

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

If the hon. Minister says he is not sure, then it means that he has no immediate and definite information on the subject.

It may be very necessary that any Minister who is put a particular question must have all the information relevant to it. He must anticipate a number of supplementary questions. It is no good for any hon. Minister to say, 'I do not know, I do not know'. If the Ministers do not know more than what is asked exactly, then there is no need for supplementary questions at all here. The House expects every hon. Minister to be posted with all kinds of information relevant to the question which may be put on the floor of the House.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): With your permission, Sir, before I move my motion, may I just say one word with respect to what was said about Ministers?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no harm in hearing a suggestion from the hon. Minister.

Dr. Katju: I submit, Sir, Ministers and Deputy Ministers make every endeavour to post themselves with information which is relevant to the question and which arises out of the question. But if, now and again, there is an attempt made to traverse or to travel from China to Peru, then I submit we have got to say, we do not know or we guess or 'I am not sure'. It depends upon the temperament of every Minister. Otherwise, so far as I am concerned, I say I do not know and finish. I cannot speculate as to what questions will be asked.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not want to raise any debate on this matter. All that I am submitting even for the consideration of the Home Minister is that the Speaker will always take care to see that only relevant questions are allowed. It is open to the hon. Minister to say that he did not anticipate that question or that he will take time to answer that question. The House naturally expects every serious attempt to be made by the Ministers to give all such information relevant to the question and if any questioner wants to go out of the way, of course, the Speaker is there to pull him up and not to allow the question. If the Speaker has any doubt, certainly he may be advised by the Minister.

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move:

"That the time for the presentation of the Report of the Committee of Privileges on the following two questions of privilege be further extended up to Friday, the 12th December, 1952—

(i) Question of privilege regarding certain papers laid on the Table of the House by Dr. Satyanarain Sinha, M.P.

(ii) Question of privilege regarding a statement alleged to have been made by Shri P. Sundarayya, Member, Council of States."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the time for the presentation of the Report of the Committee of Privileges on the following two questions of privilege be further extended up to Friday, the 12th December, 1952—

(i) Question of privilege regarding certain papers laid on the Table of the House by Dr. Satyanarain Sinha, M.P.

(ii) Question of privilege regarding a statement alleged to have been made by Shri P. Sundarayya, Member, Council of States."

The motion was adopted.

DELIMITATION COMMISSION BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the readjustment of the representation of territorial constituencies in the House of the People and in the State Legislative Assemblies and for matters connected therewith, be further extended up to Friday, the 5th December, 1952."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to

provide for the readjustment of the representation of territorial constituencies in the House of the People and in the State Legislative Assemblies and for matters connected therewith, be further extended up to Friday, the 5th December, 1952."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE. INVESTIGATION INTO WEALTH AND PROPERTY OF GOVERNMENT OFFICERS.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Sir, I must congratulate myself for having drawn this ballot and for having the honour of moving this resolution. I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take steps to investigate into the wealth, fortune or property, whether held in his own name or of any member or members of his family, jointly or severally, of any person who—

(a) holds an office under the Constitution; or

(b) is a responsible officer of the Government of India or of any State in India; and in particular, is authorised to place contracts, issue licences, collect revenues or taxes or control the procurement, storage, distribution, movement or sale of any commodity;

and is about to relinquish his post or office or retire from Government service;

and for this purpose appoint a Commission which should be authorised to call for any witness or document and make a thorough investigation into all the possessions of such an officer.

This House is further of opinion that if as a result of such an investigation any officer is found to be owning, or holding, or to have accumulated any property, which in the opinion of the Investigation Commission is substantially in excess of what could be accumulated by an honest and upright officer, the matter should be reported to this House which will after such further consideration take such action as it deems just and necessary in each case."

Shri Rane (Bhusaval): On a point of order. I submit that this resolution is *ultra vires* and is beyond the power of this House to consider. (Laughter).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me know how. Why are hon. Members impatient? Of course, hon. Members can work themselves up to laughter, but if they laugh at all times irrespective of the circumstances, it would be wrong. Let me hear the point of order.

Shri Rane: If you scan the resolution, it proposes to appoint a Commission to investigate into the fortunes and properties of the following three classes of persons: (i) persons in the State service; (ii) persons in the Union service; and (iii) persons who hold office under the Constitution of India. As regards the first category, i.e. persons in the State service, I do not object to the effect of the present resolution. I would like to submit that under article 246 of the Constitution it is only the State Legislature that read out article 246.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not necessary. I accept that point. We will assume that it is correct.

Shri Rane: Then, as regards the second category, namely, persons in the Union service, I submit that articles 308 to 314 lay down special provisions with regard to recruitment etc. In particular, article 314 gives protection to certain classes of people who were already in the service. Therefore, I submit that this House cannot discuss this point at random.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But do these provisions give protection against corruption?

Shri Rane: I am saying that they lay down a special procedure in respect of these persons.

As regards the third category, under this category come the President of India, the Vice-President of India, the Speaker of this House, the Deputy-Speaker of this House, the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States, the Prime Minister of India and members of his Cabinet, the Ministers in the States, the Judges of the Supreme Court and so on. I submit that the Constitution makes a special provision for them. Of course, acceptance of illegal gratification is against the provisions of the Constitution. If a violation of the Constitution is committed by the President, he can be impeached under article 61. Similarly, according to the relevant articles of the Constitution, the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker may also be removed. I submit that this is an indirect way of... (Interruption).