

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

tion of bonus, dearness allowance, in fact the whole wage policy, in Parliament.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Sir I want to point out...

MR. SPEAKER: I have not got his chit here.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, I have sent it, where I mentioned two points.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): The hon. Prime Minister has stated in this House that the Report of the Minorities Commission with respect to the Aligarh Muslim University Amendment Bill, which has been introduced in this House, will be placed on the Table of the House. Now it is quite apparent that the Aligarh Muslim University Amendment Bill is not coming up for discussion during this session. Even then it is absolutely necessary that the Report of the Minorities Commission should be placed on the Table of the House at the earliest during this session so that the Members would be in a position to study the report and formulate their opinions so that we can have a constructive and meaningful participation whenever the Aligarh Muslim University Bill comes up for discussion. So, I request the Government to fulfil this promise at the earliest possible point of time and place the report of the Minorities' Commission with respect to the Aligarh Muslim University Amendment Bill on the Table of the House.

SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA (Tezpur): As Shri Kapoor has mentioned, the discussion on the floods should be resumed, because there are so many Members who are yet to make their submissions and the Minister has also to reply to the discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Vayalar Ravi.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Thank you, Sir, for calling me.

MR. SPEAKER: I have got his slip. Office had made a mistake.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I want to have a discussion on the working of the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited, which is very important from the point of view of the nation, because it is one of the very important public sector units. Now it is full of corruption and nepotism and we are now losing a huge amount in foreign exchange for import, which can be avoided if this unit was functioning efficiently. I am prepared to prove all the allegations, for which I have enough documents in my possession. I would request the hon. Minister and the Government also to look into the matter and arrange to have a discussion on the working of the BHEL.

Then I want to remind you about your notice on the allegations made by Shri Madhu Limaye as well as Shri C. B. Gupta, the Treasurer of the Janata Party, about which you have promised to allow a discussion.

Then there should be a discussion on political violence, which is a very serious matter, which is taking place and the some of the former Congress leaders and being attacked. Now a CPI leader who was an MLA has been shot dead in Bihar. It is a serious matter and the Prime Minister must make a statement.

Lastly, I wish you *bon voyage*.

12.45 hrs

#### STATEMENTS UNDER RULE 199

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Statement under rule 199 by Shri Raj Narain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Some members have given me notice that they are objecting to the statement being made—Dr. Subramaniam Swamy,

Mr. Vayalar Ravi, Mr. Eduardo Falero and Mr. Bharat Bhushan. These are the members who have given me notice. They are raising a point of order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Under what rule?

MR. SPEAKER: They say, under rule 199, he has no authority to make a statement now. That is what they have said. They are objecting to that. They are all raising a point of order.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): On a point of order, Sir... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot raise a point of order against a point of order.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: My point of order on the floor of the House must be respected.

MR. SPEAKER: They have given notice that they are raising a point of order.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: For raising a point of order, no notice is necessary. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C. K. JAFFER SHARIEF (Bangalore North): It is a relevant question with regard to the procedure of the House, whether a notice is required for raising a point of order.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Are you starting the procedure that for raising a point of order you must give an earlier notice?

MR. SPEAKER: Not at all

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Why precedence for them?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): Sir, I am not here trying to prevent Mr. Raj Narain from making a statement as such. After all, we all would like to hear him. He says many entertaining things.

Compared to rule 357, rule 199 suggests an extra provision which is not there in the case of rule 357. If you look at all the statements made by Ministers who have resigned in the past, you find that there are occasions when Ministers have not made a statement. Take, for example, the case of late Mr. Krishna Menon. It was stated in the House that the reasons for the resignation of Mr. Krishna Menon were widely known and, therefore, it was not necessary for him to make a statement.

Now, Mr. Raj Narain was given an opportunity to make a statement. He withdrew that option. He has now again decided to make a statement. His resignation was not a resignation on his own. The letters of resignations have been placed on the Table of the House and also the reasons have been widely known by Mr. Raj Narain in the newspapers. Therefore, I would suggest that the time of the House need not be taken in listening to Mr. Raj Narain's statement. We already know what he is going to say. It has been widely publicised.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Sir, my point of order is a little different. Rule 199 is very clear. If you go through carefully rule 199, sub-rule (2) says:

"A copy of the statement shall be forwarded to the Speaker and the Leader of the House one day in advance of the day on which it is made."

It is very well known that you had allowed Mr. Raj Narain to make a statement and you had also allowed the Prime Minister to make a statement thereto. It was put on the order paper. We raised certain points of order on which you gave your ruling also.

Now, after the ruling given by the Speaker, Mr. Raj Narain wanted to postpone making that statement. A copy of the statement is already given to you; it is in your possession. This

[Shri Vayalar Ravi]  
is a basic fact. I would also like to draw your attention to the statement made by Mr. Raj Narain which has appeared in the *Indian Express* on 22nd August which reads:

"He has now got more material with him. So, he wants to utilise for the proposed statement on 24th August."

This is from the *Indian Express* dated the 22nd August.

MR. SPEAKER: Please read it out.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: The headline is:

"Raj Narain threatens to make a statement"

Here it is said:

"The proposal to make Mr. Charan Singh Party President met with hostile reaction in the Party. Mr. Raj Narain now says that he does not want it either. Mr. Raj Narain says that he has now got more material with him which he wants to utilise for the proposed statement on August 24."

I will pass on the paper to you, Sir.

There is another interesting statement. It has come in today's *Patriot*:

"Raj Narain firm on Statement.

"After a 40 minute talk with his mentor, Mr. Charan Singh, in the evening, Mr. Raj Narain told newsmen that he would make the statement at about 2.00 p.m. The statement is believed to have been toned down after consultations with Mr. A. B. Vajpayee and Mr. Madhu Limaye..."

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA (Serampore): This can be read after he has made the statement... (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, my point of order is this. In this back-

ground, I am raising two issues. One is, whether the statement which had already been given to you first is with you and whether he has made any alterations or additions in the statement already given to you. The second point is whether it is permissible under the rule for a former Minister who wants to make a statement, after having given a copy of the statement to be kept in the confidential custody, to make any change in the statement or not, whether under the rules he has any right to change his statement.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): My point of order is this. Rule 199 has only very little scope. It says:

"A Member who has resigned the office of Minister may, with the consent of the Speaker, make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation."

The question that arises is whether Mr. Raj Narain had resigned his Ministership or he had been sacked. This is a very important point. Suppose a Minister is dismissed, he has no right, under rule 199, to make a statement. If he has voluntarily resigned, then only the question of making a personal statement under rule 199 will arise. The framers of this provision have very carefully done this, and only the Ministers who had resigned on their own have made statements. Here is an extraordinary situation where a controversy erupted in the Janata Party, and out of that controversy, a crisis was created and he was asked to be sacked; and the Prime Minister dismissed him. The question is whether a dismissed Minister can be allowed to make a statement under rule 199.

Another point is what Mr. Vayalar Ravi has rightly made. Not once or twice but thrice, Mr. Raj Narain threatened the whole House and the Government that he was going to make a statement: with that dagger he was coming to Parliament House.

This is very relevant. One day earlier he has to submit a copy of his prepared statement to the Speaker. I would like to know whether he had already, long back, given to the Speaker a copy of the statement to be made by him on the floor of the House and if so, whether he has made any amendments or mutilations to his own statement now. This is a serious situation. From what he has done, it appears that there will be a law and order situation in the country if he makes a statement on the floor of the House. It is a threat that he has offered to the Prime Minister and to the Government, ultimately to the House and to the whole country. I do not know whether they have made any bandobust already. (*Interruptions*)

I do not know if this whole edifice will collapse if he makes the statement. But this is about the lighter aspect and how he has treated this House with scant respect. Then he is not making his statement. Sir, as a dismissed Minister he has no right to make a statement. I want that he should not be allowed to make the statement.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): I want to draw your attention to Rule 199. According to Rule 199 you were kind enough to permit Mr. Raj Narain who resigned from Ministership to make a statement on that day. He gave a copy of the statement to you and a copy to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House. Now that matter was postponed. I do not want to go into that.

Now you have again permitted him to make a statement. A copy of the statement must have been given to you and also to the Leader of the House rightly, because you have permitted him and I do not want to challenge it. The question is whether the copies of both the statements which were given to you at that time and this time are the same or not. My

submission is that no addition or deletion can be made once a copy of the statement is given to you. That is No. 1

My second point is: that Mr. Raj Narain is competent to make a statement. He is perfectly justified and he can give the reasons for his resignation. I do not want to comment on that. But my submission is that he can only state the reasons of his resignation regarding the incidents which occurred before his resignation. If he says something about the incidents which occurred after his resignation, that he should not say. He should include only those aspects of the matter which occurred before the resignation.

These are my two points.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKER (Gandhinagar): On this matter last week when some of us raised points of order, you were pleased to give a general ruling. I must say that we heard the ruling with great respect, but you left two important aspects rather open and perhaps rightly so, on that occasion last week.

I do not want to repeat the points my hon. friends have made. They, I think, are valid. I want you to consider this matter from a different angle also. One is that it so happens that in this matter of resignation of a Minister and a statement to be made by him under Rule 199, as the Rule stands to-day, I see that the Chair does not come into the picture at all. After all, the Minister has resigned on a political issue and on differences with the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. Now the situation has so arisen that you are permitting him and he is not making the statement. Then you are allowing him to postpone it and now you are allowing him to-day. Unfortunately, all this involves the Chair's intervention in a matter which is not the Chair's field. It is not in the domain of the Chair. The Chair can only give permission or not give permission. You gave him the permission to

(Prof. P. G. Mavalankar) make the statement last week and now you are giving him permission to-day. He could have made the statement last week but he is making the statement to-day. If both the statements are identical then I have nothing to say. If they are not identical, then a very difficult, and if I may say so, a very dangerous, point is added that the Chair is getting involved under Rule 199 in something which is a political matter, wherein the Chair should not and out not to get involved. But, if the statement is identical, of course, this point lapses.

Secondly, you will see the wording of the Rule 199 sub-clause (1) : "A member who has resigned the office of Minister may, with the consent of the Speaker, make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation." My friend, Mr. Lakkappa-- I do not know why people should laugh everytime he gets up. Sometimes he makes very serious points....

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: He always comes in between the Opposition and the government and neutralises the position.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I tell you. The point is: you will have to read this sub-clause (1) rather carefully. It is true that technically speaking Shri Raj Narain has resigned. But was it a resignation in the sense in which resigning Ministers come forward with a statement to explain, because of some important difference of opinion with the Government, with the Prime Minister and or with the other Ministers? My understanding of what we normally do witness is: if the resignation of a Minister comes out of his own serious fundamental disagreement with the Prime Minister and his Colleagues and therefore he wants to come to the House to explain to the House why he wanted to resign and why he cannot agree with the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Council of Ministers, this rule is applicable. But, in this case the whole House knows— because the Prime Minister has already

laid on the Table of the House the entire correspondence—that it is not a case of the Minister resigning of his own will, he has resigned because of compulsion. Therefore, my point is that Rule 199 (1) is technically satisfied, but he has not resigned of his own: he was forced to resign and, therefore, Rule 199 sub-clause (1) need not operate in this case.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): It does seem to me that some Hon. Members on the other side are seeking strange information from the Chair. What I write to the Chair is no business of the House unless what I have written is divulged in the House.. It is strictly confidential between me and the Chair and there can be no intervention in it of any sort. Let it be quite clear in the minds of the Hon. Members that it is a substantive right of every Member to make such communication to the Hon. Speaker as he likes and also to make such changes in the communication as he likes before the communication is divulged in the House.

Now, the Hon. Members must also realise that, by raising these objections, they are trying to whittle down that very substantive right of an Hon. Member. I may make a statement under Rule 377 and before the statement is made in the House, I may make some changes in it or additions to it; no other Hon. Member has any business to object to that. Therefore, I would very earnestly implore the Hon. Members on the other side not to raise this objection which will serve to whittle down this right of an Hon. Member.

Then, Mr. Speaker, you have been asked to say what kind of a statement the Hon. Member has submitted to you earlier. Now, it is always available to me, before I make the statement, to go up to the Speaker and say 'Mr. Speaker, these are the changes I want to make, because of the changed circumstances and because of the additional information that has been made

available'. I will always have the right to go up to the Speaker, otherwise, there might be a statement made in the House which would be out-of-date, which would be irrelevant, which will have no bearing on the situation and so on. So, with these submissions, I would request you not to take into account some of the objections that have been made by the Hon. Members and to ask the Hon. Members to make the statement now.

13.00 hrs.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD (Calicut): If I remember correctly, last time when Mr. Raj Narain was given time to make the statement, it was no one condition. The condition was that he wanted to get further information. Therefore, it necessarily follows that the statement as such will stand and, in addition to that, he will make something more. That being the condition on which you allowed him not to make the statement on that day....

MR. SPEAKER: No, no; there was no such condition.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD: I am sure the records will show....

MR. SPEAKER: I have got the records here. It was after I had decided the matter that he made some observations. The order was given earlier.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD: Am I correct in taking it that it was stated in the House....

MR. SPEAKER: It was stated in the House. He stated in the House that he wanted some other information, but the order was given earlier.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD: The reason for that order was....

MR. SPEAKER: The order was given earlier; he made the statement later. The order was that I will not

compel him to make the statement. The order was in regard to the four points raised. Saying that it is in the discretion of the Member whether to make a statement or not, I said I cannot compel him. Secondly, I said the statement given to the Speaker is not the property of the House. Regarding the question of delay, I said I am not going to decide and, as regards whether he has another right to make a statement, I said I am not going to decide it because these matters will come up at a later stage; because you know that the normal rule followed is, either the Speaker or the courts do not decide things in *absentia*. They decide only the issues that arise for the time being.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD: But is it on record that he wanted further time?

MR. SPEAKER: Long after I made the order, he voluntarily stood up and said that he wanted further time.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, the limitation as spelt out in Rule 199 is:

"199(1) A member who has resigned the office of Minister may, with the consent of the Speaker, make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation."

Therefore, all the facts that are pertinent are before his resignation leading to that resignation and no reference can come later on about post-resignation factors as a part of their explanation given for resignation so that the limiting factor is the date of resignation and before that and not after any new factors or facts which might have come after resignation. That cannot be included in the statement. But at the same time, kindly see sub-clause (2) of rule 199:

"199(2) A copy of the statement shall be forwarded to the Speaker and the Leader of the House one day in advance of the day on which it is made."

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

That means if the statement explaining resignation is to be made with your consent today, then one day in advance, which means yesterday. So another limiting date or time-limit is yesterday. That is one day before today. If he has communicated to you any statement which he wants to make today, then the statement which he has sent to you yesterday will be relevant and not whatever he might have done earlier. These are the two factors

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Sir, I want to make two points.

PROF. SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Sir, how many are you going to allow?

MR. SPEAKER: What can I do?

PROF. SAMAR GUHA: Earlier also the same points were made. The same points are being repeated. Is it the way of making points? Dozens of people will be standing up and the same points would be repeated. You are allowing them.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sathe did not speak.

(Interruptions)

श्री हुकम देव नारायण यादव (मधुबनी):  
घाप कहिये "हाँ" या "नहीं"।

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Sir, a very important point has been raised by my hon. friend, distinguished friend, Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra and I want a specific ruling on this point and your guidance.

श्री बुल्लिवार सिंह मलिक (मोदीपत):  
यह क्या तमाशा बना रहा है?

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: The most important thing is a statement which is submitted to you under Rule 199, is it a communication as is being sought to be made out or is it a matter, substantive matter, which has to

come under rule 31 in the List of Business? Now, I can understand if somebody writes to you any Member that does not automatically become the property of the House. Now, Sir, rule 199....

MR. SPEAKER: That question has been decided.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: No, Sir. He has raised it again. Shyam Babu has raised it again. He has raised that it is in the nature of a communication. If that is so, it cannot come under Rule 31—List of Business. But, if it is a motion to be admitted by you under Rule 199, as per the requirements, this House is entitled to know whether any change has been made between the day when notice of intention was given and the day when the Member decided to exercise his right. This is a very valid point whether there is any other extraneous matter which can be brought in.

Now, Sir, Rule 199 is a very different from the right of personal explanation. This can only be exercised by a Minister—a Member who has resigned from the Council of Ministers. This raises my second point. I have given notice of two questions under Rule 40 read with 54(1) to Mr. Raj Narain. The Member has informed me that he has not been served with these notices by your Secretariat

Now my contention is that if you say this, is part of the Business laid down as per the Rules of Procedure—Rule 31—then the rule 40 clearly says:

"... resolution or other matter connected with the business of the House for which that member is responsible;...."

So, my contention is that if it is laid down in the Business, if the Member concerned has resigned from the Council of Ministers, then, I am entitled to exercise this right under Rule 40 read with 54(1). There is a difference in 54(1) from other types of

questions, that, for Short Notice Question, if it is addressed to the Minister, it goes to him. This option is to be exercised by the Minister. Similarly, under Rule 40, it is contemplated that any question can be put by a Member to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us be brief.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: That is whether it is starred or unstarred. Then my contention is that it is permissible and the question of a debate arising out of this does not arise and the Member is entitled to answer my question, if it is not a debate; otherwise he is not entitled to answer but you are entitled to.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What is all this? Mr. Jain. A Member has got a right to speak but not all at the same time. Yes, Mr. Jain.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I have called Mr. Jain.

SHRI RAM LAL RAHI (Misrikh): Please listen to me. I want to draw your attention....

MR. SPEAKER: No, no, I have not called you.

SHRI RAM LAL RAHI: I have been sitting here. You do not allow me.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. You have been sitting here. Everybody seems to have priority over others. Everybody is on a point of order. He is already on a point of order.

SHRI B. P. MANDAL (Madhepura): I am on the point of procedure. There cannot be any debate on a point of order. Under Rule 378, there cannot be any debate on a point of order. It must be brief. Everybody is taking a lot of time.

MR. SPEAKER: You are absolutely right.

SHRI B. P. MANDAL: There cannot be double standard. When we raised it some time ago, we were told that there cannot be a debate on a point of order. And to-day you are very liberal on the points of order by allowing everybody to go on.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a peculiar case.

श्री विमल चन्द जैन (सिक्की): अध्यक्ष महोदय, व्यवस्था के प्रश्न नियम 376 के अंतर्गत उठाये जाते हैं। लेकिन कभी कभी ऐसे प्रश्नों को इस नियम के अंतर्गत न ला कर धारा 376 आई० पी० सी० के अंतर्गत ला दिया जाता है।

रूल 199 में साफ कहा गया है कि सदस्य यह कहे कि उसने वक्तव्य देना है। यह रूल इस प्रकार है:—

"A member who has resigned the office of Minister may, with the consent of the Speaker, make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation."

My humble submission is that 377 does not arise. You should not have given the opportunity to raise any point of order. It has appeared as an item on the agenda paper for today and if the Minister wants to make a statement let him make a statement.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA RATH (Aska): Sir, my humble submission is that this is an august body and on every second of the House we are spending Rs 900/- and in the name of point of order you have started a regular court over here. Then there will be no end to it. We will not be in a position to transact business of the House. In the process important issues are being relegated to the background. You have already heard three-four members on this point from both sides and you put an end to the matter and take your decision. (Interruptions)



श्री हुकम देव नारायण यादव (अधुवनी) :  
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा ब्यबस्था का प्रश्न है।  
 प्राप हुकम देने वाले हैं और मेम्बर, हुकम  
 मानने वाला है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप हुकम देने वाले  
 हैं और मैं हुकम मानने वाला हूँ।

श्री हुकम देव नारायण यादव : अगर  
 प्राप हां कहना चाहते हैं तो हां कहिये और अगर  
 प्राप न कहना चाहते हैं तो न कहिये। मामला  
 साफ है। इस पर बहस को क्या बात है ?  
 अगर प्राप ने माननीय सदस्य का बयान  
 करवाना है, तो उन्हें करने दीजिए। हम सब  
 लोग उसे सुनने के लिए बैठे हुए हैं। जल्से  
 जल्दी बयान दिलवा दीजिए।

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Sir, I  
 will restrict myself to the ambit of  
 rules. As correctly pointed out by the  
 members and I read rule 199:

"A member who has resigned the  
 office of Minister may, with the con-  
 sent of the Speaker, make a personal  
 statement in explanation of his resi-  
 gnation.

A copy of the statement shall be  
 forwarded to the Speaker and the  
 Leader of the House one day in ad-  
 vance of the day on which it is  
 made:"

Now, as per the Paper you have taken  
 the copy on an earlier occasion and you  
 permitted Mr. Raj Narain to postpone  
 it. As per the Business Paper the  
 Leader of the House to make a state-  
 ment pertinent thereto. I am not in  
 agreement with Mr. Lakkappa—it has  
 been endorsed by Prof. Mavalankar—  
 stating that it is a resignation and  
 there is nothing stated if it is a volun-  
 tary resignation.

Sir, you will remember when Mr.  
 Mohan Dharja was the Minister in the  
 previous government he was dropped  
 by the ex-Prime Minister. Now, he  
 could not avail himself of this oppor-

tunity. Many members raised this  
 point in the House and wanted him  
 to make a statement but it was a case  
 of dropping. As this point has been  
 discussed I want to be clear on this  
 subject, namely, the resignation—if it  
 is voluntary alone is permitted under  
 Rule 199.

Secondly, Sir, under Rule 377, a  
 statement is made. Now you must see  
 Rule 357 also. Please see Speaker's  
 Direction No. 115C. It is a personal  
 explanation. I read it. It is a personal  
 explanation of a member who happen-  
 ed to be a Minister in the Council of  
 Ministers. After his resignation, he  
 may come forward with a statement.  
 Mr. Sathe has correctly stated that the  
 statement must refer to the date of his  
 resignation and nothing beyond that.  
 Because, that is the reason, Sir, why,  
 after the proviso it is stated that this  
 House is not permitted to discuss the  
 subject. So, no debate is permitted.

As a Judge, Sir, you understand  
 the spirit of these rules. The spirit of  
 these rules must be taken into con-  
 sideration, first, rather than giving an  
 opportunity to anybody to expose his  
 intelligence on the subject.

The spirit behind the rule is this:  
 This is a Personal Explanation of the  
 Minister concerned, who was in the  
 Council of Ministers.

If he has resigned for reasons, either  
 by compulsion or voluntarily, he can  
 make a statement but that statement  
 must restrict itself to this condition.  
 That is why it is stated as Personal  
 Statement. Perhaps he was not well.  
 (Interruptions) That is why I say this.  
 The Chair has been involved in this  
 matter and you have been asked to  
 permit him to make a statement now.  
 He has postponed it for reasons best  
 known to him. Now he is coming for-  
 ward. You might have seen a state-  
 ment in *The Patriot* that it may be  
 toned down. But what I say is, this  
 statement cannot go beyond what has  
 been presented to you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You have mentioned that. Other people have mentioned that.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** You please read the Direction.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am looking into it.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** It is a Personal Explanation. My point is this. The statement must be in conformity with the statement which has been made earlier. It cannot be changed. That is my submission.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have understood your point. Now, a number of objections have been taken to Shri Raj Narain making a statement under Rule 199 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the House.

I shall deal with them one by one.

The first contention raised is that Shri Raj Narain did not resign voluntarily but he resigned only at the instance of the Prime Minister and therefore he has no right to make a statement under Rule 199.

I do not see any substance in this contention. Rule 199 covers all types of resignations. It has been well-accepted in the British Parliament as well as in this country that whenever a Minister resigns either voluntarily or at the request of the Prime Minister, it will entitle him to make a statement in the House.

The second contention taken is that Shri Raj Narain has no right to make any change in the Statement. It has been said that having given one statement at an earlier stage, he should not be allowed to give another statement at a later stage. I see no force in that contention. The statement is that of a Minister resigning and it is in his Personal Explanation regarding his resignation. People might try to polish their words. People might try to put their ideas in a different manner.

2592 LS—11

So long as the statement in question is a personal statement in explanation of his resignation, any change that might be effected by the Minister concerned cannot be objected to.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** As long as they do not polish shoes....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Keep it to yourself. Why do you say? Parliament House should not be dragged into polishing shoes. It is a most unparliamentary way of doing things, Mr. Sathe. Kindly don't say that.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** He has been doing it for the last 5 years.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE):** That is what you did in emergency.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It will not be proper for me to disclose to the House what statement Mr. Raj Narain had submitted to me at an earlier stage. That statement, as I ruled earlier, has not become the property of the House. That is entirely a communication submitted by an hon. Member of the House to me and that communication is with me. As I mentioned earlier, he has a right to make any change as long as the change conforms with Rule 199.

It has been contended that having given one statement and having taken a date for making the statement, as he has failed to make that statement on that day, he is not entitled to make a statement on a subsequent day. I see no support for such contention under Rule 199. No limitation whatsoever has been prescribed in Rule 199 as regards the time for making the statement. It may be that when a statement is unduly delayed, the Speaker may not permit the Member to make a statement. The statement has been made during session and, therefore, I do not think, I will be justified in refusing him permission to make the statement.

[Mr. Speaker]

It was contended that the Speaker ~~does~~ not come into the picture under Rule 199 and he has merely to allow a Member to make a statement and nothing more. I am unable to accept this contention. It is the Speaker's duty to examine the statement and see whether it is relevant under Rule 199 and it is only thereafter that he has to give his consent in the matter.

It was contended that last time the adjournment was given to Shri Raj Narain on certain conditions. No such condition had been prescribed and my order makes it clear that the postponement was not conditional at all.

It rightly contended that the Minister who has resigned cannot bring in extraneous matters which are not relevant to his personal statement in explanation of his resignation. I will not permit Shri Raj Narain to make any statement which is extraneous to Rule 199(1).

Shri Unnikrishnan has raised a contention that he is entitled under Rule 41 to put questions to Mr. Raj Narain after he makes his statement. I do not think that Rule is relevant for the present purpose. Rule 41 is a general rule. In my opinion, Rule 199 is a self-contained rule and, therefore, Rule 41 does not come into operation.

Shri Raj Narain.

श्री राज नारायण (रय बरेली) : श्रीमन् आपकी प्राज्ञ से गदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को कुछ मुगलाने हैं . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: You must only read the statement; nothing else.

श्री राज नारायण : कृपया इन्हें पढ़ा कि मैं ईत किया गया उनको... (अवधान) हम कहने के लिए तैयार हैं कि हमारे राष्ट्रमिनिस्टर के साथ वही बातचीत हुई है . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is not relevant; I have already decided. Kindly confine to your statement.

श्री राज नारायण : इन्होंने यह कहा है कि मेरे सामने कोई दूसरा विकल्प नहीं दीखता कि मैं इस्तीफा देने के लिए कहूँ लेकिन प्रागे नहीं लिखा Therefore, I ask you to resign.

(अवधान) मगर मैं ने इस्तीफा दे दिया ।

श्रीमन्, मैं अपने त्याग पत्र के संबंध में संसद में कोई वक्तव्य दूँ या नहीं इसका निर्णय बहुत आसान नहीं था। इसका इन्द्र कुछ दिनों तक दिमाग में चलता रहा जिसके दो तीन कारण थे :

एक तो यह कि मुझे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री की बातों का प्रतिवाद करना पड़ेगा और उनके आरोपों को असत्य प्रमाणित करना पड़ेगा। यह प्रक्रिया स्वयं में कष्टप्रद थी किन्तु प्रश्न यह भी था कि हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री की तस्वीर धूमिल हो सकती है और प्रधानमंत्रित्व के नैतिक आधार पर भी आंच आ सकती है।

दूसरे अब तक स्थिति इतनी स्पष्ट हो गई है और जनमानस इस संबंध में पूर्ण विश्लेषण कर सभी बातों को इतनी अच्छी तरह समझ गया है कि विशेष प्रकाश डालने की आवश्यकता नहीं रह गई है।

किन्तु फिर सोचा कि सर्वोच्च राष्ट्रीय संस्था संसद के प्रति एक प्रकार से समादर का अभाव होगा अगर मैं उनके सामने विनयपूर्वक उपस्थित होकर एक महत्वपूर्ण नाटक के आवश्यक तथ्यों से उसे अवगत न करा दूँ।

13.29 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने मुझ से त्याग पत्र मांगा था उमते उन्होंने दो तीन आधार बनाये थे ।

मैंने प्रथम उन्होंने कहा था कि मैंने उनसे मुलाकात में समापन प्रतिबंध के संबंध में अपनी अनभिज्ञता व्यक्त की थी। किन्तु उन्होंने इस संबंध में जांच पड़ताल की और वे इस

निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचे है कि मैंने जानबूझकर कर एवं सुविचारित ढंग से कानून (विधि) को भंग किया था।

श्रीमन प्राप मेरे विरुद्ध आरोप में कानून भंग पर विशेष ध्यान दें। कानून भंग करने का एक ही अर्थ हो सकता है — देश में संसद या विधान सभाओं द्वारा पारित विधिवत ला कानून की अवहेलना या उल्लंघन।

स्वाभावतः यह प्रश्न उठता है कि वह कौन-सा कानून शिमला में जारी था, जिसकी अवज्ञा का अभियोग मुझ पर लगाया जा रहा है। मुझे बताया गया है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने काबीना यानी (कबिनेट) —हम हिन्दी में कबिनेट को काबीना कहते हैं — मैं तथा जनता पार्टी की एक उच्चस्तरीय समिति में कहा कि शिमला में भारतीय दण्ड संहिता को 144 धारा लागू थी और मैंने उसका जान-बूझ कर तोड़ा था और सभा की थी। किन्तु जो हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार की ओर से स्पष्ट दी गई है ( प्रतिलिपि संलग्न है ) और जो मुख्य मंत्री हिमाचल प्रदेश ने मुख्य मंत्री बिहार को कहा (जिसे मुख्य मंत्री बिहार ने एकपत्र के रूप में लिपिबद्ध कर दिया था और जिसकी प्रतिलिपि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री तथा मुख्य मंत्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश को भेज दिया गया था ) उससे यह स्पष्ट है कि ऐसा कोई कानून उस समय वहां लागू नहीं था।

ऐसी परिस्थिति में इन निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचना अनियमित है। मैं जानता हूँ कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने सर्वथा सत्य आरोप लगाया था।

अगर मोखिक या ब्रिटिश राज्य के मामले से घाने हुए प्रतिबंध का महारा भी लिया जाए तो उसका पूर्व सूचना मुझे नहीं थी। जो सरकारी स्पष्ट माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जो कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री जो से मिली है, उसमें भी इसका उल्लेख नहीं है कि किसी सरकारी कर्मचारी ने मुझे इसकी सूचना दी थी।

मुख्य मंत्री अपने 26 जून के पत्र में माननीय प्रधान मंत्री को सूचित करते हैं :—

“Secretary (Health), Deputy Commissioner and Superintendent of Police, Simla received Shri, Raj Narain at Himachal Bhawan at 12.10 A.M. Shri Raj Narain was received at Chandigarh and escorted all the way to Himachal Bhawan by the Deputy Commissioner and Superintendent of Police, Solan.”

किन्तु यह नहीं कहते कि इन में से किसी एक सज्जन ने मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में बताया, बल्कि यह ध्यान देने योग्य है कि वे इस बात पर बल दे कर कहते हैं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश की मंत्री कुमारी श्यामा शर्मा, जिन का यह कतव्य था कि वे सारी स्थिति से मुझे अवगत कराएँ, ने भी ऐसा नहीं किया। मैं मुख्य मंत्री के पत्र के 11 वें पैरे की तरफ सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ . . . . .

श्रीमान कुछ लोग सदन में सो रहे हैं। श्रीमान सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य हमारी बात सुनेगे नहीं, तो हमारे साथ न्याय कैसे होगा। हम बयान देने जाये हैं — इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य—शामक पक्ष और विरोध पक्ष —दोनों ध्यान से सुनें।

यह मुख्य मंत्री के पत्र का 11 पैरा है—

श्री सी० के० जाफर तारीफ (बंगलौर-उत्तर) : यह प्राप को कैसे मिला ?

श्री राज नारायण : प्राइम मिनिस्टर जी ने दिया था।

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : Why do you charge me?

श्री राज नारायण : मर, प्राप ने दिया था

“I may also bring to your kind notice the attitude of Miss Shayama Sharma, Minister of State, in this

[Shri Raj Narain]

particular episode. She was in Simla on that day. She was also informed that Shri Tripathi was insisting on having this meeting on the Ridge. She spent a lot of time with Shri Tripathi and Shri Raj Narain, but as far as my information goes, she did not explain the whole position to Shri Raj Narain and Shri Tripathi. She was certainly in a position to clarify any misunderstanding. But she did not do so. Her attitude has always remained uncooperative and critical of the Government."

AN. HON. MEMBER: What was she doing there?

श्री राज नारायण : साहब, इतना सीजिए कि उन की एक मंत्री हमारे साथ आई, मगर उन्होंने कोई... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not answer questions.

श्री राज नारायण : श्रीमन, मैं आप की भाषा का पालन करना चाहता हूँ तहेदिल से, मगर कुछ लोग बाधक हैं।

उपस्थित महोदय : आप बाधक मत बनिये उम में।

श्री राज नारायण : हां मुख्य मंत्री जी के पत्र में इतना जरूर है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पर्वतीय विकास विभाग के राज्य मंत्री श्री सत्यादेव त्रिपाठी ने मुझे सभा की मनाही की सूचना दी थी किन्तु श्री त्रिपाठी ने प्रधान मंत्री जी से स्वयं मिल कर इस का तीव्र प्रतिवाद किया था और साक्षात्कार के बाद एक प्रेस वक्तव्य में इस का खुलासा भी किया था। श्री त्रिपाठी ने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि :

"The Sunday Statesman 2-7-78

From Our Special Representative:  
New Delhi, Saturday: Mr. Satya  
Deo Tripathi, U.P.'s Minister of State  
for Hill Development, said here to-

day that he had told the Prime Minister that he (Mr. Tripathi) had not informed Mr. Raj Narain that there was ban on holding meeting in the Ridge area in Simla, "as I did not think it was my duty."

He also told Mr. Desai that it was the duty of the district authorities who accompanied Mr. Raj Narain from Chandigarh, to have informed the former Union Health Minister of the ban. In fact, Mr. Raj Narain went to the Ridge after the afternoon tea at Raj Bhavan and Himachal's district officials were all the time accompanying him."

श्रीमन, आप इस प्रकार देखेंगे कि आरोपों का कोई आधार नहीं था। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कानून भंग का अभियोग लगाया है उसकी पुष्टि मौखिक या पारंपरिक प्रतिबंध से, अगर ऐसा प्रतिबंध लागू भी रहा हो, तो नहीं हो सकती। कानून शब्द का प्रयोग प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जानबूझ कर मेरे ऊपर गंभीर आरोप लगाने की मंशा से किया था और आज एक हल्के-फुल्के मौखिक प्रतिबंध द्वारा या अंग्रेजों के जमाने से चली आती हुई किसी परम्परा के आधार पर वे असत्य आरोप को सत्य सिद्ध नहीं कर सकते।

सभा की अनुमति वहां के संबंधित अधिकारियों ने नहीं दी थी। इसके आसार मुझे सभा-स्थल पर पहुंच जाने पर ही मालूम हुए। किंतु, श्रीमन, इसको ध्यान में रखें कि सभा स्थल पर ले जाने वाले सरकारी अधिकारी थे, गाड़ी भी जिस में मुझे ले जाया गया सरकारी थी और अगर सरकारी अधिकारियों ने जाने से मुझे रोका होता तो मैं वहां हरगिज न जाता। सभा स्थल पर जाने के बाद मुझे घायोबकों ने बताया कि पुलिस वहां से ध्वनि-विस्तारक ध्वं बंद कर उठा कर ले गई थी और सभा करने से रोका था। मगर मैं वहां किस स्थिति में था इस पर श्रीमन पूरी हमदर्दी से गौर करें। वर्ष

हो रही थी और कुछ ही घेर में पांच-सात हजार लोग वहाँ छाता लिए हुए बड़ी उत्कंठा से एकत्र हो गए थे। उसी स्थल पर उन्होंने करीब तीन सप्ताह पूर्व माननीय विदेश मंत्री श्री भटल बिहारी बाजपेयी जी का भाषण सुना था। वह भी एक सार्वजनिक सभा थी, जिसका आयोजन शिमला की जनता-पार्टी ने किया था। उस सार्वजनिक सभा की घोषणा करने वाला जनता-पार्टी द्वारा प्रसारित एक पोस्टर भी इसके साथ संलग्न कर रहा हूँ।

हम ने पोस्टर की कापी करा दी है। यह पोस्टर है, इस को देखा जा सकता है। इस में लिखा है :

“जनता पार्टी के मुख्य नेता माननीय भटल बिहारी बाजपेयी (विदेश मंत्री) तिथि 3-6-78 को सांघ 5-30 बजे रिज मैदान में विशाल जन सभा को सम्बोधित करेंगे। आप से निवेदन है कि भारी संख्या में पधार कर अपने प्रिय नेता के बिचार सुनें।

नोट: महिलाओं के प्रलग में बैठने की विशेष व्यवस्था की गई है।

निवेदक

जनता पार्टी, शिमला।”

इस से यह प्रमाणित हो जाएगा कि शांता कुमार जी मत्स्य से कितना स्नेह रखते हैं। पोस्टर में ‘जनसभा’ की घोषणा तो है ही साथ ही साथ यह भी निवेदन जनता-पार्टी शिमला ने किया है कि “महिलाओं के प्रलग से बैठने की व्यवस्था की गयी है”—जनता पार्टी ने की, अर्थात् जनता पार्टी शिमला द्वारा व्यवस्था की गयी है, सरकार द्वारा नहीं। इस में शांता कुमार जी के इस कथन का कि श्री भटल बिहारी बाजपेयी की सभा सरकार द्वारा आहूत की और उसका आयोजन

सरकारी तत्वावधान में किया गया था, ऐसा प्रत्यक्ष है जो हत्यक के नीचे नहीं उतारा जा सकता।

वह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि रिज में सिर्फ श्री भटल बिहारी बाजपेयी जी की ही सार्वजनिक सभा नहीं हुई थी, उसके पूर्व कई राजनैतिक नेता श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण, श्री प्रताप सिंह कैरोँ प्रादि तथा राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ के प्रधान एवं साईबाबा भी वहाँ पधार चुके थे और जनसमूह को संबोधित कर चुके थे।

वह कहा गया है कि घण्टों के बमाने से वहाँ पर एक प्रकार का प्रतिबंध चला आ रहा था। इस संदर्भ में मैं राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी के मई 13, 1931 की रिज मैदान की सभा का उल्लेख विशेष रूप से करना चाहूँगा। श्री जगदीश शर्मा की ‘इंडियन नेशनल कांग्रेस : ए डिस्टिक्टिव बिब्लियोग्राफी’ के 540 पृष्ठ में कहा गया है कि : “ए पब्लिक मोटिंग वाज हेल्ड प्राय रिज एट शिमला टु बेकलम महात्मा गांधी। इन कन्कलुजन गांधी जी एक-बोर्हटिड इ प्राडियंस टु बर्क फार दी स्प्रेड प्राफ बहर एंड दाइकाट प्राफ नाहर।”

श्री गुलराकेश पंत एवं श्री हृदयेश शर्मा, हिमाचल युवा जनता सदस्यों ने, जो प्रधान मंत्री जी की संयुक्त पत्र लिखा था वह रिज पर सार्वजनिक सभा के संबन्ध में स्थिति को पूर्णरूपेण स्पष्ट कर देना है। मैं उस पत्र के कुछ अंग पढ़ने की आज्ञा चाहूँगा :

“On 15th August 1947 India got freedom and some old conventions of British rule were ignored such as citizens without wearing pants were also allowed to roam on the Mall. It will be the biggest lie of its kind if anybody dare to say that public meetings and functions are banned on the Ridge and the Mall at Simla. For example, the Congress public meeting was addressed by the local

[Shri Raj Narain]

Congress leaders and late Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, Chief Minister, Punjab State. That during Congress regime not only opposition leader Shri Jalprakash Narain addressed public gathering at the Ridge but Late Shri Golwalkar RSS Chief also addressed a rally on the Ridge. Even the present RSS Chief addressed a rally at some place.

Condolence meetings on the murder of Rastra Pita Bapu and on the death of late Shri Zakir Hussain were also addressed by leaders of different parties on the Ridge. Every year on Bapu's birthday gatherings are addressed by political and social leaders on the Ridge. Processions are taken in the shape of 'Prabat Pheri' on the Mall Road and Ridge. Satya Sai Baba addressed number of gatherings on his visits to the city.

Shri Shanta Kumar C.M. Himachal Pradesh started with by taking all the Janata MLAs on the Ridge to administer them the oath. It is a mystery how that type of function could ever be an official function. Who sought its permission and who granted that type of permission?"

श्री सत्यदेव बुर्गेरी एम० एल० ए०  
श्री इस कथन की पुष्टि इस प्रकार करते हैं :

"After Independence the State Capital of Himachal was at Simla from its very inception, although Simla was a part of United Punjab. All the Ministers of Punjab used to address public meetings on the Ridge Maidan. The Central Ministers whosoever came to Simla and desired to address public were never disallowed to use the Ridge for that purpose."

यह भी बता देना आवश्यक है कि मेरे लिए सभा का आयोजन 25 जून को किया गया था जो एक महत्वपूर्ण दिन है क्योंकि उसी

दिन को 3 वर्ष पूर्व देश में आपासकासीन स्थिति की घोषणा की गई थी। ऐसे अवसर पर जब कोई मंत्री सभा संबोधित करे तो लागू किया हुआ कानून भी उठा लिया जाता है। उस संख्या में लोगों को निराश करने का यह परिणाम भी हो सकता था कि वहाँ प्रशान्ति होती और युवा वर्ग क्रोध और अप्रवेश में एक तहलका मचा सकता था जो स्थानीय सरकार के लिए किसी प्रकार हितकर नहीं होता। इसलिए सभा स्थल पर पहुंच जाने के बाद उस बड़े जन समूह को, विशेष रूप से युवा वर्ग को उस महत्वपूर्ण दिन को मैंने संबोधित करना ही अपना कर्तव्य समझा।

श्रब मैं लगाए गए दूसरे आरोप पर आता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने त्याग पत्र मांगने हुए मूझ पर यह भी आरोप लगाया है कि मैंने अपने भाषण में मुख्य मंत्री हिमाचल प्रदेश पर तीव्र प्रहार किया था।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कितना लम्बा है ?

श्री राज नारायण : धीरज रखिये ।  
(Interruptions)\*\*

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप स्टेटमेंट पढ़िये ।

(Interruptions)\*\*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Also, whatever the Members interrupt will not go on record.

श्री राज नारायण : अगर मैं ऐसा करता तो निस्संदेह यह मेरे लिए वांछनीय नहीं था। लेकिन यह आरोप भी कितना असत्य है यह मुख्य मंत्री बिहार के 6-7-78 के पत्र से जाहिर हो जाएगा। मैं उस पत्र का उद्धरण पढ़ना चाहता हूँ मुख्य मंत्री बिहार अपने पत्र में मुख्य मंत्री हिमाचल प्रदेश को लिखते हैं कि :

"... शिमला की जिस घटना को ले कर श्री राज नारायण जी से

मंत्री परिषद् से त्वावपत्र मांगा गया उसके सम्बन्ध में आपने मुझे जो जानकारी दी उससे मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि यदि सारी बातें सही रूप में प्रधान मंत्री के सामने नए सिरे से उपस्थित की जाएं तो पार्टी में जो संकट पैदा हो गया है उसका समाधान निकल सकता है।”

आपने मुझ से कहा है कि रिज एरिया में 144 धारा लागू नहीं थी बल्कि तथ्य यह है कि इस एरिया में किसी भी राजनैतिक पार्टी को एक लम्बे जमाने से सभा करने की इजाजत नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में एक सरकारी आदेश है। कहां सरकारी आदेश है किसी को पता नहीं है।

आपने मुझे यह भी जानकारी दी कि श्री राज नारायण जी के बोलने के पहले आपके विरुद्ध रिज पर उपस्थित कुछ लोग नारे लगा रहे थे। जहां तक श्री राज नारायण जी का प्रश्न है उन्होंने उपस्थित लोगों से आग्रह किया कि वे आपके विरुद्ध नारे नहीं लगावें। आप ही के कथानुसार उन्होंने यह भी कहा—“श्री शांता कुमार जी जनता पार्टी के हैं और आप लोग भी जनता पार्टी के ही हैं तो आप उनके हुए और वे आपके हुए।” उनके विरुद्ध नारा नहीं लगना चाहिये। यह शांता कुमार जी का एक्सटेंस है।

मगर इससे भी ज्यादा मैं अपने भाषण के टेप रिकार्ड पर ध्यान देने के लिए आप से आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ। इस टेप रिकार्ड में किए भाषण को स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी ने मेरे पास भेजा है यद्यपि कि इस में बहुत कुछ कांट्रैक्ट की गई है और यह एक पूर्व योजना के अनुसार है। मैं इसे आघोषांत पढ़ने के लिए मदद से क्षमा चाहूंगा। समाचारपत्रों की बात आप जाने दें। ब्रिजियों के भाषण की रिपोर्ट सी०आई०डी० लेती है टेप रिकार्ड से इस डैमोक्रैटिक एज में भी, इस पर आप ध्यान दें। उसी का जो हम को प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने सारांश भेजा है टेप रिकार्ड का मैं उसको हूबहू पढ़ रहा हूँ।

भाबरल भी राव नारायण, रिज मंत्रालय, सिल्लार जनसभा युवा जनता : विभांक 25-C-78

श्रम मैं बोल रहा हूँ। “देखिये भाषण हमारा बोलने का मन नहीं कर रहा है। मैं यह नहीं समझ पा रहा हूँ कि यहां की सीटिंग को खराब करने की कोशिश क्यों की गई। मुझे ये बातें मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रही हैं शांता कुमार जी भले धादमी हैं, अच्छे धादमी हैं, समझदार हैं, यह जो युवा जनता के लोग हैं ये शांता कुमार ही के तो हैं। ये अग्रर अपनी यहां सभा कर लें, लाउड-स्पीकर बगैर के साथ तो इसमें शांता कुमार जी का क्या नुकसान है।” यह हमारा भाषण चल रहा है टेप रेकार्ड sent to me by the Prime Minister himself. देखिये जब टेप रेकार्ड होता है तो श्रम पब्लिक भी बोलती है। यह प्रश्न पूछ रहे हैं लोग। “माइक पुलिस क्यों ले गई? क्या ये पुराना शासन का तरीका जनता पार्टी की सरकार भी चलाएगी क्या?” यह प्रश्न है जनता की ओर से। यह मेरा जबाब है— “कभी नहीं। श्रम सवाल जनाब टेढ़ा हो गया मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। किसी को दोष देना नहीं चाहूंगा मैं। आप लोगों से भी निवेदन करूंगा युवा जनता के नेताओं से कि शांता कुमार जी को कुछ बुरा भला न कहें। वे हमारे हैं हम उनके हैं। आज इस बात का जरूर लोगों को दुःख है कि यहाँ अग्रर सभा हो जाती तो बिगड़ता क्या?” श्रम वहाँ से डाट डाट डाट, क्योंकि हमने यह कहा था कि अग्रर सभा हो जाती तो कहीं गगन फट जाता, कहां धरा धंस जाती? “तो हमको शांता कुमार जी का तार कल मिल गया था कि अग्रर आप रात में रहेंगे तो मैं नाम को लीट आऊंगा और मुलाकात करूंगा क्योंकि हमारा कार्यक्रम लगा हुआ है इसलिये मैं बाहर रहूंगा और दिन में आपके सामने नहीं आ पाऊंगा। ये हमारे भाई जैन साहब हैं। यह युवा जनता के एक वहाँ के सक्रिय मेम्बर हैं। रा-



## [श्री राज नारायण]

कुमार काउन्सलर हैं यहां के हमारे भाई जैन साहब हैं। उन्होंने प्रश्न किया है कि प्रगति पार्टी की सरकार ने साल भर में क्या किया है? मैं इसी पर आपको रखूंगा। पहली बात तो हमने यह की कि जो इंदिरा की तानाशाही सरकार ने आपके मौलिक अधिकार छीन लिये थे सिविल राइट्स छीन लिये थे उनको हमने आपको वापस कर दिया। देखिये, आपको वापस कर दिया और अगर आपका माइक कोई छीन ले तो इसमें आपका दोष? अब हमारे जैन साहब ने एक सवाल पूछा है दूसरा जिसका जवाब मैं दे रहा हूँ। हमने आपको फंडामेंटल राइट्स मौलिक अधिकार भी दिया—मौलिक अधिकार वह क्या है—आप बिना हथियार के जहां चाहो तहां आओ जाओ। क्या आप अपने अधिकार को छिनने देंगे यह आपको सोचना है? 25 जून को रामलीला मैदान में भी जयप्रकाश जी ने प्रस्ताव रखा था कि "अगर 29 जून से पहले-पहले इन्दिरा जी का इस्तीफा नहीं होता, इंदिरा जी इस्तीफा नहीं देती तो इंदिरा को हटाने के लिये राष्ट्रध्यापी अभियान शुरू कर देंगे।" अब प्रश्न आ रहा है उधर से। "शान्ता कुमार जी ने इंदिरा जी का रास्ता क्यों पकड़ा?" अब मैं बोल रहा हूँ। "क्यों पकड़ा यह उनको सोचने दो—क्या अपने मौलिक अधिकारों को आप छिनने देंगे, यह बात आपको समझनी है। मौलिक अधिकार आब सरकार छीने तो आप चुप रहेंगे? तो अगर शान्ता कुमार जी को इस बात की जानकारी होती तो साहब इनकी पुलिस यहां से माइक उठाकर नहीं ले जाती। आप लोगों को यहां एकत्रित क्यों होने दिया? मैं शान्ता कुमार जी को कहता हूँ कि उन्होंने माइक क्यों लिया?" सब सभा में पड़बड़ी मच गई—"आप खड़े है, पानी में खड़े हैं, इसलिए अब तो शिमला से हमारा रिश्ता ज्यादा बढ़ेगा—(शोर) हमने महंगाई बहुत-सी चीजों की खत्म कर दी—(शोर) आज जो महंगा शासन की कामयाबी हुई है,

अब इसको पसन्द करते हैं या निन्दा करते हैं? मंच से माइक छीनना ये बन्दूकबंद और उसूल के खिलाफ है, इसकी निन्दा होगी या नहीं? जो निन्दा करते हैं, वो हाथ उठावें (शोर) अब मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा, क्योंकि हमको दिल्ली जाना है, आप अपनी ताकत को बढ़ायें, मजबूत करें, युवा जनता के लोग अपनी ताकत को बढ़ायें, संगठित करें। आपसे प्रार्थना करके इतना ही बोल करके मैं जा रहा हूँ। इन्कलाब जिन्दाबाद—(शोर)।" अब मैं चल दिया।

श्रीमन् इसको सुनकर अगर सदन मुझे मुख्य मंत्री पर कड़ा प्रहार करने के लिए दोषी ठहराए तो मुझे कुछ कहना नहीं है। मैं इतना ही निवेदन करूंगा कि जिन लोगों ने इसे पढ़ा या सुना है, उनके दिमाग में यह धारणा बनी है कि उन परिस्थितियों में भी बहुत जल्द या संयम से काम लिया गया था। इससे ज्यादा संयम से मैं काम ले सकता हूँ?

श्रीमन्, यही दो आरोप थे, जिनके आधार पर प्रकाश रूप से मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी का कोपभाजन बना।

मैंने जो तथ्य एवं तर्क प्रस्तुत किए हैं, उनसे यह स्पष्ट है कि असत्य का तानाबाना बुनकर मुझे उसमें फंसाने का प्रयत्न किया गया है। दो एक दिनों तक लोग इस मायाजाल में फंसे रहे हों और मेरी प्रतिभा भी उनके सामने कुछ घूमिल प्रतीत हुई हो, लेकिन अब यह धारणा की तरह माफ हो गया है कि अपने साथियों को मतभेद के कारण नीचा दिखाने के लिए सत्ता का किस प्रकार दुरुपयोग किया जा सकता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : मत्य, मत्य।

श्री राज नारायण : इस दुरभि-संधि को वास्तविक रूप में आप और अच्छी तरह तब समझ पायेंगे जब आप प्रधान मंत्री जी की मेरे प्रति कुछ दिनों से उभरती हुई दुर्भावना को खुल्ला पर दृष्टिपाठ करेंगे। शिमला कांड तो एक बहाना मात्र था। स्पष्ट है कि

प्रधान मंत्री जी बहुत विनों से बात में लगे थे कि मुझ पर तथा भूतपूर्व गृहमंत्री चौधरी चरण सिंह पर वार करें।

जब प्रधान मंत्री जी अमरीका प्रवास के बाद 17 जून को वापिस आते हैं, तो पहली बात तो जो उनकी जवान से निकलती है, उसमें दुर्भावना की गंध है। आप इसको जरा देखें कि उस दिन उन्होंने अपनी सम्भ्यता और संस्कृति की कितनी बड़ी मिसाल रखी थी। विदेशी राजदूतों एवं अन्य गण्यमान्य व्यक्तियों के समूह में मेरे ड्रव लगाने पर उन्होंने मेरे प्रति अपशब्द कहे थे। खुशबू लगाने पर जब इतनी बदबूदार बात निकल सकती थी, तो श्रीमन्, अनुमान कर सकते हैं कि उनके दिमाग में मेरे प्रति कितना जहर भरा हुआ था। उसके बाद प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जनता पार्टी के संसदीय बोर्ड की 22 जून की बैठक में अपनी दुर्भावना जनता पार्टी के एक मंत्री से व्यक्त की—“आप राजनारायण को यहां से (यानी पार्टी से) निकाल दें, मैं उसे मंत्रिमंडल से निकाल दूंगा।”

14.00 hrs

इतना ही नहीं, बल्कि जब उनके एक सहयोगी ने कहा कि इस तरह की कार्यवाही से पार्टी में फूट होगी, पार्टी तहसनहस हो जायेगी, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यहाँ तक कह डाला कि “कुछ नहीं होगा, सिर्फ राज नारायण और चौ० चरण सिंह बाहर जायेंगे।” और ये बातें श्रीमन्, शिमला कांड से चार दिन पहले की हैं।

माननीय प्रधान मंत्री इस सिलसिले में आगे बढ़ते गये और राज खुनता गया। मामूय होता है कि जब जहर एक बार दिमाग में इकट्ठा हो जाये, तो बाहर निकलकर ही दम लेता है। उन्होंने कोटा की सार्वजनिक सभा में 25 जून को सिंहजन्म कर ही दिया कि “राज नारायण या तो अपना व्यवहार ठीक करें या

बाहर जायें।” इस प्रकार प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने मंत्रिमंडल के एक साथी के साथ बर्बर के लिए एक नई आचार संहिता प्रस्तुत की।

श्रीमन्, मैं सदन से विनयपूर्वक यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या ये बातें एक पूर्व-निश्चित संकल्प एवं योजना की धोर संकेत नहीं करती।

शिमला कांड को चाहे जिस रूप में देखा जाये, वह 25 जून को हुआ था। लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी की दुर्भावना तो 17 जून को अमेरिका से लौटने पर हवाई अड्डे पर तथा 22 जून को पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड की बैठक में, जो अनुशासन की कार्रवाई के लिए धनचिह्नित थी, और 25 जून को कोटा की सार्वजनिक सभा में पहले ही मुखर हो चुकी थी, सारी दुनिया के सामने उनका इरादा साफ हो चुका था। उसके लिए उनका शिमला की 7,000 फीट की ऊंचाई पर इस तरह की परिकल्पना करने की जरूरत नहीं थी।

श्रीमन्, मुझे यह भी लगता है कि कुछ प्रमुख बुनियादी प्रश्नों पर प्रधान मंत्री जी के साथ मेरा जो मतभेद रहा है, वह भी जिम्मेदार है मेरे प्रति प्रधान मंत्री के रुख-परिवर्तन में। जो पत्र मैं लिखता रहा हूँ, वे सब मैं बता रहा हूँ। सरकार के कायकलापों में गुणात्मक परिवर्तन का अभाव और किमानों, मजदूरों तथा विद्यार्थियों के लिए नई प्राणा बढ़ाने वाले कार्यक्रमों का अभाव मुझे महीनों से खलता रहा है। समान शिक्षा के नाने हम मौखिक रूप से देते तो रहे हैं, किन्तु फौमी स्कूल ज्यों के त्यों कायम है। बुढ़ापा पेंशन योजना तथा बेकारी भत्ता योजना भी लागू नहीं हो पाई है और धामदनी तथा खच्च की सीमा बाधने की दिशा में कोई सार्थक कदम नहीं उठाया गया है। किसानों का गुड़ जब उचित कीमत पर बिकने लगा, तो ऐलान करके गुड़ के निर्यात पर

[श्री राज नारायण]

प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया गया। गन्ना और चीनी की कीमतों में न्यायोचित संतुलन नहीं किया गया। औद्योगिक नीति का भी समुचित कार्यान्वयन नहीं किया गया। इसी तरह सर्वोच्च न्यायालय और उच्च न्यायालयों में न्यायाधीशों की नियुक्ति की प्रक्रिया से भी मुझे असंतोष था। भ्रष्टाचार निवारण एवं शाह कमिशन की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार दोषी व्यक्ति-ब्यक्तियों के विधान के तत्काल कार्यान्वयन की दिशा में भी कारगर कदम नहीं उठाए गए। इन बातों से मुझे जो मानसिक पीड़ा होती रही है, उसको मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को पत्रों एवं मौखिक रूप से विगत 10 महीने से समय समय पर अवगत कराता रहा हूँ। मैं उन पत्रों को साक्ष्य के रूप में यहाँ पेश करना आवश्यक नहीं समझता हूँ। कुछ अन्य विषयों की भी चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता, जिन पर प्रधान मंत्री जी और मेरे बीच तीव्र राजनैतिक मतभेद रहे हैं। यदि मैं ऐसा कहूँ, तो मुझे यह भय है कि शिमला कांड गौण हो जायेगा, जिस पर पड़्यंत्र की यह इतनी बड़ी इमारत खड़ी की गई।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक बात का उल्लेख यहाँ विशेष रूप से करना चाहता हूँ। वह यह कि जब चौ० चरण सिंह सांघातिक हृदय रोग से आक्रांत होकर रुग्ण शैया पर पड़े थे, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उन पर और मुझ पर एक साथ वार किया। यह सदन प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा स्थापित इस नवीन सांस्कृतिक कीर्तमान पर विचार करे कि जिस चौ० चरण सिंह को सभी लोग जनता पार्टी का एक मुख्य संस्थापक मानते हैं, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उन पर किस समय वार किया? जब वे सख्त बीमार थे।

अन्त में मैं माननीय सदस्यों से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि "धर्म चक्र प्रवर्तनाय" के प्रकाश में, जो अध्यक्ष के आसन के ऊपर से सदन को उद्भासित करता है, सत्य-असत्य का

विवेचन करें और दोषी कौन है, इसका निर्णय निष्पक्ष हो कर करें।

यदि कोई भी यह मानकर चलता है कि मैंने किसी कानून का उल्लंघन किया है, तो मैं मांग करूँगा कि श्री शांताकुमार जी मेरे विरुद्ध कानूनी कार्रवाई करें और मुझे गिरफ्तार करायें, और तब मैं न्यायालय में जा कर इस बात की मांग करूँगा कि कोई न्यायिक ग्राह्य न होते हुए मेरे खिलाफ कार्रवाई की जा रही है और यह उतनी ही महत्वपूर्ण कार्रवाई होगी, जितनी कि इलाहाबाद उच्च न्यायालय में मेरी चुनाव याचिका थी।

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir. I am glad that the long-awaited statement is here before the House. If it had not been made so very interesting in his characteristic manner, it would have been difficult to have had patience for all that he has said.

I would like to refer first to what he said last. Then I will come to the earlier part about Simla. I am surprised that he now finds that I was not well disposed towards him from the very beginning. That is what he has now discovered. I do not know why he remained silent all the while and why he respected me, and respected me in no uncertain terms. Even on the 27th June he made such a statement. He referred to my speech at Kota. He said that he did not find anything objectionable about it. On the contrary, what I said was only for his benefit. That is what he said then. Now, he puts a different interpretation. In the Kota meeting I had not mentioned him by name at all. Only in the workers' meeting one of the workers asked, 'If Mr. Raj Narain makes a breach of discipline, what will be done?' I said if he makes a breach of discipline, he will go. That is all that I said. There was no question of my saying anything in the Kota meeting. In the Kota meeting there were

followers of Raj Narainji who shouted 'Raj Narain Zindabad, Morarji Desai Murdabad' and all kinds of slogans were raised and pamphlets distributed. Then I told them, 'This is not right. This is indiscipline and if any members of Janata Party indulge in indiscipline, then they have no place in the Party.' That is all that I said there. I did not mention any names at all.

Then again he refers to the proceedings of the Parliamentary Board meeting of the Janata Party. I do not know how he can refer to it here. But there is no limit to which he can go. Therefore, I am not surprised by it. I wish he had not said it in the manner in which he has said. What I said there—now that he has referred to it—I must clarify. When the question was raised, i.e. the question of taking disciplinary action against him for carrying on a campaign against the President of the Janata Party, and for carrying on a violent public agitation, on that, a notice was issued to him and it was considered there. There I was asked to take disciplinary action against him as he is a Cabinet Minister. I said, 'No. That depends upon the Parliamentary Board's decision. If the Parliamentary Board holds him guilty of indiscipline, then he goes from the Cabinet'. That is all I said. I do not know what wrong have I committed in saying that. These were garbled reports sent out by members. This is not uncommon in this country. Even Cabinet meetings' proceedings are reported by some people. They go on doing it. We have still to go a long way before people will observe full discipline in a proper manner. We have got to deal with it with patience.

Then he says that when I returned from America on the 17th of June, he met me and I admonished him before all people—now there were not all people near him, they were behind him much farther away—I do not know what they heard. But he met me and he began to apply 'titra' to me. I had received reports of what he was doing here and what a disturbance he was

creating and what it meant for the Janata Party. So I said: 'You are applying 'khushbu'.

यहां तो खुशबू लगाते हो पर और क्या कर रहे हो ? "और भी खुशबू कर रहा हूँ ।" पर मैंने कहा कि आप बदबू फैला रहे हैं । यह मैंने कहा था ।

I really said that because I meant it. That was what had happened in my absence. I had no hesitation in saying that to him. But, if he objected to it, why did he not mention it to me afterwards? If he took it ill, I would have certainly told him that 'I am sorry if you take it ill. I would not say it.' But I never thought that he would take it ill. He thinks that he alone could crack jokes and others have no right to respond. That is Raj Narainji's permanent attitude. What he says is right, what others say is wrong. Well, I do not want to enter into those polemics. But this is not the way of dealing with this matter. Then he said that 'I had hatched a conspiracy in America to remove him.'

श्री राज नारायण : यह मैंने कहा नहीं था पर अब कहूंगा ।

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That statement is made publicly.

श्री राज नारायण : आप कैसे कह रहे हैं कि मैंने कहा ?

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : पर यहाँ तो आपने कह दिया । पहले से मैं कर रहा हूँ, आप को मालूम हो गया । कांस्पिरेंसी तो नहीं कहा, मगर यह कहा ।

श्री राज नारायण : यह सब पर्सनल है ।

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Therefore it is there. Now where is the ques-

[Shri Morarji Desai]

tion of my making any question conspiracy in America? Did I know that he was going to address a meeting in Simla on the 25th of June?

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Meaning he did it at the instigation of...

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** No. I do not think he meant. I am sorry. I won't agree; I cannot attribute such motives to him. But he is aggrieved and therefore he is certainly angry. That I could realise. But what could I do?

Now, I come to the episode of Simla. I discussed with him the matter and told him that this is very wrong, what he has done. Then he said 'I did not know of any prohibition there of a public meeting.' These are his words. I did not tell him that there was a ban under Section 144, Criminal Procedure Code. That he has missed. But, I did tell him that 'when it was prohibited there and you addressed it; it was wrong.' He said: 'I did not know about it.' Then I said 'All right, I will enquire further.' Then, the next day, I enquired further about it. I called for the remarks of the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh. I also called the Secretary of the Yuv Janata Party or Yuv Janata Morcha as it was called there. Several others came and I verified from him also. Then I formed my impression, came to this conclusion that he knew it. I put it to the House itself and to you to judge whether my conclusions are right or wrong.

Now, when it was contended here that there was no prohibition there, the British Government is brought in here. Yes, the ban on meetings has been there for a long time. Why? Because Simla is a place where many tourists go and where many people go during the summer with their families and Ridge is the

place where people go for a walk, morning and evening. There is no other place where they can go: It is, therefore, that it has been in force there. Except governmental functions no other functions are to be held there.

Then, a parallel of Mahatma Gandhi is given. Mahatma Gandhi, could be allowed anywhere. There is no question of Mahatma Gandhi, or, on his death, if anything is done, then nobody will say anything. But, in 1970 the Chief Secretary had issued orders--executive orders had been issued--this was all under the Police Act. Action is taken under 144 only for this purpose. Then again, in 1973, the Government and all the political parties met and decided that there should not be any meetings held there and those proceedings are there with me. And then when my friend, Shri Raj Narain ji says that there was no prohibition of the meeting, why did his disciples then ask for permission? They asked for permission on the 24th, the Yuva Janata Morcha of Himachal Pradesh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yuva Janata.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** Yuva Janata Morcha. It was called a Morcha then. It is Yuva Janta, it is not Yuva Janata Morcha, but they called it like that at that time because that was a morcha which was taken. They asked on 24th and the and the permission was refused.

Again the gentleman whom he quotes, who is a Minister in Uttar Pradesh, Shri Satya Dev Tripathi, he phoned to the authorities and said, 'You must do it.' 'The Chief Minister has prohibited this,' the authorities told him. 'The Chief Minister is not here.' He does not know about the meeting. He is away in Lahaul, Spiti. There is no communication there. He was infor-

med that Raj Narain Ji was coming but he was never told that there was an intention to hold a meeting.

Therefore, there was no question of his prohibiting anything on that particular occasion whereas he said C. M. had done this. Then again late at night he tells them, 'We are going to do it.' One of their workers says that 'we are going to disobey this prohibitory order. We are going to held a meeting. Even if bullets fly we do not mind. We are going to take those bullets.'

Now, is this all absence of knowledge of prohibitory orders? Then next morning arrangements were made by the very person who had asked for permission. He was told that 'you hold a meeting in the Ladies Park which is nearby, where generally such meetings are held and he said: 'Well, then, facilities should be given.' Government helped them in arranging for mike and everything else in Ladies Park because Shri Raj Narain Ji was going to address that meeting, a Cabinet Minister from here. Therefore, Government arranged all that in Ladies Park.

Now, does this show that there was no prohibitory order? Now, the question comes up whether Raj Narainji knew it or not. He himself has said in his statement here:

सभा की अनुमति वहाँ के संबंधित अधिकारियों ने नहीं दी थी, इस के आसार मुझे सभास्थल पर पहुंच जाने पर ही मालूम हुए।

Granting that he knew only when he went there but then if he had left the meeting I would have had no quarrel. I would not have held him responsible for breach of the order. He is a Cabinet Minister. On going there he knows this because people talk about it. They attacked Shanta Kumar. 'He did say that you should not raise slogans.' (Interruptions)

That is what I have said. The tape-recorded speech comes in because it

was a meeting which was illegal. And police certainly took the proceedings of the whole meeting. Therefore, he comes in not because he was a Minister; he was not sacred, if he broke that prohibitory order but he was treated as such because no action was taken by the police there to disperse the meeting, or to prosecute them only because of Raj Narainji was there. Therefore, to say that he did not know, even when the tape-recorded speech, copy of which I have sent to him—he has read out, parts of it or whole of it I do not know.....

श्री राज नारायण: आप को जो हम ने दिया है वही हम ने पढ़ा है।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : मैंने कब कहा नहीं।

I don't say 'no'; but he says, it is tampered with. Can there be any greater fantasy than that? How can his voice record be tampered? Did you oblige him by giving some fake things? How could this be done? How could the tape recording be fake?

श्री राज नारायण : शब्दों को हटाया जा सकता है, लाइन को हटाया जा सकता है।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : खट खट करके आपने पढ़ा है। वह तो आपके सामने लिया ही नहीं।

When meetings are held, when minutes are taken, by the time speeches are recorded, there are some parts always missing by the noise and therefore you put dots. But then, that also becomes a theatrical business. Well, it can be, because without that, there is nothing! But this is not the way. But if at all he did say, this is what he himself has said:

क्या आपने मौलिक अधिकारों को आप छीनने दोगे यह बात आपको समझनी है। मौलिक

। [श्री मोरारजी देसाई]

अधिकार आज सरकार छीने तो आप चुप रहोगे । आज जो यहां शासन की कार्यवाही हुई है आप इसको पसन्द करते हो या निन्दा करते हो । मंच से माईक छीनना ये जमूरियत और उसूल के खिलाफ है, इसकी निन्दा होगी या नहीं ? जो निन्दा करते हैं वो हाथ उठाएँ ।

इससे ज्यादा टीका क्या करनी थी उस चीफ मिनिस्टर की ? यह टीका नहीं तो क्या है ? निन्दा करो, हाथ उठाओ इसका क्या मतलब होता है । क्या गालियां दी जायें तो ही निन्दा होती है ? नहीं दी मैं कबूल करता हूँ । मैं मानता हूँ गालियां नहीं दूँगे ।

The fact is that he has admitted all that. What does that show? And, it is all a trumped up story that the mike was taken away by the Police. No mike was put there by anybody. If the mike is taken away and if that is what they say, does he not know then that the meeting was not allowed? And if a meeting was not allowed, why should he remain there? Why should he address it?

And if he addresses it, he forgets that he was a Cabinet Minister and not a political worker at that time. If he had been only a political worker and done this, I would not have quarrelled with him. He has a right *Satyagraha*. But if a Cabinet Minister sets this example there, how can a Government be carried on?

If I go to some State and there is a prohibition of a meeting and if I break it, would I deserve to be a Prime Minister or a Minister here? (Interruptions) I am coming to it. I am not missing it. Now the question is how was the meeting of Vajpayee allowed? I was also allowed. But they were both Government meetings. This is forgotten. Then comes a poster which is shown here. That also can be easily explained. When I went there, Raj Narain ji

also was with me. Both of us addressed the meeting on the Ridge. But it was a Government function for the Prime Minister and when Vajpayee went, that was also a Government function held by Government. Therefore the meeting was allowed.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What was the Government occasion for that? How can you call it an official function? What was the Government occasion?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That, I will let you know. That very much applies to you.

श्री राज नारायण : नोटिस का, पोस्टर का, माइक का पैसा पार्टी ने दिया ।

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: In several States I have found the practice that when Government holds a meeting for me, the party also issues posters to see that the meeting is attended by many people and that is why this was done. There is no other reason for it.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order now.

श्री राज नारायण : हम को अधिकार है कि आपकी असत्य जो बात है उसकी असत्यता को प्रमाणित करें ।

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: My friends may shout.

श्री राज नारायण : आपके भाषण में असत्य ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : आप ही तो सत्यवादी हैं । यह कैसा सत्य है ?

That is not right. That is not true. I did not interrupt my friend. Now, what is he worried about and

want to interrupt me when I am making a statement? He goes on doing it. (Interruptions) I don't want to call anybody any names. He has a right to say; perhaps he thinks he has a right to call others liars. I do not want to say anything.

श्री राज नारायण : हमने आपको लायर नहीं कहा। आपके भाषण में असत्य था।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : भाषण में असत्य है, तो मैंने ही कहा होगा, दूसरा किसने कहा ?

There cannot be any 'lie' in this and lungs are no proof of the truth of any fact. That must also be understood. Loud vehemence and loud retorts do not establish that right is on their side. Therefore, let it be considered coolly. I had to do it because if a Cabinet Minister behaved in this manner in public, even supposing he considered a prohibitory order to be wrong, a Cabinet Minister must not flout it. I have no doubt about it in my mind.

श्री मंत्री राम बागड़ी : आपने खुद कहा है..... (व्यवधान)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: And this is how you observe discipline and this is the demonstration of it. I have nothing further to say.

14.30 hrs.

#### DELHI POLICE BILL—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the House will take up the following motion moved by Shri S. D. Patil on the 23rd August, 1978, namely:—

"That the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the regulation of the police in the Union Territory of Delhi, as amended, be passed."

Yesterday, this Bill could not be passed. Now, let the lobbies be cleared.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the regulation of the police in the Union Territory of Delhi, as amended, be passed".

*The motion was adopted..*

14.30 hrs.

#### MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Rameshwar Patidar.

[SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN in the Chair]

(i) REPORTED DISCONTENTMENT AMONG THE PEOPLE OF MADHYA PRABESH OVER NARMADA TRIBUNAL AWARD.

श्री रामेश्वर पाटीदार (खरगोन) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान ऐसे सार्वजनिक महत्व के विषय की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ जिसके कारण मध्य प्रदेश में असन्तोष एवं काफी रोष है। मध्य प्रदेश के धार खरगोन इलाके में नर्मदा प्राधिकरण द्वारा जो फैसला दिया गया है, उसमें मध्य प्रदेश के हितों को ध्यान में नहीं रखा गया है और न ही म० प्र० की सिचाई एवं पानी की आवश्यकता पर ही उचित ध्यान दिया गया है। 76 लाख एकड़ नर्मदा कछार की भूमि में मध्य प्रदेश सिचाई करना चाहता है। ट्रिब्यूनल द्वारा नियुक्त कृषि विशेषज्ञ डा० अम्बिका सिंह ने मध्य प्रदेश को 20 एम० ए० एक० पानी देने की सिफारिश की थी, जिसे ट्रिब्यूनल ने भुला दिया है। गुजरात को अर्वाइड द्वारा जो आई० एम० ए० एक० पानी एलाट किया गया है, उतना पानी काफी कम उंचे नवागाम बांध से भी गुजरात को मिल सकता था।