Committee was very conscious that under the Constitution the Prime Minister had no authority to institute any inquiry against the Chief Ministers for their alleged omissions or commissions and only the respective state Legislature has the right to remove them. But as the Government is run by the Congress Party, they went a step further and took notice of allegations against as many as three Chief Ministers and they ordered inquiries and actually they were removed. So how can it be said that nothing has been done and this recommendation has not been implemented? Actually it has been implemented one step further.

Then, Sir, Shri Santhanam's suggestion with regard to getting funds from the business community and industrialists was impracticable. It has been suggested that persons who have money should not pay it to political parties. Mr. Santhanam admits that for running elections political parties require large funds, but he suggests that it can be collected through small donations of one rupee or less than that but he does not want big industrialists to make contributions to political parties. The big business and industrialists, who have capacity to pay, need not pay but they are only to amass wealth. He has also suggested that industrialists and businessmen should be banned from indulging in political activities. How is that possible? Under the Constitution, nobody can be prevented from indulging in political activities. Then how can an industrialist be prevented from organising a political party or standing for election?

These are impracticable suggestions which have not been implemented. Therefore, I request the mover to withdraw his Resolution.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : महोदय, भ्रष्टाचार पर यह चर्चा करने का अवसर मिला है। संथानम् कमेटी ने जो सुझाव दिए थे उनके बहुत से भागों को अमल में लाने की बात कही जा रही है, लेकिन मुख्य रूप से यहां से भ्रष्टाचार शुरू होता है, मंत्रिमंडल से, राजनीतिक दलों से, उसके सम्बन्ध में अगर सुझाव लागू न किए जायें तो फिर जड़ में भ्रष्टाचार बना रहेगा। हम केवल प्रस्ताव करके ही भ्रष्टाचार को कभी समाप्त नहीं कर सकते। भ्रष्टाचार की चर्चा करने मात्र से सरकारी पक्ष को कष्ट होता है; कहते हैं कि इससे लोगों की कार्यक्षमता पर असर पड़ेगा। आज स्थिति ऐसी है कि भ्रष्टाचार और पक्षपात के आधार पर काम करने वाले लोगों के साथ जैसा व्यवहार हो रहा है उनकी शिकायतों के कारण ही आज कार्यक्षमता पर प्रभाव पड़ा है और इस कारण से हम इस चीज को छिपाना चाहें, चर्चा भी करना न चाहें तो यह कदापि उचित नहीं हो सकता।

सीरियस चार्जज के फैसले करने या न करने का अधिकार कुछ मुट्ठी भर राजनीतिज्ञों ने अपने हाथ में लिया है उससे कभी सन्तोष नहीं हो सकता। आखिर सन्थानम् कमेटी ने भी इन दस लोगों की क्यों अपनी राय जाहिर की? क्योंकि आज चारों तरफ भ्रष्टाचार की चर्चा है, उसकी शिकायतें होती हैं। एक स्तर उन्होंने तय किया कि अगर दस विधान सभा के सदस्य या दस लोकसभा के सदस्य कोई आरोप लगाते हैं तो सिद्धान्त रूप से उसके पीछे तथ्य माना जाना चाहिए। अब यह बात अलग है कि सरकार इन दस लोगों की बात को स्वीकार न करे। मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार स्पष्ट रूप से कहे कि यह दस की संख्या हमें स्वीकार्य नहीं है, इतने लोगों की संख्या हम साधारण-तया हाउस के कोरम को मानकर चलें कि अगर इतने लोग आरोप को लगाते हैं तो फिर सरकार को सन्थानम् कमेटी ने जो जांच की व्यवस्थाए

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

की हैं उनको लागू करने में कोई रुकावट पेश नहीं करेगी, क्योंकि आखिर जब तक इन अधिकारों को हम किसी न किसी व्यवस्था के आधार पर मोड़ कर नहीं चलते, ये आरोप-प्रत्यारोप चलते रहेंगे। भ्रष्टाचार के इतने उदाहरण सामने आ रहे हैं, केवल सफाई देने से काम नहीं चल सकता—जैसे अभी मुख्य मंत्रियों के विरुद्ध अभियोग-पत्र दिए गए। सरकार ने केवल प्रेस वक्तव्य दे दिया कि उनमें कोई तथ्य नहीं था। प्रेस वक्तव्य देने से स्पष्टीकरण नहीं होगा, समाधान नहीं होगा। मैं यह चाहूंगा कि कम से कम जिन्होंने यह आरोप लगाए हैं उनके एक-एक आरोप के विश्लेषण के बाद उनको यह जवाब जरूर मिलना चाहिए कि क्यों उन आरोपों को उसने सीरियस नहीं समझा, किन कारणों से वे सीरियस नहीं माने गए ताकि उस सम्बन्ध में वे और तथ्य जुटा सकें, और तथ्य उपलब्ध करके सरकार के सामने रख सकें जिनके न होने की वजह से सरकार उनको सीरियस नहीं मान पाई और वे उसकी पुष्टि में सीरियस प्रमाण दे सकें। केवल एक प्रेस वक्तव्य के द्वारा सारी चीज पर पर्दा डालने का प्रयत्न श्रम्य नहीं माना जा सकता। जब तक यह पद्धति ठीक प्रकार से लागू नहीं की जायेगी, ये आरोप बने रहेंगे, अविश्वास बना रहेगा और इस भ्रष्टाचार को हम कभी समाप्त नहीं कर सकते।

जो मंत्री या मुख्य मंत्री आरोप सिद्ध होने के कारण पदमुक्त किए गए, उसके बारे में अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने भी कहा है कि केवल पदमुक्ति पर्याप्त नहीं है, साधारण नागरिक की हैसियत से, आरोपी सिद्ध होने के बाद उनको कठघरे में खड़ा करना चाहिए, उन पर मुकदमा चलाना चाहिए। केवल पदमुक्ति भविष्य के भ्रष्टाचार को रोकने के लिए कभी भी उदाहरण नहीं बन सकती। मैं किसी एक व्यक्ति के ऊपर मुकदमा नहीं चला या एक व्यक्ति को पदमुक्त किया गया यहां तक ही अपने आपको सीमित नहीं रखना चाहता।

आखिर जब भ्रष्टाचार के विवाद में इस प्रश्न को उठाया जाता है तो इन उदाहरणों से हम भविष्य में भ्रष्टाचार करने वाले लोगों को किस प्रकार से रोक सकते हैं उसकी तरफ हमें ध्यान देना पड़ेगा। आज हम सफाई दे दें कि उनके आरोप सिद्ध नहीं हुए, लेकिन अपने-अपने शहरों में, अपने-अपने गांवों में जब मंत्रियों को बड़े-बड़े बंगले बनवाते हुए, बड़ी-बड़ी जमीनें खरीदते हुए, जमीनों पर अंगूरों की खेतियां करते हुए देखते हैं तो केवल सरकार के प्रेस वक्तव्य के द्वारा दी गई सफाईयों से कि उनके खिलाफ कोई आरोप नहीं थे कभी लोगों के मन में सन्तोष पैदा नहीं हो सकता। राजस्थान में एक मंत्री हैं—विमुक्त जातियों को पिछड़ी जातियों को जमीनें दी जायें। उनको रिहेबिलिटेड करना जिनका उद्देश्य हो अगर वे ही उनकी जमीनों को हड़प कर लें—स्वयं वे पिछड़ी जाति के नहीं हैं, ब्राह्मण हैं, उच्च कुल के हैं। अगर वे इन पिछड़ी जातियों की जमीनों पर कब्जा जमाने की कोशिश करें और फिर भी उनके ऊपर आरोप न लगें, उनके बारे में जांच न हो, तो इस प्रकार की व्यवस्थाओं से कभी भी आप भ्रष्टाचार को रोक नहीं पाएंगे, मजबूत ही करेंगे।

मुख्य मंत्रियों के बारे में कुछ व्यवस्था है, पर मंत्रियों के बारे में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है, केवल मुख्य मंत्री पर छोड़ दिया गया है कि वही उसकी जांच करे। हम जानते हैं कि राजनीतिक दवावों के आधार पर मंत्रिमंडल का गठन होता है। राजस्थान के मंत्रिमंडल का अभी और विस्तार किया गया और ऐसे लोग सम्मिलित किए गए कि जिनके ऊपर पहले से ही भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप हैं, जिनके ऊपर, जिनके सारे जीवन पर, कुछ कलंक चढ़े हुए हैं। उनका स्पष्टीकरण नहीं हुआ, उन्हें मंत्रिमंडल में सम्मिलित कर लिया गया। आज उस मुख्य मंत्री से हम यह अपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते ऐसे लोगों के खिलाफ, जो जब मंत्री नहीं थे तो उन पर आरोप लगा दिए गए—जो ऐसे लोगों को मंत्रिमंडल में सम्मिलित कर सकता

है—जांच कराएगा। किस प्रकार से उनके खिलाफ भ्रष्टाचार की इन्वैयरी बिठाएगा ? इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि हमें उन मंत्रियों के लिए भी ऐसी व्यवस्था तय करनी चाहिए जिसमें कम से कम डिस्क्रिशन का पार्ट हो क्योंकि यही डिस्क्रिशन आज भ्रष्टाचार को जन्म दे रहा है। मैं कदापि यह नहीं कहता कि डिस्क्रिशन नहीं रहना चाहिए, लेकिन डिस्क्रिशन जिन लोगों को उपयोग में लाना है उनकी इन्टेग्रिटी चाहिए, देशहित चाहिए, उनके मनों में जनहित चाहिए। आज जितने लेवल तक नीचे से नीचे तक इस डिस्क्रिशन के प्रयोग करने का अधिकार दिया गया है और जिस प्रकार का आम स्तर है उसमें आज दुर्भाग्य से यह कहना पड़ता है कि उस डिस्क्रिशन का उपयोग देशहित और जनहित में नहीं हो रहा, स्वार्थों की पूर्ति के लिए हो रहा है। और ऐसे अधिकारी और ऐसे मंत्री जिनको इस अधिकार का उपयोग करने का अवसर मिलता है वे भी उनके पर ऐसे कायदे ढड़ देते हैं, सूचनाओं को प्रसारित करने में इस प्रकार की दुविधाएं उपस्थित कर देते हैं, ऐसी कन्डीशन्स लगा देते हैं जो कुछ इन्टरेस्टेड पार्टियों के लिए स्पेसिफिकली एप्लाइ करती हैं। पहले से ही उनके दिमाग में होता है कि किन को लाभ पहुंचाना है, किनका इस आधार पर चुनाव करना है—उसी प्रकार जैसे यह कहा गया कि एक को चुन लिया, दूसरे को चुन लिया। मैं समझता हूं कि इसको इतना इन्फ्लेन्स वे में नहीं देखना चाहिए। दुर्भाग्य इस बात का है कि प्रतिदिन जो उदाहरण उपस्थित होते हैं उनमें इन्फ्लेन्स न झलक कर डेलीबरेट अटेम्प्ट झलकता है और उस सारे डिस्क्रिशन को जानबूझकर तोड़ मरोड़ कर लोगों को विशेष प्रकार की सुविधाएं प्रदान करने के लिए उपयोग में लाने की कोशिश होती है।

सदाचार समिति का भ्रष्टाचार के निवारण के लिए भी नाम लिया जाता है। अभी जो नए अध्यक्ष चुने गए हैं सदाचार समिति के, वे भी राजस्थान के हैं। उनको पद्मश्री की उपाधि से विभूषित किया गया है। वे राज-

स्थान में पहले वित्त मंत्री रह चुके हैं। राजस्थान विधान सभा में जब उन पर आरोप लगे तो वे लाजवाब हो गए। अन्ततोगत्वा, राजस्थान की विधान सभा में बीमारी का बहाना लेकर वे बैठे रहे, फेस नहीं कर सके। अब सदाचार समिति के मुखिया बना कर यहां पर लाए गए हैं। वे सदाचार की शिक्षा दे पायेंगे यह राजस्थान का कोई व्यक्ति विश्वास नहीं कर सकता। और अगर इस प्रकार के व्यक्तियों को आप ऐसे स्थानों पर रखते हैं तो यही सदाचार समिति कहीं भ्रष्टाचार की जनक बन जाय तो किसी प्रकार का आश्चर्य नहीं होना चाहिये।

5 P. M.

यहां पर ये सारे सरकारी मुहकमे हैं, सरकारी कामकाज चलते हैं, मुझे दुख है कि आज इन सारे इंस्टीट्यूशंस में पोलिटिकल लाइफ से जो रिटायर कर दिये जाते हैं जनता के मतों के आधार पर या लोगों के दबाव के कारण या करप्ट होने के कारण या किसी और कारण से उनको इन संगठनों में स्थान दिया जाता है, बड़े-बड़े पद दिये जाते हैं, एक प्रकार से उनकी परवरिश करने की व्यवस्था की है, तो इन व्यवस्थाओं से भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ेगा, भ्रष्टाचार रुक नहीं सकता, मिट नहीं सकता। अगर हम इस पहलू से भ्रष्टाचार पर विचार नहीं करते, इसको दूर करने की कोशिश नहीं करते तो केवल सरकारी कर्मचारियों को सीधे रास्ते पर लाने के कुछ उपाय कारगर नहीं होंगे क्योंकि आज इन निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधियों पर ब्यूरो-क्रेसी हावी हो गई है निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधियों की कमजोरी के कारण। आज वह उसे कंट्रोल नहीं कर पा रही है। केवल कानून से, केवल चार बनी हुई व्यवस्थाओं से ब्यूरोक्रेसी को रास्ते पर नहीं ला सकेंगे जब तक कि इलेक्टोरेप्रेजेन्टेटिव्स या जनप्रतिनिधि इस स्तर को कायम न करें जिससे कि ब्यूरोक्रेसी पर वह हावी हो सकें। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Is it the pleasure of the House that we sit for some time more?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:

Let us sit till 5-30 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): But the general opinion seems to be that we should rise now.

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب): وہ تو آپ کی پارٹی ہی ہے پوچھنے کی کیا ضرورت تھی؟ آپ بیٹھے بیٹھے فیصلہ دے دیتے۔

†[श्री अब्दुल रानी (पंजाब): वह तो आपकी पार्टी ही है। पूछने की क्या जरूरत थी? आप बैठे बैठे फैसला दे देते।]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No; I want to have the sense of the House.

شری عبد الغنی: اکثریت تو آپ کی ہے ہی وہ تو ہمارے کہنے کو سننا نہیں چاہتے۔

†[श्री अब्दुल रानी: अक्सरियत तो आपकी ही है। वह तो हमारे कहने को सुनना नहीं चाहते।]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The mover of the Resolution has to reply; he should be allowed that opportunity. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Even if we sit, the list of speakers is very large.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: How many?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): There are three more from this side and there are four or five from the other side. So we cannot accommodate all of them. Even if we sit for 15 or 20 minutes or till 5 • 30 and if each speaker confines himself to five minutes or ten minutes, we can have two or three more speakers. That is all.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Let the mover of the Resolution reply to the debate and we will close with that.

tt] Hindi transliteration.

Otherwise, it is not fair to the House, it is not fair to the debate, it is not fair to the Opposition.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): AH right.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Sir, I am grateful to hon. Members of this House who have either supported my Resolution opposed it, but I will confine my remarks mainly to the reply of the Minister and some of the Members who have passed the Resolution, because there is no necessity, I feel, to refer to those who have supported the Resolution and buttressed it with their arguments.

Sir, I am sorry to say that the reply of the hon. Minister has not satisfied me, nor, I feel, has the reply been up to the mark. Sir, he said a very dangerous thing. He was very happy that the Government had accepted most of the recommendations regarding the Administrative Services, regarding the officers, but he is not prepared to accept the recommendations relating to politicians. He went to the extent of saying that the recommendations, if accepted, will be ruinous to democracy. I want to submit that this very attitude and the two standards that they have, which were clearly brought out in my speech by quoting not ordinary persons but persons like Mr. Setalvad, are the things which are actually ruinous to democracy in this country.

He also said that by this process, the Opposition is carrying on a character assassination campaign against politicians. Here I want to submit that if character assassination is going on then it is not the Opposition that is responsible for that but it is those persons who want to avoid a judicial enquiry. You know, Sir, in the case of Sardar Partap Singh Kairon the Das Commission was set up and because he was the Judge of the Supreme Court, whatever his decision was everybody accepted it with bowed heads, but in the case of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, what is the position? . Mr. Krishnamachari is not satisfied because he feels that justice has not been done to him and those who have made allegations against Mr. Krishnamachari are not also satisfied because they feel that there is a *bona fide* case but nothing is being done.

Similarly, I want to draw your attention to the Orissa case. In the case of Orissa,

they went to some extent and the C.B.I. inquiry came. But even though it has been proved that somebody has stolen the property of the exchequer, you have let him free by saying that he has stepped down from office and is having a political holiday outside. Nor have you satisfied the persons who have been accused, Mr. Patnaik and Mr. Mitra, because they feel that justice has not been done to them. By not giving power to the judicial authority to inquire into such allegations, they are neither satisfying the persons who are making the allegations nor those persons who are standing in the dock. I want to impress this point upon the Government and I want to submit to the hon. Minister that it is no use getting some satisfaction by punishing certain officials. The report has categorically stated that unless corruption is eliminated from the political field, unless corruption is eliminated from the Ministers, in the political level, the climate will not be changed. Nor will it be possible for you to punish the officers or eliminate corruption from the Administrative Services.

In this connection, though I have no time, I want to refer to the Report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission. It was not headed by persons of any political party; it was headed by a Judge and others in that Commission were very impartial persons. I do not want to go into details but they have also categorically said that it is very dangerous to say that everybody is corrupt but it is also equally dangerous to say that corruption is not a grave problem in India. They have also said categorically that unless political parties free themselves from corruption, unless public men, unless the rulers, unless the Ministers, free themselves from corruption, even from the corrupting influence of the big business of this country, you cannot eliminate corruption from the field of Administration. So, whether it is the Report of the Santhanam Committee or whether it is the Report of the Monopolies Enquiry Commission, with one thing everybody agrees and that is that unless you eliminate corruption from the political level, unless you eliminate it from the Ministerial level, you cannot eliminate it from the Administration.

I also want to submit that Ministers are enjoying certain powers and privileges and the Government servants are subordinate to them. And

whenever they feel that some officer is not dancing to their wishes, they can always frame some charges against him, hold him responsible for something or other and punish him. They are not allowed to go free. They are also criminally punished, even if they resign from Service. But in the case of politicians, in the case of public men, for whom the standard should be much higher than in the case of men in the Services, we are telling them to step down. Nothing will happen to them. They will enjoy their ill-gotten money, as Shri Dahyabhai Patel said, and they will carry on. They will get an opportunity as what the ex-Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir wants or the ex-Chief Minister of Orissa wants.

So, in the end, I am very sorry to say that I cannot agree with the arguments that have been advanced by some hon. friends. Moreover, I want to point out one argument that came up in the course of this discussion. As you know, when Mr. Sapru intervened, he raised a point of law. I do not want to say whether he is right or wrong. No doubt, the situation is different in India, because the Chief Ministers are Congressmen and the Prime Minister is also a Congress woman. So, there is this possibility. Even if I take for granted that Mr. Sapru is correct, because a Congress woman is the Prime Minister of India, she can sit in judgment over a Chief Minister, because he is also a Congressman.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That will be a Party affair.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: I can understand that.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But corruption is not a Party affair.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: The code of conduct, they have said, is not a Party affair. They say it is a governmental affair. I say that the code of conduct is nothing but a farce. The code of conduct is not being challenged because the Chief Minister belongs to their Party and the Prime Minister also belongs to the same party. Suppose the character changes tomorrow and a different Party comes into power. Even now, if Mr. Sapru's contention comes true, what will be the position of this code of conduct? So, let us not have two different standards for politicians and

[Shri Banka Behary Das.] administrators. A criminal person, whether he is an administrative man or a public man, is a criminal. He is a thief who steals somebody else's property or the State's property. There is no difference between the two. Rather I would say that those who steal the property of the society, steal the property of the exchequer, are greater criminals than the others. Let us not have different standards for politicians and the administrative services. Let us have only one standard. If we believe in the judiciary, let us give all the facts to the judiciary. Let them judge. Let them say that we are not criminals. Then, we can go to the world and say that we are not criminals. That is the standard that we require, not only in India, but in all developing countries.

So, in the end, while I do not agree with the Minister or the opinion that has been voiced from the other side, I humbly submit—whatever may be the decision of the House—the days are running out. We know what is happening around us. We know what is happening in Pakistan. We know some days back what happened in Indonesia and Ghana. Let us not go the same way. Let us learn at least from history. Let us learn at least from Kautilya, though he may belong to an old age. Though I claim myself to be a progressive, I never claim that morals are different for progressives and conservatives. Truth is truth. What was true of Kautilya, what was true at that time that Ministers should be above those temptations, is also true just now. It is more so because we are now living in a democracy. We are not living in an age of feudalism.

So, in the end, I again submit that this House should accept this. Even if they reject it, I would humbly submit that if the Home Minister is sincere, even if all kinds of pressure are brought on him, if he wants to keep up the standard of morality that he advocated two years back and from which he has retraced so far, he should consider this. I hope that the time will come when the Congress people will realise that corruption is a great problem. Even if it is confined to a few persons, let them be isolated. Let all others be free. Now, do not mix up those who are corrupt with those who are not corrupt. I would humbly submit that if you want to isolate corrupt persons, the only course for it is that you should have an

impartial authority. Let us have faith which the Constitution-makers gave to the judiciary and have an enquiry commission, whenever a *prima facie* case of corruption is established.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Thank you. Would you like to withdraw it or you want the Resolution to be put to vote?

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: Sir, on a point of order...

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: No. 11 is a question of principle. It will have to be put to vote.

شری عبدالغنی : کیا میں پوچھ
سکتا ہوں کہ ہمارے ہاؤس میں یہ
ایک روایت ہے اور یہ آپ کے
ڈسکریشن پر ہے کہ آپ کسی پارٹی
کو چاہے وقت دیں یا کسی کو وقت
نہ دیں - اگر یہ ڈسکریشن ہے
تو یہ آپ کو ڈسکریشن تمام پارٹیوں
کے حق میں استعمال کرنا چاہئے -
میں یہ دعویٰ نہیں کرتا ہوں کہ
میں اس مضمون کا باوا آدم ہوں
لیکن ہماری پارٹی کو وقت نہ دینا -
میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اگر ہاؤس میں
ایسی باتیں چلتی رہیں گی تو آپ
چاہتے ہیں کہ ہم سب لوگ جو
اپنی وہ شرافت ہے، جو تمیز ہے جس
کو ہم نے رکھا ہے اس سب کو
ختم کر دینا چاہتے ہیں اور جب
آپ چاہیں گلا کاٹیں اور ہم کو
موقعہ نہ دیں - اس لئے میں جاننا
چاہتا ہوں کہ اس میں چیئر کا کیا
ڈسکریشن ہے -

हिंदी में पूछ सकता हूँ
[] Hindi transliteration.
कि हमारे हाउस में यह एक रवायत है और यह

आपके डिस्क्रिशन पर है कि आप किसी पार्टी को चाहे वक्त दें या किसी को वक्त न दें। अगर यह डिस्क्रिशन है तो यह आपका डिस्क्रिशन तमाम पार्टियों के हक में इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए। मैं यह दावा नहीं करता हूँ कि मैं इस मजमून का बादा-आदम हूँ। लेकिन हमारी पार्टी को वक्त न देना, मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हाउस में ऐसी बातें चलती रहेंगी तो आप चाहते हैं कि हम सब लोग जो अपनी वह शराफत है जो तमीज़ है जिसको हमने रखा है उस सबको खत्म कर देना चाहते हैं और जब आप चाहें गला काटें और हमको मौका न दें।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Sir, on a point of order, I take strong exception to the remarks of my friend, Mr. Abdul Ghani. He said that you wanted to throttle the debate. In fact, you have been far too liberal. We may have finished at 5 o'clock and you have allowed the debate to go on even after five. Shri Abdul Ghani has not had the courtesy to thank you for the goodness that you have shown to the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I want to make it clear to Mr. Ghani that when we have got

a limited time and when there are so many parties, it is not possible to accommodate every party and in considering it; naturally, those parties, which have got a greater following, will have to be given precedence. This is what we have been following and in my own humble way I have also been following it. I think the House also knows that we do our best when we sit here to see that the Opposition, as far as possible, is accommodated much more than even the Congress Party.

Now, as the mover is not withdrawing it, I will put the Resolution to vote. The question is:

"That 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 motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at seventeen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on. Saturday, the 7th May, 1966.