

**SHRI C. M. POONACHA :** That will create so much of inter-sectional friction. Already, there is clash of interests. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend is the president of the Firemen's council....

**AN HON. MEMBER :** No, he is not.

**SHRI C. M. POONACHA :** There is also the drivers' council.

The drivers feel that the firemen have not been taking orders from them. There is thus no co-ordination between them. There is an element of friction between them. That is being fomented by certain people and that affects the operation of the railways, but the blame is being put on the railways. This is a very strange type of logic. Therefore, I cannot accept the contention of my hon. friend.

There will have to be a stage when we might perhaps have to think of having a single union in order to see that the railwaymen's interests are safeguarded fully according to the rules and procedures and the law of the land. Then only we shall be able to ensure the smooth and efficient working of the railways. Fomenting sectional unions may be a matter of interest for a particular Member or a particular group of persons. But speaking in the interests of smooth working of the railways, I would plead with the hon. Members of the House that it is high time that we gave serious thought to the interest of labour and the interest of the organisation and we facilitated the formation of a single labour union so that the interests of the workmen could be safeguarded and the working of the railways could be ensured on a proper footing. With these words, I commend the Demands for the acceptance of the House.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I shall now put the cut motions to vote.

*All the cut motions were put and negatived.*

**MR. SPEAKER :** The question is :

"That the respective Supplementary sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the order paper be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course

of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1969, in respect of the following Demands entered in the second column thereof, viz. Demands Nos. 2 and 15."

*The motion was adopted.*

15 Hrs.

**MOTION RE. STATEMENTS OF DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER ON HIS SON'S BUSINESS CONNECTIONS**

**MR. SPEAKER :** We will now take up the Motion tabled by Shri Madhu Limaye.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) :** Before you call upon Shri Limaye, may I point out that there is a half-hour discussion scheduled for to-day in my name? I wonder if it would be possible to have it taken up on the 23rd, if convenient to you, instead of today.

**MR. SPEAKER :** We will postpone it today and have it taken up some other day.

**श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय आपकी इजाजत से मैं निम्न प्रस्ताव आप की और सदन की खिदमत में पेश करना चाहता कि :

"इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री तथा वित्त मंत्री ने अपने पुत्र/निजी सचिव के व्यापारिक सम्बन्धों के बारे में न केवल एक बार बल्कि दो बार 30 अप्रैल, और 24 जुलाई, 1968 को सभा में मिथ्या वक्तव्य दिए और इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखते हुए कि प्रधान मंत्री ने उन्हें त्याग-पत्र देने को नहीं कहा, यह सभा एतद्द्वारा उप-प्रधान मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री के आचरण का निरनुमोदन करती है।"

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज की बहस में व्यक्तिगत द्वेष, ईर्ष्या और बदले की भावना बिलकुल नहीं है।..... (व्यवधान)..... नहीं है, नहीं है। सवाल है सिद्धांतों की रक्षा का, आदर्शों की प्रतिष्ठापना.....

**SHRI RANE (Buldana) :** I rise to raise points of order on the Motion just moved by Shri Limaye.

AN HON. MEMBER: Under what rule?

SHRI RANE: I am quoting the rule..

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: He can do so after Shri Limaye has made his submissions and you have placed the Motion before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Probably for his moving the Motion itself he is taking objection. Let us hear him.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): There can be only one point of order at a time, not points of order.

SHRI RANE: My submission is that under article 75(2) and (3) of the Constitution, this motion cannot be taken up. Secondly, a Motion cannot be admitted as long as there is no specific rule to that effect, and without a prescribed form. Even under existing rule 186, it is barred. The next objection is to its form and wording. I submit that the form of the Motion moved by Shri Limaye is contrary to our usual practices and conventions. You have admitted this Motion under rule 189. Till 12th August, about 139 Motions have been admitted by you. If you look to the form and wording of this Motion, it is contrary to those practices and conventions.

Before elaborating my points of order, I want to make some general observations.

Sir, your decision to admit and fix a date for the discussion of this Motion is, in my humble opinion, of far-reaching consequences for the future. It will affect not only the working of this House but the working of State Legislatures. It will also affect perhaps about 500-700 Ministers, individual Ministers in this country.

AN HON. MEMBER: And their sons also.

SHRI RANE: Therefore, I appeal to you, to the whole House and to Government also to give very careful consideration to this question.

AN HON. MEMBER: That has been given.

SHRI RANE: I submit in all humility that perhaps when you admitted it and the Government gave their consent to it, the

consequences of this for the future were not fully realised.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli): We do not want Government's consent.

SHRI RANE: From the constitutional point of view, the motion is contrary to the provisions of article 75, clause (2) of which says:

"The ministers shall hold office during the pleasure of the President",

while clause (3) says:

"The Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the House of the People"

Looking at the substance of the motion of Mr. Limaye, I submit that it is nothing but a backdoor motion of no-confidence, as in that motion he has tried to spot out the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister and he wants that the House should express its disapproval of their conduct. My submission is that under our Constitution, no individual Minister can be held responsible to the House.

In this connection, I also draw your attention to the Commentary of Mr. Basu on article 75. I shall only refer to page 456 (1965 edition) where he says that there is no provision in our Constitution for the individual responsibility of the Ministers to Parliament and that in conformity with article 75 of the Constitution and Rule 198 of the Rules of Procedure, it is a collective responsibility. At the same time he points out that in England individual Ministers are responsible to the House of Commons. So, here, in view of the specific provision of the Constitution, I submit that there is no provision under which the conduct of an individual Minister or Ministers can be questioned by a motion.

Sir, I do not know how you have categorised this motion, as a censure motion or a no-confidence motion. Even if you have categorised it as a censure motion, I like to draw your attention to page 303 of *May's Parliamentary Practice*, 1964 edition, where it says that a motion of lack of confidence in the Government is called a vote of censure. So, even if you have categorised it as a censure motion, it can only be taken as a motion of no-confidence. So, even if you have categorised

it as a censure motion, it must fulfil all the requirements and formalities laid down in Rule 198. Under Rule 198, if you find that a motion is in order, it must be put to the House for leave and if more than 50 persons rise in their seats, then only it can be admitted. So, my submission is that for this motion this formality has not been observed, and therefore it is not admissible.

My additional point is this. My submission is that you have admitted this motion under rule 189. When you categorise a motion as no-day-yet-named motion, Rule 198 casts obligation on you to circulate it to the Members. But the substantive rule is 186. I object to this motion being moved and I base my objection on rule 186(4) and (6). Sub-rule (4) says that it shall be restricted to a matter of recent occurrence. Even the wording of the motion says that it relates to a statement on the 30th April and 24th July. By no stretch of imagination can it be said that it is a recent occurrence. Again, sub-rule 6 says that it shall not revive discussion of a matter which has been discussed. You know and the whole House knows that a discussion had taken place on 24th July. Mr. Madhu Limaye raised on 24th July privilege motion and wanted it to go to the Privileges Committee. On the 24th July everything was discussed. There is nothing new that will be discussed by this motion. He categorised the statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister as misleading. I do not know what Hindi word he has used now. Not only that. In his speech he demanded the resignation of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister replied at great length and said : 'I am not going to oblige Mr. Madhu Limaye by resigning on his asking. But if the Prime Minister wants me to do so, I shall do so'.

MR. SPEAKER : You are going into details now; they have been discussed already.

SHRI RANE : My submission is that all these points had been discussed then. There is nothing new. This motion cannot be called a new motion by any stretch of imagination.

As regards the form, I should request you to refer to rules 60 and 61 which pres-

cribe the form in which adjournment motions should be moved. Then there are rules which say clearly that it should be couched in decent language. This is an important motion no doubt. I also draw your attention to Rule 209 which lays down the procedure with regard to cut motions expressing disapproval of policy. There should also be a prescribed form for such motion as that of Shri Limaye. My submission is that this motion does not conform to any of the forms of motions prescribed by our rules and hence on this ground also, this cannot be admitted.

Sir, of course, I have no objection to discuss this matter because I have learnt that the Government is keen that the matter should be discussed. But my point is that as long as this motion is not amended to conform to prescribed forms of no-day-yet-named motions, it cannot be discussed in this House in the present form and wording. That is my submission.

MR. SPEAKER : All these aspects had been considered. It is not as though I just agreed to that. We went into the rules. It is not a no-confidence motion where I should put it to the House and ask fifty Members to rise in their seats. Here is a censure motion. The Speaker may naturally admit it. But Government must find time. The Leader of the House has to find time for discussion of this motion. Call it no-day-yet-named motion or whatever it is. Under rules 184 and 185 there are a number of opportunities for the Speaker to admit a motion. But time can only be fixed by the Leader of the House and the Government. In the case of a no-confidence motion, the Speaker has got full power and immediately he puts it to the House and fifty persons get up and then it is discussed. But this is a censure motion which has been admitted and time is found only by the Leader of the House and the Government. Naturally, I secured the consent of the Leader of the House, and she has agreed also for this being discussed on a particular date and at a particular time. After all, when it is discussed not only here in the House but outside also, in the press, it is good that it is thrashed out on the floor of the House and an opportunity is given to hon. Members on both sides of the House to

speak about it, instead of every day,—  
(*Interruption*)

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central): Article 75 must also be taken into consideration because he has raised a very valid point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I am on my legs. They are valid: whether the motion that is admitted is valid or not. Naturally, it is not a no-confidence motion, as I said earlier, where I should put to the House and then secure permission. It is a censure motion which has been admitted, and the Government also has found time. There is nothing illegal in this. Government can certainly take courage in both hands and say, "No, we want to discuss this matter here." And it is good for the House also to discuss it, instead of some hush-hush or some news coming up every day which is neither desirable nor good for democracy and the country. It gives an opportunity for Morarjibhai and others also to make a reply. Therefore, let us proceed with this.

I would appeal to Members on both sides of the House to raise it to a level where we shall discuss it without excitement and without hitting below the belt, either this side or that side. Mr. Madhu Limaye.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbili): Sir, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it a point of order? I do not want any assistance. I have given my ruling.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO: Just one word. (*Interruption*)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Let me hear him; let us see what his point is.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO: We are all interested in knowing the facts; I have nothing against that aspect of the matter. But the mischief has been manoeuvred so that the name of the Prime Minister could also be brought in, in this particular context. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. It is over. I have given my ruling. There is no point of order. Shri Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जैसाकि मैंने प्रारम्भ में ही कहा था—आज की बहस में व्यक्तिगत द्वेष, ईर्ष्या और बदले की भावना का सवाल नहीं है.....

(व्यवधान).....सवाल है सिद्धान्तों की रक्षा का, आदर्शों की प्रतिष्ठापना का, और स्वस्थ लोकतान्त्रिक परम्पराओं के निर्माण का । इस का फैसला, अध्यक्ष महोदय, सिर्फा संख्याबल से यहां पर नहीं होगा, अन्तिम फैसला तो जनता की अदालत में ही होगा । अगर उप-प्रधान मंत्री आज इस्तीफा देंगे तो जीत मेरी नहीं होगी, जीत होगी नैतिकता की, इस सभा की, लोकतन्त्र की और स्वयं श्री मोरारजी देसाई की । इसलिये आज की बहस में हमें न गाली-गलौज करनी चाहिये, न व्यक्तिगत आरोप-प्रत्यारोप करने चाहिये । जब उप-प्रधान मंत्री जी से मैं इस्तीफे की मांग करता हूं, तब मेरा यह मतलब नहीं है कि वह बेइमान हैं या देशद्रोही हैं या व्यक्तिगत रूप से रिश्तखोर हैं । मैंने हमेशा श्री मोरारजी देसाई का आदर किया है, आज भी रुपये पैसे के मामले में उनकी नीयत पर मैं शक नहीं कर रहा हूं, लेकिन अफसोस के साथ आज मुझे कहना पड़ रहा है कि असत्य बात करने के वे अपराधी हैं और अपनी भूल गलती और अपराध को छुपाने के लिये वे लगातार असत्य भाषण करते चले जा रहे हैं ।

इस वक्त हमारे सामने सिर्फ तीन सवाल हैं—पहला—उप-प्रधान मंत्री के द्वारा सदन को बार-बार जानबूझ कर गुमराह किया जाना, दूसरा—उप-प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा पद ग्रहण के पश्चात् भी अपने लड़के को प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी बनाये रखने का औचित्य और तीसरा—मंत्रियों के नजदीकी रिश्तेदारों का उन के नाम का इस्तेमाल कर सम्पत्ति इकट्ठा करने का प्रयास—ये तीन सवाल हैं । आपको याद होगा 30 अप्रैल को उप-प्रधान मंत्री जी ने तीन-चार बार सदन को कहा था कि उन के लड़के ने सारे कारोबारों

## [श्री मधु लिमये]

और व्यापारी रिश्ते छोड़ दिये हैं। आज से नहीं, 1964 से और साथ ही दो दफा उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि उस वक्त से वह प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी के नाते मेरी सेवा कर रहे हैं। 24 जुलाई, को मैंने उनके इस असत्य वक्तव्य पर एतराज किया था।

अपनी बात के समर्थन में मैंने कुछ दस्तावेजी सबूत पेश किए थे, खास तौर से 8 जुलाई, 1965 की डोडसल प्राइवेट लिमिटेड और उप-प्रधान मंत्री के पुत्र तथा प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी, श्री कांति देसाई के बीच हुआ समझौता, जिसमें श्री कांति देसाई को रु० 2050-00 का मासिक मेहनताना देना तय हुआ था। मैंने यह कहा था कि वह समझौता उस कम्पनी में उनके लड़के की लगातार चल रही नौकरी और कम्पनी के साथ उनके व्यावसायिक सम्बन्ध का सबूत है।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने अपने उत्तर में यह दावा किया था कि उस समझौते में कुछ भुगतानों का जिक्र है; और यद्यपि यह भुगतान दिसम्बर, 1960 के समझौते के अन्तर्गत उनके पुत्र को मिली अधिकतम तनखाह के बराबर हैं, पर ये भुगतान उनके लड़के द्वारा पहले की गई सेवाओं के बदले में मिलने वाले सेवान्त लाभ के तौर पर, टर्मिनल बेनिफिट की तौर है और वह किसी तरह की नौकरी या व्यावसायिक सम्बन्ध की निशानी नहीं है। उन्होंने कहा था जैसा कि समझौते में बताया गया है, टर्मिनल बेनिफिट का भुगतान उनके लड़के द्वारा पहले की गई बहुमूल्य सेवाओं के लिए है। यह एक तरह का व्यावसायिक मूल्यांकन है, जिसका वह फर्म ही फैसला कर सकती है और माननीय सदन मुझ से यह अपेक्षा नहीं करेगा कि मैं इसके और इस तरह के दूसरे व्यापारिक मामलों की तफसील में जाऊं।

मैंने यह मांग की थी कि यह मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति को भेजा जाये और

समिति श्री कांति देसाई और डोडसल प्राइवेट लिमिटेड आदि के बीच हुए सौदे की जांच करे और सच्चाई का पता लगाए। उप-प्रधान मंत्री के लिए, जिन पर इस मामले में आरोप था, यह बिल्कुल मुनाबिस नहीं था कि वे दस्तावेजों की व्याख्या करने का काम खुद अपने हाथ में ले लेते। आपने अन्त में यह कहा था कि इस मामले के तथ्यों पर विवाद नहीं है और न श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने ही दस्तावेजों की प्रमाणिकता को चुनौती दी है। इसलिए यह सिर्फ व्याख्या और भाष्य का मामला था। और इसका निर्णय प्रधान मंत्री को और सदन को करना होगा।

उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने यह दावा करते समय कि जून, 1964 के बाद उनके लड़के ने कम्पनी के लिए काम करना बन्द कर दिया, हमें यह नहीं बताया कि उनके लड़के ने 1960 का समझौता औपचारिक रूप से खत्म किया है और जून, 1964 और मार्च, 1965 के बीच भुगतान लेना भी बन्द कर दिया है।

किसी तरह के व्यावसायिक और व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध का अस्तित्व निश्चित करने के लिए इस बात का कोई महत्व नहीं है कि उन्होंने कम्पनी के लिए काम करना बन्द कर दिया। महत्व इस बात का है कि इस अवधि में उन्होंने कम्पनी से पैसा लिया या नहीं। अब मैं अपनी बात साबित करने के लिए सबूत पेश करूंगा।

मेरे द्वारा अंकित किये गये दस्तावेज 'अ' में 1 जनवरी, 1965 को डोडसल प्राइवेट लिमिटेड द्वारा व्यवस्थापकीय पदों पर नियुक्त कर्मचारियों की सूची है और इस दस्तावेज में श्री कांति देसाई का पांचवां नाम है। इससे यह साबित हो जायेगा कि श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने यह सूचित कर सदन को गुमराह किया है कि उनके लड़के जून, 1964 के बाद कम्पनी से अलग हो गए। तथ्य यह है कि उनके प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी बनने के बाद भी उनके लड़के ने न सिर्फ फर्म के

साथ अपना व्यावसायिक सम्बन्ध जारी रखा, बल्कि कम्पनी के लिए "काम करना बन्द कर देने" के बाद भी वह वही वेतन और वही कमीशन लेते रहे। इस से न सिर्फ यह पता चलता है कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने सच बात नहीं कही, बल्कि इससे यह भी साबित होता है कि उनके लड़के की तथाकथित बहुमूल्य सेवा असली अर्थ में सेवा नहीं थी, बल्कि उनके पिता की स्थिति और प्रभाव से ठेके और लाइसेन्स लेने के लिए दी गई रिश्वत या भुगतान था और वे कानूनी तौर पर कम्पनी के कर्मचारी बराबर बने रहे।

श्री कांति देसाई और डोडसल के बीच जून 1964 से मार्च 1965 तक व्यावसायिक सम्बन्धों के जारी रहने सम्बन्धी तथ्य के अलावा मैं ऐसे अकाट्य प्रमाण रखूंगा कि जो यह सिद्ध करेंगे कि उस बीच जबकि 1965 का समझौता लागू था, श्री कांति देसाई को जो पैसा मिल रहा था, वह पेंशन या टर्मिनल बेनिफिट जैसी कोई चीज नहीं बल्कि सेल्स डायरेक्टर के रूप में उन्हें मिलने वाली तनख्वाह थी। मैं यहां डोडसल कम्पनी के अधिकारियों द्वारा प्रस्तुत किये गये फार्म ग्यारह की प्रतिलिपि प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूं।

यह दस्तावेज न केवल "टर्मिनल बेनिफिट" की भ्रांति को तोड़ता है बल्कि डोडसल तथा श्री कांति देसाई के दरम्यान 1965-68 के बीच मालिक कर्मचारी के रिश्ते को भी सिद्ध करता है। पहले "व्यवस्थापकीय पदों का तफ्तीली" नामक फार्म ही लें। इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए कि श्री कांति देसाई कम्पनी के साधारण कर्मचारी नहीं थे, बल्कि ऊंचे तबके के अफसर थे। दूसरे उनका डायरेक्टर आफ सेल्स का पद। तीसरे यह कि इस फार्म में दी गई मासिक रकम जुलाई, 1965 से समझौते के मासिक भुगतान से मिलती है। साथ ही दो हजार पचास रुपए के इस कथित "टर्मिनल

बेनिफिट" के लिए "बेसिक सैलरी" शब्द ही काम में लिया गया है; न कि "टर्मिनल बेनिफिट" के लिए जैसा कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने दावा किया है। यह शब्द उप-प्रधान मंत्री अथवा उनके कानूनी सलाहकारों की खोज है। यह न तो करार में ही है और न ही मेरे द्वारा आपको दिए गए 'बी' और 'सी' फार्मों में ही। चौथी बात, कर्मचारी श्री कांति देसाई को बोनस का भी अधिकार था, जोकि समय-समय पर बोर्ड आफ डायरेक्टर्स द्वारा घोषित किया जाना था। पेंशन लेने वाले अथवा टर्मिनल बेनिफिट पाने वालों को बोनस के फायदे नहीं मिला करते, सिर्फ कर्मचारियों को ही बोनस मिला करता है।

इस प्रकार जून, 1964 से अप्रैल, 1965 तक श्री कांति देसाई नौकरी पर रहे और इस बीच उन्हें वही तनख्वाह और कमीशन मिलता रहा जो 1960 के समझौते में उन्हें दिया गया था। फिर अप्रैल, 1965 के बाद वह दो हजार पचास रुपए के वेतन पर डायरेक्टर आफ सेल्स के पद पर काम करते रहे।

इस प्रकार तथाकथित टर्मिनल बेनिफिट की बात कर श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने संसद् और भारत की जनता के साथ बहुत बड़ा धोखा किया है।

उप-प्रधान मन्त्री ने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि "कमीशन फीस का बन्द होना इस बात को सिद्ध करता है कि 1965-68 के बीच किसी व्यापार की आशा नहीं थी।" लेकिन कमीशन का न होना व्यावसायिक सम्बन्धों का न होना साबित नहीं करता। मालिक कर्मचारी के रिश्ते, बोर्ड आफ डायरेक्टर का सदस्य होना तथा और कई व्यावसायिक रिश्ते बिना कमीशन के भी हो सकते हैं। तीन दस्तावेजों में कई व्यावसायिक पदाधिकारियों के नाम हैं, जिनमें से केवल तीन को कमीशन दिया गया है जिनमें दो किला चन्द परिवार के हैं और

[श्री मधु लिमये]

तीसरे श्री कांति देसाई हैं। यह 1960 के समझौते के तहत है। इन दस्तावेजों के अनुसार औरों को कोई कमीशन नहीं मिला है। इसलिए सिर्फ कमीशन का न होना कुछ सिद्ध नहीं करता।

लेकिन जैसा कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री जी ने खुद कहा है कि कमीशन का लेना व्यावसायिक सम्बन्धों का एक प्रमाण हो सकता है। अतः उनके पुत्र द्वारा 9-10 महीना तनखाह के साथ कमीशन भी लेना उनके कथनानुसार यह सिद्ध करता है कि जून, 1964 से मार्च 1965 तक डोडसल फर्म के साथ उनका व्यावसायिक सम्बन्ध बना रहा।

डोडसल के अलावा कांति भाई के कम-से-कम उनके 5-6 रिश्ते हैं कि जिनके बारे में मुझे जानकारी थी और 29 जुलाई को ही मैंने उप-प्रधान मंत्री को उससे अवगत कराया था।

लेकिन उस के बाद भी उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने 2 अगस्त तक स्वयं पहल करके इस बारे में कोई निवेदन नहीं किया, न अपनी गलत बयानी पर खेद प्रकट किया। 24 जुलाई, को उन्होंने कहा था कि अगर मैं उन के पास जाता तो वे मुझे डोडसल करार की नकलें देते। अगर यही बात थी तो उन्होंने स्वेच्छा से डोडसल वाले तथ्य को 30 अप्रैल से 24 जुलाई तक स्वयं जनता के सामने क्यों नहीं रखा या उस तथ्य से मुझे अवगत क्यों नहीं कराया? नये दस्तावेजों के बारे में भी उन्होंने न हमें न स्पीकर साहब, आप को कोई जानकारी दी। जब हमने ये तीन नये फार्म, नये दस्तावेज आप के सामने पेश किये तब जाके उन की सत्यता को स्वीकारने के लिए वे मजबूर हुए हैं। आयकर विभाग उन के मंत्रालय के तहत आता है। इनकम-टैक्स कानून की 206 खण्ड के तहत हर कम्पनी को या संस्था को अपने ऐसे मुलाजिमों की फेहरिस्त, जो टैक्स देने वालों की श्रेणी में आते हैं, तथा उन के सम्बन्धी

सारा तफसील फार्म नम्बर 24 को भर कर प्रस्तुत करना पड़ता है। वे पता लगा सकते थे कि क्या 1964 से 1968 तक डोडसल कम्पनी के द्वारा कान्ति भाई के बारे में भी एक नौकर के नाते यह जानकारी उन के विभाग को दी जाती थी या नहीं? लेकिन इस की जांच कर उस सम्बन्ध में सारे तथ्य सदन के सामने रखने का उन्होंने कोई प्रयास नहीं किया। 1964 में कांतिलाल देसाई उनके सचिव बने। लेकिन अप्रैल, 1965 तक उन को तनखाह भी मिलती रही और कमीशन भी। उस के बाद तीन साल यानी 1968 तक उनको तनखाह और बोनस भी मिलता रहा। इस तरह उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन के सामने झूठ बातें कहीं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने 29 जुलाई के अपने पत्र में उन को जानकारी भी दी थी कि उनके बेटे और सचिव ठाकर्स कम्पनी से जुड़े हुए हैं। यह नई बात मैंने उनको बताई थी। बाद में हम लोगों ने सबाल किया तब उन्होंने कबूल किया कि हां, 31 जनवरी, 1967 तक वे उस कम्पनी के चेयरमैन रहे।

मेरा ख्याल है कि वह इस तथ्य को भी नहीं काटेंगे कि बाम्बे जनरल ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी के कान्ति भाई 1966 तक मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर रहे हैं। इस कम्पनी को बिड़ला आदि बड़े-बड़े पूँजीपतियों की एजेंसियाँ मिलती हैं और आज भी वे ही इस कम्पनी को अपनी पत्नी तथा लड़कों के नाम से चलाते हैं।

पी० एम० ट्रेडर्स के साथ भी मालिक के रूप में उनका नाता, रिश्ता रहा है। ट्रेड विंगज नाम की एक पर्यटन कम्पनी के वह अभी तक डायरेक्टर रहे हैं और विबग्यौर कम्पनी के साथ भी श्री मोरारजी देसाई के निजी सचिव बनने के बाद कई महीनों तक कान्तिभाई का सम्बन्ध ज्यों का त्यों बना रहा। बाम्बे इंडस्ट्रियल एण्ड केमिकल कम्पनी भी उन के और उनके साथी के कब्जे में रही, क्योंकि उस में हिस्सेदार दि बाम्बे जनरल ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी रही है जिसके कान्तिभाई अरसे तक मैनेजिंग

डायरेक्टर रहे हैं और वास्तविक दृष्टि से आज भी उसको चलाते हैं। बाम्बे इंडस्ट्रियल एंड केमिकल कम्पनी को बिड़ला गुट के सौराष्ट्र केमिकल्ज तथा केशोराम काटन मिल्स की एजेंसियों तथा कमीशन बराबर मिलता रहता है।

क्या इन सभी रिश्तों को, जिनका मैंने अभी जिक्र किया, उप-प्रधान मंत्री सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध कहेंगे ? क्या यह कलचरल रिलेशंस हैं ? क्या ये सभी व्यापारिक और कारोबार वाले रिश्ते नहीं हैं ? और भी इन के ऐसे बहुत सारे काम हैं और धन्य हैं कि जिनके बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा जा सकता है।

यहां यह जानना भी महत्वपूर्ण है कि श्री कान्ति देसाई की फर्म बम्बई जनरल ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी तथा डोडसल के बीच पहला एग्रीमेंट जिस वर्ष में यानी 1956 में हुआ था उस समय श्री मोरारजी देसाई बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री का महत्वपूर्ण पद संभाले हुए थे। उस के बाद केन्द्रीय सरकार में कामर्स और इन्डस्ट्री का महकमा उन के पास था। फिर जब 1960 में दूसरा करार हुआ तो वे केन्द्रीय वित्त मंत्री थे। इस प्रकार उनके मंत्री होने के कारण उन के बेटे को खुश करने की कोशिश पूंजीपति तथा कम्पनियां लगातार करती रहीं। यही नहीं, 1964 में व उसके बाद, जब वे सत्ता में नहीं थे, उन का गुजरात, उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकारों में तथा व्यापारिक क्षेत्रों में काफी प्रभाव था। मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूं कि स्वयं श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने पूंजीपतियों से अपने लड़के को एजेंसियां दिलवाई। उन के कहने की आवश्यकता ही नहीं थी। उनके कहे बिना, मैं मान लेता हूं कि बिड़ला, हड़ियां, किलाचंद आदि ने कान्ति देसाई को व्यापार में काफी सहायता दी। परन्तु इस बात पर कौन विश्वास करेगा कि ये सारी एजेंसियां, कमीशन, तनख्वाह, भत्ता आदि

इनको मुख्यतः इस बात के लिए नहीं मिलता रहा है कि वे वित्त मंत्री के नजदीक के रिश्तेदार हैं, बल्कि इसलिए कि वे बहुत काबिल शख्स हैं। वास्तव में उनका बेटा उनके ऊपर या उनके विभाग के ऊपर अपना प्रभाव डाल कर अनुचित काम करवाता है या नहीं, यह एक अलग बात है। मेरे लिए इतना काफी है कि हिन्दुस्तान के पैसे वाले लोग समझते हैं कि कान्ति को खुश करने से, उनको एजेंसी, कमीशन आदि देने से उन को व्यापारिक फायदा होगा। इसलिए श्री मोरारजी का यह कहना कि उनके पदों व प्रभाव से उनके पुत्र को कोई लाभ नहीं मिला है, हास्यास्पद है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर श्री मोरारजी देसाई कहेंगे कि बजट के बारे में, बैंक रेट के बारे में उन्होंने कोई बात उनके लड़के को या किसी शेयर बाजार में धंधा करने वाले दूसरे व्यक्ति को नहीं कही थी तो मैं विश्वास करने के लिए तैयार हूं। लेकिन बजट की चर्चा और बैंक रेट की चर्चा उन्होंने जिन इने-गिने अधिकारियों के साथ की थी क्या उनमें से किसी ने यह गुप्त बातें श्री कान्ति भाई को उनके पुत्र और सचिव होने के कारण नहीं कही होंगी ? अगर सरकार कोई निष्पक्ष कमेटी नियुक्त करे तो बम्बई के शेयर बाजार में धन्धा करने वाले जो तीन व्यापारी हैं उनके और कान्ति में क्या सम्बन्ध थे, उसका रहस्य खुला सकता है। वित्त मंत्री का यह निवेदन कि ये तीन कान्तिभाई के मित्र नहीं हैं, गलत है। मेरे कुछ मित्रों ने कहा है कि उनकी हिसाब-किताब की बहियों को देख कर वे सत्य खोज कर निकाल सकते हैं।

आज इस देश में चारों ओर भ्रष्टाचार फिजूलखर्ची और भाई-भतीजावाद का जो साम्राज्य फैला हुआ है, उसका सब से बड़ा कारण यह है कि स्वतन्त्रता



[श्री मधु लिमये]

के बाद मंत्रियों ने तथा नौकरशाही ने पूँजी और सम्पत्ति के साथ गठबंधन कर अपने रिश्तेदारों को आगे बढ़ाया या कम-से-कम उन के नाम का दुरुपयोग कर आगे बढ़ने पर रोक नहीं लगाई।

लेकिन मुझे कान्तिभाई के कारनामों में दिलचस्पी नहीं है, मुझे मतलब सिर्फ मोरारजी देसाई की गलत बयानी से है। मुझे आपत्ति इसलिए है कि उन्होंने अपने बेटे को अपना निजी सचिव बनाया। सत्य को छिपाने की तथा असत्य सूचित करने की उन की साजिश का एक नमूना और देखिये। जब उप-प्रधान मंत्री से पूछा गया कि आपने अपने बेटे को, निजी सचिव को इंटरनेशनल मोनोटरी फंड के सम्मेलन में भारतीय प्रतिनिधिमंडल में सलाहकार किस आधार पर बनाया और उन्हें भारतीय प्रतिनिधिमंडल के सलाहकार के रूप में क्यों भेजा तब उस का उन्होंने अजीबों गरीब जवाब दिया। मैं उनके जवाब से एक ही वाक्य पढ़ता हूँ। वे कहते हैं :

"Shri Kantilal Desai was given an Adviser's badge to permit his entry to the precincts of the Conference Hall and to enable him to attend social functions organised in connection with the meetings."

यह इंटरनेशनल मोनोटरी फंड के बारे में है।

"The description as an Adviser is a technicality for just this limited purpose."

इस तरह के गम्भीर मामलों को यह कह कर कि वह बिलकुल गम्भीर नहीं है या उनका कोई महत्व नहीं है और उन में महज टैक्निकैलिटी है ऐसा कह कर वह टालने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

इस प्रसंग में मैं इंग्लैंड के प्रोफ्यूमो केस की चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ जिसमें बरतानिया का संसदीय लोकतंत्र निखरा। उस समय के हाउस आफ कामन्स के प्रस्ताव को उसके

लम्बे इतिहास में एक गौरव का क्षण माना जाता है। प्रोफ्यूमो टोरी सरकार में युद्ध मंत्री थे। उन का लड़ाई का रेकार्ड बहुत अच्छा रहा था और वह ब्रिगेडियर के पद पर पहुंचे थे। जैसा कि डेनिंग ने कहा है उन की देशनिष्ठा संदेह के परे थी। फिर भी असत्य भाषण और औचित्य भंग को लेकर उन्हें मंत्रिमंडल से तथा कामन्स से त्यागपत्र देना पड़ा।

ब्रिटेन के मंत्रिपरषद् के सदस्य राम और सावित्री के अवतार नहीं थे और न हो प्रोफ्यूमो को एक लड़की से रिश्ता रखने के कारण हटना पड़ा। उन्होंने सदन के सामने गलतबयानी की, सदन को गुमराह किया सिर्फ इसीलिए उनको इस्तीफा देना पड़ा। उन के पत्र से यह बिलकुल साफ हो जाता है।

मैं पूरा नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ क्योंकि मुझे जल्दी खत्म करना है।

MR. SPEAKER : Conclude now.

SHRI P. G. SEN (Purnea) : Let him read the whole thing. Don't stop him. Otherwise, he will bring in another motion. (Interruptions)

श्री मधु लिमये : जरा शांति से सुनिये। यह प्रोफ्यूमो साहब का पत्र है प्रधान मंत्री के नाम से।

SHRI P. G. SEN : He is repeating the same thing.

श्री मधु लिमये : रिपोर्ट कहां कर रहा हूँ।

"Dear Prime Minister,

You will recollect that no 22nd March, following certain allegations made in Parliament, I made a personal statement. To my very deep regret, I have to admit that this was not true and I misled you and my colleagues of the House. I have come to realise that, by this deception, I have been guilty of a grave misdemeanour and, despite the

fact that there is no truth whatever in other charges.....

यानी सिक्थोरिटी वगैरह के बारे में । डेनिंग ने कहा कि देशभक्ति का भी सवाल नहीं है, सिर्फ गलतबयानी का सवाल है ।

"....I cannot remain a member of your Administration nor of the House. I cannot tell you of my deep remorse for the embarrassment I have caused to you, to my colleagues in the Government, to my constituents and to the party which I have served for the past 25 years."

यह सब आपको डेनिंग की रिपोर्ट 71-72 पृष्ठ पर मिलेगा ।

ब्रिटेन की संसदीय गरिमा का प्रमाण सिर्फ यह पत्र नहीं है बल्कि यह तथ्य भी कि इस गलतबयानी को लेकर टोरी सदन नेता श्री मैक्लोड ने स्वयम् कमान्स में उनके खिलाफ—यानी एक ही दल के सदन नेता ने अपने मंत्री के खिलाफ—सदन की अवहेलना का प्रस्ताव रक्खा था और उस को पारित किया गया था । श्री मैक्लोड के लम्बे भाषण का एक ही वाक्य पढ़ कर मैं आपको सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"Some people are surprised, perhaps, that the penalty for a lie should be as fierce as it is in this case. But no one who cares about the House of Commons can think this for a moment because the whole structure of our life together is built on the fact that although we do not trust each other's policy, we trust each other's words. Therefore, although this is, I admit, a savage blow to the Government and to the public life in this country, it is also, because of that very fact, a blow to the House of Commons too."

हम हमेशा ब्रिटेन की परम्पराओं की बात करते हैं, लेकिन इस उदाहरण को हम अपनी नजर के सामने रखें । भारत में लोग धर्म की, मर्यादा की, कर्तव्यपालन

की और आश्रम व्यवस्था की चर्चा तो खूब करते हैं, लेकिन जहां गद्दी और पदों का सवाल आता है, उन को छोड़ने के लिये बिल्कुल तैयार नहीं होते । आखिरकार, लोकतंत्र की प्रतिष्ठा के लिये, इस सदन की शान के लिये और लोकतंत्र की रक्षा के लिये उप-प्रधान मंत्री को चाहिये कि प्रोफ़्यूमो की तरह वे अपने पद से त्यागपत्र दें और इस सरकार में, नौकरशाही में और दूसरे क्षेत्रों में इससे भी अधिक खराब काम करने वाले जो लोग हैं उनको हटाने का रास्ता हमारे लिये खोल दें और उनके आदर्श पर चलने के लिए अपने उदाहरण से दूसरों को प्रेरणा दें ।

इस बहस में सवाल सिर्फ एक है और सीमित, कि क्या उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन को अपने लड़के तथा निजी सचिव के व्यापारी रिश्तों के बारे में गलत जानकारी दी या नहीं । क्या इस गलती को सुधारने का अवसर मिलने पर भी उस गलती को उन्होंने न सिर्फ नहीं सुधारा, बल्कि उस पर चादर डालने की कोशिश की । 12 अगस्त को आगे बढ़ कर उन्होंने तो इस बात से ही इन्कार किया है कि श्री कांतिलाल देसाई उनके प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी थे ।

क्या ऐसे वक्तव्यों से उप-प्रधान मंत्री की और विशेषतः इस सभा की प्रतिष्ठा को ठेस नहीं पहुंची है ? इसीलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे सिद्धान्तों के लिए तात्कालिकता से ऊंचे उठ कर लम्बान के लिये सोचें । जो लोग श्री मोरारजी देसाई से कुछ पाना चाहते हैं वही उन को यह सलाह दे सकते हैं कि एक असत्य को छिपाने के लिये अस्प असत्त्वों की पूरी मालिका ही में फंसें, लीपा-पोती करते जाओ, मगर हटो मत ।

लेकिन मैं अपने को उनका मित्र मानता हूँ, उन की इज्जत करता हूँ । मुझे उनसे कुछ लेना नहीं है, लेकिन मैं यह जरूर

(श्री मधु लिमये)

कहूंगा कि इस बात से मुझे बहुत तकलीफ है कि उन के जैसा आदमी आज गलतबयानी कर फिसल रहा है, और अपनी फिसलन से समूचे सार्वजनिक जीवन में हताशा और निराशा पैदा कर रहा है।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह उचित है कि जब मैंने सार्वजनिक हित में और सदन के अधिकारों और सदन की प्रक्रिया की पवित्रता की रक्षा करने के लिये इस मामले को उठाया तो, उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने निम्न स्तर पर उतर कर उल्टा मेरे बारे में विकृत मनोवृत्ति, रोगमन तथा बदले की भावना में प्रेरित होना आदि शब्दों का प्रयोग किया ?

इस लिये मेरी गुजारिश है कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री आदर्श के लिये इस्तीफा दें या पार्लियामेन्टरी कमेटी के सामने जायें, और आखिरी बात मैं प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में कहूंगा जो केवल प्रधान मंत्री नहीं हैं, इस सदन की नेता हैं, कि टोरी सदन नेता मैक्लोड की तरह दलीय स्वार्थों को त्याग कर, अपनी जिम्मेदारी को वे निभायें वना हमें इस प्रस्ताव पर वोट करवा कर अपने दायित्व को, अपने फर्ज को निभाना पड़ेगा।

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That this House, having regard to the fact that the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister has made false statements to the House not once but twice on the 30th April and the 24th July, 1968, concerning his son's/Private Secretary's business connection and also the fact that he has not been asked by the Prime Minister to resign, hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister."

Before I call somebody to speak, I would like to inform the House that the time allotted for this is three hours; of course, the time of three hours will be equally divided between the Opposition and the Congress—the Opposition will get half the time and the Congress Benches will get half the time. Natu-

rally, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister will take some time. The time for the various parties is : Swatantra 15 minutes; Jan Sangh 11 minutes; D. M. K. 9 minutes; Communist Party 8 minutes; Communist Party (Marxists) 7 minutes; S.S.P. of course, is over now, no more time for that; P.S.P. 5 minutes and Unattached 20 minutes.... (Interruption). This is the time to which they are legally entitled. Independents get 20 minutes; I can call about two members... (Interruptions.) May I appeal to the hon. members to keep quiet; shouting will not help me...

श्री मोलहू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : इस का टाइम एक घंटा बढ़ा दिया जाये।

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Molahu Prasad will please learn how to sit quietly; by shouting he is not contributing anything.

As I was saying, from Independents, I will call about two members; they have 20 minutes; if a dozen members want to speak, then it will be difficult; I can only call two or three members.

A suggestion is before me that Mr. Morarji Desai should reply immediately so that the hon. members on both the sides would be usefully participating in this debate. Therefore, I request Mr. Morarji Desai to speak.

Before he starts, there are some amendments given notice of by Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Jyotirmoy Basu, Shri Abdul Ghani Dar, Shri George Fernandes and Shri Shivajirao S. Deshmukh. Are they moving them ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I beg to move :

That in the motion,—

for "and also the fact that he has not been asked by the Prime Minister to resign, hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister"

Substitute—"resolves to appoint a Committee of eighteen Members of Lok Sabha, to be nominated by the Speaker, to investigate into the whole matter"(1)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : I beg to move :

That in the motion,—

(i) for "false statements" substitute—  
"false and misleading statements"

(ii) after "business connections" insert—

"and also his (son's) association with and access to Government documents and documents of an International Organisation on behalf of and in an advisory capacity of the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister"(2)

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR (Gurgaon) : I beg to move :

That in the motion,—

for "and also the fact that he has not been asked by the Prime Minister to resign, hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister"

substitute—

"resolves to refer the matter to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India for his opinion whether the Deputy Prime Minister's conduct is objectionable in the eyes of law"(3).

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Bombay South) : I beg to move :

That in the motion,—

for "hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister"

substitute—

"hereby resolves to appoint a committee of fifteen Members of Lok Sabha, to be nominated by the Speaker, to investigate into the whole matter; and to consider and report by the last day of the first week of the next session whether the statements and conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister were derogatory to the dignity of the House and inconsistent with the standards which Parliament is entitled to expect from the Members and especially from a Minister of the Government; and

further resolves that the Committee shall have power to hear and/or receive evidence, oral or documentary, connected with the matters referred to the

Committee or relevant to the subject matter of the enquiry and that it shall be in the discretion of the Committee to treat any evidence tendered before it as secret or confidential, and that the Committee shall have power to hear and/or to receive evidence, oral or documentary, in Bombay and/or any other place in India as the Speaker may decide."(4)

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani) : I beg to move

\*\*

That in the motion,—

(i) for "false" substitute—

"frank and forth-right"

(ii) after "Secretary's" insert—

"alleged"

(iii) for "and also the fact that he has not been asked by the Prime Minister to resign, hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister"

substitute—

"and while approving the said statements is of the firm opinion that there is nothing in the said statements which would depart even slightly from the high standards of public behaviour and national or international precedent"(5)

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डेस : (बम्बई दक्षिण) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस तरमीम पर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है और उसको आप सुनिये । अगर आप रूल 344(2) को पढ़ेंगे तो उसमें यह लिखा हुआ है कि :

"An amendment shall not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote".

आप मधु लिमये जी का प्रस्ताव पढ़ चुके हैं । मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ । लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्री देशमुख की जो तरमीम है उसको आप जरा गौर से देखें । श्री मधु लिमये ने कहा है कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने गलत बयानी की है, फाल्स स्टेटमेंट किया है जबकि श्री देशमुख का कहना है कि उनकी जो गलत बयानी की है वह

"frank and forthright"

\*\*Disallowed—Vide Speakers' ruling, Col. 2825.

## [श्री आर्जुन करनजीजी]

बयानी है। बिल्कुल ही उलटा अर्थ देने वाला उनका यह संशोधन है।

जो मधु लिमये जी के प्रस्ताव का आखिरी हिस्सा है, आप्रेटिव पार्ट है, उसको आप देखें। उसमें कहा गया है :

'and also the fact that he has not been asked by the Prime Minister to resign, hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister'

यह जो आप्रेटिव पार्ट है उसके बारे में श्री देशमुख का कहना है कि :

'and while approving the said statements ....

उन्होंने प्रोफ्यूमो को एड करके इंटरनेशनल प्रेसीडेंट भी लिखा है।

'is of the firm opinion that there is nothing in the said statements which would depart even slightly from the high standards of public behaviour and national or international precedent'

आप नियम 344(2) को देखें :

"An amendment shall not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote".

इस एमेंडमेंट के द्वारा माननीय मधु लिमये का जो प्रस्ताव है उस प्रस्ताव को बिल्कुल नवशा करने जैसी बात सदन के सामने आ जाती है। इसलिये मेरा आप्रह है कि इस नियम के अनुसार एक एमेंडमेंट को आप यहां पेश करने की इजाजत न दें।

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH : I am grateful to my hon. friend, Shri George Fernandes, who has described my amendment as negative. I will plead with you to be kind enough to understand what exactly he means by 'negative amendment'.

AN HON. MEMBER : Negative vote.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH : My hon. friend, Shri Fernandes, like feminine behaviour, would not indicate that he means 'no' when he says 'yes' and means 'yes' when he says 'no'. Shri Madhu Limaye's Motion, as it stands, is negative

and he has characterised the Finance Minister's statement as 'false' and, therefore, says that the House should 'disapprove' of the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister. My amendment tries to make it positive. I hope my hon. friend now understands the difference between negative and positive and will agree to accept what is positive.

MR. SPEAKER : The Law Minister.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : On a point of order. I want to give you an instance.

MR. SPEAKER : I have called the Law Minister.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Why do you allow the Minister to speak now ?

THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI GOVINDA MENON) : We are discussing a Motion under rule 184, that is, on a matter of public importance. If you look to the previous precedents, you will see that a certain matter of public importance is stated and then the House takes a stand, whether it approves of a certain procedure or disapproves of it. Here under 184, you have allowed a discussion of what the Deputy Prime Minister stated on a previous occasion. Shri Limaye says that he disapproves of that conduct. I think the Motion being under rule 184, it is legitimate for another hon. Member to say that the House approves of that conduct.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : On a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER : This is a very strange argument.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order is on the substitute Motion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : My point of order is on the substitute Motion.

May I remind you that when there was a Motion brought forward by Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah disapproving the conduct of Shri H. N. Mukerjee, some of us here wanted to move a substitute motion approving of his conduct that was disallowed. I did not expect double standards from the Law Minister.

SHRI NATH PAI : I wanted to make a very simple submission.

I was astonished to listen to the Law Minister's submission *vis-a-vis* what has been raised by Shri Farnandes. The precedent of this House is very clearly established. You allowed a motion moved by me which stated, "This House disapproves of the conduct of the Governor of Bihar". It was not imperative that it should be amended by saying something. So, that submission by him is irrelevant. You may take a decision on any other basis, but the simple motion saying that the House disapproves does not need to be amended, as has been established by precedent.

MR. SPEAKER : I will look into it later on. The occasion comes only when I put it to the House. We will hear Morarjibhai meanwhile. I will give my thought to it.

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. friend, Shri Madhu Limaye, has come the subject, and in that process, has made mention that I misled the House on the last occasion when I made a statement on the subject, and in that process, has made certain allegations against my son which, in his view, purport to establish his contention. He has referred to the following evidence in order to substantiate his argument :

- (a) In two forms filed by DODSAL and signed by the Company's office-bearers, my son is shown as an employee in the list of employees as on 1st January 1966 and 1st January 1967; and
- (b) In a form relating to an earlier period, my son is shown as an employee as on 1st January 1965 eligible to draw both salary and commission.

The House will recall that I have already made two statements in recent months on the subject of my son's business activities. Whilst I have tried to place before the House the facts as I knew them, it is somewhat distressing to me that this particular matter should be subjected to a campaign so persistently and relentlessly notwithstanding the fact there is no convention or practice, no rule or regulation, that a son or a daughter of a Minister should

cease his or her normal activities—whether professional or business. Nor is it unusual or uncommon that a son or daughter should assist his or her father, particularly at an advanced age. My distress is all the greater when it is borne in mind that during most of the period covered by these contentions I was not a Minister. I yield to none in upholding the high traditions of public life. So far as my own performance in that sphere is concerned, my life has been an open book. There has never been any suggestion that I have promoted my son's interest in any of his business activities whatsoever. In fact, my knowledge of my son's activities has never been of a detailed nature. I have never discussed with him his business, profession or activities. I have always taken a detached view, and sought to ensure that he does not come anywhere near the discharge of my official responsibilities. I have studiously avoided getting involved with his business activities and had left it to him to pursue his own business activities with the injunction that he must not do anything that would be contrary to law or ethics or compromising of my position in public life.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with these preliminary remarks, I would now deal with the general statement of my Hon'ble friend that I misled the House. I stated that my son had given up business in 1964 whereas, according to my Hon'ble friend, he actually continued his business activities for some years after that. Before I deal with the specific pieces of evidence brought up by Shri Madhu Limaye in connection with the alleged continuance of business connections with M/s. Dodsai (Private) Limited, I should like to give the background picture. The House will recall that on the 31st August 1963, I resigned my office of Finance Minister. Thereafter I began to take more active part in public and organisational affairs. In fact, it became a whole-time involvement. It required constant travels and mostly an outdoor life which entailed not only long and frequent journeys but also addressing public meetings, attending to organisational affairs, meeting workers, addressing public bodies and a multiplicity of engagements all of which I could not keep a track of, without subjecting myself to excessive strain of a continuous nature. My son watched this

[Shri Morarji Desai]

for some time. He felt I needed his assistance. So he decided to shed his business activities and devote himself whole-time to assist me in the discharge of my responsibilities, particularly in regard to my engagements and public relations. I appreciated his motive and gave my consent. I left it to him to pursue his line as to how best to carry out his intention. I also generally observed that the intention was being translated into action. But I have never familiarised myself with actual details and the process of his disengagements, except recently—a knowledge for which I am indebted to my Hon'ble friend Shri Madhu Limaye in view of the interest which he has taken in the matter and which he in turn argued in me. I have now learnt that in pursuance of his determination expressed to me, my son resigned from five companies on the 25th August 1964 and from another company on the 8th December 1964. The companies concerned are—

1. Galileo Instruments Limited,
2. Permanent Magnets Limited,
3. Vibgyor Limited,
4. Bombay Steam Navigation Co. (1935) Limited,
5. Mohatta & Heckel Limited, and
6. Display and Decorators (Private) Limited.

He continued to be associated with the Bombay General Trading Co. (Private) Ltd. and Thacker & Co., from both of which he resigned on the 23rd September 1966 and 31st January 1967 respectively. He continues to be a Director of Trade Wings (Private) Limited, a travel agency concern. From all these companies he has been receiving only Director's fees, the total amount of which cannot be called by any means as handsome remuneration or a source of profit. Of none of these he has been an employee or a promoter of business. There is one firm—P.M. Traders—of his with which he continues to be associated as it is in his sole ownership. The firm has not done any business after 1964, and only the commissions on the past business have been deposited. There has thus been a steady fall in the income of this firm and in the year ending 31-3-1967, it ran into a loss.

It will be seen that after my son told me that he would sever his business activities, he has taken active steps to liquidate his connections with business houses and where he maintained them, he did so only in a nominal capacity. There is no evidence to suggest that he took, after the dates I mentioned, any active interest in any of the firms with which he was originally connected. The knowledge of details which I have subsequently acquired and which I am sharing with the House does not very much alter my earlier remarks that he had virtually ceased business activities in 1964 and it was a question of time before he could also formally disassociate himself from them. In the circumstances, I would submit to the House that there is nothing in the subsequent account which I have just given which can lead to the conclusion that earlier I had given a wrong picture to the House. In fact, what I have stated above would reaffirm that I was substantially correct in the statement that I made. If anyone says that being a Director or a Chairman or continuing an agreement for a few months without actively doing any work amounts to doing business, it might be technically correct. The statement made by me on 30th April 1968 was an extempore statement and I spoke from my general recollection of facts. When I spoke to the House on 24th July 1968, I placed before it such facts as had come to my notice till then. It has been my constant endeavour, in this as in all other matters, not to say anything which would mislead the House but to place before it all the facts as I knew them at the time. I trust the House is interested in the substance of things and not in technical debating points.

I shall now come to the specific points of evidence which have been produced by the Hon'ble friend and on which he relies with zeal and apparent conviction. As regards the first contention, viz., that in certain forms my son is shown as an employee in the list of employees as on 1st January, 1966 and as on 1st January, 1967, I would like to point out that the termination of my son's connection is governed by the specific agreement of 8th July, 1965 to which Shri Madhu Limaye has referred earlier and under which on account of the services rendered by my son, he became entitled to receive certain payments from

the company from 1965 to 1968. In that agreement, the following clause occurs—

“WHEREAS the said Kantilal during his employment with the Company has rendered very valuable services to the Company;

AND WHEREAS the Board of Directors of the Company in appreciation of such valuable services has decided to pay him as provided hereunder ....”

It is clear from the provision of the agreement that my son's services stood terminated with effect from 1st April, 1965 and that the only connection with the firm that was left to operate was payments that would be made to him under the agreement. In the circumstances if he is described as an employee in certain forms submitted by the Company, it is for the Company and not for me or my son to explain how this happened. I understand that in the stamped receipt given for the payment in the form sent by the Company, there is no mention of him as Director of Sales. I can only infer that the Company used certain standard forms prescribed under Income-tax and Company Law and in those returns payments made to former employees receiving terminal benefits had also to be shown in the category of salaries. So far as the allegation regarding bonus is concerned, broadly the same inference would appear to apply but in fact no bonus was paid or received. The House will agree that I can only deal with the facts as they are and cannot explain the accounts and documents maintained by the Company. In any case, these accounts and documents cannot wash out the agreement of 8th July 1965 or alter the nature of my son's position or the payments he received thereunder.

As regards the payments that he received from the Company under the July 1965 agreement, my Hon'ble friend has objected to my describing them as 'terminal benefits'. It is clear from the agreement which is the governing document in this matter that even though business connections between my son and the firm terminated, he received payment for past services rendered to it. I cannot find more apt words than 'terminal benefits' for the payments received by my son. My Hon'ble friend is entitled to choose any other appropriate word from his better know-

ledge of the English language. I would not quarrel with him on that score. So far as the House is concerned, I would only say that such agreements of payments of terminal benefits between certain executives and the firms concerned on the termination of their service are neither unknown nor uncommon.

As regards the second piece of evidence, namely, the form in which my son is shown as an employee as on 1st January, 1965 eligible to draw both salary and commission, Shri Limaye appears to have reached conclusions on his own interpretation of this form. The sequence of events has been that my son informed the Company some time in June 1964, when I was to undergo an operation, that he wanted to discontinue his services with the Company. I believe there was some persuasion by the Company asking him to continue on the ground that his services had been found to be very valuable and that he should be able to find some time for the Company's work even while he was assisting me. The talks continued for some time. Eventually the Company agreed to relieve him with effect from the end of March 1965. The date-line was inclusive of the period of six months' notice as provided for in the terms of appointment. The position, however, does not alter. In fact, my son did not participate in the business of the Company and ceased to do any work for it from June 1964.

Looking at the background and the facts of the matter, I have no hesitation in saying that my Hon'ble friend has spared no pains to find mole-hills of which he could make mountains, but the facts remain facts. It is not I who am guilty of misleading the House. It is my Hon'ble friend who has misinterpreted facts and confused the picture. The House is used to him and to his technique. I am sure all of us take him philosophically as I often do.

However, what I have said is sufficient to show that not only have I endeavoured to give a full picture of my son's business activities in the House but that there is no breach of propriety or lack of good conduct involved. Despite this, my Hon'ble friend has chosen to pursue this matter with his usual self-righteousness. He has even chosen not to wait for a reply to the letter which he wrote to me on 29th July



[Shri Morarji Desai]  
1968 and in which he had raised these and other matters purporting to be connected with the activities of my son. I had written to him that very day that I would take time to reply as the points mentioned by him involved detailed investigations and examination and I would therefore take some time. Instead, he has chosen to raise the matter in the House without waiting for my reply. He has not been content with all this. He has gone to the absurd length of suggesting that the decision of the Cabinet meeting over which I presided, regarding allocation of Teen Murti House as the Prime Minister's residence, had been made with an eye on this matter. It is for the House to see whether such insinuations on his part are motivated by a regard for public interest.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not have at this stage to proclaim the standards which I have set for myself for my Parliamentary and public life. Throughout I have striven hard to maintain my actions and activities in line with the innermost urges of my conscience. I have tried to do so with as much regard for truth and rectitude as I was capable of. I have given my time unreservedly to the demands of public affairs and to the responsibilities and duties of public offices. I have also had to meet the calls that have been made on me for the service of the great political organisation to which I have the honour to belong and for maintaining the highest traditions of Parliamentary life. In doing all this I have seldom taken notice either of public clamour or public applause. The conscientious discharge of my duties has been an article of faith with me. In the process of doing so, I have not spared my family, my friends or my colleagues. Even today if I had found my son doing anything wrong, nobody would be more ready than myself to deal with him as he deserved. I fail to see why any one should point a finger of scorn or accusation at me or at him when not only is there no question of propriety involved but when he has gone out of his way to terminate his business activities in the discharge of the obligation that he owes to me by virtue of my position. Except indulging in allegations, nobody has so far given any tangible evidence to show that my son took advantage of my position in his business

activities during the time he was engaged in them. The House will, therefore, appreciate my distress that for no fault of mine, my son and I should have been made the subject and cause of preoccupation of the Hon'ble House on so many occasions and over such length of time. I only hope that the House will forgive me and also my Hon'ble friend for it. It would be a sad day for democracy if on such inconsequential and essentially untenable grounds and on unfair tactics, motions of privilege and similar other issues should keep on being raised without regard for facts.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have done. But before I sit down, I would like to thank you and the House for the indulgence shown to me. I know that I have transgressed on the time of the House but I felt that I owed to the House and through it to the country that I should place the entire picture before it and also endeavour to bring out the substantive issues in a proper perspective. What I have said, I have said with frankness and with honesty of purpose. I request the House now to deal with the matter according to its traditions, its sense of decorum and dignity.

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is an issue and a matter which we have to deal with today that is extremely distasteful. It is distasteful not only because of the nature of the subject, not only because it concerns the Deputy Prime Minister of this country, but also because it concerns a senior figure in our public life, who has a notable record, a long record, of service in the days of the struggle for our country's independence. I myself, Sir, have been in prison with the hon. Deputy Prime Minister at least twice in the same prison and I came to respect the great sense of discipline and restraint which he showed during those days of incarceration. Therefore, for me it is distasteful to have to speak on this occasion a duty which has to be performed.

When dealing with a situation like this we have to think of certain fundamental considerations, and I would like to suggest to the House that there are three by which we on these Benches feel actuated. First is the supreme necessity of maintaining the highest standards of integrity in our public life. This is the basis on which democracy can survive in this country and

anything that weakens it strikes at the root of our democratic Constitution and our way of life. Therefore, however distasteful the task may be, there can be no connivance at anything that is considered to depart from the highest standards of propriety demanded by public life. The question is...

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : अध्यक्ष महोदय,  
मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

SHRI M. R. MASANI : No, I am not yielding. I do not yield.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : उन के भाषण पर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है । मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आर्टिकल 105 (3) ...

SHRI BUTA SINGH : (Rupar) What is the point of order ?

MR. SPEAKER : I myself do not know. Unless I hear it, how can I say ? Let us hear it.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : अध्यक्ष महोदय,  
मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER : With regard to the speech you cannot raise a point of order. In the midst of a speech do not interrupt him. It is not proper.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : उन के भाषण पर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है, प्रोसीजर के बारे में मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

MR. SPEAKER : Whatever it is, will you kindly sit down ? I am on my legs.. (interruptions). You should not interrupt in the middle of a speech like this. We have all heard with rapt attention Shri Limaye and Shri Desai. Now when another hon. Member is speaking, in the middle of the speech, to raise a point of order is something unimaginable. I do not think in any parliamentary democracy it is allowed. If you raise a point of order in the middle of the speech it means that a speech can never be allowed to be completed unless you like it. Unless you appreciate it, you will never allow anybody to speak. That is wrong.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिये :

MR. SPEAKER : No, I will not allow it.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I was about to say that the second consideration should be that there should be much more interest in policies and principles than in personalities; and on occasions like this personalities become the main issue before the House. The third consideration that we on these benches feel is that it is our role to play the part of an Opposition and not to be involved or to be dragged into being satellites or lobbies of one group or another within the Government or the ruling party. These are the three considerations against which I would like to judge the situation with which we are faced.

Unfortunately, this issue has now developed a great deal of political overtones. The subject of the motion seems to stand out against the backdrop of a brawl between two sections in the Government and the ruling party, though I have no doubt that both of them will find their way into the same division lobby later this afternoon! There is considerable evidence to suggest that the attack on the Deputy Prime Minister comes, to some extent, from his opponents within his own administration and his own Party.. (interruptions). That at least is how it looks and that is how most of the people in India and abroad look at it. To quote an instance, a sober and staid journal like the *Times of London*, referring to the evidence adduced by the supporters of the motion, went on to say that this was "presumably supplied by Mr. Desai's rivals within the Government".. (interruptions).

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना है. . . .

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I am not quoting your evidence.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह मेरे ऊपर इस तरह से इनसिन्टुएशन नहीं कर सकते हैं । मैं नियम के अन्दर व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा रहा हूँ ।

MR. SPEAKER : Now what is your objection, and under what rule ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं नियम बता रहा हूँ ।

MR. SPEAKER : Please tell me your objection.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री मसानी ने . . . . .

SHRI BUTA SINGH : At this rate, when I am raising a point of order Shri Madhu Limaye is bound to hear me. I am raising it.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप पहले मेरी बात सुनिये . . . . .

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore) : Sir, I rise on a point of order. . (interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Will all of you please sit down ? When we make speeches, it is not that we agree with everything. When Shri Madhu Limaye made his speech, it is not that Shri Masani and everybody on those benches agreed with him. Therefore we must tolerate people and allow them to express their views, whether we like it or not. That is the minimum democracy that we have to uphold in this House. Therefore I would appeal to Shri Madhu Limaye and to others also that they allow him to continue his speech whether they like it or not. Shri Madhu Limaye has got the right to reply. When he replies, he can reply to everybody. He has the right to his speech.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE rose—

MR. SPEAKER : When you rise to speak, points of orders can be raised by others.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : They were raised.

MR. SPEAKER : I do not think so. You made such a long speech and I do not think any point of order was raised.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : It was done.

MR. SPEAKER : That was before the speech.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी एक बात सुन लीजिये ।

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : Sir, this cannot be tolerated. After your saying all this, we will not tolerate this.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं मीन मसानी साहब से इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे जो कुछ

भी कहना चाहें कहें लेकिन ऐसी कोई बात न कहें . . . . . (व्यवधान) . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER : I think, he has a right to speak, even if it reflects on somebody. He can only explain it in his own speech later on but he cannot prevent people from speaking.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I was trying to explain, Mr. Speaker, the political overtones that this matter has acquired in the minds of the common people of this country and how people outside look at it. Here is the Editor of *Current*, Shri D. F. Karaka, writing from Delhi on August 17 :—

"The feeling in Delhi . . . is that these controversies raised, questioning the integrity of veteran Congressmen, are inspired. While the heckling and the questioning is conducted mainly by Opposition members, in which the Communists, as is to be expected, play a notable part, there is a strong suspicion among senior leaders of the Congress Party that members of Mrs. Gandhi's Kitchen Cabinet and the so-called 'Young Turks' have a hand in it, although from behind the scenes."

I can go on quoting report after report from Delhi pointing out what the people believe. In the *Hindu* of August 14 there is a report that, at a meeting of the Congress Working Committee, Shri S. K. Patil, the Treasurer of the Congress Party, accused certain Ministers close to the Prime Minister of having a hand in the attack on the Congress President and senior Congressmen and making information available. I do not know to what extent these charges are true, but I do say that there is enough circumstantial evidence to make us on these benches feel that we should be careful not to become a cat's paw, not to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for one group in the Government who might be gunning for the other.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade) : Whose advocate are you ?

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I am nobody's advocate.

That does not mean that nothing wrong has happened, that there is no substance to the point of Shri Madhu Limaye in bringing this motion before this House. With

all my respect for the Deputy Prime Minister, I have to say to him that he has, unfortunately, allowed himself to be put in a position which is vulnerable, which is exposed, which is not fair to him and which is not fair to the public life and the high standards of public life in this country. I would appeal to him, even now to disassociate himself from his son and his other activities. I am not asking him to turn his back on his son; I would not dream of asking him to do that. But there is a certain appropriate distance that people who occupy high public office have to maintain between themselves and those who are near and dear to them. That distance has not been maintained in this case. If it was not for that, all that is happening today, which I deplore, would not be happening. I, therefore, once again appeal to him even now to consider whether it is not wise, correct and a service to the country to say : "I carry on my life; somebody related to me carries on his life, but there is a certain distance which I maintain." One can be a friend; one can wish somebody well. One does not want to turn one's back on anybody. But one should keep a certain distance which public office enjoins.

For these reasons, we regret that we on these benches are unable to vote against the motion moved by Mr. Madhu Limaye. On the other hand, we find it equally difficult to vote for it. That is for two good reasons. One is that we do not appreciate the kind of company in which we would find ourselves and the other motivation; of some of those behind it. There are those who belong to Parties that do not only not believe in democracy but who scoff at "bourgeois ethics" and who make a mockery of the virtues. They expect only Mr. Morarji Desai and the rest of us to practise these but they are immune from "bourgeois ethics". I do not propose to join hands with them to condemn the Deputy Prime Minister. The other reason why we will not vote for the motion is that we believe that behind this motion there is a certain amount of support from a coterie in the Congress Government which has done more than any single individual can to corrupt the press and the politics in this country by permitting the misuse of funds released by trade with Soviet bloc. For

these reasons, we will not join in this motion.

We believe, on these benches, that the whole of the Congress Party has now.. (Interruptions). The people in this country have now come to the feeling that this Government has, at last, lived its day and that the Congress Party has now got certain evils widespread in them, such as self-seeking, lure of pelf and power and intrigue that is inevitable perhaps, after twenty years, any party would be corrupted. But precisely because they have been for twenty years in power it is high time we have a change of Govt, in this country. Nothing short of the removal of the entire Government will give relief to the country.

Today, we are asked to choose between two evils. We refuse to choose between evils. I for one have learnt from Mahatma Gandhi that one should not choose a lesser evil but one should reject both. It is in that spirit that we say : "A plague on both your houses!" We are not here to help one of you, to knife the other. We want the whole of you to be removed. To that objective we shall continue to dedicate ourselves.

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH (Bombay-North-West) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Motion which, in substance, is a motion of No-Confidence. Mr. Madhu Limaye has neither the courage nor the honesty to use the word 'No-Confidence'. He has tried to use the word 'Disapproval'. What is the consequence ? If this Motion were carried....

श्री मधु लिमये : इस मोशन का स्वरूप अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके साथ बातचीत करके तय किया है। फिर ये इस तरह की बात क्यों कह रहे हैं ?

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH : I do not want Mr. Madhu Limaye to interrupt me. I hold the floor. I do not want his interpretation or interruption.

As I was saying, Mr. Madhu Limaye has neither the honesty nor the courage to describe his motion in proper terms. He has used the word 'Disapproval'. If the Motion is carried, the Government and Mr. Morarji Desai are bound to resign. It is a normal consequence of a No-Confidence motion. Mr. Madhu Limaye wanted to avoid that

[Shri Shantila! Shah]

word by using the word 'Disapproval'. That shows that whatever his motive, he has used mean tactics.

Secondly, he said that he was not actuated by *gali galauj*. I should have liked to believe it. I would have believed it had I not read a statement, a few days back, in newspapers issued by Mr. Madhu Limaye that Mr. Morarji Desai and the Prime Minister had entered into a conspiracy as a result of which the Teen Murti house was to be given to the Prime Minister and, she will support Mr. Morarji Desai. If it was not *gali galauj*, what else was it? Is that the standard which he preaches here and practices outside? This is not the way in which public affairs are conducted. Mr. Madhu Limaye thinks himself to be a pontif; he takes a pontifical attitude; he holds the inquisition, he lays the charge, he punishes the evidence, he condemns the man, he pronounces the judgment and he says that this is the sentence. Mr. Madhu Limaye has produced evidence which even in a court of law is inadmissible; a statement filed by a company with a government officer will not be admissible as evidence either against Mr. Morarji Desai or against his son. Mr. Limaye does not know law. If he pays fees, I can teach him. He only wants to hit the headlines...

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirapalli): If fees are offered...

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH: I do not want any offer.

Mr. Madhu Limaye is not interested in democracy; he is not interested in high standards of life; he is simply interested in dramatising incidents so that he can hit the headlines tomorrow. Otherwise, how is the Profumo case relevant here? Profumo case was a case where the man said that he was guilty. How is that relevant to the case where the facts are not only disputed but are also denied? The whole idea is to get into the newspapers somehow to prejudice the public mind. Mr. Limaye also poses himself as the monopolist custodian of the morals of the world; he is the only person who knows what high standards are, how people in public life should behave! And anybody who comes under his ill-favour is condemned! His judgment is final! Now I will take the points one by one... (Interruption).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I never knew that he was so clownish.

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH: If Mr. Banerjee thinks that way, may I pay a compliment to him by saying that he has done this more often in this House than what I have done. Let him not throw stones at others.

Now I will take a few facts. I do not want to go into details; the Deputy Prime Minister has done so.

One important point in this matter is that from the date he resigned, i.e., 31st August, 1963, till he became the Deputy Prime Minister in February-March 1967, he was out of office. All the allegations and documents referred to are of the year 1965; they relate to a point of time when Mr. Morarji Desai was not in office. Therefore, even if Dodsels wanted to please him, at least in 1965, there was nothing that could have been done; Mr. Morarji Desai could not have then obliged them, and I do not know whether my hon. friend then anticipated that he would become the Deputy Prime Minister... (Interruptions).

Now I will take those documents. Much has been said about the use of the word 'salary' in the statement filed by the company. There are three documents. In fact, it begins with 1956. In the document of 1956, Mr. Kantilal Desai has been referred to as a commission agent getting commission. According to the second document of 1960, he is entitled to a salary of Rs. 2,050 plus a commission. According to the third document of 1965, he gets only Rs. 2,050, but no commission. A play was made upon the word 'salary'; since in the statement filed this amount is shown under the head 'salary', it is argued that he is an employee. This is a very common misunderstanding and the word 'salary' has been used loosely and not necessarily in the sense of employee relationship. This is done in many places; of all people and of all institutions, Parliament itself uses the word 'salary' in respect of Rs. 500 paid to the member every month. Are the Members of Parliaments who draw a salary of Rs. 500 per month servants of anybody, either of the Parliament....

SHRI NAMBIAR: Servants of the people.

**SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH :** Servants of the people. They do not represent the people. We represent the people. They represent the people of Russia.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** He represents the people of America, Pentagon and all the big capitalists in the world.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Let him come to the point. He has already taken seven minutes.

**SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH :** It is very interesting to compare the two documents. In the document of 1960, it has been mentioned that the 'remuneration of the employee shall be a salary of Rs. 1650 per month for the first year and Rs. 2,050 per month thereafter'. The word 'salary' has been used in this first document.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** Mark 'employee'.

**SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH :** I have practised law much more than he. The word 'salary' has been used in the first document and he has been described as an 'employee'. In the second document, the word 'salary' does not occur at all. The clause says : 'The company shall pay him Rs. 2,050 per calendar month for a period of three years with effect from 1st April 1965'. There neither the word 'salary' nor the word 'employee' is there, though both were used in the earlier document.

If these words have been used in the form, does the document prevail or does the form prevail ? Obviously the document.

Therefore, this play with the word 'salary' is all improper, purely intended to bolster up a weak case.

Then what about a director ? How does a director in a limited company act ? A director, ordinarily, only deals with the agenda coming before the meeting. May be, the managing director is more closely associated. The Chairman may be con-

sulted from time to time, but normally a director of a limited company, does not deal with the day-to-day affairs, except the agenda as it comes before them. The only payment the director receives is the director's fee and may be the dividends on the shares he holds. Apart from that a person is allowed to be a director of 20 companies. A man may be a director of a bank, a pharmaceutical concern and of a trading

business, and he may be a lawyer. His business is that of a lawyer, but because he is director of a bank, he does not become a banker; because he is director of a pharmaceutical company, he does not become a doctor; and because he is director of a trading concern, he does not become a businessman. Therefore, the director's position is a position which these friends should understand.

As regards the post of Director of Sales, Shri Kanti Desai was never a member of the board of directors. That word 'Director' of Sales is not used in the same sense.

My friends here seem to be laying down a new law, that a son or son-in-law of a person high in office starts with a disqualification.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** Only he said that he is 'miles away'.

**SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) :** Not 'miles away', but 'smile away'.

**SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH :** My friend has been deceived by the wrong reproduction in a yellow journal in which this matter has been confused. In the *Blitz* issue of June 15, it has been stated :

"My son has given up all business contacts since 1964.... He is miles away from such things".

The suggestion here, by putting in these five dots, is that he has given up business contacts and was miles away. This is yellow journalism, pure and simple. These five dots cover five pages in which Shri Morarji Desai dealt with three points. The first subject he dealt with was his son's connections in business. The second subject he dealt with was his foreign tours. The third point he dealt with was budget leakage. The phrase 'miles away' was used in connection with budget leakage and not in connection with business. This yellow journal has put in these five dots immediately after that statement omitting the other portions which follow so as to convey the impression that the words 'miles away' was used in connection with the business. The Deputy Prime Minister never said that. This is the way in which public opinion is sought to be poisoned or influenced.

I ask : is a son or son-in-law or daughter disqualified from serving the father ? We

[Shri Shantilal Shah]

have examples of this. Kumari Maniben Patel served Sardar Vallabhbhai throughout his life. So did the present Prime Minister, Indira Behn, serve her father. If, however, the son of Shri Morarji Desai serves him, it is wrong.

By being the son of a Minister, does a citizen lose his rights as an ordinary citizen? Should not Mr. Kantilal Desai do ordinary business as an ordinary citizen? A son is bound to get certain benefits. If a man is the son of a Minister, then when visitors come to the Minister's house, they are bound to meet him, but it has never been suggested and I challenge my friends to produce either a document or a man to say that Mr. Morarji Desai has even once either recommended his son or even introduced his son to any businessman anywhere.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह (खगरिया) : उसकी आवश्यकता ही नहीं है, आपको पता होना चाहिये ।

श्री मोलह प्रसाद (बासगांव) : बिन मांगे मोती मिले, मांगे मिले न भीख ।

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH : I have tried to verify these facts from several businessmen in Bombay with whom I have close acquaintance, and they have all told me without exception that Mr. Morarji Desai has never recommended, nor even introduced his son. Now they say that because he is his son, he has a special disqualification, he is not an ordinary citizen of India, he should not try to carry on trade, business or any other activity, a son must not earn anything.

Mr. Limaye has preached, I take it, that one should not take interest in one's son. Would he say that a man should take interest in his brother? Does not Mr. Limaye recollect that he wrote to me a letter about his brother's appointment as an honorary doctor? (Interruptions).

SHRI NAMBIAR : Honorary doctor. He did not ask for employment.

MR. SPEAKER : For everything you should not interrupt. He has a right to reply.

SHRI NAMBIAR : He did not ask for any employment, it is honorary doctor.

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH : My hon. friend has no knowledge how medical practice goes on every doctor, rather than doing anything else, would first like to be an honorary doctor in a Government hospital because that is the stepping stone to practice. Why did he want his brother to be an honorary doctor in the Satara District Govt. Hospital? There cannot be one standard for him and another for us.

Therefore, I say we are all human beings, we all have our weaknesses. We have affection for our children, wives, brothers, and therefore we should not accuse Mr. Morarji Desai that he has done something because they have some political purpose to serve. I claim to be a friend of Mr. Morarji Desai and I have told them frankly whatever I have felt. But they feel that he is a tower of strength, and that if they can impeach him, run him down, do something to tarnish his prestige, they will succeed some day in coming to power. But these are false hopes. It is much better that out of respect for democracy they give up these shady tactics and unfair means by which they seek to achieve their ends.

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South) : Mr. Shantilal Shah has put the thing very correctly. His first proposition is that we should all be human beings. That is just the difficulty with Mr. Morarji Desai. He refuses to acknowledge that he is a human being. He wants to establish that he is a superhuman challenging everybody's morality, everybody's morals, everybody's standards including his own colleagues in the ministry.

I will give you one example. His son gets 'P' forms very quickly, goes about wandering in Japan, South Korea, Manila where he meets him accidentally. (Interruptions). When a delegation wants to go, he will hold it back until somebody intervenes. This very speech which he has made here shows that after doing all this his claim to be considered superhuman is not correct. If he comes down to ground and becomes human, he will realise that he has bungled. How? There are three points made out by Mr. Shantilal Shah : the business of his son, the travels of his son and the standards of his son. There are two or three things on record. What is the business of his son? In this debate the whole discussion

had been limited to Dodsals. That is not the only thing that is under discussion. How has the Finance Minister, the superman and a father has behaved towards his private secretary, his son and a citizen Mr. Kantilal Desai ? Mr. Kantilal Desai started making money when Mr. Morarji Desai was the Finance Minister and a power in the Bombay State. He amassed lakhs when Morarjibhai was a power in Maharashtra, in the Bombay State. Let him deny that. Even now, he has got assets which give him an income of about a lakh of rupees per year. These assets have been acquired when Morarji Desai was Finance Minister or Chief Minister and so on. There is a method in the madness, in the relation between the son and the father. I do not say that the father pushes the son into business. But then there is an unwritten understanding or by implication something like that always happens. He may enquire about it because he has asked the police to enquire about his son. How is it that when Mr. Kantilal Desai makes money by selling his shares in Permanent Magnets which were not worth their value at three times their value to the Ruias, the Ruias were excused Rs. 40 lakhs in income-tax and after Mr. Kantilal Desai has received about Rs. 30 lakhs order on the New India Insurance the Ruias were searched and their income-tax papers seized. There is the second example of this Dodsals itself. Their agreement with him expired in March or April 1968. Within eight days the Dodsals were searched. Why ? Because Kantilal Desai has a method. He sold his shares and took money from the Ruias and made good business. Then information went and their books were seized. I do not say that Mr. Morarji Desai organised it. But how is this coincidence there ? Within one week after the end of the agreement to pay Rs. 2,050 to him per month, the Enforcement Directorate raids all their thirty offices. Why ? There was an agreement and I think Mr. Desai should read that again. He says "when the services were terminated". The valuable services were evaluated. Why is he given three years' extension ? Is that new payment made without any service ? No. There is no such word as 'past' in that document; there is no word as 'terminated'. But there is service to be rendered by Mr. Kantilal Desai for the next three years for which he is paid Rs. 2,050 per month. After he terminates

his business as sales director, the service he renders to Dodsals is to keep mum. This is paid to keep the secrets at least for a period of three years. This is written in the agreement that he will keep the secrets. Moral has been purchased at the rate of Rs. 2,050 per month. That is all I am saying.

**श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) :**

क्या बुराई है ?

**श्री श्री० अ० डांगे :** बुराई कुछ नहीं है—

**श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा :** वफादारी बुराई हागी आपकी डिक्शनरी में ।

**श्री श्री० अ० डांगे :** वफादारी दो हजार पचास रुपये की क्या है मारल्ल ।

It is the very basis of morality. It requires paying Rs. 2,050; even that was not observed. The moment that agreement was terminated, Dodsals were searched on the basis of information given by Kantilal Desai to the Enforcement Department, as soon as the agreement was over. This is *vaffadari* ! That is, for three years, he keeps the secret; it percolated either perhaps through the Ministry or somebody, and as soon as that agreement was over, next week, the office is searched. *Vaffadari* wonderful, Rs. 2,050 for three years to keep the secrets and thereafter also; but thereafter it is not valuable. I would like him to look into this as a man who stands for good relations, between people; of course, between him and his Private Secretary.

The next point that I would like to make is this. How did he get on in all these trances ? He did not give him foreign exchange; Morarjibhai he has said it; Just £ 100 or so. That is nothing. But how does he get through ? Why should he get into the audience hall of the World Bank for social functions ? I absolutely agree that you should have the services of your son to serve you, at the age of 72. When that agreement took place, you should have been about 67, but even then, you should have your son to serve you. I had no objection to it at all. My objection is, you are trying to paint your son as an emblem of virtue and claiming that you are also another emblem. Therefore, virtue is born out of virtue. My submission is that vice has been born out of virtue and you cannot manage it; just you can-



[Shri S. A. Dange]

not. That blighter, excuse me for using that word—is of a kind that you cannot control him. And that is why all these things have been happening. So, Mr. Morarji Desai, may I ask you through the Speaker this thing? He says he has no access to official papers. Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. Kantilal Desai are residing in the same house or not?—Yes; they do. May be it is Mr. Morarji Desai's house or his house. Now, is it possible, Mr. Morarji Desai? When you are reading a confidential report of the Finance Ministry, when Mr. Kantilal Desai knocks at the door, what happens? "Who are you?" you will ask, and then, will you ask, "Are you my son, Private Secretary or businessman?" "If you are my son, do not enter; I am reading official files. If you are my Private Secretary, please talk through the door; and if you are a businessman, out you go until I finish my files". Then what does he serve you for? As a Private Secretary? Is it just to give you a nice cap and a glass of water? Let him do it, but then, when he comes in while the Finance Minister is reading an official report, is Mr. Kantilal Desai supposed to look this the other way and then give you a glass of water? Just see the picture that you are giving, Mr. Morarji Desai, to the House and to the country. Your son as a Private Secretary has no access to official files and you and he, at the same time, are sitting in the same room of the House! Can one believe it, and you want the world to believe it. Therefore, Mr. Morarji Desai, what you are trying to do is to overpaint your morality; that is the tragedy. And that overpainting has landed you in trouble. Therefore, my submission to you is, please accept that you are a human being; that you were, as a human being trying to run the Bombay Ministry by shooting 105 workers, by putting people in jail—the Ahmednagar workers—and all that. You were carrying out the sacred duty on the one side to the people, by suppressing the working class, while your son was carrying out his duty of making money out of that working class. That is the point. Therefore, please, if you wish to serve this country better, I would request you to withdraw. I won't use the word "resign."

Now, you have another proposition which I should request you, Mr. Morarji

Desai, you should have done, with your high morals, propriety and so on. That comparison with Profumo, I do not like. A Brahmachari with a son cannot be compared to Profumo. It is wrong; historically wrong. I am not using that word. But there was an instance here in this House: when Krishnamachari was suspected—there was not even a proof—that he had somehow helped Mundhra, he quietly walked out before Nehru told him to resign. He went out so quietly. Shri Krishnamachari is a noisy man and so he should walked out with noise. Pandit Nehru went to see him at the airport. That is also true.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Lal Bahadur Shastri?

SHRI S. A. DANGE : That is an accident. That has nothing to do with morality. I do not compare Mr. Desai with anybody, neither Profumo, nor Krishnamachari, nor anybody else.

To one unfair question which the Deputy Prime Minister raised I cannot help replying. For example, he said: "I would resign" not if we all tell him but if the Prime Minister tells him, or if he feels that the Prime Minister would like him to do it, he will resign. That is unfair. Because, what is the pact between you all? You became the Deputy Prime Minister on the understanding that you support her to be the Prime Minister and she remains the Prime Minister on the understanding that she makes you the Deputy Prime Minister and gives you an important portfolio....

(interruptions) सारी बात अभी बाहर आ रही है

This is the pact. It is well-known to the whole world. It is not a secret. So, how can the Prime Minister ask you to resign unless she herself wants to go away or is challenged by these men of the party, 40 versus 60 or 60 versus 40, the army of the Birlas....9 (interruptions)

दुनिया जानती है कि इस पैक्ट के होने के बाद मिनिस्ट्री बनी है।

Therefore, if he is a real moral man with courage, he should not wait for his resignation for the request of the Prime Minister; he should say "Here, it is." There has been some lapse; there has been some slip. Whatever it may be due to, whether the Prime

Minister asks him or not, when there is such a debate about his son's association with business, travel and all that, he should resign.

**SHRI K. N. TIWARY (Bettiah) :** You should also resign because there were so many charges against the Communist Party in Kerala.

**श्री की० अ० ठाणे :** केरल की गवर्न-  
मेंट बहुत अच्छी तरह से चल रही है।  
बड़े आए।

**श्री शिवनारायण :** अपना बैंक बैलेंस  
बतलाइये।

**SHRI S. A. DANGE :** I know your connections with Birlas. I know many of you. Do not worry. You are bound to stand by him.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Let him conclude now.

**SHRI S. A. DANGE :** The point is this. We are discussing neither Russia, nor China, nor Kerala or Bengal, but the simple relation between an unworthy son who belongs to a worthy father. I do not want to detract from all the compliments given to him. So, I stick to the proposition that if he is true to himself and wants to serve the country and establish wonderful norms of morality, then he should withdraw, resign from his post, and not say : "let this House ask me" or "let the Prime Minister ask me". If you really examine yourself properly, as you examine others—you are in the habit of calling somebody a very unworthy man; you think you have got the monopoly of being impudent to every member except for the fact that you are not humble to yourself—you have no alternative except to follow what is suggested here. Therefore, I would plead that he should, consistent with his character, consistent with his career all these years, really throw away this thing. He can again come back when perhaps the trouble will again start. Why worry about it now ? The Government is stable and it will go on.

So, my submission is this. The case is proved. Shri Kantilal Desai continued to be in employment when Shri Desai was Minister and the moment his employment was terminated, the Enforcement Directorate, which is unfortunately run by Shri

Desai, carried out a raid on that company. Whether it is connected or not, I do not know. But these are the facts. I am sticking to the documents which he has admitted to be true. That admission being there, I want to know whether as an upright, forthright (according to the amendment) and frank man, he would stand by the so-called pact of internal allocation of portfolios or he would stand by the wonderful norms he has preached to everybody and not allow any stone to be thrown into the dirt because that *Blitz* is on his head always. Anything written in the *Blitz* is dirt. But if the *Blitz* discovers the dirt somewhere, it should be examined and found out.

17 HRS.

For the sake of the morals of this country, for the sake of the morals of the business community of this country and for the sake of the working class in this country I would request Shri Morarji Desai to resign and set an example.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Kripalaniji.

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) :** Is it me that you called, Sir ?

**AN HON. MEMBER :** It is a case of confusion between the husband and the wife.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I called you, but if you are giving a chance to her I will be very happy.

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, we must clear the issues before we come to any judgement. First of all, we must understand that when matters like these arise, we are here like the Judges and we must behave like the Judges.

17.02 HRS.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The first issue is : Did Shri Morarji deliberately tell an untruth ? I think, it would be impossible with the evidence we have before us to say that he deliberately told an untruth. It is a fact that he told what he was told by his son. It was nothing that he took out of his brain or, as he has himself said, out of his knowledge, because he said that he had very cursory knowledge of the dealings of his son, which is quite possible. I think, as judges we must give

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

him the benefit of doubt. I am only saying what would happen in a court of law when there is not sufficient evidence to prove that the man is deliberately telling a lie. I submit that there is not sufficient proof.

The second question is whether his son was actually carrying on business when he (Morarjibhai) was the Deputy Prime Minister or the Finance Minister. I really do not know that; I cannot discuss that point because one does not know where business begins and where business ends. Unfortunately, I have never been in business; so, I do not know these things. Shri Shah may be knowing more of that. But to a layman it does appear that he had business connections. But what the experts say is a matter for the experts to decide, but he was in business and Shri Morarji cannot deny that he had altogether cut off all connections with business.

The third issue is whether Morarjibhai should have him as his private secretary. About this I have already said that in public affairs we have not only to be correct but we have to appear to be correct before the public. I believe that this was not the correct position for Shri Morarji to take in making his son as his private secretary. A private secretary is called a private secretary but it is a public office. Of course, the private secretary is appointed by the Minister; he is not appointed by any other authority. The Minister has the power to appoint anybody. My experience tells me that, in this country, generally, these private secretaries are appointed from relatives, from cousins, from brothers-in-law, from the caste-in-laws and from the province-in-laws. Unfortunately, it has become a custom in our country. If Mr. Morarji Desai thought that he had a right to appoint him as a private secretary, I should think, he should have been more careful considering his reputation in the country, considering that he enjoys the reputation of being a very upright and moral man. Not only a moral man, but he sometimes prescribes to others also moral behaviour. I think, in this matter his conduct was incorrect.

It is said that the sons of Ministers and Prime Ministers cannot be precluded from business. But that business must be very straight-forward business. Unfortunately,

no business in India is straight-forward. There are very few people, as Mr. Morarji Desai, will himself admit, who pay their taxes properly. There are no businessmen, I say, without exception, who do not do some black-marketing or other. There are no businessmen who do not corner these permits and licences and such other things. Let the sons and the daughters of the Ministers and Prime Ministers satisfy themselves that they are fortunate enough to be born such. If they do not consider that as their good fortune and if they want to amass wealth, I say, they are not doing the proper thing by their parents. Their parents have already given them the prestige of being born. I am glad that I have no son. I thank God that I have no son in this corrupt age.

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** Why don't you adopt one ?

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI :** I would adopt you. It will be a very profitable proposition if you allow yourself to be adopted.

The children of such big people should be satisfied with that. We know what even Gandhiji's son did. What did Gandhiji do ? Gandhiji declared publicly that he had nothing to do with his son. Yet our people are so idiotic, so foolish, that they went on giving him advantages. How can one do that ? I know, Mrs. Gandhi did not give an account of Rs. 4 and in *Young India* Gandhiji wrote, "Kasturba has been a thief, nothing less than that." If these were the standards kept before us. I think, it is expected of Mr. Morarji Desai to act upto those standards because it will redound to his credit.

There is a fourth issue which Mr. Madhu Limaye did not mention and that is of the Prime Minister. I really cannot understand what the Prime Minister has to do in this business. She has to accept the word of Mr. Morarji Desai or she has to reject his word. So far as I know, resignations from office have effected after there have been judicial inquiries and certain allegations have been, more or less, proved; then the Prime Minister has asked the Minister to resign. This happened in the case of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari; this happened again in the case of Shri Malaviya. But here there is no such allegation against Morarji Bhai

and even Mr. Madhu has not done this. I said in my last speech that I have no doubt that our Finance Minister is honest, patriotic, and he loves his country. There is no question about that. But this is a question which the Prime Minister has to decide herself. It is not something which we could impose upon her that she must necessarily deprive herself of the services of a man whom she considers to be very efficient and very desirable. There are many inefficient persons already in the Cabinet. I submit I mean no disrespect to any Minister because I have seen that Ministers are appointed for subjects of which they know nothing. Take, for instance, Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao. What does he know of shipping? Take Shri Asoka Mehta. What does he know of oil? (interruption). Does he know anything of oil? Do you know why this is done? I know it. I know that it is because it is felt that if the Minister does not know his subject, he brings a fresh mind to it. There was a Health Minister; she was a doctor and the doctors found out that her knowledge of medicine stood in the way of their functioning because she brought her antiquated knowledge that she received long ago. I can quite understand that. It is very logical, it is very systematic, that a Minister should know nothing about his subject. I would not talk of the Defence Minister. It is a very good appointment because he never held even a kirpan.... (Interruptions).

As for telling untruths, if we are going to accuse a Minister for telling untruths, for suggesting falsehood, for misguiding the House, then I think, every Minister, including the Prime Minister should be asked to resign. I suppose, this is rather hard on the Ministers because how could they have become Ministers unless there was something very shady in their conduct. (Interruptions). I am not joking. A writer who has examined the lives of 14 Prime Ministers in England says that there was never a Prime Minister who did not see the a but hit below it, that they had no hesitation in misguiding the people and in telling them untruths. If that is the criterion that Mr. Madhu keeps before the Ministers, I think, all of them should give their resignations today. I excuse them for all the untruth that they tell because I think, if I were in their position, I would

also be like them. (Interruptions). Let us keep watch on ourselves. I think, this point has been sufficiently discussed and I think, we should leave it at that. We should leave this matter to Mr. Morarji Desai to decide for himself what is right under the circumstances.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha. (Interruptions).

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Mr. Morarji Desai is a graduate in science and not in finance.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आचार्य कृपलानी जी के भाषण के बाद मेरे लिये कुछ कहना बहुत मुश्किल हो जाता है, इसलिये कि उन्होंने जो भाषण दिया उससे ऐसा लगता था कि उन्होंने जान-बूझ कर आज के इस वातावरण को हास्यापद बना दिया। मैं जानती हूँ कि उन्होंने ऐसा क्यों किया—वह समझते हैं कि आज का जो वातावरण है उसकी बुनियाद बहुत खोखली है। दादा को मैं इतने दिनों से जानती हूँ और मुझ से भी ज्यादा दूसरे बहुत से लोग जानते हैं—उन्हें मालूम है कि उन के इस तरीके में बहुत गहराई है। उन्होंने आज यह साबित कर दिया कि श्री मधु लिमये का जो प्रस्ताव है, उसकी बुनियाद इतनी खोखली है कि इस प्रस्ताव का जो अन्जाम होना चाहिये वह दादा के भाषण से मिला है।

हूँ! चूंकि आपने मुझे बुलाया है, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसलिये मुझे भी इसके बारे में कुछ कहना है। मधु लिमये जी ने यहाँ पर दो-तीन सवाल उठाये हैं। पहला सवाल उन्होंने प्रिविलेज का उठाया, जो कुछ दिन पहले उठाया था, उस दिन श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने जो उत्तर दिया, उससे उनका सन्तोष नहीं हुआ। बाद में वह यह प्रस्ताव लाये और जो अपनी दृष्टि से बुनियादी तथ्य साबित किये इसलिये कि प्रिविलेज मोशन वह उठा नहीं सकते थे, क्योंकि हमारे हाउस का कायदा है कि अगर एक बार उसको अन्जाम नहीं दिया जाता, उसको स्वीकृति नहीं मिलती, तो फिर उसको नहीं हटाया जा सकता।

## [श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

मधु लिमये जी का एक ही काम है—रुल्लू की किताब को घोट घोट कर पढ़ना, रुल्लू और डायरेक्शन की किताब को वे सुबह से लेकर शाम तक पढ़ते हैं और इसी में वह फलने फूलने लगे हैं, बाकी उन्होंने कुछ नहीं किया। रुल्लू की किताब को पढ़-पढ़ कर—इसमें कोई शक नहीं—अखबार के पहले पन्ने पर रोज-रोज अपना नाम दिखा पाये हैं, सारे मुल्क में नाम कमाया है। उनके इस बिज़नेस को करने में, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कोई एतराज की बात नहीं है, चूंकि वे ईमानदारी से दो-तीन घन्टे रोज मेहनत करते हैं। मैं जानती हूँ—चूंकि वे इसको प्रिविलेज मोशन में उठा नहीं सके, इसलिये उन्होंने धारा 184 के अन्तर्गत यह प्रस्ताव यहाँ उठाया है। परन्तु सवाल इसमें धारा 184 के अन्तर्गत बहस का नहीं है। श्री राने ने यह सही कहा था कि प्रिविलेज का जहाँ तक सवाल है, प्रिविलेज हमारे सदन में किस बात से होता है? एक तो यह कि कोई जान-बूझ कर झूठ बोले जिस से हाउस की कार्यवाही में बाधा पड़े, जान-बूझ कर इस मकसद से कि हाउस के सदस्यों को अपना कर्तव्य करने में बाधा पहुँचे उसका मतलब प्रिविलेज होता है। दूसरे—यह जो कि प्रिविलेज में नहीं आता है—किसी सदस्य ने या किसी मंत्री ने जो वक्तव्य दिया हो और उसमें जो जानकारी दी गई हो, हो सकता है कि उसकी पूरी जानकारी उस सदस्य या मंत्री के पास नहीं है। अगर उसकी जानकारी नहीं है तो फिर यह किस तरह का न्याय है—क्या यह लोक-सभा एक ऐसा कारागार है—जहाँ न्याय के मायने हैं कि अगर गलतीसे कोई ऐसा वक्तव्य देता है जिसकी उसको पूरी जानकारी न हो, उससे सदन को सन्तोष नहीं होता है तो क्या इसकी सजा यह है कि मिनिस्टर से कहा जाय कि रिज़ाइन करो या सदस्य से कहा जाय कि रिज़ाइन करो। हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी पर किसी सवाल को उठाते हैं और यहाँ मिनिस्टर का या मेम्बर का कोई अलग-अलग प्रिविलेज नहीं है।

जो सदस्यों का प्रिविलेज है, वही मंत्रियों का भी प्रिविलेज है। एक सदस्य अपनी जिम्मेदारी से किसी सवाल को उठाता है लेकिन हो सकता है कि उसकी पूरी जानकारी न हो। हम यहाँ पर कई सवाल उठाते हैं, उसकी पूरी जानकारी नहीं होती है तो उसका खंडन सरकार की तरफ से होता है, उसका खंडन माननीय सदस्य भी करते हैं तो क्या वह प्रिविलेज का मामला बन जाता है? वह प्रिविलेज का मामला नहीं है। अगर गैर जानकारी में कोई बात कही जाती है तो हाउस को मौका देना चाहिए उस व्यक्ति को वह उसको सही करले और अध्यक्ष महोदय आपको भी मौका देना चाहिए, वह चाहे कोई सदस्य हो या मंत्री हो, कि वह उस गलती को सुधार ले। क्या इस संसद् को हमने लोहे का पिंजरा बना लिया है। . . . . . (ध्यवधान) . . . . .

मैं किसी भी पार्टी की टीका नहीं कर रही हूँ। जब आपका सवाल उठाऊंगी तब आप बोलिएगा। इस तरह से टोकना आपको शोभा नहीं देता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपको सामने एक रूलिंग रखना चाहती हूँ। आपको मालूम होगा श्री मावलंकर की एक बहुत मशहूर रूलिंग है। श्री गोपालन जो कि इस सभा के सदस्य हैं, उन्होंने एक बार श्री कृष्णामाचारी के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज का मोशन उठाया था जिसपर श्री अनन्तशैलम आयंगर ने रूलिंग दी। श्री आयंगर ने अपनी तरफ से तो जो कुछ कहा वह तो कहा ही लेकिन उन्होंने अपनी रूलिंग में श्री मावलंकर की रूलिंग का भी हवाला दिया—प्रिविलेज के मामले में एक बहुत बुनियादी मामला उठा था—वह मामला क्या था वह इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहती हूँ, आयंगर जी के शब्दों में ही :

“So far as this House is concerned, there is an earlier case which is directly in point.... In the first case, Shri C. Subramaniam and Shri Ramnath Goenka,

M.P.s., gave notice on the 23rd March, 1951 of an alleged breach of privilege to the effect that in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, 1951—this is after the Constitution came into force and article 105(3) had become applicable—it had been stated that sago globules, calcium lactate etc. industries were to be given protection for the first time for which Parliament's sanction was sought, whereas in the Administrative Report of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry issued in February 1951 it had been stated that the Government had accepted the Tariff Board's recommendations and granted protection to sago globules, calcium lactate etc. industries. In this case, the Statement of Objects and Reasons which was supposed to inform the House regarding this matter stated that for the first time protection was sought for, whereas in the Administrative Report issued by the same Ministry it was stated that it had already been granted and acted upon."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस पर श्री मावलंकर जी ने क्या रूलिंग दी ? यह एक बुनियादी प्रिविलेज की बात है। आबजेक्ट्स ऐंड रीजन्स में एक गलती हुई थी जो कि सरकारी आँकड़ों से ही साबित होती थी कि और सरकार ने कोई ऐसा कदम नहीं उठाया जिससे कि सदन के सामने गलती का समाधान हो जाता, तब तक जब तक कि यह मामला सदन के सामने नहीं आया था। मावलंकर जी ने जो रूलिंग दी उसको मैं आपके सामने पढ़ना चाहती हूँ जो कि आर्यंगर जी के शब्दों में ही है :

Shri Mavalankar, my predecessor recorded the following note on that notice.

"I have not been able to appreciate as to how there is any breach of privilege of Parliament. The substance of the allegations seems to be that the Minister concerned, or the Government have not made the fullest disclosure, or have made misleading statements. This may be regrettable, but I do not understand how this constitutes a breach of privilege, even if it be assumed that the failure to give full or correct information was intentional."

श्री मावलंकर जी की रूलिंग तो यहाँ तक जाती है कि अगर इन्टेन्शनली भी मिसलीड करने की कोशिश की जाय तो उसके बारे में भी अनफारचुनेट ही कहा जा सकता है या उसके बारे में दुःख प्रकट किया जा सकता है। परन्तु उसकी प्रिविलेज का मामला नहीं बनाया जा सकता। लेकिन हमारे यहाँ प्रिविलेज का मामला रोज एक खेल बन गया है। लोगों के मन में डर होने लगा है कि यह पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य किस तरह के हैं। आज स्थिति यह है कि अखबार में लिखने वाले लोग, किताब लिखने वाले लोग और कवि और लेखक जो हैं उनको हमसे डर होने लगा है कि अगर वह कुछ बोलेंगे तो पकड़े जाएंगे। आखीर यह पार्लियामेंट है या लोहे का पिंजड़ा बना कर हम ने रखा है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

दूसरी बात प्रोप्राइटी की उठाई गई। यहाँ पर इस बात की सफाई हो जानी चाहिए। मैं पहले यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि दादा हमारे बुजुर्ग हैं, उन्होंने कहा कि अच्छा हुआ मेरे बच्चे नहीं हुए। परन्तु कोई भी परिवार हो, उसका कोई सदस्य अगर कुछ करता है तो उसके लिए क्या लाजिमी है कि उसका गला घोट दिया जाय या आबारागदी करने के लिए उसे सड़क पर डाल दिया जाय ? और यह उस मुल्क में हम बात कर रहे हैं जो मुल्क बहुत शान से कहता है कि हम औद्योगिक विकास करना चाहते हैं, हम अपने यहाँ कल-कारखाने लगाना चाहते हैं। और उस मुल्क की यह पार्लियामेंट है जो इस बात को मान कर चलती है। मैं मधु लिमये जी से कहना चाहती हूँ कि जब उन्होंने यह सवाल उठाया तो क्या उन्होंने कोई चार्ज लगाया, इसके अलावा श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने जो वक्तव्य दिया वह पूरा नहीं था बल्कि अधूरा वक्तव्य था ? क्या आप ने श्री कान्ति लाल देसाई पर कोई चार्ज लगाया है ? इनके जो नेता हैं श्री रवी राय उनसे दो दिन पहले मैंने मजाक में कहा था। उनसे मेरी अच्छी मित्रता है। बाहर हम मित्रों जैसे रहते हैं। तो मैंने रवी राय जी से कहा था

## [श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

कि आप ने श्री मधु लिमये जी को कुछ कहने के लायक नहीं रखा। 5-6 सवाल जो उन्होंने उठाए थे उसके बारे में रवी राय जी ने और अब्दुल गनी दार साहब ने रखा, इनकम टैक्स का मामला उठाया गया, कम्पनी ला के बारे में, फारेन एक्स्चेंज के बारे में मामला उठाया गया मैं तो नहीं समझती कि मेरा इनकम टैक्स भी ठीक है या नहीं, हो सकता है दो चार रुपये का फर्क हो..... (व्यवधान)..... मुझे कोई घबराहट नहीं है। मैं चोंचलेबाजी में विश्वास नहीं करती हूँ। गरजने वाले बादल बरसते बहुत कम हैं। तो मैं यह कह रही थी कि श्री मधु लिमये ने श्री कान्ति लाल देसाई के बारे में कोई भी ऐसा मामला नहीं निकाला जिस के सम्बन्ध में यह कहा जा सके कि उन्होंने कोई गैर कानूनी काम किया।

इसके बाद सवाल उठाया जाता है प्रोप्राइटी का। इसका मतलब क्या है? मैं श्री डाँगे साहब से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि आप की पार्टी के एक बड़े वरिष्ठ सदस्य थे चन्द्रशेखर सिंह और उनके पिता जो बिहार सरकार में कांग्रेस के मंत्री थे। इन का बेटा इनके साथ ही घर पर रहता था और कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का तमाम काम करता था, कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी की मीटिंग में जाया करता था।..... (व्यवधान) तो उस समय आपको कैसा लगता था? हम इस बात को महसूस करते हैं कि राजनीति में रहने वालों के लिए चाहे उसका लड़का या लड़की व्यापार करे चाहे उसका लड़का या लड़की राजनीति में जाय, कल को मेरी लड़की अगर कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी की मेम्बर बन जाय तो क्या मैं एतराज करूंगी? नहीं करूंगी।..... (व्यवधान)..... मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि अगर किसी पार्टी का काम करने वाला सदस्य है, उसकी नीयत बेईमानी की नहीं समझी जानी चाहिए और अगर यह माना जाता है कि पार्टी का काम करने वाला आदमी श्री ईमानदारी से अपने माँ-बाप के यहाँ रह

सकते हैं तो फिर यह क्यों नहीं माना जायेगा कि कोई बिजनेस करने वाला आदमी अपने माँ-बाप के साथ ईमानदारी से बिजनेस करते हुए रह सकता है? यह जरूरी नहीं है कि उस के बिजनेस में उसके माँ-बाप का कोई हाथ हो।

आखिरी बात मैं और कहना चाहती हूँ। यहाँ पर प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी की बात कही गई। मैं मानती हूँ कि श्री मोरार जी देसाई को प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी का शब्द इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहिए था।..... (व्यवधान)..... मैं उन के घर में काफी आती जाती रहती हूँ, इसलिए मुझे मालूम है कि श्री कान्ति भाई क्या काम करते हैं।..... (व्यवधान)..... उन्होंने प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी का शब्द जो इस्तेमाल किया उससे गलतफहमी हुई। सारे हाउस में और सारे देश को गलत-फहमी हुई। बाप के घर में अगर लड़का खाने पीने का हिसाब रखता है तो क्या वह प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी का काम है? मैं जानती हूँ कि मिनिस्ट्रों के प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी लड़के और लड़कियों की शादी करवाते हैं, स्कूल में बच्चों के ऐडमिशन करवाते हैं, इस पर मेरा एतराज है। और मैं चाहती हूँ कि मिनिस्टर्स इस सिलसिले में एक स्टैंडर्ड कायम करें कि जो सरकारी प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी हो वह सिर्फ सरकारी काम ही करे। सरदार पटेल के बारे में मैंने सुना है कि उनके प्राइवेट रुम्स के अन्दर कोई उनका प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी नहीं जा सकता था। मैं तो कहूंगी कि जितने मिनिस्टर्स हैं वह प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरीज से इस तरह के काम लेना बन्द करें। घर के काम घर के लोगों से करवाएं। वह उसको करते होंगे ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है।..... (व्यवधान)..... जहाँ तक प्रोप्राइटी का सवाल है क्या दुनिया में यह कभी नहीं हुआ, मैं आपको बताऊँ कि चर्चिल साहब का जो लड़का था रैन्डाल्ड चर्चिल—माउन्ट बैटन की किताब आप पढ़ें—चर्चिल का लड़का जब लड़ाई में अफ्रीका में था तो उन्होंने माउन्ट बैटन की मार्फत केसाल्वाका कांफेंस में अपने लड़के को बुलाया और फिर

वह बराबर अपने बाप के साथ रहा, उसी प्रकार रूजवेल्ट ने अपने लड़के ईलियट रूजवेल्ट को, जहाँ वह काम करता था वहाँ से निकाल कर व्हाइट हाउस में रखा। मैं डॉंगे साहब से ही पूछना चाहती हूँ कि जब कोसीजिन साहब यहाँ पर आए थे और वह उनसे बात करने के लिए गए थे तो क्या वह गैर-सरकारी बात थी? क्या वह बात देश के हित में नहीं थी? अगर श्री मोरारजी देसाई के लड़के गए हैं और किसी से व्यक्तिगत ढंग से बात की है तो इसमें कोई एतराज नहीं होना चाहिए।

उनके जो नेता हैं, श्री कोसीजिन, उनके बारे में मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमारी जो वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री हैं जब वह रूस गई थीं तो श्री कोसीजिन ने और उनकी सरकार ने उन को बड़े आदर से अपनी कान्फ्रेंस टेबल पर बुलाया था और जब स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के साथ उनकी जो बात चीत हुई थी उस बातचीत में श्रीमती गाँधी ने हिस्सा लिया था, क्या इससे कोई भी व्यक्ति इकार कर सकता है? लेकिन चूँकि यह एक हकीकत है इसलिए इससे कोई भी इकार नहीं कर सकेगा। इसलिए ऐसी चीजों को, घरेलू मामलों को सदन में रखना यह एक बहुत गैर मुनासिब चीज है। घरेलू मामलों को घरेलू ही रखा जाना चाहिए। यह श्री मोरारजी देसाई पर ही छोड़ दिया जाये कि वह जो फैसला करना चाहें वह अपने घर के बारे में करें। इस हाउस के अन्दर यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि हाउस उन के ऊपर छीटाकशी करे। जय हिन्द।

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI:** May I suggest to Congressmen that nobody has attributed motives to Morarjibhai. Nobody should attribute motives to Madhu. He is trying to do his duty as he conceives it, and we must not, therefore, make any remarks about it.

**श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा:** श्रीमधु लिमये को मैंने कोई नोटिस ऐट्रीब्यूट नहीं किया है। मैंने उनको वो कुछ कहा ही नहीं है।

**SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Sir, the Deputy Prime Minister, in his statement today, told us that there is no rule in the country or anywhere, where sons and daughters and other close relations of Ministers should not be in business. Certainly there is no such rule, but I would like to remind him of the genesis of this whole episode. On the 30th April, Mr. Umanath, a Member of this House, raised this question. He did not object to Mr. Morarji Desai's son being in business, but what he objected to was that a person who is in business should be the Private Secretary of the Deputy Prime Minister. And it was to that, that Mr. Morarji Desai reacted very badly. Mr. Morarji Desai said, "I treat them with contempt; I treat this allegation with contempt." And this is being said not only now, but from the year 1964, that "my son has no business connections." What does it mean? It means Mr. Morarji Desai himself admitted that if his son had any connection with business he should not be his Private Secretary. This is the simple meaning. Otherwise, why should Mr. Morarji Desai at that time react very badly? This is the proposition.

After that, what are the things that have come in evidence? After all, Mr. Morarji Desai now says that he has made a very frank statement. Unfortunately it is a fact that every statement of his comes only after some disclosure is made, and then he tries to explain away that thing. This is how the matters have come up. He on his own volition has not come before the House to place all these facts; when people had questioned him, when other facts were brought to his notice, then he comes forward with a statement trying to explain away that thing. That is how things have happened in this House.

What is the question now? With regard to the business connections of Mr. Kantilal Desai, Mr. Morarji Desai does not now totally deny it. He only says that the statement that he has made substantially correct; not fully correct but substantially correct. And he tries to explain away the fact that he has continued to be director of the companies by saying that he has been receiving only a director's fee. I dare say that a person in the position of Shri Morarji Desai, who happens to be the



[Shri P. Ramamurti]

Finance Minister of this country, knows fully well that directorship is not just an ordinary thing; directorship entails also certain responsibilities. After all, under the Companies Act, if somebody is a director, if the company is guilty of defalcation or malpractice, the entire board of directors can be sued both civilly and criminally. Therefore, for him to come and say that his son has been just receiving his director's fees does not convince anybody. The very fact that he attends the meeting of the board of directors shows that he is taking an interest in that concern. Otherwise, why does he attend a meeting of the board of directors? Just for a cup of tea and receiving the director's fees? No. He goes there to discuss the affairs of the company where certain resolutions are adopted and certain policy decisions are made. These are the functions of the board of directors. What else is it? What other business connection has he got? Therefore, all this explanation that he wants to give, or tries to give, will convince no one.

Then, even now he does not come out openly saying "I made a mistake; my son has been having connections with them". That he has not said. I am not now concerned whether he deliberately made that statement or not but the fact remains that even now he goes by what his son has said. When facts have been brought openly in this House, when for example Shri Umanath brought them in the House, or Shri Madhu Limaye later on, when serious allegations have been made against his son, as a responsible man was it not necessary for him to make inquiries to find out the real position instead of relying on the words of his son. Was it not for him to say "I will make inquiries and find out the position. I will not be guided by what my son has stated; I will make enquiries from other sources so that all facts can be ascertained"? But he never made such an inquiry. Whenever a new fact was brought to his notice, he came out with the statement "I enquired of my son and he has given this fact".

For example, take this question of the terminal benefits. That contract is now being sought to be explained by saying—I do not know why he has not gone and

made any inquiry of that firm; he simply says "I do not know"—it is for that firm to explain why it has shown this as a salary for the employee. It is a funny thing. When the whole country is discussing this question, even now he does not think it necessary to call Dodsall & Company and find out why it has done it. Or is it a fact that that agreement itself was a fraudulent agreement in order to hide certain facts? There may be something fraudulent about it. Why should we not think that these two people colluded for making this kind of agreement, making it appear that he has severed all connections with the company when in reality he continues to have that connection? What sort of inquiry did he make in this case? I want to point out that even today he does not think it his responsibility to make a thorough inquiry. Neither does the Prime Minister think it her responsibility to make a thorough inquiry when so much of cloud is there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you not make inquiries?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If the CBI is with me, I will make inquiries. If the machinery is put in motion, facts can be found out. We do not have the machinery. It is for the government to make inquiries because it has got the machinery at its disposal. If that machinery is available to us, we will make inquiries in no time. It is a very funny situation that we have to point out all these things. If we had the machinery, we would have had made the inquiries then and there.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: The photostat copies could not have fallen from heaven.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: So many allegations are made against Shri Kantilal Desai and he is under a cloud. After all, he is not a paragon of virtue. Whether he has done something or not, at least the people in the country talk so much about him, how he became rich, how he was able to utilize his position and so on. I do not say that Shri Morarji Desai helped him but, at any rate, Shri Desai did not prevent his son from utilising his father's position. Otherwise, why did Dodsall & Company engage him? It is a company engaged in contract work in both the public and private sector. Why did it appoint Shri

Kantilal Desai as its employees? It appointed him for the purpose of securing business from the public sector undertakings, from government. Why did it not appoint somebody else? It appointed him because he happened to be the son of Shri Morarji Desai, who at that time happened to be a Minister of the Union Government. It is all well-known to everybody. Therefore, it is absolutely essential for him to make some inquiries. But he has refused to do it even today.

I will give one or two examples here. The Finance Minister said that Shri Kantilal Desai was given a nominal foreign exchange. Very well, When he accompanied his father to attend that conference lasting about a month he was given only £90 and he went at his own expense. I would like to know from the Finance Minister whether any person can live for one full month in Europe, in America and in Brazil on £90. If not, who met his expenses? If his expenditure was not met out of government funds, who met it?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :  
The Russians and the Chinese.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : If the Russians and the Chinese met his expenses, let us make an inquiry into that. Why are you shirking an enquiry? Let us find out why the Russians and the Chinese met them. If somebody else met those expenses, why is it that they met his expenses? It is a matter which has got to be gone into.

Similarly, we are told, our Deputy Prime Minister himself has stated that, that later on he went to Seoul and all those places and joined him in Manila. Our Deputy Prime Minister had gone to Manila just for three days; therefore he went earlier. When a question was asked, he said that he went there on some invitation. We would like to know whose invitation it was. After all, Shri Kantilal Desai had severed all connections with business and if he had severed all connections with business, what is the business organisation that had invited him? If he was not invited by any business organisation, then he must have been invited by the Governments of those countries. Why did the Governments of those countries invite a private individual? Was it because he happens to be the private

secretary of Shri Morarji Desai?

All these are factors which have got to be gone into.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :  
They have invited Members of Parliament also and they have gone there.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Yes. At any rate, Shri Kantilal Desai was not a public figure, except that he happened to be the private secretary of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Finance Minister.

Shri Morarji Desai made the excuse that it is nothing but Shri Umanath may be motivated by personal ends. He might say that, but here is the *Sunday Standard* which is owned by Shri Ramnath Goenka. I know, our Deputy Prime Minister, when he goes to Madras, often stays with Shri Ramnath Goenka. Therefore he cannot dismiss him as an enemy to him. Shri Ramnath Goenka's paper has published a message sent on April 30 from Tokyo by the PTI. I dare say that the Deputy Prime Minister cannot say that the representative of the PTI in Tokyo was motivated by personal grudge against him. What is the message? The message says :—

“South Korea and India have agreed to hold their second trade conference in New Delhi next month, official Korean sources disclosed here yesterday.

Agreement to this effect was reached in Seoul between the Korean Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Pil Sik Chin, and Mr. Kantilal Desai of India.”

When such things have appeared, Shri Morarji Desai knew that these news items were appearing in the press not only of this country but even of South Korea. When such things had happened, when it is possible for people to utilise that position, what were the steps that Shri Morarji Desai had taken all these months or since he became the Deputy Prime Minister to see that no opportunity is given to this man, Shri Kantilal Desai, to exploit his position. That is the simple question that we are concerned with.

17.43 Hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

From that point of view I should point out that he has not made any amends. It is not a question of truth or untruth, but

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

whether by keeping Shri Kantilal Desai as his personal private secretary or whatever be the name, he has been able to give him opportunities to exploit his position while continuing to have some business connections or other. That is the simple question.

My hon. friend, Shri Masani, was saying, "I cannot oppose this; I cannot support it." He also quoted *Current* as expressing the common man's opinion. I hope, he knows that from P. M. Traders, a company owned by Shri Kantilal Desai, very recently, last year I think, a few thousands of rupees were given to them as loan when they were in an extremely difficult position and for the rest Shri Kilachand came to their help. It is such interests that these papers represent and not the common people. I hope, Shri Masani, will at least know that fact now.

In the end, you may dismiss this whole question but you cannot get away from the fact that the image of this Government and of the Deputy Prime Minister himself before the people of this country is thoroughly sullied because of these things. If you want to continue that sullied nature, go with it; to hell with you. What am I to do? After all, I can only point out that it is a mire; do not get into the mire. But how can I prevent people, who are determined to go into the mire? I cannot prevent it. But it is in your interest to see that the image that is already sullied does not get further and further sullied and it is high time that from that point of view on his own volition Shri Morarji Desai withdraws from this Government. It is from that point of view that we support this motion.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब यह चर्चा चल रही थी तब मैं ट्रेजरी बेंच पर बैठे हुए मंत्रियों की आकृति का खास तौर पर अध्ययन कर रहा था और विशेष रूप से यह देख रहा था कि इन सारी चर्चाओं को सुनने के बाद किस के चेहरे पर क्या हाव-भाव आ रहे हैं। उनमें से एक या दो व्यक्ति इस प्रकार के थे जो सारी चर्चाओं को सुन कर बड़ा सन्तोष अनुभव कर रहे थे, शायद इसलिये कि जन्होंने

विवाह नहीं किया। सोचा होगा कि अगर कहीं हम ने भी विवाह कर लिया होता और हमारे भी सन्तान हुई होती तो नहीं कहा जा सकता कि हम को भी कहीं चर्चा का विषय न बनाया जाता। शास्त्रों में लिखा है कि :

“अपुत्रस्य नास्ति गति”

जिनके सन्तान नहीं होती उनको स्वर्ग नहीं मिलता। लेकिन मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि मंत्री बनने के लिये यह परिभाषा बदलनी पड़ेगी और उसमें यह होना चाहिये कि :

“सपुत्रस्य नास्ति गति”

जिसके सन्तान होगी उसका भविष्य सुखद नहीं है।

आज की सारी स्थिति को देखने के बाद या तो भारत में इस प्रकार की परम्पराओं का प्रारम्भ करना चाहिये और सोचना चाहिये कि जो लोग मंत्रि परिषद् में सम्मिलित होना चाहें उनके बेटे बेटियां केवल पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर ही हो सकते हैं, और कोई दूसरा काम नहीं कर सकते, या फिर इसके लिये कोई और नियम निर्धारित करने चाहियें।

दूसरी सब से बड़ी चीज यह है कि अगर कहीं मेरे जैसे आदमी को, जो कि पुनर्जन्म में विश्वास रखता है, भारत में मरने के बाद दुबारा जन्म लेना हो तो मरते समय उसको यह जरूर कहना चाहिये कि भगवान, अगर भारत में मेरा जन्म हो तो खास तौर से मंत्रियों के घर में जन्म मत देना। जो मेरे पिता को बदनाम करने के वास्ते मुझे हथियार न बनाया जाये।

मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता होती इस बात की कि जैसे बजट प्रस्तावों पर चर्चा करते समय यह प्रकरण आया था कि श्री मोरारजी देसाई के बजट प्रस्तावों का पहले रहस्योद्घाटन हो जाने के कारण कुछ लोगों ने शेर खरीद कर बजट प्रस्तावों का लाभ उठाया था। यदि यह सिद्ध हो जाता और आज भी सिद्ध हो

जाये तो मैं पहला व्यक्ति इस संसद् में होऊंगा जो इस बात का आग्रह करूंगा वित्त मंत्री से या उप-प्रधान मंत्री से कि उनको अपने पद पर नहीं रहना चाहिये ।

लेकिन एक बात मैं भी श्री मोरारजी देसाई से भी कहना चाहूंगा, और वह यह कि इस अभागे देश की यह परम्परा ही रही है उनको ही पहली बार इस तरह से नहीं छोड़ा गया है । जब इस देश ने सरदार पटेल को नहीं छोड़ा । जब इस देश ने पं० गोविन्द बल्लभ पन्त को नहीं छोड़ा, जब इस देश ने श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी को नहीं छोड़ा, और और तो और जब इस देश ने गरीब प्रधान मंत्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री को नहीं छोड़ा, तब अगर आज उनको इस चर्चा का विषय बनाया जा रहा है तो वह चर्चा का विषय बनते समय इस इतिहास को अपनी आँखों से ओझल न करें ।

मुझे इस बात को कहते हुए बड़ा कष्ट होता है और इस बात को देख कर थोड़ा दुःख भी अनुभव हो रहा है कि हमारे देश में राजनीतिक परम्परायें इतने छोटे स्तर पर बराबर उतर रही हैं कभी मिनक कोट को ले कर चर्चा करना, कभी हार को ले कर चर्चा करना, कभी स्वेतलाना को ले कर चर्चा करना, पालियामेंट का स्तर यदि इतना ही नीचा उतरता चला गया तो इस देश में जनतंत्र का भविष्य अन्धकारमय हो जायेगा, हमको सोचना चाहिए अवश्य इन सारी बातों पर । हमें पालियामेंटी चर्चाओं के स्तर को सदा ऊँचे स्तर पर बनाये रखने के लिये इन बातों पर मिल कर विचार करना चाहिये ।

मैं नहीं कह सकता कि श्री मोरारजी देसाई की पारिवारिक स्थिति क्या है ? लेकिन मैं आप से मनुष्यता के नाते एक बात पूछना चाहूंगा, और आपके द्वारा सारे सदन के सामने इस प्रश्न को रखना चाहूंगा कि इस अवस्था में आ कर जिसमें उप-प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरारजी देसाई इस समय चल रहे हैं—

मेरा इशारा है कि जब वह अपनी आयु के लगभग 80 वर्ष को स्पर्श कर रहे हैं— और इस पर भी उप-प्रधान मंत्री तथा वित्त मंत्री के अपने दायित्व को निभाते हैं, अपनी पार्टी का काम भी करते हैं । ऐसे समय में अगर उनके पारिवारिक जीवन में कोई इस प्रकार की न्यूनता है जो उनके बेटे अपने पिता के स्वास्थ्य की दृष्टि से उनके हर पारिवारिक कार्य में सहयोगी बनने की दृष्टि से सहायक बनते हैं तो उसको आलोचनाओं का विषय बनाया जाय, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित नहीं होगा ।

एक बात मेरी अपनी दृष्टि में यह भी आती है कि वह अधिक से अधिक आलोचनाओं के जो कारण बने हैं उनमें एक कारण और भी है । उसे मैं समझता हूँ कि भाषा का भी बहुत दोष रहा है । श्री मधु लिमये ने जिस समय इस प्रश्न को उठाया था, उसके उत्तर में अगर उस समय उप-प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हिन्दी के शब्द का उत्तर हिन्दी में ही दे दिया होता और अंग्रेजी में न दिया होता और बजाय प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी कहने के निजी सहायक उनको कह दिया होता तो शायद यह स्थिति इतना गम्भीर रूप धारण न करती और इस प्रकार का वातावरण न बनता । स्थिति यह है कि प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी शब्द जब उन्होंने कहा तो उसके तरह तरह के अर्थ निकाले गए । मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि अगर सरकारी कर्मचारी के रूप में कान्ति भाई की नियुक्ति हुई है और सरकारी कर्मचारी के नाते उन्होंने किसी भी प्रकार का पैसा सरकार के खजाने से लिया है या सरकार द्वारा पैसा उनकी दिया गया है तो निश्चित रूप से यह आपत्तिजनक चीज है ।

एक दूसरी बात भी है । सरकार की किसी फाइल के ऊपर, अगर कान्ति भाई की कोई भी किसी प्रकार की टिप्पणी है या किसी प्रकार का नोट है तो वह भी एक आपत्तिजनक

[श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री]

चीज है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं इस बात की सन्तुष्टि कर लें।

एक पुत्र के लिए इससे बड़ा क्या अपराध हो सकता है कि जिस समय उसका पिता मंत्रिमंडल में नहीं था उस समय वह इमी सरकार के खजाने में उससे कहीं ज्यादा इनकम टैक्स देता था उसकी तुलना में जबकि उसका पिता मंत्रिमंडल में है। आप देखें कि अपने पिता के स्वाभिमान और गौरव की रक्षा के लिए उसने किस तरह इनकम टैक्स दिया है। 1964 में जबकि उसके पिता मंत्रिमंडल में नहीं थे उसने 69,000 रुपया इनकम टैक्स का दिया। और 1967-68 में जबकि उसके पिता मंत्रिमंडल में थे। उसने चौदह हजार ही इनकम टैक्स का दिया है।

मैं बड़ी नम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस देश के राजनीतिक जीवन को सुरक्षित रखना है तो जिन व्यक्तियों ने अपने राजनीतिक जीवन में कुछ परम्परायें और आदर्श स्थापित किये हैं और उनका पालन किया है, उनका आदर होना चाहिये। आज मोरारजी देसाई के ऊपर आक्रमण नहीं किया जा रहा है बल्कि एक विशेष विचार-धारा के ऊपर आक्रमण किया जा रहा है। उस विशेष विचारधारा पर आक्रमण करने के लिए जो श्रृंखला है वह यहीं तक नहीं है, दुर्भाग्य से वह श्रृंखला भारत से बाहर तक भी जा चुकी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी अपना उत्तर देने समय जो प्रश्न मसानी जी ने उठाया है उस प्रश्न को भी भाँखों से ओझल न करें। कहीं उनके घर में ही तो इस प्रकार के लोग नहीं हैं जो एक प्रकार की चर्चा को चलाने में सहायता दे रहे हैं? कहीं ऐसी बात तो नहीं है कि यहाँ तो यह चीज चर्चा का विषय बन रही है, इस पर यहाँ चर्चा चल रही है और कहीं से सारे के सारे इसके ड्राफ्ट बन कर आ रहे हैं। ये सब कहीं से आ रहे हैं इन तमाम चीजों के पीछे क्या रहस्य है? प्रधान मंत्री जी इसका भी उत्तर दें ताकि

देश का राजनीतिक वातावरण शुद्ध बना रह सके।

**SHRI THIRUMALA RAO (Kakinada) :** Before I begin my speech, I want to draw the attention of the House to a publication in today's daily of Delhi, the great *Patriot*, in which they have given this in headlines :

**"ALLEGATIONS AGAINST KANTILAL DESAI.**

Prime Minister told to get legal opinion.

Office-bearers of the Congress Parliamentary Party met the Prime Minister on Sunday and asked her to seek judicial opinion on the allegations about Mr. Kantilal Desai's business connections after 1964."

I contradict it completely and it is as black a lie as the ink in which it is printed. (Interruptions).

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) :** Who are you to contradict? Let the Prime Minister contradict it.

**SHRI THIRUMALA RAO :** I am the Deputy Leader of the Party. Who are you to talk about my Party? I am the Deputy Leader of the Party, and I contradict it.

This paper is publishing all sorts of insinuations and sowing seeds of discontent and disunity among the Congress Party by publishing unauthorised reports. We know the history of this paper. It has unabashedly and openly attacked the Prime Minister and wanted her Government to fall. It has attacked the Deputy Prime Minister. It is doing everything in its power to discredit this Government. This is another piece of lie which I am here to contradict.

Coming to the Motion proper, I do not want to go into the legalistic details and into the details of the transactions of Shri Kantilal Desai. My hon. friend, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, has made a speech in golden words stressing that we should for all times stand for upholding the dignity and the prestige of this House. On the other hand, my friend, Shri Dange, has flown in from Bombay to hurl a few stones at Shri Morarji Desai. What moral right have Shri Dange and people like him to preach probity and uprightness in public

life to us? Has not China published a magnified edition of the life of Shri Dange? All the newspapers have published it. I want him to see it. In it, they have described him as a revisionist of the Russian school.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal): See the National archives. He was a British spy.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO: We know the Communist party. When I refer to them, I am reminded of a story. A man went to his father-in-law's place and said 'Here also there is sky'. He thought the sky was there only in his village. Here also we see the Communist Party. In Kakinada, we have got the Communist Party. Shri Basavapunniah was a member of it. He has accused Shri C. V. K. Rao of having stolen large quantities of gold jewels and cash in Telengana, and said that it was not handed over (Interruptions).

SHRI NAMBIAR: I take strong objection to this sort of thing.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO: I am quoting from Shri Basavapunniah's speech in Kakinada. He says that Shri C. V. K. Rao has stolen a thousand rupees worth of gold and silver from Telengana and if he does not account for it, his head will be chopped off. These are the people who come here and preach morals to us.

SHRI NAMBIAR: What is the subject-matter?

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO: Here is my friend, Shri Madhu Limaye. We have been watching his career here from the very beginning. Was it not the stunt of his erstwhile leader to throw as much mud against all the Congress leaders as possible? Was he not accusing Jawaharlal Nehru of spending Rs. 25,000 of public money, government money, daily on his maintenance?

How many times has it been contradicted and how many times was it persisted in? What sort of nonsensical questions they used to ask about our leaders? It is such people and their followers who have the temerity to come and attack the Treasury Benches now? They speak in an idealistic vein about upholding dignity and propriety

of behaviour. After the SSP has come into this House, all the proprieties and dignities of this House have been destroyed. Do we not know that clandestinely they take away official files from officers and claim it as their privilege to lay such things on the Table?

SHRI NAMBIAR: What about the Jayanti Shipping Company? He was a director of that Company.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO: You are all fellow-travellers. You are so divided among yourselves. You can never hope to come and occupy the Treasury Benches. All these friends of the United Fronts are dreaming of displacing the Congress. It will remain a dream only. Here is a version given by a foreign correspondent, an impartial man.... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Everybody has read it.

SHRI NAMBIAR: They could not get at Dharma Teja and his wife.

Still he is talking these things at us. (Interruptions).

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO: I have known you all my life.

SHRI NAMBIAR: He was a Director of the Jayanti Shipping Company. We know what has happened to that company.

18 Hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: When you were speaking, you were heard with rapt attention by the other members. Why don't you also do the same thing?

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO: This is from the newspaper *La Metropole* dated 1st August under the caption "India searches for Political Stability", and it says:

"Therefore, continued Mr. Heim, the stars were favourable for a renovation of the Congress Party. Not only have anti-Congress United Fronts proved a failure the Indian perspective grows brighter at every level; political confusion is disappearing, the spectre of famine is receding and economic development is re-starting after two years of stagnation. A new hope rises for Indian democracy. The Congress should take heed of the

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

lessons which the electorate taught it last February. It should meditate on the thesis of Beatrice Pitney Lamb who notes correctly that in India, the saint, the disinterested person has very many more supporters than the candidate who launches out with personal ambitions'.... India needs a new and hynamic Congress. In the light of current experience it has been seen that, in spite of all its faults, this party is the sole guarantor of national unity in a nation where this unity seems to be threatened by several interests.... There is in the destiny of this country and this people a great morality, something that is exalted and exalting, which leaved the impression that India goes forward on different waves but always on the same river."

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं अपने मित्र श्री मधु निमये को बधाई देना चाहता हूं। मैं जब उन का भाषण सुन रहा था तो मुझे बरबस डाक्टर लोहिया की याद आ गई ! डाक्टर लोहिया मूर्तिमंजक थे, निर्माण के पहले वह ध्वंस में विश्वास करते थे। श्री लिमये ने डा० लोहिया की मूर्ति-तोड़क परम्परा को आगे बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न किया है। उनका जोश तथा लगन देख कर कभी-कभी मुझे ईर्ष्या होती है। सामला कितना भी कमजोर क्यों न हो, वह बड़ी दृढ़ता के साथ उसको पेश करने हैं और भले ही जजों का निर्णय उनके खिलाफ जाय, लेकिन दर्शक उनसे बिना प्रभावित हुए नहीं रहता। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तो संयोग की बात है कि आज श्री लिमये ने उप-प्रधान मंत्री को अपने प्रहार का विषय बनाया है, अभी उन्होंने कहा कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री के प्रति उनके हृदय में बड़ा आदर है। सचमुच में श्री लिमये का उद्देश्य है इस सरकार को तोड़ना, इस शासन को अपदस्थ करना है। इसके लिए वह कोई भी हथियार अपनाने के लिए तैयार रहते हैं। लेकिन इस प्रस्ताव में उन्होंने उप-प्रधान मंत्री के साथ प्रधान मंत्री को भी लपेटा है और इसके कारण उनके

कुछ मित्रों को कठिनाई हो सकती है जो उप-प्रधान मंत्री के विरुद्ध तो लट्ट लिए घूमते रहते हैं लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री को स्पर्श करने में भी कतराते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री लिमये ने जिन तथ्यों को सदन के सामने रखा है उनमें से बहुत से तथ्य बम्बई के एक साप्ताहिक पत्र द्वारा प्रकाशित किए जा चुके हैं। यह साप्ताहिक उप-प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ एक नियमित अभियान चला रहा है। उस अभियान को चरित्र हत्या की भी संज्ञा दी जा सकती है। यहाँ तक कि वह साप्ताहिक पत्र उप-प्रधान मंत्री को गाँधी हत्याकांड में भी अपरोक्ष रूप से शामिल करने का दुस्साहस कर रहा है। यह मामला जाँच का विषय है, इसलिए मैं कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि बम्बई के उस साप्ताहिक को अनेक मंत्रियों का समर्थन प्राप्त है। वह समय-समय पर उस के साथ विशेष भेंट वार्ता करके उसे सम्मानित करते रहते हैं। राजधानी के राजनैतिक क्षेत्रों में खुले आम यह चर्चा चल रही है कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री के विरुद्ध इस साप्ताहिक द्वारा जो जैहाद छेड़ा गया है, उसके पीछे मंत्रिमंडल के कुछ लोगों का हाथ है। बम्बई से एक नया साप्ताहिक प्रकाशित हुआ है, उस का नाम है 'इंडियन मानीटर' कहते हैं उस साप्ताहिक के पीछे वह लोग हैं जो हाल ही में बम्बई में इकट्ठे हुए थे और जिन्होंने कांग्रेस में सामूहिक नेतृत्व की चर्चा की थी। क्या प्रधान मंत्री के नेतृत्व पर से उनका विश्वास हट गया है? इस नवे साम्ताहिक ने अपने पहले अंक में अपने नई दिल्ली स्थिति संवाददाता का एक समाचार छपा है जिसका एक अंक में उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ :

"So the Prime Minister's priorities shifted to undermining Mr. Desai and Mr. Nijalingappa. This was sought to be done through yellow journals raking up Kanti affair and through a controversy about Mysore Government's agent in London. Mr. Dinesh Singh and the over-ambitious communist Minis-

ter of State Mr. Raghunath Reddy worked overtime passing on data about these controversies."

मैं नहीं जानता, इन रिपोर्टों में कहाँ तक सच्चाई है। लेकिन इस बात की जाँच होनी चाहिए कि जो तथ्य साधारण पत्रकारों के लिए उपलब्ध नहीं होते हैं, जो तथ्य संसद् के सदस्यों के लिए भी प्राप्य नहीं हैं, वे तथ्य एक विशेष समाचार-पत्र में किस तरह पहुँचे? क्या किसी मंत्रालय ने तो उन तथ्यों को नहीं पहुँचाया? ऐसा लगता है कि वर्तमान सरकार एक विभाजित सरकार है, एक खंडित सरकार है। संसदीय लोकतंत्र में मंत्रिमंडल को संयुक्त उत्तरदायित्व के सिद्धान्त पर काम करना चाहिए। लेकिन यह संयुक्त उत्तरदायित्व का सिद्धान्त आज हवा में उड़ा दिया गया है। मंत्री एक-दूसरे के विरुद्ध काम कर रहे हैं। मंत्रिमंडल गुटों में बंट गया है। इस मंत्रिमंडल के हाथ में देश की स्वाधीनता, देश की अखण्डता देश की सीमायें सुरक्षित नहीं हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात मैं कहना चाहूँगा श्री शांति लाल शाह ने उस बात को थोड़ा सा लिया है। उस बात को और भी अधिक स्पष्ट किया जाना चाहिए। यह बात कही जा रही है कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने बजट के समय भाषण करते हुए यह कहा कि उनके पुत्र बिजनेस से मीलों दूर थे। यह तथ्य नहीं है। इस सदन में बैठे हुए सदस्यों को तथ्यों को पवित्र मानना होगा। राय प्रकट करने में हम स्वाधीन हैं। प्रश्न सार्वजनिक जीवन में शुद्धता और पवित्रता को बनाए रखने का है। जिसने जो गलती की है, उसको इंगित करना होगा। लेकिन गलत आरोपों को लगाने की प्रवृत्ति से बचना होगा। मैं उस कार्यवाही के अंश को पढ़ना नहीं चाहता। जब उप-प्रधान मंत्री अपने पुत्र के बारे में उत्तर दे रहे थे तो वह बजट के रहस्योद्घाटन की चर्चा कर रहे थे, पुलिस द्वारा की गई जाँच का उल्लेख कर रहे थे। उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कभी नहीं कहा कि उनके पुत्र बिजनेस से मीलों दूर हैं

उन्होंने स्पष्ट कहा था कि उनके पुत्र इस तरह के गड़बड़घोटालों से मीलों दूर हैं। लेकिन यह बात जनता में प्रचारित की जा रही है, इसका खण्डन होना चाहिये। गलत बातें प्रचारित करके हम लोकतान्त्रिक जीवन की शुद्धता को कायम नहीं रख सकते और न हम जनता के सामने अच्छे मान-दण्ड स्थापित कर सकते हैं।

इस बात से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता कि उप-प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने अपने पुत्र के बारे में सदन में जो वक्तव्य दिये उन वक्तव्यों में थोड़ा अन्तर है। मैं ये मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि श्री मोरारजी भाई सदन को गुमराह नहीं करना चाहते थे, लेकिन उन्हें यह मान लेना चाहिये कि उनके पुत्र ने उनको जरूर गुमराह किया और सारे तथ्य उनके सामने नहीं आए। पुत्र के नाते पिता की गरिमा को देखते हुए पिता के उच्च पद को देखते हुए, कान्तिभाई का यह कर्तव्य था कि सारे तथ्य उप-प्रधान मंत्री के सामने रखते और वे तथ्य फिर सदन के सामने आते। लेकिन, अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह पहला ही मौका नहीं है जब किसी लायक बाप के नालायक बेटे ने, किसी लायक पिता को किसी नालायक बेटे ने गुमराह किया हो, जब निकट सम्बन्धियों के कारण किसी सार्वजनिक नेता की स्थिति जनता की दृष्टि में बिगड़ी हो, सरदार प्रताप सिंह कैरों का नाम लिया जा रहा है, लेकिन सरदार कैरों की मैं तारीफ करूँगा, उन्होंने अपने पुत्र से नाता तोड़ लिया था, सार्वजनिक रूप से वह अपने पुत्र से सम्बन्ध विच्छेद की बात करते थे। कोई बेटा पिता की सहायता करे, वृद्धावस्था में उसकी मदद के लिये, उसके कष्टों को कम करने की कोशिश करे, इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं कर सकता और जब श्री मोरारजी देसाई उप-प्रधान मंत्री नहीं थे तब अगर बेटे को उन्होंने प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी भी नियुक्त किया तो उस पर किसी को अंगुली उठाने का अधिकार नहीं है। हर एक बाप को



## [श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

अपने बेटे से सहायता प्राप्त करने का और हर एक बेटे को अपने बाप की सहायता करने का अधिकार है, लेकिन उप-प्रधान मंत्री नियुक्त होने के बाद कहीं सीमा रेखा खींची जानी चाहिए थी। मंत्रियों को न केवल सन्देशों के परे होना चाहिए, बल्कि सन्देशों के परे दिखाई भी देना चाहिए। इस विवाद में किसी ने उप-प्रधान मंत्री की प्रमाणिता पर सन्देह नहीं किया, न उनकी देश-भक्ति पर किसी को सन्देह हो सकता है, लेकिन सार्वजनिक जीवन एक दुधारी तलवार की तरह से है, इसमें अपने सगे सम्बन्धियों के प्रति कठोर बनना पड़ेगा, स्नेह के सारे सम्बन्धों को तोड़ना पड़ेगा। यह भगवान राम का देश है, जिन्होंने एक व्यक्ति के कहने पर जगत जननी सीता का परित्याग कर दिया था। सीता की पवित्रता पर उन्हें सन्देह नहीं था।

भवभूति के शब्दों में उन्होंने कहा था—

स्नेह दयां च सौख्यं च

यदि वा जानकीम् अपि

आराधनाय लोकानाम्

मुंचतो नास्ति मे व्यथा।

मैं स्नेह को छोड़ दूंगा, दया को तिलांजलि दे दूंगा, व्यक्तिगत सुख की चिन्ता नहीं करूंगा, आवश्यकता पड़ी तो सीता को भी छोड़ दूंगा, शासनाय लोकनाम नहीं, दण्डनाम लोकानाम नहीं—दादा चिन्तित न हों, उन्हें पत्नी को छोड़ने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी—यह हमारा आदर्श है। उस आदर्श पर हम सब नहीं पहुँच सकते, लेकिन जो नेता हैं, जिन्हें जनता का मार्गदर्शन करना है, क्योंकि राजनीति आज जीवन का केन्द्र बन गई है, लोग प्रेरणा के लिये राजनीतिक नेताओं की तरफ देखते हैं उन्हें आदर्श रखना होगा भगवान् वृष्ण ने गीता में कहा है—जैसा बड़े लोग आचरण करते हैं, वैसा ही छोटे लोग अनुकरण करते हैं। आज प्रश्न केवल पार्टी का नहीं है, प्रश्न केवल विरोधी दल और सरकार का भी नहीं

है, इस देश में सार्वजनिक जीवन का स्तर गिर रहा है, राजनीतिक परपूँजी का प्रभाव बढ़ रहा है, राजनीतिज्ञों और भ्रष्ट पूँजी-पतियों का अपवित्र गठबन्धन हो रहा है, पद का दुरुपयोग करने की प्रवृत्ति घर कर रही है, कोई सगा सम्बन्धी किसी सार्वजनिक नेता की उच्च स्थिति को बिगाड़ न दे, इसके लिये सार्वजनिक नेताओं को मावधान होना होगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने प्रारम्भ में जो वक्तव्य दिया, उसमें उन्होंने यह बात मानी कि जो तथ्य उन्हें बताये गये, वे उन्होंने रखे और जो तथ्य बाद में उनके ध्यान में आये, उनके बारे में उन्होंने सदन को विश्वास में लेने का प्रयत्न किया। मैं जानता हूँ यह काम बड़ा कठोर है—श्री कान्ति भाई उनके सहारे हैं, उनके इकलोते बेटे हैं, माँ की तबियत खराब है, परिवार में एक दुर्घटना हो चुकी है—हम मानवीय पहलुओं को भी दृष्टि से ओझल नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन गलती इन्सान से होती है और गलती मानने वाला इन्सानियत से थोड़ा ऊपर उठ आता है। मोरारजी भाई अगर यह स्वीकार करें कि जहाँ तक सार्वजनिक जीवन का प्रश्न है वे अपने पुत्र की मर्यादा तय करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रकरण समाप्त हो सकता है और भविष्य के लिये इस प्रकार की सम्भावनाएँ पैदा होने के दरवाजे बन्द हो सकते हैं। कान्ति भाई ने मोरारजी भाई की कान्ति को थोड़ा कम कर दिया है, इसके लिये हम सब लोग बहुत दुखी हैं। हम नहीं चाहते कि उनकी कान्ति कम हो, लेकिन यदि वे अपने पुत्र की मर्यादा में रख सकें तो फिर लोकतान्त्रिक मर्यादाओं की रक्षा हो सकेगी।

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: The hon. Member said that I should make limitations. I have already said that there is a limitation—he does not do any government work. Beyond that limitation, what have I to do? If anybody shows that he

has done it and can prove it, I shall certainly be prepared to receive any penalty.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** The Seoul incident is a proof.

**SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI** (Gonda) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the fag end of the debate I do not think there is much left for me to say. There were very eloquent, very excitable, very keenly sarcastic, in fact all kinds of speeches and I am sure I cannot compete with all of them. But I share the sentiment of Shri Masani that this debate is not only distressing but distasteful. What are we, 500 people representing the whole of India, sitting here, discussing? Is this discussion going to achieve what Shri Madhu Limaye said—to raise the standard of morality—or is it a debate to vilify the personality, to bring down the image of a person who, on the whole, enjoys universal respect?

This matter has been high-lighted beyond any need. Shri Dange used the phrase "over-painting". I think this matter has been so much over-painted that it has become disgusting. Not only has this been raised in the House a number of times unnecessarily, but a vilification campaign has been going on in a particular section of the press to which mention has already been made. What are we discussing here? Shri Morarji Desai's omissions and commissions or Shri Kantilal Desai's omissions and commissions? What has Shri Morarji Desai done? When, all on a sudden, he was faced with certain questions, when he was challenged, when he was not prepared for it, with whatever information he had in his possession, he made a statement "my son has severed his connection with business". What he said was in good faith and to the best of his knowledge. If he had only used the phrase, "I am making the statement to the best of my knowledge", all this discussion would not have taken place. I think, it is highly unfair to expect a father to make a statement on behalf of an adult son. How many of us know what our children are doing? How many of us know the ramifications of the actions of our children? It is not possible; it is not even at all fair to expect the father to know all the details. Therefore, I think,

what Shri Morarji Desai said on the whole bears it out that his son assured him that he was getting out of business and was in the process of severing his connections with them.

Now I come to the important question of Shri Kantibhai being his secretary. It is well known that Shri Kantibhai did not hold any Government office as the Secretary to the Minister.

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** How well known?

**SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI :** There are various kinds of secretaries. There is an official Secretary; there is the personal assistant—there are all kinds of other secretaries to the minister. Shri Kantibhai held none of these positions. The Government did not appoint him; he did not draw any salary. He only helped his father. If a son helps his elderly father in his work, there is nothing wrong. Many people do that. The moot point is whether Shri Kantibhai saw any official file or put his signature on any file or dealt with any official work.

**SHRI NAMBIAR :** We do not know.

**SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI :** He did not. Therefore he was really helping his father. It is a misnomer to use the word 'Secretary'. He was not that; he was a son doing his duty by his father. I am sorry that Shri Morarji Desai used the word "Secretary". But I agree with many of the hon. Members that it would have been better if he had been even informally referred to as Secretary which has raised so much misunderstanding.

Then, when he went out during that international conference he was designated as an adviser. An explanation has been given about this. It may have been very innocently done, but I only wish that this had not been done. Because it had been done, it has given rise to certain suspicions and misunderstanding which has greatly hurt the personality of Shri Morarjibhai.

As my hon. friend before me said, not only you have to act correctly but have to appear to be acting correctly. Unfortunately, a minister has to set in a glass house. He is exposed to all kinds

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

of attacks, fair or very unfair attacks, attacks generated from within this country and even from outside. The remote control is somewhere else; the motive is something very remote. There are various kinds of attacks to which a minister is exposed. Therefore a minister has to be extraordinarily careful.

My deep regret is that he has been made the target of this vilification campaign which is going on for ever so many months. I would like to ask my hon. friends whether the personality of Shri Morarji Desai is coming in the political field today. Have we not known him over the last 40 years? Is he like many of the ministers, whom we did not know yesterday—we do not know their background—but who are ministers today Shri Morarjibhai has been in the public field for a long time and he is known for his rectitude, honesty and straightforwardness. This is the man who has been made the target of attack! That is why there is suspicion all round that it is a deliberate move to bring down the stature of this person so that the Congress Cabinet also loses its stature. That is why we are opposed to this resolution.

Then, the editor of the *Blitz* has been carrying on a vilification campaign. We have all our experience of *Blitz*. On the one hand, *Blitz* is carrying on a very righteous campaign for morality and veracity, on the other, here is a letter that the editor of *Blitz*, Shri Karanjia, had written to Shri Kantibhai, where he says :—

"I think, you have a good case inasmuch as it would be absurd for anybody to suggest that a son should quit business and sacrifice legitimate profit because the father happens to be a minister."

You see the double-faced dealing of Editor Karanjia. I am sure, nobody is surprised at the ambivalent editor. He can go to any length. One day he will abuse, another day he will apologise and on the third day he will again cringe. It is such a person who has been carrying on this campaign against Shri Mararji Desai.

If we are discussing the conduct of the Minister, there are two or three things into which we have to probe. Did the Minister

connive at getting business for his son? Did the Minister deliberately help his son to get business? Did he betray Government secrets? Did he betray the national interest? These are the questions to be asked. Is there anybody in the House who is prepared to say that Mr. Morarji Desai, deliberately, connived to get business for his son or he spoke to important capitalists to give business to his son or he, in any way, even indirectly, exercised his influence to get business for his son? Then did he betray secrets of Government or did he betray the national interest of the country? I am sure nobody, however much he would like to attack in this debate, would dare say that.

Whom are we discussing here? We are discussing Shri Kantibhai Desai. Is he such a big personality? Is his personality a colossus in India striding over the whole country that we, 500 representatives of this country, should go on discussing Shri Kantibhai Desai for days and months? I would like to know: Is he such a big industrialist or business personality that his financial deals are going to create a revolution in the economy of India? Are we going to fall or rise over the deals of Shri Kantibhai Desai? We are wasting time over an absurd or a minor matter. A small little thing is engaging the attention of all these people. We are wasting time of the House. The Nation is aghast at the way we are carrying on. (*Interruptions*) So many things were said. I do not want to go into them. My very able and dear friend, Mr. Dange, said why and how all these raids were made on Dodsai and Co., after Shri Kantibhai Desai severed his connections with them as he wanted to take revenge. Now, the raids emanated from the inquiry started by the Deputy Director (Enforcement), Bombay, not from the headquarters. The headquarters knew nothing about it. It was in the normal course of the inquiry. I want to know: Is there any proof for all these statements which have been made by such important persons? By sheer deduction, by sheer surmise, by sheer putting certain facts together, the thesis is being compiled that Shri Kantibhai Desai did this or that. Many people take a very exceedingly moral pose from the Opposition. I do not want to go into that. I do not want to descend to the level to which some of them have descended. I would ask all these people who

have been trying to attack us to go and see in how many parties, how many charges have been made or have not been made, on some of the leaders and whether they can answer them.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :** Mr. Dange himself. He was attacked by the Left Communists so badly.

**SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI :** I would like to make an appeal to the Members of the Opposition. Up to this time, it was the Congress that was responsible for Government here and elsewhere. But now the time has come when many Opposition parties are holding the responsibility of Government. When they sit in Government, they are also exposed. I would like to know, during the last one year when various Opposition parties have carried on the Government in different parts of the country, how many of them can stand up and say that their conduct has been so good and clean that no criticism can be made against them ? Therefore, I say, you please be a little restrained. Tomorrow you may come in the picture. Mr. Madhu Limaye may sit here—I think, he has got a fair chance—and he may have difficulty to explain his conduct. You are adopting these tactics to defame the Government. These tactics do not pay; they are not in the real interest of the country.

Now, I want to come to a very important point which deserves all our attention. It has been said openly and there is a lot of suspicion—In fact, the atmosphere in Delhi stinks—that all this pressurisation, all this propaganda, has emanated from somewhere else. What is the effect of all this in the country and outside ? You are destroying the image of a person who is universally respected in the country.

Outside, the foreign countries use the press, the radio, to carry on all sorts of propaganda against our country. I am sorry to say that because we have taken aid from many countries, we have looked to many countries for aid, they are not satisfied with their having created powerful lobbies here, they are not satisfied with propaganda alone, now their appetite has increased and they want to have a say even in our administration, even in the selection of Cabinet members or even in pushing them out. I want to say this. We may be a poor country,

40LSS/68—13

we may be an underdeveloped country, we may be backward in many respects, but we have fought for the freedom of this country and we would not tolerate the interference of any foreign power, from the right or from the left. I hope, the Opposition members there and the Congress members here will watch against it, will guard against it, and see that we are not made the cat's paw of any foreign power; we should see that they are not allowed to interfere in our internal affairs in any way. Therefore, we should cry a halt to this kind of witch-hunting, to this kind of mud-slinging, which is going on. If we are really anxious about the public morality of this country, let us sit together and discuss, but this kind of mud-slinging does not elevate us.

Something was said by Mr. Masani about division in the Cabinet itself which has given rise to this. I will, in fairness, say that there is such a talk among the public, there is such a suspicion. The Prime Minister herself is sitting here and she is the best person to repudiate that charge strongly and say that we are a united house, we stand united and there is no such division.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara) :** I have listened very patiently all that has been said on this matter and, really speaking, I was thinking that, when I speak. I would probably be able to associate myself with the amendment given by Shri Shivajirao S. Deshmukh, specially the portion in which he says, "for 'false' substitute 'frank and forthright' ". I was expecting such a statement from the Deputy Prime Minister because what has been said here is this; nobody, not even the Mover and all those who have participated, has questioned his personal integrity; nobody has questioned his patriotism; nobody has alleged that he, by virtue of the office that he holds, has given certain advantages to his son or whatever business he has done, he has done through the assistance or help or connivance of the Deputy Prime Minister. What we are concerned here in this House is not about the personal affairs of Shri Kantilal Desai or Shri Morarji Desai; they are their personal affairs. But what we are concerned here, why we are discussing this matter, is this. Now how does Parliament itself come into the picture ? If

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

Mr. Morarji Desai wants his son to help him at his old age—many might be doing that—nobody would question that, but here this question arose—I may remind the House that it is not Mr. Limaye who raised it first—on the 24th April; the first question was raised by Shri Umanath. When he raised the question, it was for Mr. Morarji Desai then and there or at least later on, to say, "This matter has suddenly come up; I am not familiar with the things that are done by my son and the others in the business affairs". He should have been upright enough to say, "I am not aware of all the details; I will come forward with a statement". But he did not do that. Some hon. friends have referred time and again to his statement in which he has said, "My son is miles away from business after 1964". (Interruptions) I know. You interpret 'other things'.

'Other things' mean budget leakage, this and that. But I think he cannot take shelter only on that phrase because here he has said repeatedly in reply to Shri Umanath that he is not in business, that he has gone out of business. Therefore, let nobody say that Shri Morarji Desai has not made a statement saying that his son has gone out of business.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI :** I have made it, and I maintain it.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY :** That is the real difficulty. By making one mistake, he has committed several blunders. I agree with him when he says that relations like sons or daughters of administrators or Ministers or political leaders should not be debarred from doing business. But here the point is that Shri Morarji Desai has defended the actions of Shri Kantilal Desai all through. If he had said 'I spoke *Extempore*. I am not familiar with the details', it would have been a different thing. But he maintains his stand now. That is why I say he has committed a mistake and has gone on committing several other mistakes. Propriety would have demanded that he should not take up this attitude.

Then look at the controversy about this Personal Private Secretary. In one moment, he says that he is his Personal Private Secretary and accompanies him in

some of his official tours. At the same time, he also says—I can quote—that he has drawn no money from Government. If he has accompanied him as Personal Private Secretary on official tours, did he go merely to give some help to him in a personal capacity to look after him? Or did he do something else?

He has also admitted in reply to a question that he was to be made an Adviser because it was necessary for him to attend certain social functions and in order that he might be permitted to go into those functions, this was done.

The last question on the subject reveals a different picture. The office probably wisely put it in a different manner. They have said that technically he is not a Private Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister or Finance Minister; he was helping the Finance Minister in his non-official capacity.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** What is that?

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY :** Just see how they want to wringgle out of it. Shri Morarji Desai would not, I thought, behave like this and try to explain it away in this technical way, but would come forward with a fortnight statement.

If we go to the other question, what does he say? He says :

'Whenever there has been any occasion, I have made enquiries through the police against my son, whenever some papers like this have come, I have not let it alone.'

That he said that his son was miles away from any of this kind of things.

I want to point out to him that his son did not give him all the information. But did his police, in the course of these investigations, at any time give him this much which he has admitted to be a correct, valid document? In this document, Dodsall have said this—this is circular No. 827 :

"Mr. Kantilal Desai has joined our organisation; In order to promote our business, he will be paying particular attention to schemes of the public or private sector. His headquarters will be in Bombay. He will be visiting other places also.

"You are requested to prepare a list of all schemes for which tenders are to

(M)

be submitted and similarly a list of schemes where tenders have already been submitted, where our position is sufficiently competitive to merit special effort. The second list should contain important information regarding the competition to be met and give sufficient information and proper follow-up. This list should be for his attention in our office".

What does it show ? It shows that Kantilal Desai was mainly concerned with dealings with the Government so that he can bring influence over the Government machinery to get things done for Doddsals. Did the police give this information to him ? If they gave him this information, what did he do and how did he prevent it ? It is a matter of shame that a technical view is taken when it was pointed out to him that his son's name was still there in the list submitted to the company law administration. What does Morarji Desai say now ? He says : it is not for me to explain; there are certain formalities to be complied with; they have to say something since they are giving a salary; so they have fulfilled this technical requirement by giving his name as the director of sales; the company should explain it, not I. Thereby I think he has made the company liable for action because this is a black way of doing things. They are giving money for a certain purpose. He is not doing any business; he is no longer the director of sales. Yet his name is entered as director of sales and Mr. Desai replies in this way. What does he mean by this ? What steps has he really taken about this matter ? I have no doubt that this House does not want that the image of a person of his stature and eminence and with such a past record of service should be tarnished like this; nobody has any pleasure in doing these things. It is a public duty. Parliament has to get a clear picture about this matter. I have gone through all these records. I have read what has appeared in the Press. I had even tried to discuss this matter personally with Morarjibhai. I thought that he would probably come forward with a statement saying : what I said was not correct; I publicly apologise because full facts were not before me; I regret that sometime was spent on this. Some such statement would have cleared the atmosphere. When I talked to

him I felt that he was probably going to make that statement. But as it happened, this is the weakness of a father. Let everybody learn this lesson. No father, not even a mother should ever defend their adult sons or stand here as a guarantee as to what they are doing or not doing. That is the mistake. The position that has transpired after the Deputy Prime Minister's statement is that there is no question of privilege as some have stated. That question has already been decided. The only question that remains is whether he has placed all the facts before Parliament, whether what he said earlier was not correct. From that point of view the matter still remains to be cleared. We are not interested in this minister or that minister going or Morarji Desai going or Indira Gandhi going. We are interested in ousting this Government as a whole. We are not a party to all these things, those who are at the back of these things, nefarious foreign elements, etc. That is all deplorable, whoever they are. We must face the issue. I think you should appoint a committee. Let the committee go into these things. We do not want anybody's head on this question. Therefore, there should be no hesitation in accepting my proposals. Let us go into the matter and examine all these things. If Morarji Desai comes forward with a statement that it was an error of judgment on his part and says : 'I made an *extempore* speech and I publicly apologise', then the matter would end.

वाणिज्य मंत्री (श्री विनेश सिंह) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी अपने वक्तव्य में माननीय सदस्य श्री वाजपेयी ने किसी एक नये अखबार का, और जाहिर होता है कि गैर-जिम्मेदार अखबार का, जिक्र करते हुए मेरा नाम लिया था। उस के पहले किसी एक और इसी हुए स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के माननीय सदस्य ने कहा था कि मंत्रिमंडल में कोई फूट है। मैं माननीय सदस्य से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह चाहे जितनी चेष्टा करें, हमारे बीच में फूट या गलतफहमी नहीं ला सकते। आइन्दा वह कोई और ठोस बात कहने की कोशिश करें। मुझे तो ऐसा

[श्री दिनेश सिंह]

लगता है कि कहीं एक ही जगह की बहती हुई हवा के शिकार तो दोनों नहीं हो गये हैं।

**SHRI RAJARAM (Salem) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think you for the opportunity you have given me to participate in this discussion initiated by Shri Madhu Limaye. I heard Shri Madhu Limaye with rapt attention. Mr. Dinesh Singh has also has given some explanation about the Cabinet's unity. These are all common things in the Congress Government. Before T. T. Krishnamachari went out of the Government, some Minister gave such a kind of statement, but the man has gone there. It is a natural thing.

After hearing Shri Madhu Limaye's speech today, I am reminded of one thing. You know, and you are aware that from R. K. Shanmukham Chettiar's days no Finance Minister lived as Finance Minister for more than three years. So, I think a day has come today. (*Interruption*). We are not worried about what all the others have said. In this Opposition, there is one pertinent point, and it is this. When Shri Umanath put a question in this House, our Deputy Prime Minister jumped at him and shouted at him in the House, saying that his son has no business connection.

**MR. SPEAKER :** It has been pointed out already.

**SHRI RAJARAM :** Those points have been made, but I will make them again. The point now is, public memory is too short, but not the politician's mind. That is why the motion has come today. Especially Shri Madhu Limaye's mind is just like elephant's memory, and he has brought out the case in such a way.

On this matter, our Deputy Prime Minister has, rightly or wrongly, even today, to Unstarred Question No. 4256, put by Shri Bhogendra Jha, given the same answer. The question is :

"Whether and to what extent during this period M/s. Dodsai (P) Ltd., secured orders, made purchases and had other business deals with the help of Shri Kanti Desai."

To this question, Shri Morarji Desai said :

"No kind of business connection was continued and after June, 1964, no orders

were secured and no purchases nor business deals were made by Shri Kantilal Desai for M/s. Dodsai (P) Ltd."

Even in spite of this reply, there is fine proof here that he has taken money up to Rs. 2,050. Kantilal Desai was a paid employee of Dodsai & Co., till January, 1967; he was still a Director of Sales with a basic salary of Rs. 2,050. That Shri Kantilal Desai had given up all business contacts since June, 1964 and was taking only terminal benefits is totally incorrect and misleading. Shri Dange said that he is not worried about other things but he is a little worried about Shri Morarji's morality being painted in that way. Perhaps he does not know that Shri Kantilal Desai is a director of Vibguor Limited which deals in paints. That is why he is painting more and more of his morality in this country.

When there was a suspicion that Shri R. K. Shanmugam Chetty had dealings with some business firms, he had given some consideration to his business friends, he resigned immediately. So also other Ministers when there was any suspicion about their actions. Similarly, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari also resigned and went away. I am not demanding the resignation of Shri Morarji Desai. As stated by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, the leader of the PSP Party, let the Prime Minister and Shri Morarji Desai submit the whole case to a parliamentary committee to avoid any more controversy.

Now every week some story or other is published in the papers. Whether the story is true or false, the people in the country are thinking that something is going on inside the Cabinet, that too behind the Deputy Prime Minister. They must come forward and give full clarification for all these things.

As far as the explanation given by him today is concerned, I am not satisfied with it. It is understood that the Congress Party has issued a whip to its members on this question. This is not a question which has to be decided by issuing a whip. It has to be decided by the conscience of the members, keeping political morality in view.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT  
AND COMPANY AFFAIRS:**

(SHRI RAGHUNATH REDDI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I emphatically deny the allegations made against me by a weekly called *Indian Monitor*, quoted by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, that I gave any information to any newspaper or person regarding the Deputy Prime Minister or the Congress President.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Are you ready to face an inquiry ? The Prime Minister should tell us something about it.

MR. SPEAKER : The Prime Minister.

श्री अब्दुल गनी दार : (गुडगाँव) आन ए प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर । जो एमेंडमेंट्स हम लोगों ने दी हुई हैं उन पर आप हमें बोलने का मौका दें और उसके बाद प्रधान मंत्री जी बोलें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

شری عبدالغنی دار (گڈگانو) :  
آن اے پوانٹ آف آرڈر — جو امینڈمنٹس  
ہم لوگوں نے دی ہوئی ہیں ان پر  
آپ ہمیں بولنے کا موقعہ دیں اور  
اسی کے بعد پردھان منتری جی  
بولیں تو زیادہ اچھا ہوگا ۔

MR. SPEAKER : Will you kindly sit down ? Either you stand or I stand. Both of us cannot stand at the same time. The amendments were moved already and they are before the House—not only your amendments but the amendments of Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Jyotirmoy Basu, Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh and Shri George Fernandes. They will all be put to the vote at the proper time.

SHRI ABDUL GANI DAR : Without any speech ?

MR. SPEAKER : Yes.

SHRI ABDUL GANI DAR : That is not fair.

MR. SPEAKER : May be so. Now, the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA

GANDHI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I first say just a word about the admission of this motion ? It is true, Sir, that you had referred the motion to me and to the Deputy Prime Minister. But we were informed by your Secretariat that you had already admitted it and you were asking only about the time of its discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : That is right; consultation only about the time.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am rather distressed that senior members of this House such as the hon. Members Shri Masani or Shri Vajpayee should have introduced a new element in this discussion by quoting from newspapers which are not known either for their objectivity (*Shri M. R. Masani : Such as London Times*) or their honest reporting.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Do you include the *London Times* in that category ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I do include in that category with reference to news from India.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Will the Prime Minister tell us what she considers as the authentic newspaper ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : As all hon. Members know, these things have a slant.... (*Interruption*).

SHRI PILOO MODY : *The National Herald*, is it ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Perhaps they believe that what they suggested reflects some kind of Machiavellian wisdom or strategy but it is, I am sorry to say, merely cheap political propaganda and, if I may say so, wishful thinking on their part. Some extraordinary charges have been made. I am glad that the two Ministers here have refuted them. I think, the charges are as irrelevant as they are ridiculous.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Will you hold an inquiry ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The entire country knows.... (*Interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER : Will you hold an inquiry for all what other people have said ? ructions like this. Shri Madhu Limaye will have the right of reply. He can ask (*Interruption*). There should not be inter-anything then if he wants. Will you hold an inquiry for all that has been said, this



[MR. SPEAKER]

side of the House also ? It is not possible. If after every sentence you interrupt and do not hear, it is impossible to proceed.

SHRI PILOO MODY : But she must tell us which newspaper gives authentic news. Then I will read only that newspaper.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have noticed the great interest which the Opposition parties always display in the unity of our side. They themselves, of course, combine only for one thing. Hon. Member, Shri Dwivedy, said it himself, so I can quote him. They want to make every effort to oust this Government. Many methods have been tried and one after the other they have failed. So now there is one more effort to divide us by making allegations and spreading all kinds of rumours. I should like to tell them that the Congress Party is not going to assist them in their designs into reality.... (Interruption).

The Deputy Prime Minister has made a comprehensive statement dealing with the points raised and has already given to this House the details of his son's business connections.

It is no one's case, except the venerable Acharyaji's, that the sons or other near relations of ministers should not engage in business. Indeed, Shri Kantilal Desai has been in business for some considerable time. He was in business even when the Deputy Prime Minister was a Union Minister from 1957 to 1963, which I might remind the last speaker on that side, was for more than three years. Hon. Members opposite have not charged that there was anything wrong in that. Then there is a period between 1963, when Shri Morarji Desai left office, until he joined Government again in March 1967. It was during this period that Shri Kantilal Desai gradually severed his connections with most of the firms with which he was concerned. Today he is director of one private limited company and one proprietary firm which, according to the statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister, has ceased to do any fresh business.

We all agree that while there is no bar to the sons and relatives of ministers carrying

on normal and legitimate business, there is an obligation, as the hon. Members opposite and also on our side have pointed out, as much on such relatives as on ministers themselves that there should be no occasion for any doubt to be raised that relationship with the minister has been utilised for the advancement of any business.

Hon. Members opposite have not produced evidence in support of the charge that Shri Kantilal Desai used his position as a son to promote his business interests. Indeed, the Deputy Prime Minister has, categorically, stated in his statement today that he has sought to ensure that his son did not come anywhere near the discharge of his official responsibilities. I have no reason to doubt that the Deputy Prime Minister has assured himself of this.

19.00 HRS.

The essence of the charge in Shri Madhu Limaye's motion is that in making certain statements, the Deputy Prime Minister has, deliberately, misled the House to an extent which would amount to a breach of privilege of this House and would attract the disapproval of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on two separate occasions, you have ruled that, in fact, there was no breach of privilege. It is, therefore, clear that whatever the hon. Member opposite might say regarding the adequacy or otherwise of the statements made by the Deputy Prime Minister, there was no wilful or intentional misrepresentation. What then is the motive attributed to him specially since, at that time, he was not in office?

Public life imposes a heavy burden of duties and the responsibilities on us all and none is more onerous than being called upon to sit in judgment over the actions of one's colleagues and specially on those whose lives have been spent in public service. My colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, as many Members have pointed out, has to his credit many years of devoted and dedicated public service. He has, through the years, come to occupy a position of eminence in public life. No one has cast aspersions on his personal integrity. When I am accused of dereliction of duty in not calling upon the Deputy Prime

Minister to resign, I am bound to ask : What case the hon. Members opposite have made out which should impel me to oblige them, and to part with a trusted colleague ? The statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister clarifies the context in which he had made the earlier statements.

I submit that the Motion before us is misconceived and deserves to be rejected.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, before I call Shri Madhu Limaye to reply, I would like to clarify that the Motion was admitted by me and it was only for fixing up the time that I had requested the leader of the House. I need not quote the rule. The rule is there. It is quite clear. Therefore, if anybody has any doubt, he should not have it. There should be no doubt in anybody's mind. The Motion was admitted by me and I had requested the leader of the House to fix up the time. It was only the question of whether it should be 19th or 20th, not the question of admission of the Motion. Shri Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, बहस के दौरान मैं उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कही है कि जिस से मेरी बातों का खण्डन हो। मेरे द्वारा जो तथ्य सदन के सामने रखे गए हैं उन में से एक भी तथ्य के बारे में उन्होंने नहीं कहा कि वह गलत है। केवल डोडसाल के बारे में नहीं, बल्कि अन्य 6-7 कंपनियों के बारे में मैंने जो बातें कहीं एक-एक को इन को कबूल करना पड़ा और ये चीजें इन्होंने स्वेच्छा से, स्वयं पहल कर के सदन के सामने नहीं रखी हैं। सवाल कर के, बार बार प्रश्न पूछ कर हम ने इन से कबूल करवाया है। इस में इन का कोई ..... (व्यवधान) ..... और क्या है ? इन्होंने स्वेच्छा से नहीं कहा है। हम ने कबूल करवाया है, इसलिए इस का श्रेय उप-प्रधान मंत्री नहीं ले सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बहस में सिर्फ तीन विषय थे। रूस क्या कर रहा है, अमेरिका क्या कर रहा है, इन के कबीना में फूट है या नहीं, कोई मतलब नहीं था इन का इस बहस

से। तीन सवाल थे। क्या जानबूझ कर के इन्होंने असत्य भाषण किया ? "जानबूझ कर" शब्द पर मैं जोर देता हूँ। दूसरी बात—क्या उप-प्रधान मंत्री और वित्त मंत्री बनने के बाद भी अपने ऐसे बेटे को जिन का कारोबार से और व्यापार से सम्बन्ध रहा है, ऐसे बेटे को सचिव बनाए रखना उचित था ? और तीसरा सवाल मंत्रियों के नामों का इस्तेमाल कर के जो फायदे उठाए जाते हैं रिश्तेदारों के द्वारा उस पर रोक लगाना मंत्रियों का कर्तव्य है या नहीं सार्वजनिक जीवन की शुद्धता को बचाए रखने के लिए, ये ही सिर्फ तीन सवाल थे।

अब जानबूझ कर गलत बयानी के बारे में मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, मैं उन को मिसकोट नहीं करना चाहता, इसलिए उन के शब्दों में ही मैं रखता हूँ, अगर उस में समय जायेगा तो मेरा दोष नहीं है। यह 30 तारीख को उमानाय जा के और मेरे जवाब में उन्होंने कहा है :

"Let him know that my son has given up business from the year 1964, not now."

तो मुझे सिर्फ साबित यह करना है कि 1964 के बाद भी कान्तिलाल का व्यापारिक रिश्ता रहा या नहीं, क्योंकि इन के शब्द हैं :

"from the year 1964, not now."

आगे यह कहते हैं :—

"Therefore, he went out of business and joined me as my Private Secretary. 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."

इस में उन्होंने तीन बार कहा कि वे मेरे प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी हुए। अतः अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब व्यापारिक संबंधों का भण्डा फोड़ होता है तो रवी राय के प्रश्न के उत्तर में वे क्या कहते

[श्री मधु लिमये]

हैं ? 12 अगस्त को, उन को सवाल किया जाता है :

"When Shri Kantilal Morarji Desai became his Private Secretary ?"

यह 12 अगस्त का जवाब है। देखिए झूठ को मालिका कैसी है :

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

अध्यक्ष महोदय, स्वयं तीन बार प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी शब्द का इस्तेमाल करने के पश्चात् 12 अगस्त, को मोरारजी देसाई एक नया भाषण कर के सदन के सामने आते हैं कि वह प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी नहीं हैं। अब मैं ऐसा अकाट्य सबूत देता हूँ अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कान्ति भाई के द्वारा लिखा हुआ पत्र है। यह 4 मार्च, 1968 का पत्र है। मैं बैठने के लिए तैयार हूँ, यह खड़े हो कर इस बात को कह दें अगर इन की हिम्मत है तो..... (व्यवधान).....

-842 PSP मतलब  
Private Secretary Finance  
"-842—PSF—68H"

यह इस पत्र का नम्बर है। इस पत्र के पीछे लिखा है :

"Office of the Finance Ministry, New Delhi"

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बैठने के लिए तैयार हूँ..... (व्यवधान)..... मैं यिल्ड करने के लिए तैयार हूँ.....

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Mr. Limaye was on his legs. I see no reason why so many should get up. He is on his legs. He is explaining something and we are hearing him. (Interruption). Let us hear Mr. Limaye. If he wants anything, he will say.... (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिमये : हिम्मत नहीं है ? खड़े क्यों नहीं हो रहे हैं ? मैं ईल्ड करने को तैयार हूँ.....

श्री रवि राय : (पुरी) : अभी भी एन्क्वायरी कीजिएगा ?

MR. SPEAKER : I do not know what reply. Nobody knows anything. We have not even heard him. He has shown some letter and has quoted some number. Let us hear him.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पत्र पढ़ने का सवाल नहीं है, मेरे कहने का सम्बन्ध ऊपर के नंबर से है। इस में लिखा है 842 पी० एस० एफ० 68 (एच०).....

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव (बारामती) : पत्र कहाँ से आया है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, दो मिनट हो गये हैं, मैं और पांच मिनट रुकने के लिये तैयार हूँ— मैं साबित कर रहा हूँ कि वह प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी थे या नहीं थे— क्या बहु खड़े हो कर जवाब देंगे, क्यों खड़े नहीं हो रहे हैं ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : पत्र को पढ़ा जाए।

श्री मधु लिमये : पत्र के कन्टेन्ट्स से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, आप समझ नहीं रहे हैं कि मैं सवाल क्या उठा रहा हूँ।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : ओरिजिनल लैटर कहाँ है, ऐसे नहीं चलेगा।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं पत्र को ले करने के लिये तैयार हूँ। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी इजाजत से ले करने वाला हूँ। टेबल पर रखने वाला हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER : Let the letter be passed on to the Deputy Prime Minister. He may see it. None of us knows anything about this. He may pass it on to the Deputy Prime Minister.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : Then he will be able to find out.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : Let me see what it is.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** मैं अपनी बात बता रहा हूँ। प्रश्न यह है कि 12 अगस्त को श्री मोरारजी देसाई अपनी स्टोरी, बदल रहे हैं, कह रहे हैं कि—

"Shri Kantilal Desai has not been appointed as Private Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister".

जब कि यह पत्र 4 मार्च, 1968 का है।

**श्री क० ना० तिवारी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो चिट्ठी बे दिखला रहे हैं, उस के कन्टेन्ट्स पढ़ जायें, तो मालूम हो  
(व्यवधान)

**श्री मधु लिमये :** कन्टेन्ट्स से मतलब नहीं है। मेरा मतलब सिर्फ पत्र की PSF वाली संख्या से, मुहर से और सरकारी स्टैम्प से है।

MR. SPEAKER : I want the House's attention now. The point is this. He is not reading the contents of the letter because there is nothing in that. He is making the point that even today on the 19th August, he claims to be the Private Secretary.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : That is the only point.

MR. SPEAKER : It need not be denied by Shri Morarji Desai now. Let the letter be passed on to him and after he sees it, he will be able to explain later.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I am not talking about the contents.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secundrabad) : The document may be laid on the Table.

MR. SPEAKER : Not on the Table. It may be passed on to the Deputy Prime Minister.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** ठीक है मैं ऐसा कर रहा हूँ।

**श्री रवि राय :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपकी इजाजत से इसे टेबिल पर रखा जाय।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन लोगों के ध्यान में बात नहीं आई, लेकिन आपके ध्यान में आ गई—इस लिये मैं खुश हूँ। सवाल यह है कि ये 4 मार्च, 1968 को भी अपने को प्राइवेट सैक्रेटरी फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर कह रहे हैं, उसके अनुसार पत्र लिख रहे हैं, फाइल का तथा पत्र का नम्बर भी बाकायदा दिया जा रहा है और पीछे मुहर में भी लिखा हुआ है—इसे मैं मोरारजी भाई की खिदमत में पेश करता हूँ।

अब, अध्यक्ष महोदय, टरमिनल बैनिफिट्स के बारे में इन्होंने बहुत कुछ कहा—मैंने अपने प्रस्ताविक भाषण में कहा था कि कान्ति भाई डोडसल कम्पनी के नीकर रहे हैं या नहीं यह निश्चित करने की जो चार कसौटियाँ मैंने बताई हैं, उस में एक यह थी कि उन को 21 मार्च, 1968 तक बोनस का अधिकार रहा। मैं कानून के बारे में कुछ नहीं जानता हूँ—लेकिन शान्ति भाई कहाँ भाग गये, जरा आइये, क्लास लीजिए, मैं अपने को सर्वज्ञानी नहीं मानता हूँ, वह बतलायें कि जिनको पेंशन मिलता है, टरमिनल बैनिफिट मिलता है, वे बोनस के अधिकारी होते हैं या नहीं? मैं इस बात को नहीं जानता, मैं ईल्ड करने के लिये तैयार हूँ, शान्ति भाई के लिये ईल्ड करता हूँ, मोरारजी भाई के लिये ईल्ड करता हूँ, मेरे दिमाग में वे रोशनी डालें, सदन के लिये रोशनी डालें।

**श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा :** क्या उन को बोनस मिला है?

**श्री मधु लिमये :** उस में लिखा है कि वे बोनस के अधिकारी हैं। बोनस का अधिकारी कौन होता है—नीकर होता है या पेंशन लेने वाला होता है? इस का जवाब शान्ति भाई दें, कल दें, परसों दें, मैं अनन्तकाल

[श्री मधु लिमये]

तक इन्तजार करने के लिये तैयार हूँ, क्योंकि मैं हमेशा उनसे सीखने के लिये तैयार हूँ।

श्री मनुभाई पटेल (डभाई) : शान्ति भाई ने आपके भाई के लिये भी कहा था, उस का क्या जवाब है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं उस पर भी आता हूँ धबराइये नहीं।

SHRI NARENDRA KUMAR SALVE (Betul) : He wants to know the legal position.... (Interruptions.)

MR. SPEAKER : Lessons on law cannot be held in Parliament now. If there is any point of order, I am obliged to call you. Lessons on law cannot be imparted to us; none of us can learn it now.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH : All points of law are based on points of order.

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of order ?

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH : The hon. Member says that on the basis of the documents which he has produced, the name of Kantilal Desai appears in a list which is described as the list of employees.

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of order ? You are making a speech.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH : Let me conclude.... (Interruptions.) Section 17 of the Income-tax Act specifically prescribes....

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. There is no point of order.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH : It enjoins that it should be described as salary.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order. If he wants to make a speech, he raises a point of order. I have understood your point very well. Now, Mr. Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ यह जो टरमिनल

बैनिफिट वाला एग्रीमेंट है, उस को छोड़ दीजिए, जो पुराना 1960 वाला एग्रीमेंट था, वह जब तक 6 महीने का नोटिस दे कर समाप्त नहीं किया जाता है, चालू रहने वाला था। अब मोरारजी भाई ने बतलाया है कि नोटिस अक्टूबर महीने में दिया गया, लेकिन उस के पहले ही, यानी जून में ही, उन्होंने कम्पनी के लिये काम करना बन्द कर दिया। अब मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जून, 1964 से 31 मार्च, 1965 तक 9 महीने का समय है, उस में उन को तनखाह भी मिलती है, और कमीशन भी मिलती है। तो इन 9 महीने की बाबत तो कम से कम मोरारजी भाई स्वीकार करेंगे कि वे झूठ बोलते रहे, क्योंकि उन्होंने स्वयं कहा है कि कमीशन मिलना यह बिजनेस रिलेशन की एक निशानी हो सकती है। तो नौ महीने तक इन को तनखाह मिलती रही, कमीशन मिलता रहा, बोनस के यह अधिकारी रहे इसलिए कम से कम नौ महीने की अवधि के बारे में मोरारजी भाई झूठ बोले :

यह खुलकर कहा गया, या सूचित किया गया कि हम लोगों को कुछ कांग्रेसी मंत्रियों के द्वारा जानकारी मिलती है, कुछ यहाँ के सदस्यों ने भी यह सूचित करने की कोशिश की, लेकिन आज मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन लोगों की न हिम्मत है और न इन के पास कोई जानकारी है। डोडसाल की जानकारी जरूर मुझको ब्लिट्ज़ से मिली है। लेकिन बाकी सारी जानकारी मेरी अपनी है, जो बम्बई में जानकार आदमी रहते हैं, उन को कान्ति भाई के बारे में पूरी खबर रहती है। यह सारी कम्पनियों की जो फेहरिस्त थी, वह मैं ने मोरार जी भाई को भेजी थी। केवल डोडसाल का मामला नहीं है; ठेकस का मामला है, इंडस्ट्रियल केमिकल कम्पनी का ट्रेड विंग का मामला है, बाम्बे जनरल ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी का मामला है, इन्होंने कहा कि वी० एम० ट्रेड्स का धंधा और आमवनी

घट रहे हैं, उस का कारण स्वाभाविक है क्योंकि कान्ति भाई 66 तक बाम्बे जनरल ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी के मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर रहे। और उस के बाद इन्होंने क्या किया उन्होंने अपनी पत्नी को बना दिया नामिनल। लेकिन जमे यही रहे और वो० एम० ट्रेडर्स का सारा बिजनेस बाम्बे जनरल को ट्रांसफर किया। तो अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मामला समाप्त नहीं हुआ है। हम को अधिकार है सवाल पूछने का और जब तक इस को सफाई नहीं होगी, मैं इस मामले में चुप नहीं बैठूंगा। मैं तो चलता ही रहूंगा।

श्री शान्ति लाल शाह ने मेरे बारे में एक बात कही। उस की तफसील मैं मैं जाना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि समय लगेगा। लेकिन आप मुझे समय दें तो मैं खुलासा कर सकता हूँ। मैं स्वयं पूछना चाहता हूँ और उन को चैलेंज देता हूँ कि अगर मैंने अपने किसी भी रिश्तेदार या दोस्त की नियुक्ति के बारे में कोई सिफारिश की है, मेरे भाई का भी मामला ले लीजिए। सेलेक्ट इन्होंने किया, अप्वाइंट इन्होंने किया—तो मैं कमेटी के सामने जाने के लिये तैयार हूँ—मैं मोरारजी भाई की तरह से भागने वाला नहीं हूँ। अगर कोई भी अनुचित काम मैंने किया है तो मैं तैयार हूँ। आप किसी को भी नियुक्त कीजिए। तीन सदस्यों की समिति नियुक्त कीजिए। वे कांग्रेसी सदस्य ही हों। मुझे एतराज नहीं है। तो मैं उस के लिए तैयार हूँ। अब इस से ज्यादा क्या चाहिए आप को? उन्होंने सूचित करने की कोशिश की कि मैंने अपने भाई से दिलचस्पी ली। तो मैंने यह कब कहा कि रिश्तेदारों में, भाइयों में और बेटों में दिलचस्पी मत लो। क्या मेरा यह प्वाइंट था?

मैं कह रहा हूँ कि मोरारजी देसाई के द्वारा यहाँ पर कुछ बयान दिये गये हैं, वे मिथ्या हैं या नहीं? जानबूझकर असत्य बयान दिए गए हैं या नहीं यह सवाल मैंने उठाया है। दूसरा सवाल मैं ने यह उठाया है कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर बनने के बाद अपने

बेटे को जो हमेशा व्यापार से सम्बन्धित रहा, निजी सचिव बनाए रखना उचित था? प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी इनके शब्द हैं, 30 अप्रैल को तो सही बोले लेकिन 12 अगस्त को उस के बारे में फिर झूठ बोल रहे हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन का डबल झूठ है। पहले व्यापारिक रिश्तों के बारे में झूठ। कम से कम 30 अप्रैल को उन्होंने कहा कि वह प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी हैं, यह कम से कम इन्होंने कबूल किया था और सत्य बोले। लेकिन उस के बाद उस सत्य पर भी यह टिके नहीं। और 12 अगस्त को जवाब देते हैं कि कान्ति भाई को प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी कभी नियुक्त ही नहीं किया। इसलिये वह पत्र मुझे पेश करना पड़ा। और भी झूठ बोलते जायेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान में 50 करोड़ लोग हैं, केवल कांग्रेस के मंत्री ही नहीं हैं, और उनके पत्रों से मेरी फाइल भरी हुई है। इसलिए अब यह मामला समाप्त होने वाला नहीं है। आज भी श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी के बाद मोरारजी भाई खड़े हो गए और कहा कि मैंने मर्यादा बाँधी है। क्या खाक मर्यादा बाँधी है? 24 जुलाई को मौका था सारी बातों के कहने का, यह कह सकते थे कि मुझे गुमराह किया गया। और अगर यह बात सही है कि इन को उस दिन पता नहीं था, जैसा कि सुरेन्द्र द्विवेदी जी ने कहा, तो 24 जुलाई के बाद 2 अगस्त तक उनको मौका था। 29 जुलाई को मैंने पत्र लिखा था जिसमें ठेकसं इत्यादि कम्पनी का जिक्र था।

आज मैं रहस्य आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि इनके बारे में मेरा दृष्टिकोण जितना उदार और सौम्य रहा है, आज मुझे यह कबूल करना पड़ता है कि किसी दूसरे मंत्री के बारे में वैसा नहीं रहा है, महज इसलिए कि मैं इनकी उम्ह का लिहाज करता हूँ, उनका आदर करता हूँ—यह बात बिल्कुल सही है। दो संदेशवाहकों के साथ दो अगस्त के पहले—जबकि फोटो-

[श्री मधु लिमये]

स्टेट कापी नहीं आई थीं, मैं आपसे दो अगस्त को मिला और नोटिस दी—जोकि इनके मित्र हैं—मैं उनके नाम नहीं लेना चाहता—उनके द्वारा मैंने मोरारजी भाई से कहा था कि अगर आप अपनी गलती मान जायेंगे कि मैंने गलती की है और आप काँति भाई को बम्बई भेजेंगे तो मैं जानता हूँ इनके कारनामे वहाँ भी बन्द नहीं होंगे, तो कम मे कम आप के बारे में हमको कुछ कहने को नहीं रहेगा। विरोधी दल का कोई भी सदस्य सरकारी दल के एक बड़े नेता के बारे में इससे अधिक सौम्य रवैया क्या अपना सकता है? आप जवाब दें, यहाँ पर ताराजी बैठी हैं और दूसरे सदस्य बैठे हुए हैं? श्रीमती सिन्हा ने स्वयं मुझ से कहा है कि “मैंने एक दफा श्री मोरारजी देसाई से कहा कि मधु लिमये बहुत सहानुभूति आपके प्रति दिखलाते हैं।” तो उम्र का लिहाज मैं हमेशा करता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, ये लोग कहते हैं कि दिनेश जी, इन्दिरा जी और ये लोग हम को जानकारी देते हैं। ये क्या छाक पत्थर हम को जानकारी देंगे? अब इनके बारे में एक जानकारी मैं देता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री और उप-प्रधान मंत्री का आज मिलन क्यों हो रहा है, राजनीतिक मिलन? एकता की घोषणा क्यों हो रही है? इसका कारण मैं पेश करता हूँ..... (व्यवधान)....

जब ये पुत्री थीं प्रधान मंत्री की तब ये भी इसी तरह के काम करती थीं। फर्क इतना ही है कि काँति व्यक्तिगत व्यापार वगैरह करते थे और इन्होंने सार्वजनिक चन्दे आदि के लिये यह किया। इन तथ्यों का भंडा फोड़ करने के कारण मेरे मृत नेता की यहाँ पर बहुत बुराई की गयी..... (व्यवधान).... मुझे खेद है कि यहाँ विरोधी दल में भी कुछ आरती उतारू नेता हैं, उन्होंने मेरे मृत नेता का यहाँ पर अपमान किया, आज वे जवाब देने के लिए नहीं हैं, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि मैं उनका अनुयायी हूँ, मुझे

फख है, मैं कहूँगा, डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया, जिनके लिए आपकी आँखों से आँसू निकल रहे थे, तो क्या मैं कहूँ कि वे नकली आँसू थे, नकाशु क्रोकोडाइल टीयर्स..... (व्यवधान)..... लेकिन मैं ऐसा नहीं कहूँगा, मैं मानता हूँ कि इनके मन में भी मेरे नेता के बारे में कुछ प्रेम था। आज इन सवालियों को उठाना, प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री के द्वारा, विरोधी दल के सदस्यों के द्वारा उचित था? स्वतलाना का मामला ही लीजिये, मैं आज मीनू मसानी साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वे श्री शास्त्री जी से सहमत थे? क्या उस समय सभी विरोधी दल वालों ने नहीं कहा था कि स्वतलाना के मामले में..... (व्यवधान)..... कि व्यक्तिगत आजादी, स्वतन्त्रता का सवाल है? और हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई की जो परम्परा है उससे यह महान सवाल जुड़ा हुआ है? डा० लोहिया सिर्फ ऐसे सवाल नहीं उठाते थे, गरीबों के जितने सवाल उन्होंने और हमने उठाए हैं और किसी ने उठाये हैं? तारकेश्वरी जी हमारे बारे में सर्वलाइट में लम्बे लम्बे लेख लिख रही हैं, उनका उत्तर मैं बिहार में ही दूँगा, यहाँ नहीं, दूँगा वैसे पटना की एक बड़ी सभा में मैंने जवाब दिया भी है।..... (व्यवधान).....

अब मैं इस पर आ रहा हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री ने मोरारजी भाई का समर्थन क्यों किया। प्रधान मंत्री की हिम्मत नहीं है, यह मैं तीन बार अनुभव कर चुका हूँ। जहाँ हमारे बम्बई के मित्र सदोपा पाटिल का सवाल आता है, वह चाबुक निकालते हैं, हम 66 में देख चुके हैं सुब्रमण्यम् के मामले में, मन्ू भाई शाह और शचीन्द्र चौधरी के मामले में, आप भी जानते हैं क्योंकि आप उस वक्त मंत्रिमंडल के सदस्य थे। मैं पाटिल साहब की तारीफ करता हूँ, वे आज लोक सभा में नहीं हैं, हमारे जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज ने उनको हराया तीस हजार

से अधिक वोटों से, आज वे हाई कोर्ट में भी हार चुके हैं और सुप्रीम कोर्ट में गए हैं, वे दो बार हार चुके हैं, लेकिन उन की ताकत जबर्दस्त है। कम्पनी डोनेशन के मामले में यहां सभी लोगों ने समर्थन किया और ताराजी ने भी समर्थन किया लेकिन ताजुब की बात है .....  
(व्यवधान) .....

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :  
Sir, on appoint of order. The hon. Member cannot use my name wrongly. I would request you to ask him to mention my name correctly.

श्री मधु लिमये : हिन्दुस्तान के पहले प्रधान मन्त्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू की पुत्री जो आज इस पद पर बैठी हैं, यह भी मेरे नेता की देन है, इसलिए उनका स्मरण करते हुए आपकी खिदमत में पेश करता हूं कि यह पत्र जोकि पाटिल साहब के दोस्त और राज्य सभा के सदस्य बाबू भाई चिनाय, प्रेसीडेंट आफ इंडियन चैम्बर्स आफ कामर्स एण्ड इन्डस्ट्री, उनके नाम से लिखा हुआ है, बहुत पुराना है 1957 का लेकिन इसलिए दे रहा हूं कि क्या उप-प्रधान मंत्री का बेटा और क्या भूतपूर्व प्रधान मन्त्री की बेटी, मामला तो एक ही है ! आप जरा सावधानी से सुनिए, आखिरी वाक्य बड़ा मजेदार है :

"Some time ago I was given to understand that in view of the financially favourable results of the industrial exhibition a donation of Rs. 2 lakhs was likely to be made to Janahit Nidhi, which is a public charitable trust.

I am the Chairman of this trust. The other trustees are Justice P. N. Saprui, M.P., and Miss Padmaja Naidu, Governor of West Bengal. Now that you have taken over as the Chairman of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, I wonder whether you are in a position to let me know if the donation is likely to materialise.

I shall, of course, inform my father of the donation the Federation, makes to the Trust."

यह अंतिम वाक्य देखिये अध्यक्ष महोदय कि बड़े लोगों के नामों का कैसे इस्तेमाल होता है ..... (व्यवधान)

मैं अपनी बात को खत्म करते हुए सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि इस का यहाँ वोट से फैसला नहीं होगा बल्कि इस का फैसला जनता की अदालत में होगा। इसलिए अन्त में एक ही वाक्य मैं मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि इन लोगों में जो गुटबाजी है, दलबंदी है, उस से मुझे जरा भी मतलब नहीं है। मैं श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी की राय का बिल्कुल समर्थन करता हूं और उसे दोहराता हूं कि इस सरकार को जल्द से जल्द हटाना हम अपना पवित्र कर्तव्य समझते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद का जब मामला आया था तो उस वक्त भी हम ने नैतिकता और लोकतंत्र के मिथान्त का सवाल उठाया था। श्री रवि राय ने यह मामला उठाया था। हम किसी ग्रुप वाले नहीं हैं। हमारी पार्टी में कोई लोबी वगैरह नहीं चलेगी। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया की देन है इसलिए नहीं चलेगी। उसे हम नहीं चलने देंगे ..... (व्यवधान)  
इसलिए चाहे वह फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद का मामला हो, राजा दिनेश सिंह का मामला हो, उप-प्रधान मंत्री का मामला हो, भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री की बेटी का या प्रधान मंत्री का स्वयं अपना मामला हो, हमें जब भी मौका मिलेगा, जब भी कोई गलती मिलेगी तो उस को हम छोड़ेंगे नहीं। लेकिन वे विश्वास करें कि मेरे मन में उन में से किसी के बारे में तनिक भी कोई द्वेष ईर्ष्या या बदले की भावना नहीं है। आज भले ही वह इस मेरे कथन का विश्वास न करें, लेकिन



[श्री मधु लिमये]

पाँच साल के बाद उन को पता लगेगा कि मेरे मन में तनिक भी द्वेष, ईर्ष्या या बदले की भावना नहीं थी। जनता ने मुझ को यहाँ चुन कर भेजा है इसलिये जनता के प्रति जो मेरा कर्तव्य है केवल उस को मैं यहाँ पर अदा करना चाहता हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER : Some amendments are there. I said in the beginning that I will give my ruling about Shri Shivajirao's amendment\* later. It is good that I took my time. Shri Banerjee also mentioned something at that time which, I am afraid. I did not hear properly, but I got the records.

SHRI NATH PAI : What about the letter ?

MR. SPEAKER : He is taking it. He is not able to say anything.

The Resolution was moved by Shri Venkatasubbaiah against Professor Hiren Mukerjee and Shri Shambhali. Shri S. M. Banerjee tabled an amendment which was completely contrary to that. I had disallowed it. You can oppose a motion but you cannot have an amendment which gives it a different meaning. He wanted them to be complemented, while Shri Venkatasubbaiah was criticizing them, for

what they did in the Central Hall. This amendment is exactly similar to that. Therefore if I disallowed that on that day, I cannot allow it today; it will be improper. Therefore I disallow it.

Now I shall put Shri Banerjee's amendment to the vote of the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं उसका समर्थन कर रहा हूँ। मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह श्री बनर्जी के अमैडमेंट को मान रही हैं ? अगर वह तैयार हों तो फिर सभी लोग उस पर राखी हो जायेंगे।

MR. SPEAKER : If they are ready, they will vote with you. There is nothing more to be done now; no more discussion.

Now, I put Amendment No. 1 of Shri S. M. Banerjee to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That in the motion,—

for "and also the fact that he has not been asked by the Prime Minister to resign, hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister"

substitute "resolves to appoint a Committee of eighteen Members of Lok Sabha, to be nominated by the Speaker, to investigate into the whole matter"(1)

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 13]

[19.42 hrs.

## AYES

Abraham, Shri K. M.  
Adichan, Shri P. C.  
Ahmed, Shri J.  
Anbazhagan, Shri  
Anirudhan, Shri K.  
Badrudduja, Shri  
Banerjee, Shri S. M.  
Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy  
Esthose, Shri P. P.  
Fernandes, Shri George

Bhagaban Das, Shri  
Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh  
Chakrapani, Shri C. K.  
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri  
Chittybabu, Shri C.  
Dange, Shri S. A.  
Durairasu, Shri  
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath  
Nambiar, Shri  
Nath Pai, Shri

\*Vide Col. 2736

**AYES—contd.**

Ghosh, Shri Ganesh  
Gopalan, Shri P.  
Janardhanan, Shri C.  
Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra  
Joshi, Shri S. M.  
Kameshwar Singh, Shri  
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali.  
Kisku, Shri A. K.  
Kuchelar, Shri G.  
Limaye, Shri Madhu  
Madhukar, Shri K. M.  
Maiti, Shri S. N.  
Mayavan, Shri  
Menon, Shri Vishwanatha  
Misra, Shri Srinibas  
Modak, Shri B. K.  
Molahu Prasad, Shri  
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.  
Nair, Shri Vasudevan

Nihal Singh, Shri  
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo  
Patel, Shri J. H.  
Patil, Shri N. R.  
Rajaram, Shri  
Ramamurti, Shri P.  
Ray, Shri Rabi  
Reddy, Shri Eswara  
Samanta, Shri S. C.  
Sambhali, Shri Ishaq  
Satya Narain Singh, Shri  
Sen, Shri Deven  
Sequeira, Shri Erasmo de  
Sezhiyan, Shri  
Sharma, Shri Yogendra  
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar  
Shastri, Shri Sheopujan  
Subravelu, Shri

**NOES**

Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
Aramugam, Shri R. S.  
Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan  
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar  
Barua, Shri R.  
Basumatari, Shri  
Baswant, Shri  
Besra, Shri S. C.  
Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
Bhandare, Shri R. D.  
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri  
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.  
Bohra, Shri Onkarlal  
Burman, Shri Kirit Bikram Deb  
Buta Singh, Shri  
Chanda, Shri Anil K.

Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
Chavan, Shri D. R.  
Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
Choudhary, Shri Valmiki  
Dalbir Singh, Shri  
Das, Shri N. T.  
Dass, Shri C.  
Deoghare, Shri N. R.  
Desai, Shri Morarji  
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.  
Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.  
Dhillon, Shri G. S.  
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri  
Dinesh Singh, Shri  
Dixit, Shri G. C.  
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri  
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira

## NOES—contd.

Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti  
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal  
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati  
 Govind Das, Dr.  
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan  
 Hajarnawis, Shri  
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri  
 Hari Krishna, Shri  
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.  
 Heerji Bhai, Shri  
 Hem Raj, Shri  
 Iqbal Singh, Shri  
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas  
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.  
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri  
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.  
 Kamble, Shri  
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Karni Singh, Dr.  
 Katham, Shri B. N.  
 Kavade, Shri B. R.  
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.  
 Keshri, Shri Sitaram  
 Khadilkar, Shri  
 Khan, Shri M. A.  
 Khanna, Shri P. K.  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta  
 Krishna, Shri M. R.  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati  
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.  
 Mahadevappa, Shri Rampur  
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri

Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao  
 Marandi, Shri  
 Master, Shri Bhola Nath  
 Masuriya Din, Shri  
 Mehta, Shri Asoka  
 Mehta, Shri P. M.  
 Melkote, Dr.  
 Menon, Shri Govinda  
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali  
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri  
 Mohsin, Shri  
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati  
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda  
 Mukne, Shri Yeshwantrao  
 Murthy, Shri B. S.  
 Murti, Shri M. S.  
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.  
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya  
 Nanda, Shri  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati  
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath  
 Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila  
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath  
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani  
 Pant, Shri K. C.  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Parthasarathy, Shri  
 Patel, Shri Manibhai J.  
 Patel, Shri Manubhai  
 Patil, Shri Deorao  
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.  
 Pradhani, Shri K.  
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.  
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi  
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri

NOES—Contd.

Raj Deo Singh, Shri  
Raju, Shri D. B.  
Raju, Dr. D. S.  
Ram, Shri T.  
Ram Dhan, Shri  
Ram Dhani Das, Shri  
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
Ram Swarup, Shri  
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri  
Rana, Shri M. B.  
Randhir Singh, Shri  
Rane, Shri  
Rao, Shri Jaganath  
Rao, Dr. K. L.  
Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
Rao, Shri Muthyal  
Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi  
Rao, Shri Thirumala  
Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.  
Raut, Shri Bhola  
Reddy, Shri P. Antony  
Reddy, Shri R. D.  
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila  
Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
Sadhu Ram, Shri  
Saleem, Shri M. Yunus  
Salve, Shri N. K. P.  
Sanghi, Shri N. K.  
Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
Sapre, Shrimati Tara  
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati  
Sayyad Ali, Shri

Sen, Shri Dwaipayana  
Sen, Shri P. G.  
Sethi, Shri P. C.  
Shah, Shrimati Jayaben  
Shambhu Nath, Shri  
Shankaranand, Shri B.  
Sharma, Shri M. R.  
Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore  
Sheo Narain, Shri  
Sher Singh, Shri  
Sheth, Shri T. M.  
Shinde, Shri Annasahib  
Shinkre, Shri  
Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri  
Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
Siddayya, Shri  
Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri  
Singh, Shri D. V.  
Sinha, Shri Mudrika  
Sinha, Shri R. K.  
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan  
Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwar  
Snatak, Shri Nar Deo  
Solanki, Shri S. M.  
Sonavane, Shri  
Sundarsanam, Shri M.  
Surendra Pal Singh, Shri  
Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
Swaran Singh, Shri  
Tamaskar, Shri  
Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
Uikey, Shri M. G.  
Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra  
Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra  
Verma, Shri Balgovind  
Verma, Shri Prem Chand  
Virbhadr Singh, Shri  
Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra

MR. SPEAKER : The result\* of the  
Division is Ayes : 57; Noes : 192.

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, I put Amend-  
ment No. 2 of Shri Jyotirmoy Basu to the

vote of the House.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, there is Amend-  
ment No. 3 by Shri Abdul Ghani Dar.

\*The following members also recorded their votes :

NOES : Sarvashri B. N. Bhargava and Shantilal Shah.  
40LSS/68—14

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : चूंकि आपने मुझे बोलने का वक्त नहीं दिया, इस लिये मैं नहीं चाहता कि मेरा अमेंडमेंट बोट किया जाये।

शरी عبدالغنى ڈار :- چونکہ آپ نے مجھے بولنے کا وقت نہیں دیا اس لئے میں نہیں چاہتا کہ میرا امینڈمنٹ ووٹ کیا جائے -

MR. SPEAKER : I did not give Mr. Jyotirmoy Basu any chance; I did not give Mr. Banerjee any chance to speak. Will you kindly sit down? I am putting it to the vote of the House....

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : मैं नहीं चाहता कि मेरे अमेंडमेंट पर वोट हो।

शरी عبدالغنى ڈار :- میں نہیں چاہتا کہ میرے امینڈمنٹ پر ووٹ ہو -

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI : He does not want to press it.

MR. SPEAKER : He cannot make a speech now. I did not give a chance to Mr. Banerjee or Mr. Jyotirmoy Basu in spite of their amendments....

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : मैं नहीं चाहता कि मेरे अमेंडमेंट पर वोट लिया जाये।

شری عبدالغنى ڈار :- میں نہیں چاہتا کہ میرے امینڈمنٹ پر ووٹ لیا جائے -

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Abdul Ghani Bar wants to withdraw his amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

श्री जार्ज फरनेस्की : मैं अपना अमेंडमेंट वापस ले रहा हूँ क्योंकि श्री बैनर्जी का अमेंडमेंट खत्म हो गया है।

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Fernandes also wants to withdraw his amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER : Now I shall put Mr. Madhu Limaye's motion to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House, having regard to the fact that the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister has made false statements to the House not once but twice on the 30th April and the 24th July, 1968, concerning his son's/Private Secretary's business connections and also the fact that he has not been asked by the Prime Minister to resign, hereby disapproves the conduct of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister." The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 14]

[19.44 hrs.

#### AYES

Abraham, Shri K. M.

Adichan, Shri P. C.

Ahmed, Shri J.

Anbazhagan, Shri

Anirudhan, Shri K.

Badrudduja, Shri

Banerjee, Shri S. M.

Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy

Bhagaban Das, Shri

Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh

Chakrapani, Shri C. K.

Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri

Chittybahu, Shri C.

Dange, Shri S. A.

Dar, Shri Abdul Ghani

**AYES—Contd.**

Duraiasa, Shri  
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath  
Esthose, Shri P. P.  
Fernanda, Shri George  
Ghosh, Shri Ganesh  
Gopalan, Shri P.  
Janardhanan, Shri C.  
Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra  
Joshi, Shri S. M.  
Kameshwar Singh, Shri  
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali  
Kisku, Shri A. K.  
Kuchelar, Shri G.  
Limaye, Shri Madhu  
Madhukar, Shri K. M.  
Maiti, Shri S. N.  
Mayavan, Shri  
Menon, Shri Vishwanatha  
Misra, Shri Srinibas  
Modak, Shri B. K.  
Molahu Prasad, Shri

Mukerjee, Shri H. N.  
Nair, Shri Vasudevan  
Nambiar, Shri  
Nath Pai, Shri  
Nihal Singh, Shri  
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo  
Patel, Shri J. H.  
Patil, Shri N. R.  
Rajaram, Shri  
Ramamurti, Shri P.  
Ray, Shri Rabi  
Reddy, Shri Eswara  
Samanta, Shri S. C.  
Sambhali, Shri Ishaq  
Satya Narain Singh, Shri  
Sen, Shri Deven  
Sezhiyan, Shri  
Sharma, Shri Yogendra  
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar  
Shastri, Shri Sheopujan  
Subravelu, Shri

**NOES**

Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
Arumugam, Shri R. S.  
Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan  
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar  
Barua, Shri R.  
Basumatari, Shri  
Baswant, Shri  
Besra, Shri S. C.  
Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
Bhandare, Shri R. D.  
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri  
Bhargava, Shri B. N.  
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.  
Bohra, Shri Onkarlal  
Burman, Shri Kirit Bikram Deb  
Buta Singh, Shri

Chanda, Shri Anil K.  
Chandra, Shrimati Jyotsna  
Chaturvedi, Shri R. I.  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
Chavan, Shri D. R.  
Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
Choudhary, Shri Valmiki  
Dalbir Singh, Shri  
Das, Shri N. T.  
Dass, Shri C.  
Deoghare, Shri N. R.  
Desai, Shri Morarji  
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.  
Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.  
Dhillon, Shri G. S.  
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri  
Dinesh Singh, Shri  
Dixit, Shri G. C.  
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri

## NOES—Contd.

Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti  
Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
Ghosh, Shri Parimal  
Girja Kumari, Shrimati  
Govind Daa, Dr.  
Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan  
Hajarnawis, Shri  
Hanumanthaiya, Shri  
Hari Krishna, Shri  
Heerji Bhai, Shri  
Hem Raj, Shri  
Iqbal Singh, Shri  
Jadhav, Shri Tulashidas  
Jadhav, Shri V. N.  
Jaggiwan Ram, Shri  
Kahandole, Shri Z. M.  
Kamble, Shri  
Kamala Kumari, Shrimati  
Karan Singh, Dr.  
Karni Singh, Dr.  
Katham, Shri B. N.  
Kavade, Shri B. R.  
Kedaria, Shri C. M.  
Khan, Shri M. A.  
Khanna, Shri P. K.  
Kinder Lal, Shri  
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta  
Krishna, Shri M. R.  
Kureel, Shri B. N.  
Kushwah, Shri Y. S.  
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati  
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.  
Mahadevappa, Shri Rampur  
Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand  
Maharaj Singh, Shri

Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini  
Mandal, Dr. P.  
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
Mane, Shri Shankarrao  
Marandi, Shri  
Master, Shri Bhola Nath  
Masuriya Din, Shri  
Mehta, Shri Asoka  
Mehta, Shri P. M.  
Melkote, Dr.  
Menon, Shri Govinda  
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali  
Mishra, Shri Bibhud  
Mohammad Yusuf, Shri  
Mohsin, Shri  
Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati  
Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda  
Mukne, Shri Yeshwantrao  
Murthy, Shri B. S.  
Murti, Shri M. S.  
Naghnoor, Shri M. N.  
Naidu, Shri Chengalraya  
Nanda, Shri  
Oraon, Shri Kartik  
Padmavati Devi, Shrimati  
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath  
Palchoudhari, Shrimati Ila  
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath  
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani  
Pant, Shri K. C.  
Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
Parthasarathy, Shri  
Patel, Shri Manibhai J.  
Patel, Shri Manubhai  
Patil, Shri Anantrao  
Poonacha, Shri C. M.  
Pradhani, Shri K.  
Pramanik, Shri J. N.  
Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi  
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri

Raj Deo Singh, Shri  
 Raju, Shri D. B.  
 Raju, Dr. D. S.  
 Ram, Shri T.  
 Ram Dhan, Shri  
 Ram Dhani Das, Shri  
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
 Ram Swarup, Shri  
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri  
 Rana, Shri M. B.  
 Randhir Singh, Shri  
 Rane, Shri  
 Rao, Shri Jaganath  
 Rao, Dr. K. L.  
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
 Rao, Shri Muthyal  
 Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi  
 Rao, Shri Thirumala  
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.  
 Raut, Shri Bhola  
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony  
 Reddy, Shri R. D.  
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila  
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
 Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal  
 Sadhu Ram, Shri  
 Saleem, Shri M. Yunus  
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara  
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati  
 Sayyad Ali, Shri  
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan  
 Sen, Shri P. G.  
 Sethi, Shri P. C.  
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben

Shah, Shri Shantilal  
 Shambhu Nath, Shri  
 Shankaranand, Shri B.  
 Sharma, Shri M. R.  
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sheo Narain, Shri  
 Sher Singh, Shri  
 Sheth, Shri T. M.  
 Shinde, Shri Annasahib  
 Shinkre, Shri  
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
 Siddayya, Shri  
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri  
 Singh, Shri D. N.  
 Singh, Shri D. V.  
 Sinha, Shri Mudrika  
 Sinha, Shri R. K.  
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan  
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari  
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo  
 Solanki, Shri S. M.  
 Sonavane, Shri  
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Swaran Singh, Shri  
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
 Uikey, Shri M. G.  
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra  
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand  
 Virbhadr Singh, Shri  
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra

MR. SPEAKER : The result\* of the Division is : Ayes : 57; Noes : 193. 19.45 HRS.

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER : The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, August 20, 1968/Sravana 29, 1890 (Saka).*

\*The following Members also recorded their votes :

NOES : Sarvashri J. N. Hazarika, Sitaram Kesri and Deorao Patil.