

obviously we will not be able to talk to each other also.

I can assure the hon. Member that the Government of India are not obvious of the withholding of cargo by the Pakistan authorities and we hope that if Pakistan ever agrees to come to the table, we will be able to raise this issue as well.

Shri R. Barua: In pursuance of the policy of having better relations with our neighbours and in view of the Tashkent agreement, should we not proceed to normalise relations with Pakistan without waiting for exchange of communication links?

Shri I. K. Gujral: The hon. Member will agree with me that ever since the cessation of hostilities, the Government of India have left no stone unturned to create understanding between our two countries. We are going to the farthest extent to see that India and Pakistan live as peaceful and good neighbours and friends. As regards tele-communications also, it is not a question of being unilateral. For instance, our tele-communication channels up to the border are working very effectively and very efficiently. But calls generally do not get there. Therefore, we remind them to improve the tele-communications. Unfortunately, the response to us is not good. We have also fixed meetings and tried to check up the apparatus. We have asked them to agree to hold joint meetings. The Director General here has been writing to his opposite number in Pakistan almost every month to agree to a meeting at that level which can improve the tele-communications. But unfortunately, there has been no response.

Wealth of persons holding Public Offices

+

34. **Shri A. B. Vajpayee:**
Shri N. S. Sharma:
Shri Shri Gopal Saboo:

Shri Brij Bhusan Lal:
Shri Sharda Nand:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to set up a high-powered commission to inquire into the wealth of all those who held public offices during the last 20 years;

(b) whether any suggestions to this effect have been received by Government;

(c) if so, the action taken thereon; and

(d) if the reply to part (a) above be in the negative, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) Such an inquiry is not called for, would involve a great deal of fruitless work, and would not be in the public interest.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: क्या इस प्रकार का आयोग नियुक्त न करने का एक कारण यह भी है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार को डर है कि यदि ऐसा आयोग बना तो बहुत से व्यक्तियों के मामले उस आयोग के सामने आयेंगे जिन्होंने पिछले बीस सालों में अपार सम्पत्ति इकट्ठा की है और क्योंकि वे व्यक्ति कांग्रेस पार्टी से सम्बन्धित हैं इसलिये सरकार ऐसा आयोग बनाना नहीं चाहती है?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: No, it has nothing to do with it. If there are any specific allegations against anybody and if a *prima facie* case is made out against some person, inquiries will be made. But to make some sort of very blanket proposition of inquiries against all people who held public office in the last twenty years is something like talking without knowing what one is talking about.

की जगह बिहारी बाबूदेवी : क्या वह सच नहीं है कि पहले भी जो व्यक्ति सत्ता-सक्त थे उनके बिचड़ निश्चित धारोप लगाये गये थे, उदाहरण के लिये राजस्वान के मुख्य बन्दी के खिलाफ, उत्तर प्रदेश के कुछ संघियों के खिलाफ, लेकिन उनके खिलाफ, कोई जांच नहीं की गई थी जिन के खिलाफ जांच की गई उनको अपने पक्षों से हटाना क्या ? मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस मामले में संतानम कमेटी ने जो सिफारिशें की हैं उन सिफारिशों को सी फील्डवी स्वीकार करने के लिये सरकार तैयार क्यों नहीं है ? सिफारिश यह भी कि अगर दस एम० एल० ए० या दस एम० पी० किसी व्यक्ति के बिचड़ धारोप लगाये तो उसकी जांच होनी चाहिये। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसे स्वीकार करने में सरकार को क्या कठिनाई है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I think all these matters were discussed when the Santhanam Committee's recommendations were discussed from time to time. One thing which was accepted was having a code of conduct for Ministers both in the States and at the Centre. That code of conduct has been accepted and action on the basis of that code is taken.

Shri Banga: When?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Wherever allegations are made. In the code, certain procedures are laid down. If there are any allegations against Ministers in a State etc. they should be forwarded to the Chief Minister and he should be asked to look into the matter. If the allegations are against a Chief Minister, the code of conduct lays down....

Shri Banga: If the Prime Minister herself is in the dock, what is the use of this procedure?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It is no use merely making all these statements.

Shri Banga: It is not an irresponsible statement.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I did not say responsible statement.

Shri Banga: You were saying they are talking without knowing what they are talking about.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Certainly I have got respect for the hon. Member, but he should have some respect for us too.

Mr. Speaker: I would request the hon. Minister to answer the question.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The code of conduct recommended by the Santhanam committee has been accepted in principle. Then again after the elections, when the new governments came in, I circulated this code of conduct to the Chief Ministers' conference, and I have requested them to accept this and adopt this.

Shri Nath Pai: I am glad to be told by the Home Minister that Government have decided to accept the recommendation of the Santhanam Committee. Having been a member of the committee, it comes as a surprising news to me, because so far as we know, there has been a statistical acceptance, i.e. 97 per cent of the suggestions and recommendations of the committee have been accepted, but what this statistical amount of acceptance means....

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I said that the code of conduct recommendations have been accepted.

Shri Nath Pai: I am coming to that. Your predecessor, Mr. Hathi, used to do the same kind of, I would not say, trick, but jugglery of words, that 97 per cent of the recommendations have been accepted. You did not say this I know, but what I am trying to point out is this, that the Government have avoided accepting the king pin of the recommendations. For the first time,

when you, Mr. Speaker, were the President of the Congress, you said that every office-bearer who was holding office should submit to you a statement of his assets and, if there were any liabilities, of course, of his liabilities too. I do not know whether this was later on confirmed by the Congress President who succeeded you in office, Mr. Sanjiviah. He also made the claim that a man who is a pauper today becomes a Minister, and within three years he is a millionaire. This came from you and from the man who held the same distinguished office after you. In the light of this I do not know why Mr. Chavan feels very offended if a suggestion is made that an inquiry like this should be held. Perhaps if you have nothing to hide, why shun the inquiry? Maybe, most of you will be found to be innocent and the cobwebs of misunderstanding will be removed.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am not offended. It is not a question of offence, it is a question of the administrative practicability of the proposition. I am not at all offended. Government have certainly accepted the principle, and as a part of the code of conduct, Ministers have to submit their assets and liabilities statement to the Prime Minister, the State Ministers can submit to the Chief Ministers. That is accepted. So, certainly there are written commitments made by the Ministers concerned with the Prime Minister and the Chief Minister. It is part of the normal record. This is something which the Ministers will be held up to. But if some specific allegations are made then certainly one can make an inquiry.

Shri Ranga: They have been made.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: How can you say that against all the public office holders in the last 20 years an enquiry should be held? It is holding some sort of inquiry against democracy as a whole. I do not know how members make such a proposal.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: The magnitude of corruption is colossal.

Shri Hem Barua: A memorandum was submitted by some MLAs and MPs from Mysore. What has he done to that?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is it not a fact that the demand for the appointment of a commission like this is a part of a smear campaign and a character assassination campaign which are carried on by certain political parties, and is it not a fact that the appointment of a commission like this will mean the gradual end of democracy which we hold so dear in India?

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: Is that a question?

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : मंत्री महोदय ने अभी बताया है कि आचार-संहिता बन गई है, जिसके अनुसार मंत्रियों को अपनी सम्पत्ति का ब्यौरा देना पड़ेगा। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह आचार संहिता सिर्फ आगे आने वाले मंत्रियों के लिए ही है या यह आचार-संहिता उड़ीसा, पंजाब और राजस्थान आदि प्रदेशों के उन मंत्रियों पर भी लागू होगी जिनके खिलाफ इस प्रकार के गम्भीर आरोप लगाए गए थे कि हुकूमत ने भी यह महसूस किया कि उनको अपने पदों से इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिए और इस कारण जिन्होंने अपने पदों से इस्तीफा दे दिया।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The code of conduct is something which can be made applicable to Ministers while they are in office and naturally the code of conduct can be put into operation when it is accepted. It is applicable to those who were in office on the date on which the code of conduct was accepted and that is observed.

Shri K. Lakkappa: The hon. Home Minister said that if specific allegations were made by the Members, enquiries would be held. Allegations were made against the Chief Minister of Mysore in a Memorandum submit-

ed to the Home Minister, Prime Minister and the President also, by thirty legislators who are all responsible people. We have received no reply so far to that memorandum. Does this Government intend to defend the culprits or will it take any action to implement the Santhanam Committee Report? I want a categorical answer in this behalf.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am not in possession of all the facts. If a specific question is put, certainly I will answer it.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : पायंट प्राफ़ थाईर । आप ने इस सदन में कहा है कि वहाँ तक सप्लीमेंटरीज़ का प्रश्न है, जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने क्वेश्चन दिया है, पहले आप उनको पुकारेंगे और फिर दो तीन और माननीय सदस्यों को सप्लीमेंटरीज़ पूछने का अवसर देंगे । हम यह देख रहे हैं कि जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने क्वेश्चन दिया है, उन में से बहुत से के नाम छूट जाते हैं और दूसरे लोगों को पहले अवसर दे दिया जाता है । मेरा निवेदन है कि जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने ब्रह्म भेजा है, पहले उन को मौका दिया जाना चाहिये ।

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the point it is an important question. I do not want anybody to misunderstand. Even if ten minutes more are spent on this question, it does not matter. Otherwise, Ministers and even the Speaker are likely to be misunderstood.

Shri K. Lakkappa: I rise on a point of order. I put a specific question.

Mr. Speaker: This is a general question and you have brought in a specific question. You can put it as a separate question. A supplementary he may not be having an answer. He cannot remember the case or all the charges against so many ministers. If you put a separate question, he would question.... (Interruptions).

श्री कर्ण लक्काप्पा : आप वृत्त नशी को संरक्षण दे रहे हैं ।

Shri K. Lakkappa: I would like to explain to you the relevance of this question. He said that if specific allegations were made by responsible people, he would hold an enquiry. My question arises out of the answer given by the Minister, and therefore it is relevant. He should make a categorical statement and I am entitled to a reply as a matter of right. I would request him to reply to my answer.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Not so many people should rise at the same time. Shri Lakkappa has raised a point. If the hon. Minister has not got the information, he may give it later on. That is a different matter. Next question.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Tenneti Viswanatham.

Shri Nuth Pal: What is your final position?

Mr. Speaker: I said that is a separate question.

Shri J. M. Bawas: How many complaints he has received about the ministers—let him at least reply that question.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Certainly in the past, certain complaints were made against certain Ministers and Chief Ministers. This is the general information I have got; if I have got to go into details of the allegations made and the conclusions reached, it will be difficult for me to answer. A complaint was made about Shri Nijalingappa and the action taken was, the Prime Minister requested the Cabinet Sub-Committee to consider those allegations, and the Cabinet Sub-Committee reached a conclusion that there was no ground. (Interruption).

Shri Nath Pal: That is not Santhanam Committee's recommendation.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am telling you about the procedure that is accepted and what the Government did about it. (Interruption). We have accepted a code of conduct, and on that basis, as I said, if there are specific allegations and if a *prima facie* case is made out, certainly Government will have to go into the matter. In these matters, the Prime Minister did receive complaints and the Prime Minister asked the Cabinet Sub-Committee to look into the case, to consider the case, and the Sub-Committee has gone into these matters. The conclusion was that there were no grounds for the Central Government to take any action. (Interruption).

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: How much time has he taken to give this much information?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Tenneti Viswanatham.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: It is a very important matter. Let us know the facts.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: The Home Minister referred to the case about a Chief Minister, but I want to know with reference to other Ministers, whether any reports or complaints were made according to the code of conduct by Chief Ministers against any of their own colleagues in the Cabinet and whether any action was taken at any time. Is there a single case in which, the code having been accepted, it was implemented in any of the States?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: In some cases where complaints were made about certain matters in the States, those complaints were made to the chief Ministers and the Chief Minister did make an enquiry into it and gave his opinion on these matters. That happened in the case of West Bengal, for example,

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Panigrahi; let this question monopolise the question hour today; let the other side also have a chance.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: May I know whether the Home Minister has received any allegations against Shri Hare Krishna Mahatab with regard to evasion of income-tax and also his complicity in the Serajuddin affair and, if so, what steps have been taken to enquire into these allegations?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I cannot answer all these questions regarding everybody. I have not got any information.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Nath Pal. Let us exhaust the whole matter.

Shri Nath Pal: Thank you, Sir. May I draw the attention of the Home Minister to a patent contradiction in the two statements he has made? A specific case was promptly mentioned by my colleague, Shri Hem Barua and it was reiterated by Shri Lakkappa, and it was almost a challenge which the Home Minister thought it fit to throw in our face. I am not interested in blanket charges. I want specific instances. And an instance was cited, within which a memorandum was presented, signed by legislators of both these Houses and by the Mysore Assembly. Then the reply came. He said, "I have." What was his earlier reply? His earlier reply was that "we have accepted the recommendation of the Santhanam Committee." And then Mr. Chavan added in the course of his reply to the second supplementary that a Cabinet Sub-Committee looked into this memorandum and reached the conclusion that there was no *prima facie* case. This is a contradiction in the purest terms. (Interruption). संधानम समिती की सिफारिशें मानने नहीं हैं, याद दायर नहीं है।

According to the Santhanam Committee's recommendations, if a memorandum is signed by 5 or 10 legislators and presented to the President, who will be panel to look into it? Not a Cabinet sub-committee. Thou shall not be the judge of the conduct. That is the Santhanam Committee's firm recommendation. The panel will be constituted by judges of the Supreme Court, one of whom will be given the task of looking into the memorandum. He is the authority to find out whether there is a *prima facie* case or not. The Government has tried to side-track the safeguard provided by the Santhanam Committee. They framed charges against their own colleagues and they found perhaps that they were not suitable enough to look into. Don't you think, Sir, there is a total contradiction? He earlier told us that the Santhanam Committee's recommendation has been accepted. For looking into the charges, the Santhanam Committee made no recommendation with regard to the Cabinet.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: What I have said earlier is on record. I have not said that all the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee were accepted. In this matter the code of conduct was accepted. The other recommendations that the hon. member mentioned are not accepted. It is a statement of fact. Regarding the statements made on the floor of the House, he can refer to the records of this House. Even about this particular enquiry to which a reference was made, the Prime Minister did make a statement on the floor of the House about the action taken sometime in February, 1965.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Should we spend the rest of the question hour on this question? I think some other opportunity can be taken for a more detailed discussion on this.

Shri Raaga: It has been sufficiently exposed. I think no purpose will be served by spending more time on it.

Mr. Speaker: Even if we spend the whole hour on this, we are not going

to have any result. If hon. members want a separate discussion under some rule, it can be considered. We have spent nearly half an hour on this. Spending another 20 minutes on this is not going to solve the problem. I suggest that some other opportunity may be taken to discuss this subject. Next question.

Coronation of the Nizam

*35, **Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:**
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Coronation Ceremony of H. E. H. the Nizam Asif Jah VIII was held at Hyderabad on the 7th April, 1967;

(b) if so, whether it was held with the approval of Government;

(c) whether it is also a fact that soon after the inauguration, quit notices were given to thousands, mostly poor people, who were in the service of the late Nizam for decades including ejection notices served on close relations of the late Nizam;

(d) whether any representation on these matters has been received by Government; and

(e) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). According to information received from the Andhra Pradesh Government, H.E.H. the new Nizam held the traditional succession ceremony on the 8th April, 1967. It was not necessary for the Nizam to obtain the Government's approval in this regard as the function was purely personal.

(c) to (e). Government are aware of the Nizam's intention to retrench some excess staff to effect economy in his household expenditure. It is not known how many have been so retrenched. No representations have been received by Government in this regard. Since this relates to private