

by D.P.M.

12.33½ hrs.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER**

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, while replying to the debate yesterday on the Motion regarding disapproval of the conduct of the Prime Minister and myself, Shri Madhu Limaye waved a letter purporting to establish that there had been inconsistencies in my statements concerning the role of Shri Kantilal Desai, for my secretarial work. I would have explained this yesterday, but before saying anything categorically, I wanted to go through office copies of letters written by my son and satisfy myself that he had not written anything which was not in connection with my engagements or public relations work.

The letter in question is a letter in Hindi on the subject of appointment with the heading :

“उप प्रधान मंत्री भवन, 5, डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद रोड”

with a letter No. 842-PSF/68/H dated 4th March, 1968 and signed Kantibhai.

This particular letter and several dozen letters which I have been able to examine in the short interval have not been signed by him using the designation of my Private Secretary. The members of my official personal staff use the designation of Special Assistants, Private Secretary and Additional Private Secretary or Personal Assistant on the top of the letter-head. No such designation has been used by my son either in this letter or in any of the communications I have come across. All that has been mentioned in them is the address of my residence, with an Issue number subsequently put down by the despatcher. All letters issued from my residence or office must necessarily carry a letter number for purposes of reference and record. The record is a running series of all letters issued

on my behalf. The replies are sent in the light of my instructions on the correspondence. There is a separate register and record of letters issued by me personally. In order to deal with the issue of inconsistency in my statements on the subject, let me quote what has been stated on different occasions. In my extempore statement on 30th April 1968, I said as follows :—

“I could not afford in those days any other Private Secretary and he was good enough to come and serve me as my private secretary and from that time on he has continued to serve me as my private secretary, even today, but he is not borne on Government establishment. He is not paid by Government anything for that matter.

“He, therefore, accompanied me in September-October when I had gone out for more than a month, because many friends said that I should be accompanied by him as my personal, private secretary to look after me.”

In my statement on July 24 I had said as follows :—

“I had drawn distinction between the role of my son as my private Secretary when I was out of office and as my personal private secretary when he accompanied me on one or two official tours. No part of the cost was met by Government, nor had my son access to official records.”

In the reply to the question of Shri Rabi Ray on the 12th August 1968, which Shri Madhu Limaye read out yesterday, the answer was :

“Shri Kantilal Desai has not been appointed as Private Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister. He has, however, been assisting him in his non-official work.”

Shri Limaye and the entire House know that Shri Kantilal Desai has not been appointed as my Private Secretary after I came to hold office. The ques-

[Shri Morarji Desai]

tion of any formal appointment prior to my coming into office obviously does not arise.

As regards his role, the statements have been consistent in that he had been assisting me in my non-official work, that is, social engagements, appointments for interview, and public relations work. He has had no authority to go beyond these spheres.

May I add that, if it is the sense of the House that he should not sign even letters for giving appointments for interviews, I shall stop the practice.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): Yes; that is right.

श्री मधु लिमये : : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मैं आपका ध्यान रूल (व्यवधान) अब तारकेश्वरी जी, आप जरा पांच सात दिन चुप बैठेंगी तो आपको भी सहूलियत होगी और सदन को भी।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) : आप भी चुप बैठिए। दूसरों को सबक सिखाने के पहले अपने उस पर अमल करिए।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं तो नियम के अनुसार व्यवस्था के प्रश्न पर खड़ा हूँ। मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने का नियम 378 में अधिकार है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह इन्होंने जो व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण का बयान दिया है और जिसकी कि आप ने इजाजत दी, मुझे पता नहीं, यह पहले आप ने बयान देखा था या नहीं। लेकिन जहाँ तक मैं देख पाया हूँ यह अभी-अभी इनके द्वारा पढ़ने के दो चार मिनट पहले आप के पास आया है, शायद सोचने का भी आपको मौका न मिला हो। प्रक्रिया यह होनी चाहिये कि व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण वाले बयान स्पीकर के पास बहुत पहले पहुँचने चाहिए; ताकि अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप

फैसला कर सकें कि यह बयान नियम के अनुसार है या नहीं। अब नियम क्या है यह देखिए। नियम 357—परसनल एक्सप्लेनेशन। यह परसनल एक्सप्लेनेशन में है ऐसा मैं समझ कर चलता हूँ। अगर मेरी गलती है तो आप सुधारियेगा।

"A member may, with the permission of the Speaker, make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House, but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward, and no debate shall arise."

अब मैं यह साफ करना चाहता हूँ कि इन्होंने जो बयान दिया है यह बिलकुल विवादग्रस्त है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, रवी राय

MR. SPEAKER: That is your contention. No more speech is necessary for that.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो स्पष्टीकरण में बाद में हूँ ?

MR. SPEAKER: No question of "Baad".

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आपको लिख भी सकता हूँ, अगर आपकी वैसी इच्छा हो।

MR. SPEAKER: No question of writing. You think it is debatable.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह मैं बाद में बताऊंगा कि डिबेटेबल है या नहीं? . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV (Bara-mati) rose—

SHRI RANDHAWR SINGH (Rohtak) rose—

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) rose—

MR. SPEAKER: Will all of you please sit down? The concerned two persons are here. Why do you want to complicate it? Please sit down. (Interruption).

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): I really fail to understand this. If a procedural matter is

raised, why should the members get exercised and rise like this ?

MR. SPEAKER : Now, it is a simple matter. Yesterday....

SHRI P. G. SEN (Purnea) : On a point of order....

MR. SPEAKER : Is it a point of order against my standing ? Will he kindly sit down ?

SHRI P. G. SEN : Before this is taken up....

MR. SPEAKER : Will he first sit down ? When the Speaker is on his legs, no other Member should get up. Later on, after I sit down, he may also shout along with others, and I would have no objection because I cannot control him also. But at least he should observe this rule that when the Speaker is on his legs, he should not get up and speak. Let him hear me for at least two minutes before he says anything.

Yesterday, toward the fag end of his speech, Shri Madhu Limaye waved a letter....

SHRI P. G. SEN : That is my point of order....

MR. SPEAKER : I am getting a terrible headache. I do not think that I would last long at this rate. The point is that Shri Madhu Limaye waved a letter and began reading something from it yesterday. I did not know anything; naturally, in the course of his speech he read out some letter written by Shri Kantilal Desai, and it was passed on to Shri Morarji Desai straight. Naturally, Shri Morarji Desai could not reply on the spot without verifying. Therefore, after verifying and studying, he had sent me a copy of a statement which he has made now.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा इस पर आक्षेप है, हम लोगों को दो-तीन दिन पहले भेजना पड़ता है, लेकिन इन्होंने अभी भेज दिया है ।

MR. SPEAKER : During the Question Hour.

L4ILSS/68-9

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन हमको दो-तीन दिन पहले भेजना पड़ता है... (व्यवधान)...

MR. SPEAKER : Will the hon. Member sit down ? (Interruptions.) I am trying to give the answer. Why should other hon. Members try to answer on behalf of the Speaker ? Can I not answer it ?

My point is that before it was included in the agenda it was sent to me. It is not as though after I had included it he had sent it to me; it is only after he had sent it to me that I had included it in the agenda. After going through it during the Question Hour. I got it included in the agenda, and it has been included here. So, how can Shri Madhu Limaye say that it was included before ?

श्री मधु लिमये : यह डिबेटेबल है या नहीं, यही मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER : On my action there can be no questioning. I have included it in the agenda. It was only after that that I permitted him to read it. I wonder where there is any question of a point of order. There is absolutely no offence involved in it.....

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं साबित करूंगा कि यह डिबेटेबल है.....

MR. SPEAKER : Later on, he may complain. But I have found that there is nothing debatable, and therefore, I have allowed him. Now, let us go on to the next item.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : Mr. Speaker, Sir. ON A personal explanation....

MR. SPEAKER : Will the hon. Member kindly sit down ? Shri Morarji Desai.