

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya]

Parliament Secretariat for the use of Sanskrit on certain ceremonial occasions, but I was told it cannot be used unless it is there in article 343. I have not raised the question of *lingua franca*. I have not raised any other question. I have suggested Sanskrit only as an integrating factor in the present India; not only India, but it will integrate us with the rest of the world, particularly the eastern Asia. Some years ago, I was in Saigon and I met the Education Minister of Burma there. I asked the Education Minister of Burma how they found out technical words for their language. He said that they tried to find out those words from their Burmese language and when they could not find them in the Burmese language they went to Sanskrit. Even now the Education Minister of Burma is doing it. What is the difficulty in our case, I do not know.

I shall quote only one more instance and then conclude. I spoke of Israel. When that State was formed the Jews from all sides came and amongst that multi-national and multi-language people the only way they found to bring about unity was to restore Hebrew. This could be done even in our present case as a measure of integrating factor.

I shall conclude with a saying of Bhavabhuti that comes to my mind now. This time when we close the chapter which began in 1958 and when I conclude it sadly, the words of Bhavabhuti come to my mind:

“ये के राम इ अयन्त्यवजाम्
जानन्तु किमपि तान् प्रति नैषयन्तः”

Those who are ignoring me today, whatever knowledge they may possess, let them also know that my efforts have not been for them. Then he said:

“उत्पत्स्यतेऽस्ति मम कोऽपि समानर्थकः”

There are others who think like me and more will come. Then he concluded:

“कालोऽध्ययम् निरवधि विप्लाव पृथ्वी”

The world is vast and time is eternal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is he going to do with his Bill?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Let the Bill be disposed of by the House itself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is an amendment by Shri N. R. Ghosh. I shall put it to the House.

The amendment was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st March, 1964.”

The motion was negatived.

15.24 hrs.

DISCLOSURE OF ASSETS OF MINISTERS BILL

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Bill to provide for the periodical disclosure of assets of Ministers be taken into consideration.”

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Would it be in order, Sir, if at this point of time I move for extension of time for the discussion of Shri Kamath's Bill? Could I suggest to the House that an extension by two hours would be very appropriate?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us see. We will proceed now.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: This would be taken up later?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as I rise to move for consideration of my Bill to provide for the periodical disclosure of assets of Ministers, I am oppressed by a feeling of pain and sorrow that the Congress Party which once commanded the admiration of the world, the willing allegiance of millions in our own country, which bears on its roll of honour such illustrious names as Lokmanya Tilak, Mahayogi Aurobindo, Lala Lajpat Rai, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das and Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, has now sunk so low in the estimation of millions of our people, that at Jaipur, recently, there was a public confession of guilt and corruption. From Jaipur to Jaipur, from Jaipur in 1948, when the Congress Party met in plenary session, to Jaipur in 1963 when its elective body, the All India Congress Committee, met, the party in power seems to have come full circle. In 1948, I believe, a member of the Congress Party went on fast, went on hunger-strike, to bring home to the party in power, to the rulers, to the leaders of the party, his proposition for laying down a code of conduct for Ministers. Fifteen years later, in the very same city of Jaipur, the Prime Minister talked openly—might be painfully, perhaps an agonising reappraisal—about corruption and the need to put an end to corruption if our country is to go forward on the road to progress, prosperity and ordered development.

The Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to my Bill says that it seeks to do nothing less. As I have said, the evil of corruption in the administration must be effectively and ruthlessly fought at all levels lest freedom, democracy and socialism should cease to have any meaning at

all for the people of this country. Then I have proceeded to show how rules and regulations have been laid down for public servants, for the government employees, for the Central services. I have got a copy of the Central Civil Service Conduct Rules 1955 which have, with regard to government employees, laid down the rules which *a fortiori* rather than *ipso facto*, should apply to the Ministers as well, because, as I have said in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, what is considered necessary in the case of government servants who have security of tenure, retirement with pension at the end of their service and who stand in danger of removal or dismissal from service for proved misconduct, should be considered even more so in the case of ministers for whom there are no such built-in checks or deterrents.

The genesis of this move which I am making today harks back to the days of the Constituent Assembly when that indefatigable fighter for purity in administration, Professor K. T. Shah, moved an amendment to the article which prescribed oaths for the ministers and for such other dignitaries. I also moved an amendment. There was a debate on Professor Shah's amendment as well as mine. At the end of the debate, Dr. Ambedkar, the pilot of the Constitution Bill said something which is interesting. I will read certain excerpts from what Dr. Ambedkar said. He said:

"This is a very laudable object, namely, that the ministers in charge should maintain purity of administration. I do not doubt anybody in this House can have any quarrel over this matter."

Can we say today also with confidence that nobody in this House will have any doubt over this matter? Then he said:

"We, all of us, in the Constituent Assembly are interested in seeing that the administration is maintained at a very high level

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

not only of efficiency but also of purity. The question really is what ought to be done, what ought to be the sanctions for maintaining that purity".

That is the word used. Then he went on:

"It seems to me there are two sanctions for ensuring purity in the administration. One is, namely, that we should require by law under the Constitution not only that the ministers should make a declaration of their assets and their liabilities at the time when they assume office, but we must also have two supplementary provisions."

That is what he insisted upon. He said that there must be two supplementary provisions besides this. Then:

"One is that every Minister on quitting office shall also make a declaration of his assets on the day on which he resigns....

I do not think any Minister has done it so far, neither when he entered office nor when he quitted office.

"...so that everybody who is interested in assessing whether the administration was corrupt or not during the tenure of his office should be able to see what increase there is in the assets of the Ministers and whether that increase can be accounted for by the savings which he could make out of his salary."

The other provision that he wanted was that there should be punitive action also—this is a long piece and I do not have the time to read the whole of it. He said that there must be some action taken in case the Minister cannot account for the increase in assets from the salary or emoluments that he receives during the term of his office.

Then, I put a question:

"May I Sir, presume that Dr. Ambedkar at least accepts the amendment in principle....

—that is, my amendment and Mr. K. T. Shah's amendment—

"...and that he has not resiled from the stand which he took the other day with regard to this matter?"

This is what Dr. Ambedkar said:

"I do not resile from my view at all. All I am saying is that the remedy provided is very inadequate.....

—he said that the remedy provided is very inadequate—

"...and not effective and therefore, I am not in a position to accept it."

Then, Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena said:

"Make it more comprehensive and effective".

To that, Dr. Ambedkar said that that was for the movers of the amendments to do and that they had not done it. That was how this matter could not be finalised in the Constituent Assembly. Dr. Ambedkar not merely said that the entire House agreed with the principle of this amendment, but he also further said that he wanted to make it more effective. But unfortunately it was not done. So, it did not find a place in the Constitution.

Since the Constitution was promulgated, adopted, during the last 14 years, we have seen that the Congress Party has been in power. Unfortunately for the country and unfortunately for its own sake, for its integrity and health, it has been too long in power. We have seen moral degradation, corruption and inefficiency, which are now being voiced by Congress leaders themselves. Time

was when during the struggle for freedom, princes and millionaires, rolling in wealth and luxury, cheerfully embraced voluntary poverty but today, by an irony of fate as the Congress President himself has said, since Congress came to power after the freedom struggle was over, paupers have become millionaires.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: No, no. He did not say that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is now reversed—paupers have become millionaires. There are Ministers who owned not even a cycle when they took office, but who today have a fleet of cars and use limousines. That is the state of the Party in power today, and the people are being exhorted to do this kind of thing and that kind of thing, this kind of sacrifice and that. But the Party with a socialistic pattern which it has adopted has tried to establish a new class, a new rich class which was not there before and there is a small society, the Congress Party, which now may be described, slightly modifying and adapting the fine phrase of R.S. Tawney, great British economist, very appropriately as the perquisitive society. Not merely do the Ministers enjoy perquisites with regard to houses and rents and such other things, but also.....

Shri Joachim Alva: You have said that they have a fleet of cars, but have you equally paid a tribute to the Prime Minister who has only a tiny car?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There are exceptions to every rule.

I would also invite your attention to the fact that not only these perquisites extend to what are included in the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Bill which will also come later on before the House in another connection—that other Bill of mine—but there are also perquisites which are not so very lawful, and those

perquisites, in chemical or scientific parlance, are the byproducts of office and secret byproducts at that. I am reminded of what the ex-Chief Minister of Orissa is reported to have said—I do not know whether the press reported him correctly—soon after the Das Commission's report regarding the former Minister of Mines and Fuel, was out. He is reported to have said: there is nothing serious about the matter; it is a part of ministerial processes. These reports said something to that effect. And may I say, perhaps to him, to many Congressmen in power, it has become a sort of *mamool*—such by products?

Shri K. C. Sharma: Why are you black-mailing your friends simply because they are in a different party?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I say this? Today it has become endemic in the body politic. If it were not so, would my friends act thus? A senior Minister, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda starts declaiming from the house-tops—at any rate from the house-tops in his own Sabarkanta constituency; I do not know why he should choose his own constituency for his campaign against corruption. I wonder whether it was during his election campaign he found out that it was most infested with this disease, with this evil. Anyway, he chose his own constituency to begin his campaign against corruption. I personally wish that this campaign should have begun at home, right in Delhi, because the fountain-head of corruption is here in the Capital, the fountain-head of corruption is here in the Government, the fountain-head of corruption is here in some Congress leaders who live and move and have their being in this Capital of India. Here he should have started the campaign and an oath should have been administered by Shri Nanda to his own colleagues in the Council of Ministers and then he should have gone out to the people. That would have been a more fair and just procedure.

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

Now, may I invite the attention of the House to what has been happening to the Congress party during last 13 years? They are today weighed down with a guilty conscience. There is no doubt about it. The Party in power has no moral courage to face facts squarely and with vigour. Always they are fearing what might happen to themselves, what might happen to their chairs and offices and positions of power—intoxication of power and also blindness brought on by power, blindness to the public weal and public welfare, too long an addiction to power, sticking like leeches to office.

Here is what happened in Sadashivnagar, Bangalore in your own State of Mysore—you know it very well, and you might have attended the meeting at Sadashivnagar. On the 16th of January, 1960—it is more than three years ago—the Prime Minister speaking there announced that all Congress Ministers—the language is very categorical; I am only trying to follow up, what he said, by my Bill—would be asked to voluntarily disclose to the Working Committee the assets they hold from time to time—it means periodically; it is the same thing—and explain any increase or decrease in the assets. I suppose.....

Dr. M. S. Aney: You are only paraphrasing what he has said.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes; I have only paraphrased it. It is neither more nor less.

The Prime Minister wanted the assets and liabilities to be disclosed to the Working Committee. I submit that this is not a party matter, because the Ministers in office are supposed to function for the whole people and for the whole nation. They are not mere party instruments, but they cater to the people; the very word 'Minister' means one who ministers to the welfare of the people or serves the

people, and, therefore, they have a public trust and a public responsibility, and, therefore, it is in the fitness of things that they should come before Parliament, the supreme legislature, the sovereign instrument of the will of the people here in this country, and lay on the Table of the House, or lay before the House according to such procedure as may be prescribed, the assets that they hold from time to time and explain any increase or decrease in their assets. Afterwards, I do not know what happened subsequently to the Prime Minister's exhortation; I do not know whether it remained just a pious exhortation or was implemented. It appears that even in the Congress Party, the Prime Minister's exhortation was not needed. Therefore, it is imperative today that we should have a law; when the Prime Minister, the tallest in the Congress Party cannot get his advice, his directive implemented by his party, what is the alternative open to us? Is it not the alternative that we should come before Parliament under the august chairmanship of you, Sir or the Speaker, and ask that this must become law so that they will be compelled by law to disclose their assets because they have so far refused to disclose them voluntarily? Perhaps, there are too many skeletons in the cupboard, too many skeletons to hide. That is why they would not disclose.

I learnt from the papers—I do not know if my memory serves me aright, that the Prime Minister was the only person who had disclosed the assets; he had asked his other colleagues also to disclose, but it seems he was the only person to disclose his assets, and no other Minister has done it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: No, no. My hon. friend is very wrong. That is not so.

It is not only the Ministers . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am open to correction, if I am wrong.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: . . . who were asked to disclose but even the Members of Parliament had been asked, and we have submitted our returns. I am at least one who sent his returns. So, why should my hon. friend over-exaggerate?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am sorry my hon. friend did not hear me fully. I wish he had some patience. I said that Ministers had not disclosed. . . .

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: They have gone much farther than that.

Shri Buta Singh: How many Ministers have sent their returns?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Every Minister was supposed to file his return. I am confining, myself at the moment only to Ministers, because the Prime Minister's exhortation was to the Ministers only.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: They have gone much farther than that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Are you calling me to order or my hon. friend to order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am calling those hon. Members who are disturbing Shri Kamath to order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Thank you very much. I appreciate it very much.

The Prime Minister exhorted the Ministers to declare their assets. I am glad that many Members of Parliament were also asked to disclose their assets, and I am glad that Shri Harish Chandra Mathur has done it; I do not know how many more have done it along with him. I am glad if he has done it. But, in this Bill, I am talking only of Ministers. My Bill refers only to the Ministers, applies only to Ministers. I however hope that it will in course of time extend to all politicians in or out of office, in all parties. I hope that will be done. But let us make a beginning, a serious beginning, and

let us see how this beginning has to be made and what the background of the matter is. Four years ago, the Prime Minister had asked the Ministers to disclose their assets. I do not know how many have done it. I would like to know if my hon. friend the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Hajarnavis, has got the statistics.

Shri Hajarnavis: I shall give them to my hon. friend.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: My hon. friend may please make a note of it lest he should forget. Let him tell us whether all the Ministers have disclosed their assets.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: He will give all the assets and liabilities.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let him tell us how many Ministers have implemented the Prime Minister's directive which was given at Sadashivnagar in January, 1960.

Shri Buta Singh: Include Chief Ministers also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The term 'Ministers' includes the Prime Minister and Chief Ministers also.

Shri Warrior: State Ministers also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I point out that the Prime Minister's exhortation was in 1960? Today, we are at the close of the year of grace 1963. I am glad to find that the new Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Shri Shamsuddin, on the 9th of November last, that is, about a month ago, had made a statement in Srinagar that the Jammu and Kashmir Government had asked the Central Government to go into this matter of the assets of Ministers. I only wish that this were done with retrospective effect, not merely for those in the Jammu and Kashmir Government but for all, in other States also, for all Ministers. All the Ministers should come forward straightforwardly and sincerely with a declaration of their

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

assets and liabilities during their term of office. I would also like to ask the Minister of State whether the request of the Jammu and Kashmir Government has been seriously considered, and if so, with what result.

Here, I would like to say one or two words only, because I do not wish to go into details. Some two years ago, I remember that there was in some Bengal papers a reference to a Minister who had acquired or purchased land in a very fashionable locality, like Mayfair, you can say, of one of the important cities of India, from certain *benamidars* who were Government contractors, and purchased that land at a price which was extraordinarily low compared to the market prices of land prevailing in that very fashionable locality of that particular city. That was what was mentioned in the papers at that time. I do not know what has happened to the party in power. It has been too long in power. They have had the misfortune of having been too long in power, which is unfortunate not only for themselves, as I said earlier, but for the country also, and also for their integrity. They have been far too long in power, and they have developed a callous disregard for public opinion and press opinion and also, may I say, parliamentary opinion. That is most unfortunate. It augurs ill for the healthy growth of parliamentary democracy in our country.

Nothing was done in this matter. I do not know whether Government cared to inquire into this matter when the press came out with those charges. In the case of the Serajuddin affair also, you know, Sir, how it took three months from the beginning of the year or the beginning of the budget session up to the end of the budget session this year, it took three months of fighting every inch to make the Prime Minister agree to a judicial enquiry or a quasi-judicial enquiry or a private judicial enquiry into that matter. Is that the way things should be done

by Government in the interests of the purity of administration and the rooting out of corruption which the Prime Minister himself in Jaipur, not so long ago, just two months ago, laid emphasis on, when he categorically said—I am glad he is here in the House now, and I hope that he will take whatever I say in the spirit in which it is offered; I am doing this with the sole objective which Dr. Ambedkar mentioned in the Constituent Assembly, namely to maintain the highest level not merely of efficiency but also of purity in the administration—that corruption must be rooted out?

There are lots of things appearing in the press, and there are serious charges which have been made against the former Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, in the front pages of newspapers and weeklies here. These things just accumulate and no action is taken and no inquiry is made into these matters, how a man who at the time of assuming office had perhaps, I do not know how much, but only a few hundreds or a few thousands of rupees with him, and perhaps a very small hut or a small cottage or a small house, but who after ten years of office or five years or eight years of office, has come to collect lakhs, or how in Mr. Sanjeevaiah's words, paupers have become millionaires, and how they have got palatial houses, and how they acquired land not merely in their own State, not merely in their own town, but outside their State. How do these things happen? Why should they happen? Why is the Prime Minister so heedless of these things?

Shri Buta Singh: He protects them.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why is it that he has no heart for rooting out corruption in our country? May I say in all humility and with all respect to him, as I said in the beginning, that in the roll of honour which the Congress Party had, his great father's name is also inscribed? The son too led this country in the company of Mahatma Gandhi and Netaji Subhas Chandra

Bose, and thousands listened to him, and thousands were impressed by him, and thousands sacrificed their all. To-day, what purpose have all those who sacrificed their all, who have become martyrs served what purpose have they served if a few enrich themselves at the cost of so many, if those few exercise the gift of the grab? The gift of the grab is certainly a spectre that is stalking the land to-day.

The Prime Minister has perhaps the gift of the gab, the God-given gift of the gab. But many of his colleagues, I am sorry to say, have the gift of the grab, and they have enriched themselves at the expense of the many.

I refer not merely to Bengal. With regard to Punjab, there is an inquiry pending. I do not want to go into it because it is more or less *sub judice*. There also the same thing is seen. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister has given the impression, the same impression which he gave in the case of the Jeep scandal 14 years ago, of trying to shield the guilty and the corrupt. The same impression is conveyed to the people here, it is reflected in the press and also in Parliament. I am sure he does not wish to convey it, but unfortunately, he has created that impression that he is shielding the guilty, those Ministers who have amassed wealth at the expense of the many, in the midst of the grinding poverty of the mass of our people. He himself said in Jaipur that the rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer. I will go further and say that the Ministers have become a new rich class, the like of which India has never seen.

I do not accuse all the Ministers. There are some good Ministers. The Prime Minister exhorted them to be good at Sadashivnagar, Bangalore. But they did not follow his advice. Is the Prime Minister so powerless that he is unable to get his own directive implemented? I do not think so. I shudder to think what will happen if this goes on merrily. He tells them in all seriousness, the press frontpages

it—it is made the lead item—that all Ministers should declare their assets to the Working Committee. I will go further and say that they should declare it to Parliament. But what happened? The Prime Minister was the only exception, shining in solitary splendour.

Shri Nath Pai: And Shri Mathur.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: And Shri Mathur and some others among Members of Parliament. The Ministers in the whole of India are so large in number, so numerous that they can form a trade union of their own. All these cohorts, these serried ranks of Ministers, striding up and down the country, flying up and down the country. I hope the Prime Minister will tell us—I request him to tell us—what has happened to that directive.

There were also very serious charges against a Chief Minister, unfortunately now no more, in Madhya Pradesh, which we tried to bring up here in the First Lok Sabha. Then the Prime Minister adopted an Ostrich-like attitude. Unfortunately, he refused to accept the suggestion made by us to constitute a committee to inquire into the assets of the late Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla. That was also not done.

Later on there have been cases in court, defamation cases and things of that kind. They have been decided one way or the other. One matter is pending in the Supreme Court. I do not want to refer to it. The High Court of Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, has referred to it very categorically, very clearly and advised Government that in all such cases of serious allegations made against Chief Ministers on other Ministers, those in power, those in office, there must be a close, thorough, independent judicial inquiry into the assets of Ministers and how they came by them.

Before I close, I would only like to say what has been said more beauti-

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

fully, more sublimely, by our scriptures, by the Gita:

यद्यदाचरति श्रेष्ठः तत्तदेवेतरो ज्ञः ।
स यत्प्रमाणं कुरुते लोकस्तदनुवर्तते ॥

Whatever example, the Prime Minister and his colleagues—we are living in a political world, for good or ill, politics dominates, political leaders are now the leaders of the people, not spiritual leaders, nor religious leaders—whatever example they set, the people will look up to that example and follow it. There is an even more cryptic saying:

महाजनो ये न गतः स पन्था ।

'Mahajan' means not moneylender; here it means 'great'. Whatever example is set by the great, that is the path of the ordinary common man. I will, therefore, commend my motion for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the periodical disclosure of assets of Ministers, be taken into consideration".

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I support the motion moved by my hon. friend, Shri Kamath, and I have a hope—I am afraid I have many unfulfilled hopes in this House....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Just a second. Will ten minutes to each Member do?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I move that the time be extended by two hours.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): It may be extended; we want to put the whole thing in correct perspective.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shall we extend it by two hours?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is opposition?

Shri Nath Pal: It is unanimous. We did not hear a single dissentient voice.

Shri K. C. Sharma: I am opposed to it.

Shri Raghunath Singh: How long are we going to sit?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will have one hour more for this.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Are we to sit till 6 P.M.?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This will be carried over to the next session. We will carry on upto 5. At 5 P.M., we have a half-hour discussion.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Let it be finished today. It is no good carrying it over to the next session.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is nothing wrong in that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will extend it by one hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Two hours.

May I submit that for the Sanskrit Bill we gave 3½ hours in all? I do not say that was unnecessary. But this is equally important. Moreover it has been upgraded from "B" to "A" category.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: I must pay a compliment to Shri Kamath for trying his utmost to prevent me from getting the extension of time for my Bill.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Let the Chief Whip say what he wants. As a matter of fact, we are anxious that Members on this side also should get a proper opportunity. We are all for fighting corruption. Nobody is more anxious than we to see that the reputation of our Ministers is above suspicion. We definitely say that we must get an opportunity to put the whole thing in a correct perspective.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right, two hours.

Shri Hajarnavis: Whatever time the House desires to have, we are agreeable to it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am glad the House has agreed to an extension of time for the discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the time-limit should be 10 minutes for each Member so that as many Members as possible may be accommodated.

Shri P. K. Deo: Those who represent various groups should be given proper opportunity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No groups in this.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: As I was saying, this is a very plausible Bill which Government should persuade itself to accept. I am glad, as Shri Kamath said he was glad, that the Prime Minister is here, for otherwise before he arrived, we got an impression that on Government side, there was not a tendency to consider this Bill to be of the importance that it deserves.

16.00 hrs.

We often hear in this House about corruption, and being a people rather prone to quotation, we hear a little too often a quotation from Acton about power being a corrupting factor. While power surely corrupts, power can also ennoble and let us hope at any rate and let us order our conduct accordingly that power in this country would not corrupt our Ministers and others who are in enjoyment of that power but that it would ennoble them; that it would enable them to become better servants of the community. The fact of the matter, however, is that as Mr. Kamath has put it, we have got today what is something like a perquisitive society and this play upon the word acquisitive reminded me of what I read somewhere a little while ago about there being in today's world a kind of class

distinction about which Karl Marx was completely unaware and that was a distinction between those who have expense accounts and those who have not. Ministers and others in their category and similar categories to happen to belong to a segment of society which if it is described perquisitive should not be taken too uncharitably by them. In this House it is not our desire to blackguard anybody in Parliament. We come and we meet each other and I suppose that we can claim that the best of personal relations subsist between Government and the Opposition. There is no intention on the part of the Opposition to attack Government for attack's own sake. But when things go wrong, and they go wrong in the wrongest fashion from time to time, something surely has got to be done about it. What is the point behind the Kamaraj plan, for instance, talked about so much? The idea surely is to tell our country, because our country accepts the idea of renunciation, that power can be renounced by people who have enjoyed power, that service is to be preferred before self. Surely, it is the essence, if there is any essence, behind the political party's manouevres; surely that is the best interpretation we can put upon the basic motivation of the Kamaraj plan. If that is so, why should not the Ministers set an example! As Mr. Kamath said: *Mahajanah Ena gathah sa panthah*:

16:03 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Whichever way Ministers go, there are millions, myriads of people who would follow and the administration would be so much rid of the unsavoury character which today it seems to have got. Why should not the Ministers set an example in regard to this? Everybody knows that justice should not only be done; but it should also appear that it is being done. Mr. Kamath wants that Ministers should voluntarily do this, or under the pressure of the law. He has suggested the pressure of the law:

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

because voluntary methods have proved to be futile. The Prime Minister's desire expressed openly in 1960 remained unfulfilled.

Shri Hajarnavis: Every Member of the Congress Party has sent his return in terms of that.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We are not concerned with what Members of the Congress Party do in regard to the executive of their own organisation. We are concerned here with the public image that the Minister of this country has got. We do not want the public image of the Ministers of this country, whichever party they may belong to, to be sullied in the way that it is being sullied in the present-day world. It is for your sake that we are trying to do so. You seem to resent it and I do not know why.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He means they, through you.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: How does Mr. Mukerjee say that this Government resents it? When I put the question to the Home Minister about those in political authority, he immediately agreed. How can he say that this Government resents it?

Shri Nath Pai: We look at the face of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.... (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: You will also have to disclose your assets.

Shri Nath Pai: Agreed straightaway; apply it to all.

Mr. Speaker: No one should discuss among themselves.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, there must be certain parliamentary norms also when we are discussing a measure which is sought to be put on the statute book; we are to find out the pros and cons of the matter. Members of the Congress Party individually and Ministers individually might

be unimpeachable; I do not question them. They might have rendered accounts in some quarter or the other. I do not even question that. What is concerned here is the public image of Ministers and other people in similar positions which has been sullied in this country. Something has got to be done about it. One remedy suggested by Mr. Kamath is that Ministers in the Centre and in the States should be compelled by legislation, since they do not do so by means of persuasion, to furnish their accounts, their assets and their liabilities. I am not going into things in detail, besides there is hardly any time. But there are cases galore of Minister's misbehaving.

I am sorry to have to say so. These cases in many instances go unpunished. Mr. Kamath referred to a particular instance of a Union Minister who acquired during his pendency of office as Minister considerable landed properties in a very fashionable area of a very important city through a *benamidar* who was a Government contractor who was waiting upon Government favours in order to make more money. He paid a sum of money which was extraordinarily low for that transaction. This is a matter which I tried to bring to the notice of the highest quarters but nothing very much happened. This is a matter which does not relate only to the technicality of it. I am sure the Minister might get up and say: I got it with my own money; what the devil have you got to say about it? But that is not the point. During the pendency of his office as Minister, a Minister should behave in the way that the country expects of him. He should not enter into transactions with dubious people. Soon after I came to Parliament in 1952, I had to bring to the notice of this House the fact that a certain Minister went to Calcutta and stayed with a very big industrial magnate. That was his address. I took it up before the House and the Prime Minister said that it was not right. But after that time, I can

make out that the practice is, whatever be his business in Calcutta or Bombay, his address is: care of the Ministry, whatever it is. They do not say where he stays, but they do stay with those people. At a time when the affairs of Mr. S. P. Jain—I am sorry I am referring to a name but that name is so notorious that it does not matter one way or the other—were in everybody's mind because of the unsavoury things that were coming in the open, there was the Prime Minister's 70th birthday, a very happy occasion, on which we wrote our appreciation of a very great man. He got a book published. He got many of us also to write and presented it to the Prime Minister. The Films Division of the Government of India took a photograph and showed it all over the country. A person who is behaving in that fashion has access to even the highest personalities in this country.

In Kerala, for instance, the Chief Minister behaves very shabbily.

Mr. Speaker: He should not go into particular cases. He is not here to answer.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In Kerala, Sir, what happened was that the charges were made publicly and the President of the Kerala Congress Committee wanted that the charges should be investigated and ultimately the matter went to the Prime Minister who made his own private investigations and he said that there was no *prima facie* case about it. He is the person—the Prime Minister—who is peerless as far as this country is concerned. We know he is that kind of person. We do not want to put him to trouble. But why is it that these matters have to be referred to him and to him alone? Because, in him, people have confidence? Why is it that he, generally speaking, tries to shield these people and gives this kind of award, and when there is another kind of thing, when there is reference to the Supreme Court and that sort of thing, he has to take

recourse to special pleading in order to justify his own position? Why should we be driven to a position where these things have to be referred to the Prime Minister? Why should I have to write about it to the Prime Minister? Why, when the Central Government acquires property by what apparently seems to be dubious methods, I have to write to the Prime Minister? I do not want to trouble the Prime Minister with this kind of thing, but there must be some machinery through which something should be done in regard to this matter.

We have to have some such organisation as Ombudsman. Tomorrow, we are having another discussion on corruption, but we should have at least an initial start made in terms of the Bill of Shri Kamath, namely, that the Ministers should say what their assets are at the time when they join office and later on also. This is why I feel that it is only fair, it is only fair to the Ministers, fair to the House and fair to everybody that this Bill is adopted.

There is no aspersion on anybody. If there are charges, it is no good merely saying that our country is addicted to gossip: there are charges and counter-charges which really mean nothing at all. When there are charges, let them be investigated. If some charges are brought irresponsibly, let those who have brought those allegations be brought to book. But there is no way out. The only thing that one can do is to shout vainly and hopelessly in Parliament if one can proceed in compliance with the rules, sometimes we do have to seek recourse to those methods which cannot entirely be justified because otherwise we cannot bring up these things. But this is the only forum, this Parliament, where we can raise our voice for good or bad, and the only individual person who can do something is the Prime Minister. But again, like the good man that he is, he has a weakness for his proteges. "Love me,

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

love my dog" seems to be the principle; how can it be? We certainly have love for him but not for those who merely follow his instructions. That is why it is only right and proper that the Ministers should themselves agree that they shall put everything before the proper authority in regard to their assets and their liabilities. That would be a great gesture; that would be a fine example to the world; that would be something which would do more towards the elimination of corruption in this country than merely tinkering with things here and there. That is the gesture, therefore, which we expect from the Ministers, and though from the attitude of my hon. friend the Minister of State I perhaps should not harbour any such hope, I do have a lingering feeling that maybe good sense will dawn on the Government, and that a simple measure which would help to prove the integrity of our Ministers and to improve the tone of our public life altogether will be accepted by Government and the country at large.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill. My simple argument is this: you ask a professor whose qualification for appointment is that he is a Master of Arts; you ask him again, "well, on first Saturday of every month, you show the degree to the Vice-Chancellor". Is it not a most stupid proposition in the world? What is the qualification of a Minister? I quote from Jennings; he says:

"The most elementary qualification demanded of a Minister is honesty and incorruptibility."

Then he elaborates that the Minister is not expected to enter into contracts which, to the public prejudice, may benefit him. Then again he says: there are certain rules of prudence, and one of those rules says that the Ministers should carefully avoid all transactions which can give colour countenance to the people that they are doing anything which the rules forbid. If a man goes against what

is essential for his holding the office, the remedy is open to the House and that is to bring in a motion of no-confidence against the Government, and the Government would be removed. The Prime Minister who chooses his colleagues chooses them because he thinks that the men who join his Cabinet are men of integrity and are incorruptible. The colleague he chooses must be loyal to his chief and the loyalty in a situation which we are thinking of includes integrity which is an essential part of loyalty to the land.

Therefore, my simple contention is that it is not a salutary provision, because if you begin to abuse any decent man in the street, in course of time, that man will shed off his decency. Once you begin to doubt the honesty of a man whose very essential claim to office is that he is honest and incorruptible....

An Hon. Member: Nobody is doubting.

Shri K. C. Sharma: If you do not doubt, you do not bring this sort of legislation. What is the fun of it? There is a difference between a Minister and the man in service. The man in the administration is not subject to public opinion in the sense in which a Minister is open to the House and get himself removed if the House has no confidence in him. For a Minister certain rules are laid down. To secure the honest and loyal services of a public servant, certain rules are made. The public servant is not open to public criticism as a Minister. So, my contention is that it offends the accepted precedents. (*Interruption*). It offends the very status of a Minister in a democratic Government. In all democratic Governments all over the world, the Minister is addressed as the "honourable Minister". Where does the honour of a Minister lie? If you suspect his honesty or his integrity, where does it lie? That amounts to something: that he is suspected just

as a criminal is suspected under section 110 of the Criminal Procedure Code. It is not a question of this Minister or that Minister. It is a question of the prestige that the Minister commands, because he commands certain things as a member of the Cabinet, or as head of the Government. If you insult him like this, you insult not A or B; if you insult Mr. Nehru's Cabinet, you insult the head of the Indian Government, and therefore you insult your own people.

I would like to say this. You say: If a man is corrupt, you go to the Prime Minister, and say, "Here are the papers, and you dismiss him. If you do not dismiss him, we will bring a no-confidence motion".

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member might address the Chair.

Shri K. C. Sharma: I submit that this is an impossible position. Constitutionally, it is unacceptable in the decency of public life. It is not salutary to the good administration that we look to for our Government.

Many things are asked: why corruption is there. Corruption has never been and can never be the act or the default of one individual or set of individuals. Corruption is a social phenomenon which depends upon a certain stage of social institutions and the cultural development of a people. If you hang all the Ministers, corruption will not be eliminated. You hang every Member of Parliament; corruption will not be eliminated. Why? Why are the people corrupt?

Mr. Speaker: He is addressing me!

Shri K. C. Sharma: Corruption was prevalent in Spain and the Spanish Duke once said, "If I dismiss even every member of my Cabinet because he is corrupt, I will not find another man to be honest to be appointed my minister". So, unless there is education, employment, industrial advancement, and production, unless everybody gets his due in life, unless everybody is secured with a full life, corruption cannot be elimi-

nated. Nothing truer and nobler has ever been said in the world than in the Vedas: "The crow Bushavada told, the Eagle bearer of Vishnu, the Keenest pain is of poverty". When a man is hungry, nothing is nobler and greater to him than his life. When you do not create the means of livelihood, when you do not create the means of employment....

Mr. Speaker: He should remember he is addressing the Chair. (Laughter)

Shri K. C. Sharma: You may laugh because you are fools....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That is not the proper way of addressing hon. Members. I presume and I am certain that everybody here is an intellectual. All the difficulties would disappear if he addresses me; I am a very patient listener and he would not find any difficulty. The Members on this side also should have to listen patiently.

Shri K. C. Sharma: I beg to submit that all this loud cry of corruption, nepotism, etc. is not attributable to the Ministers or the administration or a set of people. It is a social phenomenon, which is bound to last so long as the cultural, social and economic conditions of the country do not change.

So, I submit that in the name of democracy, for the prestige of the administration, for the good working of the democratic set-up, it is necessary that the Minister should be honoured; his prestige should not be lowered down and the suspicion or doubt which would be all right in the case of criminals under section 110, Cr.P.C., should not be attributed to him. With these words, I oppose the Bill.

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री कामत, ने जो बिल पेश किया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ, यद्यपि मेरे विचार से यह बिल भी नाकाफी है। आज देश में जो परिस्थिति है, उस को

[श्री काशी राम गुप्त]

दृष्टि में रखते हुए इस बिल में कुछ ऐसी धारार्यें जोड़ी जानी चाहिएँ थी, जो कारगर होतीं ।

अभी अभी मेरे मित्र, श्री के० सी० शर्मा, इस बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट कर रहे थे । शायद वह भूल गये कि जो पार्टी इस समय सत्तारूढ़ है, उसने स्वयं अपने एम० पी० और एम० एल० एज० से उनके एसेट्स आदि बारे में हिसाब मांगने की योजना बनाई है, और कहा जाता है कि उस के मुताबिक वे हिसाब भी देते हैं । यह बात स्वयं इस बात का प्रमाण है कि समय और परिस्थिति के अनुसार काम हुआ करते हैं । कागज पर लिख देना कि मिनिस्टर जिम्मेदार होता है, इससे ही अगर कुछ हो जाता हो, तो जो घोटाले रोजाना हो रहे हैं, वे न होते । इसलिए यह जरूरी है कि इस प्रकार का बिल लाया जाये और उसको क्रियाशील बनाया जाये । मैं नहीं समझता कि सरकार इस का विरोध करेगी या इस बारे में कोई आपत्ति करेगी ।

मेरे मित्र, श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माथुर, ने कहा कि वह भी हिसाब देने वालों में हैं और सब लोग हिसाब देते हैं । लेकिन जाबते में किस तरह के हिसाब दिये जाते हैं और उनके बारे में क्या अमल होता है, अगर वह इस विषय पर ठंडे दिल से विचार करेंगे, तो वह स्वयं सही निर्णय पर पहुंच सकेंगे । वास्तविकता यह है कि ऐसे ऐसे उदाहरण मौजूद हैं कि जिन लोगों के पास आजादी से पहले खाने को नहीं था, जिन के पास कोई काम नहीं था, आजादी के बाद वे कुछ वक़्त के लिए अंदी रहे और आज उन के पास बहुत सी जायदाद है, बहुत सा रुपया है, बहुत सा रोजगार है । वह सब कहाँ से आ गया ? यह जानने में कोई मुश्किल नहीं हो सकती है, अगर नीयत साफ़ हो । लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि जाने कौन ।

जब कूप में ही भांग पड़ जाये, तो फिर कौन आदमी होगा, जो इस बात की जानकारी करेगा ? आज स्थिति यह है कि सब एक दूसरे को छिपाते हैं ।

एक बार की बात है कि माननीय श्री डेबर ने, जब वह कांग्रेस के प्रेजिडेंट थे, यह एलान किया कि वह दलबन्दी को समाप्त करेंगे । जब वह ऐसा न कर सके, तो मैं ने उन से प्रश्न किया कि इस का क्या कारण है । उत्तर में उन्होंने कहा, "मैं क्या करूँ ? सब का दबाव है ऊपर ।"

श्री शिव नारायण (वांसी) : दलबन्दी का इस बिल से क्या ताल्लुक है ?

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : दलबन्दी भी करप्शन का जरिया है । जब ये लोग दलबन्दी भी समाप्त न कर सके, तो जिस को करप्शन और भ्रष्टाचार कहते हैं, उस को केवल साधारण बातों से समाप्त नहीं किया जा सकता है । इस बिल में केवल इतनी बात रखी गई है कि मंत्री महोदय सालाना अपना हिसाब पेश करें । मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जब हम दूसरे आदमियों का हिसाब मांगते हैं, बहुत सी कम्पनियों का हिसाब मांगते हैं, उन पर पाबंदियां लगाते हैं, तो यह कहना कि हम मिनिस्ट्रों पर पाबंदी इसलिए न लगायें कि वे मिनिस्टर बन गये हैं, इस बात का घोटक है कि हमारे मित्र वास्तविकता को नहीं समझते ।

इस सम्बन्ध में वह जो दलील दी जाती है कि मिनिस्टर जिम्मेदार हैं, कबिनेट में हैं, इसलिए जब तक उन के खिलाफ़ कोई अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव न लाया जाये, तब तक वह कानून बनाने का औचित्य नहीं है, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह दलील निराधार है, क्योंकि जो मिनिस्टर ईमानदार है, यह कानून बनाने से उसको बल मिलता है, उस को सहूलियत मिलती है और जो मिनिस्टर बेईमान होगा, उसके रास्ते

में रूकावट पड़ती है। कानून बनाये भी इसीलिए जाते हैं। आज हमारे देश की परिस्थिति इस प्रकार की बन चुकी है कि हर एक आदमी भ्रष्टाचार की बात कहता है और भ्रष्टाचार आम चर्चा का विषय हो गया है। मैं जानकारी के आधार पर कह सकता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के लोग भी छिपे छिपे कहते हैं कि अमुक आदमी ने बर्झमानी कर ली है, अमुक ने नहीं की है, आदि, आम जनता और विरोधी दलों का तो प्रश्न ही क्या है। जब विरोधी दलों के अतिरिक्त स्वयं सत्तारूढ़ दल के लोग ही एक दूसरे को बर्झमान कह सकते हैं, तो इस दिशा में कोई कानून न बनाना और अपने आप को घंघट में छिपाये रखना उचित नहीं है। पाप को छिपाना कभी भी अच्छा नहीं होता है।

जो परिस्थिति आज देश में है, उस को दृष्टि में रखते हुए यदि यह कानून बनता है, तो इससे देश को लाभ होगा, प्रजातंत्र को लाभ होगा, जो पार्टी पावर में होगी, सत्तारूढ़ होगी, उस को लाभ होगा और विरोधी दलों को भी लाभ होगा, क्योंकि एक रास्ता निकलेगा, एक तरीका निकलेगा, जिस के आधार पर हम नुक्ता-चीनी कर सकेंगे। अगर किसी मिनिस्टर ने हिसाब दिया है और हम को जानकारी होती है कि उस ने सही हिसाब नहीं दिया है, तो हम उससे जवाब-तलब कर सकते हैं। आज भी मिनिस्ट्रों से जवाब तलब किये जाते हैं। आज जो विधि-विधान मौजूद हैं, उनके अनुसार हम उनकी जवाब-तलबी करते हैं और उनको जवाब देना पड़ता है। अगर कानून के जरिये ऐसा विधि-विधान आ जायेगा, जिस के अनुसार हम मिनिस्ट्रों का हिसाब देख सकें, तो हमारे लिए यह शर्म की बात नहीं होगी, न ही यह देश के लिए कोई क्लंक् की बात होगी।

इंग्लैंड में एक घटत घटी, जिस में और प्रकार का भ्रष्टाचार हुआ। उस के आधार पर एक मिनिस्टर ने इस्तीफा दिया। हमारे यहां तो हर रोज़ भ्रष्टाचार के इल्जाम

लगते रहते हैं, लेकिन कोई इस्तीफा देने का नाम नहीं लेता। हमारे यहां की स्थिति ऐसी हो गई है कि लोग इतने निडर हो गये हैं कि भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप लगते हुए भी अपने पद पर जमे रहने की कोशिश करते हैं। इस अवस्था में क्यों न एक कानून बना कर उन को काबू में किया जाये? यह बड़ा सीधा-सादा मामला है। आवश्यकता तो इस बात की थी कि इस कानून में इस से भी ज्यादा कारगर धारायें रखी जातीं, लेकिन जो भी किया गया है, वह बहुत ठीक है और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हमारे गृह मंत्री महोदय इस बारे में बहुत अच्छे ढंग से सोच कर कदम उठायेंगे।

मैं जानकारी के आधार पर यह कह सकता हूँ कि यदि पिछले मिनिस्ट्रों के चिट्ठों की किसी निष्पक्ष ट्रिब्यूनल के द्वारा जांच की जाये, तो देश में कुछ दूसरा ही नज़ारा नज़र आयेगा। सत्तारूढ़ पार्टी को इस बात से डरना नहीं चाहिए। उस को चाहिए कि वह अपने आप को ठीक करने के लिए इस प्रकार की निष्पक्ष जांच कराये। जांच के आधार पर जो भी लोग उनके सामने आयें, चाहे जितने भी बड़े वे लोग हों, जितने भी उच्च स्थानों पर वे आसीन हों, अगर साबित हो जाता है तो उनको हटाया जाये। आज होता यह है, अखबारों में भी हम यह पढ़ते हैं कि पार्टी में ही सब कुछ करने की कोशिश की जाती है, सरकार में उस चीज को लाने की कोशिश नहीं की जाती है। पार्टी में भी एकतरफा ढंग से काम होता है, एक दूसरे को दबाया जाता है। यह निश्चित है कि यह चीज ज्यादा दिनों तक चलने वाली नहीं है। यदि इन बातों को रोकने की कोशिश की गई और ठीक प्रकार से की गई, सही प्रकार से की गई, जिस प्रकार से करने को कहा जाता है, उस प्रकार से की गई तो जनता में एक दूसरी ही भावना पैदा होगी, दूसरा ही भाव जन्म लेगा और दूसरी ही क्रान्ति आयेगी। अगर क्रान्ति आपको लानी है तो जरूरी है कि अभी से समझ

[श्री काशी राम मुत्त]

लिया जाये कि क्या करना है और सरकार को इस प्रकार के बिल को मान लेना चाहिये। यहो मेरा निवेदन है।

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे कामत साहब यह छोटा सा रेजोल्यूशन लाये हैं। मेरे मित्र जो अभी बोल रहे थे, उनके भाषण को मैंने बड़े ध्यान से सुना है। मैं बोलना नहीं चाहता था लेकिन मजबूरन मुझे बोलना पड़ रहा है। मैं एश्योरेंस देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी पार्टी में दम था कि हर एक मेम्बर से चाहे वह असेम्बली का मेम्बर है या पार्लियामेंट का या फिर मिनिस्टर है, एकाउंट मांगा है और हिसाब लिया है। यह हमारी ईमानदारी का सब से बड़ा सबूत है।

मिनिस्टर की चौकिंग कब होती है? वह तब होती है जब वह इनकम टैक्स का सब हिसाब देता है। मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट भी देता है। नमाम देते हैं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर भी देते हैं। हर अदमी का एकाउंट चैक होता है। इस काम के लिए अक्सर मुकदमों हैं, सारी मशीनरी बर्क कर रही है। एक दम से कह देना कि सब बेईमान हैं, इसको किमी भी तरह से माना नहीं जा सकता है। मैं इसको मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। संसार में कहीं भी इसको माना नहीं जा सकता है। हमारे देश की पॉलिटिकल पार्टीज का यह एक कायदा सा बन गया है कि खड़े हो कर कांग्रेस वालों को कह दो कि सब बेईमान हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय आप इस सदन में सब से ऊंचे हैं, हम सब आपका कहना मानते हैं। लेकिन ये होश नहीं रखते हैं और इनको पता नहीं होता है कि ये क्या कह रहे हैं और क्या कर रहे हैं। इतना भी लिहाज इनको नहीं रहता है कि हम जो कुछ . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : शायद उन्होंने मुझे नहीं कहा, आपने कह दिया।

श्री शिव नारायण : आपका नेतृत्व यहाँ चलता है। आप इस कुर्सी पर बिराजमान हैं। लेकिन आप देखें कि ये आउट ऑफ कंट्रोल हो कर बात कर जाते हैं। क्या कहना चाहते हैं, क्या नहीं इनको पता नहीं होता है। चौकिंग हो, हमारी गवर्नमेंट तैयार है। हम पीछे नहीं हैं। हम ने मुल्क में दिखा दिया है अभी हाल में कि छः मंत्र के मिनिस्टर और छः चीफ मिनिस्टर स्टेट्स से गढ़ियां छोड़ सकते हैं, त्याग की भावना से काम कर सकते हैं . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : रिश्तत के बारे में क्या कहना है ?

श्री शिव नारायण : आप सुनना नहीं चाहते हैं, यह नमूना है। आगुमेंट को सुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। टालरेंस का यह नमूना ये पेश कर रहे हैं। यह उनका हाल है जो भारत के संरक्षक और मालिक बनने वाले हैं। तब क्या होगा, ईश्वर ही मालिक है . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : कमी बनने वाले नहीं हैं।

श्री शिव नारायण : मैं नमूना बता रहा हूँ। ऐसी नीयत कमी नहीं आयेगी। नमाम कानून बने हुए हैं। डी० आई० आर० लागू है। कल हमने एक बिल पास किया है। उसके मुताबिक अगर कोई बेईमानी करता है तो सरकारी मशीनरी को अधिकार है कि वह उसको पकड़े। फिर चाहे वह मिनिस्टर हो, या एम० पी० हो या कोई अफसर हो। जो भी हो उसको पकड़ा जा सकता है। "बुरा जो देखने में चला तो बुरा न दीखा कोय"। दूसरों के मामले बड़ी जल्दी ये देख लेते हैं। अपनी बुराइयों का इनको पता ही नहीं है। उनको ये देखते ही नहीं हैं। उनको भी इन्हें देखना चाहिये।

यह कहा गया है कि कल तक हमारा कोई खाना ठिकाना नहीं था। मैं कहना

चाहता हूँ कि जैसे इधर हैं वैसे उधर भी है। कोई फर्क नहीं है। सुबह का वाका बतलाना चाहता हूँ। एक साहब ने एक बहुत बढ़िया कार खरीदी। जब पूछा गया किस की है तो जवाब मिला की फलां की है। मैं नाम नहीं लेता हूँ। एम्बेसेडर गाड़ी थी। आप भी बरी नहीं हैं, अगर हम नहीं हैं तो। अगर आप कहते हैं कि हम फलां से लेते हैं तो आप भी तो किसी से लेते हैं। किसी की एजेंटी आप भी तो करते हैं। मैं आपोजीशन वालों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनको डिगनिटी की बात करनी चाहिये। मुझे प्रो० ईश्वरी प्रसाद हिस्ट्री पढ़ाते थे। उन्होंने मुझे कहा कि तुम्हें इससे बड़ी डिगनिटी कहीं नहीं मिल सकती है। तुम पब्लिक के रिप्रिजेंटिव हो, पब्लिक ने तुम्हें इलैक्ट करके भेजा है पार्लियामेंट में। एक मेम्बर की डिगनिटी बहुत ऊंची होती है। हमें चाहिये कि हम डिगनिटी को मेंटेन करें, ऐसी बात करें जिसकी मान्यता हो, संसार में हमारा नाम रहे। छोटी बात हमें नहीं करनी चाहिये। अगर हम भी वैसी ही बात करते हैं जैसी स्ट्रीट में इक्का वाला और रिकशा वाला करता है तो क्या डिफेंस हम में और उन में रह जायेगा।

मैं नहीं कहता कि आप क्रिटिसिज्म न करें। आप करें लेकिन कंस्ट्रक्टिव करें, नमूने का करें। छोटी बात न करें। बड़ी बात करें। आप जो बात कर रहे हैं, छोटी कर रहे हैं। (इन्टरप्राइज) मैं माकूल बात कर रहा हूँ और मुझे बीच में टोक रहे हैं। आप बीच में बोलते जा रहे हैं। मैंने तो आपका नाम भी नहीं लिया, आपके बारे में कुछ कहा भी नहीं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का नाम तक नहीं लिया। आपके ऊपर मैं सवालियों की बौछार कर सकता हूँ, आपके ऊपर मैं कई इलजाम लगा सकता हूँ। आप हमें उपदेश देने चले हैं, हमारे मुखर्जी साहब चले गये हैं। अभी वह बोले हैं। पर उपदेश कुशल बहुतेरे। आपने हम पर कई इलजाम लगाये हैं। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारी स्लेट क्लीन है, आप

से ज्यादा क्लीन है, इसको मुल्क मानता है, दुनिया मानती है, इतिहास मानता है कि कांग्रेस वालों ने देश के कल्याण के लिए बहुत कुछ किया है। बहुत साफ सुधरा काम किया है। हम आप जैसे देश द्रोही नहीं हैं, देश की पीठ में छुरा घोंपने वाले नहीं हैं, हमने देश के साथ विश्वासघात नहीं किया है, जैसे आपने किया है। हम आपकी तरह पेकिंग के एजेंट नहीं हैं। हम पर छोंटा कशी की जाये, यह उचित नहीं है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट निहायत ईमानदार है, निहायत भलमनसाहत से काम कर रही है, इस डेमोक्रेटिक सैट अप में हर एक को राइट है क्रिटिसाइज करने का अगर कोई कांग्रेस वाला गलती करता है तो उसको भी पकड़ कर जेल में बन्द किया जा सकता है।

यहां बड़ी बहस हो रही थी कि फलां को क्यों बन्द किया गया। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह डीलेपन से काम न करे, किसी से रियायत न करे, अगर मैं जुर्म करता हूँ तो मेरे खिलाफ तत्काल कार्रवाई करे, दो चार रोज़ में करे, दो चार दिन में मुझे पकड़ें और बन्द कर दे। आठ महीने के बाद बन्द करे तो अननैसरी क्रिटिसिज्म को आप इनवाइट करते हैं। मेरा यह आपन चैलेंज है कि कह दिया जाये कि हम पीछे नहीं हैं, हम कमजोर नहीं हैं, गवर्नमेंट कमजोर नहीं है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट इससे भी सख्त कानून लाये, हम उनको पास करेंगे, हम किसी मिनिस्टर को ब्रशने वाले नहीं हैं। बड़े अचछे, उत्तम, श्रेष्ठ, त्यागी और तपस्वी हमारे पास हैं और इसका नमूना कामराज प्लान में आपके सामने रख दिया गया है। आप में दम नहीं है। आप नहीं कर सकते हैं। हम में भलाई की कमी नहीं है। आप से ज्यादा भलाई हम दिखा सकते हैं और दिखाते हैं। मुल्क आगे जा रहा है। जिम्मेदारी हमारी जरूर है। हम आपका क्रिटिसिज्म सुनने को तैयार हैं, लेकिन जैनुइन क्रिटिसिज्म आप करें, जैनुइन डिमांड आप पेश करें।

[श्री शिवनारायण]

अपोजीशन पार्टी जो होती है, उसको कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि गवर्नमेंट को रिप्लेस करने की वह तैयारी करे। आपको चाहिये कि आप तैयारी कर के आये और ऐसी बात कहें कि हम आप को कोट न कर सकें। कल यहां पर जब कामत साहब को कोट किया गया तो उधर से वह कनकनाने लगे। जब होम मिनिस्टर साहब बोल रहे थे तो वह उनकी बात सुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं थे। सब से बड़े अपोजीशन के लीडर ने एक बात कही थी। जब उनको कोट किया गया तो वह उबल पड़े। आप हमारी बात सुनने को अगर तैयार नहीं हैं तो हम आपकी बात को कैसे सुन सकते हैं। ७५ वरम के बजुगं की बात की आप नुक्ताचीनी करते हैं। जब हम घोटी पहने हुए घूमते थे गांव गांव में तो वह जेलों में बन्द थे, उन्होंने पुलिस के डंडे खायें थे। शास्त्री जी मेरी बगल में बैठे हुए हैं, वह हमारे पुराने नेता हैं। उनके जमाने में हम ने वालैटीयर के तौर पर काम किया है। वे जेल गये थे और हम गांव गांव मामूली बर्कज की तरह से घूमा करते थे . . .

श्री विश्राम प्रसाद (लालगंज) : आप कितनी बार जेल गये हैं ?

श्री शिव नारायण : आप से अच्छा हमारा इतिहास है। आप नहीं जानते हैं कि क्या क्या हम ने कुर्बानियां की हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके जरिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस वाले गलत बात नहीं करते हैं और न गलत बात करने के लिए तैयार हैं। जितने आनेस्ट, जितने ईमानदार इस मुल्क में कांग्रेस वाले हैं, आप नहीं हैं, नहीं हैं, नहीं हैं, यह मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस रेजोल्यूशन का विरोध करता हूँ।

श्री सिहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं . . .

श्री बृजराज सिंह (बरेली) : कांग्रेस वालों को ही क्या बुलाया जायगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तीन इधर से बोल चुके हैं, तीन अब उधर से बोल लें तो इस में क्या गुनाह हो गया ?

श्री सिहासन सिंह : यह विधेयक जो कामत जी ने सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है, यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है। इस पर बड़ी गम्भीरता के साथ इस सदन में विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। शायद इसी विचार से सदन में सर्वसम्मति से इसके लिए समय बढ़ा दिया गया है और दो घंटे और इसके लिए एलाट कर दिये गये हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दो घंटे औरों के लिए हैं, आपके लिए तो सिर्फ पांच मिनट ही बाकी हैं।

श्री सिहासन सिंह : दस मिनट दिये जायेंगे, यह तो तय हो चुका है। अभी तक तो मैं एक ही मिनट बोला हूँ। इस विधेयक के पीछे जो भावना है, उस भावना से इस सदन के किसी भी माननीय सदस्य को शायद विरोध नहीं होगा। आज देश में भ्रष्टाचार का काफी और धारा प्रवाह प्रचार हो रहा है कि बड़ा भ्रष्टाचार फैला हुआ है, चोर बाजार फैला हुआ है और इस को किसी तरह से रोका जाये। इस भ्रष्टाचार को रोकने के लिये हमारे नये गृह मंत्री काफी जोर से कदम बढ़ा रहे हैं। अभी अभी निकला कि अधिकारियों के भ्रष्टाचार को रोकने के लिये उन्होंने कोई कमीशन बनाने का आयोजन किया है। इस तरह से वे सक्रिय हैं। इस के पहले भी काफी काम हुआ है।

अभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का मैसूर का वक्तव्य पढ़ कर सुनाया गया। यह कहना कि हम ने हिसाब नहीं दिया, कांग्रेस ने उसे नहीं मांगा, यह बात सही नहीं है। कांग्रेस ने हर एक कांग्रेस के सदस्य से उस का हिसाब मांगा। मंत्रियों से भी मांगा। इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे बह

कहना है कि मांगने के बाद उस पर क्या कार्यवाई हुई यह हमें आज तक पता नहीं है। मांगा तो गया। दिया भी शायद सभी ने लेकिन उस पर कार्यवाई क्या हुई यह पता नहीं है।

इस विधेयक में हम कुछ कमी देखते हैं। आज जो भ्रष्टाचार है वह सब स्थानों पर नहीं है। मंत्रिमंडल हमारा पवित्र हो, उस पर किसी की उंगली न उठे, यह बात जरूर है। लेकिन आज देश में जो भ्रष्टाचार है उस का एक कारण यह भी है किसी हद तक कि आज हमारे मंत्रियों के ऊपर भी उंगली उठाई जाती है। यही आधार नीचे के स्तर के अधिकारियों का होता है। वे कहते हैं कि ऊपर भी तो देखो। लेकिन यह आधार नहीं होना चाहिये। सीता को राम ने त्यागा तो केवल इसी विचार से कि जनता चाहती थी कि उस का राजा सर्वांगीण पवित्र हो। उस में कोई कालिमा न हो। सीता के प्रति और राम के प्रति जनता का यह आक्षेप था कि वह राम उस सीता के साथ कैसे रह रहे हैं जिस को रावण ने किसी कारण से हो पकड़ तो लिया हाथ से। इस पवित्रता का खयाल कर के राम ने बारह बजे रात को सीता को अपने महल से बनवास को भेजा और उस वक्त अपने भाइयों को बुला कर यह कहा कि आज तक मैं ने जितनी भी राजाजायें दी हैं, सब की राय से दी हैं, आज एक राजाजा दे रहा हूँ, यह जानते हुए कि वह राजाजा सर्वथा अनुचित है, असत्य है, लेकिन जनता की इच्छा है कि वह अपने राजा को सर्वांगीण परिवत्र देखना चाहती है। वह मुझ में एक दोष बतलाती है इस लिये उस दोष को मुझे काट निकालना है। आज यह दुःख की बात है कि हमारे राज्य पर उंगली उठती है। इस लिये यह विधेयक अपनी जगह पर ठीक है लेकिन स विधेयक को राजतन्त्र तक, मंत्रियों तक ही सीमित नहीं रखना चाहिये। हम सभी इस राजतन्त्र के अन्दर हैं। इस लिये उचित यह था कि जो लोग प्रजा से चुन कर आते हैं, उस के प्रतिनिधि हो कर आते हैं, वे अपना हिसाब

किताब प्रजा के सामने रखें। बनने के बाद धनी नहीं हुए, होंगे जो कि सदस्य होने के बाद धनी अभी हमारे पूर्ववक्ता मह जिंक किया। मोटर खरीदने के लिये जो वह कोई सदस्य ही है। मंत्री तो खरीद ही सकते हैं। इस लिये यह विधेयक पूर्ण नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह विधेयक आया और मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस बात की आज चर्चा चल रही है उस में हम सभी सहायक हों। जिस देश का गृह मंत्री इस बात की फिक्र में हो कि इस देश से किसी तरह से इस भ्रष्टाचार को, चाहे वह मंत्रियों का हो, चाहे सदस्यों में हो, चाहे हमारे कर्मचारियों में हो, किसी में हो, किसी में हो, उस को दूर किया जाय, तो हमारा कर्तव्य है कि हम उस में अपना सहयोग दें। लेकिन यह जरूरी है कि विधेयक जो हो वह सर्वांगीण हो, एकांगी न हो। इस विधेयक के एकांगीपन से मेरा विरोध है। यह विधेयक केवल मंत्रियों की ओर ही इशारा करता है। इस को सब की तरफ इशारा करना चाहिये। आज हम सदस्य हैं, कल मंत्री हो सकते हैं, जो आज मंत्री हैं वे कल सदस्य हो सकते हैं। इसी तरह से विरोधी पक्ष वाले घर आ सकते हैं।

श्री कामत से मेरा अनुरोध है और सरकार से भी कि यह बड़ा गम्भीर विषय है। इस की गम्भीरता को हम केवल छोटे दायरे में न रख कर पूर्ण दायरे में देखें और ऐसी व्यवस्था लावें जिस में कि हर एक आदमी, चाहे वह सरकारी कर्मचारी हो चाहे सदस्य हो, चाहे मंत्री हो, जिस समय वह पद ग्रहण करता है, वह अपना पूरा हिसाब देवे और उस का डिक्लेरेशन करे। कौन डिक्लेरेशन करता है और कौन नहीं करता, यह मैं नहीं जानता। बाबा राघव दास ने मुझे एक चिट्ठी लिखी। वे बड़े पुण्यस्मृति पुरुष थे, उन्होंने चिट्ठी लिखी कि फौजाबाद के राजे महाराजों और जमींदारों के निकल जाने के बाद जितने जुवेलर्स हैं वे बड़ी चिन्ता में पड़े कि हमारी

[श्री सिहासन सिंह]

जुवेलरी कहां बिकेगी और कौन उस को खरीदेगा। राजे महाराजे तो निकल गये लेकिन जुवेलर्स ने उन के स्थान पर अधिकारियों को पाया। उन्होंने चिट्ठी लिखी कि फैजाबाद के जुवेलर्स कहते हैं कि जो पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० के इंजीनियर्स और दूसरे विभाग के लोग हैं वे और जो ठेकेदार हैं वे इतनी जुवेलरी खरीदते हैं जिस का ठिकाना नहीं है। राजे महाराजे तो गाढ़े बगाड़े खरीदते थे लेकिन यह लोग तो रोजाना खरीदते हैं और हमारे ग्राहक बहुत बढ़ गये हैं। यह हमारे भ्रष्टाचार का नमूना है। इस लिये हम को चाहिये कि हम सर्वांगीण कार्य करें। जहाँ भी कोई किसी तरह से सरकारी क्षेत्र में आता है, जिसका राज सत्ता से सम्बन्ध हो, उस की कदम कदम पर जांच हो। उस जांच में वह बतलाये कि हम ने यह धन कमाया, चाहे ईमानदारी के जरिये से हो चाहे किसी और तरह से हो।

आखीर में एक बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ। युधिष्ठिर से बहुत प्राचीन काल में नारद जी ने एक प्रश्न किया कि धन कैसे होता है। युधिष्ठिर ने बतलाया कि चोरी से। जिस को जितना बड़ा धनी देखो उसे उतना ही बड़ा चोर समझो। मगर यह देश के प्राचीन इतिहास की बात है। लेकिन आज भी उसी तरह से हो रहा है। इस लिये मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करते हुए श्री कामत से कहूंगा कि वे इस बात पर दुबारा विचार करें और एक ऐसा बिल लावे जो सब के लिये हो। हम सब लोग पवित्र हैं जिस में जब हम निकालें तो जनता हम को समझे और हम भी खुश हों। कोई भी हम पर उंगली न उठाये कि यह आदमी जा रहा है जो कि एम० पी० है और एम० एल० ए० है, जैसे कि आज हम को मुफ्ती पैसेन्जर कहा जाता है वैसे न हो।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं कामत साहब से कहूंगा कि वे इस मेरी बात पर विचार करें।

Mr. Speaker: We will continue the discussion on the this Bill next time.

16.45 hrs.

**RE: CALLING ATTENTION TO
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE**

Mr. Speaker: Shri P. G. Sen, The Minister is not here. It is very unfortunate. I had informed him in the morning that I will take it up at 16.45 hrs. I had informed the House. Just at this moment the Minister is not here. That situation should not arise in future.

Shri Hari Vshnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): The Deputy-Speaker, I think, later on extended the time of the Government Bill by one hour, and this Bill of mine would have gone on till 17.45 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: This was definitely put down at 16.45 hours.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarnavis): The time was extended.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Minister is not here.....

Mr. Speaker: In the meantime we are taking up another item.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: (Calcutta Central) Even as a matter of precedent, what is the kind of thing the House ought to do? I do not think this has ever happened before.

Mr. Speaker: I will just think over it. He might also think over it and suggest it to me.

16.46 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO
MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE**

REPORTED INEFFICIENT WORKING OF CENTRAL EMPLOYEES CONSUMER CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): I call the attention of the Minister of Home