

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

employment with the Nizam, Government; cannot interfere.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: Is it not a fact that the police surrounded the palace of the Nizam? Is it not a fact that even the members of the family of the late Nizam were searched? Is it not a fact that the light and water-supply to the palace were cut off, so that the inmates and families of the late Nizam were compelled to leave? Is it not a fact that 12,000 poor employees of the late Nizam, including those who were receiving some pension, were retrenched and their pension stopped?

Mr. Speaker: He can just say "Is it not a fact" once; that will cover the whole thing.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: Let him say that it is not so. My question is this: is it not Government's responsibility to see that the privy purse is utilised for the sake of maintenance of the family and staff of the Nizam? In this case, when the grievances were mentioned to the Chief Minister of the State or the Government of India no notice was taken and no permission was given to sue the Nizam in the court of law. On the one side you see injustice being done and on the other you avoid all avenues of protection.

Mr. Speaker: This is not a question.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: My specific question is this: will the hon. Home Minister assure this House that permission will be given to all these aggrieved persons to sue the Nizam in the court of law. Sir...

Mr. Speaker: Let him answer. Please sit down now.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: Sir, I hope I will be allowed to put my second supplementary?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: All that the hon. Member mentioned may be a fact, but I have no official information in the matter, except that the hon. Member

himself once met me and mentioned about the closest relatives of the Nizam. Then I said that it was better for him to take up the matter with the Chief Minister of Andhra. Certainly there may be some cases where some human considerations are involved, and if he writes personally to me I may also look into the matter. But I have got no official confirmation of this. It is a fact that the Nizam himself wanted to have some sort of economy in the entire household expenditure because his privy purse is drastically reduced. Intimation of that intention of his was given to us. Beyond that I cannot say anything more authoritatively on this.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: He wanted to know whether permission will be given or not.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: These are some of the privileges of the princes which are guaranteed to them under the Civil Procedure Code and Criminal Procedure Code. Normally, in these matters we follow the processes laid down and our intention is to liberalise in these matters. But, naturally, I cannot give a blanket assurance that in each case permission will be given; we will certainly consider these matters on merits.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Onkar Lal Berwa.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: Sir, I have my second supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I thought he had finished by combining half-dozen questions in one. I will call him again.

श्री बाँकार लाल बेरवा : राजाओं को जो प्रीवी प्रसूँ दिया जाता है, वह उनके नौकरों के बच्चों के लिये और उनके मुचरन के लिये दिया जाता है। जब कि हैदराबाद के निजाम ने 12 हजार कर्मचारियों को छोट दिया है, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार उनको इस बात किसना क्यथा दे रही है तथा इन कर्मचारियों की छोट

के कारण जो खर्च कम हुआ है, उस को दुष्टि में रखते हुए क्या उन को कम प्रीवी फर्स दिया जाएगा, सरकार इस पर क्या विचार कर रही है?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Sir, I cannot give my views on what size of household the Nizam should have, how many servants he should have and what amount he should spend on them. Certainly that is a personal matter for the Nizam to decide. The former Nizam had quite a huge privy purse but that has been very drastically reduced now. (Interruptions). I understand his difficulty and the need to economise. In that matter, if he takes some reasonable action to economise certainly you and I cannot complain. At the same time, as I said, if there are any human considerations involved, naturally, he is expected to look into them.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: The argument advanced by the Home Minister.....

An hon. Member: That was his reply and not any argument.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: All right, it has been stated by the Home Minister that he wants to retrench because he wants to effect economy. May I ask how can the richest man in the world put forward an excuse like that? Apart from that he is building a new palace.....

Mr. Speaker: It is all a matter of opinion. The hon. Member is explaining the whole case. There is no question being put by him.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: This is my question. When Sardar Patel was the Home Minister, a list of properties, both moveable and immovable, was given by the late Nizam to Sardar Patel. Has any assessment been made by the Home Ministry to find out what exactly is the wealth of the Nizam so that the wealth tax and the estate duty may be levied and, if that has not been done, why not?

Mr. Speaker: Shri M. R. Krishna.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: What is the reply to my question?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: The reply should be given.

Mr. Speaker: He has no answer. Shri M. R. Krishna.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: Does it mean that he will not pay the wealth tax and the estate duty?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: How can I answer like this?

Shri M. R. Krishna: May I know whether it is a fact that the present Nizam is preventing the relatives of the late Nizam who are enjoying some funds from the trust which has been created with the approval of the Government of India from seeing the accounts of the trust and, if so, whether the Government of India will be in a position to find out whether the present Nizam is constitutionally correct in preventing the beneficiaries of the trust which has been created with the approval of the Government of India from seeing the accounts of the trust?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I can certainly go into these things if specific facts are brought to my notice. These are matters in which to a certain extent, Government of India can give them advice. But whether we can legally intervene or interfere in the matter depends upon the interpretation of facts. If the hon. Member gives me certain information, I am prepared to look into it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Arising out of the question put by Shri Bakar Ali Mirza, may I know whether, after the death of the Nizam, any assessment was made of the vast property, both moveable and immovable, including the jewellery, of the Nizam? When a man dies leaving a huge property behind him, the estate duty is levied. I want to know whether it has been

brought to his notice by the sister of the present Nizam that this Nizam is sending out jewellery through Britishers and Turks to some foreign countries. This is one of the reason why even the most trusted men of the ex-Nizam are being removed so that this jewellery can be sent out.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Of course, I will have to go into the facts before I can give any definite answer on the floor of the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: They have sent a memorandum to you.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That will be looked into. At the present moment, I can not give any definite information on the floor of the House. If the hon. Member is prepared to discuss it with me, I will discuss it with him. If he puts any specific question, I will reply to him.

श्री संवरलाल मुक्त : क्या मंत्री यहोद्य बतलवेंगे कि इस तरह की निम्न यदि नहीं बनी है, तो वे उस निम्न को बनायेंगे और जो पैसा बाहर गया है, यदि वह बाहर गया है तो उस की इन्वॉयरी करावेंगे तथा धारा बह पैसा बाहर न जाय, इस के लिये कोई प्रावन्दी लगावेंगे ?

श्री संवरलाल मुक्त : मैंने यह नहीं कहा है कि निम्न नहीं बनाई हुई है। निम्न बनी हुई है, लेकिन किस चीज की बनी हुई है, कब बनाई गई थी, इसके लिये यदि मुझे कुछ कहना है तो उसके लिये इतिहास बतावेंगे। फिर भी जो बातें धारण बतलाई हैं, मैं उन को मही मानता हूँ।

श्री संवरलाल मुक्त : यदि नहीं बनाई है, तो क्या धारा उसको बनावेंगे ? धारा में क्या बाहर न जाय, इस पर रोक लगाने के लिये क्या कोई प्रावन्दी लगावेंगे ?

श्री संवरलाल मुक्त : इसके बारे में मैं उकर देख लूँगा और तोष लूँगा।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let him make a statement after some time.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: On a point of order, Sir. I wanted to know whether the Home Ministry has prepared a list or not. It is part of the agreement between the Government of India and.....

Mr. Speaker: You are giving information. There is no point of order. He may kindly resume his seat.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: It is a wrong statement.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I have no information here.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may know the Agreement better. But there is no point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let him make a statement on this. It is a very serious matter.

श्री प्रेमचन्द वर्मा : मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि निजाम के पास कुल कितने म्नात्रिम है और उन पर कितना खर्चा बँटा है और पहले के निजाम को कुल कितनी मामाना प्रिवी पर्स मिलनी थी और मौजूदा निजाम को कितनी मिलती है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The late Nizam was in receipt of a privy purse of Rs. 42,85,714, free from all taxes. This amount was paid in accordance with the Agreement signed by the late Nizam on 25th January, 1950 and it was payable to the late Nizam only during his life time. The Agreement also provided that provision for the successor would be made by the Government of India subsequently. In accordance with this provision, the Government of India have fixed the privy purse of the new Nizam at Rs. 20 lakhs.

Shri S. Khandu: The hon. Minister admitted that there was a coronation ceremony of Nizam. This coronation ceremony in a free democratic India smacks of colonialism and imperialism. In view of this, I want to know from

the hon. Minister whether a suitable legislation will be enacted to abolish this sort of coronation ceremonies by Nizams and other princes throughout India?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It was not an official ceremony. Possibly there was some ceremony in a purely personal way for succession in the family.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether the Government have experienced any difficulties because of the fact that the princes are not being governed by the common Civil and Criminal Procedure Codes and, therefore, they cannot be sued in the court of law, and if so, whether the Government is thinking of reviewing the entire position of the concessions given to the princes so that they can be brought under the normal law of land?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: This has become a part of the normal law of the land. This House itself has accepted. As far as the question of suing under the Civil Procedure Code or the Criminal Procedure Code is concerned, the privilege is that they cannot automatically be sued unless they get the permission of the Government of India. In this matter we are considering the question of liberalising the process and we should try to see that those people who have any grievances get an opportunity to try them in the court of law. As far as the other privileges are concerned, I think it is time that we have another look at them also, but in that matter, the Government's intention is to invite some of the leading princes and discuss with them and see if we can take them along with us on these.

Crossing into Indian Territory by East Pakistani Muslim Families

+
*26. **Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta:**
Dr. Karal Singh:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the reported

crossing into the Indian territory by East Pakistani Muslim families recently;

(b) the number of families involved and the motive behind such migration; and

(c) the steps taken to prevent such incidents even if they are due to food scarcity conditions prevailing in East Pakistan?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). Unauthorised entry of East Pakistani muslim nationals into the neighbouring Indian territory has been reported in the recent months. Of them, only 14 cases of entire families illegally entering into Indian territory have been reported. Food scarcity and economic hardship in the areas of East Pakistan adjoining India and the desire of those Pak muslim nationals who were earlier evicted from Indian territory to re-enter India are among the causes for these attempts at unauthorised entry.

(c) Effective steps have been taken by the Centre and the State Governments concerned to prevent such infiltration, like (i) increased and more frequent patrolling; (ii) greater vigilance by the border out-post staff etc.

श्री कंचर लाल गुप्त : क्या श्री मंत्री महोदय बता सकते कि पहले भी ये लोग यहाँ इस प्रकार पर आते रहे हैं, यदि हाँ, तो जो आये हैं उन की संख्या कितनी है और उनको वापिस भेजने के लिये सरकार क्या प्रयत्न कर रही है ?

श्री यशवन्त राव चव्हाण : बहुत पहले की संख्या तो मामूली नहीं है लेकिन जेरे पास दिसम्बर, 1966 से मार्च, 1967 तक की कीमतें हैं। उन के अनुसार घनम में दिसम्बर 1966 में 347 लोग आये, नवम्बर 1966 में 177 आये, दिसम्बर 1966 में 149 आये, जनवरी 1967 में 102 आये,