

[Shri Dajiba Desai]

honesty, justice etc. Can he expect justice; can he expect honesty and can he expect sincerity? There are various programmes before the country—there is law and order problem here. As stated by some of the Members here, we are here to discuss the law and order problem because this is a state subject. Law and order problem is after all a problem which the ruling Janata Party has to face.

The ruling party must have one political approach in every State. In one State they support the backward classes; in another State they support the scheduled castes and yet in another State one section of the party supports the higher class whereas the other section of the party supports backward classes. If the party tries to divide or bifurcate the various sections or various communities on caste lines it will not be possible for them to implement any positive decision.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, take the question of education. The previous ruling party based its education policy on Kothari Commission. The Janata Party has also based its education policy on Kothari Commission. The previous Government relied on the Agricultural Prices Commission the Janata Government is also doing the same thing. So, my point is that the Janata Party is trying to continue the economic policies of the Indira Gandhi Government. Indira Gandhi came out with a 20-point programme. The Janata Party has come out with a minimum need-based programme of 7 points. The points are the same. Only difference is that they declared that they will implement them vigorously. They could not implement it vigorously. Then where lies any difference.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am warning this Janata Government. The Janata Party started with a slogan of total revolution. For that they must have a socialist approach. Some people in the Janata Party are eloquent about it but they succumb to the

majority in the Janata Party. If they accept socialism then they will have to change the entire structure of planning. Inequality cannot be abolished by giving some alms to the poor and guaranteeing good profit to the industrialists. Plan has ensured a fair return to industrialists but at the same time there is no guarantee of remunerative prices or need-based wages to the agricultural labour or the working class. The present No Confidence Motion is a warning to the Janata Government. They will have to change everything. I am expressing this warning on behalf of my party.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been patiently hearing all that has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and all others who have spoken in support of the No Confidence Motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I thought I would benefit by what he said and that it would help Government in rectifying mistakes which required to be rectified. The Opposition has a right of moving No Confidence Motions—whether they do it responsibly or irresponsibly it is their business. It is not for me to judge. It is not for me to object to it. That is why I welcomed it immediately and said, let it be discussed immediately. But then I heard nothing now I have been hearing all these things ever since this Government assumed office.

The same things are being repeated over and over again from the very beginning. I can prove it by records if they want to have any proof. It is there if anybody wants to see the record. But I do not want to take the time of the House in recounting these things all over again. Only two new arguments were advanced, two new charges, if I may say so. It is good that they have come out with these

charges so that the people may know what the truth is. The two new charges are that my Principal Secretary is running the whole show. There was a caucus before and there is a caucus now and that my son is doing something like this. Now, there cannot be a more fantastic statement than whatever has been said in this connection. The Principal Secretary has nothing to do with the selection of officers. The appointment of officers emanates from the Ministries concerned and the decision is made by three persons, namely the Minister concerned, the Home Minister and the Prime Minister. This is not a new practice. This practice has been there since 1947. And there is no question of my Principal Secretary trying to influence me in any way. If he tries to interfere, he will not remain in my office even for a day. I would, therefore, be obliged to the hon. Members if they can give me one instance where he has influenced my decision and got one man in who should not have got in I shall be very thankful for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He could influence.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Whom did he influence? That was the old style. This is not the style now. Even the Prime Minister does not influence other Ministers. They are free to make the recommendations that they want. And I have never suggested any name to the Ministers. Therefore, what is the use of saying this kind of thing? And then a case was made about my son making an unscheduled flight at Tehran. I do not know what is unscheduled flight....

AN HON. MEMBER: Halt.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It was the plane which stopped over at Tehran. It was not done for him. When I had gone earlier, there was also unscheduled halt then. It was not for him. What is the meaning of saying that he made an unscheduled flight? He

went to London from Moscow via Tehran. If he had come here and then gone there, it would have cost him more money. It was not the Government money that was spent on him. I have made it clear so many times before whenever somebody asked me about it. Then it was asked why he went there. This was in September last. He went there at his own expense to sever the last connection of business he had acquired in 1970. He used to go there before every year with the full knowledge and permission of the Reserve Bank of India. He wanted to get out of it so that there is no connection left with any business whatsoever. He had severed all other connections with business here in 1964, but this had remained. He thought that it was necessary that he should get out even from this so that nobody could raise a finger. But what can one say of people who always want to see something wrong in everything which they want to imagine?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Why is Chaudhuri Charan Singh wanting to try him?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is between him and me.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a matter of national concern, a Minister writing to you that he wants to try such and such person... (Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is a different matter altogether. The Home Minister can say and I can also tell him. That shows the freedom with which we work among ourselves; it does not mean anything else.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a public matter.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: If anything *prima facie* is established, I would be the first man to prosecute him.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The Home Minister says that there is *prima facie* case.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: He has not said that; That is all wrong. He has never said so; that is a lie if anybody says so.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: What does he say?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I am not going to tell you and oblige you in this matter. My hon. friends depend upon Blitz--God help them--a paper which has always been a tissue of lies...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It was a question raised in Parliament.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I have known Blitz for the last thirty years and I always treated it with contempt. I do not want to take notice of yellow papers; nor do I want to take notice of those who deal in yellow journalism. I can only sympathise with them for their want of prudence. But if they don't have it, who am I to give them prudence? I do not want to offer any advice in this matter. But this shows on whom the opposition depends to show that there is no confidence in this government. What have they come to? I thought that they would change by years' experience and give up their old methods. But I find that they are still fond of them. I cannot help them. Who am I to say that they should not do so? But if they feel that by this method they will be able to break the Janata Party, they are very much mistaken. I agree and I would not say that there is nothing wrong with us. I will be the last man to say so; no party can claim that there is no difference anywhere, in any party. Show me any party, even in England, even in America, even in Germany wherever you go, you will find differences. There were no open differences during the last few years in their party. But I was told of the inner differences that were there. I do not want to speak

about them; I am not like them. I do not believe in resorting to such methods to condemn anybody. But these are matters where if they were careful, I do not think they would have done what they have done here. I cannot compliment them on their performance. What have we done, they ask. Is this not a great change, the change that has taken place? The change is so remarkable that the world knows it. If there is no full satisfaction, I can understand. I cannot say that there is full satisfaction nor can I say that full satisfaction can be given in a year in every matter. But there is nothing of which we have to be ashamed nor is there anything that we have not done which we could have done or that we have failed in doing it. There is no item on which anybody can say that.

They cited many things. They cited prices. Are not prices more this March than what they were in March last? If they deny the figures what am I to do? We do not claim that they have one down. If they have to go down they have to be stable first. And if after ten years record of inflation every year, barring six months of Emergency, we have halted rise in prices, is that not some achievement?

But why should they admit it? They, they have to condemn themselves which they are not yet prepared to do. Yes, I know, there are several hon. Members on the other side who had quietly suffered all kinds of things during the Emergency and even before. They have now begun to admit, some in public and some in private, that Emergency was wrong and should not have been there.

They say now that there is no change. Is this a small change that everybody is free to say what he likes throughout the country? Is it not the greatest change from the times when we tried to point out the

shortcomings of the Government but were taken away in the darkness of night, whisked away somewhere without letting anybody know where we were taken? Thousands of them were taken away and crowds were brought here in lorries and trucks, Government military trucks to prove that people had confidence in them.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Kisan rally?

(Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: How can I give any sense of shame to people who do not know what shame is? (Interruptions) How can I give it? It is not possible for me to give any sense of proportion when there is none? How am I to do it?

It is my misfortune that I have to reply to this debate. It is no pleasure for me to have to say these things. I am not happy but I have to reply to it; otherwise, things will go by default. The change you see is that can go about without let or hindrance, they can say whatever they like.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: May I just say one sentence? The fearlessness had led to one thing in the United States. I may just quote a few lines from 'India Abroad'. An advertisement has appeared in it and it is this:

"SERVICES—We deliver rupees in India. Competitive rates—fast action. Any amount, at any place. Transaction thru banks, Easiest way of doing it—everything done by telephone. Personalized services, satisfaction guaranteed. H. Parikh (Financial Consultant) Orient Express, Journal Square, Jersey City."

An advertisement has come that they will make compensatory payment. That is where the fearlessness had led to. This is published in the United States. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You have mentioned that.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: These are legacies which we have received from my hon. friend and it is that legacy which is making it difficult for this Government to get over everything and make faster progress. (Interruptions)

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Since he mentioned about fearlessness, I mentioned that. An advertisement is put that rupees will be paid in India for dollars in 'India Abroad', a magazine published in the United States and so many Indians read it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: They are sorry that we are undoing the wrongs that they heaped upon us people. We have not yet been able to remove all wrongs completely and that is our misfortune. But the wrongs are so many that they cannot be removed quickly. What we could do quickly, we have already done and you see the result of it.

There is complete freedom of press, so much so that what we say may not be published but what they say is published with big headlines. I can prove it by production of those news papers, if they want to see.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: That is why the yellow press is there.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is not the yellow press. Yellow press is a very small part of it. A large part of it is not yellow press. Then, on the media who is getting publicity? It is given to everybody. If at all, they get more publicity than they deserved at any time. Was opposition ever heard on media before? Yet they say there is no change. It has been done for the first time in this country, that in the elections the Opposition had the facility of speaking on the radio as much as the ruling party. For the first time this is done.

We are also trying to see that media become independent and do

[Shri Morarji Desai]

not remain subservient to Government. But it requires careful consideration. We had appointed a committee. The report has come. We will soon take a decision. But to say that we have done nothing, has no meaning.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Media has been captured by one organization.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: By whom has it been captured? The agencies were merged into one in the past regime. There was one 'Samachar' only; and all were bundled into it, and made to do what they liked. All that has been separated and they are made independent. And we don't interfere with them in any manner whatsoever. Not only that. I have told the Press: 'If you want to have your own arrangement, you must have it. I don't want to nominate anybody on the Press Council. You should look after the Press yourselves and regulate it yourselves. If any law is violated, certainly Government will step in. But that is only when law is violated; and the action can be taken in a court of law. But for that, we will not interfere in any manner whatever.' I have never asked any Editor or Correspondent to see me, unless he wanted to come and see me. And there also, I have never said, "You should do this or should not do that". I only say, "You better ascertain the facts and write as you like." We don't want to interfere with the freedom of the Press in any manner.

Take the Opposition. Is the Opposition now in the same cramped state in which it was before? The Leader of the Opposition has been recognized fully. And it was for the first time in history that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker were elected unanimously in this House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The credit goes to the House.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I agree that credit goes to the House. The Opposition would have been willing to

do that even before; but it was never consulted. Not only that It was defamed in every possible way. We don't believe in retaliation. Not only that. The President has also been elected unanimously. (Interruptions) I don't say that the credit is not due to you, I say that credit goes to all.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Dr. G. S. Dhillon was elected unanimously.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: The Speaker was not elected unanimously—not in the real sense. Therefore, to say that nothing has happened, is only denying facts. I can say nothing more than that.

Look at food supplies There is more food available to-day. And those whom I met in Bombay and in other cities have said that whenever they wanted things, they get them. Formerly all those things were not available There is now more production Industry is doing better. It has not done enough, I am quite sure. But it takes time A year or 13 months is not enough to change everything and bring Heaven in this country. We have never promised that. We don't do it.

There is Education It requires to be changed; but we cannot change it by ourselves, as they were doing. We want to taken the educationists with us in this matter. Therefore we are discussing education with those who are concerned with it and trying to come to a consensus in the same manner as we are doing in this House on many matters. That is why it takes time. The Constitutional Amendment should have been done much earlier. But we did not want it without taking the opposition with us, as much as possible. We have been able to come to a large measure of agreement even in the anti-Defections Bill; it is delayed because we wanted to consult the Opposition so that it has a smooth

passage and it becomes more effective. I must say I was very happy this morning when in our discussions we could come to agreed conclusions and reached a consensus. That is why we have to have patience in this matter.

If my hon. friends think we can wash out every wrong thing they did in thirteen months, then I would like to say that we have washed out some; other things still remain to be washed out. That takes a little time; but it will not take more than a year more to wash out the remaining dirt.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Do not wash them in public.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is left to you. If you want me to do it, I do not know whether you will be able to stand up to it. This, I know; but it is not my business to expose anybody. I have never done it and I would not do it. If you come to me privately, I will tell you what I know, on condition that you do not publish it. But this is not the way to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about your secrets?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I have no secrets. If I have, let anybody find them. But, somehow, over the years I was close with many of them. So, I know what they really are. That is how the world is. I do not find fault with them. We all have feet of clay; everybody has some failing or the other. Who am I to find fault with them? But they want us to be saints whereas they want to remain what they were. I think that is not the way to increase our capacity or make the Government more effective.

Let there be responsible dignified criticism. Criticism can be made, provided it is made with dignity. When they go on shouting at those who speak from here, they do not see anything wrong in it; they say that is their right. But when some people

from here have a dig at them, all of them get up and ask "what is going on?" This is not the way to meet arguments (*Interruptions*) What does the hon. Member think he is doing? He is demonstrating how he interrupts all the while. I have not interfered with anybody; I have not interrupted anybody. This is not the way to do it. But they pop up and down all the while, because that seems to be the only exercise they know. If it had been really an exercise in dignity with cogent arguments, I would have been very thankful to them.

As I said before, I welcome this no-confidence motion, because I am glad that it brings the two factions together. Those who have factions are now talking about factions? In my party where are the factions? Yes, there are differences of views as my colleague, Shri Jagjivan Ram, said, it is an unprecedented thing in history that five parties, differing from one another but all believing in democracy, fighting against one another for 30 years, criticising one another, come together voluntarily without any pressure from anybody, except the pressure of the people, who wanted democracy to be saved. Therefore, we came together and emerged practically as a new party, which was not fully formed constitutionally in the normal sense, wins the Lok Sabha elections in a striking manner, which opens the eyes of the world, but not the eyes of my hon. friends. Those who have eyes, but do not see—what can I tell them? I can lead a blind man, but I cannot lead a person who can see, but does not want to see. What can I do to them?

And then it was also said by Jagjivanramji that we are working together. It does not mean that all our hearts have come together. Therefore, there are bound to be some differences, differences of opinions and views. That is not healthy in my views, I do agree, but it is not an unusual phenomenon. It is natural. If it did not happen, it

[Shri Morarji Desai]

would have been unnatural. We would not have lasted. It is because of this that it will be cemented.

And I want their factions also to be cemented. I want a strong opposition. I do not want a weak opposition. It is the business of the opposition to show the faults of the Government, and also try to see that they get the mandate of the people to replace the Government in a constitutional manner. It is their right. That is what democracy means. And that is why I want that they should recognise this.

I believe what is happening is natural in the conditions in which we have come together, but that also will settle down. We will not oblige you. Don't think that you are likely to come here soon. But if you behave like this, you will never come here again.

I only want that they should be dignified in what they say, that they must have more regard for facts and truth, rather than only eagerness to attack and make us feel. That way nobody feels anything. I wish they had said something which would have made me think. I do not know what reply to give because there is nothing on which I can say anything to them, there is nothing which requires any telling. But my hon. friends go on saying what they like. Let them do so. After all, it is they who have to pick up wisdom, not I. I am trying to pick up such wisdom from them, as is therein them. Everybody can have wisdom I cannot say that there is anybody without any wisdom whatsoever. I can never say that. I am trying to learn from them. I do not want them to learn from me if they do not want to.

On the one side they give me a compliment that I am a Gandhian. On the other side, they depict me as a fool or a convector. That is not the way.

They bring here cases of oppression, terrorism of oppression of Harijans,

law and order problems, but these are not problems which only relate to us, they relate to all. I do not want to go on with this argument. This has been happening. And we have got to stop it. We are not able to stop it much, I agree, but this is also a legacy that we have got, and it is not created only by those people; these are also inherent in the conditions of the country. I do not want to blame anybody for these things, but these are things which we have got to stop. Formerly these incidents were not published. The Harijans, the tribals and the backward classes had no courage to fight it or speak about it. I am very happy that they are able to fight and speak out today, and that is why when my colleagues here on this side speak very strongly about it, I have patience with them, I appreciate their feelings.

But, do my hon. friends want to spoil the atmosphere further and not make it better? If they are interested in improving the situation and making this country great for the benefit of all of us, this is not the way to go about it. That is all that I can plead with them.

I have nothing to advise them. This is no sermon. It is my business as Leader of the House to advise them if necessary, but I know that advice must not be given to anybody who does not want it. One who does that would be stupid. That I learnt when I was young, not now. If they say many things and I have got to reply to them, they consider it a sermon. God help them again. Do they expect that I must not say anything which I must say to refute what they are saying in a wrong manner? If I say that, how does it become a sermon. If I say that I want the opposition to be strong, would I be giving a sermon? I say that the opposition will be strong only if it becomes dignified and disciplined in the House because it goes out from the House outside and I was simply very unhappy when I was told in one argument that this House does not represent the conditions in the

country. The people out side represent them. Are we not representatives? Is it not derogatory to the Parliament and its authority? This House represents the best in the country, whatever they may be.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI:
Nobody said this.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It was said here. I will show it from the record. That is not right. It has been said from the front benches opposite. It has not been said from the back benches.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI:
Whom is he referring to?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I can tell you but I do not want to name people. It is not said by one but by two. If they did not say it and if they say, they did not say it, I accept it. I have no difficulty about it. But let them see afterwards what they have said in a hurry without knowing what they are saying. That also is a malady from which we are suffering here. I hope, we do not suffer from that malady as a result of this no-confidence motion.

I am thankful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for making an exhibition once again of what weaknesses they are suffering from. If they want to press the no-confidence motion, they are free to do so. But that will not add to the dignity in any way. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really disappointed that in rising to reply, there is nothing in the speech made by the Prime Minister which I have got to reply to. He said only one thing that the people who have eyes do not care to see, cannot see. After listening through two days speeches if the Prime Minister does not see anything that has been said which is to be taken note of, I only repeat what Christ said once: "Those who have eyes to see, let them see; those

who have two ears to hear, let them hear."

The Prime Minister, unfortunately, does not have the ears to hear what was being said here.

A question was repeatedly asked why this no-confidence motion was brought forward. Many of the no-confidence motions were discussed in the past. Many Members in this House are witness to that. There is one thing absolutely distinct as far as this motion and the speeches on this motion are concerned. With the exception of one or two speeches, it will kindly be noted that the motion sought to rest not on corruption charges and mudslinging but on national issues. Not that there are no corruption allegation to be made; there are quite a number. I do not want to make any allegation but I have got with me a letter from Shri Shibban Lal Saksena who sent this to me where he said:

"I have been deeply distressed and pained at the corruption of some of the Ministers in the Central Cabinet. I have already given you a chargesheet containing hundred-and-one specific charges against..." (I do not want to mention name; it is here.) "And another chargesheet against another Minister..." (I do not want to mention. That is there in the letter.)

I have got the corruption charges with me. I could just read out those charges and could have started mudslinging process. But, I believe, the Parliament of India, if one can avoid it, must not be used for that purpose. National issues must be raised; national issues must be projected. National issues were projected here.

In the course of the budget discussion, every demand was discussed and a sum-total of impression has been formed and a sum-total of impression has been reflected in this House.

What is it that you heard from here? Congress (I), Congress,