

failure by husband to pay maintenance or permanent alimony granted to the wife by the Court under certain enactments or rules of law. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2520/78].

II. (a) A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Department of Company Affairs), Notification G.S.R. No. 728, dated the 28th April, 1978, under sub-section (3) of section 720-A of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2442/78].

(b) A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, Notification G.S.R. No. 627, dated the 20th May, 1978, under sub-section (3) of section 637 of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2443/78].

(c) A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Department of Company Affairs) under sub-section (3) of section 642 of the Companies Act, 1956:—

(i) G.S.R. No. 623, dated the 13th May, 1978, publishing the Public Companies (Terms of issue of debentures and of raising of loans with option to convert such debentures or loans into shares) Amendment Rules, 1978.

(ii) G.S.R. No. 626, dated the 20th May, 1978, publishing the Company's Liquidation Account (Second Amendment) Rules, 1978.

(iii) G.S.R. No. 851, dated the 1st July, 1978, publishing the Companies (Secretary's Qualifications) (Amendment) Rules, 1978.

(iv) G.S.R. No. 852, dated the 1st July, 1978, publishing the Companies (Secretary's Qualifications) (Second Amendment)

Rules, 1978.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-244/78 for (i) to (iv)].

(v) G.S.R. No. 373(E), dated the 17th July, 1978, publishing the Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Fourth Amendment Rules, 1978. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2493/78].

I. Notification under the Representation of the People Act, 1950.

II. The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (Recruitment of Members of Staff) Amendment Rules, 1978.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table:

I. A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, Notification S.O. No. 393(E), dated the 19th June, 1978, under sub-section (3) of section 13 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2519/78].

II. A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, Notification G.S.R. No. 357(E), dated the 10th July, 1978, publishing the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (Recruitment of Members of Staff) Amendment Rules, 1978, under sub-section (3) of section 67 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trades Practices Act, 1969. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2494/78].

POINTS OF ORDER RELATING TO THE CORRESPONDENCE EXCHANGED BETWEEN THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE FORMER HOME MINISTER

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a point of order. I have given a notice of motion under Rule 158 of the Rules of Procedure, and under Rule 170 the Chair has to decide on the admissibility of the motion. When

[Shri Devendra Nath Dwivedi]

I saw you in the Chamber, Sir, you said that you wanted some time to consider the admissibility and I have agreed. I do not want to talk anything on the motion so that you may arrive at some conclusion. I just want to make one or two points because the House is surcharged with emotion and the House is very much interested as to what is going on about the scandal of correspondence between the Prime Minister and the ex-Home Minister.

Sir, I would just read out for your benefit and for the benefit of the House a statement made by the Prime Minister when a similar question arose in 1974 and what he had said has proven to be prophetic. This is very relevant and would be very helpful. It is like quoting an authority after which you need not read any author. Now I am quoting Mr. Morarjibhai Desai as a Member of the Lok Sabha on December 9, 1974. In the matter of placing paper on the Table, Mr. Morarjibhai said:

"And when it comes to the business of Parliament where it becomes vital to have it, then Parliament is the highest body and it must have it. It must have all the papers. No secret papers of the Government can be secret from Parliament. The only stipulation would be that when Parliament sits in a secret session nothing can be divulged. After all, the authority of Parliament is above Government and Government is not above Parliament. If that is not realised by the Government it will be a sorry day for parliamentary democracy and Parliament cannot abdicate its authority."

These the last two sentences are very prophetic;

"This is what power does. I hope the Prime Minister will realise it. If not today some day it will have to be realised. Power has that effect on everybody, I do not exclude myself from it."

How prophetic it has proven! And this is called poetic justice. So I want to make a brief submission, Sir, before you decide on the admissibility of the motion.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): On a point order, Sir.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: I am already on a point of order. That should be first disposed of.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have a submission. After this I would make my submission.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: I am finishing. I will not take more than a minute. You are the custodian of the rights of the House. Since the beginning of the present session this House and the people of this country are surcharged with emotion. They are pre-occupied with this scandal that is going on, about how to dust the dirt beneath the government. They want the truth to come out, and you yourself played a role in trying to resolve the crisis. Now the House feels, the Members of Parliament feel, that because almost everything has gone to the Press—because editorials have been written; verbatim the text has gone to the Press—any attitude on the part of the Government, after that, not to place the papers on the Table of the House is tantamount to committing contempt of this House. Therefore, Sir, I want you, as Chairman, to direct the Government because if the Government does not do that and if this Government continues to show its contempt for the House, then it will be very difficult for Members of Parliament to conduct the business in a manner in which they can apply their mind, and because this is uppermost in our mind, we do not want to conduct any other business. Therefore, my last submission is that you must give your ruling today in the afternoon. In the afternoon you must give your ruling on the admissibility so that we can

conduct the business. Otherwise it will be impossible for us to sit peacefully as representatives of the people. It is a very serious matter. As the Prime Minister is here, maybe he is going to announce that he is going to place the papers. Therefore, let him be given the opportunity to place his viewpoint.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Members cannot direct the Chair to do this and that.

(Interruptions)

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI): May I say that the hon. Member forgets that there is no analogy between that case and this case? Let me say what it is. That case related to corruption in issuing a licence and not correspondence between Ministers.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Corruption between Ministers' families. Family corruption.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I heard you patiently. What has happened to him? He is excited, I don't know why.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): He has already admitted that he is disturbed mentally.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Silence, please.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: When he says that the whole country is involved, it only means he, his friends and his followers. Nothing more than that. (Interruptions). A vast part of the country is not concerned with it at all. But he can make statements, I have no quarrel with him. What I said then related . . .

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: To what? Corruption.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: . . . to the correspondence to be placed on the Table in the licence case. That is not what is sacrosanct. I will cer-

tainly put such cases in Parliament. I will never say "No."

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I only rise on a point of order because for all times to come this would be a precedent. There are enough precedents in both the Houses. When any Member tried to quote from the proceedings of the other House, the presiding authority has specifically said, "Whatever you want to say, you can say on your own but no proceedings of the other House can be quoted in this House." The hon. Member has quoted what Shri Morarjibhai Desai had stated in the other House. I do not want to go into the merits of the case, but if you allow quoting whatever has happened in the other House, it will be very bad precedent. And once when I tried to do it in the Fifth Lok Sabha, I was told by the Speaker, "You cannot quote what has happened in the Rajya Sabha that would be a bad practice." Therefore, I would like to know your ruling on this issue.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA (Bihar): Sir, I only want to add to what my hon. friend, Mr. Dwivedi, has said. I have also given a notice under rule 168 and I want...

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI LAL K. ADVANI): Sir, are we going to have a debate on this? You permitted a Member to make some observations.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Only one minute, Sir. I only want to add to whatever Mr. Dwivedi has said. I have also given a notice under rule 168 for a motion to be moved in the House and I would request you to take a decision this afternoon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, before you speak up...

(Interruptions)

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH (Gujarat): Sir, you are permitting a debate on a matter which is already under your consideration. That is what it is.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:
Sir, have you disposed of the point
of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I am a little surprised at the argument which the Prime Minister has put forward by trying to make a fine distinction between the present case and the Tulmohan Ram case involving the granting of a licence. Sir, this distinction is somewhat artificial. We are not concerned with the refinement of it. Here there are some allegations which have come to light and also appeared in the Press involving certain individuals who are not members of the Government—and some of them are. This is what has appeared in the papers. For the present, as I am speaking, I do not know what has happened in your Chamber. This is in the Press. Are we not entitled in Parliament to know these allegations which involve public standards, propriety in public life and moral values, and all the rest of it? Sir, this is what I would like to know. Now, should they not be treated the property of the House so that the House can give its opinion as to how they should be dealt with, whether the allegations are valid or not, and, if valid, to what extent they are valid and what should be the action to be taken on them? Must these be left to the Prime Minister, who is involved in some way or the other, and the former Home Minister, to decide—and that too in the context of settling their quarrels, the quarrels between the two big guns of the Janata Party. Sir, it does appear from the newspapers today that the subject-matter of their discussion was as to what should be the fate of

the so-called correspondence. One is saying: "Withdraw the charges". The other is saying: "I am ready to accept the cancellation of the correspondence, but not prepared to withdraw the charges." What is all this going on? What are they dealing with? Are they dealing with their internal domestic affairs in which the country is not involved? Or, are they dealing with a public matter? Sir, propriety in public affairs is not an internal affair of the Cabinet members or, for that matter, the members of the ruling party. Propriety in public life is a public issue to be debated and thrashed out in public and, above all, in Parliament. That is the standard to be set.

Why is the Government shying away from laying the correspondence, including the letters the Prime Minister has received against Mr. Charan Singh and his family and other from various sources, including two Janata legislators? We cannot simply understand it. Sir, we are asked to be onlookers, to read the newspapers and see how the horse trading is going on over the correspondence. Is this the way to treat Parliament, especially when it is in session? I ask you this question and it is for you to give guidance.

Sir, there is no norm which would be violated. On the contrary, norms will be set if the Prime Minister comes forward with laying on the Table not only all the correspondence but also all the readable material. He should come forward and say: "Here is the material for the nation and Parliament to judge"—that would be a forthright and frank manner of dealing with a public issue of this dimension—rather than seek argument and prevaricate.

Therefore, I think, our demand for laying the correspondence on the Table of the House is very reasonable and requires to be supported by all concerned. My friend raised a point of order. On what? We are not quoting from what is said in

the other House. We are quoting what is known to the public. We are quoting facts of life. And there is no harm in quoting even from the proceedings of the other House without naming specifically the other House. It is always done. Sir, Mr. Morarji Desai, who should come forward before anybody else, is trying to back out of it. Why is he afraid of the search-light being put on him? I cannot understand it. Sir, therefore, there is a fool proof case for the correspondence and other relevant papers being laid on the Table of the House. Those must be brought to the House to be thrashed in this House and in the other House before the eyes of the nation. The nation, the public and Parliament must judge them. Give pronouncement not only on the merits of the allegations in possession of the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister but also on what should be the follow up action. It is a simple thing. Is this the way? What for? Mr. Morarji Desai is not doing justice to himself, and certainly he is not bringing credit to the parliamentary system.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO JOSHI (Delhi): On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA (Andhra Pradesh): On a point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All are on points of order, Sir.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, apparently, the point made by my friend, Prof. Madhu Dandavate...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no, you have not been allowed. Do not take down.

(*Shri K. K. Madhavan continued to speak*).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I think, Sir, one of the very important members of the Janata Party...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not allowed you to speak. I have allowed Shri Jagannath Rao Joshi to speak. If you are going to speak like this, it will not be recorded. Do not take down.

(*Shri Dinesh Goswami continued to speak*).

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : सभापति जी, यह सवाल केवल भ्रष्टाचार का नहीं है इसमें एक बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण अंतर सिद्धांत का है। स्वस्थ लोकतंत्र के लिए मंत्रियों की सामूहिक जिम्मेदारी बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है इसलिए आदर्शनीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो सवाल उठाया है कि...

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : श्रीमन् मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है...

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी : क्या मंत्रियों के आपस का पत्र व्यवहार खुला किया जाये. . (*Interruptions*) यह सवाल भ्रष्टाचार का नहीं है, कल जाकर मंत्रियों के बीच का पत्र व्यवहार यहां टेबुल पर रखने की प्रथा अगर शुरू हो गयी तो फिर सामूहिक जिम्मेदारी के रूप में जो खुले रूप से विचार होना चाहिए उस पर रोक आयेगी। सवाल यह है कि आगे चलकर स्वस्थ लोकतंत्र की दृष्टि से आपका रुलिंग देना बहुत जरूरी है। मेरे मित्र बहुत बोल रहे हैं जो टाईम कैप्सूल गड़ा था That was meant for the future generation, but that was not disclosed in this House. We insisted for it. टाईम कैप्सूल में जो रखा था सभापति महोदय, उसको तो हमको बताया नहीं गया (*Interruptions*) इसमें मैं आपकी रुलिंग चाहता हूं। एक बार यदि यह परम्परा यहां आ गयी तो फिर खुले रूप से विचार करने की सारी प्रथा ही समाप्त हो जायेगी। लोकतंत्र चलना मुश्किल हो जायेगा। मैं इस पर आपकी रुलिंग चाहता हूं, यह भ्रष्टाचार का सवाल नहीं है। (*Interruptions*)

श्री श्यामलाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
खोदा पहाड़ निकली चुहिया ।

श्री पोलू मोदी : मरा नहीं जिन्दा निकला ।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : हमको तो
उसको निकालना पड़ा था ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, one minute please. Hon. Members, please resume your seats. Let us be calm and quiet. I have received notices of the motion. I will examine them thoroughly and will let you know the ruling when I am to give. Therefore, let us not discuss further.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Andhra Pradesh): Today only, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot dictate. If you dictate... (Interruptions) It all depends upon the subject-matter and the precedents and all that. I will have to look into it. I will let you know. That is all. Now, next item, Calling Attention. Mr. Kalp Nath Rai.

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : मेरा व्यवस्था
का प्रश्न है ।

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, will you please allow...

MR. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: One second. Will you please allow a Member of the Opposition to express a point of view which is different from that of the other Members of the Opposition? Because you are going to give a ruling, I will like to...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I will give, I will see.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: Please listen to what I am going to say. You see, an atmosphere has been created in this House which I think is sufficiently concerned with the dignity and decorum of this House. It also involves...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been now...

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: Please listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What am I to listen?

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: You have allowed others to speak. Why don't you allow me? This is a matter which involves, Mr. Chairman, the dignity and the decorum of this House. Also, Mr. Chairman, threats have been held out that proceedings will not be allowed to be carried on—Mr. Chairman, may I have your attention? Threats have been given in this House that proceedings will not be allowed to be carried on unless a certain demand is fulfilled. Since it is a matter of conscience with me and since I think... (Interruptions) I am not going to be cowed down by anybody. Since this is a matter which, I think, involves the basic principles of parliamentary democracy and functioning of democracy, I will like to submit to you before you give your ruling that two questions are involved in this. One is a question allegedly involving charges of corruption made by the former Home Minister against the Prime Minister and his son and some references made by the Prime Minister against the former Home Minister and members of his family. As Members of the Opposition, wherever we suspect any corruption, it is our duty to fight it and to see that it is exposed. It is entirely a different matter and I will join every Member of this House in carrying on a crusade for fighting for exposure of corruption. But the other issue involved is whether correspondence between two Ministers should be laid on the Table of the House or not. I will like to submit that I think it is very indecent on the part of any person to try to probe into private correspondence between two individuals... (Interruptions)

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Not private correspondence.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
Let me speak. I will not yield. Sir,
I must be heard. (*Interruptions*) I
must be heard. (*Interruptions*) I
must be heard. I am not going to
yield.

श्री रीशू मोदी : एक ईमानदार आदमी
मिल गया आपको, शुक करो ।

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
Mr. Chairman, this is not the way.
(*Interruptions*) I must speak. I must
have my say. Secondly, Sir,...
(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yadav, why
are you not allowing others to speak?
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
Mr. Chairman, Sir, secondly when
this question was raised, the Prime
Minister left it to the Chairman and
to the Speaker in the two Houses to
decide... (*Interruptions*) Let me con-
clude; otherwise there will be distor-
tions. The Prime Minister left it to
the Chairman and to the Speaker in
the other House to decide what should
be the manner in which this corres-
pondence should be made known to
the Members of the Opposition. You,
in your wisdom, Sir, decided that this
correspondence should be shown to
leaders of the Opposition in your
chamber (*Interruptions*) No, I will
not sit down. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
Sir, I am standing on a point of order.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: I
must have my full say.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
I am on a point of order...

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister
left it to the Chairman of this House
and the Speaker of the Lok Sabha...

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
I am on a point of order...

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: I
am speaking on my point of order. I
should be allowed to have my say.
Sir, the Prime Minister left it to you
and to the Speaker in the Lok Sabha
to decide what should be the form in
which the correspondence should be
pursued. Now, you decided in your
wisdom that the correspondence will
be seen by the leaders of the Opposi-
tion in your Chamber. Even before
that correspondence was seen by the
leaders of the Opposition, the Con-
gress I declared that whatever may
be the correspondence, we are going
to pursue this matter and we will
force that the correspondence.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA
(Gujarat): Sir, on a point of order...

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
I am on a point of order, Mr. Chair-
man.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
Mr. Chairman, it is for you now to
decide whether this correspondence
should be placed here on the Table
of the House and you may be within
your right and in view of what the
Prime Minister...

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
On a point of order...

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
On a point of order...

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
Mr. Chairman, you should not suc-
cumb to their blackmail. You have
allowed me to make my submission.
Therefore, you must not succumb to
blackmail...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude
quickly.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: I
am just concluding. My last sentence
is this...

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
On a point of order...

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
On a point of order...

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
Sir, you don't succumb to the black-mail. I want to make my submission. You have allowed me to make my submission. I am not going to yield to these interruptions. I will not allow them to get my viewpoint distorted...

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Mr. Chairman, please listen to my point of order...

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA:
There cannot be a point of order unless the previous point of order is disposed of. And I am talking on my point of order already.

Sir, I was submitting that the Prime Minister left it to you, and those leaders should have the decency, they should have the honesty to come to your Chamber and see the correspondence, and after accepting your ruling, after going to your Chamber, after seeing that correspondence, in pursuance of their political objective of trying to divert the attention... (Interruptions)... because I suspect that this House is being used for that purpose. I submit to you. Mr. Chairman, that I will not be a party to the game which the Congress-I is trying to play in this House. I submit that you should make a decision and announce what you think is the right course to adopt. If you feel that the correspondence should be laid on the Table of the House, then you should direct the Government accordingly. But you should not succumb to threats or blackmail.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Mr. Chairman, you are not allowing us. You have allowed him. Prior to Mr. Mishra, you did not allow Mr. Maurya when he rose on a point of order. You do not allow members of our party.

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): A point of order takes precedence over everything else. When an honourable Member is on a point of order, another Member cannot rise on another point of order. Ultimately it is the duty of the Chairman to give..

SHRI PILOO MODY: To give precedence to Mr. Ranga...

(Interruptions)

श्री भोला पासवान शास्त्री (बिहार):
श्रीमन्, यह प्रश्न इस सत्र के प्रारम्भ से ही चल रहा है। आप सब को यह मालूम है। मैं इसको विस्तारपूर्वक यहाँ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। यहाँ जो सदन को आपने कहा था कि हम सदन को चलने दें और आप इस पर विचार करके कोई रास्ता निकालेंगे, आपने उस दिशा में प्रयास किया और एक रास्ता निकाला। वह रास्ता क्या था? वह रास्ता यह था कि सरकार की तरफ से वह पेपर्स, जो कार्सपोडेंस हुई है प्राइम मिनिस्टर और होम मिनिस्टर के बीच में वह रखी गई। आपने यह भी फैसला दिया था कि इस पत्राचार को कौन-कौन पढ़ेंगे इस हाउस में—उस हाउस की बात मैं नहीं जानता। वह पत्राचार हमने पढ़ा। आपके आदेश के मुताबिक हमको जो जो हमको हिदायतें थीं कि आप नोट नहीं कर सकते हैं, हम लोगों ने उसको माना। लेकिन यह प्रश्न इस सत्र के शुरू से चल रहा है और अब जो यह प्रश्न इस सदन में उठा है, श्री द्विवेदी ने उठाया है, उनका जो मोशन है उस पर आप रूलिंग दीजिएगा। लेकिन प्रश्न तो काफी चर्चा का विषय बन गया है। जो हमारी तरफ से बोल रहे थे मिश्रा जी, मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि जितना काऊन्डाउन करने की जरूरत नहीं थी जितना उनको काऊन्डाउन कर रहे थे इस पार्टी के लोग यह अपोजिशन को टालने का तरीका नहीं है। मैं इसको फील किया। मैं इस वक्त यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि एक कोटेशन श्री द्विवेदी ने उस सभा का दिया, वह भी अपनी जगह पर है। उसका जवाब प्रधान मंत्री ने दिया। उन्होंने जो समझा कहा। आज जो सदन का रख है वह यह है कि इसके बावजूद भी सदन का अधि-कार है, उसे कोई नहीं ले सकता है—न आप ले सकते हैं, न कोई ले सकता है। आज मैं

सदन का जो रख अभी देखता हूँ वह यह है कि सदन यह चाहता है कि जो पत्राचार हुआ है उसको टेबल आफ दि हाउस पर रखा जाए। इससे सदन का यह ख्याल है। अब फिर सवाल उठता है कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से यह तुरन्त कहा जायेगा कि हम नहीं रख सकते हैं। फिर पुराना प्रश्न आयेगा। जिस प्रश्न को शुरू किया गया था और जो आपने बीच-बीचा में किया, इसके बाद कहा कि हाउस चलेगा और चलने दिया गया। आपकी बात की अवहेलना नहीं हुई। लेकिन सदन आज बैठा हुआ है, प्रधान मंत्री भी हैं, और लोग भी हैं। आज यह सवाल चर्चा का विषय हो गया है कि सदन चाहता है कि वह पत्राचार टेबल पर रखा जाये।

(Interruption)

एक माननीय सदस्य : नहीं चाहता। . . .

(Interruption)

श्री भोजपासवान शास्त्री : प्रश्न यह है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री और कोई मंत्री सरकारी बेंच की तरफ से उठकर कह सकते हैं कि दो मंत्रियों के बीच का व्यक्तिगत मामला है, वह कह सकते हैं कि हम नहीं रख सकते हैं। लेकिन जो पत्र पढ़ा गया और आज तमाम पत्रों में आया है, स्टैंडसमैन में आया है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा है कि पहले वह चार्ज वास लें। वह कौन चार्ज है? क्या बात है। उसमें कहा गया कि पहले वे अपना चार्ज वापस कर लें, तब मामला आगे बढ़ेगा। वह क्या चार्ज है? मतलब है कुछ चार्ज है—साँप है, छलुंडर है, क्या है हम लोग नहीं जानते। वह हम लोग जानना चाहते हैं।

दूसरी बात जो पत्राचार हुआ है उसको पढ़ने से या जो अभी स्पीचें हुईं उनको सुनने से सब तरफ से सोचकर जो हमने अपना विचार किया है, मैं यह समझता हूँ और मेरी अपनी आनैस्ट ओपिनियन, फीलिंग है कि

सरकार की तरफ से साधारण प्ली पर, टेकिनकैलिटीज पर नहीं रखेंगे इससे मामला बहुत आगे बढ़ गया है। गवर्नमेंट पार्टी का आदमी कह सकता है, लेकिन यह जो पत्राचार था वह देश के प्रधान मंत्री और देश के गृह मंत्री के बीच का था। यह चौधरी चरण सिंह और मोरारजी भाई के बीच का पत्र-व्यवहार नहीं था। वह पत्राचार है मूलक के सबसे बड़े कस्टोडियन का, जिसको डेमोक्रेसी चलाना है उनका पत्राचार है। अतः वह देश के सामने आये और जनता उसको समझे। यह प्रश्न ऐसा नहीं है कि हम इसे आसानी से टाल सकते हैं क्योंकि यह प्रश्न ऐसा है कि हमारे देश में जो नैतिकता का प्रश्न है, पब्लिक मारेलिटी का प्रश्न है और आनैस्टी का प्रश्न है, डेमोक्रेसी को चलाने का प्रश्न है जिसका हम लोग दावा करते हैं लेकिन उस दावे को स्पष्ट करने वाले जो तथ्य हैं, ऐसे ऐसे प्रश्न आते हैं, ऐसे ऐसे मौके आते हैं, अगर इन मौकों पर हम इसको टैविनकैलिटीज के नाम पर छिपाना चाहें तो इस देश का क्या होगा, हम नहीं कह सकते हैं।

कल दूसरी पार्टी पावर में आ सकती है। कल हम भी पावर में आ सकते हैं। अगर हम लोगों ने इसे देख लिया तो बाहर जनता हम से पूछेगी कि तुम लोगों ने क्या देखा है। तुम सब ने मिल कर साँठ-गांठ कर ली है। जैसे देहाती में कहावत है कि 'चोर-चोर मौसेरे भाई'। हम लोग देख लें और किसी को न पता लगे तो यह बड़ी भयंकर बात है। हम प्रधान मंत्री जी के प्रति जितनी श्रद्धा और विश्वास रखते हैं वह रहेगी। चौधरी चरण सिंह के प्रति जितनी श्रद्धा और विश्वास है वह रहेगी। चौधरी चरण सिंह और प्रधान मंत्री का सवाल नहीं है सवाल है इतने बड़े देश का जिसे हम लोग चला रहे हैं। इसलिए इस सवाल को टालमटोल नहीं किया जा सकता। मेरा यह अंतिम निर्णय है, मेरा ही नहीं जितने आपोजीशन में हमारे भाई बैठे हैं उन

[श्री भोलाप.सवान शास्त्री]

सभी का और मैं तो यह भी समझता हूँ, मेरा यह ख्याल है कि जनता पार्टी के कुछ सदस्यों का भी यह अंतिम निर्णय है।

श्री मनुभाई पटेल (गुजरात) : आप यह कैसे जानते हैं।

श्री भोलाप.सवान शास्त्री : आप यहां भले ही कुछ कह लीजिए पर इसे मैं जानता हूँ। सभापति जी, मोशन आपके पास है आप उस पर रूलिंग दीजिए। तमाम विचारों को दृष्टि में रख कर रूलिंग दीजिए। हम आपके आदेश को मानते आए हैं और मानेंगे ये चीजें ऐसी हैं जो देश में बहुत बढ़ रही हैं और रोज-ब-रोज अखबारों में निकल रही हैं। ऐसा यह क्यों समझते हैं कि वह मामला होम मिनिस्टर और प्राइम मिनिस्टर का निजी मामला है। यह उनका निजी मामला नहीं है। इसलिये हम चाहते हैं कि सब के विचारों को ध्यान में रखते हुए अपने विचार को रखिये और उस पर रूलिंग दीजिए। आपकी रूलिंग के बाद ही हम लोग कुछ कर पायेंगे।

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I want to say something on this. (Interruptions)

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, I rose on a point of order and said something. (Interruptions). I did not mean it. Mr. Maurya was on a point of order and he had raised his point of order long before that. But then you went to the next item of business relating to the Calling-Attention Motion and Mr. Ka'p Nath Raj was on his legs to call the attention of the hon. Prime Minister. Just then you allowed Mr. Mishra and he rose and Mr. Maurya was requesting you to allow him. (Interruptions).

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: long before that.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: He was not allowed and, therefore, I

thought that I should intervene. I thought so because he was not, being allowed and I had to stand up to make my point of order and say that there was a point of order. I had to go on saying that I was rising on a point of order because you did not allow me at all. Why should there be any discrimination between Members. That was my point of order before you. We seek your protection and I would request you to see that no discrimination is made between Members.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Sir, I would like to make a submission. Since you have allowed the other Members, I think you can allow me also. So many things have been said and I do not want to go into all those things. The only point that I would like to make is this: The Prime Minister must seriously consider this position now. Whether he places the thing on the Table of the House or not today, Sir, in the whole country, the Government has made a fool of itself. Sir, it is making a fool of itself. Without standing on prestige, it should do something. In the whole country, the Government is now a laughing-stock. Therefore, it is much better for the Government, for the Prime Minister, to place it on the Table. So many things are appearing in the Press. It has already been placed before some leaders. In the interest of the Government itself, it should be placed. I do not want the Government to become a laughing-stock. In the interest of the Government itself, I say that the letters may be placed officially so that non-official things do not come out at all. Or, the Government should say that whatever has come out before the public is false. If you are able to contradict it, it is all right. Otherwise, the Government is a laughing-stock in the whole country now. I want to put an end to this situation.

श्री बुद्धप्रिय मौर्य : मैं आपसे यह नम्र निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि व्यवस्था के प्रश्न

पर जब मैं खड़ा होता हूँ तो बोलने के लिये नहीं खड़ा होता हूँ। मेरा नम्र निवेदन यह है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री और भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री के बीच जो पत्र-व्यवहार हुआ और उन्होंने जो एक-दूसरे पर आरोप-प्रत्यारोप लगाए, एलोगेशन्स और काऊंटर एलोगेशन्स लगाये इस सम्बन्ध में जब चर्चा हुई तो हमने आपकी सेवा में एक मोशन दिया था।

श्रीमन्, मेरा कहना यह है कि मैंने आपकी सेवा में जो प्रस्ताव दिया था। उस प्रस्ताव पर यहां पर बहस होने के लिए मैंने प्रार्थना की थी और यह भी कहा था कि आप शीघ्रातिशीघ्र इस पर अपना फैसला दें, लेकिन अभी तक उस पर कोई फैसला नहीं हुआ। इसी बीच में यह बात निकल आई कि नेताओं को वह पत्र-व्यवहार दिखाया जायगा।

SHRI PILOO MODY: He should not be allowed to speak in peace. He disturbs every speaker in the House. When Mr. Misra was on a point of order, he said that his point of order should be given precedence. . . (Interruptions).

श्री बुद्धप्रिय मौर्य : श्रीमन्, मेरा निवेदन यह है कि ये पत्र कोई साधारण नहीं है। इस मामले पर नेताओं के विचार आ गये हैं। जो पत्र-व्यवहार प्रधान मंत्री और भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री के बीच में हुआ है उसके बारे में भी विचार आ गये हैं। पत्रों में एक दूसरे पर आरोप-प्रत्यारोप लगाये गये हैं, ये विचार भी नेताओं के आ गये हैं। आपने इस सम्बन्ध में कारस्पोंडेन्स विभिन्न दलों के नेताओं को दिखाया है, उसके बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि वह सदन के सदस्यों को नहीं दिखाया जाएगा और सदन में उनकी चर्चा नहीं होगी। दुर्भाग्य से या सौभाग्य से वे पत्र अखबारों में छप गये हैं। यहां तक अखबारों में आ गया है कि भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री ने माननीय प्रधान मंत्री

की सरकार पर यह आरोप लगाया है कि Janata Party is working under the shadow of corruption. यह बात भी अखबारों में छप गई है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने यह आरोप लगाया है कि भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री की पत्नी श्रीमती गायत्री देवी के खिलाफ उनके पास चिट्ठियां आई हैं कि वे भ्रष्टाचार करती हैं। उनके दामादों के खिलाफ भी शिकायतें आई हैं कि वे भ्रष्टाचार करते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस सदन को कहां ले जाना चाहते हैं? यह मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस पर आपका निर्णय होना चाहिए। मैं सिर्फ बोलने के लिए ही खड़ा नहीं हुआ हूँ। मैंने एक प्रस्ताव आपकी सेवा में दिया है, लेकिन उस प्रस्ताव पर अभी तक आपका फैसला नहीं आया है। सम्पूर्ण पत्र-व्यवहार अखबारों में छप चुका है और उस पर सब तरफ चर्चाएं हो रही हैं। लेकिन इस सदन को मौका नहीं दिया जा रहा है कि वह इस पत्र-व्यवहार पर चर्चा करे। इतनी बड़ी भयंकर दुर्घटना हो गई, इतने बड़े भयंकर आरोप और प्रत्यारोप एक दूसरे के विरुद्ध लगाये गये हैं और यहां तक कि पूरी की पूरी सरकार के ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप लगाये गये हैं, लेकिन फिर भी इस विषय पर इस सदन को बहस करने का मौका नहीं दिया जा रहा है।

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): Is it a point of order or are you allowing a discussion? . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your leader wants to speak.

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : श्रीमन्, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि सदन की गरिमा को रखने के लिए अब समय आ गया है कि आप इस विषय पर सदन को बहस करने का मौका दें और बहस करने के बाद आप इस सदन के सदस्यों को इस बात का मौका दें कि इस सम्बन्ध में उनके पास जो जानकारी है वह भी वे इसके साथ जोड़ दें। इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह भी

[श्री बुद्धप्रिय मौय]

कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह पत्र-व्यवहार जो आपने नेताओं को दिखाया है उसमें यह कहा जाता है कि किसी लिंक फाइल का जिक्र है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन पत्रों को भी आप नेताओं को दिखाये, उनके बारे में यहां पर चर्चा हो। श्रीमन्, मेरा निवेदन यह है कि यह कैसी बिडम्बना है कि मेरे प्रस्ताव पर अभी तक आपका फैसला नहीं आया है, लेकिन देश के पत्रों में इस पत्र-व्यवहार के सम्बन्ध में तरह तरह के प्रचार हो रहे हैं। पूरी सरकार बदनाम हो रही है, जनतंत्र बदनाम हो रहा है। इसलिए मेरा कहना यह है कि आपकी सेवा में मैंने जो प्रस्ताव दिया था उस पर आप अपना फैसला दें। इस सम्बन्ध में आपका कोई फैसला न होने के बावजूद इस पत्र-व्यवहार पर बाहर चर्चा हो रही है, अखबारों में बातें छप रही हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में मेरी यह मांग है कि इस विषय पर सदन में डिसकशन होना चाहिए।

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: When I rose to make my submission, you told me that let the other hon. Member Mr. Joshi raise his point of order and then you would give me a chance. But after that others have also spoken. Does it mean that in this House if a Member observes discipline and responds to your ruling he does not get a chance or is it that only one who can cow down others and deprive them of their opportunity gets chance to speak? My complaint is, why is it that you did not allow me a chance after Mr. Joshi, and you permitted Mr. Misra to speak... (Interruptions). Mr. Misra said that this correspondence should be tabled, and...

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: I did not say that... (Interruption)... Let me explain. I did not say that it should be tabled. I have said that the Prime Minister left it to the Chairman to decide as to how this correspondence should be brought to the notice of the Opposition. The Chairman in his wisdom informed the leaders of the Opposition that it should be... (Interruptions)...

Not to allow the proceedings to be carried on is absolutely wrong... (Interruptions).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Now, my point is this that I am a Member of this House with full rights and I am not bound by the Prime Minister's wisdom of not placing the letters. I have a duty to my countrymen. I feel that when there is a gross allegation of corruption against the Prime Minister and against the Home Minister, it is my duty to know what the allegation is. Mr. Morarji Desai, the hon. Prime Minister tried to make a distinction in this case from the Tulmohan Ram case. Yes, there is a fine distinction between this case and the Tulmohan Ram case and this House must keep that in mind. In Tulmohan Ram's case, what the opposition wanted to see was the report of the C.B.I. during inquiry and it is the normal practice not to show the reports of inquiries or investigation because it hampers investigation and comes in the way of fair dispensation of justice. In this case, what we have tried to see is something like a First Information Report which the Home Minister has lodged against the Prime Minister saying that these are the allegations against you. This First Information Report is a public document. I should have understood if the hon. Prime Minister would have said that the complaint was false and if the Janata Party would have taken action against Chaudhari Charan Singh for making wild and baseless allegations against the Prime Minister. But the position today is that both of them are trying to compromise. If the newspaper reports are correct, saying that you withdraw the allegations and I take you back in the Cabinet. I do not know the position. Is not this Parliament and myself, as a Member of Parliament, supposed to know what the position is. We have come to a peculiar situation. Up till now the Home Ministers used to lose their positions because they did not take action on complaints when certain complaints of corruption

or some offences came to their notice. This is the first instance in democratic history when a Home Minister has lost his job when he told the Prime Minister that these are the charges of corruption. There is no such parallel in the democratic history of the world. They are saying that since these are privileged documents, they cannot be placed in the House. I want to know that supposing it came to the notice of the Home Minister that a Member of the Cabinet has committed a crime, let us say, a murder and he asks the Prime Minister that there should be an inquiry on it since he has certain evidence or information about it. Then can the Prime Minister say that these are privileged correspondences and he will not allow such allegation of criminality to be public? Under the normal law of the land, if a crime comes to the notice of an individual, it is his bounden duty to report it to the police. So far as the Minister's are concerned, even if there is an allegation of a certain crime, it can be thrown under the carpet in the garb of a privileged document. I can understand that inter-Ministerial correspondence should not be placed in the House normally if it relates to an affair of the State. Am I to understand that things have come to such a pass that corruption today has become an affair of the State. Can the Prime Minister say that corruption is an affair of the State and therefore, what we discuss about corruption between me and the Home Minister is a private and privileged document and the Parliament cannot know and the country cannot know?

Sir, lastly, it has been said by Mr. Mishra that you have, in your wisdom, taken a decision that it should be seen in the Chamber. May I remind that when the Tulmohan Ram case was brought in the House and when that arrangement was made, what one of the hon. Members of the House said? I quote:

"When I am told that no further action can be taken either in the

House or outside until that case is over, am I not bound by that condition if I agree with it." Therefore, I do not agree with it."

It was further said that Parliament has a duty of its own irrespective of any conditions that can be laid down upon the leaders. The leaders may have come to their own terms and conditions. I have got a duty to myself and as I have got a duty to my countrymen, I demand of this House with all seriousness that this cannot be a preserve of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. The country must know what the allegations are. After all, how can you expect this Government to run if there is an allegation and a counter-allegation between the Prime Minister and the Home Minister? Let the documents be placed on the Table of the House. Let the country know, and let us all be clear about it. If there is nothing against the Prime Minister, we would be the first to stand up and say that this type of allegations against responsible men of public-life should not be made. And we will ask further that those who have made the allegations, they should be dealt with in some way or the other. But the allegation is made and you will not take action. (*Time bell rings*). This has completely, as I said earlier, polluted the entire atmosphere of the country. And I beg of you, Sir, in the interest of the highest tradition of parliamentary democracy, give a direction to place these letters. We have given our motions. I gave it long back. Consider it. At least, ask the hon. Prime Minister to lay it before the House so that the country may know that we the Members of this Parliament are not trying to cover up corruption.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. Leader of the Opposition speaks, I would like to clarify one thing. When I said in this august House that I will discuss this matter with the leaders of the Opposition and also the Leader

[Mr. Chairman]

of the House and try to find a solution, I presumed that the House accepted my suggestion. And because it was accepted, I took the responsibility of calling and inviting the leaders of all the parties and I had a discussion with them. Three sittings were held and it was decided there as to what exactly would be the solution and what procedure should be followed. Accordingly, I came here and I announced the solution here which all of you know. On that day, nobody raised any objection to the formula accepted at the meetings. In spite of all that, if you are trying to raise anything—you have given notices of the motion and I have said that I am going to examine it thoroughly—I must make it clear—because all of you are getting an opportunity and you are trying to get your views recorded—that what I have done, I have done with the approval of the House and I have not done it on my own. I want to have my views recorded, so that the outside world may not think that I have done something against your wishes.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
Sir, my motion stands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your motion is eternal.

विपक्ष के नेता (श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी):
मान्यवर, आपकी आज्ञा हो तो 2 मिनट में अपनी बात कह लूं। मान्यवर, जब से यह सदन 17 जुलाई से आरम्भ हुआ है तब से यह प्रश्न बराबर उठता चला आ रहा है और आपने देखा होगा कि सदन के सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने चाहे कोई भी दल हो, पार्टी हो सब ने इन बात की मांग की कि पत्राचार यहां रख दिया जाए। आपका यह कहना ठीक है कि एक रास्ता निकला कि लीडर्स इसको देख लें। लीडर्स ने देख लिया। अब अखबारों में यह निकला कि प्रधान मंत्री जी में और भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री जी में झट हुई, मुलाकात हुई और 80 मिनट बातचीत हुई। अखबारों में यह भी निकला कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भूतपूर्व

गृह मंत्री से यह कहा है कि आप अपने चार्जें वापिस लें और भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री जी ने कहा कि यह सारी कॉन्फ्रेंस कौंसिल सम्झी जाए दोनों अपनी जगह पर मौजूद हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी यह कहने वाले कि अपने चार्जें वापिस लो और भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री यह कहने वाले कि यह कौंसिल सम्झी जाय। अब, मान्यवर, सारा सदन यहां बैठा हुआ है। अखबारों में जो चीज निकली है उससे एक बात स्पष्ट है कि भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री जी ने कुछ चार्जें लगाए और प्रधान मंत्री जी उनसे यह चाहते हैं कि चार्जें वापिस लिए जायें। क्या सदन और इस देश को जानने का अधिकार नहीं है कि भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री ने क्या चार्जें लगाए हैं और प्रधान मंत्री जी कितने चार्जें को चाहते हैं कि वापिस लिया जाए? यह कौन सा पत्र-व्यवहार है जो कि दोनों के बीच में बैठ कर तय हो रहा है कि कौंसिल सम्झी जाए। मान्यवर, मैं ऐसा सम्झता हूं कि गृह मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री का पत्राचार एक व्यक्तिगत और दो व्यक्तियों का पत्राचार नहीं माना जा सकता। स्वयं गृह मंत्री जी ने अखबारों में दिया, मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को याद दिलाना चाहता हूं जब उन्होंने अपना वक्तव्य देते हुए समाचार पत्रों में यह कहा—कि मेरा रिजिगेशन शायद इसलिए मांगा गया है कि मैंने मोरारजी भाई के ऊपर और उनके परिवार के ऊपर कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी बिठाने के लिए मांग की थी, शायद इसलिए हमारा त्यागपत्र मांगा गया है। यह अखबार में रिपोर्ट होती है।

अब मान्यवर, मैं इसके बाद सम्झता हूं कि—प्रधान मंत्री जी का मैं बड़ा आदर करता हूं—उनका यह कहना कि दो व्यक्तियों में यह पत्राचार रहा है, मैं सम्झता हूं कि यह ठीक नहीं है। इसके कारण देश में सरकार की भी प्रतिष्ठा घटती चली गई है, प्रधान मंत्री जी देखना नहीं चाहते हैं और सुनना भी नहीं चाहते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि जिन्होंने यह सवाल उठाया है वे लोग या उनके दोस्त,

इसमें दिलचस्पी रखते हैं। जो बातें अखबारों में निकल रही हैं उनको आप देख रहे होंगे। उसके बाद भी अगर उपेक्षा करें तो यह स्थिति खतरनाक हो जायगी सरकार के लिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि उसके लिए भी यह सफाई होना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि प्रधान मंत्री पर जो आरोप हैं, वे निराधार हैं और गृह मंत्री के ऊपर भी अगर आरोप लगे हैं तो वे निराधार हैं। नहीं तो सारा देश जब तक इस स्थिति में रहे कि कैबिनेट के दो वरिष्ठ मंत्रियों ने एक दूसरे के ऊपर बड़े भारी आरोप लगाये और सारे मंत्रि-मंडल को कहा उन्होंने . . .

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: May I correct my hon. friend? The Home Minister has made no charges of corruption against me. Nor have I made any charges of corruption against him.

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : जी हाँ, यह बात सही है, आप कह रहे हैं कि मेरे खिलाफ नहीं लगाया है और उनके पुत्र के खिलाफ लगाया है। बात ठीक है, लेकिन आरोप लगाया है उन्होंने और जो उनके वक्तव्य में प्रकाशित हो चुका है वह सारे मंत्रिमंडल पर है। उन्होंने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है :

"I am surrounded by corrupt people and I am relieved because I am out of the Cabinet now."

यह कहा उन्होंने कि मुझे बहुत शांति मिली कि मैं निकल कर बाहर आ गया, क्योंकि मैं चारों ओर से घिरा हुआ था करप्ट लोगों से। तो जो आदमी पत्र व्यवहार में, समाचार पत्रों में, वक्तव्यों में यह बात कह देता है कि सारे करप्ट आदमियों से चारों ओर से घिरा हुआ मंत्री मैं रहा हूँ और निकल आया हूँ कैबिनेट से, आज तो हमको बड़ी राहत मिली हुई है और प्रधान मंत्री जी के बेटे के ऊपर मैंने कमीशन शाफ इन्क्वायरी बिठाने की मांग की थी इसलिए इस्तीफा मांगा गया था मुझसे,

इसके बाद भी मान्यवर, अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी कहें कि दो मंत्रियों के बीच का यह पत्र व्यवहार है और देश को जानने का अधिकार नहीं है तो मैं अत्यन्त नम्रता के साथ वह रहा हूँ कि यह बड़ी भारी हउधर्मी होगी और इससे देश को, मेरे ख्याल से बड़ा भारी अवल्यण होगा। आज सारे देश और जो विरोधी दल यहां बैठा हुआ है एक नहीं, सबकी मांग है कि वह पत्राचार ऐसा है कि जो तमाम टेबुल पर रख दिया जाय। मोशन भी आपके यहां भेज चुके हैं उसके ऊपर भी आप देख कर के जल्दी से जल्दी फैसला करें, क्योंकि यह प्रश्न ऐसा है कि हमारे सारे देश को और हम सब लोगों के जितने यहां बैठे हुए हैं, उनके मस्तिष्क में एक प्रकार की हलचल सी पैदा कर दी है। इस स्थिति में रुदन को ले चलना और चलाना हमारे और आपके लिए जितना कठिन होगा उससे ज्यादा बठिन हो जायगा सरकार के लिए। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस मांग को मान लिया जाय, रवीकार कर लिया जाय और पत्राचार टेबुल पर रख दिया जाय और जो मोशन भी आपको यहां दिया गया है उसके ऊपर भी आप जल्दी फैसला करें।

1 P.M.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Reported statement of the Prime Minister to the effect that India would not undertake Nuclear Explosions even for peaceful purposes and the views expressed by him on the previous Nuclear Explosion in India in 1974

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to his reported statement that India would not undertake nuclear explosions even for peaceful purposes and the views expressed by him on the previous nuclear explosion in India in 1974.