

far as the Home Minister is concerned.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: What is the amount spent?

(No reply)

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: May I know who are these V.I.P.s who are entitled to travel by I.A.F. plane free?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: The President, the Prime Minister and the Vice-President are entitled to the use of I.A.F. aircraft. Then the following personages are also entitled to the use of those aircraft if it is essential to do so and no other aircraft is available—the Defence Minister, Home Minister, etc.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: In view of the fact that both the Transport Ministry that is to say the Indian Airlines, and the Defence Ministry possess small planes, may I know why the Home Minister, instead of using small planes, always goes by a big plane?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: The Home Minister has gone three times by helicopters, and he goes sometimes in small planes also.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The Minister said that the Home Minister was taking always an I.A.F. plane. May I know how much it works out per flight mile? How much does it work out per mile of flight?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: As we have not to pay, the account is not with me.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know if in any case essential defence work has been ignored by the I.A.F. merely to go on a special flight for the Home Minister?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other Member who wants to put a question?

PROBE AGAINST S. T. TARKESHWARI SINHA

\*139. { SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE:†  
SHRI A. D. MANI:  
SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Attorney General has advised further probe into the allegations made against Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, the Deputy Minister of Finance; and

(b) if so, what is Government's decision in this regard?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA): (a) The Attorney General's opinion is to the effect that in respect of two out of the four items there is a good *prima facie* case for a further enquiry, the third one may also be further looked into, while the fourth item is not, in his view, a matter in which further investigation is desirable.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: May I know who made the original complaint against Mrs. Sinha and to whom was the complaint made? Was it made to the Home Minister or to the late Prime Minister, and also whether before referring the papers to the Attorney General, any explanation was called for from Mrs. Sinha?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I will take up the questions from the end. The late Prime Minister was consulted and he agreed that the papers be referred to the Attorney General. Also before referring the papers to the Attorney General, the Deputy Minister concerned had several opportunities of seeing what the

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri A. B. Vajpayee.

complaints were and of giving her own version about them, and in the first instance it was in August-September 1962 that information reached the S.P.E. about certain matters. That was then brought to the notice of the then Home Minister and afterwards several steps were taken, including a reference and note being shown to the Deputy Minister concerned. This went on over a period.

**SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE:** May I know whether the explanation of the facts submitted by the Deputy Minister was also referred to the Attorney General as was done in the case of Shri K. D. Malaviya?

**SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA:** Yes, Sir.

**श्री मेधागनी :** क्या وزیر صاحب

فرمائیں گے کہ جب ۱۹۶۲ء میں ان کے نوٹس میں یہ بات آئی یا ہوم منسٹری کے نوٹس میں آئی تو کیا انہوں نے ہاؤس کو کہی گلفیڈ پلس میں لیا - دوسرے یہ کہ اگر یہی رپورٹ یا ایسی ہی رپورٹ کسی آفیسر کے ہمارے میں آتی تو کیا اس کو سرکار فوراً سمیٹھ کر لیتی یا نہیں کرتی -

†[**श्री अब्दुल गनी :** क्या वजीर साहब फरमायेंगे कि जब १९६२ में उनके नोटिस में यह बात आई या होम मिनिस्ट्री के नोटिस में आई, तो क्या उन्होंने हाउस को सभी कान्फिडेन्स में लिया ? दूसरे यह कि अगर यही रिपोर्ट या ऐसी ही रिपोर्ट किसी आफिसर के बारे में आती, तो क्या उसको सरकार फौरन सम्पेड करती या नहीं करती ?]

**श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा :** ऐसी कोई चीज जब सामने आती है तो एक अरसा लग जाता है। उसमें जल्दबाजी नहीं हो सकती। उसमें काफी उसकी तकतीश करनी पड़ती है ताकि कोई अन्याय न हो। उसमें ऐसी भी बातें आ जाती हैं, जैसे

अकबाहें हैं। और आफिसर कोई होगा तो उसके बारे में भी जरूर फौरन एक्शन लिया जाता है और लिया जाना चाहिये।

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** May I know from the hon. Minister exactly when the Government received the first allegations and also when exactly the investigation was started? Was it before the present Home Minister took over or was it after he took over? And with regard to the four items that were mentioned, I would like to know with regard to which items the Attorney General thinks there is a *prima facie* case for enquiry? And do I understand that after the Attorney General has decided that there is a *prima facie* case for enquiry, the matter is not at all settled? And therefore, may I know how the enquiry is going to be proceeded with now at this stage with regard to those two items?

**SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA:** I have already said it, but I can repeat. The exact date on which the matter was brought to the notice of the then Home Minister was 9th October, 1962. And since then various steps were taken in this connection. I do not think there is anything more to be said about it and since the matter is still under investigation I cannot give any other information.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** Sir, when the Attorney General submitted his report, what was the Deputy Minister's reaction? Did she ask for a judicial enquiry?

**SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA:** We have not got to that stage yet.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Now, we understand for the first time that the matter was brought to the notice of Government in 1962, and now we are in the midst of 1964. I should like to know why there has been such delay in disposing of this matter, even with regard to a member of the Council of Ministers when she could be asked by the Minister concerned as to what explanation she has got, and why the Cabinet did not deal with this

matter directly where it involved a member of the Government and settle the matter. And I should like to know—and that point he did not answer—what are the two items with regard to which the Attorney General said that there was a *prima facie* case for further enquiry? What is the Government doing in this matter, rather than leaving it to routine procedure?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: The Cabinet, whosoever was dealing with the matter, did well to let it be gone into, because there may be many vague charges and unless something substantial is found, it is not possible to take any further steps. As regards further action, as I have said, the matter is being considered. What more can be said at this stage?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta wanted to know the nature of the charges.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: There are a number of them. In regard to one and two, there is a basis for a further enquiry, a good *prima facie* case for further enquiry. The third charge is also to be enquired into and the fourth need not be enquired into. I cannot give the details.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Sir. The matter is extremely important. How do we know what is one and what is two? I can understand the Government saying that it will not open up on this subject at all. Now, Government tells us that there is a *prima facie* case for further enquiry in regard to charges one and two. I should like to know what exactly one and two mean. I am not asking for any other thing. What do they relate to? Do they relate to the house or to the air-conditioning apparatus or what?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: On a point of order, Sir. I think when the matter is under enquiry . . .

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: . . . it is not proper . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are entitled to know, it is our privilege and right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know what your privilege is.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I tell you. I have a submission to make, Sir. Kindly listen. You may allow the Government not to disclose the information, I know that is in your power but we should insist. The charges are there, they were published in the papers. Now, these are in our mind but what they are and how they are numbered, we do not know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister talks of one and two. I, therefore, ask him to let me know to which of the charges these numbers one and two relate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your question is quite clear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Can we get a clear answer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to enlighten the House about the nature of the charges?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: No, Sir. I have deliberately refrained from giving any further information. It is not proper to give this information.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is what I object to. Just because it is a Minister who is involved, it is not proper? I say that it is quite proper. Under what rule does this thing become not proper?

(Several hon. Members stood up.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think one Member at a time is enough.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under which rule does he say that it is not proper? Under which rule does he seek protection, I should like to know.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Apart from the rule, which possibly my colleague, the Law Minister, will find out, the point here is that the matter is being considered by the Government. If a decision is taken at this stage one way or the other, it will prejudice the course of investigation . . .

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, not at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members would realise that if six of them stand up, I do not know what to do and there is, what Mr. Gupta calls, "some confusion".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I submit that there are precedents in this House. Even when the matter has been under investigation, not only have the Government said that certain things are under investigation but have also given certain relevant things with regard to the nature of the charges. Many of the things you will find in the proceedings. That being so, why in this particular case, after the matter has been debated in the Press, the Government is not divulging the nature of the charges with regard to items one and two about which the Attorney-General has already given certain opinion.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: If the charges could be referred to the Attorney-General and his opinion sought, this House cannot be denied knowledge of the charges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Vajpayee; I should like to deal with one Member at a time. Mr. Gupta has said something and I would ask the Minister if he has anything to say. You can have your chance after that. No, Mr. Niren Ghosh. You have been on your feet all the time. Would you like to say something or would you like to leave it to the Law Minister?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: The Law Minister is trying to find out something . . .

(Interruption from several hon. Members)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we are . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: On a point of order, Sir. May I request my friends to allow me to raise a point of order? It would be in order if the hon. Minister were to take shelter under the plea that it is not in the public interest to disclose this particular matter.

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Is he prepared to take this particular plea? Unless and until he takes that plea, obviously he has to answer on the floor of the House a question admitted by you. There is no provision in the Rules of Procedure relating to questions which permits him to hold back a particular reply unless and until he takes shelter under the plea that it is not in the public interest to disclose this information.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I am forced to that extreme. I wanted to avoid that point because I think hon. Members might appreciate my feelings. The case is being dealt with and maybe it may not be necessary to do anything at all but even as it is being said, it is also, I would say, not in the public interest to give this information.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have a submission to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the Minister . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: We are entitled to know, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Sir.

(Several hon. Members stood up.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Sir. You have been good enough to admit this question and answers have been given in part but the answers do not make any sense, in view what has appeared in the papers to the contrary and this creates confusion, unless the logical sequence is followed, namely, the nature of the case is given. Nothing of the public interest will be involved or harmed by adding this little information to what he has already said. On the contrary, the public will be thinking that because it is a case of a Minister, the Ministers are trying to shield one of their colleagues. That is what the public may think and that is why the Minister is taking protection under some particular Rule. Therefore, Sir, I would submit to you to kindly consider this. It is precisely the public interest which demands that the hon. Minister should open up fully since he has opened up a little and tell us which of the charges relate to the two significant items on which the Attorney-General has given his opinion; and if he wants to take protection under the cover of serving the public interest, let him state the Rule for it, have it on record that under such and such Rule he is seeking protection.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have understood your point of order. As Mr. Gupta has said, I was good enough to admit the question, I am now bad enough to admit the plea of the Home Minister that it is not in the public interest that he should divulge the nature of the two charges!

Next question.

#### SAMYUKTA SADACHAR SAMITI

\*140. SHRI A. D. MANI: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state the relationship established

between the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Samyukta Sadachar Samiti, which was formed recently?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): The Samyukta Sadachar Samiti is a purely non-official and non-political body with Shri G. L. Nanda as President. In view of the objects and functions of the Samiti, Government welcome its constitution, will extend full co-operation to it and avail of its services in the campaign for eradication of corruption and the redress of public grievances.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, is it a fact that the office of this Samiti is located in the Central Secretariat and that the Prime Minister attends the monthly meetings of the Samiti to discuss the agenda?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: No, Sir, the office of the Samiti is not located in the Central Secretariat building, in the North or the South Blocks, but this Samiti has been given a room in the L Block, outside the Secretariat.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Will the allegations which may be made before the Samiti be allegations made on affirmation? What remedy will there be available to a person against whom false allegations are brought in?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Generally, what this Samiti will do is that it will receive complaints from the public, individuals. These will then be screened to find out whether *prima facie* there is a case or not. If there is a case, then the question will be taken up with the Government authorities. The cases may be referred either to the Central Vigilance Commission or to the departments concerned, the departmental Vigilance Officers or the Samiti may itself take up the questions.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Has it occurred to the Home Minister that it is a mat-