

St. re. Cotton Supply

would like the co-operation of the House. Rather than condemning any particular section for a proposal they put forward, solutions have been found in close co-operation with all interests concerned and it will be for us to implement them so that the crisis is cut to the minimum.

The AITUC did represent that for a whole day's closure they should have whole day's wages. Other labour representatives also made similar proposals. After weighing the different proposals, after discussing matters with them, ultimately it was agreed that this is the best solution to give half-a-day's wage for a whole day's closure.

Shri H. C. Linga Reddy (Chikballapur): Sir, I am glad the Central Government are going to the rescue of a number of cotton mills which are being mismanaged and which are about to be closed. In Bangalore City, Mysore State, two mills, the Minerva Mills and also Mysore Mills, have been closed for the last six months and about 7000 labourers have been put to a lot of loss. They have not been paid for the lay-off period. I want to know whether the Central Government is taking over the management of these two mills because the management are not anxious to re-start the mills even though the State Government has given a guarantee of Rs. 60 lakhs.

Shri Manubhai Shah: I am glad to inform the House that this question of these two mills in Mysore has been satisfactorily resolved. The State Government has guaranteed Rs. 55 lakhs in one case and Rs. 67 lakhs in the other. Both these are going through the State Bank of India and other banks in Mysore and the mills will start functioning soon.

12.25 hrs

RE: CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE
(Query)

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the legislative business.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, you promised to give me a chance.

Mr. Speaker: What does he want?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Today is the last day of this session. I have tabled a calling attention notice on a very important matter which concerns the Central Government, rather the Ministry of Defence. Sir, as you are aware, there was a strike lasting 45 days in Hindustan Aeronautics, Kanpur. As a result of our good offices and the good offices of the Defence Ministry, we were able to persuade the workers to withdraw the strike. At that time Shri Swaran Singh was not the Defence Minister. Then a clear assurance was given by us to the workers that there will be no victimisation. Yet, 30 employees have been dismissed and about 100 employees have been discharged from service. I would only request you to avoid a similar strike in the future in Kanpur, where the situation now is very explosive. I would request the hon. Minister to make a statement that he will apply his mind and reconsider the whole matter, instead of leaving it to HAL. I have full faith in him.

Mr. Speaker: I will find out the position.

12.27 hrs.

RE: ENQUIRY INTO ALLEGATIONS
AGAINST MINISTERS

श्री मधु लिमये (मृगेर) अध्यक्ष
महोदय, क्वि आज घाबरी दिवस है.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने पहले ही इस को
डेढ़ घन्टा चलाया है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : बहुत धन्यवाद। लेकिन हमारा दो मिनट निवेदन सुन लीजिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस लोक सभा में तीन-चार मामले कुछ ऐसे उठे हैं, जैसे राजस्थान का सोने का मामला, मनुभाई शाह के सम्बन्ध में किये गये कुछ आरोप जिस पर उन्होंने भाषण दिया, फिर सचिन् चौधरी के बारे में दुग्रा और सबसे अन्त में श्री पाटिल और स्वर्ण सिंह का मामला ए० पी० जे० शिपिंग कम्पनी को लेकर चला, चावल की चोरी के बारे में फिर उसका उन्होंने खण्डन किया तथा कह दिया कि हम इन आरोपों से इन्कार करते हैं। परन्तु इस तरह साधारण खण्डन कर देने से मामले खत्म नहीं हो जाते हैं। तीव्ररी लोक समा खत्म होने जा रही है, इस में जो चार-पाच अग्ररे मामले रह गये हैं, इन के बारे में कोई अन्तिम फैसला होना चाहिए—या तो हमारे द्वारा जो आरोप लगाये गये हैं, वे सही हैं या गलत है, कौन बात सही है यह साबित होने चाहिये। यहाँ मंत्रियों द्वारा खण्डन किया गया है क्या उन का खण्डन सही है? इसकी सत्यता भी साबित होनी चाहिये। इस के लिये आपने यह व्यवस्था भी दी थी कि आप इन सारे कागजों को देख कर एक कमेटी कायम करेंगे, जिस कमेटी के सामने हम लोग जायें और मन्त्री लोग जायें, ताकि समूचे देश को पता चले कि हमारे आरोपों में तथ्य है या नहीं है वस, इतनी ही मेरी प्रार्थना है।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : मैं एक बात कहना चाहता था। आपको यह कह दिया गया था कि जो आरोप आप यहाँ पर लगा रहे हैं, वे बाहर लगा दिये जायें। आप उन आरोपों को बाहर लगा लीजिए, अपने आप फैसला हो जायेगा।

श्री मधु लिमये : त्यागी जी, इस तरह से न कीजिए। उन की चुनौती को डाक्टर साहब ने स्वीकारा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जायें।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने जो प्रश्न उठाये हैं, उन को वे कन्फ्यूज कर रहे हैं, घुमिले बना रहे हैं।

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, I have sent you a letter written by Shri Madhu Limaye. In that letter very serious allegations have been made against certain Ministers. I remember that when Shri Lal Bhadur Shastri was our Prime Minister he said that whenever allegations are made against Ministers, the Prime Minister of India will enquire into those allegations. I have gone through the letter very minutely and I can say that there are allegations. So, I hope you would request the present Prime Minister of India to go into those allegations; in the interest of the Ministers themselves, in the interests of the Members of Parliament and in the interest of the hon. Speaker also, there should be some sort of clarification. If the Prime Minister does not do it, Sir, it is up to you to appoint a Committee of this House to go into those allegations.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नियम 380 के अन्तर्गत लोक सभा की कार्यवाही की रफ्त में कुछ श्रद्धियां करवाना चाहता हूँ। एक का तो जिक्र नहीं करता हूँ, क्योंकि आपने मुझे कहलाया है कि मानन्य सुबह्नायक का मामला अभी आपके विचाराधीन है, लेकिन बाकी दो सुधार आप कीजिए—एक उस बहस से सम्बन्ध रखता है जो शुकवार को हुई थी और एक माननीय मंत्री ने मुझको झूठा कहा था, तब मैंने जो शब्द कहे थे, वे आपको बताये देता हूँ, जिनको निकाल दिया गया है.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से नहीं। अगर वे शब्द निकाल दिये गये हैं, और आप

उन को इस तरह से फिर यहाँ कहें और इस तरह से इसमें जाय, आप ही खुद समझें कि इस तरह से निकालने का क्या मतलब हुआ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप मेरी पूरी बात सुनिये। कल आपने कहा था कि आप लोक सभा के सामने इस बात को लायेंगे कि यहाँ से कौन-कौन से शब्द निकाल रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर मैं एक शब्द भी निकालता तो मैं जरूर लोक सभा के सामने ले आता। मैंने चूंकि एक शब्द भी नहीं निकाला इसलिए लोक सभा के सामने नहीं लाया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आपने कुछ शब्द निकाले हैं। मैं उन शब्दों को नहीं बोहराता हूँ। खाली इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजों की लोक सभा का हम बहुत अनुकरण करते हैं, वहाँ हेपनी टेपनी मिनिस्टर को असंसदीय अथवा अशासनीय नहीं कहा जाता है। अब हेपनी टेपनी मिनिस्टर और दो कीड़ी का मिनिस्टर, इन दोनों में क्या फर्क है? कोई फर्क नहीं है। अगर आप कोई नियम लगाकर या किसी और तरह से आने नहीं देंगे तो इसका नतीजा क्या होगा? इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि जो चीज मैं कहता हूँ वह साफ नहीं हो पायेगी।

अभी हमारे त्यागी जी ने कहा था कि आरोप बाहर लगाओ। मैं उन को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पचास बार ये आरोप लगाये जा चुके हैं। जन नाम की मासिक पत्रिका में भी यह बात छप चुकी है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों मुकदमा नहीं चलाया है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्यों नहीं चलाया इसके बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कर सकता हूँ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सदन में सारी बात हुई है। चूंकि अभी त्यागी जी ने

इसके बारे में कहा था, इसलिये मैंने इसका जिक्र कर दिया है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि शनिवार को विशेषाधिकार की बहस हो रही थी। तब कुछ माननीय सदस्य मेरे ऊपर, शर्म, शर्म करके चिल्लाये। उस वक्त मैंने कहा था कि कैसे बेगम हैं ये लोग। अब ये जो शब्द हैं कैसे बेगम हैं ये लोग, इन को हटा दिया गया है। इनको हरगिज नहीं हटाया जाना चाहिए था। आखिर जिस तरह से कुछ लोगों को अधिकार है कि वे मुझको, एक खास व्यक्ति को शर्म, शर्म कहें, तो मुझे भी इसका पूरा अधिकार है कि एक समूह को मैं कहूँ, किसी एक व्यक्ति का नाम लेकर नहीं, कि ये बेगम लोग हैं, जो शर्म शर्म, ऐसी बातें बक दिया करते हैं।

मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि इन दोनों चीजों का आप अपनी रपट में समावेश करवायें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इनका समावेश कराने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। डाक्टर साहब जो शब्द चाहें उसका इस्तेमाल करते हैं। अगर किसी वक्त एतराज किया जाता है तो वह कहते हैं कि हम समझे नहीं हैं, हमारी समझ में नहीं आया है। हो सकता है कि कुछ शब्दों को मैं समझ न सका हूँ। अब किसी मيم्बर के लिये दूसरे के द्वारा यों कहे चले जाना क्या शोभा देता है? किसी मिनिस्टर के लिए या किसी दूसरे मيم्बर के लिए हेपनी टेपनी इत्यादि शब्दों का इस्तेमाल या इन तरह के किसी दूसरे शब्द का इस्तेमाल क्या शोभा की बात है? इस तरह से शब्द इस तरफ से या उस तरफ से इस्तेमाल करना कोई शोभा नहीं देता है। मيم्बरों को चाहिए कि कम से कम एक दूसरे को सम्मान दें, इज्जत दें और आदर से एक दूसरे को बुलायें। इससे उनकी भी शोभा बढ़ती है और हाँउस की भी बढ़ती है।

[प्रद्युम्न महोदय]

उन्होंने एक आरोप लगाया था। अभी श्री मधु लिमये ने भी उस सवाल को उठाया है। मैंने उस दिन कहा था कि यह जो शिपिंग कम्पनी है, जिसका नाम भूल

श्री राजसेवक घाबरे (बाराबंकी) : एपीजे, बहुत मशहूर है। श्रीमंचन्द प्यारे लाल

श्री मधु लिमये : कुप्रसिद्ध है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह जो एपीजे कम्पनी है, शिपिंग कम्पनी है, इसके बारे में मैंने डाक्टर साहब से कहा था कि उनके पास और भी कोई सबूत हों, और एडीशनल कुछ पेपर्स हों तो वह उन को भेज दें। उन्होंने वादा किया हुआ है भेजने का।

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्र सबूत आपके पास हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो डाक्टर साहब ने भेजे हैं कागजात उन सब को मैंने पढ़ लिया है, अच्छी तरह से पढ़ लिया है। उनको देखने पर मुझे कोई वजह मालूम नहीं देती है कि मैं कोई कमेटी किसी मिनिसटर के खिलाफ मुकदमों करूँ।

मैंने उन कागजात को अच्छी तरह से पढ़ लिया है। बाकी जो चीज है . . .

श्री श्रीय (अलीगढ़) : अच्छी तरह से पढ़ लिया है तो आपका नाम भी मालूम नहीं है ?

श्री चन्द्रमणि लाल चौधरी (महुआ) : इस तरह से उन्हें आपका नहीं कहना चाहिए

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उनका मुकाबला आप करेंगे ?

श्री श्रीय : पी० ए० सी० में हमारे सामने गवाहियाँ आई हैं, आपके सामने नहीं आई हैं . . . (इंटरप्लान)

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to add my word of support and appreciation to what you have just now said that Members of this House should respect each other and should honour and accept each others' bona fides. That should be so. At the same time, everyone knows that the position of ministers is special and it has been recognised in our Rules also. That is why they are given the opportunity of making a statement, whenever they deem fit, with your permission.

There was the Santhanam Committee Report. So many other things had happened in order that the Santhanam Committee had to come into existence. Then, they made certain recommendations Pandit Nehru, the then Prime Minister, had said that whenever any such complaints come up, he would try to go into those complaints and a practice had come into existence thereafter and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had made further advance over it and, therefore, when some complaints were made, he insisted upon sending them for the opinion of the Supreme Court Chief Justice or someone in that position. Certain consequences also had followed. One Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, was obliged to go away because he could not face that kind of an inquiry even informally.

Shri Tyagi: No. We went away because he felt that if an inquiry was going on, his sticking to the job of Ministership was not fair and, therefore, he resigned.

Shri Ranga: It is not that. He wanted the Prime Minister to express confidence in him and he thought that if the Prime Minister had complete confidence in him, there would be no need for the Prime Minister to send that charge-sheet for any opinion from the Supreme Court Chief Justice or someone in that position. So, he stood for one principle and that is the Prime Minister was enjoying the confidence of this House and the Minister should enjoy the confidence of the

Prime Minister and there should end the whole matter and, therefore, it would be wrong for the Prime Minister to have insisted upon obtaining an opinion.

Shri Tyagi: There is some misunderstanding. Factually, the Santhanam Committee Report was considered and the Cabinet had taken a decision that whenever there is any complaint against any Minister the Prime Minister will himself make enquiries and if he is not satisfied, then the Minister will go. What Shri T. T. Krishnamachari insisted upon was that if the Prime Minister had lost confidence in him, then he should go. Otherwise, it was for him to enquire into the conduct of the Ministers.

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend has facilitated my assessment. If the Prime Minister had complete confidence, there would be no need of an inquiry. But the Prime Minister said, "I cannot very well take up that responsibility and I must have the opinion from the highest legal authority in this country before I can say that there is nothing at all wrong and that there is no substance in the complaints made. If there is nothing in that, I will continue to have the company and the cooperation of my Minister." It was over that they differed. Anyhow, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari went away.

Now, what has happened is this. Some paper has been circulated by Shri Madhu Limaye. I need not go into that because it is addressed to you. He is only raising certain points for an inquiry. We need not go into that. But certain charges were made by some of our Members here. We must consider them to have a sense of responsibility. Whenever they make any such charges without their sense of responsibility, and when the question of privilege arises, we send them, and we have sent them, to the Privileges Committee and the Privileges Committee has expressed the opinion. It has expressed its opinion in unambiguous terms that the Members should first send such letters as

were received from that man, Shri Sahi, to the Speaker first and that they should not be brought to the notice of the House. It is open to the House to go on record either for or against the propriety of any kind of complaint, not the substance, of raising it in the House by any Member. Subject to that, when some Members have already raised certain charges against some of the Ministers here, as you know, and their names have already been mentioned, it is only proper for the Prime Minister to follow the procedure that was yielded to by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and that was developed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. It has not been done.

The unfortunate thing is that we are on the eve of elections. This is the last day of the session. These charges are already there in the records of the House. What would be the position when we go to the people? Would it be in the interest of these Ministers themselves that these charges that had been levelled against them by our Members here on the floor of the House should not be investigated into and an opinion sought from the highest legal authority in this country and then made public? Would it not be in their own interest to get the charges investigated?

Now why do I say this? Would it not be in our interest as the Opposition to let the situation remain as it is today in a nebulous condition, so that we would be able to continue to tear these people into pieces on the basis of these charges? But I am looking at it from the point of view of future interest of democracy also. It would not be in the interest of democracy that Ministers should be charged in this manner and should be arraigned before the public in any way—that would apply to either this side or that side—and in that manner the prestige of the Ministry, the prestige of the Ministership should be brought down to that half-penny and two-penny status. That would denigrate democracy; that would pave the way for dictatorship; and that would

[Shri Ranga]

destroy the faith of the people in the Ministers that we should have. Today these gentlemen happen to be the Ministers. Tomorrow or the day after, some of us hope to occupy those chairs and from the Government and put them in the Opposition. Then what would be the position of those Ministers? You may say—and these gentlemen also may say—this, “why do you worry about the future? Why not we think of today? We are going to the polls. Let us face each other and the people are going to decide”. Ordinarily, people are not expected to decide these very intricate legal matters, where moral standards cannot be so easily discerned. I would appeal to the Prime Minister in the interest of Indian democracy to send these charges to one of the judges of the Supreme Court or one of the retired Chief Justices, if they like, as was done in the case of Pratap Singh Kairon—it was sent to Chief Justice Das—and Mr. Malaviya also. In that way, they would be co-operating not only with us but also with our Constitution and our practice of democracy; otherwise, things will go from bad to worse.

Two hundred years ago, in England, there was a man called Edmund Burke. He wrote a book called “Present Discontent”. There, he described the same kind of conditions as are prevailing in India today in regard to corruption, prevailing in the highest possible circles of Government. Unfortunately we are now where England was 200 years ago. England has progressed. Our friends have been saying that they are trying to achieve in ten years what other countries had achieved in hundred years. Instead of going back where England was 200 years ago, let us try to keep pace with England, if not in material progress, at least in moral progress. We thought that we were going to be far in advance of the Western world because we were the followers of Mahatma Gandhi. He held before us such high standards of public morality and trained quite a large number of us through

the organisation known at that time as the Congress. Unfortunately these people have become fair to the name of that Congress, but they have bidden good-bye to the traditions, principles and standards of the Congress and now we have gone back to where England was 200 year ago. I would like them to co-operate with us in trying to help the country to harken back to Gandian standards of public morality.

Shri S. M. Banerjee rose—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Yadav.

Mr. Banerjee has already spoken. This is not a new point that should be debated.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Today is the last day, Sir....:

Mr. Speaker: He has already spoken.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I only want to say that the Prime Minister should be called. After all, she is responsible to this House. But she has not been coming here for the last few days.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Yadav.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय किसी मंत्री के खिलाफ सदन में अगर गम्भीर आरोप लगे और उन का निराकरण न हो, तो वह उचित नहीं होगा। वह निराकरण केवल यहां पर हो जाये, लेकिन बाहर जनता में उस के बारे में भ्रम हो, तो वह भी उचित नहीं है। इस सदन की यह जिम्मेदारी है कि बाहर की जनता को इन आरोपों के बारे में बिलकुल सही सूचना मिले कि वे सही हैं या नहीं।

जब माननीय श्री पाटिल के बारे में कहा गया, तो प्राप ने कहा कि प्राप के पास जो दस्तावेज हैं, उन से कोई जुर्रम साबित

नहीं होता है। मैंने भी उन दस्तावेजों को पढ़ा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्ता उस पर बहस नहीं हो सकती है।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : मैं बहस नहीं कर रहा हूँ। मैं इतिला दे रहा हूँ।

उन दस्तावेजों में एक तथ्य तो साफ है कि चावल की छीज हुई, उस का घाटा हुआ। इस बात को सरकार ने स्वयं माना है, लेकिन वह घाटा कैसे हुआ, किस ने किया और उस के लिये कौन जिम्मेदार है, इस के बारे में मंत्री महोदय ने कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है। केवल यह कह देना पर्याप्त नहीं है कि यह आरोप सही नहीं है।

व्यापार मंत्री, श्री मनुमाई शाह, के खिलाफ भी आरोप लगे हैं। उन्होंने उस बारे में उत्तर दिया। फिर माननीय श्री मधु लिमये ने इस बारे में सफाई चाहीं, लेकिन उन को मौका नहीं मिला उन आरोपों के बारे में उन्होंने घाट दस्तावेज सुबूत के तौर पर भेजे हैं।

जब यह स्थिति हो, तो एक ही रास्ता बचता है कि इस सदन की एक समिति कागठन हो, उस समिति के सामने ये सारे आरोप जाये और उन आरोपों के बारे में खुल कर जांच हो। हमारे जनतंत्र के लिए, खुद मंत्री महोदय के लिए और जिन लोगों ने आरोप लगाए हैं, उन के लिए—सब के लिए यह अच्छा है कि आप ऐसी समिति का निर्माण करें। आप ने संकेत भी दिया था। आप ने यह ज़रूर कहा था कि आप ने वचन नहीं दिया था, लेकिन यह संकेत ज़रूर दिया था कि आप समिति का गठन कर सकते हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि आप इस समिति का निर्माण करें, जिस के सामने ये सब बातें आयें।

अभी माननीय सदस्य, श्री रंगा, ने बहुत अच्छे पायंट्स रखे। उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री और चीफ जस्टिस या जज का जिक्र किया। जहाँ तक प्रधान मंत्री का सम्बन्ध है, आज श्री पाटिल उन पर पूरी तरह से हावी हैं और प्रधान मंत्री उन के बारे में कुछ नहीं कर सकते।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारा आखिरी दिन है। इस के बाद हम अपने अपने क्षेत्रों में जा कर अपने कार्य में लग जायेंगे। आज हमारे देश में बड़े-बड़े मठा-धीशों ने गो-वध के प्रश्न पर आभरण प्रदर्शन कर रखा है। मैं ने कल आप को याद दिलाया था कि

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उस बारे में बहस चल रही है, जो कि आज ही आयेंगी।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मुनि सुशील कुमार का प्रधान मंत्री से जो पत्र-व्यवहार हुआ है, मैं ने उस के बारे में बक्तव्य देने के लिए कहा था। वह बक्तव्य दिलाया जाये, क्योंकि यह प्राग दिन-प्रति दिन भड़कती जा रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा प्रस्ताव कब तक आने वाला है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर माननीय सदस्य कार्यवाही को आगे चलने दें, तो हम प्रस्ताव तक पहुँच सकेंगे।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) अध्यक्ष महोदय,

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस बारे में काफी कहा जा चुका है। अब और बहस की ज़रूरत नहीं है। आप की तरफ से बहुत कह दिया गया है। अब आप उसी पर किनामत करें।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 'मईयां जानियां जानियां ने, गल्ला रह जानियां ने । इन मंत्रियों पर आरोप लगाए गए हैं, आप उन की जांच बिठाइये, क्योंकि आप दोबारा नहीं आयेगें ।

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): May I say just one sentence in this connection? I think that it would be in the interests of the Ministers themselves that some inquiry is made. The elections are coming and the people must know the correct position.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: (Jalore): Would you kindly permit me to say a word about it? More than the Opposition I think that it would certainly be in the interests of the ruling party or the Congress people themselves to see that there is no suspicion attaching to the conduct of any Minister. The Ministers must be above suspicion. This is the basic thing. If democracy is to function properly then it is absolutely essential that the Ministers should be above suspicion.

My hon. friend Shri Ranga said so many things with which I am in perfect agreement. I am in full agreement with him, and we have been voicing this all the time. All the time we have been saying that there should be an independent authority which will go into all such allegations as are made against Ministers. For, today, as one Member has said, there is something in the nature of character-assassination. There can be nothing worse than this. Until and unless all the allegations are cleared, the position would become extremely difficult.

I do not, however, agree with Shri Ranga when he says that we are two hundred years behind U.K. in this matter. I would submit that we are not at all far behind but we are neck to neck with U.K.

On this particular issue, it was only in October, 1966, that the U.K. Government gave special thought to this matter and they have passed an enactment for the appointment of a Commissioner for Parliamentary Investigation or Ombudsman.

As a matter of fact, the Government is extremely anxious about it. The Government appointed the Administrative Reforms Commission. The Commission has made recommendations on this particular issue covering this basic thing. The Commission devoted its first attention to it. An Interim Report was submitted, particularly because it reflects the anxiety not only of the members on this side, but also on the other side, as the Administrative Reforms Commission is not a party affair—we have got a Member of the Opposition on it. That reflects the general anxiety, and the recommendation which we have made goes little ahead of what has been done by the U.K. Parliament only in the month of October; it goes two steps ahead.

Therefore, it is wrong to say that the Government is not anxious about it. Let us be very clear on that point.

Some hon. Members rose—

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरा हयाल है और वक्त आप न खर्च करें । एक बनर्जी साहब ने कहा, सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह से कोई स्टेटमेंट चाहते हैं, कानपुर के बारे में, वह देना चाहें तो दें ।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I want to make one observation.

Mr. Speaker: No. I have asked others also to do that. He should fall in line. The Minister.

Shri D. C. Sharma: After my observation, he can make it.

Mr. Speaker: He will kindly resume his seat.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): I have just received

a chit from Shri Banerjee in which he says that some employees of the Kanpur HAL factory have been retrenched, and some others are facing some difficulty. All that he says is that I should look into it. This matter is being dealt with by my colleague, the Minister of Defence Production. Certainly I myself will also see that no injustice is done to anybody.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: 30 workers have been dismissed.

Mr. Speaker: He will look into it. That is what he wants.

As regards what Shri Ranga said, I need not go into it. It has been answered by Shri Mathur.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We want the Prime Minister to be here.

Shri Ranga: It has been supported by Shri Mathur, not answered by him.

Mr. Speaker: In the last portion of his observations, he said that the Administrative Reforms Commission had dealt with the matter and the procedure that is to be followed in the case of Ministers when complaints are brought forward. I was referring only to that.

It has been said by Prof. Ranga, that when these complaints arise, because it is the joint responsibility, the Prime Minister has to look into them; he has quoted what the first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, had done in his time.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): They are inconsistent, they are not coherent; there is no uniform policy followed.

Mr. Speaker: It is for the Prime Minister, now that these allegations have been made, whether she wants to say anything.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप क्या करेंगे ? कमेटी बनाएंगे या नहीं

2383 (ai) LS-3.

Mr. Speaker: That is for the Prime Minister.

The second thing is that these charges have been levelled on the floor of the House. It was urged that I should appoint a Committee to go into them. I had said that these proofs, if there are any further—of course, some have been laid on the Table—and any evidence that was intended to be brought, they might be sent to me so that I may look into them and then find out and give my opinion as to whether really it requires the constitution of a committee.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In the evident case of Shri Patil, you want further proof?

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने पत्रासों डाकूमेंट आपके पास भेजे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आप ने भेजे हैं उन से मैं सेटीसफाइड नहीं हूँ कि कोई कम किसी के खिलाफ आता है। और, जिस को मैं कमेटी के सामने सुपुर्द करूँ। (व्यवधान) दूसरी चीज अगर कोई हो सकती है बाहर तो वह तो बाहर का सवाल है। .. (व्यवधान)

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Some time-limit should be put to your investigation.

Mr. Speaker: Investigation?

Shri Nath Pal: Now, you have brought us to this point. You just now said that some documents have reached you, documents which were made use of or referred to in the House. If I followed your reply to Shri Limaye's interruption, you said that with regard to those documents that you are not satisfied, and would like to have further evidence.

Mr. Speaker: I had asked for any further evidence.

श्री नथु लियवे : टेलिक्स मेसेज जो मैंने आपके पास भेजा है सल्फर के बारे में, वह टेलिक्स मेसेज आपने पढ़ा है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने सब पढ़ा है । जिस तरह आप कान्क्लूजन निकलते हैं उसमें ऐसी नहीं करता ।

Shri Nath Pal: When you said that you are not satisfied, I do not know whether you were referring to all the documents or to some of them. I am not saying that the documents should be accepted. Once we make a plea to you, we must abide by your decision. That is implicit.

But let me conclude on this. We are all dispersing. We do not know what will be happening. But we go with this gnawing anxiety that on this major malady which is eroding the very foundations of our public life, we are not doing the proper thing by ourselves, by Parliament and by the country. I do not want to hold you to my views. But this is what we feel.

Shri Mathur had said that the Interim Report of the Administrative Reforms Commission had dealt with this matter. I had the privilege to be a Member of a Committee which has made a Final Report in this regard. That was the Santhanam Committee. Now, what did Government do in regard to that? The previous Home Minister said that he would accept 90 per cent of the recommendations of that Committee. May I say that he could have rejected 90 per cent of our recommendations but ought to have accepted this single recommendation. It is just like what is being done in regard to our import policy—you know I do not take the time of the House unnecessarily; you know how careful I am about that matter, and that I do not intervene unless absolutely necessary, but I have to make this point because there is a small worry which hurts me

and causes distress to me. We say that we are independent in the production of a particular commodity because we produce 98 per cent of the components and import only 2 per cent. But that 2 per cent may hold up all the production. It is the same thing with regard to these recommendations, with regard to the recommendation of the Santhanam Committee concerning the conduct of Ministers. The civil servants are not our major concern. It is what we as leaders do that is all important because we should behave as models.

In this respect, the procedure that the Government of India has laid down with regard to action on allegations has changed from Minister to Minister. It is said—you as a brilliant student of law know—that in England equity used to change according to the length of the shoe of the Lord Chancellor. Something like that happens here: one procedure with regard to the Mundhra case, another concerning Shri Malaviya and a third in the case of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. What we are anxious to know is whether when charges are made against me or against a Minister, a uniform policy will be laid down and followed and will be guaranteed. To this there should be a reply forthcoming. I very much like the objectivity, candour and honesty of my hon. friend, Shri Mathur, but as you know, Shri Mathur is little better than us in his authority. He remains a back-bencher of the House.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri L. N. Mishra): No, no; front bencher.

Shri Nath Pal: All right.

Let this be the greatest achievement of this Parliament that we did something concrete, uniform and positive in this respect. I know you cannot compel them to do anything. It is not witchhunting that we are after. I do not believe in character assassination. But what has been suggested, that you may be pleased to appoint a

committee which will look into these things, is an eminently reasonable proposal which should find your acceptance.

Mr. Speaker: I had said the other day that if some proof in any individual case is brought before me, I could look into it. I asked any Members who were in the possession of proof, apart from those that have already been produced and were on the file, to place them before me. This was what I said.

As regards the other point that the Government is not behaving in the manner it ought to. The only remedy Members have got is to censure a particular Minister or remove the Government itself. There is nothing that I can do.

Shri Tyagi: Along with that, it might also go into the record that the Ministers have contradicted the charges and repudiated them.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I only want to say this. As far as we are concerned, your decision is final. But I only say this that if the Prime Minister does not make a statement, men like Shri Patil will go and make sweeping remarks outside.

13 hrs.

POST-GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF
 MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RE-
 SEARCH, CHANDIGARH, BILL—
 Contd.

श्री बाल्मीकी (खुर्जा) : महोदय,
 मैं

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuruzha): We are only sitting up to 6 p.m. Naturally, the Patents Bill will not be reached. This is what the Government wanted, and it will happen.

Mr. Speaker: What can I do now?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: They have played their game quite well.

श्री बाल्मीकी : मैं "चिकित्सा शिक्षा और अनुसन्धान स्नातकोत्तर संस्थान चण्डीगढ़" विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ। इस अवसर पर मुझे पंजाब के स्वर्गीय मुख्य मंत्री, सरदार प्रताप सिंह कैरों की याद आती है, कि जिनके मस्तिष्क की यह संस्थान उपज है। उन्होंने अत्यन्त शक्ति लेकर अपने विशेष प्रभाव से इस संस्थान को जन्म दिया और इसके लिये प्रयास किया। मैं उन चिकित्सा शास्त्रियों को भी धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि जिन्होंने प्रयत्न करके, हादिक प्रयास करके और अपने चिकित्सा सम्बन्धी बुद्धिमत्ता से इस संस्था को चार चांद लगाये हैं। यह संस्था भारत सरकार की देख रेख में चण्डीगढ़ में उन्नति करने जा रही है और इस संस्था को राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्था घोषित करना उचित ही है। इस प्रकार की संस्थाएँ सारे देश के अन्दर खोलने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है, कुछ खुली हैं और अनेकों खोली जा रही हैं। मेरे मस्तिष्क में कोई शक नहीं है कि जो संस्थाएँ या इस प्रकार के संस्थान जो भारत सरकार की देख रेख में खुलते हैं, जैसे चण्डीगढ़ में, जो आज भारत सरकार के उत्तरदायित्व में संघीय राज्य है, यह संस्था खुलती है, तो पैसे या दूसरी दृष्टि से इनका कोई काम नहीं रहेगा तथा मैं समझता हूँ कि इनकी विशेष उन्नति और विकास भी हो सकेगा।

जिस स्थान पर यह संस्था खोली जा रही है, या जिस प्रदेश के अन्दर खोली जा रही है, कल तक वह समूचे पंजाब का अंग था, परन्तु आज हरियाणा प्रदेश अलग है, हिमाचल प्रदेश अलग है, पंजाब प्रदेश अलग है और चण्डीगढ़ एक अलग अपना स्थान रखता है। यदि इस स्थान को देखते हुए, मैं कुछ और तरह से कहूँ, तो अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप भी इस उच्च स्थान पर बैठे हैं तथा आपका प्रभाव भी मेरे मस्तिष्क पर है और वह इस दृष्टि से है कि इस प्रकार की चिकित्सा संस्था या संस्थान उन स्थानों