

friends in the Business Advisory Committee went on pressing for this legislation on two occasions. That is to say, for the last 15 to 20 days this issue is before us. It is not a surprise spring on the House. Since the West Bengal Assembly and Council have passed the Resolution for the abolition of the Council, why should we block it if they want its abolition. That was my thinking in giving this leave for introduction and since I have given leave it is there in the agenda now. I do not think any serious objection has been taken to this. Only, an assurance has been demanded by Shri Madhu Limaye that it should be passed this session.

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : It will be done.

MR. SPEAKER : It should not take more than a couple of hours because it is a unanimous decision of the State Assembly.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMIAH) : It depends on the availability of time.

MR. SPEAKER : We shall see if you can provide time for this. Now I will put it to the vote. The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the abolition of the Legislative Council of the State of West Bengal and for matters supplemental, incidental and consequential thereto."

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : Sir, I introduce the Bill.

16.15 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]  
COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL-Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Sezhiyan to continue his speech.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumba Konam) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, yesterday, I was speaking on the Bill which seeks to ban the company donations to political parties and also to abolish the managing agency system...

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) : Will you kindly tell us when the Minister is going to reply to the debate, today or on Thursday ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We have got still 2 hours and 35 minutes. He will be called, say, at about 5-30 P.M. Let the general discussion be concluded today.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Why not allow the Minister to reply on Thursday ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let us finish today at least the general discussion. There is pressure of time.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : If you call me before 5-30 P.M., I have no objection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We have got 2 hours and 35 minutes. One hour is for clause-by-clause consideration. So, one hour and 35 minutes remain for general discussion. I will call a few Members to speak. It must be concluded today.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Before 5-30 P.M. if you call me...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : In that case, you reply on the next day.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : That is all right.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Why don't we close the debate today and the Minister can reply to the debate on Thursday ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is all right.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : So, the clause-by-clause consideration will come up on Thursday after the Minister replies.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Yes.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** Sir, yesterday, I was speaking of the corrupt influence of the contributions by companies on the political parties and I also cited, apart from the contributions which are fully accounted, much of the unaccounted money which goes by the other name of black money has also gone to the coffers of the Congress Party. I also quoted from Mr. S. K. Patil himself who said, in the 1957 elections, as much as Rs. 5 crores were spent. At that time, the hon. Minister of Industrial Development intervened and said that the D. M. K. party might not have got contributions because it was not born then.

It was very much there for all these years. In 1949, the D. M. K. party was founded and in the last elections we spent as much as Rs. 10 lakhs from party funds. But none of the big business houses contributed a single pie.

As I said before, we got all this money from the people themselves for which the account has been fully given in our papers. How we got these funds? We used to go to every village, to every street corner, and organise meetings for which the people used to pay and come and listen to us. We used to collect four annas, eight annas, and in this way we collected small amounts from the poorer sections by organising dramas and meetings where the people used to pay and come and listen to our addresses. So, our account is open. That is how we collected the funds. That is the people's money given to the party, no black-marketing, no big business house, involved in it. We are very much proud of the small contributions that we have received from the poorer sections to whom we owe our allegiance and our existence. Because we do not accept any money from big houses, we are able to defy them in all the approaches they make. Once our late revered leader Anna used to say, money received from a big business house is like a butter received from the leper's hand. Let all political parties adopt the same procedure without involving themselves into the contributions made by the companies which throttle democracy and corrupt the very source of democratic institution in the country.

Regarding the second point, about the abolition of the managing agency system in

the country, I have to say that this is a very welcome move. The managing agency system in this country is an outmoded industrial feudal system where heredity plays a large part. Whatever useful services they might have done in the past, the system has now outlived its usefulness and it is high time that it was abolished. There was a Managing Agency Inquiry Committee which went into this question fully and they submitted their report about three years ago. But only now the Government has come forward with this.

Some of the arguments given in favour of the continuance of the managing agency system do not stand the test of reason and logic. Three reasons have been advanced for the continuance of the managing agency system. First, it is said that the managing agency system promotes formation of companies. Secondly, it is said that they provide the managerial talents for so many smaller and other companies. Thirdly, it is said that the managing agency system does financial promotions also. If we go into all these three things, we will find that they do not have any substantial base for them.

Let us see how far the managing agency system has contributed to promotion of companies. An analysis which has been made shows that out of the total number of non-governmental companies formed from 1956 to 1965, only 1.5 per cent of the companies were managed companies. All the others manage themselves. The authorised capital of the managed companies was only one per cent out of the total. Therefore, to say that the managing agency system has contributed to formation of new companies is not correct; the ten years' statistics do not prove that.

Regarding contribution of managerial talents, there also we find that nothing much has been done. From the structure of the managing agencies, as analysed as on 31st March, 1965, it is found that out of 860 managing agents, as many as 786 companies have been managing one company or to two companies. That means that more than 91 per cent have been managing only one company or two companies. A group of companies being managed by a single managing agency has not been common. That means that, under the name of managing agency system, they are infatuated only to draw

some commission without contributing anything to the managing system.

The third point was the financial promotion done by the managing agency system. That also has been proved false as per the Managing Agency Inquiry Committee's report; it has been found that only about 6.6 per cent of corporate funds have come from loans from managing agents or fixed deposits. 6.6 per cent is very limited. If we see the underwriting of capital issues, between 1963-64 and 1964-65, only 0.7 per cent has been given by the managing agents.

Therefore, neither in the field of promotion of new companies nor in the field of contribution of managerial talents nor in the field of financial promotion, has the managing agency system served any useful purpose. This is a past legacy. It is just like a parasite and they want to take the benefit out of the growing companies.

One argument was advanced as to why, if it is dying, we should not allow it to die of its own accord. Anything which is dying should not be allowed to live longer. In this age of advanced technological improvements, if you allow this system, it may very well become a source of concentration of economic power and concentration of industrial potential of this country. Because of the vast electronic system and computers a single company sitting in a small floor can manage so many companies. Then what is the fun of creating a law trying to curb the concentration of the economic power and trying to do away with the monopolistic tendencies in the country and on the other side giving the agency a thin wedge to be driven so that it may become a potential monopolistic centre. Even on the score that you want to do away with the monopolistic system in this country and concentration of wealth, the first you should do is that the past relic of the feudal industrial age should be abolished. The managing agency system should be done away with. As Mr. Masani considered it dying out,—it is better, Sir, if we give it an early and decent burial.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI R.K. SINHA (Faizabad) : I was listening to the speeches of some of the

Members of the Opposition. They gave partial support to this measure. Let me deal with Shri M. R. Masani first. He mentioned the great socialist party of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the Indian National Congress. He disparagingly mentioned about the great socialist party. I remember Shri Masani has a habit of denying his past. He is the person who wrote a pamphlet which was distributed by the Congress Socialist Party in the forties prising the virtues of the Soviet Union. When we were in jail in 1942, we were given a pamphlet by Mr. Masani 'Socialism Re-considered'. I do not know when he changed and became the defender of the monopoly Houses in India. Then, Sir, this great defender of the monopoly houses finding that there is a trend in support of this measure, is coming out with a neutral support. He has come out with a proposal for a joint Select Committee to discuss this Bill. He talks of the scientific system of management and this man who wants to look to the 21st century looks to the 16th and 18th century. He wants to support the tottering system of the capitalism. He is entitled to his views. The managing agency system has become the very nature of the capitalist society. Even the medium capitalist in this country to-day has developed a grouse against the monopolists because a few business houses have cornered the gains of the society. What is the managing agency system? It is a system of manipulation of the laws of economics in order to try to benefit a small minority. It is a system which denies the shareholders their proper share in the growth of the capital in the country. It is a system which militates against the very concept of freedom of the capitalist society which Shri Masani day in and day out wants. He makes no secret about his hatred of communism. He will sleep in the night and get up in the night woken up by the ghost of communism even if there are three warring communist parties in India. He talks of Moscow. He sometimes talks of China. Anybody who talks of curbing the rights of monopolists becomes a bug-bear to Shri Masani. He is entitled to his views. But the people of India will not accept those views of the Swatantra Party. Why do I support the measure brought forward by the hon. Minister? It is because the very basic structure of the society of India has become democratic. In this House I stated that a

[Shri R. K. Sinha]

man who rides a cycle cannot become an MLA. A man who rides a motor cycle cannot become a Member of Parliament. The very fact that our legislature and Parliament are to run to business houses in order to get their support, this built in structure in which our parliamentary democracy is being corrupted by the influence of big monopolists, this Bill has been brought forward to curb this system. I welcome it. We are a people's democracy. We want to be governed by the people and for the people. We do not want to be governed through the money of the industrialist for the industrialists. When you accept money from a business house, you are obliged to the business house. Money was exorted from big business houses. I want to say if the big business houses want to be puritans why are they so anxious to contribute to the Congress Party, the Swatantra Party, the Bharatiya Jan Sangh and all other Parties. Do they want to deny the shareholders of their money? Sometimes without consulting the small man who invests some money they went to give money to the parties. This must be denied. There is another factor which must be taken into view.

The power of money is a power which affects democracy in any country. The power of money creates bossism. The power of money creates hirelings in the State committees of the Parties. It leads to manipulation of membership, changing of membership; hiring of agents—District and provincial and corrupts the very structure of that society. This is the position of the Party which accepts money from big capitalists.

On the other side strength comes from the people, the peasantry, the working class, the youth and students of the country. If this Bill is passed, it will go a long way to purify the basic structure of democracy in this country. If some capitalists want to say that he wants real freedom, let him also come forward that this should be stopped. If they want to pay from their pocket, let them do so to their heart's content to the Swatantra Party. But this basic Bill should not be challenged in this House.

The other day the great defender of democracy in the country, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, talked of corrupt practices by the

Congress Party. Only day before yesterday there was a row in one of the Mohallas of Delhi. It was found that liquor had been distributed by the Bharatiya Jan Sangh to win votes. There was a group of 100 people who got liquor. How is it that 15,000 delegates were entertained at Bombay? It is being used by the Jan Sangh and they want to claim that they are the progressives in the country.

I wish to point out that it is the usurious class of people that the Jan Sangh represents.

Last year and the year before last, when there was sugar scarcity in this city, they sold sweets with the Bharatiya Jan Sangh labels. From the sale of this sweet, they got the money for their Party Fund.

Therefore, I ask: If this is not corruption in society, what else is corruption?

So, when this Bill is brought forward, we are trying to purify the social structure of the society of our country so that democracy shall not be corrupted.

Sir, no system in the world is permanent; no system in the world is perfect. That system alone is perfect which is acceptable to the people of the country at large. That system alone is perfect which serves the people of the country.

In India, there is a sinister conspiracy of the money-bags. There is the conspiracy of those people, who do not even feel for the people, and with the help of their wretched rags, they want to corrupt the democratic institutions of the country.

Sir, we have, many times, read in the Papers that the money-bags can buy legislators and ministers, that heads will roll if they do not have it their way. We have had elections for the Presidentship and Prime Ministership of the country. Certain Business Houses thought that they could decide the fate of the country. They failed in their objective.

I am not against the private sector or against the middle capitalists. But what I say is, they cannot decide as to who will rule this country. This Parliament is

sovereign and it has always been so. The power of money cannot influence the people of India, or the sovereign Parliament of India. Sir, I am not against the private sector. I am not against that growth in this country. But they must understand that they have to set some minimum standards in this country.

In these terms, I wish to support the measure that has been brought forward by the Minister.

**SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) :** I wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister for coming forward with this measure. After so much of canvassing and so much of hesitation, finally he has come forward with this piece of legislation. We are happy that it has been done. But look at the way it has been done. We find that he has done it reluctantly. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons he says :

"A view has been expressed that such contributions have a tendency to corrupt political life and to adversely affect healthy growth of democracy in the country, and it has been gaining ground with the passage of time.

He has so much reluctance to say that.

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** You go to the substance.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** That is true. Anyhow, at last it has come out of the horse's mouth that it is corrupting. Very good. But all these horses speak out after the indigestion created by swallowing lakhs of rupees from the Birlas and many others. The figures are there to speak. One of the Hon. Members said that Communists also got money. That is the only Party which does not get money and which does not claim to have got any money from monopolists and from business houses. We do not seek and we do not get.

**SHRI HIMATSINGKA (Godda) :** You get from outside India.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** It is all cock and bull story. It is no use saying so. We on this side are all happy that this measure has at long last come—except, of course, Swatantra Party because they belong to a group which contributes money for political purposes. Therefore, they do not believe in that. Barring them all others on this side are united on this,

Sir, we are happy that this provision has been brought forward and we accept it. Looking at the *modus operandi* of these big business houses, I have my own doubts whether the corruption would end with the passage of this Bill. Shri Sezhiyan explained that the black money is there. We cannot stop the black money from being passed over to other hands. It passes through black doors or back doors and all sorts of underhand dealings are there. We do not know how it can be prevented. But now business houses will find it difficult to do it openly. They will adopt all possible methods to see that corruption continues. I will ask a question to the Hon. Members on the other side. Otherwise, in a country like India, during the election campaigns throughout the country, where does a Party like the Congress get all the money? They are not collecting money from the people as we do.

**SHRI HIMATSINGKA :** Do you collect from people?

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** I collect money from the people. I started my election campaign in 1967 with Rs. 100/- in my hands. When the entire election was over, there were Rs. 200/- with me—that is, Rs. 100 more. I went from door to door, man to man. Nobody can challenge it. We have got money like that. But Congress members are not like that. For instance, take the case of the latest by-election the result of which is not yet announced. What is the news that has come about this election? One gentleman goes there and does lot of campaigning. Even the press reports favourable to this person gave stories about the wonderful way he managed his campaign. Just now an Hon. lady member has returned from that constituency with all the vigour. She also participated in the election campaign. Do you know how many jeeps were there? Where is the petrol for those jeeps and where is the money for the petrol?

**AN HON. MEMBER :** From the people.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** Which people? That is the point.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Rich people.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** Richer and the richest people, the most favoured class contributed money.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : He may spend from the back pocket while the other person may spend from the front pocket.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Where is the money in the pocket ? That is the question before us. Unless it comes from the people in the form of eight annas, a rupee or two, unless we collect it from the people in small amounts, how can we have money in our pockets ? It is only when money is collected from the people in this manner that the election will become more real. We are afraid that we are reaching a period when it will be impossible to contest an election to the Lok Sabha or to any other elected body because we shall have no money to fight the elections which have become very costly now-a-days. Hon. Members may say that what I say is wrong. But I may point out that money is being spent very lavishly in millions and that money is the money from the business-houses and from those who can pay.

If democracy is to survive in this country it is our duty to see that elections are not made so costly so that the poor man or the ordinary citizen of this country might be in a position to contest the election and the rivalry born out of money power is put an end to and that black money is not allowed to pervade into the bodypolitic of electioneering and the democratic set-up in this country.

In regard to the abolition of the managing agency system, I am thankful to the hon. Minister that at last, though late, Government have agreed to this. But the question is this. Will it work ? I find that the provision in the Bill is doubtful, for it reads thus :

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or in the memorandum or articles of association or any contract to the contrary where any company has on the appointed day a managing agent or secretaries and treasurers, the term of office of such managing agency or as the case may be the secretaries and treasurers shall expire, if it does not expire earlier, on the appointed date".

Am I to take it that the managing agency

system will be abolished completely from that appointed day.....

SHRI HIMATSINGKA : That is the provision.

SHRI NAMBIAR : What is the appointed day then ? Is the appointed day the same for all companies or is it different for different companies ?

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA (Banka) : It is 3rd April, 1970: It is mentioned there already.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Is it for all companies ?

SHRI HIMATSINGKA : Yes, for all companies.

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA : For all companies.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Then, there is some relief. Then, we can canvass here for the appointed day.

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA : It is 3rd April, 1970.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA : It is 3rd April, 1970 and not 1st April, 1970.

AN HON. MEMBER : That is the doomsday.

SHRI NAMBIAR : The hon. Member says that it is the doomsday. I do not say that it is the doomsday for my hon. friend but for the managing agency system. Anyhow, I am glad that on the appointed day, that is, the 3rd April, 1970, the managing agency system will be put an end to. But I am afraid that in its place other systems may come into existence whereby the notorious system may have an entry. To the extent that this Bill seeks to abolish managing agencies, there is progress. But will it solve the other problem ? I am afraid that it will not. To the extent that the Bill is progressive, we do not accept it.

During this session, this is one of the best pieces of legislation that we are passing. When the session is over, let us go back to the people and say that something substantial and good has been done. The credit for this goes to the hon. Minister and his able assistant. I congratulate them on having forward this Bill.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I am grateful to you for

accommodating me in the very short time that you have at your disposal. Very rarely do I agree with Shri Nambiar, but on this occasion, I would agree with him. It may be a surprise to him because he is never reasonable to me, but for his benefit, I would tell him that I am always responsible to him.

16.44 hrs.

[SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD in the Chair]

It is a fact that the whole system of electioneering has become so expensive that this country must indulge in serious public education; we parliamentarians have his obligation to start a debate in this country to see that elections are not allowed to become so expensive. It is a kind of competition. Shri Nambiar looked very innocent. But if somebody spends money on elections, then the other man also is obliged to spend money, because there is a rebounding effect. A person may not want to spend any money in the elections. But when one is fighting elections, one cannot go and sit in the Ramakrishna Mission and spend the time, but one has to meet strategy with strategy. Therefore, there is a snow balling effect. If one spends something for elections, then the other party also has to spend money in elections. (Interruptions) My hon. friends have money from various indirect channels. The Indian tax payers pay their political donations to the political parties, but there are many invisible tax-payers who may pay money for elections to certain parties.

I do not want to mention names, because I believe in the couplet :

“भेरे कलाम से बेहतर है मेरी खामोशी, न जाने कितने सवालों की आबरू रखली” ।

All the same, he should not provoke me. Otherwise, I will expose him.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly translate it into English.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :

I said :

“भेरे कलाम से बेहतर है मेरी खामोशी, न जाने कितने सवालों की आबरू रखली” ।

It means—my silence is probably much better for them because it is hidden

behind many questions which would have been exposed had I spoken.

Coming to the point, it is a fact that when a dispute arose about Tata's contribution to Political parties, they went in appeal. Though the appeal was granted by Mr. Justice Tandulkar, he was quite conscious when he delivered judgment on 11 January, 1967 about its effects. I quote :

“The power of money is proverbially known to work in many many insidious ways difficult in many cases to detect, and the danger is obviously the greater when we are dealing with monies which large corporations are free to donate.”

Further, in view of the legal provision, he felt compelled to permit alteration of the memorandum of association. In his judgment, he permitted it so that the political donations provision could be incorporated in the memorandum of association. But later on when an appeal was made by the same party to the Bombay High Court, the judgment of the Division Bench delivered on 21 July, 1967 was in these terms :

“It is with considerable uneasiness of mind and a sinking feeling in the heart we approach this appeal of the Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., that they should be permitted by an amendment of their memorandum of association to make contributions to political parties.”

It said further :

“Democracy in this country is a nascent democracy. It is necessary that democracy should be looked after.”

Painfully they have come to the conclusion that :—

“any proposal or suggestion which is likely to strangle that democracy almost in its cradle must be looked at not only with considerable hesitation but with a great deal of suspicion. Democracy in a political system which ensures decisions by discussion and debate is a healthy phenomenon, but the discussions and debates must be conducted honestly and objectively and decision must be arrived at on merits without being in-

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

fluenced or actuated by any extraneous considerations. On first impression, it would appear that any attempt on the part of anyone to finance a political party is likely to contaminate the very springs of democracy."

These are not the words of an ordinary individual, but are the conclusions of distinguished Judges who have looked at donations to political parties with great suspicion.

But whom to fight? The Government of the party to which I have the privilege to belong has been the greatest defaulter in this.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Very well said.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I have no hesitation in saying it. I am not like Shri Nambiar to gulp even the poison of his party. I have this courage of conviction.

SHRI NAMBIAR : It is in black and white here.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : My party was a party which fought elections with little money. I remember Motilal Nehru fought election at one time with four annas.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peer-made) : When?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Long ago.

Even today I think many MPs fight elections with very little money because they look after their constituencies. I do not have that kind of disillusionment with the people of this country. They have a sense of obligation. They have a sense of gratitude. I am convinced that it is very easy to handle elections through money, but it is a little harder way to go and serve the people of the constituencies. It should be the people's problem that their representative must be elected.

I know Shri Nambiar cannot get away by talking innocently that he has no money. We know who finances his election. He is a trade union leader. His trade union finances his elections. We are not leaders of trade unions; therefore we suffer. I do not grudge him. If

such organisations finance elections, we have no grudge; we do not mind it. But I have faith in the people of India and even today in the case of Members who go and work hard in their constituencies, so much money will not be needed in the elections. Shri Bibhuti Mishra fought his first parliamentary elections with 750/-. We have also not spent lot of money. But the system tends to become vicious and it is like a snowball. When one party starts spending money, the other parties also do not want to win the hearts, but compensate it by spending money, and therefore there are defaulters on both sides. I have this grudge against the Government. They should have nipped it in the bud. They brought an earlier Bill protecting donations. They legalise company loans. That was the time when they could have educated the public and elections were not so expensive. Today the method adopted in the elections is different. A lot of political donations are coming through companies and they will all go underground and will come through the black money. At least in the budget, it is noted now. Government have obligations and political parties have equal obligations and both have to sit together and devise ways and means by which elections could be fought cheap.

Two or three things made me unhappy. When the Government were conducting an enquiry into the affairs of Birlas, why did they collect money from them? It was this Government's moral obligation to say that because an enquiry was pending, they would not collect money. It does not become my party that the Government should indulge in these indiscretions so that we get a bad name. This sort of thing should not be repeated. Under what legal provisions, the party was allowed to accept a loan from the Birla group of companies? The company law does not permit loans for political parties. I understand Rs. 15 lakhs came as loan and it was allowed. If my Party is condemned, I feel the pinch of it and I have my loyalty to the party. Therefore, I have to complain against the Government. Why did they allow this to happen? This is the most vulnerable aspect and our *bona fides* are questioned. Why should we allow it? There should be no two voices. We should not talk with one voice and act in a different way. Democracy

is an open book and nothing remains secret. With great feeling of pain, I say that such political donations should have been stopped. Today somebody says that we have double dealings with Birlas and certainly that charge sticks because we had become vulnerable. It was a mistake to accept donations from persons for mid-term elections when an enquiry was pending against them.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** Very correct confessions. Let there be more confessions.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :** I am not used to receiving lollypops from Mr. Nambiar ; I feel and I say what I feel without fear or favour. It is not behind the curtain ; it is above the curtain. So, this Bill should be welcomed and it will create conditions in the country whereby elections could be fought cheaply. We should find other ways and means also. It is a fact that in the beginning some money will come through the back doors. Some people will be benefited by that. It is a fact, as Mr. Patel pointed out, that at the present moment, political donations are clean donations. It is a fact that they are clean. Nobody can deny that, because they are shown in the balance-sheets. But the money that goes into the pockets of the hon. Members are not known to anybody. Therefore, that is not clean. But this is clean and open. Therefore there is no viciousness so far as that deal is concerned. But the very purpose, the very motives, the very background of company donations should be discouraged. And let us see if democracy can survive. Does this democracy survive through money? Democracy will survive through the will of the people ; democracy will survive through the rights and desires of the people who want to keep up this democracy.

Even in the past, in 1952, we found that the party elections were comfortably fought with one car. But in the same constituencies, I have found later that they have asked for more. If there was no money, they would not have asked, but they know that funds were coming, and therefore, they ask. It may be difficult ; I do agree that it will be difficult to go and work in the constituencies to get the votes. But is it worthwhile because there is no end. It is a process of snow-balling : what you

call *ninnanabe ka phera*. There is no end to it.

In America, in regard to the election of Abraham Lincoln to the Congress, the first time when he was elected, it was fought with 200 dollars. But when he fought the Presidency, it became one million dollars. John Kennedy's election was fought with 11 million dollars, and much more has been spent in Mr. Nixon's election. (*Interruption*) I am not repeating the American history. If you allow me, I can quote the entire American history. But you had better listen and get information and then talk. I think that if this process is allowed to grow, it will go on and on and finally become a Frankenstein. Let us nip it in the bud.

I therefore welcome this Bill. Whatever past sins the Government have committed, here is the Government which has come forward courageously with this Bill. I condone their past sins and I welcome this proposal. I condone their sins in accepting money from Birlas. It is a sin to me. But I condone it, because I think that the Government has undone the past and has brought this Bill with courage. I therefore commend this Bill.

One word about the managing agency system. The managing agency system have become out-of-date in the entire world. The whole world today is living on the efficient executive. In this country also, the concept of ownership must change. But I would ask the hon. Minister, has he done enough to see that the concept of ownership must change? In any country even in the capitalist countries like America, to which some Members over there are allergic, they do not allow one individual to get hold of the ownership of the national assets more than half a per cent. But here if you take the leading companies, they have one and a half per cent, one and a quarter per cent, of the total national assets. Why not Government come forward and tell them that they cannot go beyond it? What is the use of merely hunting after Birlas? Are the Birlas going to solve the problem? If they want to stop Birlas in this way, a 101 Birlas will be born because it is your licensing system which has created all this Frankenstein. You had better improve it, where it pinches. You improve your licensing system. Do

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

not allow them to grow beyond a certain point.

The other day, I was reading in the newspapers the case of an American company; they had gone beyond the anti-trust laws by even less than just one per cent. But immediately, the anti-trust laws machinery in America moved in that direction and the company was asked to sell its shares, its ownership, and asked to conform to the limits provided by the law. Why don't you see that some such thing is done so that Birlas may not be born, so that Sahu Jains may not be born, so that Tatas may not be born, rather than witch-hunting into these matters?

17 hrs.

I know the Vivian Bose Inquiry Commission went into the matters and for 10 years they did not bring out much, because they cannot go beyond the law, and the law would not permit them to suggest that these companies must be liquidated. They cannot do it. They can only go into the question of improprieties, if Birlas had committed or Sahu Jain had committed or anybody has committed some improprieties. It would not have affected the ownership of Birlas at all. It would have only gone into some taxation proposals, some improprieties on which the Commission could have recommended that the law should take its own course. They cannot over-power the law. That would not have solved the problem. So, I am glad Government have clearly said that they are not interested in appointing enquiry committees. If you want to fight these tendencies honestly, bring a proper executive functioning in the country. In the managing agency system, the ownership remains in the background. Today in this country the executive should be encouraged. We have very bright people both in the public and private sectors. I am not anti-private sector, like Mr. Nambiar. The executive should be encouraged in this country, not because somebody was their grandfather. I welcome the abolition of the managing agency system. When I met the young business executives in the junior chambers of commerce, they also welcome this proposal. The other day in Ahmedabad I met some top businessmen, young boys...*(Interruption)*. They

are like my sons. I know Mr. Nambiar suffers from many complexes, but I did not realise that he suffers from this complex also. I was naturally very happy and proud when I found them so invigorated and the kind of mission they were developing. They know that an evolution is taking place in the business executives. I found a big change even in those whose parents and grandparents were big businessmen. They realise that this system of ownership has to change and they will cooperate with you if you ask for their cooperation. I am sure this will create a tremendous public opinion in this country and therefore, I welcome it.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS (Bankaura) : Sir, the Companies (Amendment) Bill, banning financial contribution by the corporate sector to political parties and individual has at last been brought before the House after such delay and hesitation on the part of the ruling party and the Government. The delay and hesitation is quite understandable because the provisions in the company law enabling big business houses to contribute to the coffers of political parties had worked mainly for the benefit of the Congress Party. Government's own figures show that between 1962-63, and 1967-68, the Congress Party had received a total sum of Rs. 2,05,22,790 as donation from big business houses. During the last general elections, the Congress Party was the highest recipient of contributions from big business.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : That was over-ground, not under-ground like you.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : Sir, the hon. lady member, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, said that she did not spend much for her election. But I just want to know what is amount Birla spent to get her elected.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I would like to challenge the hon. member. Let he himself conduct an enquiry. Not even Rs. 5 was spent by anybody for me. Nobody can dare to point a finger at me. I challenge him to prove any businessman spent even Rs. 5 for me. We do not come by Russian and Chinese money.

Our grandfathers were not working with Birlas.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central) : Sir, on a point of order. This is a personal allegation. Unless the allegation made by the hon. Member against Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha is substantiated, he should not be allowed to proceed with it. That portion must be deleted or expunged from the proceedings. If at all he has any evidence let him place it on the Table.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Sir, this is very serious matter. I would not like to allow that charge to remain unchallenged.

SHRI VASUDENAN NAIR : Sir, may I help you? I am sure Shri Bhandare would agree with me when I say that his party received large sums of money from the Birlas during the last general elections.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : But this is an allegation against an individual member.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Sir, he was mentioned my name and said "I would like to know how much money Birlas have spent for the election of Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha." Either he should substantiate that or he should withdraw his remarks. In my speech I referred to Shri Bibhuti Mishra and said that when he came the first time to Parliament he spent only Rs. 750 and I know it. That has nothing to do with my election. These remarks should be expunged.

MR. CHAIRMAN : If any member makes a personal allegation against another member, I will expunge it.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Sir, they should not be allowed to get away after making such kind of allegations in this House. Then we will also tell them where they get the money from. There will be no end to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let the hon. Member explain what he said.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : I simply said that I do not know what is the amount that Birlas have spent for Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.

SHRI NAMBIAR : It is up to her to give that information !

SHRI DHIRESHWAR KALITA (Gauhati) : He has not said that she has received so much.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : That is exactly the allegation. He does not know and yet he talks.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Since the hon. Member says that he has not made any allegation, we need not pursue that matter. He may continue with his speech.

SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV (Bara-mati) : Sir, on a point of order. Rule 352(2) says :

"A member while speaking shall not—

\* \* \*

(ii) make a personal charge against a member."

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has already clarified that he has not made any allegation. So, I am not going to allow this point of order.

SHRI TULSHIDAS JHADAV : He has again used the same words.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, I am not going to permit it.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Sir, some of them have learnt the technique of Hitler—say a lie a hundred times and it will stick. He has made this statement, knowing fully well that it will be carried in the newspapers and his purpose is served.

Sir, I therefore appeal to you that you must ask him to apologize or you must expunge these words from the proceedings.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member has said that he has not made any allega-

[Mr. Chairman]

tions against you. Then why should you worry? (*Interruptions*) I am sorry, I am not going to allow any further discussion on this point.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : I was talking of the money.....

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : Indian or Russian ?

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : .....received by the Congress Party in 1967 which is published and accounted for. It comes to Rs. 87 lakhs. In this Rs. 87 lakhs, which the Congress Party received in the year 1967, I do not include the amount which this party has received from underground sources.

We have to consider why the Congress Party has come out with this Bill now. Is it because the Congress Party learnt a lesson out of their defeat in the last mid-term elections? Or is there some other reason? While introducing the Bill, the Minister in charge said that he has made some promises to the hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye, that he would move a Bill on these lines. Is it because of that the Bill has come before the House? The case is not like that. It is very clear to me that when the Congress Party which was the only recipient of the contributions from the business houses subsequently found that the other parties formed by the capitalist class in this country like the Jana Sangh and the Swatantra parties, were also receiving contributions from the business houses, when the Congress party saw that they were not the only recipient but other parties were also receiving donations, it was a cause of headache for the Congress Party and that is why they have brought forward this Bill.

The beneficiaries, other than the Congress Party, of the contributions from the business houses, as I said, the Jana Sangh and the Swatantra parties, are also there and I may give you the amounts they have received. During the period 1962-63 and 1967-68, the Swatantra party received a total sum of Rs. 46,62,553 of which 1967-68 contribution amounted to Rs. 25 lakhs. During the same period, the Jana Sangh party received a sum of Rs. 1,20,399. Again, I may tell you and, through you, to the

House that this is the amount which has been accounted for and published and that the moneys received by these political parties through underground sources are not included here.

Now, the question comes as to why the big business was giving financial contribution to the political parties and individuals and for what return? As I mentioned earlier, in 1967, the Congress party alone received Rs. 87 lakhs. The top contributors to this amount were, namely, Birla contributed Rs. 15.51 lakhs, Tata contributed Rs. 11.70 lakhs, Shri Bharat Ram's Delhi Cloth Mills contributed Rs. 6.25 lakhs, Sahu-Jain group contributed Rs. 6.20 lakhs and Martin Burn contributed Rs. 5.70 lakhs. This is from the press reports. The purpose of the big business houses in extending financial assistance to the ruling party and other parties is very clear. By their contributions, they want to bring the political top-brass of the parties, specially of the party in power, into a relationship of close contact and affinity with money and business power, thereby influencing them to take all possible steps to facilitate their plunder of the economy.

The Congress Party and the Government at the Centre has been very loyal to them in this respect. Under the Congress rule, the power, position and influence of the big business and monopoly houses has grown tremendously. It is known to everybody. Not only they have been able to gather huge wealth and expand their business empire limitlessly uninterrupted but also they have been able to build up a powerful lobby in this House in their favour. They have also been in a position to create a solid clique of stooges in the highest organ of the ruling party. They have also their men in the Government itself. Otherwise how can one explain the stubborn resistance of the Government to institute high-powered probe into the affairs of the Birla house. Some Members of the Congress Party themselves have levelled serious charges against Birla house. Who does not know that the charges against Birla house relate to evasion of taxes, jugglery of shares, violation of company laws, patronage of bureaucracy, corruption and various other forms of foul games and mal-practices. Is it not a fact that the Government itself has admitted that

some of the charges are genuine. In the Rajya Sabha also, the charges were levelled not by Communist members but by Congress members, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, Mr. Mohan Dharja and others. Government have agreed that many of the charges are correct. Why then is this reluctance on the part of the Government to institute a high level inquiry into the Birla affairs? Of course, we know the reasons for that. We know how many shares one of the Finance Ministers has got in Alco-Chemicals, a Birla concern, and we also know the fact amount that particular Minister is paid per annum. We also know that a Deputy Minister had the agency of Hyderabad Asbestos, Not only the Parliament but even ordinary man of this country knows about the scandal of *Morarji-bhai Khantibhai* and Birlas. This is not a point raised from the Opposition side. This was a point raised by the Congress members not only on the floor of Parliament but in the meeting of AICC itself at Faridabad the other day.

Many instances are there wherefrom it will be seen that the Congress Party, in order to satisfy Birlas, made heinous attacks on a section of national bourgeois of this country.

There is the story of taking over the Metal Corporation of India. The Metal Corporation of India of Rajasthan was developed by one Shri A. C. Dutta, who is not a multi-millionaire but is a technical man, sacrificing his everything, so to say. When it became a profitable concern, Birla wanted to purchase the lion's share of this business in order to bring this business fully under his grip. But the managing body of that Corporation did not agree to that proposal by Birla. Therefore, according to the dictation from Birla, the Government took over that Corporation under the D. I. R. Act. Thus a profitable concern with bright future has been made a losing concern with an uncertain future—only because they opposed Birla to be the *de facto* owner of the Corporation.

We also know that one Shri Raghunath Singh, who is a Birla man, has been made the Chairman of Hindustan Zinc Limited which was taken over by Government because they could not satisfy Birla.

Although very late, I must say that the Bill is a welcome measure as far as it goes. But mere banning of contribution by the companies to political parties and persons will help...

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member should conclude.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : Most of my time was taken away by interruptions.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have allowed five minutes for those *Interruptions*.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : I will finish in two minutes. Unfortunately the power and influence of big money is so strong that the Congress party and its Government do not dare to take any drastic steps in this direction. On the other hand, the Government is bent on following the same economic policies which have led to growth of monopoly in our country. Government economic policies are oriented in favour of the private sector and big money. At one time it was said that the public sector was being developed in such a way as to capture commanding heights in the economy. Now in the Fourth Plan we see that the private sector has been allotted a considerably huge outlay. No new project is to be taken up in the public sector during the Fourth Plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI J.M. BISWAS : Foreign capital is on the increase. Controls and curbs on the private sector are being gradually withdrawn. More and more industries are being exempted from licensing. There is increasing talk about true market economy. Scientific approach to planning has fallen a prey to pragmatism. Economic disparities are widening...

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secundabad) : There is no quorum in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Bell is being rung...

Now there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS : Unemployment is on the increase. Workers' rights

[Shri J. M. Biswas]

are being curbed by various repressive laws. All these are the results of the wrong policies pursued by the Government in the past.

It is surprising that even after the Monopoly Enquiry Commission report no effective measures were taken to curb the growth of monopoly. An official study made by the Company Law administration has shown that during the short period of 3 years from 1963-64 to 1966-67 the total assets of Tatas has recorded an increase of 32% from Rs. 417.7 crores to Rs. 531 crores and that of the Birlas has increased by 74%.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow you any further. You please conclude now.

SHRI J. M. BISWAS: The total assets of Birlas have increased by 64% from Rs. 290 crores to Rs. 510 crores and of the comparatively smaller Mafatlal Group by 174% from Rs. 46 crores to Rs. 127 crores.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should conclude. Nothing will go on record. I have given you 6 minutes more. I cannot give you any further time. You please resume your seat. Shri Tulsidas Jadhav.

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव (बारामती): सभापति महोदय, कम्पनी अमण्डमेंट बिल हाउस के सामने है और इसके ऊपर बहुत से सदस्यों के भाषण हुए। मेरी राय में इस बिल के लिए गवर्नमेंट को बघाई देनी चाहिये। जितनी भी पार्टियों के सदस्यों के भाषण अब तक हुए, मैंने उनको बड़े ध्यान से सुना और सुनने के बाद मेरी राय यह है कि इस बिल के बारे में कोई भी सदस्य खिलाफ नहीं है। यह बात दूसरी है कि इस बिल को लाने के लिए सरकार को किसी ने ज्यादा धन्यवाद दिया हो और किसी ने कम, लेकिन इस के खिलाफ कोई नहीं बोला।

इस बिल पर बोलते समय कई भाइयों ने अलग-अलग पार्टियों पर इल्जाम लगाये और वे

इल्जाम हो सकता है कि किसी हद तक ठीक भी हों, लेकिन इसमें कोई चीज छिपी हुई नहीं थी। डोनेशन लेने का कानून बनाने के बाद सभी पार्टियों ने हर एक कम्पनी से डोनेशन लिया, इसलिये इसमें बेकानूनी का सवाल नहीं आता, सवाल यह है कि कम्पनियों के जरिये जो डोनेशन पार्टियों को मिला—उसी दृष्टि से हम को इसको देखना है। यह स्वाभाविक बात है कि जो पार्टी सत्ता में होती है उस को कम्पनियां ज्यादा डोनेशन दे सकती हैं—दुनिया भर में ऐसा ही होता है। लेकिन एक पार्टी के लिए चुनौती करना, उस पर क्रिटिसिज्म करना, उस पर इल्जाम लगाना, यह जरूरी नहीं था। मेरे पहले जो भाई बोले और उन्होंने जो आंकड़े बताये, उस में उन्होंने कांग्रेस, जनसंघ और स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के आंकड़े बताये—वे बराबर हैं। लेकिन उन्होंने यह आंकड़े नहीं बताये कि दूसरी पार्टियों ने कितना लिया। दूसरे के लिए नाम रखना और अपने लिये कुछ न कहना यह उचित नहीं है। जो कम्प्युनिस्ट पार्टी है उसने भी कुल 8,753 रु० डोनेशन में लिये। मैं मानता हूँ यह बहुत कम है, लेकिन सवाल कम और ज्यादा का नहीं है। सवाल सिद्धान्त का है कि कम्पनी से पैसा लिया या नहीं। एक घादमी शराब की दूकान में गया उस ने एक बोतल ली और दूसरे ने एक पैग लिया। तो काम तो दोनों ने बुरा किया। बुराई है तो बुराई है ही।

एस. एस. पी. ने भी 1963 से 1968 तक 24,550 रु० डोनेशन में लिये। पी. एस. पी. हिन्दू महा सभा, मुस्लिम लीग और पाकिस्तान मुक्लिम लीग, सभी ने डोनेशन लिये। मुस्लिम लीग ने तो कम्पनियों से 1,69,369 रु० लिये। तो मेरा कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि इस बिल की तरफ हम तात्त्विक दृष्टि से देखें। एक दूसरे पर इल्जाम लगाने से कोई काम नहीं बनता और न उस में कोई तथ्य है क्योंकि हर एक ने थोड़ा बहुत लिया है। कांग्रेस चूँकि सत्ता में है बहुत दिनों से जनता का काम कर रही है इस-

लिये लोगों ने उस को अधिक डोनेशंस दिये । उसूलन में कम्पनी में डोनेशन लेने के खिलाफ़ हूँ और इस की वजह यह है कि कम्पनी के लिए फिर प्रोबलाइज, उतराई होना पड़ता है और वह को कुछ करती है उसके खिलाफ़ ऐक्शन लेने में कोई सरकार हो या पार्टी हो, तैयार नहीं होती है । इसलिये उन से पैसा लेना ठीक नहीं है ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि कंपनी को भी ऐसा लगता है कि हम पैसा देते हैं तो हम कुछ भी करा करें मिनिस्टर और अफ़सर हमारे तावे में रहते हैं । और इस बारे में बार-बार पार्लियामेंट में सवाल भी होते हैं । तो उनसे पैसा नहीं लेना चाहिये । अब जो कानून बनाने जा रहा है वह ठीक है कि ऐसा पैसा न लिया जाय । और अगर कोई पैसा ले या दे तो तीन वर्ष की सजा है । अगर पोलिटिकल पार्टी को डेमोक्रेसी में जिन्दा रहना है और सच्ची डेमोक्रेसी देश में लाना है तो लोगों से ज्यादा से ज्यादा सम्पर्क हो और लोगों से डोनेशंस लें और खर्च करें । जब ज्यादा पैसा कंपनी से मिलता है तो आदमी भी और पार्टी भी ज्यादा खर्च करती है । मेरी राय से चुनाव में ज्यादा खर्च करना भी डेमोक्रेसी के लिये घातक है, घोखा है ।

**श्री मधु लिमये (मुं गेर) :** पाटिल साहब ने कितना खर्च किया यह भी तो बताइये । कम से कम 25 लाख हो सकता है कि 50 लाख भी हो ।

**श्री तुलशी दास जाधव :** वह आप को मालूम होगा । मैं न पार्टी के लिये बोलता हूँ और न मधु लिमये जी के लिए बोलता हूँ ।

मेरा तो यह कहना है कि एलैक्शंस में ज्यादा खर्च करना ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि उस से घनवान और श्रीमंत लोग आगे आते हैं और जाहिर है कि वह कानून आदि अपने लिये करते हैं और उस देश में न तो जैसा मेरे उधर के भाई नारा लगाते हैं कम्युनिज्म आयेगा और न

ही सोशलिज्म आयेगा बल्कि श्रीमंत व घनवान लोगों की ग्रिप उम्मीदवारों पर हो जायगी और पैसे वालों को ही मोनोपली हो जायगी जो कि वांछनीय नहीं होगा । अगर चुनावों के दौरान उम्मीदवार लोग, चाहे वह किसी भी पार्टी के क्यों न हों, पूंजीपतियों की तरफ़ ताकेंगे तो जहाँ वह उचित नहीं होगा । आये बिन की तरह से एक दूसरे की टीका टिप्पणी में ही अपनी सारी शक्ति खर्च करते रहेंगे और अपने कर्तव्य का पालन ठीक तरीके से नहीं कर पायेंगे । इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि किसी भी पार्टी को इस रीति से घनिकों से पैसा लेकर उनके प्रोब्लि-गेशन और असर में नहीं आना चाहिए ।

मेरा निवेदन है कि एक व्यक्ति जो कि ईमानदारी से जनता के बीच में काम करता है उसे अपने चुनाव के दौरान अनापशानाप खर्चा करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है । मैं खुद अपनी ही बात बतलाता हूँ कि सन् 1937, 46, 52, 57, 62 और हाल के 1967 के चुनावों के सिलसिले में मेरा खर्चा खुद का कभी भी 2000 रुपये से अधिक नहीं रहा है । सन् 37 में तो वह 400-500 तक ही रहा और 46 को देखा जाय तो हजार, दो हजार के ऊपर कभी खर्चा मेरा खुद का नहीं हुआ है । इस का कारण यह है कि मैं लोगों से जनता से सम्पर्क बनाये रखता हूँ, उन के बीच काम करता हूँ और उनकी शिकायतों को सुन कर उन्हें दूर कराने की भरसक कोशिश करता रहा हूँ । हमें दरअसल इस तरह का रवैय्या अपनाना चाहिए ताकि आम जनता यह महसूस करे कि अमुक व्यक्ति जो विधानमंडलों या पार्लियामेंट में जाता है तो वह उनका सच्चा प्रतिनिधित्व वहाँ करता है और बिना किसी भ्रिभ्रक के ईमानदारी के साथ अपने निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र का केस वहाँ पर रखता है । जाहिर बात है कि इस रीति से अगर लोग यहाँ पर चुनकर आयेंगे और जनता की सेवा का दृष्टिकोण अपने सामने रख कर काम करेंगे तो वह हकीकत में उस जनता का सही प्रतिनिधित्व यहाँ पर

[श्री तुलशीदास जाधव]

हिम्मत के साथ कर सकेंगे जिसने कि उन्हें यहां चुन कर भेजा है। एक आत्मविश्वास की भावना के साथ वह यहां ईमानदारी के साथ अपने कर्तव्य का पालन कर सकेंगे क्योंकि वह किसी के पैसे के भार से दबे हुए नहीं होंगे, किसी के उस माने में गुलाम नहीं होंगे।

मैं यह कहता हूँ कि नदी जो बहती है वह समुद्र की तरफ जाती है वह उल्टे पहाड़ की तरफ नहीं जाती है और यकीन मानिये कि आज की दुनिया सम्पत्ति का कंसंट्रेशन कभी सहन नहीं करेगी। इस तरह से पैसे का कुछ हाथों में सिकुड़ कर रह जाना आज की दुनिया इसे देर तक बर्दाश्त नहीं करने वाली है। डेमोक्रेसी की पवित्रता बनाये रखने के लिए यह खर्चा कम से कम करना चाहिए और अगर कोई पार्टी ईमानदारी व मुस्तैदी से जनता के बीच काम करे तो उसे अपने उम्मीदवारों के लिए गैर-जरूरी खर्च की जरूरत भी नहीं पड़नी चाहिए। हमने देखा है कि जो उम्मीदवार जनता में सेवा किये रहते हैं गांवों की जनता ने उस के लिए जहां वोट दिये वहां बँलगाड़ी आदि की सहूलियत भी प्रदान की। हम जब उनको घन्यवाद स्वरूप पान, सुपारी देने गये तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम किसी का पान, सुपारी नहीं लेंगे। कहने का मकसद यह है कि इस रीति से जनता से ताल्लुक बनाए रख कर उन के बीच में काम करना चाहिए।

मसानी साहब का भाषण हमेशा मैं बड़े ध्यान से सुनता हूँ और उनकी विद्वत्ता का मैं बड़ा कायल हूँ। वह काफी वर्षों से इधर कांग्रेस की टीका कर रहे हैं। इसी तरह हमारे कम्युनिस्ट्स भाई हैं वह भी जनता में काम करते हैं, उन में बहुत से त्यागी हैं और उन्होंने पिछले जमाने में काफी कुर्बानियां दी हैं लेकिन वह भी इस तरह से आये दिन कांग्रेस की टीका टिप्पणी किया करते हैं। मेरा उन सभी लोगों से कहना है कि अभी आम चुनाव में तीन वर्ष बाकी रहते

हैं और यह टीका उसके 4-6 महीने पहले से आरम्भ करें तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ। अभी वह इस में अपनी शक्ति का अपव्यय क्यों कर रहे हैं? लेकिन रोजाना इस तरीके से अगर वह आलोचना कांग्रेस की करते रहें तो उसमें कोई सार नहीं है। कोई अच्छा जो एक पहलवान होता है तो वह रोजाना काँई अपनी औरत और बहन, भाई को मारता नहीं है। उस में वह अपनी शक्ति खर्च नहीं करता है मगर कभी तो अखाड़े में ताकत बताता है। उसी तरीके से मैं चाहता हूँ कि मेरे उधर के बैठने वाले भाई प्राए दिन कांग्रेस की टीका टिप्पणी में अपनी शक्ति का अपव्यय न करें बल्कि उसे रचनात्मक कार्यों में लगाये व जनता की सेवा करें। भ्राखिर मैंने भी कोई 8-10 वर्ष विरोधी पक्ष में और पांच वर्ष लीडर प्राफ दी अपोजीशन की हैसियत से काम किया है और अनुभव के आधार पर मैं अपने उन तमाम अपोजीशन पार्टीज के भाइयों से अपील करना चाहूँगा कि इस आये दिन की केवल कांग्रेस की आलोचना करने में अपनी शक्ति को न खर्च करें।

जहां तक इस कम्पनी (संशोधन) विधेयक का सबाल है इसका तो सभी अपोजीशन वालों को एक स्वर से स्वागत व समर्थन करना चाहिये और किया है क्योंकि सरकार खुद यह बिल लाई है, अपोजीशन वाले इसे नहीं लाये हैं। कोई कांग्रेस वाले इस के खिलाफ हैं ऐसी उनकी भावना सही नहीं है क्योंकि जितनी भी स्पीचज कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से हुई हैं किसी ने भी उस के खिलाफ नहीं कहा है सभी ने उसे सपोर्ट किया है और ऐसी हालत में कांग्रेस को टीका में कोई सार नहीं रह जाता है।

दूसरी बात जो इसके द्वारा की गई है वह मनेजिंग एजेंसी सिस्टम को खत्म करना है और यह एक ऐसा कदम है जिसका कि सभी लोग स्वागत करेंगे।

जनसंघ के श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त ने कांग्रेस की इसलिए टीका की कि उस ने पूंजीपतियों

और कम्पनियों से एलैक्संस में पैसा लिया तो मेरी समझ में उनकी यह टीका नहीं आई क्योंकि मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार खुद उन के जनसंघ वालों ने भी कम से कम 1 लाख 20 हजार और 399 पैसे इन चार, पांच वर्षों में इस तरह कम्पनी से लिये हैं। इसी तरह मैं सम्मानीय श्री पीलू मोदी से कहना चाहूंगा कि वह हमारी टीका टिप्पणी करने के बजाय खुद जरा अपने अंदर टटोल कर देखें कि उनका क्या कारनामा रहा है? वह जरा खुद अपने दिल से सवाल करके पूछें कि उन्होंने चुनाव में कितना पैसा खर्च किया होगा? यह बात सही है कि आजकल चुनावों में उम्मीदवारों द्वारा अक्सर अनलिमिटेड खर्चा हो जाता है लेकिन यह दोष केवल कांग्रेस पार्टी के ही उम्मीदवारों में नहीं है बल्कि वह अपोजिशन पार्टियां भी इस की बराबर से दोषी हैं। उस में आप भी आए हैं, आपकी पार्टी भी आई है और श्री एमरसी जो हमारे वोट हैं, वह भी आए हैं।

इस बिल को लाने के लिए मैं सरकार को घन्यवाद देता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आगे से जो इलैकशन हों और उन में जो लोग चुन कर आए वे शपथ लें कि जितनी गज है उतना ही पैसा हम खर्च करेंगे हम लोगों को परसुएड करें अपनी बातों से, अपने पक्ष को उनके सामने रखें, लेकिन पैसा दे कर हम अगली इलैकशन को न लड़ें, इसका हमें फ़ैसला करना होगा और इसकी हमें शपथ लेनी होगी। पैसा खर्च कर के ही अगर इलैकशन लड़े जाते रहे, वोटज को पैसे का लालच दे कर ही अगर इलैकशन लड़े जाते रहे तो देश खाक में मिल जाएगा। तब हम सुनेंगे कि देश में बुलडी रेवोल्यूशन हो जायगा। उस अवस्था में हमें इसके लिए तैयार रहना होगा। अगर इस तरह से पैसा खर्च किया गया तो इसका नतीजा होगा कि पांच लाख तो खर्च किये जायेंगे और उसके बाद बीस लाख पैदा किये जायेंगे उन पांच सालों में जिन में कोई मੈम्बर रहेगा। यह जो मार्किटिंग की

वृत्ति है देश में, यह समाप्त होनी चाहिये, यह मेरी राय है।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : आज मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि डेढ़ साल पहले मंत्री महोदय ने इस सभा को जो आश्वासन दिया था उसको वह पूरा कर रहे हैं। डेढ़ साल पहले इस विषय के बारे में मेरा एक विधेयक आया था। तब समुची सभा ने उसका समर्थन किया था। आज भी अधिकतर वक्ताओं ने इस बिल के सिद्धान्त का समर्थन किया है। मेरे बिल में कम्पनियों के द्वारा राजनीतिक चंदा जो दिया जाता है उसको खत्म करने की बात थी और साथ साथ मैनेजिंग एजंसी को समाप्त करने की बात भी थी। उस समय कम्पनी कानून मंत्री ने कहा था कि इस बिल में कुछ कानूनी खामियां हैं, जैसे ट्रेंशरर और सैक्रेटरी का मैंने उस में उल्लेख नहीं किया था। अब इस विधेयक में मैनेजिंग एजंसी के साथ साथ ट्रेंशरर और सैक्रेटरी की प्रथा को भी खत्म करने की जो बात है, उसका स्वागत करता हूँ।

कुछ लोगों ने यह भी कहा है कि क्या इस तरह का बिल पास करने के बाद राजनीति पर पसे वालों का जो असर है, वह खत्म होगा? क्या लोकतंत्र का जो स्रोत है वह शुद्ध हो जाएगा? कुछ लोगों ने यह भी कहा है कि जैसे पूंजीपतियों से पैसा लेना बुरा है, क्या विदेशों से पैसा लेना उतना ही बुरा नहीं है? मैं मानता हूँ कि बह भी बुरा है और इस लिए मैंने विदेशी पैसे के बारे में एक विधेयक पेश किया है, मैं आशा करता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय ने जिस तरह उन्होंने यह कम्पनी विधेयक हमारा माना है, उसी तरह विदेशी पैसे के बारे में हमारा जो विधेयक है, उसको भी वे कबूल करेंगे। ऐसा उन्होंने किया तो हमारा विश्वास है कि प्रजातंत्र के प्रबाह को और ज्यादा शुद्ध करने का काम वह करेंगे।

[श्री मधु लिमये]

यह जो मैनेजिंग एजेंसी की प्रथा है यह अंग्रेजों से विरासत में हमें मिली है। असल में यह एक सामन्ती प्रथा है। यह परिवारवाद और जाति प्रथा पर आधारित है और जब तक यह प्रथा रहेगी तब तक शोषण भी चलेगा हिस्सेदारों का और जनता का। लेकिन इसके साथ जो एक महत्वपूर्ण बात है, उसको भी हमें देखना है। आधुनिक मैनेजमेंट का हम इंतजाम नहीं कर पाए हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि हर एक उद्योग में, हर एक कम्पनी में जो लायक और योग्य लोग हैं चाहे उनकी जाति कोई भी है, किसी भी परिवार से वे आए हों, उनको आगे बढ़ने का मौका मिलना चाहिये और उसके लिये जो जो काम करने जरूरी है, मैं आशा करता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय उन कामों को करेंगे।

जिस तरह से उन्होंने मैनेजिंग एजेंसी की प्रथा के समेत ट्रेडर-संकेटरी की प्रथा को खत्म करने की बात की है उसके साथ साथ आप यह भी देखें कि कम्पनियों में एक नई प्रथा चल पड़ी है। जब कम्पनी वालों ने देखा कि मैनेजिंग एजेंसी जा रही है तो उसकी जगह पर यह सोल सेलिंग एजेंसी उन्होंने शुरू कर दी। अभी अभी सियेटिक्स और कैमिकल्ज का मामला चला था। उसके हिस्सेदारों को दस साल में एक नया पैसा भी डिविडेंड का नहीं मिला। लेकिन जिस चीज को बेचने के लिये किसी कुशलता की जरूरत नहीं है, उस के लिये भी सोल सेलिंग एजेंट को कमीशन मिलता है। डायरेक्टर जेनेरल आफ टेकनिकल डेवेलपमेंट ने एक सर्कुलर जारी किया कि जो कृत्रिम रबर बनाया जायेगा, सभी रबर चीजों के कारखानों में कम से कम तीस प्रतिशत उस का इस्तेमाल किया जायेगा। उसको बेचने के लिए तुलसीदास किलाचन्द को कोई मेहनत नहीं करनी पड़ती, लेकिन उस पर वे कमीशन लेते थे।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूँगा कि कम्पनी कानून के जरिये, या दूसरे तरीके अपना कर,

सोल सेलिंग एजेंसी की प्रथा को एक-दम खत्म करना चाहिए। केवल सिन्थेटिक्स और कैमिकल्ज में ही नहीं, दूसरी कम्पनियों में भी इसको खत्म करने के बारे में वह जरूर सोचें, क्योंकि इस से हिस्सेदारों को नुकसान उठाना पड़ रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य, श्री पीलु मोदी, इस बात को मानेंगे, क्योंकि वह कहते हैं कि अन्तिम कसौटी यह होनी चाहिए कि उपभोक्ता, कनस्यूमर, के हित में काम हो रहा है या नहीं। अगर हमको उपभोक्ता के हित में काम करना है, तो मैनेजिंग एजेंटों, ट्रेडर सेक्रेट्रीज और सोल सेलिंग एजेंट्स के द्वारा जो लूट चल रही है, उपभोक्ताओं को संरक्षण देनेके लिए उनको खत्म करना जरूरी हो जाता है।

जहां तक राजनैतिक चन्दे का सवाल है, मैं एक दूसरे पहलू की ओर सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। बिड़लाज के बारे में कहा गया है कि उन्होंने कम्पनियों की मार्फत 41 लाख रुपया दिया है और उस में से 38 लाख रुपया कांग्रेस पार्टी को दिया है। लेकिन यह तो "ए" एकाउंट, सफेद पैसे, की बात है। "बी" एकाउंट के पैसे के बारे में क्या स्थिति है ?

कांग्रेस में इस समय जो दो या तीन गुट चल रहे हैं, उन में से एक गुट ने अपने साम्राज्य में, अपने छत्र के नीचे, कम्पनी कानून मंत्रालय, विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय, सफ्टवेयर मंत्रालय, इंडस्ट्रियल डेवेलपमेंट मंत्रालय, इस तरह के सब मंत्रालयों को कर लिया है। श्री पीलु मोदी उस दिन गलतफहमी में थे कि गुजरामल मोदी को टायर पैदा करने के लिए लाइसेंस दिया गया या आयात करने के लिये दिया गया। कोई इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस या इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंस देने से पहले पैसा लिया जाता है। कम्पनी कानून के अन्तर्गत उस के बारे में जांच करने का अधिकार है। लेकिन जिन लोगों के हाथों में ये सारे मंत्रालय आ गये हैं, वे इस तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते हैं।

मैंने "बी" ट्रिबल के मामले को उठाया। इस बारे में जो षड्यंत्र चल रहा था, उस से सरकार का 1 करोड़ 60 लाख रुपये का नुकसान होने वाला था। लेकिन जब मैंने इस मामले में हस्तक्षेप किया, तो झूट मिल वालों ने अन्त में सरकार को कंट्रोल की दर से पुराना माल बेचना कबूल किया। उसने एडवर्टाइजमेंट दिया था कि उन्हें 75 लाख रुपये का घाटा हो रहा है। मुझे पता नहीं कि सचमुच यह घाटा हो रहा है या नहीं, लेकिन यह बात साफ है कि सरकार का कम से कम 75 लाख रुपये मैंने बचा दिया। यह बात उन के कहने से साफ हो गई।

"ए" एकाउंट वाला जो चन्दा है, उस पर तो हमने रोक लगाई लेकिन सम्पत्ति के केन्द्रीकरण से "बी" एकाउंट वाले पैसे को इस्तेमाल करने का अधिकार उन लोगों को मिल जाता है। उसके बारे में भी मंत्री महोदय कोई न्यवस्था करें।

मैं कुछ सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। एक यह कि विदेशी पैसा और भारत की राजनीति इस के बारे में अब लीपापोती वाला काम बन्द कर दिया जाना चाहिये। कितने दिनों से सरकार ने कहा है कि हमारे पास सबूत है, क्या हुआ सेंट्रल इंटेलिजेंस ब्यूरो की रपट का? क्या हुआ सी बी आई और सी आई बी की रपट का जो इन के पास है? उस के ऊपर अखबारों में खबरें छपती हैं। लेकिन इन लोगों की कभी हिम्मत नहीं होती है कि इन रपटों को सदन के पटल पर रखें। विदेशी पैसे के जरिये से चाहे वह पैसा रूस से आता हो, या अमेरिका से आता हो या चीन से आता हो, उस के कारण हमारे देश की राजनीति अगर प्रभावित होगी तो हमारे देश में न समाजवाद पनपेगा न लोकतंत्र पनपेगा। तो इन दोनों चीजों के बारे में सोचिये।

इसी तरह सोल सेलिंग एजेन्सी के बारे में भी मैंने कहा। सरकार के हाथ में कर वसूल करने के जो अधिकार हैं उन अधिकारों को अगर आप इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे तो सम्पत्ति के केन्द्रीकरण का जो काम है वह कभी ठीक नहीं हो पायेगा। फिनेंस बिल पर जब बहस चल रही थी तो मुझे जबलपुर जाना पड़ा, इसलिये मैं बोल नहीं सका, यह जो 24 धारा थी वेलथ टैक्स के बारे में उस के संबंध में मैं आप के सामने एक बात आज रखना चाहता हूँ। 1962 में स्टेट्समैन में खबर छपी थी, जो वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री हैं उन दिनों में वह उस समय के प्रधान मंत्री की कन्या थीं, तो उस पत्र में उन की तस्वीर छपी थी कि प्रधान मंत्री अपना सारा सोना, अपने गहने राष्ट्र के लिये, युद्ध कार्य के लिये दे रही हैं...

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : क्या बुरी बात है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : अब आगे मुनिये। नीचे लिखा हुआ है कि इन्दरा जी ने सारा सोना दे दिया लेकिन अभी भी हम जानते हैं, वेलथ टैक्स के बारे में जब सवाल पूछे गए तब पता चला कि प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने 20 हजार रुपये के जो गहने हैं उनके बारे में सरकार को कोई जानकारी नहीं दी थी।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : झूठ है, गलत है।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो मौरार जी भाई ने अपने जवाब में दिया है। मैं आप को चुनौती देता हूँ। मौरार जी भाई ने स्वयं यहां पर कबूल किया है एक प्रश्न के जवाब में कि इन्दरा गांधी ने सम्पत्ति के बारे में सरकार को जो जानकारी नहीं दी, 20 हजार रुपये के सोने के जो गहने हैं उन को छिपाया। भारत की प्रधान मंत्री अध्यक्ष महोदय, सम्पत्ति के बारे में चोरी करती है, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब 1962 में

[श्री मधु लिमये]

सारे सोने का, सुवर्ण-दान इन्होंने किया तो तीन चार सप्ताह के अन्दर 20 हजार रुपये का सोना इन के पास कहां से आया ? यह गहने कहां से आए ? इस तरह की बातें जो अध्यक्ष महोदय, होती हैं और समूची दुनिया को धीरे-धीरे देश को बेवकूफ बनाने की कोशिश होती है, यह कितना अनुचित है। औरतों से अपील की गई, लड़कियों से अपील की गई कि देश के लिए आप सब कुछ कुर्बान करो, न्यौछावर कर दो, अपने गहने दे दो, लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री ने खुद क्या किया ? गहने देने का नाटक किया। 20 हजार रुपये के गहने कहां से इकट्ठे हो गए ? इसकी जानकारी नहीं है। क्या वित्त मंत्री बता सकते हैं, उन में है हिम्मत इस के बारे में सफाई करने की ? लेकिन आज हो क्या रहा है ? वित्त मंत्री प्रधान मंत्री के गलत कामों पर लीपापोती कर रहे हैं और प्रधान मंत्री वित्त मंत्री के गलत कामों पर लीपापोती करने का, चादर विछाने का काम कर रही हैं।

एक बात और पूछना चाहता हूँ, आप केवल तकनीकी उत्तर न दीजिए, मैं जानता हूँ कि बैंकिंग कम्पनी कानून मंत्रालय के तहत नहीं आता है, फाइनेंस मंत्रालय के तहत आता है, मैं मानता हूँ, लेकिन जब बैंकिंग रेगुलेशन ऐक्ट पास किया तो क्या यह नहीं कहा गया था कि इस कानून का मकसद है कि बैंकों पर और कर्ज, क्रेडिट पर सामाजिक नियंत्रण रखा जाय ? और जो छोटे कारखाने हैं, या जो छोटे उद्योगपति हैं, स्माल इंटरप्रेनर्स हैं, इन को बैंकों के द्वारा कर्जा दिया जाय। इस के लिए यह बैंकिंग रेगुलेशन बिल लाया गया। लेकिन मुझे पता चला है कि एक बड़े शिड्यूल बैंक ने मध्यावधि चुनाव के समय या उसके पहले कांग्रेस के जो सरदार हैं निजलिगप्पा साहब उनको दस लाख रुपये का ओवर-ड्राफ्ट दिया था, इस तरह की खबर मेरे पास आई है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, निजलिगप्पा और कांग्रेस क्या छोटे कारखाने हैं, स्माल इंटरप्रेनर्स हैं ?

यह क्या पैदा करते हैं ? ... (व्यवधान) भ्रष्टाचार के अलावा और क्या मैन्युफैक्चर करते हैं ? भ्रष्टाचार भूठ, जाल फरेबी इस के अलावा यह लोग और क्या पैदा करते हैं ? क्या इस को कहा जा सकता है कि यह खेती है ? क्या इसको कहा जा सकता है कि यह स्माल इंटरप्रेनर्स हैं ? क्या यह बात सही है, आप जांच कर के जवाब दीजिये, आपको गुरुवार तक का मौका मिला है। आज मैं यह आरोप कर रहा हूँ कि कांग्रेस के सरदार निजलिगप्पा साहब को मध्यावधि चुनाव के पहले एक शिड्यूल बैंक के द्वारा 10 लाख रुपये का ओवर-ड्राफ्ट दिया गया—क्या इसी लिए वह बैंकिंग रेगुलेशन ऐक्ट मोरार जी भाई ने बनाया है ? ...

एक माननीय सदस्य : बैंक का नाम बताइये।

श्री मधु लिमये : बिरला से सम्बन्धित है, आप लोग जानते हैं, मैं सभी बैंकों का नाम कहां जानता हूँ। लेकिन कम्पनी कानून मंत्री पता लगा सकते हैं। बिरला बालों से जिस शिड्यूल बैंक का ज्यादा सम्बन्ध है, वही बैंक है। ... (व्यवधान)... पीलू मोदी जी कह रहे हैं कि शायद यूको बैंक की चर्चा मधु लिमये कर रहे हैं। मुझे भी ऐसा लगता है कि शायद यूको बैंक की ही चर्चा मैं कर रहा हूँ। पीलू जी ने जो मदद की है, उस के लिए आभारी हूँ। आप इस का चर्रर जवाब दीजिये।

अन्त में मैं यह कहूँगा कि मेरा यह दावा कभी नहीं था कि दो परिवर्तन करने के बाद यानी मैनेजिंग एजेन्सी को खत्म करने के बाद और राजनीतिक बन्दा बन्द करने के बाद राजनीतिक जीवन एक दम शुद्ध हो जाएगा लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहां जहां बन्दे, सम्पत्ति का केन्द्रीकरण, टेक्स की चोरी, इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस और इन्वैस्ट्रियल लाइसेंस को लेकर जो घुटाले होते हैं, इनको रोकना चाहिये, और विदेशों से

जो पैसा आता है, उस पर भी रोक लगनी चाहिए, बी एकाउन्ट वाले पैसे का कोई इन्तजाम होना चाहिये—तभी जाकर पालनपुर जैसी घटना नहीं होगी।

पालनपुर में, सभापति महोदय, क्या हुआ ? पीलू मोदी नाराज हो जाते हैं—पालनपुर में यह साबित हुआ कि एक ओर ए एकाउन्ट वाला पैसा और बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में बी एकाउन्ट वाला पैसा दोनों एक हो गए और दूसरी ओर बेचारे मनु अमरसी और पीलू मोदी दोनों मिल कर लड़ रहे थे। तो इस तरह की जो बातें होती हैं—मैं तुलसीदास जी जाधव को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ, जब वह दौरा कर रहे थे क्या इस विषयता और गैर-बराबरी को उन्होंने नहीं देखा। इसीलिये कम्पनी चन्दे का हम विरोध करते हैं, प्रीवी पसंज का विरोध करते हैं, असमानता और गैर-बराबरी वाली जितनी चीजें हैं—एक-एक का हम विरोध करते हैं। यह कम्पनी विधेयक उसी रास्ते पर एक कदम है। इस लिए मैं आज मंत्री महोदय को बर्खास्त देना चाहता हूँ—ऐसे मौके बहुत कम आते हैं कि मैं इन को बर्खास्त दूँ—लेकिन आज यह मौका आया है, इसलिए फिर से उन को बर्खास्त देकर अपना भाषण खत्म करता हूँ।

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I support the Bill on both the counts wholeheartedly. I have been listening to the debate on such an innocent and welcome measure very patiently. I found to my great surprise and dismay that on such a bill, instead of welcoming it wholeheartedly, some Members of the Opposition have taken an opportunity to abuse the Congress profusely. It has become a habit, whether a Bill is a welcome one or not, with them to take the greatest possible opportunity to abuse the Congress profusely. It has become a habit, whether a Bill is a welcome one or not, with them to take the greatest possible opportunity to abuse the Congress and assassinate the character of some of the top-

ranking leaders and those who are in the seat of power and authority.

Let me give the illustration of Mr. Limaye. An assurance was given to the House, in pursuance of which this measure has been brought. But he has taken this occasion to criticise the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Congress President, and so on. Our communist friends also have abused the Congress profusely. All sorts of extraneous things were summoned to support their arguments. What is their argument ? It is to support the Bill ! Is it not strange logic ? Sir, this is a simple measure. Government would like to ban company donations to political parties to bring out some purity in public life. Instead of welcoming it unreservedly, they have abused the party in power.

As Mr. Jadhav said, what was allowed under the law was done in accepting donations from different companies. It is not the case that Congress alone had collected donations. Almost all parties, one and all, have received donations from companies. The figures and names are there. The document is before the House. It is not something we are saying out of our imagination to malign the opposition parties. It has been proved and recorded. But I do not say it was wrong. It was permitted under the law. Now that permission is sought to be withdrawn by changing the law. It is a simple and innocent but very important measure to bring about some purity in our public life.

So far as we poor people are concerned, we collect money from the people. It is called election fund and we fight the elections. I have been fighting elections from my younger days. When I passed out of the law college, I secured a scholarship of Rs. 75 and I spent Rs. 73 out of them on my election. In 1962, I contested against a raja. I spent Rs. 2300 while the raja had to spend a lot.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : In 1972 you need not pay even the security money !

18 hrs.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : There is an optimum minimum and a minimum optimum also.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, May 14, 1969/Vaisakha 24, 1891 (Saka).*

MR. CHAIRMAN : He may resume his speech on Thursday.

-----