

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

becoming Prime Minister, who has come there on the wave of such racial riots and such beating up of coloured people and Indians in that country? It is one thing for the Prime Minister to congratulate another Prime Minister. That is part of international practice, but just because somebody is a woman . . . (Interruptions) No self-respecting Indian can congratulate anybody of the Conservative Party, and particularly, somebody who has come on the wave of these riots. Therefore, I just want to put this on record, because tomorrow we will have Dr. Subramaniam Swamy clowning around and warning Callaghan, 'Be careful. A woman has come and emergency will come.' It was because of us, women, that this kind of feminism has come and I think it should be put to an end to because woman has to show her ability and I am sure women will show their ability as citizens of a country. . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You are showing it.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Mr. Stephen, you want me to say something about you? You blow hot and cold. Mr. Stephen was willing for a judicial probe into the events in Janpath the other day. At that time, the Government was capable of appointing a just Judge who will go into it. But then why are you going into the motives now? Don't blow hot and cold. You will be in the same boat as Mr. Jethmalani.

A last word on Mr. Sathe. I would just warn you that for the last two years. . .

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Partner, don't say that in public. You have been supporting us all through. We had been such good friends. Don't tell everything in public. You are our partner.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: One last word. He talks about the economic ills of this country and about the economic problems of our people. I will warn him. He will also be swept away by the storm that is coming because his party is only concerned with one demand 'Mataji Bachao'. So, don't talk about economic problems on Floor of the House, when you are least serious about them.

16.00 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: ALLEGED PAYMENT OF FOREIGN MONEY FOR ELECTIONS IN INDIA BY THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

की कंकर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप की आज्ञा से यह प्रश्न सदन के सामने उठाना चाहता हूँ :

a discussion regarding alleged payment of foreign money for elections in India by the American Government as disclosed by Mr. Moynihan in his book 'A Dangerous Place'.

यह बड़ा गम्भीर प्रश्न है और गम्भीर इसलिए नहीं कि किसी देश ने किसी व्यक्ति को 10, 5 करोड़ रुपये दे दिये, यह इसलिए गम्भीर है कि हमारे देश के पोलीटीकल सिस्टम को बेजोड़ किया गया, यह इसलिए गम्भीर है कि हमारे पोलीटीकल सिस्टम की इन्टेग्रेटी को खतरा पैदा हुआ ।

विदेशी शक्तियाँ इस प्रकार के देश की राजनीति में दखल डालें, पहले क्या हुआ उसको छोड़ दीजिए, आज क्या हुआ उसको भी छोड़ दीजिए पर हमारे देश की राजनीतिक स्थिति कल क्या होगी, इस पर विचार करना है । इस लिए भी यह गम्भीर है । हमारे देश में अपने विधान में प्रजातन्त्र को अपनाया है । जब इस देश में प्रजातन्त्र है तो देश की जनता ऐसा चाहेगी वैसे चलेगी । ये विदेशी शक्तियाँ भा कर इस में दखल डाल कर जिस तरह-तक को मोड़ेंगी, उस तरह क्या यह देश चलेगा ? पोलीटिकल ने कौरेक पार्टी को पैसा क्यों दिया, क्योंकि वे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की यह योजना चाहती थी कि यह

वह चुनाव में हारे थे कोई। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के पक्ष में नहीं है लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहता हूँ कि जनता की आवाज सुनी जाने लगे। अगर जनता यह चाहती है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी जीते, तो किसी विदेशी शक्ति को हक नहीं है कि वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को हराने के लिए जनता के बरडिक्ट को तोड़ कर दे। यह ठीक नहीं होगा। मैं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का उत्तम ही कट्टर विरोधी हूँ जितना कि धीरे कोई है लेकिन मैं विरोधी होते हुए भी यह नहीं चाहूंगा कि जनता की आवाज को विदेशी पैसे के जरिये से कुचल दिया जाए। वे जो सुपर पावर्स हैं, वे केवल हमारे देश में ही नहीं बल्कि दूसरे देशों में भी, अमेरिका, मिडिल ईस्ट और एशिया में इस तरह के जो पावर प्लेक्स हैं, ये लड़ाई लड़वा रहे हैं पैसे से धीरे दूसरे तरीकों से भी लड़ाई चल रही है। इस लिए हमें बहुत ज्यादा सतर्क होना है कि हमारे देश का भविष्य ठीक हो। श्री मोनोहित से क्या कहा है, यह हम देखें और जब से मोनोहित का स्टेटमेंट प्रकाश में आया है, जो उनकी किताब में लिखा है वह पत्रकारों में छपा है, तब से देश में एक खलबली मच गई है और बय-सेल सा गिरा लगता है। जगह जगह पर इसकी चर्चा है कि पहले जो एम्बेसेडर थे, वे बड़े डिप्लोमेट हैं और आज यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स में मिनिट को प्रेजेंट कर रहे हैं। भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में उन्होंने एलिवेनस लगाए हैं।

यह नहीं उन्होंने कहा कि उन्होंने पैसा मांगा और इस लिए पैसा दिया गया, उनकी पार्टी को पैसा दिया गया। यह एक ऐसा गम्भीर आरोप है कि शायद हमारे देश के इतिहास में ही नहीं बल्कि संसार के इतिहास में इस प्रकार का आरोप नहीं लगाया गया है। हम ने बहुत सी चीजें सी आई ए की एक्टिविटीय के बारे में पढ़ी हैं। लोगों ने बहुत कुछ उसके बारे में लिखा है। एक सीनियर डिप्लोमेट एक जिम्मेदार आदमी यह बात कहे कि वेने एम्बेसी को कहा कि इसकी इनकारी कराओ कि पिछले पचीस साल में हम ने क्या किया और इनकारी के बाद यह निकला कि वो बार हमने इन्वैस्टिग किया है और धान रिमांड बंगाल और केरल में कम्युनिस्टों को हराने के लिए पैसा दिया है, तो यह बहुत गम्भीर आरोप ही जाता है। प्रैस कॉन्फ्रेंस जो हुई उस में और कहा, इसको मैं आप की आज्ञा से पूरा देना चाहता हूँ :

Senator Mynihan said that the two paragraphs in his book *A Dangerous Place*, that deals with the political contributions, had to

be cleared with the CIA before publication. "Just a couple of lines took me an entire working day to get clearance", he commented.

इसका मतलब यह है कि लिखने से पहले उन्होंने स्वीयरेंस भी ले लिया। धान या एत गवर्नमेंट चुप है, एम्बेसी चुप है, बडन नहीं करती है लेकिन उनके पास स्वीयरेंस भी है कि धान रिमांड कम्युनिस्टों को हराने के लिए दो बार पैसा दिया और इनकारी करने के बाद यह चीज सामने आई। उन्होंने यह भी बताया है कि उन्होंने क्यों यह कहा है? उन्होंने कहा है कि इविरा जी इन सीजन और ब्राइट फ्रॉक सीजन भी आई ए को गालियां देती थी। मैंने पास बहुत सी कटिंग हैं 14-12-72 को एजैक्टिव कमेटी धाक कांग्रेस पार्लियमेंटरी पार्टी में उन्होंने कहा था :

The Government had definite information about the CIA activities in India but it was not proper to place the details before the public. She disclosed that the Government had received reports much in advance from its own sources that there would be disturbances in some parts of the country in September and October. These reports had proved correct.

उन्होंने कांग्रेस वर्कर्स मीटिंग सली में इन रात 2-10-72 को जो कहा था वह भी मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ। वह हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में छपा था :

She has information that the CIA had become active in India and she had asked party workers to be vigilant and counteract its activities.

Addressing the AICC session in Gandhinagar on 9.10.72 she said: The CIA was interfering in India's internal affairs. Her earlier remarks on this subject had not been fully reported. She repeated that it was not necessary to prove what an external intelligence agency was doing in this country. Persons previously associated with CIA had written books to expose its role and show how it had a hand in toppling of several Governments.

(Dis.)

[बीकबर साल मुक्त]

मेरे पास सब पत्र हूँ उदाहरण है लेकिन सब को यहाँ ब्याज करके मैं समय लेना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने हमेशा सी आई ए को बुरा बताया कहा है।

मोनिहान साहब कहते हैं कि मैंने सोचा कि मैं कम से कम नाम तो करूँ कि आखिर सी आई ए ने इस देश में क्या किया है और इन्फार्मरी करने के बाद और एम्बेसी के रिकार्ड को देखने के बाद पता लगा कि केवल दो बार पैसा दिया गया। क्या यह उबल रोल नहीं है इंदिरा जी का? सी आई ए को गालियाँ देना इन सीजन और घाउट आक सीजन हुआ कि

CIA has been indulging in our activities. There is no doubt about it.

कम से कम जो पैसा धान बिना सी आई ए से लेता है उसको तो गाली देने का हक नहीं है। यह जो उबल बेहरा है उस बेहरे का नकाब तो कम से कम अब उठ जाना चाहिये जनता के सामने, जो उबल रोल है यह चीज तो खत्म होनी चाहिये। मेरे क्वाल के मोनिहान साहब ने एक प्राइम फेसर्ड केस आज एस्टेबलिश कर दिया है जिस के आधार पर यह कहा जा सकता है कि कम से कम दो बार जब श्रीमति इंदिरा गाँधी कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष थीं कांग्रेस को पैसा आया, केरल और वेस्ट बंगाल के चुनाव के समय।

अब इसको रिबट करने लिए उन्होंने क्या कहा है? उन्होंने कहा है कि यह बात गलत है, इसको उन्होंने विनाई किया है जोकि बहुत नैचुरल भी है। वह विनाई करती रही है।

Indraji has been denying everything. It is said that after Allahabad High Court judgement, she is a woman of 14 lies.

उन्होंने इलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट के जजमेंट के पहले चौदह बार बोला है। आप जजमेंट को पढ़ें उस में कहा गया है कि चौदह बार झूठ बोला है। उनकी मान में मैं कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ। वह एक एल्बर्की लेडी हैं और मेरे मन में उनके लिये गेट रिस्पेक्ट है। लेकिन यह मैं कहे नहीं रह सकता हूँ कि गलत बात कहने की उनकी आदत है। अब उनके लिये जन को आप्र वेचें। पहले उन्होंने राय बरेली में कहा कि 'बकि मैं सी आई ए को बहुत ज्यादा क्रिटिसाइज करती थी इसलिए उन्होंने यह कह दिया है। अंडीपद में उन्होंने कहा कि यू स ए कन्ग्रेसमेंट में कुछ लोग ऐसे हैं जो मेरे खिलाफ और इसलिए यह कहा गया है। जम्मु में उनके

सबूब से से कि बार एस एस और जन संघ वालों ने कहलवाया है क्योंकि मोनिहान साहब तीन बयान इस्टीमेट के प्रेजेंट से और मात्रा भी उनसे यहाँ भी मिले से और वह इसलिए हुआ। आखिर में बार एस एस आकां। कम से कम बार एस एस -सिक्वन्सर नहीं है, ऐसा तों आप नहीं कह सकते हैं.....

एक माननीय सचिव : राज नारायण जी से पूछें।

बी कंबर साल मुक्त : वह हमारे घर की बात है।

मेरा पहना यह है कि इंदिरा जी ने कई तरीकों से रिपेक्ट किया है। उनका रिपेक्शन कुछ भी हो लेकिन पब्लिक लाइफ की मांग यह है, इंटेलि, देश भक्ति की मांग यह है कि अगर वह अपने आपको ठीक समझती हैं तो प्रां और साबित कर कि वह इन्वोलेट है।

The onus lies on Mrs. Gandhi, not on Mr. Moynihan because Mr. Moynihan has built up a *prima facie* case.

उन्होंने एक बात और कही कि मैं क्योंकि मोनिहान पर यहाँ की प्रदानतों में मुकदमा नहीं चला सकती हूँ इस बास्ते में मुकदमा नहीं चलाती हूँ। मैं बहुत बड़ा बकील नहीं हूँ स्टीफन साहब की तरह। लेकिन स्टीफन साहब इन बात को स्वीकार करेंगे कि

This book that I have got with me has been published in India. You know that Mr. Stephen, I suppose. After all the publisher and the printer of this book is in India. Cannot you sue him for defamation and if you do not find any lawyer, we can provide some good lawyer—Mr. Jethmalani.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will engage you.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त: उनको सींगसी और कांस्टीट्यूशनली डिफरेंस का केस उनके विचारों का बंधन नहीं है। इतना ही नहीं, हमारे यहाँ मंत्री भी जाम फर्माइस में भी कहा है कि मैं पब्लिकली कहता हूँ इस बात को धीरे धीरे नुकसान बहुत बलायें पता लग जाए कि कौन ठीक है और कौन गलत है। अगर वह नुकसान नहीं बलाती है, अपने आप को इन्फोर्मेट साबित नहीं करती है तो जाहिर बात है कि सब बात सही है जो मोनिटोरिंग में कही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई भी व्यक्ति, चाहे इन्विराजी हो, चाहे मैं हूँ और चाहे कोई नो या कोई भी पार्टी हो, कोई भी मन्त्रा हो, कोई भी व्यक्ति हो, जो विदेशी पैसा लेता है, मेरे विचार से उस को पब्लिक लाइफ से एलीमिनेट करना चाहिए और उस का पब्लिक लाइफ में कोई स्थान नहीं होना चाहिए और मैं यह समझता हूँ कि सरकार को कोई ऐसा कानून लाना चाहिए जिस में इस तरह के व्यक्ति को डिफेन्स कर सकें। अगर वह बीज गलत है, जो मोयनीहिन ने कहा है, वह गलत है, तो इस देश का प्रथमान हुआ है, केवल इन्विराजी का प्रथमान नहीं हुआ है। और मैं बाह्य कि 17 मंत्री जो इस की इन्विराजी कराए क्योंकि श्री मोयनीहिन ने कहा है कि य० एम० ए० गवर्नमेंट भी, मुझे पता है, इसको खतरा करेगी। जब उन्होंने ऐसा कहा है तो कम से कम होम मिनिस्ट्री उन से पूछे। मेरे खयाल से सी० पी० आई० के जो हमारे दोस्त हैं, जो उधर बैठे हैं यहाँ पर और बंगाल में भी ऐसे लोग हैं और जो कांग्रेस के लोग हैं, उन से भी कुछ इस बारे में खबर मिल जाएगी। यह प्रथमा बीसी केस है और अगर इस की इन्विराजी हो, अगर होम मिनिस्ट्री इस की इन्विराजी करेगी, तो भारतवादी के लिए लो कम से कम यह बीज ठीक हो जाएगी कि फोरेन पार्लस जो हैं, वे अपने पैसों का एम्प्लॉय न करें। यह पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, यह नेशनल कानसेंस है और इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि सबके सभी सदस्य यह चाहेंगे और इन्विराजी में इन्फोर्मेट में भी यह है कि इस की इन्विराजी हो और उस के बाद सही बीज देश के सामने आए। इसी तरह से अगर और किसी के बारे में भी चाहे वह कोई संस्था हो, व्यक्ति हो, कल्चरल धार्मिक संस्था हो, स्टूडेंट्स विंग हो, लेबर धार्मिक संस्था हो या पार्लियामेंट पार्टी हो, ए हो, बी हो या सी हो, मेरे लिए मास्ट सब के लिए एक पैसा है, इन्विराजी हो सकती है।

एक बीज और मैं कहूँगा। मेरे पास बन्हाय साहब का 60 साइन वाला स्टेटमेंट है और बन्हाय साहब ने उस में कहा है, कि कांस्टीट्यूशनल एमाउन्ट आफ फोरेन मनी यहाँ पर प्राप्ती है— मैं बाद में उस को पढ़ूँगा—और उस से देश में काफी गड़बड़ होने की प्रत्याशा है। उसके बाद मेरा प्राइमेटे मेम्बर जिन भी या और बनता पार्टी के जाने के बाद कानून भी बनाया, मैं उद्योग के

लिए आप को बसाई देना चाहता हूँ लेकिन मैं यह चाहूँगा कि कानून का क्या इम्पैक्ट है बिना-बिना फोरेन मनी, इस की एक साइंटिफिक स्टडी होनी चाहिए, कितना पैसा बाहर से आता है और मोडस प्रोपरेडी क्या है, इम्पैक्ट क्या है, कौन सा लेता है। इस की एक हायस्ट लेवल पर स्टडी होनी चाहिए और वह यह भी बताने कि क्या तरीके सरकार को धनपाने चाहिए जिन से यह रुके। इस का बँक करना बहुत जरूरी है और यह देश के लिए और सारे संसार के लिए जरूरी है।

इस के साथ ही मैं यह बात भी कहूँगा कि यह रोल जो सी० आई० ए० का है, यह खतरनाक रोल केवल हमारे देश ही नहीं बल्कि और जगह भी है और मोयनीहिन साहब ने भी यह कह दिया कि कांग्रेस पार्टी को जो पैसा दिया वह जैसे गवर्नमेंट को पैसा दे दिया।

To my mind, it is absurd, it is nonsense; I do not share his views.

मेरा कहना यह है कि पार्टी को पैसा देना और गवर्नमेंट को पैसा देना अलग अलग चीजें हैं और मैं पूरी तरह से कम्प्रेम करता हूँ अमेरिकन गवर्नमेंट को, जो हमारे यहाँ आ कर हस्तक्षेप करने की कोशिश करती है। कोई भी सरकार हो उन को इस तरह की बीज करने का हक नहीं है। मुझे मालूम है कि केवल अमेरिका ही नहीं बल्कि और देशों की सरकारें हस्तक्षेप करती हैं।

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I will take another ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: No; there are a large number of speakers. Please conclude.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त: मेरा कहना यह है कि बहुत सारी कल्चरल धार्मिक संस्था हैं, बहुत सारी डिप्लोमेटिक हैं, पार्लियामेंट धार्मिक संस्था हैं, लेबर विंग है स्टूडेंट्स विंग है उनके पास पैसों कहाँ से आता है, उस का मोडस प्रोपरेडी क्या है? एक प्रश्नकार वहाँ से निकलता है उसका मुझे मालूम है कि वहाँ पर 21 एम्बेसीज के पब्लिकेशन होते हैं एक ही प्रश्नकार में। अगर 10,000 किताबें छपती हैं तो एक लाख २० का बिल देते हैं, वेपर के सिवें भी एक लाख २० का बिल और प्रिन्टिंग प्रोसेस की एक लाख २० के होते हैं और वह किताबें बहुत बिकती हैं और

[श्री कंबल लाल गुप्ता]

वह भी पैसा उनकी जेब में जाता है। इन सब चीजों का प्रत्यक्ष प्रलय मोडम प्रीपरेन्डी है। उन सब की इनकवायरी होनी चाहिये। और हमारे देश में इससेप न ही यह देश के लोगों पर हथे छोड़ना चाहिये।

मेरे सम्हाप साहब का स्टेटमेंट पढ़ना चाहता हूँ :

"In the first place, there has been widespread concern about the receipt from foreign agencies of funds by individuals and organisations, whether working in the political or social and economic fields. Any precise quantitative assessment of the financial assistance received is not possible, but the indications are that it is selective and is not so small as to be ignored. We should not therefore minimise the likely repercussions on the future politics of our country, of the obligations that organisations or individuals incur by accepting assistance. There is also reason to think that funds obtained from foreign sources were used in the last General Elections."

मिस्ट्री लोग भी लेते हैं और सब लोग भी लेते हैं। समय थोड़ा है इसलिये नहीं बहना चाहता

प्रश्नवाचक महोदय : थोड़ा नहीं। समय ही नहीं है :

श्री कंबल लाल गुप्ता : आपने देखा होगा समाचार-पत्रों में कई देशों के पूरे ऐडवर्टिजमेंट्स छपते हैं। वो मोडम प्रीपरेन्डी प्रलय प्रलय है, उसकी भी सरकार को जांच करानी चाहिये। और उसके लिए मैं साजेस्ट करता हूँ कि एक स्पेशल सेल बनाई जानी चाहिये जो डायरेक्टोरेट मिनिस्ट्री प्राफ़ फ़ाइनेंस के अन्दर बांध रखे, जैसा कि सम्हाप साहब ने भी अपने स्टेटमेंट में जिक्र किया है।

"in collaboration with and assistance from the Intelligence Department."

साकि वह सब जांच रख जहाँ जहाँ पैसा प्राप्त है वह ठीक से यूटिलाइज होता है कि नहीं। कहा जाता है, कहे जाता है सब अगल बिस्को से पैसा इसके बारे में भी प्रकल रखे।

एक अलग-थलग संवर्धन : कमेटी बनायी थी।

श्री कंबल लाल गुप्ता : वह विरोधी संवर्धनों के बारे में होगी। उन्होंने कुछ कहा है कि कम-

प्लीट इनकवायरी नहीं हुई इसलिये उन रिपोर्टों को इन्होंने नहीं रखा। जब तक इन्कवायरी इनकवायरी न हो किसी एक प्रायमी को कंडेन करना ठीक नहीं है।

I include everybody in this. Unless there is a complete enquiry and we are fully satisfied, it is not proper to condemn a man.

एक विशिष्ट बात है कि एक तरफ़ तो इन्विजी कहती है कि सी० आई० ए० का पैसा मीने नहीं लिया। और दूसरी तरफ़ 1966-67 के इनकम टैक्स रिटर्न में कहा है कि 5,000 डालर्स प्राये हैं। और जब इनकम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट ने इनकवायरी की उस अमेरिकन युनिवर्सिटी से तो वह कहते हैं कि हमने दिया ही नहीं। तो यह 5,000 डालर कहाँ से प्राया इसकी भी जांच होनी चाहिये।

It says here:

"The Government is making enquiries into how much money Mrs. Indira Gandhi had received from a foreign institute for lectures delivered by her when she was an Information and Broadcasting Minister of the Union Cabinet.

This was disclosed by the Finance Minister, Mr. H. M. Patel in reply to a question by Mr. Nirmal Chandra Jain in the Lok Sabha today.

He admitted there had been some 'discrepancy' between what Mrs. Gandhi had shown in her income-tax returns for 1966-67 and the comments of the institute itself which said it had not paid any money to Mrs. Gandhi for the lectures."

In the income-tax return, Mrs. Gandhi says she had received \$5,000.

.....Mr. Patel further explained that it had been reported that Mrs. Gandhi had received 36,000 dollars for the lecturers in Brandies University, Waltham, in the United States."

प्रश्नवाचक महोदय : एक ही बात कह कर बराम करता हूँ। नेशनल डेपार्टमेंट में 32 लाख 80 हजार है पिछले 6, 7 साल से। किसी का नाम भी सरकार नहीं है। वह एवका कहाँ से प्राया

इसकी भी जांच करे। श्री आखिर में कहना चाहता है कि एक प्रीमिडियरी क्वेश्चन बनायी जानी चाहिये There is a *prima facie* case for it.

श्रीर उसमें यह बारे डीक्यूमेंट लाये जाने चाहिये। केदला, बंगाल में खोला को कटेक्ट करल चाहिये। पहले जो कांग्रेस में रहे हैं उनको कटेक्ट करना चाहिये और अगर इस बुरी बला को रोकना है तो आप एक ऐसा कानून लाइये कि सब पोलिटिकल पार्टीज का अकाउन्ट आडिट होना चाहिये, उनको मजबूर होना चाहिये कानून के जरिये यह बताने के लिये कि कौन पैसा देता है उनका क्या नाम है और ऐड्रेस भी हो, और आडिट तो उनका अकाउन्ट और जनता के सामने जारी बाक जानी चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं घोषणा करता हूँ कि मैंने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है इसको सदन की सभी तरफ से महमनि मिलेगी। नहीं तो देश की डेमोक्रेसी खतरे में है और भविष्य भी खतरे में है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव को रखता हूँ।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): I am on a point of order. We have built a tradition in this House that nothing offensive would be said against any party. Now the hon. mover of the motion said that a *prima facie* case has been established that money passed to the Congress Party of those days. Many of us belonged to the Congress Party of those days; and we strongly protest that the hon. Member has come in a facile way to the conclusion that a *prima facie* case has been established.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Because we have built a tradition in this House; and the Chair always pulls us up when we make any offensive remark against any party. (Interruptions). My submission is that the Congress Party of those days never believed in money power. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: You are making a speech. That is not a point of order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Why does not the Chair pull up the hon. Member?

MR. SPEAKER: There is nothing to pull him up. He is quoting somebody else. There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I will decide the point. Why don't you leave it to me to decide it?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Without establishing a shred of evidence that money passed to the Congress Party, no Member is in order to say that a *prima facie* case has been established, that money passed to the Congress Party through Mrs. Gandhi. Now, so far as Mrs. Gandhi is concerned, she can take care of herself and meet the allegations. But so far as we are concerned, we belonged to the Congress Party and we strongly protest against it if the Chair does not pull up the hon. Member who said that a *prima facie* case has been established that money passed to the Congress Party.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He is merely quoting somebody else.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: My complaint is against the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, it is the usual complaint.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You are not maintaining the tradition of the House. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I have heard you.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If the Congress Party wanted, it could have extracted any amount of money from the local industrialists. The Congress Party did not believe in getting money from them.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think there is any point of order. He is only quoting somebody else; nothing of the sort.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): I am sorry, I have to begin with a word of condolence to Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee and their kiths and kins in that their racist comrade in the Zionist movement Mr. Moynihan broke down before the cross-examination of the Indian reporters. He completely retracted his case and he made a new statement: I did not mean that money was put in a bag and some officer of the embassy delivered the money to Mr. Gandhi; that is not what I said; I only said that as Mrs. Gandhi was an official of the Congress Party, she must have been in the knowledge of the passing of that money. Therefore, I say: my hearty condolences to Mr. Gupta and my congratulations to Mr. Vajpayee for the magnificent achievement that after visiting Washington he arranged a press conference between Moynihan and a very versatile, Powerful band of Indian Reporters who got something out of Moynihan and proved him to be a pucca liar. But then, why did he print this lie in his book?

There is one aspect which you have to take a look at. Who reacted to the statement first? The statement about Mr. Moynihan's book came on the 14th; Mr. Vajpayee comes out with an immediate reaction, on the 14th itself. His friend Mr. Deoras also comes out with an immediate reaction the same day. Whoever came out with reaction on this, first, both were persons who were connected with the RSS movement. I do not find any other reaction except Mr. Chagla, after sometime saying: it is for them to prove. There is a statement in Blitz about Mr. Chagla's antecedents. I leave it at that. Mr. Deoras clarified and it is said here: "Normally we would not have commented on the issue as RSS believes not in politics but in construc-

tive work. But in this case the situation is extra ordinary as Mrs. Gandhi has herself arranged and has charged others with this crime. Two gentlemen have come out with immediate reaction, the External Affairs Minister and the Chief of the RSS. How happens it that the RSS people along queue up to applauded this Moynihan lie?

The External affairs Minister, may be for official purposes, makes a dash to Washington and off schedule he calls on Mr. Moynihan and what happens there. He says: Mr. Moynihan said that they asked for the money and they were very substantial sums involved. Unfortunately for Mr. Vajpayee Mr. Moynihan's office immediately comes out with a statement; Mr. Moynihan differs with Mr. Vajpayee's characterisation that the contribution has been substantial sums; particular facts have not been part of the conversation. Here is a person who is habituated to speaking lies. Mr. Moynihan, who is coming out with a statement in his book; here is the External Affairs Minister who meets Mr. Moynihan and comes out with a statement that Mr. Moynihan had told him that substantial money had passed out. And here is Mr. Moynihan coming out immediately with a statement saying that what the External Affairs Minister says is a lie.

Let us proceed on the basis of this picture. Then what happens? Mr. Vajpayee has got a dinner engagement which is reported in the Indian Express. There are very interesting things. According to Mr. Moynihan's office the discussion with Mr. Vajpayee took place formally on Monday night during dinner at the home of a retired diplomat, Ellsworth Bunker and Carol Laise a former ambassador of the United States to Nepal. How is it that you find this Carol Laise there. This Carol Laise is connected with

a very wonderful story; here it is and I quote:

"After 1957 elections a Congress M.P. from Deoria in U.P., Mr. Biswanath Roy raised a storm in Parliament and alleged of CIA interference in the elections. In particular he accused that American agents worked against him in favour of his rival Mr. Asoka Mehta who was from the Praja Socialist party. He said that Carol Laise then the First Secretary in the United States Embassy in New Delhi had camped in Deoria for days meddling in the elections. Carol Laise had to leave the country in a hurry following the exposure. After a brief stay in the States she returned to the sub-continent, this time as ambassador to Kathmandu."

Here, again we find this wonderful lady coming up again. 'Herbert Spivack was still in the embassy and moved around freely round the country. Carol Laise, who had to go home for her role in the 1957 elections, came down from Kathmandu to visit old friends in the second half of January and left only in early February'.

Carol came down to old friends and old friends now go to Washington to meet their own friends on a dinner engagements and who is the other...

MR. SPEAKER: From what are you quoting-

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: 'The Inside out of ICA' These are facts. Again about Carol I am saying—Kathmandu, she had to leave. All the facts I am saying.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend. But I have already contradicted that I did not meet Mrs. Carol or Mrs. Bunker. I did not dine with her. Shri Moynihan came to see me at the residence of the Indian Ambassador.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Then, who is the liar, Shri Moynihan or Shri Vajpayee? (Interruptions). Here is Moynihan saying.. (Interruptions).

His office issuing an office not saying...

MR. SPEAKER: Not about Mrs. Carol. Your newspaper report...

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: According to Shri Moynihan's office...

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Which paper?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: 'The Indian Express' your own paper and I quote "According to Shri Moynihan's office, discussion with Shri Vajpayee took place formerly on Monday night during the dinner at the home of retired diplomat Mr. Ellsworth Bunker and his wife Mrs. Carol, former United States Ambassador to Nepal".

Here, Mr. Vajpayee says—substantial money was passed out. Shri Moynihan comes out saying that amount of money was not matter of discussion. Who spoke the lie; Shri Vajpayee or Shri Moynihan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Do not shout.

Shri Moynihan's office says that there was a dinner at Mr. Bunker's house where Mrs. Carol was present. That was the statement by Moynihan's office. The External Affairs Minister says, "No, I did not go". One of the two is speaking a lie. If Mr. Moynihan is speaking a lie—my plea is that liar that he is, discard the statement in the book.

On the other hand, he must discuss that. All right. Now you cannot disown and get away with it.

Now Shri Ellsworth Bunker has got his own history.

In the Rajya Sabha debate Shri Bhupesh Gupta made certain revelations about Shri Bunker, drawing out from a book by Shri Kaul, saying that

(Dis.)

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

in the matter of promotion of Shri Kaul, Shri Bunker was involved, Mrs. Carol was involved, all these people were involved. My argument is, these persons were intimately connected with the CIA. Shri Vajpayee goes to Washington, renews his acquaintances, comes to this country and the story is so tell tale. Nothing more has got to be said about it.

Now Shri Moynihan is very angry and he has said he is angry and that is why this outburst. One of the reasons of anger he has stated—that allegation was made that the visit to Peking by Shri Vajpayee was at the instigation of America. There he takes umbrage. What a remarkable kinship?

I have been wondering all these days, how this wonderful idea of true non-alignment arose:

Now, genuine or true, whatever that be, here I get its genesis and inspiration. Mr. Moynihan says at page 18 of his book:

"Kissinger's speech came too late and was too obviously a bid to settle for what we had long rejected, a true non-alignment, in the face of what was increasingly an alignment against the West and with the Soviets. The United States was seen to be in a profound decline and history to be moving in other directions altogether."

Here long back, the idea came out from Mr. Kissinger who coined the word 'true non-alignment' which is now better phrased as genuine non-alignment. This is the assignment. CIA fellows gave you. You have taken up that assignment. You have incorporated that word in the new dictionary of non-alignment. They told you: we are retreating from the position so far taken; we will be happy if you are a truly non-aligned country in the sense that you will be nearer to us also. You accepted that position.

All I am saying is that against this background the whole thing has to be seen.

Again at page 40 Mr. Moynihan says:—this is Moynihan's visit to China.

"My half hour with Chiao Kuan-hua was not altogether pointless. I told him I did not think the Indians would soon develop a nuclear capability and suggested he approach the Indians, at least some of whom were troubled by becoming so openly dependent on the Russians now that they could not see the Americans to defend them against the Chinese."

This is the Moynihan—Kissinger lead emerging. Moynihan—Kissinger wanted true non-alignment. Moynihan went to Peking and told them about this that they visit their rightest friends in India and come to arrangement with them. These visits take place. Contacts first, visit next; Swamy first, Vajpayee next. And the canard of money having been paid to somebody sometime back in 1960 has floated by a joint arrangement between the two factions, both racists—the RSS racists and Zionist racists—both together coin it. You immediately react. You rush about, up and back. You meet your old friends, have dinner. But the whole story breaks down before the intense questioning by the Indian reporters that were there. What I am, therefore, saying is, what appears on the surface is not the real thing. The whole thing was inspired by the friends of Mr. Vajpayee. He was in the know of the whole thing. May I ask a question: are you aware of the Friends of India Society? Do you deny that Mr. Subramaniam Swamy has been the International Chairman of the Friends of India Society? Do you deny that the Friends of India Society held its conference in September in New York? Would you deny that Mr. Nanaji Deshmukh attended the conference? Would you deny that Mr. Moynihan was present at the

conference and gave a keynote address? I am putting this across to you. The Friends of India Society is connected with the entire RSS movement.

AN HON. MEMBER: What connection it has got?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Connection is so clear. RSS is having its connection with the Zionist movement of the world. This is my charge. No one is able to deny these things that he attended the conference of the Friends of India Society in New York, gave a keynote address, presided over a meeting, Nanaji Deshmukh was present and Mr. Subramaniam Swamy has been the international Chairman of that Friends of India Society. RSS need not pretend that they have nothing to do with any of these things. You are only two sides of the same coin. The link between them is racism and Zionism. Mr. Moynihan is a notorious Zionist and the whole book is a thesis of a Zionist, how he fought for Zionists in the United Nations, how the resolution came, how we fought it, how India betrayed him there. The whole book is a very vitriolic comment against the third world for bringing the resolution condemning the Zionist movement as in reality a racist movement. This is Zionism, a racist movement; your is also a racist movement. These two racist movements combine together, and what you say Moynihan approves.

His concept about India is given at page 18. His concept about India is this:

"There I was in Hindu India amidst 500 million souls, for millennia had been bound to an ethos of resignation, listening every other morning to some Member of Parliament say that the masses were growing frustrated and inevitably would become aggressive and bring down the whole structure of society."

You want India to be called a Hindu society. Your friend in the Zionist movement returns the compliment and calls it Hindu India. The racists call racists in their own terms.

You understand one another. They dictated your foreign policy. They told you to go to China. Even before you came to power, Moynihan told the Chinese people that these people are all right, Mrs. Gandhi may be bad, but there are good friends for you, develop contacts with them. These are the things that are said in this book of Moynihan. This is the background.

Therefore, I say that this sentence printed in this particular book is a sentence coined deliberately, created deliberately, planted deliberately by the RSS-Zionist conspiracy, and that is flowering up. By your subsequent conduct this is clearly being proved.

Now at page 41 what does Moynihan say? Mrs. Gandhi was still making her speeches and, finally:

"both times this was done in the face of prospective Communist victory in a State elections, once in Kerala and once in Bengal, where Calcutta is located. Both times the money was given to the Congress Party, who had asked for it. Once it was given to Mrs. Gandhi herself, who was then a party official."

There are two statements here, that in all the history only two times the money was given, that once it was given to Mrs. Gandhi herself, that only twice it was given in all the history and that nobody else was given the money. These are the two statements made. With respect to the first statement, he modified it by saying that Mrs. Gandhi was not paid.

But the tragedy of Moynihan was, it so happened that Mrs. Gandhi had ceased to be the Congress President at the time of the Kerala elections. I have got the Report of the Congress General Secretary. According to that the elections took place in February and she ceased to be the Congress

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

President on the 14th January 1960. This is what the Report of the Indian National Congress says:

"Shri U. N. Dhebar was requested by the Working Committee to take over charge of the elections in Kerala State. Then the first major undertaking of the new Congress President, Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy, after the Bangalore session was to tour the State and to put across to the people of Kerala the message of the Congress in the special context of Kerala. He attracted big gatherings. Shri Morarji Desai and Shri S. K. Patil also toured the State and had similar experience. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani also spent considerable time in Kerala and organised the people for the crucial election. Shri U. N. Dhebar, of course carried a heavy burden and there was hardly a constituency he did not visit."

Therefore, at the relevant time Mrs. Gandhi was not the President of the Congress. The charge of the campaign of the election was entrusted by Shri U. N. Dhebar, whose integrity nobody has ever questioned, to various people. Even your leader Shri Morarji Desai, was there, Shri S. K. Patil was there, so many others were there. So, it is in this picture that the charge should be seen. The moment it is said that she was not the President the whole charge of Moynihan crashes to the ground, because his only case is that Mrs. Gandhi should be presumed to have known about it because she was the Congress President. The only thing that remains is that the Congress has got the money. This is all that is remaining, which is repudiated.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: But Mr. Moynihan said that they have not given money to the President. (*Interruptions*). He has written 'official'. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Mr. Samar Mukherjee, you read the subsequent statement where he said no money

was paid to her. She must be in the know of things because she was the President. That is what he has stated.

SHRI KANWARLAL GUPTA: Mr. Stephen, why do you oppose an inquiry by the Parliamentary Committee? (*Interruptions*). And why don't you sue if you are clear?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Now, Sir, the second statement is, nobody else got the money. I have only to read out a statement made in Rajya Sabha on 18-12-1967. This is what Mr. Sundar Singh Bhandari said. I suppose you know him. He made a statement in the Rajya Sabha. I am reading a part of his speech:

"According to accusations of the left wing and even of certain Indian officials, the U.S. Embassy has so far disbursed for the purpose of election expenses the following sums in rupees:

1.5 million to Gupta (that is, Mr. C. B. Gupta) (INC, Uttar Pradesh) 9.75 million to Swatantra through Masani: 8 million to Jan Sangh and Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh: 0.85 million to Atulya Ghosh (West Bengal). Shri Y. B. Chavan: Where are you reading from?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: This is a copy of the Telegram No. 1148 dated November 8, 1966, Mr. John Freeman to Foreign Office and Whitehall Distribution."

Now, the point is whether this telegram is correct or not here is a statement made in the Rajya Sabha by Mr. Bhandari whom I suppose my friends will now disown that these disbursements were made. (*Interruptions*). In the Blitz Report dated 8-2-1967 the same statement occurred. It is after that these details were given in the Rajya Sabha. Then, would anybody contend for the proposition that if at all America gave money, it would not have been given

to the Swatantra Party, to R.S.S., to Jan Sangh, but to the Congress only for fighting an election in Kerala? Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was at the peak of his power and there was a single election to be fought in Kerala. You want it to be believed that we or Pandit Nehru or Mrs. Gandhi or Sanjiva Reddy went to the Embassy and said, "to hold an election there, give us money"? Does it stand to reason? And you people will not be given any money at all? You won't receive any money at all? You are not getting any money at all? And you want the world to believe it? You say, you will not be given any money at all? Therefore, that is the second lie I am emphasising.

MR. SPEAKER: You have taken 25 minutes. Please conclude.
 (Interrupting)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Now, Sir, Let us understand what the United States Government is and what Mr. Moynihan is.

The opening sentence of this book I am reading to show the credibility of the man, the credibility of his nation. When he was invited to become Ambassador, this is what he said:

"And so I said to the Counsellor of the Department of State in that spring of 1975, that there would be two conditions. First, I would not be lied to. That would happen only once. ... 'You do not understand', replied the hon. Helmut Sonnenfeldt smiling. 'Henry does not lie because it is not in his interest....'"

The very second sentence of this glorious book of Moynihan says that when he was offered a position, he said: "I will accept it, provided those fellows do not lie to me as is habitual with them." He is the Ambassador of his nation. And he fears that his President and Secretary of State will lie to him. What a man, what a President and what a State Secretary. And you want us to swallow whatever this tribe gulps out! (Interrupting) Why

are you laughing? Have you got any brief about it, come out with your brief.

I have here a book with me on CIA's operations, by two former CIA top brasses. This was also cleared by the CIA. And this is what they are saying:

"The CIA also makes considerable use of forged documents."

This is their respect for truth. They have three types of propaganda—white, gray and black. It says:

"'Black' propaganda on the one hand and 'disinformation' on the other are virtually indistinguishable. Both refer to the spreading of false information in order to influence people's opinions or actions. Disinformation actually is a special type of 'black' propaganda which hinges on absolute secrecy and which is usually supported by false documents."

It adds:

"A cursory examination of the documents, as submitted by Helms, indicates that they were indeed rather crude forgeries, but their message was accurate... and he knew that the 'official disclaimers' to which he referred were deceptions and outright lies issued by U.S. Government spokesmen ... but Helms in the process quite ably managed to avoid discussion of the pervasive lying the CIA commits in the name of the United States."

I read it out only to tell you what type of fellow he is whom you are swearing by as if it is a revelation to Moses from Jehovah in Heaven. This is the type of fellows you are dealing with.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Why do you oppose an enquiry by a parliamentary committee?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Any person who goes through this book particularly pages 150 and 151 will concede that Moynihan had connections with the CIA. It is the CIA he is defending.

MR. SPEAKER: You have taken 30 minutes. You wanted 30 minutes, I gave you 30 minutes.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: There was an allegation against Mr. Echeverria that he was a CIA agent. About that this book says:

"What, I asked the gathering, was the matter with being a CIA agent? It was well known that the world over there were CIA agents at the highest levels of government. In India a dear friend of mine, the hon. Piloo Mody, a Member of Parliament and a great Indian patriot, since unfortunately imprisoned by the Gandhi Government (a matter the Security Council might also wish to enquire into), had three years previously, appeared on the floor of the Lok Sabha, wearing a button that announced 'I AM A CIA AGENT.'"

17.00 hrs.

He takes Mr. Chavan to task. He is defending the CIA throughout the book. His connections are so clear. The CIA's characteristic is, character assassination, murder, physical murder if possible, otherwise, character assassination. For character assassination, wild lies, concocted lies, that is their habitual method. Nothing is a bar to them. For character assassination, lies they use, false documents they use, this is completely established and therefore, all I say is, let us not swear by what Moynihan says. Let me ask you, who is Mr. Moynihan from out of this book? This great Moynihan, who is the hero of Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta, who is Moynihan—one by one, let us see.

Moynihan is an arch conservative and anti-accommodationist. I take page 55 of this book. It is not my statement, but from their own papers:

"Kristol and I were singled out as "anti-accommodationists", supporters of the establishment, enemies of the people" and in another paper it is stated:

"In the writings of Kristol and Moynihan and other such neo-conservatives, one looks in vain for a serious effort to project the costs of the coercive measures required to assure continuing access to the resources and growing markets of the world."

This is a quote in Moynihan's own book. There, Moynihan is described like this "A person who had become a conservative in the land of the conservatives of America", you can think of the fellow and his method is coercion, coerce the third world, keep it in pieces and the accusation is that the fellow did not reckon about the cost of that method.

Now I came to his attitude to poverty (Page 63 of his books):

"Moynihan is all for freedom and that is a noble idea. But in using that freedom he seems to care not a whit for freedom from hunger, freedom from disease, freedom of opportunity, freedom from corruption and so on. To him, freedom is living under a non-totalitarian regime, by which he means a non-Communist one."

What is his attitude to poverty? I am reading from Moynihan's book and no other book. About the third world—this is the thing we must understand—.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I spoke only for 25 minutes. He has been speaking for 30 minutes. I could also have taken more.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: What is his attitude to third world countries?

"Towards third world countries, which he recently castigated in pungent language: 'shame them, hurt them, shout at them'.

This is the essence of this man. His attitude to third world countries including our country is: 'shame them, hurt them, shout at them'. This is the policy he wanted to implement. My friends there swear by that demi-God, Moynihan.

Now again his food policy....

MR. SPEAKER: You have already taken 35 minutes. Please conclude.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The food policy he took was this: he said:

"The United States did not have to give food to the nations whose representatives insulted her international official in the United Nations".

This is his attitude to third world countries.

Finally here is a very cultured gentleman! You kindly look at page 185, the language that this man is using—kindly do not expunge from the Parliamentary Proceedings what I am reading, this is what he has said—this was a debate in the United Nations. A resolution condemning Zionism as a racialism was passed. The Israeli delegate made a speech, the motion was passed condemning Zionism and immediately thereafter, he says:

"I rose and walked over and embraced him...."

I cannot read the rest and yet I have to and this is what he said:

.... "Fuck 'em". He writes it in this book.

This is the culture of the man. He uses such words and he writes for all of us to read, "Fuck 'em." Fuck whom? Fuck them, India Pakistan and everyone of the third countries. This is the language that this gentleman is using. This is his contemptuous attitude to other countries.

About non-alignment, he had a chance to say this on p. 274. Their task was to break the bloc. He speaks of his cable and

I quote "The Blocs Are Breaking Up". The previous spring Kissinger had set forth the policy of breaking up the Non-Aligned. The cable argued that we had had some success in this at the Thirtieth General Assembly, and would have more if we got more support from embassies around the world, to which I asked that the cable be sent."

Here is a man who had the task of breaking up the non-alignment movement. He claims that he broke the non-alignment movement. And our friends are acclaiming him for all the achievements of his.

This is his assessment about Mrs. Indira Gandhi. It occurs in a cable he had sent to his Government.

I quote: "It is precisely because the (Prime Minister Indira Gandhi) is not innocent, not squeamish and not a moraliser that her concern about American intentions is real and immediate. And, of course, the news from the US, as printed in the Indian press, repeatedly confirms her worst suspicions and genuine fears. Nothing will change her unless she is satisfied that the US accepts her India. She does not think we do. She thinks we are profoundly selfish and cynical counter-revolutionary power.

[Sri C. M. Stephen]

"Don't think, fellow Americans, of beguiling Indira Gandhi with talk of cultural exchange, joint industrial undertakings, or a few shiploads of cheap food. Her concern is not economic. It is political. Nothing will change her until she is satisfied that the United States accepts her India.

"Her concern is whether the US accepts the Indian regime. She is not sure but that we would be content to see others like her overthrown. She knows full well that we have done our share and more of bloody and dishonourable deeds."

This is the crime Mrs. Indira Gandhi committed that she demanded, "Accept my country. I do not want your food; I do not want your charity. Accept my country." Therefore, she raised her voice against them.

This is the CIA conspirator; the racist maniac, the congenital liar, the buffoon that he is, an uncultured man who spoke that dirty language. And here is the Minister of External Affairs running away to Washington meeting the old friend, having a dinner and coming out with a statement. There is no truth in that man. Let us condemn that sort of calumny against India.

श्री श्री संकर राव (गान्धीपुर) : मान्यवर, मैं नेता, विरोधी दल को सर्वप्रथम बन्धन देना चाहता हूँ। बन्धन देना इसलिए देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बीच को एवाइड किया है, अपनी तरफ से और अपनी दल की तरफ से, कि बीमती काशी ने या कांग्रेस ने पैसा लिया है। इस को उन्होंने दिखाई नहीं किया है और एक अच्छे कामदार पाकिस्तान में तरफ उन्होंने एक नई बात की तरफ अपनी बहुत को नहीं जाने दिया है बल्कि आर० ए० ए० की तरफ, मि० बाजपेयी की तरफ, देवराज सर्व की तरफ, मोयनीहिन की तरफ और अमेरिका की तरफ वह चुनचुनत है, वह बदनाम है, उस तरफ ही अपनी बहुत को रखा है और मैं इस के लिए उन्हें पुनः बन्धन देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने इस नई काम के सम्बन्ध में अपनी बयान और अपनी पार्टी का इस्तेफा नही किया जबकि वे अपनी

पार्टी और विरोधी दल से सब को बन्धन देता है। उन्होंने यह दिखाई नहीं किया कि कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस पार्टी के बयानों में पैसा नहीं लिया गया। इस के लिए मैं उन को फिर बन्धन देना चाहता हूँ। ऐसा करते हुए उन्होंने एक अच्छी पब्लिक साइकल का खर्च किया है।

अभी हमारे कुछ कांग्रेस के मित्र, हमारे दुश्मन और हीनियर भाई मित्र की को इसलिए बख्शते हैं कि वह कहा गया कि कांग्रेस ने पैसा नहीं लिया है। वे इस को स्वीक करते हैं। वे भी किसी समय कांग्रेस में थे और मैं भी एक समय कांग्रेस में था और इस के लिए मैं बरनिष्ठा भी हूँ और मुझे नुस्ता भी है। (बयान) मान्यवर, मैं तो अपनी सब देता हूँ। आप नुस्ता मत होइये।

श्री ब्याजकन्धन मित्र : आप ऐसी बातों को धारणी हो सकते हैं।

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

श्री श्री संकर राव : मान्यवर, यह बतवा हमारे देश में साधारण नहीं है। और यह बात भी सही है कि माननीय बन्धन और माननीय मोरारजी भाई तथा दूसरे कांग्रेस के नए नेता जो उस समय कांग्रेस में थे, यह राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन से घाय्य हुए लोग हैं। इस बात को इन्दिरा जी के सम्बन्ध में या किसी व्यक्ति विशेष के सम्बन्ध में न सोचें बल्कि राष्ट्र के सम्बन्ध में सोचें।

मान्यवर, इस मामले पर मैं कोई पक्ष नहीं देना चाहता। क्योंकि यह बात कही गई है और इन्दिरा जी ने जो पहले दिन दिनाङ्क किया उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि पैसा लिया गया, बल्कि उन्होंने कहा कि मेरे प्रधान मंत्री का नाम में पैसा नहीं लिया गया। और इसके बाद इन्धु को उन्होंने कन्धु किया, और जब कोई जवाब नहीं मिलता है तो आर० ए० ए० को स्केपोट बनाते हैं और उस संस्था का नाम सेते हैं। माननीय स्टीफन ने कहा कि सदन बसाये कि मोयनिहिन झूठ बोलते हैं या माननीय बाजपेयी जी झूठ बोलते हैं। हमारा काम वास्तव ही थायवा अथवा वह जो आदिमियों की अथवा आदिमियों के नाम से यानी उसमें इन्दिरा जी और अपना नाम भी जोड़ें। इन्दिरा जी भी झूठ बोलती हैं और आप भी अपने को शामिल कर लीजिये तब ही बतता दें कि झीन झूठ बोलता है।

मान्यवर, इस समय में एक वैश्विक तनाव उत्पन्न हुआ है। बीसवीं शताब्दी में इतिहास और विज्ञानों के विकास हो गई। और श्री आर० ए० और श्री सी० सी० श्री इस तरह की एलेक्ट्रिक है जो सब तरफ से काम करती है।

ऐसिबिनास का प्रयत्न कर रहा है ? नहान
देखभक्त भी करता है और एक राष्ट्रप्रीही भी
करता है । वो अपने देश के खिलाफ काम करता
है, ऐसिबिनास करता है वह राष्ट्रप्रीही है
और वो आसिबिनासिकता विकरलेष की बजह
के भी किन्हीं देशों को सूचना देता है और अपने
को नैतिक रूप से दोषी नहीं समझता है और
समझता है कि हम अपने आसिबिनों की हर जगह
सूचना देते और उसको बुरा नहीं मानता है,
पर वास्तव में वह भी देशप्रीही है । इसलिये बाहे
नैतिक रूप में विदेशों को सूचना दे या अपने
ईमान को बेच कर सूचना दे, वह दोनों ही गलत
हैं । इस मामले में सरकार को सूचना चाहिये ।

घाप देखिये कि किन किन माध्यमों से विदेशी
पैसा आता है । प्रखबारों में विज्ञापन निकलते
हैं, किसी खास तरह के प्रखबार में ही विज्ञापन
खास जगह के निकलते हैं, ऐम्बेसीज उसके लिये
पैसा देती हैं । हमारे देश में प्रजातंत्र है, वह देश
जिनके यहाँ डेमोक्रेसी नहीं है वहाँ तो पैसा खर्च
नहीं कर सकते इसलिये यहाँ घा कर वे अपने
रूपये को बांटते हैं । कुछ लोग समझते हैं कि
अमरीकन मनी मुद्रा है, और रूस का पैसा
बढ़िया है । कुछ लोग रूस के पैसे को गंदा
समझते हैं और अमरीका के पैसे को अच्छा समझते
हैं । मास्यवर, विदेशी मुद्रा बाहे के ० जी० बी०
की ही या सी० आई० ए० की हो दोनों ही
पणित हैं और इसके विरुद्ध देश में जनमत बनने
की जरूरत है । सी० आई० ए० क्या है ? मैं
विरोधी दल के लोगों से, प्रधान मंत्री से भी
कहना चाहता हूँ, जिन सी० आई० ए० की
पुस्तकों को नेता विरोधी दल ने पढ़ा है, बहुत
सी किताबें मैंने भी पढ़ी हैं, के ० जी० बी० के
पैसे का तो हिसाब नहीं रखा जाता है, लेकिन
सी० आई० ए० का हिसाब रखा जाता है इसलिये
हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी अमरीकन सरकार से पूछे
कि किसको इस देश में पैसा दिया गया और
कितना दिया गया । अगर नेता विरोधी दल को
इस स्टैटमेंट के बारे में जरा भी संदेह है तो सारे
मानने की जांच हो ताकि बस्तुस्थिति देश के
सामने लावे । हमारे माननीय स्टीफन साहब
समझते हैं कि अगर इन्दिरा जी ने पैसा लिया
है तो ठीक है, लेकिन मैं सोचता हूँ कि अगर
अगर के ईडने वाले किन्हीं भी सदस्य का अगर
दूर पराच तक भी विदेशी मुद्रा से कोई सम्बन्ध
है तो उसको एकपत्रीय करना चाहिये ।

हम सारी दुनिया के पैटर्न को नहीं बदल
सकते हैं । समय कम है नहीं तो मैं कहता कि
कैसे बीबी बीबी में इंडोनेशिया और इन्डोनेशिया
का निष्कापण हुआ । इन्डोनेशिया के बाद
के ० जी० बी० और सी० आई० ए० का उदय
हुआ । पहले सी० आई० ए० नाम की एजेन्सी
थी । जब पूर्व भारत पर हमला हुआ या कोरिया
में अमरीकन की आकाशवाणी मिली तो इन
संस्थाओं का उदय हुआ । और के ० जी० बी०
क्या सी० आई० ए० के विरोधी मनी प्रकार

के हथियारों से लैस है और हर तरह का काम
करने में दोनों में कोई अंतर नहीं है । आज इन
एजेन्सीयों के ऐजेन्ट पोलिटिक्स में सरकारों तक पहुँच
जाते हैं । सरकार को देखना चाहिये कि कौन ऐसे
लोग हैं, किन पदों पर हैं ताकि उनको सामने
लाया जा सके और ऐसे लोगों को देश में कोई
भी सम्मान का स्थान नहीं मिलना चाहिये । यह
एक उतूल का सवाल है । इन्दिरा जी ने सफाई
के साथ एक बार भी डिनाई नहीं किया है, जैसे
कि स्टीफन साहब ने भी नहीं किया । धार०
एस० एस० इस बक्त इन्हीं नहीं है । वह
बुरा है या नहीं इसका गम्भीर प्रश्न से कोई
सम्बन्ध नहीं है । हो सकता है कि वह बुरा हो ।
लेकिन इस बक्त तो सवाल है इन्दिरा जी ने अपना
मांगा था कि नहीं कम्युनिस्टों का विरोध करने
के लिये ? बाहे कम्युनिस्ट सरकारों का विरोध
करने के लिये पैसा लिया हो या पार्टी का विरोध
करने के लिये पैसा लिया हो, दोनों ही काम
राष्ट्र विरोधी हैं ।

17 नम्बरीपाद ने बयान दिया है,
उन्होंने एक नया डाइमेंशन जोड़ दिया । जो सबसे
ध्यादा खिलाफ वे सी० आई० ए० के लोग क्योंकि
उस समय सी० पी० एम० के और बंगला में
सी० पी० एम० की सरकार को हटाने का
मानसा था, इसलिये सी० पी० आई० वालों की
इन्दिरा जी के साथ दोस्ती हो जाती है, दोस्ती
नहीं बस्कि भावी हो जाती है । और मैं कहता
हूँ कि यह भावी नाजायज है । लेकिन उस समय
पैसा लिया गया । कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी कहती है कि
पैसे में हमको हिस्सा नहीं मिला । लेकिन इनकी
दोस्ती थी । और नम्बरीपाद जी इस देश के
कम्युनिस्ट (एम) पार्टी के जाने माने नेता हैं,
उन्होंने कहा है कि सी० पी० आई० बी भी उस
पैसे में साझेदारी रही है । इनके पास तो पैसा
आता है के ० जी० बी० से, लेकिन सी० आई०
ए० का पैसा भी इनके पास चला जायगा यह
हम नहीं सोच सकते थे । तो सी० पी० आई०
को के ० जी० बी० और सी० आई० ए० दोस्ती
का पैसा मिलता है । नेरा कहना है कि
नम्बरीपाद का सरकार को स्थान लेना चाहिये
और सारे मामले की जांच होनी चाहिये क्योंकि
इस मामले में ग्याय हो सकता है ।

पैसा मैंने कहा सी० आई० ए० का पैसा
रखा जाता है, के ० जी० बी० में रखा नहीं
मिलता है, लेकिन सी० आई० ए० के पैसा
बारे में सरकार द्वारा पता लगाया जा सकता है ।
यह बात समझ में नहीं आती सब से
इन्दिरा जी सी० आई० ए० के खिलाफ
थी । इस किताब को पढ़ने से मतीया
है कि पैसा उन्होंने लिया, लेकिन जब सी०
ए० ने पैसा देना उनको बन्द कर दिया तो
गामी देना मुक कर दी । यह किताब
मिहल ने और इसके बयान में सारी
के सामने लाने का है ।

[श्री बीजे बंकर राय]

माननीय बहादुर साहब बड़े जिम्मेदार पद पर हैं, वहाँ हाजिर में न बोलें, उनका बोलना महत्व रखता है, देश के नेता आज भी हैं वह जिम्मेदारी के साथ बोलें और अब तो इन्दिरा जी की पार्टी में भी नहीं है जो डर हो कि तबाह कर देगी, अब जरा डीठ ही कर बोलें मैं माननीय स्टीफन से नहूँगा कि इस मामले में सभी पक्षों में कांसेन्सस होनी चाहिये और इस मामले पर ठंडे बिल से विचार करें कि किस प्रकार विदेशी पैसा का प्रयोग भारत की राजनीति से रोका जाए। जितना पब्लिसिटी के माध्यम से विदेशों से पैसा आता है, जो लोग उस पैसे को पाते हैं वही क्या गाली देते हैं। सी० पी० आई० के लोगों को मिलता है वह भी गाली देते हैं। और बहुत से धार्मनाइजेशनस्त हैं जिनको सी० आई० ए० वाले पैसा देते हैं। वे गाली देते हैं के० जी० बी० को। लेकिन सत्य यह है कि पैसा दोनों तरफ से आता है। इस के साथ ही हमारा रुपये में व्यापार है, और अमरीका के साथ तो हमारा इतना व्यापार है कि उसके साथ गेहूँ के बारे में पी० एल०-480 का एग्जीमिट रहा है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हम इस देश की सब से बड़ी सभा में बैठ कर पार्टीज के इन्फ्लुस्ट में झूठ और असत्य न बोलें। देश पार्टियों से बड़ा होता है। पैसा सब तरफ से आ रहा है। पैसा लेने वालों की पहचान करनी चाहिए। इस बारे में जांच करने के लिए पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी नियुक्त करने का जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। अगर इसमें कोई कठिनाई हो, तो मैं सरकार से कहूँगा कि सभी पक्षों के साथ मिला कर जांच का एक ऐसा माध्यम बनाया जाये, जिससे आज के बाद विदेशी पैसा लेने वाले सामने आ जायें और प्रविश्य में कोई भी विदेश से पैसा न ले सके।

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): We are discussing something which calls for a deep introspection, something which calls for an attitude of objectivity more than buffoonery and injured innocence. It is not because a Daniel has come to judgment that we should be worked up or concerned about it, not because of what struck me, a flippant sentence or two that you find in a rambling book of insipid quality coming from a Harvard professor, but it is much more fundamental that we on both sides should try to answer this question—what happened in this country and what is likely to happen...

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): And what is happening.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Not because somebody strikes a posture of innocence and says, 'I do not know what happened.' I am not impressed by that. It is a larger question of an accepted fact of international life that there is a gendarme, a global subversive arm of American military—industrial complex threatening our freedom and sovereignty. To my mind, that is the most important and crucial question and the threat it poses to the democratic system not only to this country but to the whole world, to our national security and above all, the role of foreign money in Indian politics. I would urge upon the House to consider these facts more than an occasional remark or two which by themselves are important because this is for the first time in a long range of disclosures that have come about the activities of this agency that a world statesman has been implicated. This is the first time a Prime Minister, a person who has been Prime Minister of this country for eleven long years is being accused by some Daniel somewhere, that she has received an unspecified amount of money for domestic political purposes. The substance of the charge is serious enough, is not a matter to be used for scoring a political point, however much you may try to do it, I hope you will agree with me that this has to be gone into in depth not only by the appropriate investigative agencies but it has to be evaluated politically and proper lessons learnt from it.

This former Ambassador and present Senator—the less said about him the better. Here he says that he was sent here to build bridges. He not only kicked the bridge but he burnt the bridges. Now, about his performance—what it was in the United Nations and what attitude he had displayed not only to this government but to the entire third world.

is known to everyone. I do not want to call him an RSS man. That is a cheap way of doing it. That is ridiculous. But the fact is that in a book written by a former ambassador who represented the biggest, the greatest country of the world, an accredited diplomatic representative, says after a clearance from the U.S. State department and by the particular agency concerned that a former Prime Minister of a country has taken money. That is a serious matter denial apart.

Now, it is an admitted fact of intervention also. Apart from the fact of transfer of funds, the fact of intervention is more important. Let us not kid ourselves and, I hope, the Home Minister and the Prime Minister of this country would not believe this diplomat when he claims that they intervened only twice. He is not going to be believed. It is neither once nor twice—, if you say that it was just twice and it happened with Congress only! This is a fantastic unbelievable lie. The fact of intervention is admitted. Intervention in the domestic political situation of this country today stands admitted despite earlier contradictions by the Prime Minister and many others.

Sir, last April in this House when I raised the question of planting of the nuclear device in Nanda Devi glacier, the Prime Minister was angry with me. He said, "Why are you taking the name of CIA? Which is CIA? What is CIA? He adopted the posture of a wise Chinese monkey who has never heard of it. He refuses to see CIA and hear about CIA. Now, that kind of blind-folded attitude should cause concern. You go through the debate of 17th April last year. This is what he said. He said that there is no CIA and that it was an arrangement between scientific departments.

This is a lie I want to nail today. May I dare say that the draft of that very statement that he made in this

House was shown to the Delhi station CIA chief, Mr. Mulligan. I challenge this government and say that you cannot get away with all this and today my charge here is...

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, a serious challenge has been made. A serious accusation has been made. Either Mr. Unnikrishnan should prove his charge or withdraw it. Government is prepared to face an inquiry by a parliamentary committee.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN:
 On the whole gamut. (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
 Not on the whole gambit. When statements are made here we do not get clearance from any embassy. I accept the challenge. (Interruptions)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN:
 Mr. Vajpayee for heaven sake do not strike this posture of innocence. Allow me to complete.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
 Better you withdraw that charge or prove it.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN:
 Please listen to me. My charge against the former Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister is that there has been and there continues to be an informal and known understanding and arrangement between the CIA and Indian security organs which poses a great threat and which subverts the whole system. We have stationed somebody in Washington. Can he deny it? And, similarly, there is an acknowledged representative of the CIA in Delhi. There is a working understanding whereby certain areas of activities or exchanges have been permitted by the former Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister. I quote from "The Mathrubhumi" where an article has come out in the front page. The article clearly says this. The date is 5th May, 79 and this is said in the front page. Now

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

that Mr. Vajpayee has talked about that, let me quote this. This is the translation. It says:

'It is learnt that the present Prime Minister was told about this arrangement when his government assumed power two years ago and he allowed the arrangement to continue.'

AN HON. MEMBER: What arrangement?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: That is for Mr. Vajpayee to answer. If you want me to come out, I will say about the arrangement. The arrangement is not something. (Interruptions) Please allow me to speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him elaborate on the arrangement.
(Interruptions)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I am not cowed down by all these things. Don't think I am going to be cowed down by Mr. Vajpayee's antics or anybody else's antics. This arrangement is the agreement of the highest authority... (Interruptions) I don't know whether it is kept away from Mr. Vajpayee; but the arrangement existed for the past 15 or 17 years, of close collaboration between CIA and India's security agencies. (Interruptions) Yes, it is there. The question is not about Mr. Chavan or Mr. Vajpayee individually. We are not discussing individuals, I thought. If you want to bring the debate to that level, yes, there are many others whose names can come in. So, let us not talk about that. Let us not try to score points in this way. The point that I want to underline is this. The fact of intervention, as revealed by Mr. Moynihan is buttressed by the fact of this arrangement and that arrangement poses a grave threat to internal security, whatever other merits it may have had in a particular situation. There could be circumstances; every Government has secrets; every Government has certain arrangements; every Government is

benefitted in some way or the other in a particular situation, but not if it is extended to domestic, political activities.

As I said earlier, considering the background of CIA, since the mid fifties, which has functioned even within the United States as an invisible Government of the American military industrial complex, it was not just an arm of strategic intelligence; it has been a global subversive arm, known in every continent and every country, whether it was the overthrow of Mossadeq in Iran or in Guatemala or in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba or in Burma against U N Government or in Ceylon or in Lumumba's Congo or Angola.—whether it was murder or removal of Governments, CIA was there.

Having known all these facts, the former Prime Minister allowed this arrangement. And the present Prime Minister (whose party is now very happy at this disclosure that they can score a point over Mrs. Gandhi) allowed this arrangement to continue. And when a specific instance is brought before this House on Nanda Devi Caper then, he says 'Well I shall see that it does not continue' but he says 'It was done by scientific authorities. Why bring in CIA? Where is CIA?' You can go through the records. This is what he said during last April.

So, Sir, we know of CIA operations in India. There was the 'Congress for Cultural Freedom'. There have been repeated by number of instances involving CIA with teachers, journalists, politicians, trade unionists and so on. We know the role of the 'Congress for Cultural Freedom' and 'International Confederation of Trade Union'. There are number of incidents, like the incident of stealing of our late revered Prime Minister, Shri Shastri ji's blood and urine samples from Willington Hospital. Numerous things have appeared in national as well as international press.

So, these payments are only the tip of an ice berg. If it has however happened, it has been allowed to happen because as I said, because of this atmosphere of collaboration, and I do not believe as some people seem to think that you can shut your eyes and become wiser! So, on this continuing menace, neither the present Prime Minister nor the former Prime Minister can get away.

Now, as I said earlier, this represents certain forces. She cannot just say that a Section of this Government is against me and another section is not against me! This is what she said in Chandigarh. When she was asked a specific question as to whether the Government of the United States was against her, she said that "a section of the US Government was against her." She has a unique inimitable language of her own by which she can get away. When she said there was intervention in Ceylon and the Foreign Minister of Ceylon made an enquiry into this, she denied it and said "I never said that". When she said earlier in December 1977 or in January 1978 that external forces had intervened in the elections of 1977, some of us publicly asked her to name these, she refused to name them.

Now, it is the same attitude of ambivalence which is continuing and which C.I.A. is exploiting. So, let us not also be surprised. What we want is that this game of hide and seek must end once for all and whether it concerns the former Prime Minister or the present Prime Minister, the issues have to be squarely faced and settled. So, I demand today a White Paper from this Government on the activities of foreign security agencies in India including the CIA. I also demand that a parliamentary probe be held into this question.

Now, it is not merely a question of security agencies I have brought before this House and Shyam Babu also brought before this House last year the question of Iranian payments of 11 million dollars where a fraud was perpetrated on the Constitution and on this House and money was taken from the voted resources of this House and I gave certain specific names of firms and individuals and I demanded an inquiry. Hon'ble Speaker was kind enough to observe that there was more than meets the eye in this deal and suggested that it should be gone into. So, was it gone into? Only the other day when there was an Half-hour discussion raised by my friend Mr. Lakkappa on Parle group of companies, there was a question of pay off. The hon. Minister, Mr. Satish Agarwal, said that in a C.B.I. raid they had found a letter which involved a very very important person who was demanding payment of Rs. 15 lakhs in foreign exchange. Now, where is that letter? Would that letter be placed on the Table of the House? So, this question of foreign money that comes through multinationals, international racketeers or security organs polluting the domestic political atmosphere causes us grave concern. I hope your Government would accept, before challenging a particular fact of which I still repeat, that some people are involved in this and I do not want to mention all the names. Mr. Vajpayee may not know it. I can tell him privately who took that statement. Please don't get excited. Let the atmosphere be free and we are very much interested in that. The Prime Minister can no longer reducule and say "who is the CIA, which is the CIA and what is the CIA". He can no longer take that attitude. So Sir, at least this book should open our eyes and the Government should accept the demand for a parliamentary probe and a White Paper on the activities of foreign security agencies.

(Dis.)

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the revelation made by Mr. Moynihan has one very good aspect because it will increase the vigilance on the part of the whole country. Persons who occupied the topmost positions in the Government as well as in the ruling party took money from the C.I.A. to influence the elections in Kerala and West Bengal to counter the Communist growth and to prevent them to get into Government through peoples' support. That is one aspect of the revelation.

I have heard from Shri Stephen what type of man Mr. Moynihan is, what his character is etc. I am not interested in that. We are very clear that Mr. Moynihan represents the U.S. imperialist forces, he is a reactionary man; we should never think that he is a progressive man. Now, the C.I.A. and other high officials after retirement in the USA are bringing out books and giving facts which were never known before, how they acted as agents of the C.I.A. to topple a Government, to murder high political leaders and how they influenced various administrative officials or a section of the Government. We may not accept all the things indicated in the book, but generally it has been accepted that the revelations that have been made by these retired men are correct. That is why so many books have come now. Shri Stephen has quoted from some of those books. Those have been written by the C.I.A. men; they were in this job at one time.

What does Mr. Moynihan's revelations show? I am reading out what is actually mentioned in the book:

"Of the various joint Indian American enterprises, non survived the straits of 1971 more successfully than those directed against China."

This is because of the anti-imperialist sentiments of the Indians that these joint American enterprises could not withstand. Then further:

"Indian fear of the Chinese was palpable. As much as the Gandhi government may have desired American defeat in Vietnam, once that because inevitable, they could see it, would not really be to the advantage of India..."

We supported Vietnamese liberation struggle and we expressed the desire that the Americans should get defeated and Vietnam should get its independence, but when it became a reality, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the Government of India were afraid of it. So, they told that is was their desire that Americans should not be defeated there. This is a dangerous thing. This is double-facedness and this double-facedness comes out of the class position. And it is corroborated by facts. Further it reads:

"...And in private became ever more explicit on this point. And so, we continued, jointly to spy on the Chinese from the tops of the Himalayas."

When these nuclear instruments were installed on the Himalayas, the Vietnam struggle was going on. At that time, you were denouncing America and speaking in favour of Vietnam, but you were having secret collaboration for the installation of nuclear instruments on Himalayas. Is it not double-facedness? Is it your consistent anti-imperialism? Is it your real love for the freedom of the people of Vitenam? No.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Now India.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Now the argument is coming. "China attacked India; so, we must surrender to America. So, we will invite even

American Army." (Interruption) The logic is that. China attacked India. That is why you are collaborating with CIA to expose our defence forces to them. That is why collaboration is going on. (Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Now you are befriending both China and America.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : You have to understand what are the implications of this. (Interruptions) China is a socialist country. (Interruption) But you considered America to be a friend. (Interruptions) At the same time, you wanted that Vietnam should be liberated. These two things cannot go together. From the point of view of class character, this is one aspect of the matter. The second aspect of it is to prevent the Communists from growing. (Interruptions) Now people will understand why America was interested in providing money to Indira. (Interruptions) It was because Indira was in the forefront against Communists, to have the Communist Government in Kerala toppled; and it was toppled in 1959. (Interruption)

The entire history of CIA is to topple those Governments which are either Communist, or anti-imperialist; and here also, the CIA is playing the same role.

On 21st March, 1972, the noted Washington columnist Jack Anderson disclosed that CIA in collaboration with the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, a multi-million dollar international conglomerate which had 80 per cent interest in the Chilean telephone and telegraph company, conspired to trigger a military coup in Chile to prevent the election of Salvador Allende, left alliance candidate, as president in 1970. The director of ITT at the time was John McCone, former CIA chief. (It has also been disclosed that ITT paid a donation of four million dollars to the Republican Party in 1972 for Nixon's reelection.) President Allende

himself confirmed it after his election with secret documents captured after nationalisation of ITT interests in Chile. Incidentally, ITT had contracts with the Indian telephone organisation for supply of cross bar apparatus. The machinery it supplied was latter found faulty and there was demand in Parliament that India should ask for compensation.

Why was CIA interested? It was to prevent Allende being elected as President. Afterwards, when he was elected and it could not be prevented, he was murdered. This is now world history; and it is a fact. CIA is opposed to Communist and Marxist forces. Indira is opposed to growth of Communist and Marxist forces. Here is the common interest and the common basis for taking and giving money. Not only for taking and giving money, but for giving all the help, which CIA is prepared to give, to topple a communist Government or to defeat them in the elections.

In the "Times of India" to-day, there is a headline which says: "Kerala leader had admitted use of CIA money in poll." It has come in a big way. It further says:

"In Kerala, the CPI joined anti-CPM alliance in 1969 only..."

When this happened we were united. Anyway, the paper says:

"... The alliance is still continuing in the State. It was the undivided CPI that was defeated in 1960... The late Mr. P. T. Chacko, who became the Home Minister after the 1970 mid-term poll, had told this correspondent during election time that he was aware of CIA money coming to Kerala through the KPCC. He said he could not estimate the amount as he was not the Congress leader who brought the money from Madras."

So, the CIA's money is coming.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You were allotted only 7 minutes. I have rung the bell at 12 minute.

(Dis.)

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: You had allowed one speaker 40 minutes, another speaker 30 minutes and another speaker 25 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It depends upon the strength of the party.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: The Speaker had been telling them repeatedly that they were taking so much of time. I have so many points to make.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That way, you cannot go on with the debate. You have a limited time.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Mr. Unnikrishnan had referred to Nanda Devi. I am not going into it. In 1953-59, Mrs. Gandhi was the President of the Congress. Pandit Nehru was not willing to dismiss that government in Kerala. But she prevailed upon the father and that government was dismissed without assigning any reason. After that, came the elections. At the time of toppling the government, attempts were made to purchase MLAs; and even Rs. 2 lakhs were offered to each MLA so that one or two MLAs could cross over. But, at that time, all the MLAs who had supported the communist government, were so firm and showed their integrity in such a way that it became difficult for India to purchase them. So ultimately the government was toppled from above and the election came. During that election, Mr. Stephen told that she was not the President of the Congress. The election took place in February. She was the President of the Congress upto January. So, the money had been coming while she was the President of the Congress, because the money spent during the election must be in their hands before. You know the role of money during elections. Mr. Chavan's statement has been quoted and he has admitted that so much foreign money is coming. I am not saying that further money will now come. But in this particular case, the fact is quite obvious: that huge money

came to Kerala and West Bengal. Regarding West Bengal election, this reference was made in Moynihan's Book; and that was in 1971 election. Our Prime Minister Indira Gandhi came to know that if there was any free and fair election in 1971, the CPIM will get an absolute majority. There was no doubt about that. That is why, the whole conspiracy was hatched in a way to prevent CPIM, to get an absolute majority.

I have got a book entitled "Inside India Today" written by Dilip Hir. I am quoting from page 171 of the same book. It says:

"The dissolution of Parliament, in December 1970, raised the possibility that voters in the State would get the opportunity to elect their assembly as well. But the non-CPI(M) parties fearing defeat at the hands of the CPI(M) argued that due to 'disturbed conditions' in the State, 'free and fair' elections could not be held. They did not consider the 61,000 strong police force—supported by a further 24,000 members of the Central Reserve Police, the Border Security Force, the Eastern Frontier Rifles, and the National Volunteer Force—sufficient to ensure 'law and order' during elections. More radical measures had to be taken to instil 'confidence' among electors, they insisted, . . . when they realised that it would most probably be unconstitutional for the Indira Gandhi Government to withheld elections to the national Parliament in one State—namely, West Bengal—and holding these elections while not holding elections to the assembly simply could not be justified. This provided the rationale to the Centre to assign 50,000 troops to the state authorities, to be posted at district and sub-divisional headquarters, to undertake nothing more than 'routine flag marches.'

20. The C. S. M. were allotted only 12 minutes for the bell at 12 minutes
MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: . . .
President's rejection.

But soon after the troops arrived in West Bengal, in early February 1971, they were drawn into the 'comb and search' operations that were launched by the state administration (under the direction of the Centre) in Greater Calcutta, ostensibly to rid the area of 'Naxalite menace'. Not many Naxalites were caught, however, because the official tipping off the police agents who had infiltrated the movement caused the other party members too to leave an area before it was cordoned off and combed. In the end, the party which suffered most due to these operations was the CPI(M) many of whose workers, then engaged in an election campaign, found themselves rounded up as 'extremists'.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is irrelevant; you may read the whole book.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: It is fact. It says further:

"And yet since Greater Calcutta accounted for only eight per cent of the assembly seats, these arrests did not materially affect the overall electoral chances of the CPI(M) led alliance. Opposition to it was divided. The Congress was fighting on its own and some leftist and centrist parties had lined up behind the CPI. The reports of the Central government Intelligence Bureau predicted the CPI(M) led alliance winning 150 to 160 seats in a house of 280. The anti-CPI(M) forces therefore needed something drastic to happen to reverse the pro-CPI(M) trend and it did.

On 20th February, barely two and a half weeks before the polling day, Hemanta Kumar Basu, a candidate of the CPI-led alliance for an assembly seat, was attacked by a few young men in north Calcutta and killed. The President of the Forward Block, a small leftist party, H. K. Basu, an old man of 70, was a much respected public figure; and the news of his murder shocked many of the urban dwellers. Within

half an hour of the event, the Police-Commissioner of Calcutta told the press that the two young men arrested as suspects for the murder were 'connected' with CPI(M)."

That is how the CIA moves.

"An important congress functionary declared that he had authentic information that the cadres of the CPI(M) had murdered H. K. Basu."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have taken too much time; you must conclude now. I have been liberal in giving you time.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: You have allowed them so much time. I will just give another quotation from an article of Dr. Ashok Mitra:

"The present Chief Minister of West Bengal (Siddhartha Shankar Ray) who was campaigning out of town, immediately flew back to Calcutta and confided to the waiting pressmen that he had authentic information that the cadres of the CPI(M) had murdered Hemanta Kumar Basu."

That is how the conspiracy started.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have taken 25 minutes, much more than what I can give to your party; you had only 9 minutes.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: The basic question is whether Mrs. Indira Gandhi is interested in parliamentary democracy or not. These actions I have narrated are not for defending democracy; they are for subversion of democracy and using CIA methods, resorting to political murders, even the murder of such a respected leader like Hemant Kumar Bose to misguide the people against the CPI(M) to reduce the number of their votes and they have been successful. They have been successful in reducing votes because in the town area—mostly middle class people were influenced by this propaganda.

There is one para also here. After half an hour All India Radio started announcing—CPIM has murdered

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

Hemanta Bosu. People of West Bengal may vote against the CPIM in the coming election. This is how the State machinery has been used. Apart from that 1100 of her party cadres have been politically murdered and thousands and thousands of workers have been driven out of the area where we were so much influential. In this way, in 1971 Shrimati Indira Gandhi not only took CIA money but also used this CIA method by taking help from the CIA organisation to curb CPIM and subverted Parliamentary democracy. This is a dangerous thing and it must be fought throughout the country and the revelation made by Shri Moynihan, with all these backgrounds, all these facts, is proof enough that this lady can never be trusted in case of defending democracy, independence and sovereignty of the country.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Yadvendra Dutt.

I must warn the speakers that they must keep the time. Hereafter I would not be as liberal as I have been with Shri Samar Mukherjee.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur): You have taken my time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unless I take such time, you would take much time.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: I was sadly disappointed by Shri Stephen's speech today. His entire speech was to abuse his opponents. That is all. Like a clever lawyer who has nothing to say, who knows his case is weak, he abuses the other side. That is what he has done.

I expected Shri Chavan, whom I remember was the Home Minister and certain enquiries were made about foreign money involved, I expected him to get up and speak. But he has chosen to be quiet.

Statement in the press is different. Even on the floor of the House, the details should come out.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN
I have made that time in 1969, the statement on the floor of the House. Any body can refer to it in Library.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: You could have been good enough to give details of enquiry.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Dutt, I had already warned but now you got into polemic with Shri Chavan. You have already taken three minutes and then you will say that my time was taken by Shri Chavan. I am going to be very strict on time not only with you but with everybody.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: You have taken my time and nobody else's.

The whole question is of foreign money given to certain Ex-Prime Minister and certain political parties. Why was that money asked and given? That is the question. It is the mad lust of power, power at any cost. It is that lust that has driven people to take money from the outsiders and it is a matter of shame.

Demand of Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta for a parliamentary probe could be accepted. But no one has cared to accept it. Nor have they cared to sue. I thought this practice of money being used by foreign countries, passed away 200 years back but it looks that it has not passed away. Probably the foreign powers not only CIA, but KGB also in this country, they think we are Chile, Ecuador and Dominican Republic. What is this? It is national humiliation. Therefore, I hope that Government of India should request the U.S. Government who gave the money--and to whom was the money given, was it given from the discretionary fund of the State Department or from the fund of CIA for the dirty tricks? The Government should ask the US Government what was the quantum of money given. That must be brought out. I hope, the Government will write to the Government of America asking them specifically what was the quan-

sum of money passed. May I request you with all humble respect, and through you to the Speaker of this House to write to the Chairman of the Senate requesting him to request Mr. Moynihan to disclose all this shady detail of a deal, because he is a Senator and being a Senator, he is morally bound to say openly all the facts that he knows.

If this mentality, if this atmosphere of taking money from foreigners whether it is a party or an individual, is not crushed and curbed, I am afraid, the thin dividing line between patriotism and I shake in my boot to take the name of the word which is unpatriotic but symbolises the actions of Jaichand, is blurred. If political parties are given money and they accept money for election purposes, then with what face these political parties have the right to say that military officers caught spying are traitors. They are traitors to the country who for the lust of money have bartered away to foreign powers all our secrets, policies to a foreign power, the entire weaponry system and everything. When this is bartered, what else remains for your defence? May I remind my friends that the Caesar's wife should not only be pure but she should be above suspicion.

As soon as this so called scandal was brought out, the matters should have been taken up by the party or the lady concerned. She should have filed a defamation suit against the Indian publishers or she could have filed a defamation suit in America. But nothing has been done. I think, the public of India have a right to know the details of the enquiry that Mr. Chavan as Home Minister made in 1969. I request the Home Minister to publish that report giving all the details and the facts.

There is a mystery. Some suggestions are made in the book that some officials of the party have taken the

money. The official concerned denies it. This must be brought out very clearly and the Government of India should request the United States Government to publish all the facts and figures or they may give to the Government of India the entire files on this matter so that the matter can be thrashed out and inquired into properly.

It is a matter of shame to all of us whichever party we may belong. And the shame is here because in pursuance of their political ambitions, people in this country are prepared to take foreign money. There are organisations masquerading as social, cultural and economic like friendship associations. The Government should put a proper curb on them and make a proper inquiry. There I feel that our intelligence is weak. I draw the attention of the Home Minister that ordinary men like me, who go out for a morning walk, see all the embassy cars rushing about here and there. What are the embassy cars and their occupants are doing? Is any effort made to find out their movements? Have we suddenly become an open society with an open invitation for espionage in this country, open invitation for corruption in this country? What is this?

Our security arrangements should be tightened, specially in this matter, which is a matter affecting our national interests, our honour. The Government should come forward, and I hope the opposition will also co-operate with them, with whatever measures are necessary to appoint a probe Commission to go into it; whether it is parliamentary or judicial does not matter, but there must be a detailed probe in the matter and those found guilty must be brought to book. If the law is to be changed, let amendments be made in it, but the punishment must be deterrent so that the highest in the land may remember that there is no point in trafficking with foreigners for power for tours or favours.

[Shri Yadavendra Dutt]

Before I sit down, with all respect to this House, may I remind the members of this House the famous line of Illiad: "Trojans beware of the gift-bearing Greeks". The foreigners are thinking that a gift brought by them to the Indian people, politicians or political parties will make them amenable to their designs. We must remember that a gift brought by a foreigner has always a string behind it. The sense of patriotism in this country has probably gone to sleep. Whether they are ideological brothers, economic brothers or God knows what other brothers they are, let us remember that this country is our country and our loyalty unconditionally should be to this country.

Therefore, proper measures should be brought against those who betray the interests of this country, ideologically, economically or whatever it may be, so that the security of this country remains and we can raise our head with pride that this country is incorruptible, our politicians are incorruptible and our people cannot be bought.

With these words, I support the motion of my hon. friend, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, and demand that a Commission of Inquiry should be appointed to go into this question.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Trivandrum): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I never dreamed that what happened in my small State of Kerala 20 years ago would become a matter of such heated discussion in this House.

Whatever by the merits of this book, the responsibility lies on Moynihan for raising this issue. His book is an admission that CIA was interfering in the internal affairs of this country. Let us go into the other aspects later. Here is a former Ambassador who has admitted that the CIA was interfering in the internal affairs of our country by bribing the political parties to defeat some other party. What was happening in other parts of the

world has already been reported by ex-CIA men, and all these facts should not surprise us. Now Moynihan himself admits that they have interfered in the internal affairs of this country. So also, the CIA chiefs claim it is their right to interfere in other countries, when their interests are affected.

Recently, another decision was taken to have special contingents of military people to interfere in the affairs of other countries. We are already surrounded by their bases. In such a situation, the least that can be done is to break the link between the CIA and our security arrangements. This is the least we can do. I hope our Home Minister will take steps to see that the CIA is not operating in collaboration with our security organisations.

Now, coming to the question of the other side....

SHRI KANWARLAL GUPTA: You are the Secretary of the CPI. So, kindly let us know what was happening at that time.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I think you are right. 20 years ago in a small State of this big country, in a three-cornered fight the Communist Party got the majority to form the Government. Till then, all these national leaders were blaming the Communists, stating that 'you have no faith in democracy, we are the champions of democracy' and all that. And when they found that through election the Communists could come into power, their entire attitude changed. Here I may point out that I happened to be the Secretary of the Communist Party at that time. It may be in 1952 elections when the Communist Party became a decisive political factor in our State. An anti-Communist organisation was formed at the instance of a certain section of the Church. From that day onwards, campaigns were continued and in 1957 when the Communist

Party got the majority, the first thing to come out against it was in the name of the Church. A serious discussion took place within the Government. The question was: 'In order to defend democracy and secularism, should we support the Communist Government or appear to be neutral, or should we side with the Communists?' After a hot discussion, it was decided that Communists are a danger and so all should combine to fight Communists and that was the starting point of a so-called liberation movement in our State. At that time, as you know, Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the President of the Congress. Now, Mr. S. N. Mishra is not here.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is here.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Then he should tell us. This matter was taken up here at the Centre and then in their Committee it was discussed and decided that since Communism is an international menace there was nothing wrong in rallying with international forces to fight Communists and that how the whole thing developed.

Now, Sir, American money was flowing into our State like anything. There are many people who became immensely rich overnight. There are many who started businesses and for all that . . .

SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA: The Nair Service Society is there.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Yes, the Nair Service Society was also there. But Govindan Nair and Nair Service Society are different.

Whoever could be bought with money was bought. Whoever could be persuaded otherwise was persuaded, and I was very much pained to learn that the Congress organisation received money to fight us.

The Congress organisation, to many youngsters here, is an organisation

like any other to fight the elections. But the Congress had a history. Millions of people had suffered in fighting against imperialism, to build up that organisation, and then to sell it to fight a small party is the most shameful thing that can take place. I was reminded of our own history. This was exactly what had happened in the past also. In order to fight an internal opponent, we relied we sought, the help of foreigners, and our country became a slave nation. I thought that an organisation which fought against imperialism and for freedom would at least remember that for fighting an internal opponent they should not rely on foreign assistance. That has been belied.

Did all this money have any influence on the people? We were maligned like anything, we were slandered. I have no time to describe all those things. If I survive today, if I am alive today, it is only by a miracle. That was the tension that was created in our State at that time.

There was money flowing from the CIA and others. We went to the polls. In 1957 we won with 23 lakhs of votes. In the 1960 election we won by 35 lakhs of votes. Our voting strength increased by 50 per cent. All the CIA or American money or Indian money could not dissuade the people of our State.

My friends mentioned about purchasing MLAs. Yes, one gentleman who was sent from here—now he is no more. I do not want to mention his name—came there. He contacted people, money was collected. It was decided to buy over three people. They tried their best. The MLAs immediately contacted us. The news came to us. We said: go ahead and find out to what extent they will go. Actually, the money in notes was offered at that time. Those MLAs said, "No, we cannot touch your money. We are going out." By that time this gentleman, the emissary

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

from the Centre, had come back here and reported that everything was ready for the Congress takeover. There was one sensible man here at the Centre, and he was Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. He said: "Even if there is no Congress Government for the time being in Kerala, I will not be sorry for it, but if Rs. 3 lakhs of money goes for Communist propaganda, this is a humiliation to me." Everybody thought the Communist Government was going to be toppled. It did not happen.

This campaign against the Communists went on at every election. In 1962 Parliamentary election, 46 per cent of the people irrespective of all these campaigns, stood with the Communist Party. And that was reflected in the Parliamentary Election result. But then something happened the impossible happened and that was, with the Chinese invasion on our borders, the Communist Party split, something which, till then, people believed, can never happen, happened unfortunately. If any one person is responsible for that, it is not Comrade Jyoti Bosu. It is not Sundarayya—all of them had differences, but they had a feeling and understanding that the Communist Organisation should never split and that it should be monolithic and any differences should be decided within itself—that is Namboodiripad. He was responsible for splitting the party and then what happened to the party itself in Kerala. They had, when the party split, 45 Members. When we unitedly fought in 1967 elections, they got 55 seats. Then the fraternal fight started. In the next election, they got 28 and in 1977 elections, they got 17 seats. Their party again split into Naxalities and Marxists and one-third of the Members went away and that party again split. Namboodiripad still happens to be the General Secretary of the

Marxist Party and he is the arch splitter, the reason being that he should be in power.

Now Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who has built a party of her own to take power, is not worthy of even carrying the shoes of Namboodiripad in this matter. Now he has come with a statement saying that we are also participants in receiving CIA money. It is a black lie, a man of his stature, a man of this experience...

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: You were in company with that party....

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR : I have no complaint against you. He had the audacity to say such a black lie.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have to conclude.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Now, as long as Namboodiripad continues to be the General Secretary of the Marxist Party, their future is doomed. That is my feeling. Indira Gandhi is nothing in the matter of gaining personal power. She may form a party of her own. But this Gentleman, in order to maintain his position, will find theoretical explanation to cover up just like George Bernard Shaw said: "even for a murder, the Britishers used to do it on a principle" in the same way, Namboodiripad, to break and finish off the Communist Movement in the country, will find some excuse or other in splitting and finishing the Communist Movement in the country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am calling the next speaker. Mr. Baldev Prakash.

डा० बलदेव प्रकाश (भूमतसर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आज जो प्रश्न सदन के सामने है वह बहुत ही अमरीक प्रश्न है। विदेशी धन, अमरीका का रुपया इस देश की राजनीति के अन्दर इस्तेमाल किया गया। कांग्रेस की तरफ से मांग हुई थीर इन्दिरा जी को वह रुपया मिला। अब यह सवाल नहीं पंदा होता कि रुपया धारा या नहीं धारा क्योंकि रुपया देने की बात जिस व्यक्ति ने कही है, श्री मोयनिहनु ने, उन्होंने अपनी प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस के अन्दर अमरीका में एक बात थीर कही है कि जो रुपया गया है वह मेरी जेब से नहीं गया बल्कि वह सरकारी खजाने से गया है। सरकारी खजाने में वे धाकड़े मौजूद होंगे। वहां से पता लगाया जा सकता है कि कितना रुपया गया है और कब कब गया है। अब इन्दिरा गांधी से पूछने का सवाल ही पंदा नहीं होता है। उसने रुपया लिया और उकार गई। अब तो हमारी सरकार बताये कि क्या उसने उस प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस के बाद अमरीका की सरकार से इस बारे में पता लगाया है, क्योंकि यह दो देशों के आपसी सम्बन्धों का मामला है। क्या हम इस बात को बर्दाश्त करेंगे कि अमरीका रुपया लगा कर इस देश के लोकतंत्र का विनाश करे? क्या सरकार इस नीति से सहमत है?

इसी लोक सभा में तत्कालीन गृह मंत्री, श्री० चरण सिंह, ने एक सवाल के जवाब में कहा था कि किसी भी राजनीतिक दल को विदेशी धन लेने का कानूनी अधिकार नहीं है, और सरकार की तरफ से उस पर रोक है। सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अमन मोयनिहनु ने कहा है कि अमरीका के सरकारी खजाने से दो लफा धन दिया गया, तो उसने अब तक उस बारे में क्या जांच की है। अगर वह रुपया धारा है और अमरीका की सरकार ने दिया है तो हमारी सरकार ने अमरीका की सरकार को क्या प्रोटेस्ट किया है? किस अधिकार से, किस औचित्य से, किम जस्टिफिकेशन से अमरीका की सरकार ने इस देश के लोकतंत्र को तबाह करने के लिए अपने धन का प्रयोग किया? गृह मंत्री जवाब कि उन्होंने इस बारे में क्या जांच की है।

स्टीफेन साहब ने बहुत लम्बी चौड़ी तक्रार की। लेकिन उनकी सारी प्रतिभा भी एक झूठे ा खिजाने में कामयाब नहीं हो सकी। उन्होंने कहा कि फर्ला को रुपया दिया गया, इसको दिया गया, उसको दिया गया। यह कोई औचित्य नहीं है कि अगर फर्ला को दिया गया, तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को भी मिलना चाहिए। इन्दिरा गांधी ने भी कहे दिया कि मोयनिहनु तो बड़ा बड़ा है।

वे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इन्दिरा गांधी कौन सी लची है। अगर इस देश में झूठ का कोई खतार है, अगर इस देश की राजनीति में जमातान

किसी व्यक्ति ने झूठ बोला है, सत्य निष्ठा, नतिकता, प्रखलाक और ईमानदारी से जिसका दूर का भी सम्बन्ध नहीं है, तो वह श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी हैं। चाहे उनकी अपनी पार्टी के अन्दर का मामला हो, चाहे श्री तंजीब रेड्डी के राष्ट्रपति के पद पर चुनाव का मामला हो, चाहे इमर्जेन्सी की एक्सेसिज का मामला हो, चाहे यह मामला हो कि वंजय गांधी ने राजनीति से सत्यास लिया है या नहीं, कोई बताये कि क्या श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने कभी सच्चाई से काम लिया। इस देश की राजनीति में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी हमेशा सच्चाई से दूर रहीं।

जब मैं जेल में था, तो मैंने उनके अनेक वक्तव्य पढ़े इमर्जेन्सी के वक्त उन्होंने कहा कि इस देश कोई भी राजनीतिक व्यक्ति जेल में नहीं है, कुछ लोग पकड़े गये थे, वे छोड़ दिये गये हैं, जो लोग जेल में हैं, वे एन्टी-सोशल एसीमेंट्स हैं, इकानॉमिक आर्गेनइज हैं स्मगलर्स हैं, गुंडे हैं। एक दफा नहीं, सौ दफा उनका यह बयान निकला। क्या लोकनायक जयप्रकाश नारायण एन्टी-सोशल थे। क्या वह स्मगलिंग के कारण जेल में थे? क्या श्री मोरारजी देसाई एन्टी-सोशल एलिमेंट थे? क्या उस समय दो लाख राजनतिक बंदी एन्टी-सोशल थे? श्री एस० एन० मिश्र बड़े हैं—क्या वह एन्टी-सोशल थे? हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति में अगर कोई व्यक्ति हमेशा झूठ बोल सकता है, तो वह श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी हैं। उन्होंने अपनी सियासी जिन्दगी में हमेशा दूसरों पर आरोप लगाये। क्या उन्होंने किसी को स्पेयर किया? इमर्जेन्सी के बाद उन्होंने कहा कि जार्ज फर्नान्डिस ने चीन से रुपया लिया है, लोकनायक जयप्रकाश नारायण ने जापान से रुपया लिया है, वह अमरीका के एजेंट हैं, हिन्दुस्तान में जो गतिविधियां चलतीं, वे अमरीका के रुपये से चलती रहीं। और वह खुद अमरीका से रुपया लेती रहीं। जिस व्यक्ति ने लगातार देश को धोखा दिया, जिसने लोकतंत्र को नष्ट करने के लिए अमरीका के धन का उपयोग किया, मैं मांग करता हूँ कि ऐसे व्यक्ति पर स्पेशल कोर्ट में नहीं, बल्कि उसका पब्लिक ट्रायल होना चाहिए।

स्टीफेन साहब ने एक बात और कही है कि उस समय तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी प्रेसीडेंट ही नहीं थीं जब मोयनिहनु यहां था या जब कैबल के चुनाव हुए थे। लेकिन मोयनिहनु ने कोई तारीख नहीं दी है। उन्होंने अपनी प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस में यह बात स्पष्ट की है और उन्होंने यह कहा है कि उन्होंने देकार्त देब कर के दो बार रुपया दिया गया यह जांच करवायी है। उसकी तारीख क्या थी और कब इन्दिरा गांधी प्रेसीडेंट थीं, वह उस देकार्त से पता लग सकता है। तो उन का आज का यह दावा कि इसलिए रुपया नहीं लिया गया क्योंकि इन्दिरा गांधी तो कैबल के चुनाव के समय

[शा० बलदेव प्रकाश]

काँग्रेस की प्रेसीडेंट ही नहीं थी कोई माने नहीं रखता क्योंकि मोयनिहन ने फिर यह कहा है कि श्री वाजपेयी भाषिणियों एट दैट टाइम, वह बकिंग कमेटी की मेम्बर हो सकती है, उन के पास कोई और औहदा हो सकता है, जरूरी नहीं कि वह प्रेसीडेंट ही हों। लेकिन यह कहना कि इसलिए पैसा लेने की बात झूठ है क्योंकि वह उस समय प्रेसीडेंट नहीं थीं, इस का कोई मतलब नहीं है।

और बातें यहां पर कही गईं। लोकतंत्र की कुछ परम्पराएं हैं। हमारी पब्लिक लाइफ की भी कुछ नैतिकता है। अगर एक खबर छपी किसी नेता के मामले में या किसी सरकारी मंत्री के मामले में और अगर मंत्री ने उसको कॉन्ट्रिब्यूट कर दिया तो फिर हमारी यह एक परम्परा है, राजनैतिक नैतिकता है कि हम उस मामले को यहां पर न उठाएं। लेकिन मुनिकल झूठा तो उस से बढ़ करके उस का बकीस जो है वह अगर यहां पर कार्रवाई करके न दिखाए तो उस को बाहवाही नहीं मिल सकती। तो स्पीकर्स साहब ने उस बात को भी यहां पर उठाया जिस को विदेश मंत्री जी ने कॉन्ट्रिब्यूट कर दिया था कि कोई डिनर नहीं हुआ, कोई वहां पर भिसेज कराली से वह मिले नहीं, बंकर से मिले नहीं और मोयनिहन एम्बेसडर के घर भा कर उन से मिले, वह बात कॉन्ट्रिब्यूट आफिशियली हो गई थी। उस को भी इन्होंने यहां पर उठाकर यह साबित करने की कोशिश की कि यह तो पुराने सम्बन्धों को जागृत करने के लिए, वहां पर गए थे। कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है इसका। मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि अगर किसी को भी क्या मिला है चाहे वह कोई भी राजनैतिक पार्टी रही हो, चाहे वह कोई सोशल ऑर्गेनाइजेशन हो जिस ने राजनैतिक कार्यों से, राजनैतिक लक्ष्यों को सामने रख कर रुपया लिया हो, उसकी जांच यहां पर होनी चाहिए और दूध का दूध और पानी का पानी होना चाहिए। विदेश का धन देश की राजनीति में किसी तरीके से भी इस्तेमाल नहीं हो सकता। इस के बारे में फैसला होना चाहिए।

आज कुछ मूलभूत प्रश्न देश के सामने हैं। मैं इन सदन के सामने यह मांग रखता हूँ। हमें इस मामले को इधर उधर धारोप-प्रत्यारोप लगा कर के एक तरफ नहीं करना चाहिए। इतने गम्भीर प्रश्न को साइड ट्रेक नहीं करना चाहिए। मूल प्रश्न यह है कि क्या देश की राजनीति में विदेशी धन इस्तेमाल होना चाहिए। या नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर नहीं होना चाहिए तो क्या इस्तेमाल हुआ है? अगर हुआ है तो उस की रोकथाम कैसे की जाए। और जिनकी किया है उन को इस किस प्रकार से दण्डित करें? ये तीन चीजें हैं जिन्हें लोक सभा के सामने स्पष्ट रूप में खाना चाहिए और एक, तरीके नहीं, जैसा कि कहा गया है, बड़े तरीकों

विदेश का धन इस्तेमाल होता रहा है। तो आई ए के अग्रेस्ट कहा गया तो अमेरिका ने इन्दिरा गांधी को रुपया दे दिया और उस के विरोध में कहना शुरू किया तो उस वालों ने रुपया दे दिया।

मैं आपके सामने एक और चीज रखना चाहता हूँ। करेंट अखबार में छपा है—

"The Soviet Union placed orders worth Rs. 60 lakhs to Sanjay Gandhi with the seal of approval of Shrimati Indira Gandhi for supplying the petrol saving junk marketed by Maruti but made by reputed Bombay firm."

ऐसा छोटा सा एक पर्जा जो पेट्रोल सेव करने का था, उस के 60 लाख के ऑर्डर उन्होंने लिए जो इस्तेमाल नहीं हो सकता था। क्यों? केवल राजनैतिक उद्देश्य से कि जब संजय गांधी ने रशियंस के विरोध में बोलना शुरू किया तो उन को खुश करने के लिए 60 लाख रुपये मारुति के अंदर उस के भाए और एक पर्जा वहां पर बिका। क्या यह विदेशी धन का इस्तेमाल नहीं है और गलत तरीके से नहीं है? इन में क्या अपने राजनैतिक अधिकारों का दुरुपयोग नहीं है? इसी तरीके से विदेश का रुपया देश की राजनीति में आता रहा।

मैं केवल यही मांग करना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो तथ्य हाउस के सामने आए हैं जिन पर आज बहस हुई है, आज जनता की आंखें इन तथ्यों की ओर लगी हुई हैं और सरकार से आज मेरी यह मांग है कि इन तथ्यों को बिल्कुल निरावरण करके, बिल्कुल स्पष्ट कर के, नंगा कर के जनता के सामने रखना चाहिए कि देश के इस लोकतंत्र में कौन विदेशी धन का इस्तेमाल करता रहा : जो भी करता रहा वह देश का द्रोही है, चाहे उस का धन इस्तेमाल हुआ हो चाहे अमेरिका का इस्तेमाल हुआ हो, चाहे किसी का भी तो इस्तेमाल हुआ हो, वह बात हमेशा के लिए सदन के सामने स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए। जनता के सामने स्पष्ट तस्वीर खानी चाहिए। ये मांग लोकनायक जयप्रकाश नारायण की अमेरिका का एजेंट कहते रहे और उस समय की सी पी आई की श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के साथ थी, श्रीमती पार्वती कुण्डन भी श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के साथ थीं। कितना पैसा किस किस को मिला— उसकी बात धाब में नहीं कर रहे हैं बल्कि इधर उधर की बातें करके इसको साइडट्रेक करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। इसलिए यह बात स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए कि बोधी कौन है और उसकी सज्जी जाय—यह मेरी मांग है।

श्री राज नारायण (राय बरेली) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। होपहर को जब मैं घर गया तो आपके कार्यालय से हमारे पास टेलीफोन गया कि आज आपका नाम बोलने वालों की लिस्ट में नहीं है। मैंने पूछा कि क्यों नहीं है तो उन्होंने कहा कि आपने नाम भेजा नहीं। फिर हमने अपना बपत्तर बुलवाया और मुझे यह कापी मिली है :

“दिनांक 27 अप्रैल, 1979।
माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, लोक सभा,

महोदय,

मोहनलाल सम्बन्धी विदेशी धन का लेन-देन और सन् 1967 के चुनाव में श्री आई ए द्वारा दिए गए धन के सम्बन्ध में दिनांक 7-5-79 को होने वाली बहस में मैं भाग लेना चाहता हूँ। मध्यव्यव,

आपका,

राज नारायण (विभाजन सं० 100) ”

यह 27 अप्रैल की बिट्टी है और आज 7 मई है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ पार्लियमेंट की डिप्टेटरशिप क्या है। मैंने यह बिट्टी आपके पास लिखकर भेजी। और प्रश्नी हमारे पास लिखकर आपसे यहां से कि बिट्टी ने आपका नाम नहीं भेजा तो क्या बिट्टी डिप्टेटर है? इसलिए यह सबाल ऐसा नहीं है जो यहीं पर रह जाए।

श्री क्यामलमन्धल मिश्र (बेगूसराय) : तो बिट्टी ही बैठे बेयर पर।

श्री राज नारायण : नहीं बैठकर जिसका नाम चाहें बोलें और न चाहें न बोलें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं, उस समय आप हमारे नेता थे राज्य सभा में, उस समय 1967 के चुनाव के लिये सी आई ए के धन के संबंध में सभी पार्टियों के नाम लिखे गए—जनसंघ, स्वतंत्र पार्टी, कांग्रेस तथा अन्य पार्टियां—केवल एक पार्टी का नाम नहीं लिखा गया, सोवियलिस्ट पार्टी जोकि डा० लोहिया की अगुआई में है। तो इसके बारे में बहस क्यों न हो। मैं प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ क्या गांधी जी की समाधि पर मरण लेने वाले विदेश के धन से देश की राजनीति चलाने वाले इस देश की स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा कर सकते हैं? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, नहीं। यही मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। इस प्रश्न पर किस तरीके से हम जाने सके? क्या यह व्यवस्था है या व्यवस्था है? क्या किसी संविधान में किसी भी बिट्टी को इतना अधिकार दिया गया है कि जिसको सहे बोलने से, जिसको न चाहे, न बोलने दे?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : राज नारायण जी, आप पार्टी सिस्टम की बात समझें।

श्री राज नारायण : मैं डिमोक्रेटिक सिस्टम भी जानता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जब पार्टी सिस्टम अपरेट कर रहा है तो बिट्टी के पास अपना नाम भेज देते तो शायद वे भी आपका नाम यहां भेज देते। बिट्टी के पास आपका नाम नहीं था। यह मुझे बताया गया है कि आपने सेक्रेटरीयट को लिखा था।

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Under Rule 195... I am on the same subject. Under Rule 195...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may be on anything. I must reply to him. I am first replying to Mr. Raj Narain's point of order.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You cannot reply to it unless you listen to me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already started replying Mr. Sathe, please take your seat. I need no assistance. I know what I am doing.

श्री राज नारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं आपका जवाब कृतज्ञ हूँ, असल बात यह है कि मैंने उन्को भी बात की टेलीफोन पर और उन्होंने कहा कि आप अध्यक्ष को लिखकर भेजिये और हमने अध्यक्ष को लिखा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यह हमको पता नहीं है।

श्री राज नारायण : श्रीक बिट्टी को मैंने अस्पताल से टेलीफोन द्वारा सूचित कर दिया था।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीक बिट्टी की एक लिस्ट यहां पर है। पहले तो बिट्टी की लिस्ट को प्रायरदी मिलेगी और आप का नाम भी यहां है। आप ने इन्डिपेंडेंट लिस्ट भेजी है और दूसरे लोगों ने भी भेजी है। उस में आपका नाम नम्बर 1 पर है। इसलिए जब बिट्टी की लिस्ट खत्म हो जाती है तो आप को समय दे सकते हैं। आप का नम्बर 1 पर नाम है और इन्डिपेंडेंट लिस्ट सिर्फ आप की ही नहीं है, और सदस्यों की भी है।

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, kindly read Rules No. 193 and 195.

Rule 193 says:—

“Any member desirous of raising discussion on a matter of urgent public importance may give notice in writing to the Secretary-General specifying clearly and precisely the matter to be raised.”

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

After this you please look at Rule 195, I quote:

"There shall be no formal motion before the House for voting. The member who has given notice may make a short statement and the Minister shall reply shortly. Any member who has previously intimated to the Speaker may be permitted to take part in the discussion."

The discretion is of the Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already explained my position, Mr. Sathe. There is a party system which we follow. I am using my discretion and, as such, don't waste more time of the House.

जी राज नारायण : आप ने जो कहा, हम वही चाहते हैं। जब आप अपना डिस्क्रिशन इस्तेमाल करेंगे, तो चीफ़ व्हिप की लिस्ट ब्रलग रह जायगी और आप हम को बुला लेंगे।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are certain practices which we follow. Therefore, those norms will be applied while using my discretion.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I must say that I find this discussion very unusual and in more than one sense somewhat extraordinary. Such a discussion should not have taken place until it was pointedly tuned to a specific subject, namely, the maaise and disease of foreign influence and foreign money in our domestic and democratic politics. If this point is not touched at its root and if something is not brought out of this discussion as to how effectively we can get rid of this foreign money, I do not see, what is the point of exchanging verbal abuses between different parties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to touch the point raised by Mr. Raj Narain as you have just said many things to regard to his point but I must say the Opposition point that there is something fishy

about this whole matter that the money is not given to only Mrs. Gandhi and the Congress party but to others is, perhaps, being proved in the sense in which I find only a certain se of people are being called to speak from a particular party and not all who want to participate. I want more constituents of the ruling party to come out one after another to make speeches otherwise you will get a loaded discussion in favour of or against a particular point.

Having said that I want to say that the amazing and startling diplomatic bomb thrown by Mr. Moynihan is, perhaps reflective of his own character and personality. He has been a colourful and a controversial personality. He has never said things which are completely true nor, perhaps, he has said things which are completely false. Perhaps, this is the practice of all politicians and diplomats but the point is that this discussion must make it imperative on the part of the Government to come out with all facts on this matter as to how foreign money,—or, for that matter, American money or Russian money,—is pouring into Indian Political System and how it is distorting and making non-sense of our democratic politics and democratic policy. I hope that the Home Minister is going to reply to the debate. I do hope that the Home Minister will give us an assurance and a promise that they will come out with all facts. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as I have no time to go into the details, I would only give the page number and give reference to the quotation. On page 41 of this Moynihan's book "A Dangerous Place", there is a question beginning from "We had twice..."

We meaning Americans,—

"but only twice, interfered in Indian politics to the extent of providing money to a political party..."

etc. etc. ending with the words—

"Still, as we were no longer giving any money to her..."

'her' is Mrs. Gandhi—

".... it was understandable that she should wonder just to whom we were giving it. It is not a practice to be encouraged."

Now, Sir, my point is this. It is not just that twice the money was given and not just that it was given only to the congress party or Mrs. Gandhi, which is the point at issue. The Government must come forward—if they are honest—as to which parties, which individuals, which organisations which associations, have been given this foreign money and for what purposes and whether Government are going to tell us once for all that this matter will be a matter of dead past and that in future this ugly practice and vulgar practice. I shall be stopped.

Now, Sir, why I do say this? I say this because the subject really is not Moynihan or his book. That is only a provocation and a stimulation at best and at worst. But the subject at the root toady in our Parliament is a large and a deeper issue, because it hurts us it affects us, and it prompts us to take immediate steps at introspection, at correction, and at improvement of our image, image of our people, image of our country, image of our political parties and politicians.

And here at this point I want to ask one thing. I want this because the introspection is for the purification of party politics, of democratic politics and for the image of India to go up in the right sense. I want to take one more point along with this and that is, why are the Government of India fighting shy in getting the necessary detailed information directly from the United States Government. It is no use the Home Minister saying that the information

was sought from the US Embassy in Delhi and the US Embassy in Delhi saying 'no comment'. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, what do you expect from an Embassy official or Embassy people except to say 'no comment'? After all, they are diplomatic and they will say 'no comment'. But what prevents Mr. H. M. Patel and the Government from going directly to the State Department of the United States and ask as to what exactly has been done in the past, with a view to seeing that we want to get rid of these things once for all? I say this because I believe, Sir, that this CIA money particularly has been used not only for distortions and interference in the political, domestic and internal affairs of a host of countries,—not only in India, but in a number of countries in the developing world and the developed world,—but the CIA money has been used for changing Governments, for destroying governments, for getting leaders assassinated for all kinds of political upheavals. And it is not just I who thinks it myself and says this) I am on good authority when I say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, a Reuter Message of May 2, clearly says this and I quote from it.

'President Carter's spokesman said yesterday, the White House had drawn up a new charter for American intelligence agencies which would forbid major covert actions without approval by the President.'

Therefore, President Carter is now keen to ensure that henceforth no CIA money will be used for interference in internal affairs of democratic countries. Some American Government may not like India; they may not like our politicians and so on. We may be poor, but we are struggling for our democratic rights. And our honour and our self-respect as Indians, as Indian nation,—and what is most important,—as Indian

(Dis.)

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

democracy, in the developing world are at stake and therefore once for all the time has come when we must tell not only President Carter and Americans but even Mr. Moynihan one mind clearly and plainly. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, Mr. Moynihan is a senator and I understand he is going to be one of the Democratic Party's candidates for the Presidential election. And if Carter has said this, surely, that means that Moynihan too will have to be accountable. And here I want to make this point, how is it and why is it that we cannot ask for information from the Americans? I believe, the Freedom of Information Act in the United States makes it obligatory for the American Government to give out information to any American citizen who asks for it. Why not Government of India take advantage of this Act? The only explanation is, rather the only condition is that the Government of the United States will not give information which is prejudicial to the United States security. That is all. But giving money to any one or more political parties in India or to any political parties in other countries is not a question of the United States security. So, I believe it is right and proper that we must ask the United States Government to give the information.

Lastly, our parliamentary system is based on various political parties. I do not belong myself to any political party. But I accept that today political parties have to be there and perhaps this party system in a democracy is desirable. I accept that the political parties are necessary in parliamentary democracies and in fact political parties make parliamentary democracy workable. But I want to say that people living in glass-houses should beware of throwing stones at others. Now, the point is that it is true perhaps as Mr. Moynihan's book disclosed that

Mrs. Gandhi and the Congress party have taken money from the United States. But I want to know the names of other individuals in this country who got money from the United States, who have received foreign money, American or other foreign money, for political purposes because unless we know that and unless that comes up before us, we will not be able to take proper steps and have a process of cleansing our political system and democratic polity.

Sir, the political parties must be subject to having their Annual Accounts audited. The receipts and incomes are expenditure of the political parties must be audited and they must show from which sources they had received money. Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan appointed two Committees on the subject of electoral reform and I had the privilege of being a Member of both the Committees one in 1974 and the other in 1977. Our reports are there and we have mentioned in our reports the need for overhauling the electoral system and the need for maintaining and publishing the annual reports of the political parties after audit of incomes, receipts and expenditure of the political parties. I take this opportunity to demand that all the political parties and politicians of all sorts must be obliged to maintain accurate records.

Now one final word and that is, I want to suggest that this is the time when the Parliament must ask for a thorough probe, whether it is a parliamentary committee or some other investigation body. I do not want to go into details. Let the Government now tell us. Let the hon. Speaker guide us and let the leaders of the various groups find out what is the modus operandi for this, so that we can promise to our people that we have a clean, honest and upright political party system in our country and that we do not want to be cowed down by American

or any other foreign influence in our internal functioning and democratic polity.

श्री वृष वृषभ सिक्कारी (अलीलाबाद) :
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज का यह बहुत महत्व-
 पूर्ण विषय है और यह सही है कि यह मामला केवल श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की प्रतिष्ठा से संबंधित नहीं है। यह मामला इतना गम्भीर है कि इसके कारण सरकार, भारत की जनता और भारत में लोकतंत्र की प्रतिष्ठा को आघात पहुंचा है। इस प्रकार के आरोप बराबर लगाए जा रहे हैं और किसी साधारण व्यक्ति द्वारा नहीं बल्कि ऐसे लोग जो सत्ता के सब से किस्म के पक्षों पर आसीन रहे हैं, परन्तु आश्चर्य की बात है कि आज तक उसके सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने कोई गम्भीरता का पक्ष नहीं लिया और जांच पड़ताल नहीं करायी। इन्दिरा जी के जमाने में भी, जब कोई आन्दोलन हुआ या चुनाव के मोके पर या नेताओं के बारे में, कई बार यह सवाल उठाया गया कि विदेशी धन देश की अन्धकनी राजनीति में इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है। और इतना ही नहीं उन्होंने अपनी ज्ञान के बयानों में कहा है कि मुझे सत्ता से हटाने में विदेशी शक्तियों का हाथ है। परन्तु जब वह नहीं परे भी, तब भी सिवाये बयान देने के कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम या कोई ठोस कार्यवाही उसकी जांच के सम्बन्ध में नहीं की गई। आज जनता पार्टी की सरकार है, जिसने सांभजनिक जीवन में ईमान-
 दारी, साहगी और पवित्रता साने की शपथ ली थी। एक भूतपूर्व राजदूत द्वारा एक किताब में स्वेडिशिकनी स्पष्ट रूप से, नाम दिया गया है—और वह भी ऐसे व्यक्ति का जो देश में सत्ता के उच्च किस्म पर बैठा था,—तब भी आज तक उस सम्बन्ध में कोई जानकारी देना और सदन को नहीं की गई।

मैं चाहता था कि विदेश मंत्री, श्री प्रतल विहारी वाजपेयी, यहाँ पर हमें तमाम तथ्यों से अवगत कराये, क्योंकि वह भी इस सारे खेल के एक अंग बने हुए हैं। अभी अमरीका में प्रवास के दौरान उनकी मीडिनिह्न से बात हुई। उसके सम्बन्ध में अजबारी में कई प्रकार की रिपोर्ट आईं। कभी मीडिनिह्न ने किसी बात को अस्वीकार किया, और कभी हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी ने अस्वी-
 कार किया।

19.01 hrs

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

इसलिए मैं चाहता था कि वह सदन में स्पष्ट रूप से बताये कि मीडिनिह्न से उनकी क्या बात हुई और उन्होंने किसे तथ्यों की जानकारी दी। अमरीका में एक सम्भार के मीडिनिह्न से सवाल पूछा था कि साक्षर किन्ना पैसा अमरीकी सरकार या अमरीका की संसदा, सी० धार्ड० ए०, ने दिया, और किस लोगों को दिया। उस पर मीडि-

निह्न ने कहा कि अगर भारत सरकार अमरीका की सरकार से सम्पर्क करे, तो अमरीका की सरकार ने सारे तथ्य उसे बतायेगी। इसलिए मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो आदेशी आरोप लगाता है, जब वह साफ़ तौर पर कहता है कि अमरीका की सरकार से सम्पर्क करने पर ये सारे तथ्य मिल सकते हैं तो क्या वह मंत्री या सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में अमरीका की सरकार से कोई सम्पर्क किया और क्या कोई तथ्य उन्हें मालूम हुए हैं? यदि हाँ, तो उन तथ्यों को इस सदन में रखना चाहिए।

यह एक बहुत बड़ा सवाल है। अगर देश में लोकतंत्र को सथात करने के लिए विदेशी धन का इस्तेमाल किया जाये, तो एक बड़ा संकट पैदा हो जायेगा। ऐसा कि कई सदस्यों ने कहा है, डेवेलपिंग कंट्रीज में ऐसे प्रयास हो रहे हैं। भारत में भी अभी हम लोग जिस इमर्जेंसी में रहे, जिस तरह यहाँ से लोकतंत्र को कब्द किया गया, उन उध्यों को देखने से मुझे लगता है कि यह भी विदेशी शक्तियों के इशारे पर किया सम्भ। विदेशी ताकतों द्वारा कई तरीकों से प्रपने प्रच्छन्न का इस्तेमाल हो सकता है। पैसा दे कर, मदद कर के, उनकी बात को प्रुष्टि करके, बिम्ब में उनके पक्ष में जनमत बनाने में योगदान करके—कई प्रकार से देश की राजनीति और राजनीति में भ्रम देने वाले बड़े प्रभावशाली नेतारों को प्रभावित किया जा सकता है।

प्राप देखते हैं कि भारतवर्ष में चुनाव कितने खर्चीले हो गये हैं। उन्हें खर्चीला किसने बनाया? विरोधी दल के लोगों ने नहीं बनाया। जो लोग हुकुमत में थे, जिनके पास सारे साधन थे, उन्होंने चुनाव को बहुत खर्चीला बनाया। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि चुनाव पहले राजनीतिक दलों और व्यक्तियों की पहुँच के बाहर हो गये ?। इसका परिणाम यह भी होगा कि वही लोग सत्ता में रहेंगे, जिनके पास बाँहे देश की मोटी बिस्वी कब्जे में हो, या देश के बाहर की मोटी बिस्वी कब्जे में हो।

एक माननीय सदस्य : मोटी मुर्गी।

श्री अक्षयधर सिक्कारी : मुर्गी सत्रस लीजिए। अगर सभी पावर बाहे वह देश की एक देश के बाहर की हो हमारे चुनावों की प्रभावित करेगी, तो निष्पक्ष चुनाव सम्भव नहीं होगा। अगर निष्पक्ष चुनाव सम्भव नहीं है, तो संविधान में 18 क्ले के लोगों को मताधिकार देने का भी कोई मतलब नहीं रहेगा। इसलिए मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब झगडा खीर प्रक है तो इस पर सभी एक मुर्गी क्यों खाई गई? राजी जी ने कहा था कि अगर हमें देश की अर्थनीति करने के लिए देश की जनता से पैसा नहीं लिखता तो हमारा देश के कि हम अर्थनीति को बनाने के लिए विदेशी धन का उपयोग करें, उस से अक्षय

(Dis.)

[श्री बुभुक्षुषण तिवारी]

होगा कि हम राजनीति करना बन्द कर दें। यह गांधी जी ने कहा था।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो मोयनिहून साहब ने अपनी किताब में लिखा है वह अभी पूरे तरीके से साफ नहीं हो पाया कि यह सी०आइ०ए० फंड का पैसा था या एम्बेसी के डिस्कोमनरी फंड का था क्योंकि एम्बेसी का डिस्कोमनरी फंड भी होता है। यह लोगों में चर्चा भी है और यह सही भी है कि केवल कांग्रेस पार्टी ही नहीं, अन्य दलों एवं व्यक्तियों को भी विदेशी धन मिला है। 1967 के चुनाव के बारे में इसी सदन में चर्चा हुई थी और उस में तमाम दलों और व्यक्तियों के नाम दिये जा चुके हैं विदेशी धन मिला था। अमेरिका ने जो सारा पैसा दिया वह एंटी कम्युनिज्म के लिए दिया। साम्यवादी आन्दोलन या साम्यवादी विचार के खिलाफ उस पैसे का इस्तेमाल किया गया। तो जो विचारधारा या जो संगठन साम्यवादी विचार के खिलाफ लड़ते थे उन को वह पैसा दिया जाता था, ऐसा मोयनिहून ने कहा है और उसमें उस समय की तत्कालीन सरकार का भी इस्तेमाल हुआ। इसी प्रकार से साम्यवादी विचारधारा को फैलाने के लिए तमाम प्रकार से, तमाम स्रोतों से धन देना में पैसे का इस्तेमाल हुआ है। तो मेरा केवल यही कहना है कि जब तक इन मारी शंकाओं का समाधान नहीं किया जाता और जब तक हमारे विदेश संबंधी साफ साफ और सीधे तौर पर उनके अपने और मोयनिहून के बीच में हुई बातों का देश और सदन के सामने नहीं रखते, तब तक यह शंका बनी रहेगी और अगर यह शंका बनी रहती तो यह बहुत ही खतरनाक बात है। इस से सरकार की शान्त गिरती है, देश की जनता की शान्त गिरती है और देश के लोकतंत्र की शान्त गिरती है, क्यों कि यह सारी कार्यवाही केवल डेवलपिंग मुल्कों में, केवल गरीब मुल्कों में ही संभव है। अमेरिका में यह संभव नहीं है, इस में यह संभव नहीं है कि वहाँ विदेशी धन का इस्तेमाल हो। किन्तु ये जो विदेशी ताकतें हैं ये इसका इस्तेमाल करती हैं और हमारे देश में कांसिस्टवादी, तानाशाह और संगनजार्गिया वाले लोगों के द्वारा लोकतंत्र को समाप्त करने की कोशिश कर रही हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहूँगा कि इतने बड़े गंभीर सवाल पर चाहे पार्लियामेन्टी प्रोब की या उसके लिए और भी कोई जोच बैठवाई जाये और चक्राण साहब के समय में या सी०बी०आई० द्वारा जो जांच हुई थी उसकी भी क्या रफ्त है वह भी स्पष्ट रूप से सामने आनी चाहिए क्योंकि जगता है कि बाल में कुछ कासा है, लोगों के सामने फंसे हुए हैं, इसलिए सकार्ड से कोई किसी को कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। परन्तु यह चीज धलेगी नहीं। देश की जनता के सामने साफ तौर से लोगों के चेहरे को बेनकाब करना होगा और अपने लोकतंत्र को सबल करने के लिए संकल्प लेना होगा।

श्री बुभुक्षुषण (फटिहार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह एक बहुत ही गंभीर और महत्वपूर्ण मामला आज देश के सामने प्रस्तुत है। आज सम्पूर्ण भारत की बुद्धिजीवी जनता वर्तमान सरकार की तरफ उत्सुकता के साथ देख रही है। जब से यह सवाल पैदा हुआ, इस किताब का प्रकाशन हुआ, एक खतरनाक स्थान पर खतरनाक सभ्यों को उजागर किया गया, तब से अब तक सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में पता लगाने का कौन सा प्रयत्न किया? अमेरिका के भूतपूर्व राजदूत और इंदिरा शासन से मधुर सम्बन्ध रखने वाले डैनियल पैट्रिक मोयनिहून इस दुनिया में एक बहुत ही पढ़े लिखे धार्मिक माने जाते हैं। उन्होंने नौ किताबें लिखी हैं, हार्वर्ड यूनिवर्सिटी में वह प्रोफेसर आफ गवर्नमेंट हैं और चाहे वह यहूदी हों या किसी दूसरी जाति के हों, इन सबलों का उस से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। प्रश्न यह है कि भोमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने कांग्रेस प्रोफेसर की हैसियत से पैसा लिया या नहीं और उस पैसे का भारतीय सामाजिक एवं राजनीतिक जीवन पर कोई प्रभाव पड़ा या नहीं? मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि दो दो बार उन्होंने यह जिज्ञासा कि पैसा दिया गया और एक बार पैसे की बैसाखी इन्दिरा जी के हाथों में धमा दी गई। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारतीय राजनीति पर अमेरिका के प्रभाव की चर्चा करते हुए उन्होंने लिखा, इतना ही नहीं कि पैसा दिया, उन्होंने कहा कि पीएल 480 के तहत जो देश को बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर अनाज दिया गया उसके बसते देश के सार्वजनिक जीवन में प्रवेश करने का द्वार था गया था। जो देश गरीब होता है उसके पूंजीवादी देश पैसा देकर वहाँ के सार्वजनिक जीवन को कसुचित करते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने विदाम्बरम वैदियार स्मारक में भाषण देते हुए कहा था कि चुनाव प्रणाली को बदलने की आवश्यकता है। और इस बजट सत्र का उद्घाटन करते हुए हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा था कि चुनाव पद्धति में परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है। आज पैसे से चुनाव और चुनाव से सत्ता—जब तक चुनाव की वह प्रणाली बनी रहेगी तब तक हमारे सार्वजनिक जीवन से प्रत्याहार होप नहीं हो सकता है। केवल आरोप प्रत्यारोप लगाने से इस समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तथ्य का तो पता जरूर लगाया जाना चाहिए और इसका निदान भी ढूँढना चाहिए। केवल सत्ता पक्ष को यह जिम्मेदारी नहीं है, केवल स्टीफन साहब की यह जिम्मेदारी नहीं है बल्कि इस सदन में बैठने वाले अनाम्य लोगों की जिम्मेदारी है कि धार्मिक हमारा सार्वजनिक जीवन वित्त प्रति दिन जो अन्न होता जा रहा है उसका कारण क्या है?

अभी हाल में चिकमगूर में जो चुनाव हुआ उसमें करीब 90% लोगों ने वोट नहीं डाला कहा है? अन्तराला विदेशी और इसी तिवारी ने बन्द हो

राजनीतिक मनुष्य हो जाया करती है, हम अपने विद्वानों से, अपने विचारों से और अपने प्रायश्चित्तों से गिर जाते हैं।

इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सामने मुख्य प्रश्न यह है कि भारतीय राजनीति में विदेशी पैसा काम में आया या नहीं? यह सभी लोग जानते हैं और सरकार भी जानती है लेकिन सरकार के पास पता लगाने का श्रोत है। स्पीडीफन साहब ने इस गम्भीर आरोप के प्रति अपनी राय व्यक्त करते हुए कहा कि तमाम मामले गलत हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी 11 वर्ष तक इस देश की प्रधान मंत्री रही और प्राज भी कांग्रेस (आई) के अध्यक्ष पद को सुशोभित कर रही हैं, क्या उन्होंने कोई पत्र जिम्मेदारों को लिखा या सिनेट के सभापति को कोई पत्र लिखा कि तत्कालीन अमेरिकी राजदूत श्री मोयनिहन ने गलत आरोप लगा कर हमारे व्यक्तित्व, भारतीय जनता की मर्यादा और प्रतिष्ठा को कलुषित किया है? क्या उनकी ओर से इस प्रकार का कोई पत्र लिखा गया कि इस गैर जिम्मेदार मोयनिहन ने गलत आरोप लगाकर हमारे देश के गौरव पर कीचड़ उछाला है। इस सम्बन्ध में स्टीफन साहब ने कुछ भी नहीं बतलाया, केवल इतना ही कहा कि यह तमाम बातें गलत हैं। और मोयनिहन साहब यहूदी हैं और उनके विचार असत्य से भरे हुए हैं। मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेशी पैसा बुरा होता है इसलिए कि यह अपने सब राजनीतिक और सामाजिक दबाव लाता है, राजनीतिक और सामाजिक दबाव लाकर देश के स्वतंत्रता को धक्का पहुंचाता है।

इसलिए अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मामला केवल पैसा का नहीं है, यह एक गम्भीर चिन्तन का विषय है। भारतीय दुनिया का सब से बड़ा लोकतांत्रिक देश है जिसमें गांधी जैसे महान व्यक्ति पैदा हुए, महात्माजि साहब जैसे नेता पैदा हुए और जहाँ प्राज लोक नायक जय प्रकाश नारायण अपने जीवन की आखिरी बेला में सम्पूर्ण क्रांति की योजना को कार्यान्वित कराने के लिए बीबीन हैं—ऐसे देश की यह बुरा हो रही है। उन्होंने तारकूबे समिति की स्थापना की जिसने चुनाव प्रणाली के सम्बन्ध में अपनी रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत की। उन्होंने चुनाव प्रणाली में परिवर्तन के लिए अपनी राय दी लेकिन प्राज भी कोई बिल्क सरकार के सामने नहीं है। चुनाव की प्रणाली किस तरह से संबोधित की जाए, उस में किस प्रकार का परिवर्तन किया जाए, यह देखने की आवश्यकता है। चुनाव की प्रणाली अगर इसी तरह से बनी रहेगी, तो चाहे सी० आई० ए० का मत हो चाहे सी० बी० सी० या इतरा विदेशी धन हो और चाहे वह कितना धन हो, उस का चुनाव में उपयोग होता रहेगा। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि पैसा चाहे सी० आई० ए० से आए, चाहे सी० बी० सी० से आए या कहीं और से भी आए, यह गहर की तरह राष्ट्रीय जीवन

की धमनियों में बहने लगता है। इसलिए चुनाव जो स्वतंत्र लोकतंत्र का प्रतिष्ठान था, वह अनैतिकता और भ्रष्टाचार का संगठित केन्द्र बन गया है। कहीं से भी विदेशी पैसा या काला धन हो वह इसी तरह से चुनाव में इस्तेमाल होता रहेगा। इसलिए आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि चुनाव की पद्धति को बदलो और यह काम किसी एक राजनीतिक दल का नहीं है, यह सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्र के सामने एक चुनौती बन कर खड़ा है। हमारे देश में जो संसदीय लोकतंत्र है, जो राजनीतिक ग्यार्यता है, इस को स्वीकार करने की आवश्यकता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने ठीक ही कहा था, चिदम्बरम बैठियार स्मारक में भाषण देते हुए आपने संकेत दिया था कि चुनाव की प्रणाली में परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है लेकिन कौन सुनता है इस नकारवाने में तूती की भांज। आप का व्यक्तित्व बढ़ा भय्य। जब मैं यह देखता हूँ कि जहाँ राष्ट्रपति की सलाह नहीं मानी जाती है और जहाँ अध्यक्ष की सलाह नहीं मानी जाती है, जहाँ मैं नहीं जानता कि इस देश का भावप्य क्या होगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं यह कह कर समाप्त करता हूँ कि यहाँ पर आरोप-प्रारोप लगाने से समस्या का निदान नहीं हो सकता। इसके लिए तो आप को चुनाव की पद्धति में परिवर्तन करने के नुनियादी सवाल को हल करना होगा।

श्री नाथ सिंह (बीसा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे यह समाचार सुन कर अफसोस इसलिए नहीं हुआ क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि यह देश विभिन्नताओं से भरा पड़ा है। जहाँ इस देश की धरती ने अपनी कोख से राम, कृष्ण, विवेकानन्द और गांधी को पैदा किया, सुभाषचन्द्र बोस, लाल बहादुर शास्त्री और जय प्रकाश जी को पैदा किया, इसी देश में राबण, कंस, जय चन्द और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने भी जन्म लिया। सच्चाई के साथ बुराई भी साथ चलती है इस देश में।

श्री जगत साठे : आपकी कोई बेधा नहीं इस तरह से बोलने वाला। तुम्हारी धमक को क्या हो गया है। तुम क्या बोलते हो? (अपमान)।

श्री नाथ सिंह : मैं ने एक बेचकूती यह की कि इन्दिरा जी के साथ साठे जी का नाम नहीं बोला।

श्री जगत साठे : कुछ धमक रख कर बोसो। . . . (अपमान) . . . मेरा नाम जो, मुझे एतराज नहीं है।

श्री माधू सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं तो वाकफ़ात का कि इस देश में देशद्रोही का काम केवल स्वीकार करती हूँ, केवल विदेशी लोग ही करते हैं यहाँ जा कर लेकिन मुझे पता लगा कि जिस बर्ग में मैं हूँ, उस बर्ग के लोग भी इस तरह का सुझाव करते हैं। मुझे यह सुन कर खर्बे खा रही है कि राजनीतिक लोग जो इस देश का ब्यक्तिय बनाने वाले लोग हैं, वे इस तरह से देश को दूसरे देशों के हाथों बेचने का काम करते हैं और देश के स्वाधीनता को विदेशों की होखी में होखने का काम करते हैं और उन व्यक्ति के बारे में जब मैंने सुना, जिस व्यक्ति के परिवार का इस देश को प्राजाद करने में बहुत बड़ा हाथ रहा है। मुझे मालूम नहीं था कि मेहरू के परिवार में इस तरह का व्यक्ति भी पैदा होगा। . . . (अव्यवधान) . . .

श्री कर्सेन सठे : वह खुद कहता है कि उसको पैसा नहीं दिया। . . . (अव्यवधान) . . .

श्री माधू सिंह : उसने देश को बेचने का काम किया है।

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What kind of debate you are allowing? He himself is denying. I am ashamed of it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You are allowing to go on... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed him.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I am saying it again and again. This should not be allowed. Please expunge it... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please; let him continue.

श्री माधू सिंह : और की दाही में तिनका। मुझे लग रहा है कि मि० सठे ने संजय गांधी से ट्रेनिंग लेना शुरू कर दिया है। मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ सीनियर कह रहे हैं। वह एक ईमानदार व्यक्ति है और ईमानदारी की बात कर रहे हैं। मन्दा देवी से लेकर केरल तक भारत का कण कण खोज रहा है कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने कुकृत्य किया है। मन्दा देवी के मामले में की पहले श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने स्वीकार किया था कि मैंने ऐसा कुछ नहीं किया लेकिन जब तथ्य सामने आए तो चुप्पी साध गई। उस समय नहीं कहा कि मैंने ऐसा नहीं किया था। इस मामले

में भी कह रही हैं कि मैंने नहीं लिया है, एक ए प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं लिया है मैंने। प्राइमल भी उन पर बैलियां फेंकी जा रही हैं। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की बैलियां बोल रही हैं कि विदेशों से धन उन्होंने लिया है।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Who has said she has taken money? Mr. Moynihan as retracted it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, I am rising on a point of order under rule 353.

MR. SPEAKER: I thought I will give you an opportunity to reply. Now let me hear the point of order.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is under rule 353.

MR. SPEAKER: It says "no allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member". But here the entire debate is on this.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What is the subject of the motion? It says:

"to raise a discussion regarding alleged payment of foreign money for elections in India by the American Government as disclosed by Mr. Moynihan in his book 'A Dangerous Place'."

Sir, after this disclosure in his book, if the person himself comes out publicly to say that he did not say that the money was given personally to Mrs. Gandhi... (Interruptions) when the person concerned himself has said that he did not say that the money was given to Congress, can an allegation be made? Will it not be defamatory?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not want to get into facts. Now you have raised the point, Mr. Moynihan's statement is as reported in the press it was not handed over in person, but it was handed over "to our knowledge" That is the statement he has made. That is to say, it is within his knowledge. That is what I read in the newspapers. I may be wrong. I am not saying...

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The newspaper statement was that she must have known about it; others also must have known about it.

MR. SPEAKER: These things are being said in Parliament.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He is again and again saying that money was given.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not saying they are right or you are right.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Otherwise, they must prove it... (Interruptions) Against Mrs. Gandhi anything can be said. But if it is said about somebody else, you raise objection... (Interruptions)

श्री नाथू सिंह: मैं कोट करता हूँ मि० मोनिहान को। अगर इनको इरा में प्राप्ति है तो वे कोर्ट में जाए। उन्होंने कहा है:

"Both times the money was given to the Congress Party, which had asked for it. Once it was given to Mrs. Gandhi herself."

MR. SPEAKER: Later on, he has corrected it.

श्री नाथू सिंह: श्री ए० ए० के० पाटिल साहब जो उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी के कोषाध्यक्ष थे उन्होंने कहा है कि उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी को तो दिया कि नहीं मुझे मालूम नहीं, लेकिन किसी व्यक्ति को व्यक्तिगत रूप से दिया गया हो उसका मुझे पता नहीं। उन्होंने भी यह कहना शुरू कर दिया है। इसका मतलब है कि उसका इशारा किस तरफ है, वह क्या कहना चाहते हैं, सीधे रूप से नहीं लेकिन अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से कह रहे हैं कि मैं कांग्रेस पार्टी का कोषाध्यक्ष था, दो बार मोनितहन कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी को पैसा दिया, एक बार श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को स्वयं को दिया गया 1959 में और दूसरी बार 1967 में। लेकिन 1959 के बारे में श्री ए० ए० के० पाटिल का बयान है वह कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने तो उस समय नहीं लिया, व्यक्तिगत रूप से किसी ने दिया हो तो मुझे पता नहीं। इससे सिद्ध हो जाता है कि बाब में कुछ न कुछ काला है। क्योंकि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी झूठ बोलने में बहुत होशियार हैं। यदि मुझे ज्ञान बना दिया जाये, धारा तो अध्याज जी, बहुत धुंके हुए हैं, लेकिन अगर मुझे ज्ञान बना दिया जाये और दुनिया में कम्प्यूटीशन हो झूठ बोलने का तो प्रथम पुरस्कार मैं श्रीमती गांधी को ही दूँ क्योंकि उन्होंने रेकार्ड कायम कर रखा है झूठ बोलने में।

अध्यक्ष जी, 1959 में जबाहूर लाल नेहरू जी प्रधान मंत्री थे, माननीय मोचिन्द बल्लभ पन्त यह मंत्री थे और उस समय अमरीका में आइजनहावर राष्ट्रपति थे और विवेक मंत्री श्री डलेस... वे जो कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के कट्टर विरोधी थे, और उन्होंने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को दुनिया में प्रभाव रोकने के लिए सी० आई० ए० के माध्यम से भारत में हस्तक्षेप किया। जब नेहरू जी को पता लगा, और कहा गया कि केवल मैं राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करें, सरकार को भंग करें, तो माननीय पन्त जी, माननीय नेहरू जी और मोरारजी भाई, इन तीनों ने इस बात का विरोध किया कि नहीं हम सरकार को भंग नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन श्रीमती इन्दिरा ने दबाव डाला कि उस सरकार का भंग करना पड़ेगा, और जब नेहरू जी को पता लगा कि बेटी भी ने यह कुटुंब किया है तो मजबूर उनको भाग, माननीय पन्त और केवल को सरकार को भंग करना पड़ा। यह नव निम्ना की बात गुजरात और बिहार में तो बाद में आयी, केवल मैं इन्दिरा गांधी द्वारा पहले चलायी गयी। उस समय भारत में फीरेन एक्सचेंज नहीं था तो बी० एल० 480 का साफ रुपया वहीं रोक दिया क्योंकि उस रुपये को अमरीका सरकार ने कर बना करती। इस पर 1967 में सी० बी० आई० की कमेटी जांच के लिए बनायी गयी, आज तक पता नहीं उसने क्या रिपोर्ट दी, रिपोर्ट भी दी कि नहीं, कुछ पता नहीं और उसके बाद इन्दिरा गांधी नान-गेवाइनमेंट में विश्वास करती हैं और उसके इस तरह से लागू किया कि न केवल उन्होंने सी० आई० ए० से ही पैसा लिया बल्कि के० जी० बी० से भी पैसा लिया। पिछली बार उनके मंत्रिमंडल में जो मंत्री रहे हैं और सी० पी० आई० के सदस्य भी रह चुके थे उन्होंने कहा है कि के० जी० बी० से उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी ने दो करोड़ 80 लिया था। तो उन्होंने नान-गेवाइनमेंट मूवमेंट हम तरह से चलाया कि दोनों से उन्होंने पैसा लिया। जब इन्टरजेंसी लगायी सी० आई० ए० से सम्बन्ध टूट गये और के० जी० बी० से जुड़ गये, तो सी० आई० ए० ने संजय गांधी को पकड़ लिया और किस तरह से तसबन्दी का काम चला यह सब को मालूम है। एक रात में संजय गांधी हम देश का राजकुमार बनने का स्वप्न देखने लगा। यह सब बात सिद्ध करती है कि के० जी० बी० और सी० आई० ए० का पैसा यहाँ कार्य कर रहा था और उसके लिए उस समय की सरकार पूरी तरह से जिम्मेदार है।

माननीय स्टीफन ने कहा है कि

"CIA specialises in lies, in character assassination and murder". This shows, Mr. Stephen, that Mrs.

[श्री नाथू सिंह]

Gandhi is really a CIA agent, because she also believes in these three.

मैं सरकार से मांग करता हूँ कि इस बात की जांच होनी चाहिए कि विदेशी बैंकों में किन किन भारतीयों का, चाहे बेराजनीतिज्ञ हों, विजनेसमें हों या दूसरे लोग हों, कितना कितना पैसा जमा है। वह पैसा कहाँ से आया है, इसकी भी जांच होनी चाहिए। श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त ने इस बारे में जांच करने के लिए संसदीय समिति बनाने का जो सुझाव दिया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। इस समय जो भी व्यक्ति राजनीति में है, जिसकी सी०आई०ए० या के०जी०बी०से पैसा मिला है, उसको राजनीतिक जीवन में रहने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। भेरी मांग है कि इसके लिए कानून बनाया जावे और संविधान में शोधन किया जाय। मैं मांग करता हूँ कि...

श्री राजनारायण (राय बरेली) : प्रच्छन्न नगरकार। हम तो जा रहे हैं। जिलको चाहे, बुसाइये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप रेट करें।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं पार्लियामेंट में बहुत दिन से रह चुका हूँ। मैं अपने सम्मान को जानता हूँ। जो व्यवहार हो रहा है, जैसे आपका दफ्तर असह्य बोलता है, उस तरह बोलना हम अपना अपमान समझते हैं। इस लिए मैं जा रहा हूँ। (व्यवधान)।

श्री नाथू सिंह : मैं मांग करता हूँ कि...

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing anything more.

श्री उपप्रधान (देवरिया) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, केवल इसके कि मैं इस बारे में कुछ अपनी राय जाहिर करूँ, मुझे इस बात पर आश्चर्य होता है कि श्री स्टीफन और श्री साठे ने इतनी वकालत की, लेकिन वे यह सिद्ध नहीं कर पाये कि मोहनरिमा ने अमरीका से पैसा लिया या नहीं। भूतपूर्व राजदूत, मोहनरिमा, जिस दिन विदाई ले रहे थे, तब वह एक बयान देना चाहते थे। लेकिन उनको डिप्लोमेटिक एडवाइस मिली कि वह बयान न दें। उन्होंने अमरीका में प्रैस कॉन्फरेंस में जो बयान दिया, मैं उसको पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा :

"Mrs. Gandhi, the then Prime Minister changed her course, the day was not far off when she would destroy the Opposition and in doing so, she would destroy Indian democracy"

यह सर्टिफिकेट दे कर वह चले गये।

"He asked the New Delhi Embassy to review the US role in New Delhi for the last quarter century. In the end I was satisfied, we had been upto very little, we had twice, but only twice interfered in the Indian politics to the extent of providing money to a political party in a State election, once in Kerala and once in West Bengal election where Calcutta is located."

उन्होंने कहा कि दो बार देने के बाद हम ने किसी को रुपया नहीं दिया। इस पर मोहनरिमा को बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ होगा, इस बारे में मोहनरिमा ने कहा :

He adds: "Still as we were no longer giving any money to her, it was undesirable that she should wonder to whom we were giving it. It is not a practice to be encouraged."

मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि मोहनरिमा के जमाने में सी०आई०ए० की एनक्वायरी हुई थी और उसकी पूरी रिपोर्ट बनी थी। मैं मांग करता हूँ कि उसको छपवा कर सदन की मेज पर रखा जाये। अगर इस बारे में कोई कठिनाई है, तो मंत्री महोदय वह बतावें।

मोहनरिमा ने कहा है कि सी०आई०ए० ने जो पैसा दिया, यह बर्नमेट का मामला है, स्टेट डिपार्टमेंट जाने। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार या मंत्री महोदय अमरीका की सरकार को पत्र लिखें और पूछें कि किस को कितना रुपया दिया गया है। क्या उपप्रधान, राजनारायण, नानाजी देशमुख या मंत्री महोदय, एच०एम० पटेल, को दिया गया है? इस बारे में जो जानकारी मिले, वह सदन की मेज पर रखी जाये।

यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि श्रीकबर देने से विदेशी रुपया यहाँ नहीं आयेगा। जब हम कमजोर होंगे, तभी बाहर से रुपया आयेगा।

मैंने बचपन में पढ़ा है कि गर्मी में गम हवा अगर उठती है और उस जगह को भरने के लिए के लिए धूल-बखल की हवा आ जाती है। जब हिन्दुस्तान की जनता, हिन्दुस्तान का जनतंत्र, 60 करोड़ का जनतंत्र सुरक्षा जायेगा, भरने लग जायेगा, मृतप्राय हो जायेगा तो ये विदेशी ताकतें जो बैठी हुई हैं, ये धायेंगी। यह पूंजीवादी व्यवस्था है, उस का काम क्या है? आप को क्यों चिन्ता होती है कि वह रुपये में आप को टगता है, मारता है, आप की व्यवस्था को बदलना चाहता है? लेनिन ने एक जगह लिखा है, यह काफ़े इ समर मुखर्जी साहब से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ— Lenin has written at one place: Even States are bought of, what of individuals?

अरे, राज्य खरीदे जाते हैं, रियासतें खरीदी जाती हैं, मोहनरमा इन्दिरा गांधी अगर खरीदी गईं तो क्या बात है? यह तो एक छोटी सी बात है।

That is what Lenin has said.

कब ईमान लुप्त जाये कोई ठीक नहीं, और कब ईमान बदल जाये कोई ठीक नहीं।

जब गेदा सिंह कांग्रेस में चले गए थे तो उन के लिए मैंने प्रसेम्बली में यह पढ़ा था। और मैं माटे साहब के लिए कहना हूँ, इन्होंने जो कुछ मोहनरमा के लिए बकालात की, गुस्ताफी भाफ हो, मुर्गी दिल से, चिकन हाट से बकालात की। मुझे एक और याद आया स्टीफेन एंड साटे एंड इवसे लिमिटेड के ऊपर कि—

साहिल के तमाशाई अफसोस तो करते हैं, पर इन्हें बाले की इमदाद नहीं करते।

इन्दिरा गांधी की बकालात करते करते देश से इतना फेला देते हैं कि जो ग्रामीण स्तर का मजदूर है, किसान है, पढ़ा-लिखा, कम पढ़ा-लिखा या अनपढ़ आदमी है, वह ऐसा समझता है कि यूनिवर्सिटी स्टीफेन साहब सफाई दे रहे हैं इसलिए जरूर बाल में काला होगा, मोहनरमा ने जरूर पैसा खाया है। एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ स्टीफेन साहब से। मारुति लिमिटेड हमारे सामने पैदा हुआ। मैं उसका इतिहास, उस की तबारीख जानता हूँ, जिन्होंने पैसा किया उन की भी तबारीख और इतिहास जानता हूँ। मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ, बी० आर० मोहन के पैसे का क्या हुआ? दीनक सिंह के पैसे का क्या हुआ? जो बड़े बड़े लोगों ने पच्चीस पच्चीस, तीस तीस लाख रुपये जमा किए थे, और जिन्होंने दो दो तीन तीन लाख रुपये जमा किए थे कि हम एजेंट बनने इन् व नीयर फ्युचर, उन के पैसे का क्या हुआ, कुछ पता चला? एलेक्सेन फंड

जो लिया गया, 25 करोड़ रुपया हिन्दुस्तान के पूंजीपतियों ने इन्दिरा गांधी को दिया, उस का क्या हुआ? आप हिसाब क्यों नहीं मांगते हैं? हमारे यहां अगर सी० पी० गुप्त समूह हिसाब न ले तो जनता पार्टी में ऐसे लोग हैं कि जो आप मारी करेंगे और हिसाब मांगेंगे। आप उन से हिसाब मांगिए और यह बात पार्लियामेंट में आयेगी कि किस किस ने पैसा लिया। इंडियन प्रेस में भी पैसा लिया, मैं नाम नहीं बताना चाहता। तो कोई इन्दिरा गांधी ही बोधी नहीं है, जो आप हैं वह सब बोधी हैं। जो पापियों के पैसे पर चलते हैं ये देश के दुश्मन हैं। विदेशी धन का इस्तेमाल पार के जो अपनी रियासत इस देश में बनाते हैं, अपनी व्यवस्था कायम रखना चाहते हैं टाटा, बिरला, सूरजमल, नानरमल के सहारे, वे सारे लोग बोधी हैं और जनतंत्र के, जस्ट्रियन के दुश्मन हैं।

इन्दिरा गांधी की जान में करता हूँ, स्पेशल कोर्ट बिन से काम नहीं चलेगा। मेरे साथी डॉ० बलदेव प्रकाश ने जो कहा, मैं उस का समर्थन करना हूँ कि उनका पब्लिक चार्ज होना चाहिए कहां कहां से? उन्होंने पैसा लिया, वह सब बताना चाहिए। और मोयनिहून साहब से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि परदे की झाड़ से मत बोलिए। वह बयान देना चाहत थे—बड़ी डिप्लोमैटिक बात है—लेकिन उनको डर गया कि कहीं मोहनरमा उनको मिसा में न बन्द कर दें, इस डर से उन्होंने बयान रोक दिया और जब अपने देश में चले गए तो बड़े बहादुर बन गए और कहा कि श्री वाज डेस्ट्रियम डेमोक्रेसी। अन्त में उन्होंने कहा है कि इन्दिरा गांधी ऐसी लेडी हैं जिस ने 1 लाख 10 हजार आदमियों को जेल में बन्द कर रखा है और पीलू मोदी के बारे में पूछा तो इन्होंने कह दिया चन्दाण साहब ने कि वह बड़े मजे से जेल में हैं। हम भी जेल में बड़े मजे में थे मगर 99.9 परसेंट जितने मुकदमों में चले एक भी उनमें सही नहीं था? ग्राह कमीशन में हमारे मुकदमों का क्या हुआ? मैंने एक दिन सी बी आई के प्राफिसर से पूछा और कहा कि हम को मीका दो बयान देने के लिए।

मैं दो तीन बातें दोहराना चाहता हूँ। माननीय मंत्री जी से मैं मांग करता हूँ कि सी बी आई की जो जांच मोहनरमा ने बैठाई थी अपने जमाने में उसकी रपट को आप सदन के पटल पर रखें। दूसरी बात यह है कि आप अमेरिका की सरकार को जिस्टी लिबिए और उनसे कहिए कि बतावें किस किस ने कितना कितना रुपया लिया है। तीसरी बात यह है कि जो कइर साल गुप्त ने प्रस्ताव रखा है एक संसदीय समिति का वह बनाई जाये उस में स्टीफेन साहब रहे, ऊनी-कृष्णन् साहब रहे, चन्दाण साहब रहें और आप लोगों की तरफ से कोई रहे हमारी तरफ से माननीय राजनारायण जी रहे, लिये साहब

(Dis.)

[श्री उषसेन]

रहे, ये सब लोग जा कर प्रोब करें और फिर अपनी रिपोर्ट दें। वह रिपोर्ट भी यहां सदन की टैबल पर रखी जानी चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं कंवर लाल गुप्त जी की सखीबाई का समर्थन करता हूँ और उम्मीद रखता हूँ कि चाहे उस वक्त के लोग हों चाहे इस वक्त के लोग हों जो कोई भी विदेशी निजाम हो उससे पैसा लेकर कोई अपनी राजनीति नहीं चलाएगा। हम समाजवादी इसलिए नहीं हैं कि लेनिन ने कहा है या मार्क्स ने कहा, हम इसलिए समाजवादी हैं कि हमारी संरजमीन से समाजवाद पैदा हुआ, यह हम बता सकते हैं। इसलिए विदेशी पैसा, विदेशी निजाम, विदेशी निवार अगर आते हैं तो वह मुक्त को गद्दार बनाएंगे। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि जनता भागावट हो जाय और इन संकेतपोषक नेताओं से भी वह जरा बचें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI H. M. PATEL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened to this long discussion with great interest, but I must say that, except for some, the rest has been a matter of abuse and arguments against one another. The real point, as Prof. Mavaniankar has emphasized, is this: here is something that has come to light which is really very undesirable; what ought we to do hereafter to see that this kind of thing does not take place? This money is said to have been given for fighting elections. Now, we do know that elections in this country have become extremely costly and, therefore, various methods are adopted for the purpose of raising moneys to fight elections. Legislative and other actions have been taken by us to see that large companies do not pay money; that is banned. Though, of course, that has led to other methods of payment of money, certainly it is one course of black money proliferating and people relying upon that black money to fight elections. Therefore, certainly some steps have to be taken, and this is why, electoral reforms are one of the most important subjects which has to be considered: what should be done in the matter of fighting elections by people who cannot raise money on their own? Parties

also may not find it easy to raise large sums of money that are required to fight elections. This is one of the things that arises if one really studies these things.

We have already taken action. The previous Government took action. I think, the Foreign Contributions Act is now a part of our legislation. Under that, every one who receives money from abroad has to declare it; the money which comes in the ordinary, legal way, has to be declared, whatever comes has to be declared to the Home Ministry under that Act, and without its permission, it cannot be taken. But, of course, we know that there may be still other ways of money coming in, and those ways have to be pursued and studied. This is one of the points that was made by some one that a Cell should be created. Actually that exists. But those studies have to be made. For instance there are ways in which money is given. You give the trading companies large commissions. You supply books at certain prices and there are commissions on them. There are so many different ways in which moneys are being given or, are believed to be given—I should say—because these are matters which it is not easy to prove. Therefore, when some one says that we should stop this thing, now do we stop it? How do we stop these illegal ways of moneys coming into the country? There are so many different ways. For instance, there is the rupee trade that exists with certain countries. With certain other countries there are other ways by which they can pass their moneys, which are here, to different people. Therefore, we will have to watch very carefully and try and plug as many of these loopholes as possible. But to imagine that we shall be able to plug all loopholes is not possible. What ought to be done is really that a climate should be created which should say that this is the kind of thing which should be abhorred, which should not be permitted, which should not be tolerated.

What Mr. Stephen really relied more, when he seemed to have failed or exhausted in arguments, was on abuse. It is a great pity. This is not a subject in which we should indulge in this kind of things. This is a subject where we ought to put our heads together to see how we can stop this kind of thing. It is going on. We know that. What is the use of saying that the CIA indulges in so many different things. Books have come out which show in what different ways the CIA has been functioning. That is not the only intelligence agency which is operating. That is not the only intelligence agency. Our own intelligence agency is also functioning. Several other countries' agencies are also functioning. We have, therefore, to be watchful, strictly watchful, and see to it that they do as little harm as possible. This is all about that one can do. I would say, therefore, that we certainly will pursue such matters further, going into these matters more thoroughly and see what can be done to plug every possible loophole.

When people talk about intelligence agencies, it is only one of the things which perhaps one may say and at any rate after this, that any one who wants to receive money from the United States agency may desist from doing so because he can never be certain at what point of time some one in that organization is going to publish it. This at least should be a warning to them. Even to Mr. Govindan Nair it came as a surprise that these things can happen. But it does and they do happen.

I think I would consider it. It was mentioned that we should ask the United States. We have asked, the Government of India has asked not only the Embassy here but also the State Department and both of them have said, 'We have no comments to offer'...

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:
What does it mean?

SHRI H. M. PATEL: You may say anything you like. Their government is not our subordinate. They will do whatever they want. We have to consider that. We may go on asking but they may say, 'Perhaps we will give you some information on a confidential basis which would not be of much use to you.' But we have asked them. When you asked whether we have approached them, yes, we have approached them and we have asked that question.

It is not matter of whether Mr. Moynihan is taking complete truth or partial truth. But, certainly, in a person like him has gone on record, then there must something in it. It may not be the whole truth. In that some one said about Mr. Moynihan—that he never speaks ...

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: The full truth.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Yes, that he never speaks the full truth. Some other hon. Member said that he tells all lies. Sir, in such cases, that will be the position. So, I am not interested in probing that further because it does not lead to anything. When people say that we have to make inquiries, what are we to inquire further—into a matter that took place some years ago? Who is going to give all that information? Are there any records kept by anybody? I would ask you—will there be any records of it? Then what are we going into?

It seems to me—from this debate what emerges is that for the future let us see to it that this sort of things do not happen. It was suggested that party accounts should be kept and audited and so on. Certainly there is a legislation already and it was brought last year by me from the Finance Ministry...

श्री लक्ष्मी नारायण लाल गुप्ता (बजराहते) : जब पहले ही रिकार्ड नहीं रखा है तो प्रायः क्या रिकार्ड रखेंगे ?

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:
What specific steps you propose to
take?

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I am afraid I
am not in a position to tell you what
specific steps we are going to take. If
it is so simple, I would tell you cer-
tainly. I welcome any kind of sug-
gestions that you may have to give.
But it is not such a simple thing at
all. As I said when anything has to
come, that comes in surreptitiously. It
is not so simple thing. Why cannot
we stop generation of all black
money? Is it merely that we do not
desire it? So many steps have been
taken to reduce to black money but
still black money continues to be gen-
erated. There are different ways one
tries to tackle these things. This again
is one of those things which is most
desirable to suppress. It is most desir-
able and it should be brought under

control, but it is not so easy. Precisely
what steps will be taken I cannot tell.
All I can give you is an assurance that
this is a subject which we shall study
in the Home Ministry with all those
who are experts and students of these
matters and we shall try and see what
is being done in other countries. But
I would certainly say that it not
going to be a very simple exercise.

I think, Sir, beyond this I have real-
ly nothing more to say. I think I have
covered all the points.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the House
stands adjourned till 10.30 a.m. tomor-
row.

19.50 hrs. .

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
half past Ten of the Clock on Tuesday,
May 8, 1979 Vaisakha 18, 1901 (Saka).*