

SHRI YADVENDRĀ DUTT: When we take it up afterwards, I hope, you will give me time.

MR. SPEAKER: I will consider.

16 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

INCORRECT INFORMATION FURNISHED TO LOK SABHA ON 22-3-1979 ABOUT SHRI JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

MR. SPEAKER: We will now take up the Adjournment Motion. There are a large number of Members who have notified that they want to speak. Of course, this is a continuation of what we have discussed the other day also. That being so, I would request the Members ordinarily not to take more than five minutes, except the Mover and the leaders of parties.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): What is this five-minute business? Do you want the quality of debate to be maintained or do you want only the formality to be gone through?

MR. SPEAKER: Both.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If that is so, the Speaker must be more solicitous about the Members expressing their views. It does not behave you to fix five minutes to every member on such a discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall consider that.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: (Tumkur): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the House do now adjourn."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, moving my motion on a very important issue, I do not want to make any political capital. Making an incorrect statement, and that too by the Prime Minister of this country, is nothing but a blunder beyond belief. It is a Himalayan blunder and in the annals of history of Parliament we have never heard of such a statement being made by a Prime Minister, taking the issue in a casual manner. Because he is

the Prime Minister, he thinks he can announce the death of anybody in a casual manner. In fact, that is how the Prime Minister has treated this issue. Jayaprakash Narayan, a national leader, has been ailing for a long time. We are very happy that he is recovering very fast and we wish him long life. The Prime Minister made an incorrect announcement deliberately in this House and made a motion involving not only the Parliament but also the Speaker, the leaders of various Groups and the Leader of the Opposition. Then he came forward with an apology.

Sir, you must remember that I made it very clear that this Government is run by apologists. This is one of the blunders committed by the Government, headed by the great man, Shri Morarji Desai. I have great respect for the Prime Minister. I never expected that a man of his age would deliberately mislead the House, bring this issue in a casual manner and make the whole nation and in fact the world laugh at us.

I now doubt very much whether this country is safe in the hands of such a Government. Under whose guidance are they running the Government and whose opinion are they following? We want to test the credibility of the Government and of the Prime Minister. Many important statements are made in the House and, in the light of this episode, we have to verify whether those statements are true or not.

According to the Prime Minister this information was supplied by the Central Intelligence Bureau. Now this Bureau is devoting its time to transmit information from Jaslok Hospital. This is the onerous responsibility which the Intelligence Bureau has undertaken now. In the light of this, we would like to know what is the task assigned to the Intelligence Bureau.

Sir, how this Intelligence Bureau has collected such information and conveyed it to the Prime Minister which was brought to this House? It is

[Shri K. Lakkappa]

a story altogether which nobody can believe. Sir, I would like to say that this disgraceful act done by this Intelligence is for the consideration of this Government. I do not know why the Prime Minister immediately announced this news surreptitiously and casually. And even after that, he did not care to verify how he got this information. I do not want to quote anything. He should not say that there are politics involved in it. The Prime Minister has not chosen to visit the Jaslok hospital immediately even. The silence protest and boycott of Mr. Chandrasekhar and Mr. Mohan Dharja and Mr. Madhu Limaye, the Janata Party Secretary, and Mr. S. M. Joshi, the Janata Party President of Maharashtra....

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM
(Palani): He is the ex-President.

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: ... is an indication that there is a lot of contradiction. The Prime Minister probably does not want to give 'J.P.' a national honour because he has made three statements against the performance of this Government, not one. (Interruptions). These are the statements on the credibility of Government's functioning. This is how the situation could be linked up because even on that issue the Government should come out with a statement as to how this has happened. Here, there is a golden silence of the Home Minister even on this issue. He has not even made a statement so far, and not even the top Intelligence Officers involved in it made any statement, and the news of such a false information transmitted to us has kept us under suspense. They have not even suspended and dismissed the officers concerned who have given such news. I do not know in which manner this Government is functioning. Sir, I would like to know this. They have been telling that they are keeping a link with the Jaslok hospital, a hot line.

I would like to know why the Prime Minister did not even care to verify the death that has been announced to him. It is part of the duty of the Intelligence to transmit information to the Prime Minister. And to rely upon this news? In ordinary parlance, in a hospital who should declare the death? It is the doctor or the eminent doctors. There is a hot line between the Prime Minister's Secretariat and the Jaslok Hospital? So why they have not got it confirmed from the hospital? Why the information has not been checked and re-checked? And why the Prime Minister hastily came to this House and read the statement? This has to be answered and this is an unpardonable folly that he has committed and he has to answer to the nation for it.

After two days the Prime Minister went to the Jaslok Hospital, probably thinking of public opinion, and he advises the doctors that no operation is necessary. I never knew that he had become a medical expert. What a shameless thing we are doing.

The passing of the information by the Director of the Intelligence Bureau, on receiving it from his Deputy Director in Bombay, is a self-appointed task. Who had appointed him? As per reports, the false report originated from an official of the Home Department of the Maharashtra Government. Here are the Home and Information and Broadcasting Ministries. I am coming to it later, and also the Maharashtra Government, and everything is operated from the control room of Bombay. The report was first circulated to the control room of Bombay police from where it reached the Police Commissioner and the Deputy Director of the Intelligence Bureau. All these officials belong to a State where the Janata Party is ruling. All these people think that it is only because of the grace of Loknayak Jayaprakash that they are there. It is the second anniversary of this Government, and it is the second blunder

that they are committing. This is how the Government functions.

The Intelligence Bureau originally derived its authority in 1924. Subsequent developments and operations have culminated in the doubtful character of the intelligence officers of the Intelligence Bureau. Ultimately Mr. L. P. Singh was appointed to re-vamp the entire Intelligence Bureau. Even then, the present Government is shamelessly depending on such information from them. We want to know how the Maharashtra Government led by Sharad Pawar and his Secretary and the police control room passed on this information in a casual manner without verifying it with the doctors. It has created a slur for the people of this country and also the Government. This unqualified apology is no answer to all these questions.

It is reported that in Bangalore and elsewhere also, even after the clarification was issued, funeral music was going on in the All India Radio controlled by Advani.

Is this the way? Our Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, the Home Minister, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and all those who are involved in it cannot be allowed to go scot free. I would like to refer to such an incident that happened elsewhere. I would like to recall the Crichton Down case of UK, which shows the way as to what should be done when such blunders are committed. They have acted irresponsibly. The nation will be satisfied with nothing less than their complete and total resignation. There is no other way. Therefore, I demand the total resignation of this Government for the unpardonable mistake they have committed by treating Parliament with scant respect. We wish a long life to J.P. But at the same time for this unpardonable mistake of the Government, I demand their resignation.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved.
"That the House do now adjourn."

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT (Dun Dum): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. mover of the motion started by saying that he wanted to bring a motion on a matter of grave seriousness. But the manner in which he moved it betrayed the opposite. On Thursday last, when the House was reconvened at 5 o'clock and the Prime Minister came and admitted the blunder and tendered an unqualified apology, many of my friends opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, were very angry and they were speaking in very strong terms. I was sitting over here. My feelings at that time was not one of anger. It was an entirely different feeling. I felt relieved that the sad news had ultimately proved to be incorrect news and the great man is still with us. (Interruptions) I was recollecting my association with him from early childhood and particularly my very close association just before Emergency and immediately after Emergency. After Emergency, when his kidneys were irreparably damaged, he was constantly going from Patna to Jaslok Hospital, Bombay and coming back. On one of these occasions, when he was halting at Dum Dum airport—many of us were present, the hon. Member from Arambagh was there, the hon. Member from Murshidabad was there, I was there—one gentleman rather indiscreetly asked the Loknayak as to how long a man can go on living under this condition of dialysis. I felt embarrassed. I quickly intervened and I said that in a case that I had read recently, a doctor was carrying on like that for twelve years. The Loknayak gave a benign smile and said: I am also suffering from diabetes, I am a man who has exhausted the corpus of life, I am living on borrowed time, I am living on interest. He gave that benign smile and that reminded me of the Sthita prajna of our scriptures. We are discussing about that great man in this light vein. Today we are seeing angry outbursts over what was done. The Prime Minister made a statement and

[Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt]

it later on transpired that it was a mistake. He did not hesitate, he immediately came to the House, admitted the blunder and tendered his unqualified apology. What was the Prime Minister's mistake? Whom did he rely upon?

It has been stated that he irresponsibly came and made a statement over here. The Prime Minister made a statement not only after a message had come from the Maharashtra Government but after the Director of the Central Bureau of Intelligence who, I think, belongs to the same rank as that of a Secretary to the Government of India, sent a message. On his personal information, the Prime Minister came and made a statement over here which he had believed at that time, which you, Sir, had believed at that time and which everybody in the House had believed at that time.

I was listening to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and those many of my friends opposite, including the members of the Communist Party of India made on the 22nd. I thought they were sincere speeches. It reminds me of earlier days. They are today so much concerned about as to why the information was not got from the Jaslok Hospital. May I ask them, through you, Sir, when Jayaprakash Narayan was arrested during the Emergency, when he was put in the All India Institute of Medical Sciences which was converted into a jail, what sort of treatment was going on? When Jayaprakash Narayan was ultimately sent to the Jaslok Hospital, the doctors over there expressed surprise. It is common knowledge that the eminent kidney experts of the Jaslok Hospital was surprised that doctors of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences had not detected the damage to the kidney earlier. Was it really not detected or was it suppressed?

We heard the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and other op-

position leaders on that day. They showed their indignation. Did any of them show the least bit of indignation earlier over the damage to the kidneys of this great man, Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan? They said, "We have our political differences. But we have the greatest respect for him." But did they at that time, when they were calling him a fascist, when they were calling him names and saying that he was inciting violence, mutiny and all that—many of them were Ministers; many of them were holding eminent positions—show any concern about his health?

I had the privilege of working very closely for one year in the Public Accounts Committee with the Leader of the Opposition ...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): On a point of order, Sir. I believe, there was a ruling from you on that day about the speeches made on that day. Many members made an obituary reference; I do not know whether it is on record or not ...

MR. SPEAKER: It is on record; everything is on record.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: My point of order is that they are questioning the speeches and the sincerity of the members who made the speeches. Are you allowing such insinuations? (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. The Mover himself has made insinuations against the Prime Minister.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: You are setting a very bad precedent. The rule very clearly stated that no member, while speaking, shall make an insinuation or a defamatory remark.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no defamatory remark.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: You are creating a very bad precedent (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Why did you not object when the mover made all sorts of insinuations against the Prime Minister? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: As the Speaker, you make a shame of Parliament. Why are you allowing all this? You are justifying it. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT: Today they are so indignant about Jayaprakash Narayan's health. Did any of them, the whole lot of them over there, at all feel it worthwhile to consider about what his condition was when his kidneys were being deliberately damaged at the All India Institute of Medical Sciences? Did any of them for a minute consider worthwhile to know about his health? We know, when Jayaprakash Narayan was in the All India Institute of Medical Sciences and, later on, when he was sent to the Jasluk Hospital, every day, almost twice a day, the reports used to come to the Central Secretariat about the condition of his health. Was it really for finding out how he was or was it for the purpose of finding out whether the kidneys had been irreparably damaged so that he could be released only after his kidneys were irreparably damaged? These are the people. I never expected that such a man political capital would be attempted to be made out of such a human tragedy which touches the hearts of not only every one of us over here but which touches the hearts of hundreds of millions of people all over the country. (*Interruptions*). People are stooping to such depths as to make political capital out of it!

Sir, my time is short. I conclude by saying this, that a mistake has been committed—a very unfortunate mistake—and nobody is disputing it

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a Himalayan blunder. ●

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:. Yes, may be a Himalayan blunder: I

could have understood if if somebody from this side of the House had raised this issue and said these words because they would have been spoken in sincerity. But, coming as it does from the other side, I do not want to believe it. Particularly after this rather semi-humorous performance that we saw just now, I think the entire Motion lacks sincerity.

The Prime Minister, amongst us, is possibly the closest to Loknayak Jayaprakash Narain and he would possibly be the last person to come here and mislead the House. He came and admitted the blunder; he made an unqualified apology. Having been a man from the sports world, I know that when somebody comes and admits a mistake and apologises for that, hands are shaken and the matter is forgotten. I felt that it was in that spirit that Shri A. C. George brought a Resolution on that day. I thought, after acceptance of the Resolution, that we would treat that matter as closed, but no! Certain people would like to dig up the grave and certain people would like to do post-mortem. Why? It is for the purpose of creating political capital out of it.

This Motion will undoubtedly be defeated because it has not touched the hearts of the overwhelming majority over here. I think—maybe it is too much to think, but still I think—that at last good sense will prevail, even now, with Mr. Lakkappa and that the Hon. Mr. Lakkappa would withdraw his Motion.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): Mr. Speaker Sir, I rise to support this Motion. Having heard the speech of Mr. Dutt, one of my hon. friends, I feel really sorry and piqued. He attempted to make Mr. Jayaprakash Narain the subject matter of this debate. That is not the subject matter of this debate. It would be extremely embarrassing, when Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan is convalescing, to make him the subject of a controversy. It is not that. There is no denying the fact

that, with respect to the position he has taken, there are differences of opinion. I had said that even in my obituary speech. But to put the figure of Jayaprakash Narain, a convalescent man, or the name of Jayaprakash Narain forward, to make a smoke-screen of him to protect or defend the Prime Minister's action is, to say the least, not very noble. I do not want to reply to what Mr. Dutt has said: I would leave it at that and proceed to the subject.

The question is simple—whether the conduct or the act of the Prime Minister of India coming to the Parliament of India and making an announcement without proper verification on a matter of such grave and serious importance was a proper act, and whether this has to be censured by this House or not. That is the simple thing. And what were the consequences of that act? This House adjourned: not only that, but quite a number of Houses of the State Legislatures, on the basis of the announcement in the Lok Sabha, adjourned. Obituary reference were made and that evening, or the next day, Chief Minister after Chief Minister came up to the House tendered an apology. And the whole country was kept in a tension. A conduct by the Prime Minister which has these chain reactions—whether such a conduct should taken serious note of is a matter which concerns the dignity and the authority of the Parliament and the institution of the Prime Minister. It is in this manner that I am approaching this question—a question of privileges, a question of the dignity, a question of the authority of the Parliament, a question of the propriety, a question of the proper functioning and the dutiful performance of the person occupying the seat of the Prime Minister. These are the things that we will have to take note of.

Happily, there is one thing. The Prime Minister admitted, 'It is a mistake.' Mr. Kamath, the Johnson of this Parliament—the title you gave

him—immediately remarked, 'It is not a mistake, it is a blunder.' The Prime Minister said, 'It is a blunder'. What is the meaning? It is not as if there is no difference between a 'blunder' and a 'mistake'. 'Blunder' has got a specific meaning and it is 'a gross, stupid, careless mistake'. This is the meaning of the word 'blunder'. ...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Which dictionary is that?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: This is Random House Dictionary of English Language. So, a blunder is 'a careless, stupid or gross mistake in action or speech suggesting awkwardness, clumsiness, heedlessness or ignorance'. This is the connotation of the word 'blunder'. Now the Prime Minister says, 'I did something' which was stupid, which was awkward, which was clumsy, which was born out of ignorance or which was born out of carelessness. Born out of... (Interruptions) Mr Jyotirmoy Bosu, please don't interrupt.

Now, the question is: can a person occupying that high post perform that sort of an action in the Parliament of India? This is the matter which we will have to consider.

Well, what did he say? He said that his statement was based on the information that he got. What is the information? His statement is before me and he says,

"But soon after I received information from the Director of Intelligence Branch that he had received from his Deputy in Bombay information which was conveyed to him from the Commissioner's office that Jayaprakash Narain has passed away."

Well, Sir, the question is this. There are three things. The Director did not tell him that Jayaprakash Narain has passed away. The Deputy Director did not tell him that Jayaprakash Narain has passed away. The Director told him that the Deputy Director told him

that he was told by the Office of the Commissioner that Jayaprakash Narain passed away. It would have been very different if the information came to him that Jayaprakash Narain passed away. No. That was not the information....

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): That was the information.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: No. that was not the information. I am reading from the statement, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. You may defend him elsewhere. But this is the position....

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I will defend him here also.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: It is one thing to say 'I was informed by the Deputy Director that Jayaprakash Narain has passed away. It is one thing to say that and it is a different thing to say, 'I was informed by the Director that he had information. ...' from such and such place that Jayaprakash Narain passed away.

The Prime Minister was informed about the source of the information. What is the source of the information? The Office of the Commissioner of Police. Nobody says that Jayaprakash Narain passed away. Everybody told him that somebody told him that somebody told him that somebody told him that Jayaprakash Narain passed away. So it is a hearsay to a hearsay to a hearsay and with that hearsay, the Prime Minister comes here and says, 'Jayaprakash Narain has passed away'. Is this a right thing? This is the simple question.

Two questions arise. An attempt may be made to haul up the officers. May I ask you? The first question is: in the Central Intelligence structure, if an information like this is received by the Deputy Director from the Commissioner's office that Jayaprakash Narain has passed away, if he tells him direct that Jayaprakash Narain passed away, he accepts the responsibility. But he

tells him that so and so told him that Jayaprakash Narain passed away. Is it not a part of the duty of the Central Intelligence Officers to pass on that information? Is it necessary that he must verify it? He must, if the information is positive that so and so has passed away. That is not the information. If that is so, and, if you say that they must verify before they inform the superiors, does it not apply to the Prime Minister? If the Deputy Director must verify before he informs the Director and, if a director must verify before he informs the superior, the Prime Minister, should it not be that the Prime Minister must also verify before he comes before the Sovereign Parliament of India and tells that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has passed away? If, on the other hand, that is not part of the duty of those people, even then, he should have verified. That verification did not take place. That is a remissness of duty not merely negligence. This is a remissness of duty because he was telling that this was the information which he was giving. What are the circumstances? Circumstances are these: The Prime Minister has told us these circumstances.

"For the last two days I have been hearing and getting reports every few hours about the health of Jayaprakash Narayan"

I asked that question—who gave this information? He said:

"This, I was getting, directly from the Hospital before."

Therefore, he was in continuous touch with the Hospital. The Hospital was giving him information every few hours. This is circumstance No. 1. He was in touch with the Hospital. He told the Lok Sabha. Number (2) is:

"I was told that his heart has ceased to function for half-an-hour. But, again, I was told at that time that he had been revived."

Therefore there was the position that Jayaprakash Narayan's heart beat had been stopped for half an hour and then it was revived. Therefore, is it enough that you rely on the police in-

foramtion? Does it not stand to logic that even for a layman the information is that the heart beat has stopped but there is a possibility of its revival. He was in touch with the hospital authorities. The previous occurrence is there. That occurrence has been passed on at that time. So and so information was before him. At 12.30 P.M. a message was received about the gun carriage and all that. Then he says—

"But the Secretary did not say that he had passed away."

That is true because I verified that. After 1230 on this occasion he was told that J.P. was perfectly all right; he has not passed away. And he verified it.

Therefore, continuously he was in touch. This past incident taken together—was it not the duty of the Prime Minister to verify this matter before he came to the Lok Sabha is the question. Any normal man should have done it. What do you mean by negligence? You know the difference, Sir, between rashness and negligence. Negligence is something which a normal man, under the circumstances, should have done but omitting to do that is negligence. This is sufficiently clear. He omitted to do what he should have done. And that negligence, he says, is not a crime. I submit, Sir, it is a crime. In a Penal Code, negligence is a crime. There are two types of negligence. One type of negligence is that which arises irrespective of the result, that is *per se* a crime—Sections 279, 280, 280, 282, 284; 286 and 287 are handling of certain negligent things. Even if the consequences do not follow, even then, that negligence *per se* is a crime. The other is when negligence becomes culpable if something follows; negligence is culpable if death follows. Negligence is culpable if grievous hurt follows. So, there is negligence admittedly. The present type of negligence of course does not find a place in the Penal Code because when McCauley wrote this, he never thought that there

would be Morarji Desai once in a time coming and telling this sort of thing as a result of which this House would be put to such a quandary. The question is: in a Parliamentary thing, if as a result of his negligent action, consequence did follow, this is my submission, in the eyes of Parliament, that it is a culpable negligence and that has got to be censured. The simple question is: such a person cannot be entrusted with the affairs of the State.

Now, the very important matter is this.

Now, the question is that my friend has also said that his coming and giving apology is enough. These are not matters which are to be viewed like this. But is that apology an apology clean from the breast. If you analyse the statement, you will find there are three or four aspects to the statement. One is the admission part; the second is the justification part; the third is the glorification part and fourth is the retraction part.

Admission part is where he says: It is a blunder. He goes further and says: It is alright. The punishment is that I am giving an unqualified apology to the House. Therefore, he admits that there is a blunder. There is an offence—an offence deserving punishment. And law giver that he is he decides what the punishment must be. He agrees that it must be punished but he gives punishment and says that this punishment is enough. The accused gives the punishment to himself and stops with it.

What is the justification part? His justification is this: Every body was expecting it. This is the attitude! It means everybody was expecting this to happen all the while. Then this exchange took place: "Some members No, No. Shri Morarji Desai: No use saying 'no' 'no'." Everybody was expecting This is now one thing. The second thing is Director of Information is involved and another officer is involved. Therefore, I did not feel like enquiring. I have already, Sir, dealt with that aspect of the question as to what the

information was. Therefore, that is the most wonderful thing. The third is that this thing had happened before. So, Morarji Desai, always depends on precedents. If this has happened before, well this is the end of the matter. Nothing more he is prepared to say. This has happened before. "No nonsense like that. I am not prepared to accept that kind of a thing because these things have happened before. This is not the first time." As this is not the first time and this has happened before—I do not know where—therefore, that is the justification. If this thing has happened somewhere else that is the justification he brings forward.

The fourth justification is if I delayed it I would have been charged with remissness to the House. Well, his respect for the House is very well known. The moment members make a demand he comes in we know what sort of Morarji Bhai is. What has happened in the case of Kosygin and so many things. Therefore, I am only at the point of trying to justify. If I had not done I would have been wrong. I did the correct thing in reporting. That is the position he takes. Then again charging for remissness has happened earlier. Therefore, I did. Well Sir, that is the second part of it.

The most wonderful part of all is that the glorification part of it. He not only justifies but takes the credit that, "I only hope and pray that this wrong publication of the news of his death gives him ten years more life. I have always believed that and that is what is happening. This is the good which may come out of the blunder. That is what I hope. I have always believed it. This is not the first time that I am saying this." Again this is not the first time I am saying it. "As a result of this something good comes." The recovery of J.P. is due not to the heroic efforts of the doctors attending on him, not due to the prayers that are being offered and not on the attention that he is receiving but the clumsy announcement and the blunder that he

committed, as a result of that he survives.' Could there be a more insult at the face of the doctors? Could there be a more insult to the people who are trying to revive J.P.? On that also he wants to take the glory and he not only justifies but he glorifies and says that if JP revives and survives it is because of me—I came and made the declaration. That is the Morarji Desai we have got wonderful before us.

Finally, Sir, the retraction part of it. Retraction is, let us take note of this sentence. He started his sentence with this:

'I regret and apologise for the mistake that has been done. But it was not done thoughtlessly or casually.'

What does it mean? He says 'It was not done thoughtlessly or casually'. I again ask, what does it mean? It means, it was done thoughtfully and deliberately. When you say, it was not done thoughtlessly or casually, it means, it was done thoughtfully and deliberately. Why? Because, if I do not do that, you would have taken me to task for that. By this JP had revived. If I did not do that, JP would not have revived. Therefore I did it **thoughtfully and deliberately**. Therefore I did that. That was not done thoughtlessly or casually. So, Sir, this is the wonderful position which he has taken! Then he says:

'I agree it was a blunder—No Himalayan blunder. No non-sense like that. I am not prepared to accept that kind of a thing, because, these things have happened before. This is not the first time.'

He was retracting the whole thing—no Himalayan blunder, no non-sense like that. That is the wording that he uses—'no nonsense like that.' I am not going to accept it. I stand by it. It is absolutely good, all good things are to follow from that. So, Sir, if this is the position, what is the apology? If that is justified, what is the apology?

given? Let us see what is the apology which he has given, Sir. Let us have a look at it. He has not apologised for his conduct. He has put in these words very deliberately. He says:

'I deeply regret and apologise for the mistake that has been committed in the information that was conveyed to the House in the morning.'

So, the mistake is in the information—not in the conveyance of the information! The mistake is in the information—the information is given by somebody, haul him up, take him to task. But I did the proper thing. Therefore, he closes with these words: 'I have no hesitation to do this. But this does not mean that I have done a crime. I have done nothing.' He says, I have not done any crime, I have not done any mistake. I have done a glorious thing, and let the nation be thankful for that!

So, this is Shri Morarji Desai in his true, typical form coming before the House. He says: 'I will not oblige you friends, with a resignation.' Well, Sir, are we such fools to expect this, of all people, from Shri Morarji Desai? We will never do it. We know that you sent out Charan Singh. When Charan Singh said something, you demanded retracting, he did not do it. In order that your Chair may be saved, you took him back. You do anything. But here, my submission is only this. I did not expect Morarji Desai to resign because he is a 'right honourable gentleman' and they are all 'honourable gentlemen'. I did not expect Morarji Desai to any amends to this House because Morarji Desai is an infallible man, he will never do it. Mr. Charan Singh was reported to be saying: 'To err is human'. My submission to Charan Singh Ji is, please do not insult Morarji Desai. We are all human, but he is super-human. He will never err. He has never erred. He will never make mistakes. Whatever he believes that is verify. Whatever he holds, that is truth. Whatever he says, that

is correct. Whatever prescription he gives, that is the best. Please do not say 'err is human' because he is a super-man. Super-man that he is, he had the visionary wisdom to see that the best treatment to him is to come and make this announcement in the House, deliberately, not inadvertently, but thoughtfully. Glory to JP; Glory to Morarji Desai also. Therefore, Sir, my submission is this: This is an insult to Parliament. This is an insult to the democratic institutions. He says: "They are trying to find fault with me". He does not say that this was my fault. But he says "they are trying to find fault with me and they want me to disappear". Morarjibhai I am making this statement not because I am anxious that you must disappear. If you disappear, somebody else will come there. I am not going to come in your place. I will still be here. I am not anxious to get you out, but I am anxious that the Chair of the Prime Minister of India should not be occupied by a person who, on the floor of this House is capable of a performance which even according to you was clumsy, was awkward, was careless, was stupid. I did not want the Prime Minister of this country to be stupid, I did not want the Prime Minister of this country to be an awkward man, I did not want the Prime Minister of this country to be a clumsy man, I did not want the Prime Minister of this country to take this House for granted. You took this House for granted. Therefore, I charge you, as hon'ble that you are, if you have got the sense of honour, the sense of honour must show you the way, the way is to tender the resignation and walk out and if that is not done, glory to you and history will ever remember you. I support this motion.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM (Palani):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are discussing a very sad incident, sad from every point of view and therefore as far as my party is concerned, I want to state categorically that it is not our demand

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

that he should resign, and he should not resign on our demand. As far as Jayaprakashji is concerned, we all have great respect for him and I could tell the hon. Members that I visited him in the hospital not once or twice but many times, even during the Emergency. But this is a matter of conscience as far as the Prime Minister is concerned. Various aspects are being pointed out. It is not even for the party, it is for the Prime Minister to decide according to his conscience how he should make retribution to the House and to the nation. This is my point.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): Sir, this motion reeks of hypocrisy and the mover of the motion himself did not take it very seriously as demonstrated by the arguments that he placed before this House and also the histrionics followed by our very able leader of the opposition, Mr Stephen. False information is not often but several times given to this House, sometimes innocently and sometimes corrected by Members of this House or pointed out by the Members of this House. As far as failure of the information by Intelligence Bureau is concerned for not obtaining accurate information, we have had many examples of this kind. Sometimes it has been fortunate, for example, we would not all have been here today but for the wrong information given by the Intelligence Bureau to the former Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, that she should win the elections and on that false information, they held the election and they lost, I know myself, Sir, during the Emergency I was able to come from abroad, come to Parliament and leave the country again and the Intelligence was none the wiser for it. How was the whole thing done? So, in a complex situation, I am not surprised if lapses of this kind took place and I cannot see how the Government, how the Prime Minister can be held accountable for every such action. I did not see Mr. Stephen moving any adjourn-

ment motion during the emergency or raising such matters against his leader, the Ex-Prime Minister.

The topic today, as he says, is not the wrong information conveyed about Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, but it is the ineptness of the Government and what he calls the stupidity of the Prime Minister. This is the issue for him. Side by side, the mover of the motion raised the question of importance of Shri Jayaprakash Narain. He said that he is such a great figure and such information should not be taken lightly. Of course, if Shri Lakkappa is very much concerned about the health of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, I might say that I have my own rapport with Jaslok Hospital; there is shortage of blood, he may take the next plane and go there and donate a few point of blood.... (Interruptions) He would be none the poorer for that.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Shri Subramaniam Swamy says that blood is not available. This is the revelation that he is giving to us.... (Interruptions).

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I am not after his blood; let me make that clear.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Or a point of order. Are we getting a new information. There was a mistake on that day. Now, another information is being given that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is short of blood. Are we to take that.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): Let the Health Minister make a statement; he must come to the House and tell us if there is shortage of blood (Interruptions). It is a very serious matter. (Interruptions).

SHRI VASANT SATHE: An hon. Member makes a statement in the House from his personal knowledge. He says, in Jaslok Hospital, Jayapra-

kash Narayanji is short of blood. His life may be in danger. The Government must immediately tell us if there is shortage of blood otherwise he must withdraw .. (Interruptions). Are we making a joke in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Subramaniam Swamy; please confine yourself to the subject.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He must withdraw what he said. Do not make this House a laughing stock.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: This is a very serious matter.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Shri Subramaniam Swamy said that he has information about the shortage of blood. He must withdraw it (Interruptions).

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I was not after their blood; I must assure you that.... (Interruptions).

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): There was so much noise and we did not hear what exactly Shri Subramaniam Swamy said. But I would like to assure the hon. Members; and the Government would like to assure the House that there is no shortage of blood for Shri Jayaprakash Narayan.

AN HON. MEMBER: When the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Ministers are there, how is he competent to reply to this point?

MR. SPEAKER: Anybody is good enough.

17.90 hrs.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: On a point of order. There is a method by which Government expresses its opinion in this House. I could understand the Health Minister saying it, because it is a subject which he deals with. The Prime Minister is here; the Deputy Prime Ministers are here. My point of order is that, when the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Ministers are here, is it open for the Minister of Steel and Mining to come forward and

say things on behalf of Government? (Interruptions).

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): I don't know why so much row is being made about my colleague saying something. What I understood from what Dr. Swamy said was this, that it is not a question of shortage of blood for Jayaprakash Narayan. There is shortage of blood in his body, and blood transfusion has to be given. He said, 'Let him give blood to him.' (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members may remember that they will have their time.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: The Prime Minister's statement in Parliament says that the Director of Intelligence Bureau informed him. The Director of the Intelligence Bureau is a person of Secretary's rank; and in case he has some piece of information—it is a question of how our Government is to be run—and when an information is given by such a senior official whose job is to collect information and he gives it to the Prime Minister, it is expected that that senior official has already checked it up.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: He has not answered my question.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: If to-day, the Intelligence Bureau were to inform the Prime Minister that a particular country has declared war on us, I do not think it is going to be a matter on which the Prime Minister himself will have to go to the front and see how much damage has been done. Government runs on faith, that when the seniormost officer is providing adequate information, he is doing the necessary checking. I think, therefore, that the issue is not so much as whether there was a malafide intention. It is not a question of whether there has been a deliberate intention, as Mr. Stephen says. The issue simply, clearly and straightforwardly, has been that there

has been a lapse in information collection; and that, therefore, responsibility has to be fixed in this matter.

I am a little concerned about the way they are praising Jayaprakash Narayan. They say, "We had political differences, but we had great respect for him. And, therefore, we are concerned. It is not an ordinary death that has taken place, nor is it an ordinary news. It is a question of the life of a great revolutionary man." I agree that they could have had political differences with JP! but that is not what they said throughout. I will just give you two quotations to show what they had said. Mrs. Gandhi had written a letter to Dr. Benjamin Spock, an American, and said this about JP:

"Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has for a long time carried on a campaign against the Government.... In his extreme anger and frustration at the lack of popular support...." (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: No, when Mr. Lakkappa said that the Prime Minister was motivated in making that statement, was it relevant?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: The personality of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan is very much relevant to this debate, because if it is just an ordinary case of misfired information, there are other rules. The adjournment motion has been brought because the information was not only wrong, but it was connected with Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. And they say, they have no differences. They have political differences, but they think that he is a great man, and therefore, they have taken this umbrage. I say what the ex-Prime Minister has said. She said:

"In his extreme anger and frustration at the lack of popular support, he called upon the Army and the police to disobey orders."

Now I will read out from the book *Why Emergency?* It is on page 24. It says:

"Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, it is well-known has never accepted the Constitution. He has no faith in it and, therefore, the democratic procedures enshrined in it are of no consequence to him."

I can understand Mr. Ram Dhan getting excited because he is attached to Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan; and he has paid a price for it. He had gone to jail for it. But they have no moral authority to rise here and say that this is a terrible thing. I want to know what is this that they are really after? The nation was shocked to hear this news, but the nation is sickened to see the political exploitation of this event for their own personal ends. There is nothing in it. They have got nothing to do with their love for Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan which is nil. And Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan himself would know what these people are. I would say that this House need not take up this adjournment motion any further. In fact, it should be rejected. In fact, in the first stage, it should not have been admitted.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition said that the subject matter of this debate was not Loknayak Jayaprakash Narayan. I heartily agree with him. But may I humbly ask whether these subject matter of this debate is Shri Morarji Desai and not the Prime Minister of this country? If that were so, he would not have gone into the description of the man Shri Morarji Desai. He should have gone into the functioning of Mr. Morarji Desai as the Prime Minister. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is for the first time probably in the parliamentary history that the Leader of the Opposition has heaped such choicest epithets on the Leader of the House, on the Prime Minister. This showed pathological obsession with a person

called Shri Morarji Desai, who is so much respected in the country—throughout the country—and even outside.

(Interruptions)

I am not going to pay him in kind. That is not our culture. He might try to provoke us, but we cannot get provoked. His description was simply splenetic and I think that in his cooler moments he will repent what he has said in the heat of the movement. Mr. Speaker, then to me again, the subject matter of this debate is not also the individual officer at the various levels, but the subject matter of the debate is the functioning of the administrative system which has been responsible for it. I am not trained in a tradition in which I would demand the head of the petty officer, but I will demand the head of the Minister, the head of the Government. But, what my hon. friend, the mover of the motion did was that he was all the time trying to blame the officials at the various levels. Some persons on our side also apportioned the blame to the officials. But the whole question is whether we have got a properly constituted authority to inform the Government and to inform the House in the matter. Mr. Speaker, this is a basic question to which our hon. friends on the other side or even on this side should have addressed themselves. In other words whether the hon. Prime Minister was informed by the properly constituted authority, whether the persons who feed the information into this system were the persons authorised to do so. Now, any person can feed the information into this system—the various agencies—the intelligence bureau is one of the informants in this wide world who could feed this information into the system—and any man on the street.

But it is not the business or function of the intelligence bureau, so far as I have known it, to feed this kind of information into the system. So the Prime Minister was not informed

by a properly constituted authority in regard to this matter. In fact there is no properly constituted authority which we can locate or identify in such matters. Who is the person? Which is the agency which shall do it?

Then, Mr. Speaker, the question that I want to ask is also this—as you happen to be the guardian of this House—who is the properly constituted authority to inform the House in such matters? What I find in this case is one of the strangest things that could happen in this House. Straight away the hon. Speaker plunges into the business of paying homage to the departed soul. Even a formal announcement is not made. I have gone through the debates as unfortunately I did not happen to be present on that occasion. Even the formal sad announcement was not made. Usually the House is informed that a sad thing has happened, that a great leader has passed away. But here right from the very beginning, without even the formal function having been performed in this House, the obituary references were made in this House. I think in future it would not happen.

Then Mr. Speaker, in such matters when the persons concerned do not happen to be members of this House, who is the person who must come before the House and inform the House? I think the hon. Speaker should not undertake this responsibility upon himself. In this case what I find is that, may be out of love, affection, solicitude for the great leader Shri Jayaprakash Narain, the hon. Speaker thought that he must inform the House about it. But I maintain that in such matters it should be left to the government to come before the House and inform it. Otherwise, the Speaker would be subject to all kinds of criticism in the future as he would be taking upon himself the responsibility which should rightly belong to the executive. That should not happen in future, although there is one

saving example in the past. In the past government always came before the House and informed about the death of eminent persons of not only this country but also of the world. Even the death of some important officials was mentioned in this House. Once the death or retirement of a Cabinet Secretary was also mentioned by the great Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru. The death of Mr. Stalin was mentioned by the Prime Minister in this House. But there is one saving example as I said, and the hon. Speaker can refer to that. That was in the case of Shri Aurobindo. We happened to be in the House at that time. The hon. Speaker made the announcement about the sad demise of that great savant and sage Shri Aurobindo in this House. If the hon. Speaker has placed JP in that category no man can find fault with that. But ordinarily the practice should be that in such matters it is the executive which should come before the House and inform the House.

Now, please do not misunderstand me when I have to say a few words about the strange anomaly that we are discussing today; I cannot in all conscience call it an adjournment motion. My hon. Friends have become so very rhetorical on this motion. But I do not find that there have been many instances in the past when even a day was allowed to pass after the adjournment motion was admitted. It was for the first time in this House that four days have been allowed to pass before the adjournment motion has been taken up; in the past it was only one day and that was again, Mr. Speaker, with the common consent of the House.

But there was no consent in this matter. Yet this matter has been passed on to the fourth or fifth day. I do not think that it has been proper to do so. This has happened. We are asked to participate with a sense of urgency in the matter which is of the greatest

public importance. It is this which should characterise the adjournment motion. We can in fact take pride that we have invented a new concept of adjournment motion and we are contributing a new concept to the parliamentary practice. I submit the kind of thing, the proposition, that we are discussing to-day is unknown to parliamentary practice. It is not known at any rate, as an adjournment motion. In fact the matter has been made superlatively normal. It is more normal a proposition than the proposition under 184 and 193. That is the fate which this matter has met.

However, if I am participating in this debate it is only with a view to creating safeguards for the future. I do think that every right thinking person should bring the curtain down on this episode. The guilt does not exist after the confession has been made. The guilt ceases to exist, the guilt does not continue after the confession has been made. There is absolutely no doubt about it. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition was trying to analyse with all the casuistry, the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, I must say that he was doing some insult to our intelligence. The hon. Prime Minister was quite clear in his confession about this and there was absolutely no qualification or reservation. Can there be any doubt about it? The Prime Minister said, "The punishment is that I am giving unqualified apology to the House and also to the nation." He was also speaking to the nation and it is not merely to the House. "I have no hesitation in saying this," this is what the hon. Prime Minister said. Further on may I remind the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister said, "I do not want to cite previous instances or anything because there is no question of justifying a mistake which has taken place". Where is the question of justification then? Since he is addicted to some words-justification,

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

glorification and all the rest of it, the hon. Member was exhausting his vocabulary on this, otherwise there was no sense in what he was saying on this. What surprised me the most, it almost shocked me, was that the hon. Leader of the Opposition did the finest sentiment of the hon. Prime Minister. In fact he has misinterpreted that finest sentiment. I do not know how he was satisfied about this. That sentiment was—"I hope and pray that this mistake gives him ten years more of life and early recovery. He said something which has the smell of our earth, of Indian sort, of our great tradition. People say, when in dreams one sees a person during then the person gets a longer lease of life. Could there be a finer sentiment than this as expressed by the hon. Prime Minister? And yet my hon. friend has said that this is self-glorification. This sentence to my mind speaks of infinite love, affection and solicitude of the hon. Prime Minister for the Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan for me, the majesty of the House, the greatness of the House lies in closing the chapter and not pursuing it. Now, this House would be less than a great House if it did not accept the unqualified apology of the Prime Minister. Could anybody in this House and in this wide world attribute any bad motive to the Prime Minister.

After all, even if any person attributes any bad motive, how would it be shown to a purpose, because it was bound to boomerang; My hon. friends are full of such evil thoughts, if I may say so, if they attribute such evil motives I really do not know. But all said and done, I must join the others in expressing deepest regret that such an error should have occurred and it should have occurred in relation to a person who is bound to go down in history as one of the tallest Indians! The hon. Prime Minister said that everybody was full of apprehension....

MR. C. M. STEPHEN: He said, expectation.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Expectation in that particular context means that. In English, you cannot construe like this. You read any Englishman's English. They would also be using such word. I have always felt that the Prime Minister's English not bad from that point of view. It might be more sonorous when the hon. Leader of the Opposition speaks. But when the Prime Minister speaks with his quiet dignity and in his usual characteristic manner, I think his English is admirable. But the point I was making was this; when the Prime Minister said that everybody was full of apprehension, I think he should have thought at the same time that everybody knew Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's life during the last three years was a defiance of science and assertion of God's special favour. That also was thought by everybody. So, in the given situation, I would plead with my hon. friends opposite that they should not press this motion. In fact, it would be the undoing of what the House has achieved. The object of all punishment is what the Prime Minister has given to the House. The punishment itself is not an object. What the Prime Minister has given to the House--his unqualified apology--is the very product or result of the punishment which the House wanted. With this motion, I must say that the whole thing is sought to be undone. But I have every confidence that the House will not allow it to be done.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Mangalore): Sir, I stand to support the motion. I submit that it is a horrendous error committed by the Prime Minister of this country. As you know on the particular day on which the death of J.P. was announced, the doctors were struggling hard to save his life. But unfortunately, on the floor of this House, J.P. was murdered. I am very sorry to submit that when I was in Mangalore in my constituency on that day, PTI conveyed the news saying, "J.P. is dead, Parliament adjourned, Parliament mourns death of

J.P." etc. Afterwards I read the news in the papers that our Deputy Prime Minister, Shri Jagjivan Ram, was found wiping his tears and our Railway Minister, Prof. Madhu Dandavate, was found wiping the tears that were rolling down from his eyes. This was the situation. All the 540 Members of Parliament were informed in this manner by a responsible citizen of this country. I must submit at this juncture that it was the blackest day in the years of history of Parliament. Can we say that it was a casual act, that it is not an act of negligence, that it was not a stupid act of the Prime Minister of this country? Today we can say that the Prime Minister has committed a Himalayan blunder. And he has confessed the crime. As you know, confession of the crime is followed by punishment. What is the punishment to follow?

Sir, you have not committed any mistake during your long time as judge of the Supreme Court. But on that day, you were also made to commit a grave error.

I submit that it is a grave error committed by the Prime Minister of this country. What is happening in the country today? What is the feeling prevailing in the country? People think if this Government is not in a position to deal with the state of health of Jayaprakash Narayanji what would have happened if there was a war or if there was a serious situation? If it comes to that, what will happen to this country? Whether these people will be in a position to rule this country and give effective administration to this country? That is why, on 23rd August, 1978, JP has stated that this Government is not functioning very well; this Government is incompetent and our Prime Minister is an arrogant person and that he is giving a clean administration to the country. Further, he said that our Prime Minister had not sent any person to consult him even though he was the person who formed

the Janata Party. The Janata Party people claim that JP is their patron saint. When he is their patron saint, when he is responsible for the formation of the Janata Party, it would be their duty to consult him on every matter. But, according to him, he was neglected JP had clearly stated that he was kept in darkness. That is why, all the people were in a hurry to announce that JP was dead because they did not want him to live any more.

Further I submit that when I see their mood here, I feel that they are not at all serious about JP's life. Our Prime Minister had stated that he was dead. Today, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, the shadow Prime Minister of this country, says that there is no blood available for JP.

श्री मोक्षय प्रसाद (सीवान) अध्यक्ष जी, मेरा व्यक्त्या का प्रश्न है। माननीय सदस्य जब इतने गंभीर आरोप हम पर लगा रहे हैं कि हम चाहते थे कि लोक नायक जय प्रकाशजी मर जायें तब उन्हें श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण जी के प्रामाणिक वक्तव्यों को यहाँ पर उद्धृत करना चाहिए, न कि अपने मन में गद्ग का धनच करते हुए इन्टर-प्रिटेन देना चाहिए। व यहाँ पर बातों को उलट-पलट कर गलत धर्म दे रहे हैं।

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARI: Now, which statement is correct? Can we give any credibility to the statement of Dr. Swamy? It is not a mere statement made before the House. We have to find out whether there was any blood, whether there is blood available for J.P. Today, the Prime Minister says there is sufficient blood. Some Minister may also say that there is enough blood. But tomorrow, they may come before the House and say that there was not sufficient blood and Dr. Swamy had clearly given indication of that and that nobody was there to give blood for J.P. So, my submission would be can we given any credibility to the statement of Dr. Swamy? So, I demand the resignation of the Prime Minister.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA (Serampore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard with rapt attention the speeches made by the opposition as well as ruling party members.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Where are you sitting?

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: I am sitting where I am; you have the eyes to see it.

I would humbly request the hon. Prime Minister to set up an Enquiry Committee to go into the matter and find out how this sort of news appeared here in Delhi, which was announced by the Prime Minister in Lok Sabha and then broadcast by the AIR throughout the country. We must know the actual source of this news; the person responsible for it must be found out and brought to book so that the other persons who are still there will be more careful. Because, the Prime Minister and the whole country should know that Shrimati Indira Gandhi planted so many persons in the Government and they are trying their best to malign this Government and to create instability in the country. It is for this reason that I would appeal to the Government to set up an Enquiry Committee to go into this matter.

Then I would like to know what has happened to the one-man Enquiry Committee, called the Nagappa Alva Committee, which was appointed to enquire into the health of Jayaprakash Narayan while in detention. If you will kindly allow me, I would like to read one paragraph from the interim report submitted by Dr. Alva.

MR. SPEAKER: That report has not been placed on the Table. It is not before the House.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: It is relevant for the discussion that we are having. If you kindly bear with me for two minutes. . .

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a question of bearing with you. No such report is before the House.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: The report says:

"One man commission headed by Dr. K. Nagappa Alva submitted an interim report to the Government in March 1978. The Commission is understood to have failed to solve the mystery of digoxim toxicity Mr. Narayan was found to be suffering from soon after he was detained at the Sohna tourist complex in Haryana on June 26, 1975."

I will request the Prime Minister to place the interim report on the Table of the House so that not only a few opposition members sitting here but the whole country will know that a conspiracy was hatched by the previous Prime Minister. (Interruptions) We know for certain that in Patna a funeral ceremony was arranged. Is it a fact or not? Let them give their version. I can give so many examples.

MR. SPEAKER: But there is no time; only five minutes for your party.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: I want to tell you that at least Shri Morarji Desai was magnanimous enough to admit the mistake. But what happened to the previous Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who committed so many crimes throughout the country? She is still not repentant for those crimes. You go to the country and you will know what the people feel and say about her. And thereby the people will also know what is what. So, I will humbly request them to please give up their hypocrisy and try to learn that by bringing this adjournment motion they can do no good either to the nation or to 'J.P.' or to themselves. So I will request them to withdraw their motion honourably. Otherwise they will know the fate of their motion.

With these words, I fully and strongly oppose this bogus adjournment motion.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for at last you have called me. As some Members have suggested, when you break the rules and conventions only then problems are created. And it is the convention of this House that you actually call the Members on the basis of party strength. And I also expected to participate in the discussion during the time when the House is in full capacity.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to discuss this matter in a two-faceted manner. I do not want to treat it as some of Members tried from this side as if some innocent act has taken place, and brush it aside. In this context, I want to bring to your notice and to the notice of the House the event that took place on that particular day and the discussions that you had with the leaders of all the parties and with the Ruling Party, especially with the Prime Minister. Secondly, I do not want to politicise this issue and ask the Prime Minister to resign because in any parliamentary democracy it is not the Prime Minister who is to be asked to resign, it is entirely the Cabinets responsibility. The Cabinet is responsible for it. (Interruptions). I think people will listen with sense at least for some time. So, I am not asking the Cabinet to resign on this score during the discussion today. This side cannot furnish information about the functioning of the Intelligence Department. You may ask some of the Members of the Party which ruled in the past about it, but you cannot ask me about it. But I expected from your side not the statement of a Member like Dr. Subramaniam Swamy who made a statement in a casual manner all the while opposing people on this side, but I expected your side to come out with particulars of how your Intelligence Bureau is functioning.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): You can ignore Dr. Subramaniam Swamy.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I expected you to come out with a statement on how your Intelligence Department is functioning and how you are supplied with material. Sir, as I stated earlier, this cannot be treated very lightly also because . . . (Interruptions). I want to take up the question that that is a matter that is to be discussed in a serious manner. Why? Because it is not a question of some death or just because some of the Members try to attribute that because it is about Lok-nayak, the Speaker came out and gave the information, but it is a question of treating certain matters, how you announce them. Say, for example, you get information about a riot in a particular place through your Intelligence Department, I mean the I.B. Suppose it is a false and contradictory statement. If you give directions from here to that particular person to shoot them down to death, what will be their fate? So, it is a serious matter if you take it in that light and discuss that aspect of it.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: Like in 1975?

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Let us forget about 1975. Let us discuss about 1979 now. (Interruptions). I can understand him. I say, it is a serious matter because such information is passed on in such a casual manner—I do not want to say 'casual', but it looks like that.—I do not want to go into the intricacies of the legal definitions or the dictionary meanings of all the words that were spoken because you know how grammatically we speak on different subjects. I do not want to go into it. But I want to bring to the notice of this august House how casually the information was given to this House about the incident that took place. Everybody is trying to say that the guilty is next, next and next to the last. And we are trying to justify it and say that somebody is guilty, but it

is a very serious matter and I agree with you on that, but I do not agree with Shyam Babu's saying that on the next day you should take up the adjournment motion. I am a person who believes that we should not stand only by precedents. We have to create precedents also. You see what the Janata Party President a Member of this House, says about it. He says it is a serious matter, it is a serious lapse. and it is an irresponsible statement—such a thing coming from the Head of the Government and the head of the Ruling Party, a Member of this House.

So, it is a serious matter which has to be discussed threadbare. I expected some kind of serious proposition and material from this side, so that I could base my arguments on them, but unfortunately we only try to express our loyalty to Loknayak all the while. We will be very much ridiculed. I am sure he will read the obituary references made by Stephenji, Chavanji and myself and others. He will have the pleasure of reading them, and he will come to a conclusion how people talk about a man after his death and how talked earlier about him. Fortunately, I had the same respect for him earlier as I have today, because I have always respect for elders.

Today, the question is how the Government has miserably failed. Unfortunately, it is a Cabinet form of Government, it is not a Government of Morarjibhai alone. The entire Treasury Benche must feel sorry for it. Not only the Government, the Janata Party must feel sorry for it. I can understand how Mr. Bhattacharya is trying to defend, but that is a different matter. But when you come forward with an explanation, you must be serious about it. As Members of this august House, we must also feel sorry because we are being laughed at by the entire world.

It is not a question how I praise J.P. on the wrong news of his death. It is not a question how I am happy that the news is wrong, and that he is going to live for another ten years. It is a

question how a sorry spectacle this august House has become before the nation and the world also.

This incident did not stop with us here. Hearing the news of the happenings in the Lok Sabha the highest authority or patron of democracy, many legislatures got adjourned. Fortunately or unfortunately, my legislature of Tamil Nadu also got adjourned on the news not only from the radio, but also because it spoke of the references made in the Lok Sabha. So, it is a serious matter because the entire democratic set up is being affected. As I said earlier, it is a question of the functioning of not only the I.B., but of the entire system of your administration.

I have a feeling that it should not be treated like this that just because the Prime Minister came forward with an unqualified apology, with a confessional statement as Mr. Mishra said, he feels sorry for it, it should be treated as closed. It is not a question of penalising the Prime Minister or any particular individual. It is a question how he is being assisted by Ministers and departments to head this Government, because of which we came to cut such a sorry figure.

It is a serious matter. I will come to you also. You called us. At that time you were nervous. I felt sorry for you because J.P.'s life was a question of hours. When I asked if it was a question of days, you said it was a question of even minutes. You consulted us, you consulted me along with Mr. Stephen and others also.

MR. SPEAKER: May I tell you one thing? What we discussed with the leaders, if you are going to make it public, I will have to, I will have no. . .

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I am not divulging. Everybody attributed it to you. I am not going to divulge what you said to me. With my limited brains, I am able to follow the rules. Fortunately, God has given me that

much for brain. Everybody tried to accuse you on that day and even to-day. You came forward and read out a statement. Is it a fact? Is it not a subject matter for us to discuss? You don't try to shut me out.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not shutting you out.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Before I completed, you started saying, "Hereafter I will not consult you". In that case, I will also say "Hereafter I will not come to you."

MR. SPEAKER: I said it will become difficult.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: It is a reciprocal thing. If you start saying that before I complete, I may have to say that hereafter I will not come to you at all. Please allow me to say what I wanted to say. . .

MR. SPEAKER: I have always allowed you

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: . . . on the events that took place on that day

So, it is not a question of Loknayak. When we said about Aurobindo, we never meant Aravinda Bala, because I am still alive. Aurobindo belonged to the nation, and so you referred to him. Loknayak also belongs to the nation and so you referred to him. I do not find fault. But the question is: on that occasion immediately was it necessary for us to have obituary references, because I think this adjournment motion has to be discussed so that we can benefit for the future. If a Minister comes forward with a particular statement, we do not discuss it immediately. This morning he gave a statement about Kosygin's visit. You said we do not discuss it immediately. You allowed it. I would request that on such occasions, you should make it a point not to allow obituary references to be made on the same day unless you are satisfied about it. That is what I.

wanted to say. Finally I wanted to say this is a matter which is a serious one and let us not simply close it. This is a matter which requires a serious thinking and a serious thinking for a parliamentary democracy is to enquire into it, not only that, take action against those who are responsible for it, not against the small bachas, but take action against those people who are responsible for it. I am not prepared to agree with Mr. Bhattacharya that the henchmen of Mrs. Gandhi are still there. If that is the case, you have no right to rule this country any further. If you are not able to remove the henchmen of Mrs. Gandhi, you are incapable of ruling this country. So, let us not put forward this argument and try to fool the people of this country. The people are vigilant. The writings on the walls of this country are well written. They bungled on the news about the death of the Loknayak. They are responsible for making all the references that made them look ridiculous. Now they try to dig out the whole thing and fool the people of this country. It is an insult not only to the Prime Minister, but to me also. It is a personal insult to every citizen of this country and to every Member of his House. My own feelings is that, the Prime Minister expressing his feelings about it is not enough. He must come forward and say what are the steps that he is taking. It is a question of saying that these are the things that have taken place and what action he is going to take. He must also inform this House what action he has already taken. I hope that the Government will function properly at least in future.

PROF. SAMAR GUHA (Contal): Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I come to the subject of the adjournment motion, I hope the House will join me in expressing our deepest joy that the news House will join me in expressing our hope and fervent prayer that JP recoups and recoups early to guide the destiny of our nation, as the beacon of our national life. With these few words, I would say that undoubtedly

words, I would say that undoubtedly the episode that had happened can be rightly termed as a bungling, a blunder, a costly mistake. But the question is, was that mistake *mala fide*, motivated, intentional, deliberate or one committed with some sinister design for some sinister purpose? That should be the perspective of our assessing the nature, the gravity and the character of the mistake that has been committed. When this costly mistake was made, this bungling was made, there was a wave of worry and anxiety and even condemnation against the Government. All over the country, the people have felt, how is it that the Government could Communicate this kind of information without proper and abundant caution and abundant verification? Undoubtedly, the people have the right to express their views in such a sensitive matter. But at the same time, I was thinking of the other aspect also, a little philosophical aspect, I hope, we all hope that JP will recoup and we will have time to talk to JP and in a lighter vein we shall communicate to him what has happened. I was thinking of what his reaction will be. Will he get angry, feel worried? No. Will he make any comment? As I have been one humble associate of JP, I have had the opportunity to know him very closely for days together. What will be his comment? He will not make any comment. A sweet, mild and benign smile will flash over his face and he will keep silent. I would like to say that if we philosophically analyse the incident the episode that has happened, it is a very unfortunate incident in its nature. But there is a very interesting aspect of it. Great men, when they are leaving do not get an opportunity to know the depth of the popular feelings for them. When they pass away, the people express their feelings in a way that can never be known to them. He does not know it; he does not see; he does not hear. But, as I said, this costly mistake, a very unfortunate episode, has turned out to be a brilliant thing. I should say. Perhaps, JP is

the first man of that category, a great man. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Who baffled death.

PROF. SAMAR GUHA: . . . who not only baffled death but through the mystery of death-news or the haze of death-news, he will come to know of love and affection for him. Every great man even if he lives a life of complete abandon and self-abnegation will feel that the people have love and affection for him. But when JP will know, when his death was broadcast all over the country, the Parliament adjourned, all the Assemblies all over the country adjourned the people came out in the streets, the bazars were going to be closed, what a magnitude of expression of feeling of love and affections for him he will see and hear. I think, even this costly mistake an unfortunate thing, will give some satisfaction to JP that he earned, to what extent, the love and affection of people.

As I started saying, certainly, I also call it a blunder. What has happened is distressing; it is a bungling, a blunder, a costly mistake, committed by the Government. But, at the same time, I would say, it is a greater blunder, a greater bungling, that has been committed by my friends on the other side by bringing an adjournment motion on this issue. Is this an issue which should be taken as an adjournment motion, such a delicate issue, such a sensitive issue, which involves the question of life and death of one of our greatest sons, the greatest man of India, whom we call Loknayak and by whose service and movement, for the last 30 years, he has completely changed the momentum of a certain regime, by some kind of a peaceful revolution which he has brought about by his selfless service? Is this the time, is this the occasion, is it an issue to bring it in the form of an adjournment motion? If the Government has made a bungling, I should say, unfortunately, from the standpoint of moral issue, from the sensitiveness of it, from the point of view of a delicate issue, as it

is, they have committed a further blunder.

What the Government has done is shocking; what has happened is shameful to us. But still more shocking and more shameful is on the part of others, the people on the other side, in trying to make a political attempt and to take a political advantage of a very delicate, a sensitive, issue involving the question of life and death of the greatest son of our country today. If they had taken it up in a different way, in the form of a resolution, certainly, they would have found us with them. I consider it a serious lapse. What is the source of communication? What is the mechanism of getting information? What is the mechanism of communicating the information to the Government? That is the serious point that you have to take into consideration, not the issue for which my friends on the other side have come with an adjournment motion. I hope, they have certain respect for J.P. But they are trying to take advantage of the situation. I repeat, on such a delicate issue.

Having said that, I would say, the seriousness and our concern lies somewhere else. We have to know how the Government, not only in this matter, say, in the case of war; say, in the case of espionage; say, in the case of natural calamities; say, in other cases—there are many things—gathers information. If the source of gathering intelligence and the means of communication is so faulty, it is a dangerous thing. The Government will collapse; it will create a disaster for the Government, if that source of collecting information is not corrected. So, the method of communication needs to be corrected. Here, the Chief of the Intelligence Bureau communicates an information to the Home Ministry and the Home Minister passed on that information to the Prime Minister. Why did not the Home Minister try to ascertain it—what is the source of information, how did it come, etc.? It

was very easy to get in touch with the Hospital. Why was it not done? I can understand the emotion of the Prime Minister and others who were so charged with emotion and sorrow. It is a human thing. They perhaps thought that in such a matter such a news cannot be wrong, that it is inconceivable that such a news can be wrong and that it could be communicated so lightheartedly. Nobody could believe it. Therefore, the Prime Minister I should say, with the emotional feeling and a feeling of remorse reacted to such a news. He has communicated the news to you and he has himself suggested to you and both of you communicated it to the House.

I will conclude by saying that if it is said that it is a crime—yes, it is a mistake, yes, it is a bungling, yes, it is a blunder, yes, it is something which is more serious, but the question is: whether these serious things can be construed a crime. The criteria of judgment is whether all these lapses have been committed intentionally, purposely, deliberately, with a *mala fide* intention, with a malice behind it or with a sinister design. I think even my friends there would not say a word about it. If not, it cannot be construed as a crime. It is a matter of admission of one's lapses. It is some kind of a moral condemnation which the government deserves, and, the Prime Minister promptly and very rightly expressed, not only expressed, but promptly and rightly he offered an unconditional apology to the people and the people have accepted it.

I think with a sense of humility and understanding of the thing and the delicate nature of the issue involved, my friends on the opposite would have brought the issue, not in the form of an adjournment motion, but in some other form where you would have also found us to participate with you to find out the source from where these incorrect informations are communicated to the government and how this

costly mistake occurred.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Cannanore): Last week, when we were in session we were told by the Prime Minister that JP was no more with us and then this House expressed its condolences. That was a very serious matter because by discussing that way, we brought down the credibility of this Parliament and as we discussed this matter and it was announced on the Radio and it was followed by adjournment of 4 Legislatures in the country.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If anybody wants to go out, kindly go out without making noise and also don't stand in the middle of the way.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: They are moving sound.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Empty vessels make a lot of sound

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Therefore, the question is: How to restore the credibility of this Parliament. We have to also look into what are the factors which led the government to come before this House and the Prime Minister to make that statement.

I do not, for a moment, think that the Prime Minister made that statement with ulterior motives or *mala fide* intentions. But, then, is it a virtue for a Prime Minister to be gullible? I do not think that also. The question is: I agree with Mr. L. N. Mishra when he said...

AN. HON MEMBER: It is not L. N. Mishra, it is S. N. Mishra.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I am sorry—it is Shri S. N. Mishra, not L. N. Mishra ..

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Sworn enemy of L. N. Mishra.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN:... when he said that there should have been certain arrangements, certain authorised arrangements by which the information could have been passed on to the Prime Minister.

And he said that there is no such arrangement. There I beg to differ. In the hospital where Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan is under treatment there is a panel of doctors looking after him and the Prime Minister being the Prime Minister, has got all the arrangements and all the facilities to contact that panel of doctors and get the news confirmed. I do not know why the Prime Minister has been taken for a ride by the junior official of the Intelligence Bureau.

Now, the whole explanation given to this House is that a small Intelligence Bureau officer, some Deputy Director or someone of Maharashtra informed the Intelligence Bureau Chief here and he passed on this message to the Prime Minister. And the Prime Minister, in his eagerness to inform the House came and made this announcement in this House.

Sir, That should not have happened. This was the most unfortunate part of it. I do not say what action should the Prime Minister take whether he should resign or whether he should apologise and all that. I agree with Mr. Subramaniam; The Prime Minister is a Gandhian and a moralist. If the Prime Minister thinks that his apology to this House was good enough to restore the credibility of this Parliament, before the country and the people, I have no quarrel with him. But, that is for the Prime Minister to decide and let him come and say that that apology was enough. But, Sir, for the Prime Minister, maybe, the apology is enough. But, what about those officials who informed the Prime Minister and misled the whole country and the people? Can they get away like that—the Prime Minister's coming with an apology

before the house while some people are saying "don't be after the blood of these small officials." I am not in agreement with them. But this is not a small matter. This institution of Parliament has been brought to disrepute; its credibility has been questioned. And we have been put in a ridiculous situation by that announcement. A scandalous development has taken place and those responsible should not go unpunished. If Government has got the courage to take action instantaneously, then, the officer on whom the responsibility was pinned down by the Prime Minister, for this false information, should have been suspended and then an enquiry should have been conducted. They have not done anything of that sort.

Sir, these are some of the aspects of the matter which we are interested in. So, I hope that the Prime Minister will inform us what are the steps he has taken and whether he is still satisfied with this apology and that is enough to restore the credibility of this institution?

Sir, it is a very serious matter. There are other ways in which people in responsible position behaved. Just now I was informed that the West Bengal Legislature on hearing this news, did not act like the way our Prime Minister did, they did not rush to the House with a condolence motion even after the Prime Minister's announcement has been broadcast by Radio. They adjourned the House for half-an-hour to get the feels confirmed whether the news was correct. When they found that the news was incorrect, they re-assembled and transacted the business. Here the wisdom of the Prime Minister, unfortunately for us and unfortunately for the country, was of a different type.

He came, rushed and made the unfortunate announcement. Therefore, the question is whether that gullibility should go unpunished and un-questioned.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House has already been informed of the Sequence of events leading to the unbelievable and Himalayan blunder in the announcement by the Prime Minister to the House of the death of Loknayak Jayaprakash without any confirmation from the Jaslok Hospital, without any confirmation from the Janata Party President who was coming there, without any confirmation from the Chief Secretary, Chief Minister or the Governor of Maharashtra. I do not want to go into the sequence of events. When I came to know of this blunder my own reaction was that I was reminded of what Jayaprakash had said on the midnight of 26th June when he was told that Emergency has been declared:

बिनाश काले विपरीत बुद्धि

That is what has happened to this Janata Government. Before their destruction their intelligence has gone wrong and that is why this could happen, such an unbelievable thing, in which the institution of Parliament and government has been brought to shame and has been made an object of ridicule not only before this country but before the whole world. That can only happen because the government has lost all its senses.

Sir, one must understand what were the reasons behind this hurry. Why was there such a hurry by the Prime Minister to announce this to the House in which unfortunately you were also stampeded into. The reason must stem from the inner goings in the Janata Party where there is unseemly wrangling to prove themselves more loyal to Jayaprakash. Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that if Jayaprakash had been fully conscious today he would not have appreciated the unedifying spectacle of ministers flying on government expenses just to get their names in the press to say that

they had visited Jayaprakash and seen him behind the glass door. One has to understand that this was the problem for which Morarji Desai had to demonstrate that he was the first to announce the so-called death of Jayaprakash. For two years this Janata Party forget about Jayaprakash. He had himself given a statement three months back saying that nobody comes to consult him. None of these ministers really went to Jayaprakash. Now, they are trying to be more loyal than the others and competing in an unseemly way to show their great loyalty to Jayaprakash.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what is happening to the treatment Newspaper reports say that on last Thursday, Tagmet, a life saving drug was not available in Jaslok Hospital Mr S. M. Joshi, leader of the Janata Party in Maharashtra went out to get the life saving drug with hundred rupees. He found that the shopkeeper was charging Rs. 1200/-. This government is so incompetent that it cannot keep in stock the most important life saving drug, Tagmet, in that hospital. This is what has come out in the newspapers.

AN. HON'BLE MEMBER: It is not correct. One injection costs Rs. 100 and twelve injections were purchased.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Shri S. M. Joshi complained that it was being sold in blackmarket. This is the concern they have for Jayaprakash. When that man is fighting for life outside the Jaslok Hospital using microphones bhajans are being sung. Is this the way we care for the sick in the country. This is the most unedifying spectacle we have seen? Prime Minister's announcement has caused irritation in Janata circles and I am not surprised at Chandra Shekhar's statement when he said that it is utterly ridiculous and heads should roll on this issue. Somebody has to take

the responsibility. If Prime Minister had said that I am wholly responsible for the information then I would have understood that he was a moralist and he is not disclosing the source but he came to the House and said that the Intelligence Branch gave him wrong information. Now, the responsibility has to be fixed somewhere because Prime Minister has already belittled the intelligence service of this government before the whole country and the whole world Janata Government is really in a sad state. It is really in its विनाश काँन and that is why it has विपरीत बर्त that i why today we find the devil's advocate pleading for the government—starting from the Janata Party talk-tank Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, Shri S. N. Mishra and Samar Babu who I might say lacked conviction that they usually have. They were not with their heart in defending the Prime Minister on this issue.

Before concluding, I wish to say that while we should all pray for the long life of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, the question is that of the Prime Minister. This is not the first time that the Prime Minister is making a wrong statement to this House, or some off-the-cuff remarks. He made off-the-cuff remarks or expressed his personal views on Sikkin. He made some off-the-cuff remarks on Pondicherry due to which some 40 lives were lost. And now comes the most perfidious remark of all. He had advised the English Doctor who is flying here not to operate on JP. Morarji Bhai giving a lecture to the surgeon on what is to be done on JP. I am told, Sir, that this is not the first time that the Prime Minister has given a wrong information. I am told that in 1949 as Home Minister of Bombay, he had telephoned to Dr. Subbarayan, who was the then Home Minister in Madras, and told him: 'Your son Mohan Kumaramangalam

died in police firing in Telengana. So, Sir, this is not the first occasion. This has happened once in 1949. I would not call him to resign, but I place before the country and the nation this situation of a Prime Minister making such kinds of off-the-cuff remarks, who is making this mistake and then taking a holier-than-thou attitude, who is making sermons on the mount. And whether he is acting responsibly is a question that he should answer. In the meeting, heads must roll on this issue. This issue cannot be treated as closed. This issue has belittled the whole country, the whole Government. The people responsible must be found out and punished. With that, Sir I fully support the Adjournment Motion moved by Mr Lakkappa.

MR SPEAKER: Now, before I proceed further, the time fixed is upto 6-30 p.m. Should be extend it?

HON MEMBERS: No no

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister said he would require 15 minutes. We have to give 5 minutes to Mr Lakkappa to reply. (Interruption) What can I do?

SHRI K GOPAL (Karur): You gave our party only five minutes

MR SPEAKER: Whose time I have to take for those shouting and other things? You have taken more than 25 minutes

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It is unfair.

SHRI K GOPAL: We will not cooperate with you. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER: Why don't you bear me? Have I got the right to extend time without the consent of the House? Rules don't permit it.

SHRI K. GOPAL: Why you are cutting our party's time?

MR SPEAKER: Nobody is cutting your party's time

SHRI K. GOPAL: We will not cooperate with you. (Interruptions)

MR SPEAKER: There is no use shouting. Under which rule I can extend time? Show me the rule

SHRI K. GOPAL: You gave us only 5 minutes. Otherwise, We will not cooperate with you

MR. SPEAKER: Once he talks he loses control over himself

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr Speaker, Sir if my hon friends want to abuse me, I have no objection. I cannot object to it. And I do not want to reply to all the epithets which have been used with reference to me by the hon Leader of the Opposition. He is a lawyer, he was practising on criminal side probably I have had experience of more than 200 criminal lawyers when I was a magistrate. Therefore I know who has got that ability. But I have nothing to say about what he has said, because I cannot deny that there was a mistake. Therefore, if they come and castigate me well, that is also a punishment which I must take. Therefore, I do not want to enter into arguments. But whether this was done casually or not has got to be seen and in this matter, an inquiry is being held by the Maharashtra Government and they have not yet finished it. I have received an interim report today and they have suspended their Under Secretary in the Home Department from whom this information proceeded. May I say that I do not want anybody to be punished hastily or in any wrong manner? If there was any deliberate lapse, certainly punishment should be given. But these heads must roll is the demand and that is why there is all this now. Well, I do not want to refer to any personalities. I know they would want me to involve myself in it but I am glad to hear it. I am not going to talk about it. If my hon friend the Leader of the Opposition, says that he has now know me properly, I am glad to hear it. I hope my hon friend, Mr. Saugata Roy will not tell in future that I am a good man. I wish he becomes truthful in future and not remain what he was in the past. That is all I would say because

that is what he has proved to me today I may have committed a mistake No, I must say I committed a mistake But was it out of malice, was it *mala fide* or was it out of any other intention? Even that was attributed to me by the mover of the motion Well I did not expect anything better from him because he does not realise when he speaks what epithets he hurls at people He is very fond of them He said that JP had made three criticisms of me and therefore I did it I have not seen any criticism that JP made of me But even if he had made it and if I had thought of something harsh about him I would not deserve to be called a human being This is my ideal of life Then there may be differences of views There are serious differences of views between me and the Leader of the Opposition but that does not mean that I should wish ill to him Perhaps they reflect their own mind and impute ill will to me I cannot help it I wish I could persuade them to coast out such a feeling from themselves because it hurts them It does not hurt me But as a friend—I consider myself a friend of them even if they do not—I have got to put it before them and that is why I have put it before them on this occasion It is a matter of pain that people should lose themselves in this manner I do not want any hasty action to be taken Therefore the matter is under proper enquiry If the suspension of the officer from whom the information proceeded had not been made perhaps it would have been taken as another blunder What can one do about it? One has therefore to take some action until the whole inquiry is finished But this mistake is a blunder I gave an unqualified apology to the House and to the nation And they say unless I resign there is no other punishment for it (*Interruptions*) My conscience is with me and not with Mr Lakkappa I do not know whether he ever heeds his conscience before he preaches it to me I wish he did that I have deeply examined this matter within myself,

whether I should step down Not that I have not done that I have taken the blame for it, because I was the person who informed you I do not therefore, Sir find fault with you When I inform you you are bound to take it how can you question me. Therefore, it was is very uncharitable to attribute it to you but when people want to go at people and when the gift or oratory is given God help the person concerned It is all that I can say I am very fortunate that I do not have the gift of oratory, otherwise I would have been tempted to enter into competition about this very matter and repay in the same coin but that would be very wrong in my view It is therefore Sir that I must say that I have no desire to dilate upon this matter further Sufficient has been said by my friends here Even the matter which was once said by Dr Subramaniam Swamy was sought to be changed and given a different meaning When he said shortage of blood, he did not mean that there was short age of blood for Jayaprakash Narain If there was shortage of blood for Jayaprakash Narayan it would not be merely a matter for censure for the hospital it would be a matter of censure for the youth of the whole nation that no blood is forthcoming There is any amount of blood forthcoming from everywhere but just as they wanted to make a point he wanted to make a point Well, after all, if they believe in tit for tat, and if he gives them tit for tat what can I do? I do not believe in it That is all I can say I advise him often not to do tit for tat but just as advice is wasted on them and it is wasted on him also What can I do? This shows in what spirit this has been said and in what spirit this debate has taken place When my hon friend brought in this adjournment motion, I did not oppose it But they ought to consider whether there is any sense of proportion in this it is for them to consider

I did consider about their demand that I should resign I came to the

conclusion after deep thought that if I were to accept that demand, I would be committing an even greater and more grievous blunder and, therefore, I am not going to resign.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset, I must make it clear that this adjournment motion was not brought by me in this House, as has been said by some hon. Members with any ulterior motive and to make a political capital out of this. The hon. Members who have opposed this motion have made very eloquent speeches, but all of them have conceded one point that there was a great blunder committed in conveying this wrong information to the House.

I am sorry to say that the various points raised by this side of the House have not been properly explained. We are unable to follow the manner in which this Government and its machinery is functioning. I do not know how far the House and the country at large would feel satisfied with the reply given by the hon. Prime Minister. He has explained how the information was conveyed to him through the Intelligence and other sources and he passed on the same to this House. How far he was responsible for conveying this wrong information to this House, people will judge for themselves. We are sure, the truth will come out, but this is not the way, the Government should treat parliamentary institutions such as this House.

In view of these things it is not that I demand the resignation of this Government just for the sake of it, but I have done so on the basis of past precedents when the Government had committed acts of omission and commission of grave proportions. In those situations, conscience prevailed and they tendered their resignations. It is in that spirit that I made my point. The reply given by the hon. Prime Minister is not only unpalatable, not conducive to parliamentary practices, but it was not expected of a head of Government to make such a speech.

We are not at all politicalising this issue, but we are invoking the seriousness of the situation arising out of such lapses. It is not correct to give wrong information to this House and to treat this Parliament with scant respect. It is a slur. It is against ethics and morals and the Gandhian philosophy which you are advocating.

So, it is quite relevant that we have brought in this adjournment, and you are very right in accepting it. I would say that the points that we raised were not answered properly. I would like to show that the hon. Prime Minister has said things for the consideration of this House and the country at large, on the basis of hear-say evidence. It is said here:

"The Deputy Director of Intelligence in Bombay received the incorrect news about Mr. Jayaprakash Narain's death from the Bombay Police Control Room."

He accepted that. But what is the remedy that he has suggested? Parliament should not become a farce, or a talking shop. We are putting this question seriously before ourselves. Parliament should not be treated in a light manner: It is also said here:

"The Deputy Director sent a correction when he found that the Police Control Room was mis-informed about Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's death."

The Under-Secretary was earlier told by the Chief Minister's Secretary that an aircraft had been kept ready.

Why did the Chief Minister's secretariat, the Prime Minister's secretariat, the Intelligence Bureau, the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, after obituary references were made here, not check the veracity and correctness of the earlier statement, in view of this correction passed on to the Prime Minister's Secretariat by the governmental agencies? This was not done. Even the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting did not do it. The golden

silence of the Home Minister was not explained properly. How are the Home Ministry and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting functioning? Even after half-an-hour, the other channels of the radio were having this mourning sound. How did they have this invisible censorship in broadcasting? Therefore the functioning of half a dozen Ministries and the Secretariat is involved here. So it is a very serious matter that I have brought in. The Press and the public at large have condemned the attitude and the manner in which it was done.

I do not consider that the reply given was completely in consonance with the manner in which the Prime Minister should have replied. All the Members have agreed, whereas the Prime Minister is coming out with a mere analogy. Will it be enough to satisfy the people of this country? I leave it ultimately to the judgement of this House and to the conscience of the people of this country. But such a deliberate action should not be repeated and the culprit should not be allowed to go scot free however big he may be.

In view of this I am not pressing for any division in this matter but at the same time I warn this Government taking this opportunity that such things should not be repeated.

MR SPEAKER Is it the pleasure of the House to permit Shri Lakkappa to withdraw his motion?

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA No withdrawal.

MR SPEAKER I have got to ask for it.

(Interruptions)

AN HON MEMBER. It has been talked out.

MR SPEAKER. No talking-out is allowed.

(Interruptions)

MR SPEAKER Is it the pleasure of the House to permit Shri Lakkappa to withdraw his motion?

SHRI SAUGATA ROY No Sir. It should not be done this way.

(Interruptions)

MR SPEAKER Then I shall put it to vote. The question is:

‘That the House do now adjourn.’

The motion was negatived.

18 29 hrs

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1979-80—Contd.

Ministry of Defence—Contd.

MR SPEAKER The House will now resume discussion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Defence. Mr Yadvendra Dutt.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur) I would like to have more time to speak on this Demand. I request I may be permitted to speak tomorrow.

MR SPEAKER The House now stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11 a.m.

18 30 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday March

27, 1979/Chaitra 6, 1901 (Saka)