

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

frankly to the Minister that so-and-so is corrupt, how will the Ministers come to know of it? Is the Minister omniscient? It will be tantamount to the fact that we shall have to connive at corruption and keep quiet for fear of being prosecuted.

If I write today, as I said in my speech, that Mr Mathai has accepted illegal gratification, with a view to helping the Minister in an enquiry, still, I am open to prosecution. Though the Minister passes on to someone else that letter for enquiry, he is open to prosecution as well. It may be that in fact, the Minister may not be actually hauled up in a court of law, but that is a different matter.

There is just one more word which I would like to say with regard to the comments of *The Times*. The feud between Members of Parliament—with regard to the privilege of Members of Parliament—and the Press is a historical one. Ever since nearly two hundred years ago when the agitation was started, the press has always taken up that attitude, and in the present circumstances, the remarks of *The Times* are peculiarly inept. It says 'privileges of the Parliament, and not of the Members'. But article 105 definitely says, of the members of the Parliament and of the committees.

Shri Jadhav: Which shall be defined

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Therefore, I say that those remarks do not apply.

It is up to this House to reject this Bill if it likes, but I thought that here was a very important question of privilege involved, and I thought that it would be better that this House should concentrate its attention and in its wisdom to take whatever line of action it wants to take. I can only say that it will be a sad day when Members of Parliament are deterred from freely making complaints of corruption to the Minister. One hon. Member asked, 'If this privilege is

granted, what will become of democracy? I ask, 'What will become of democracy, if it is not granted?' Democracy will be corrupt to the core. Your administration will be corrupt to the core. No Member of Parliament will dare to point out to the Minister any corruption for fear of prosecution saying here is corruption right under his nose. If you think that the purity of administration is something less than the rights of half a dozen Members to go to a court of law, you are welcome to reject it. Otherwise, I think this is a Bill on which Government must bestow their attention, and even if they want to reject it, they must see to it that they bring forward some other legislation to safeguard the position of the Members of Parliament, so that they can discharge their duties fearlessly and freely.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is

"That the Bill to define powers, privilege and immunities of Parliament and its Members in certain respects be taken into consideration."

The motion was negatived

17 hrs.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of sections 56 and 123)

Mr Deputy-Speaker: We shall take up the next Bill—Shri Ram Krishan is absent. Shri Radha Raman

Shri Radha Raman (Chandni Chowk) I beg to move.

"That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951, be taken into consideration".

2305 Representation of PHALGUNA 1, 1880 (SAKA) the People (Amendment) Bill

The Bill which I have placed before this House is quite an innocent and harmless Bill. As will be noticed from the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I have made it clear that it is meant to amend sections 56 and 123 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would the hon. Member like to continue next time?

Shri Radha Raman: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House stands adjourned till 11-00 hours on Monday.

17.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, February 23, 1959/Phalguna 4, 1880 (Saka).