

requirements of the refinery. As regards the terms and the period and the interest etc. I shall lay the information on the Table of the House.

भ्रष्टाचार-विरोधी आन्दोलन

+

- * 484. { श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी :
 श्रीमती सावित्री निगम :
 श्री स० चं० सामन्त :
 श्री सुबोध हंसवा :
 श्री बागड़ी :
 श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा :
 श्री कृष्णपाल सिंह :
 श्री मा० ल० जाधव :
 श्री जेजे :
 श्री काजरोलकर :
 श्री गुलशन :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की रूपा करेंगे कि :

(क) उन्होंने कुछ समय पहले जो योजना घोषित की उसके अनुसार भ्रष्टाचार विरोधी आन्दोलन में सरकार को कितनी सफलता मिली है ;

(ख) क्या इस काम के लिए किये गये उपाय पर्याप्त सिद्ध हुए हैं ; और

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो इस काम के लिये क्या उपाय तथा व्यवस्था की गई है और उसकी कौन सी नई अन्तिम तारीख निश्चित की गई है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री हाथी) : (क) सरकारी प्रशासन में भ्रष्टाचार निवारण के उपायों में पहले ही पर्याप्त प्रगति हो चुकी है ।

(ख) और (ग). सदन के सभा पटल पर एक विवरण रख दिया गया है । [पुस्तकालय में रखा गया—रेकॉर्ड संख्या LT—4782/65]

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : हमारे गृह-मंत्री श्री नन्दा जी ने कुछ समय पूर्व एलान किया था कि भ्रष्टाचार को दो वर्ष के अन्दर समाप्त कर दिया जाएगा । प्रश्न में यह पूछा गया है :

'if not, the measures taken and the machinery set up for the purpose and the new deadline fixed therefor?'

इसका उत्तर नहीं दिया गया है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो दो वर्ष का समय निर्धारित किया गया था उस में भ्रष्टाचार उन्मूलन हो चुकेगा ? यदि नहीं, तो कौन सा समय रखा जाएगा । यह प्रश्न पूछा गया था लेकिन जवाब नहीं दिया गया है ।

श्री हाथी : उन्होंने भ्रष्टाचार उन्मूलन के लिये पूरी तरह से नहीं कहा था उन्होंने यह कहा था

'There will be sufficient impact on the anti-corruption drive. We have never said that it would be absolutely eradicated in two years'.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): I was engaged in something else. When I heard my name being mentioned, I rushed from my place to the chamber.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is welcome.

Mr. Speaker: If the answer has already been given, it is not necessary that he should answer it. Let him hear the second question.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Reference was made to his pledge.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं ने यह पूछा था कि श्री गुलजारीलाल नन्दा ने ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री हाथी ने बताया है कि उन का कहना यह नहीं था कि रिस्क बिल्कन मनी जायेगी

यहां से, बल्कि उस का इम्पैक्ट होगा और उनका कहना है कि वह हुआ है ?

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : मैं तो यही जानना चाहता था कि वह हुआ है या नहीं ।

Shri Nanda: Nobody is more conscious of the responsibility that I undertook, and the obligation I incurred I remember this everyday.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: November 1963.

Shri Nanda: I do not know; one cannot judge himself as to one's own part, whether it is a full rendering of the account or not. My colleague stated that it has made that impact. I personally will not be able to make any claim at all. I think in a little while, there will be a full survey of the activity during this period to be placed before Parliament because what I said was said on the floor of this House. I have already placed in the hands of the Prime Minister my offer to resign on a certain day. But it will have to be judged on that record which will be placed before Parliament. You, Sir, can make arrangement for any evaluation that has to be made. For my part, my mind is very clear.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: That was not what we wanted.

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : यह जो बयान सभा पटल पर रखा गया है उस में बतलाया गया है कि सन् 1961 में करप्शन के 1091 केसेज पकड़े गये...

Mr. Speaker: I should assure the Minister that there is no one here who wants him to resign. They only wanted to draw his pointed attention to the commitment he had made. Again and again, they want to draw his attention to what he had committed himself to.

Shri Ranga: He need not have made that statement on that occasion, and he should not have repeated it. It is true this is a deep disease of this Government. He himself has stated that it has got deep roots. After he had made that very bold and reckless statement, he need not take all the responsibility himself. The whole Government should take that responsibility. If anybody is to go, this whole Government should go. We have already stated that.

Some hon. Members rose—

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : जो बयान सभा पटल पर रखा गया है उस में बतलाया गया है कि सन् 1961 में 1091 केसेज प्रष्टाचार के पकड़े गये । लेकिन सन् 1964 में यह 1875 से घटायत् 80 फी सदी की वृद्धि हुई । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्रष्टाचार उन्मूलन के लिये कदम उठाने के बाद इन केसेज में वृद्धि हुई या घटने घाप हुई, या रूकावट होने पर भी यह वृद्धि हुई । इस वृद्धि के कारण क्या है ।

Shri Hathi: The reason is clear. It is because of the greater number of detection of such cases.

श्री बागड़ी : इस प्रष्टाचार को मिटाने के लिये श्री नन्दा ने ऐलान किया था लेकिन उन की कोशिश के बावजूद प्रष्टाचार नहीं मिटा । क्या श्री नन्दा ने इस के कारण सोचे हैं । अगर सोचे हैं तो क्या इस मुख्य कारण यह नहीं है कि जो प्रष्टाचार है वह ऊंची जगहों के लोगों के जरिये होता है और ऊंची जगहों पर उन का हाथ नहीं पड़ता है । इस के लिये क्या तरकीब की गई है ।

श्री हाथी : जो विवरण सभा पटल पर रखा गया है उस में बहुत से कारण दिये गये हैं । और उन का उपाय किया गया है यह भी लिखा गया है ।

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: The hon. Minister just now said that the question whether corruption has been reduced or decreased is to be determined by the impact. What is the criterion of judging the impact? If there is more detection, does it mean that there is less corruption, and if there is less detection, does it mean that is more corruption? I want to know what it is specifically.

Shri Hathi: Impact neither means more detection nor more corruption nor more cases, but it certainly means that there is a certain drive in the Government and also a popular movement, that there is a greater awareness among the officers and people that there is some machinery geared up for this purpose. That is the meaning of impact.

Shri Nanda: I would like to add that so far as this impact of any measures that are adopted is concerned, they must lead to certain results, and, therefore, in the first instance, when the arrangements are strengthened and the approaches are made from various directions, it must lead to a larger percentage of detection of cases, and then, later on, other things follow. But then at some stage it must be evident that actually the incidence has decreased. With the help of statisticians, we have introduced a method of sample survey etc., and it is being found in certain departments that, taking a proper statistical sample as to how many irregularities are detected, taking the whole range, there has been some improvement, for example in Customs. I cannot say off-hand exactly to what extent. Therefore, there is a way of finding the impact in both ways—detection as well as improvement.

Shri Ranga: Two Chief Ministers had to go out.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री बागड़ी आपने कहा, या कि भ्रष्टाचार का कारण यह है कि वह ऊंची जगह से चलता है और वहाँ तक
1196 (A) LSD—2.

गबनेमेंट का हाथ नहीं पहुँचता है। यही सवाल था न।

श्री बागड़ी : वहाँ हाथ पड़ता ही नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है उस में लिखा है कि जो ऊंची जगह हैं उन पर भी हाथ डाला है।

श्री ना० नि० पटल : क्या यह सच है कि कुछ दिनों पहले गुजरात के एक सज्जन ने लिखा था कि भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ रहा है और अगर उस को खत्म नहीं किया जायेगा तो वह प्रगति स्तान करके भ्रष्टम हत्या कर सेमें, और उन सज्जन ने भ्रष्टम हत्या की। अगर सरकार को इस के बारे में मालुम था तो उसने उस भ्रष्टम हत्या को रोकने के लिये कुछ प्रबंध क्यों नहीं किया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह सवाल नहीं उठता।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know whether it is a fact that the main root of corruption is the handsome political donations taken by the ruling party from the big industrialists, and if so, whether the hon. Home Minister has evolved some method to see that such political donations are avoided in the larger interests of avoiding pollution in politics.

Shri Nanda: Corruption, wherever it occurs, and whatever the sources of the pollution must be tackled, and I do not think there is any particular place only in which it is found.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My question is whether it is a fact that the main source of corruption both in the administration and in the ruling party is the fact that handsome political donations are taken by the ruling party, with the result that these industrialists create corruption in various places. I would like to know what

steps Government contemplate taking to stop taking political donations from these people.

Shri Nanda: I am quite sure in my mind that no political party should be dependent for their sustenance on any such sources, but I am not bringing in free donations given to one party or another.

Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh: Is the hon. Home Minister aware of the fact that a person who has been compulsorily retired by the President of India on proved charges of corruption and who was not thought fit enough even to be a collector has been appointed as a Vice-Chancellor of a university in India and, if so, what steps have the Government taken in this matter?

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow individual cases to be discussed.

Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh: That is corruption.

Shri Ranga: He has not mentioned any names. Are they aware of it?

Mr. Speaker: Does the name remain hidden after all this statement? I cannot allow it to be discussed here, whether it has been proved or not, what the Minister has to say. Instead of helping in that direction, probably we do more harm.

Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh: He has been removed by the President.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going into individual cases on this question.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: In the long list given in the statement, there is a code of conduct for ministers. It seems that the States like Mysore and Assam have not accepted the code of conduct. May I know whether the Ministers of States which have accepted it have submitted or disclosed their assets and liabilities, the business connections of the families, etc. and, if so, whether the Government is in a position to place a copy of this statement on the Table of the House?

Shri Hathi: The names of States which have accepted the code are given in the statement; the others which have not accepted it are considering it and I hope they would accept it. The Ministers have to furnish the statements *prima facie* to the Chief Minister of the State concerned; they are not to be submitted here.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Can you not get the statements and place them on the Table of the House for the Central Ministers and Chief Ministers? It is said here that the Chief Ministers have to submit their statements to the Prime Minister. Can they not get that, statement and give it to us?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has put a question about the States.

Shri Hathi: The Central Ministers have all submitted their statements to the Prime Minister.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Will you place them on the Table?

Shri Hathi: It is not to be placed . . . (Interruptions).

Shri Krishnapal Singh: Sir . . .

Mr. Speaker: I have been looking to that side; he has stood up now. I have noticed him; he should not be impatient; I will call him.

Shri R. S. Pandey: To eradicate corruption from the country how many official and non-official agencies are working, and what is the result?

Shri Hathi: About any particular agency, in a government department at the State and the Centre, it should be impossible to mention any particular machinery because each department by itself has to be vigilant and active to see that the cases are disposed of without delay, because delay is one of the causes which lead to corruption. Therefore, the primary business of the Government should be to see that there is efficiency in the administration and less of delay, and these are all the departments which by themselves are the agencies which are functioning. (Interruption).

Shri Ranga: May I know, in view of the fact that several references were made to the Finance Minister's dealings with various concerns and in view of the Finance Minister's own reply both here and in the other House, would the Government consider the advisability of placing on the Table of the House, a statement made by all the Central Ministers to the Prime Minister, in regard to their contacts with business, directly by themselves and through their relatives and others who are very closely associated with them, and if they are not prepared to do so, is it because they are afraid of the truth?

Shri Hathi: There is no question of being afraid of the truth. But, as I said, so far as the present position stands, the Government has no intention of doing so. *(Interruption)*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Government seems to be disinclined to place before this House, that is to say, before the country, the statements submitted already by the Ministers to the Prime Minister here. May I know if the Government have taken this decision when this appears to go against creating an anti-corruption atmosphere in the country? Has Shri Nanda himself any answer to this charge which the people are bringing up against the Government?

Shri Nanda: I did not quite follow the question, but. . .

Mr. Speaker: The answer has been that the Government is not prepared to put that statement—the answers that they have received or the assets that the Central Ministers have disclosed to the Prime Minister. The question was whether that is going to be placed on the Table of the House. The answer was "No." The question now is, why is not the Government prepared to put it on the Table of the House.

Shri Nanda: The Prime Minister is fully competent and is capable of

looking after the integrity of his Ministers.

Shri Ranga: No, Sir. *(Interruption)*. I wish to draw your attention to one fact. The Cabinet Sub Committee kept that report in regard to Biju Pa'naik and those people as secret. It was this House which had the privilege of exposing the hollowness of the claim made by my hon. friend that the Government can be trusted and the Government is fully capable of keeping public integrity intact. We question their claim for maintaining public integrity. *(Interruption)*.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members must be alive to the high responsibilities so far as I can exercise them.

Shri Ranga: They make too much of a claim.

Mr. Speaker: Whether it is right or wrong, what further can I do? The question was put, and the Minister has answered. During the Question Hour, I can get only the information. If they have further to argue or question them, they may do it in some other way, but not during the Question Hour.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is not a question of any argument. The question was why they are not inclined to put it on the Table of the House. Without giving a direct reply to that, he said the Prime Minister is the custodian of their integrity, etc. We are not interested in that. They have decided that the Ministers will submit their reports to the Prime Minister. That is all right. But why is it they are afraid of placing the statement on the Table of the House? Is there any hanky-panky about that or any fear of exposing anything? What is the matter?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Party interest; not public interest.

Shri Nanda: I have previously stated very clearly in the House that if there are any complaints about a Minister, certainly a certain course will be fol-

lowed which, I said, was going to be different from that which led to the situation regarding the Orissa affair. There will be, if there is any kind of enquiry needed, it will be through an independent agency. Having done that, I do not think there can be any need for any statement of assets to be submitted by the Government. So, that should be a complete answer to that question. As to the independent question whether, if there is anything against a Minister, it is going to be looked into or not, I have already made that clear.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. They can raise it in a different manner. They have so many other occasions.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The question has not been answered, Sir. At the same time, the sanctity of the Question Hour is something which I am sure you will be pleased to uphold. If in the process of asking a question we do not elicit information which is not virtually forthcoming, then the point of the Question Hour is completely lost. My submission is this: please bear with me for one moment. We are all prepared to believe in the *bona fides* of the Home Minister, Shri Nanda, in regard to his campaign against corruption. We have been asked to serve on footling little and anti-corruption committee and that kind of thing. But the country wants to know certain things in regard to the assets of ministers. Because of the country's demand, ministers are having to supply this to the Prime Minister. We want that this matter is made public to the country, so that the misgivings are removed. The Minister stands on ceremony and you are bound by the rules of procedure or whatever that may be. The result is that the country does not get to know the facts of the case and does not get satisfaction. This is a most undesirable state of things.

12.00 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: I have explained my position. I have already told the hon.

members that there might be other ways of having a discussion and trying to find out the reasons, etc. All those things, of course, can be discussed, but that would be a different discussion altogether. So far as the question hour is concerned, I have no authority to compel a minister to say something which he does not want to say. He says, we don't think there is any need and we are not prepared to put it on the Table of the House.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has not said that there is no need. We wanted specifically that answer, which he evaded.

Mr. Speaker: He has said that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is not the question, what would be the form of enquiry if complaints are made against ministers....

Mr. Speaker: The question was put and the answer has been given. It may not satisfy hon. members, but that is a different thing altogether. I have only to regulate the questions and answers here. I cannot go beyond that. There are other ways of raising a discussion if they are not satisfied with the conduct of the ministers.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You should come to our protection if the question is one thing and the answer is something different.

Mr. Speaker: In that respect, information is wanted and the information is given that they do not think there is any need to place it on the Table of the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order, Sir. As far as I am aware, whenever a minister refuses to give the answer to a question, he takes usually the plea of public interest. Does he take that plea now or does he take the plea of party interest?

Mr. Speaker: It is no question of public interest. The statement has come from them that they are not

prepared to place it on the Table of the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: For what reasons?

Mr. Speaker: That may be raised in a different manner.

Shri Krishna Pal Singh rose—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Krishnapal Singh. I have to apologise to you that on account of these interruptions, I could not call you.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

Strike by Workers in Cashew Factories

S.N.Q.—4. { **Shri Warrior:**
+
Shri Vasudevau Nair:

Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether 80,000 workers of Cashew factories in Kerala State have resorted to strike;

(b) if so, what are the issues involved; and

(c) what steps Government have taken to settle the dispute?

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) There was a strike by Cashew workers in Kerala.

(b) The main issues were Bonus for 1964-65 and other general demands presented by different unions.

(c) The Labour Commissioner, Kerala Government held series of conciliation conferences. The final conference was held on the 1st September 1965 when the parties arrived at a settlement and the strike was called off from the 2nd September, 1965.

Shri Warrior: What are the agreed points in the settlement that has been reached?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: They have agreed to pay 8-1/3 per cent of the annual earnings of the workers as bonus for 1964-65. So far as the staff are concerned, they are to be paid two

months' wages as bonus. The other terms will be settled later.

Shri Warrior: May I know whether the employers' organisation is contesting that they are not liable to pay 8-1/3 per cent, but they have only to pay 4 per cent, which is the minimum put in the bonus ordinance?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: Whatever the contention might have been, now the employers and the workers both have agreed and they have come to a settlement that the bonus will be 8-1/3 per cent.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would like to know what is the machinery there to see that the particular agreement which has been reached between the workers and employers is properly implemented and they do not change from 8-1/3 per cent to 4 per cent?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: The hon. Member knows very well, being a veteran trade union leader, that there is the State Implementation and Evaluation Committee which would look into all cases relating to violation of agreements, settlements and awards.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Extradition of Walcott

*485. { **Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:**
Shri E. S. Pandey:
Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Surendra Pal Singh:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 369 on the 10th March, 1965 and state the action taken so far for initiating extradition proceedings against Walcott?

The Minister of state in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hathi): The arrest warrants with the original depositions and exhibits obtained from the Court of the Additional Chief Presidency Magistrate, Bombay, have been forwarded to the Indian High Commission, U.K., for initiating extradition proceedings against Walcott and two others.