

27 hrs.

DISCUSSION ON STATEMENT LAID
ON THE TABLE RE. REPATRIA-
TION OF DR. DHARAM TEJA.

डा० राध भनौहर जी हिंदा (कन्नौज)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे सामने बोडा सा सकट
रहा है कि क्या मैं इस बहस को बापस से लू,
क्योंकि हम लोग—मेरे जैसे भादमी—अभी
कोयले की कोठरी की ब्योड़ी तक पहुँच ही
नहीं पाये हैं, लेकिन फिर भी हमको कोयले
की सक्तीरे लगने लग गई हैं, तो जो लोग
बीम बरस में उत कोठरी में पड़े रहे हैं, उनको
कुछ कालिख लग जाये। इगमें आश्चर्य की
क्या बात है। इसलिए मेरे मन में यह बात
उठाने लगी है कि मैं इन बहम कनेफिंग मूह
से उठाऊँ। लेकिन आज आप मुझे माफ
करें, मैंने हाँ कर दिया है कि मैं अपना पुरानी
कसौटिया—देश, सब ईमान और वचनबद्धता
—पर ही चलूँगा, हालाँकि मैं सोच रहा हूँ कि
या तो मैं उन कसौटिया को छोड़ूँ, या अपने
समूह को छोड़ूँ और या कोई ऐसा रास्ता
निकालूँ, जिसमें दोनों का घुला-मिला कर,
कुछ कसौटी को ढाला करूँ, कुछ समूह को
ढीला करूँ और किसी तरह काम चलाऊँ।

माननीय मंत्री जी न जो नयान आपके
सामने रखा है, उसके वाक्यों से ही यह पता
चल जाता है कि यह मामला कितना गहरा
है। उन्होंने सफाई दी है, एक फर्ज अदा
किया है—और वह फर्ज कैसा है, यह उनके
बयान के सफाहा 3 पर भाग (बो) और (सो)
से प्रकट हो जाता है। ऐसा मालूम होता है
कि जैसे कोई भादमा बेबारा यह तय न कर
पा रहा हो कि “हा” कहूँ या “न” कहूँ, इन
दोनों के बीच में खिंचा जा रहा हो, उसकी
आरम्भ टुकड़ों में टूट रही हो।

(बी) में कहा गया है

“The Directorate of Enforcement
also had received similar papers
between the 7th and 11th May,
1966. On examination, they found
there were no grounds for arrest-

ing Dr. Teja under the Foreign
Exchange Regulations Act on the
material then available.”

अर्थात् डायरेक्ट्रेट आफ एनफोर्समेंट के पास
डा० तेजा को पकड़ने के लिए कोई मामूली
नहीं है।

(सी) में वह कहते हैं

“On the request of the Director
of Enforcement, the Secretary
in the Ministry of Finance (Depart-
ment of Revenue and Insurance)
consulted the Director of the Cen-
tral Bureau of Investigation on
11th May, 1966,

(उसी तारीख को, जबकि डायरेक्ट्रेट
आफ एनफोर्समेंट का वे कागज मिले)

if anything could be done to arrest
Dr. Teja”

बड़ी विचित्र बात है। मंत्री महोदय एक
तरफ तो यह कहते हैं कि डायरेक्ट्रेट आफ
एनफोर्समेंट कहता है कि डा० तेजा को
गिरफ्तार नहीं किया जा सकता है और
दूसरी तरफ वह कहते हैं कि डायरेक्ट्रेट को प्रार्थना
पर सा० बा० आई० से पूछा गया कि क्या
डा० तेजा को गिरफ्तार करने के लिए कुछ
किया जा सकता है। इमने ज्यादा और क्या
सुझाव चाहिए? यह मैं मंत्री महोदय के
बयान से—अपने नहा—बता रहा हूँ।

(डो) से तो मामला बिल्कुल साफ हो
जाता है कि श्री राध मचमूब अपने मन के
खिलाफ कोई काम कर रहे हैं। कहते हैं

“It is not correct that at any
stage the Enforcement Directorate
specifically requested ”

“रिक्वेस्टेड” नहीं, “स्पेसिफिकली रिक्वे-
स्टेड”,

“that Dr. Teja be arrested
and his passport seized.”

[डा० एम मनोहं लोहिया]

मन्त्री महोदय अपने लिए निकलने का रास्ता रखना चाहते हैं। कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने "रिक्वेस्ट" तो किया था, लेकिन "स्पेसिफिकली रिक्वेस्ट" नहीं किया था। यह अद्वैत जुबान, या सभी जुबानों की महिमा है कि अगर आदमी को कोई ऐसी बात कहनी हो जिससे बाड़ा बहुत मन भस्माये, तो इस ढंग से कह दीजिये।

जब यह प्रश्न उठना है कि आखिर यह सारा मामला क्यों आ रहा है ता मुझ भूम-किर कर आप का श्री तेजा की परती रणजीत तजा का बात बतानी पड़ता है। वह लाजवाब अरिस्त है। (अव्यवधान) मैं सुना है कि भारत के एक मृतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री के हिसाब से वह एक लाजवाब अरिस्त है। मैं खुद चाहता हूँ कि जब वह यहाँ आए ता मैं उस देखूँ। रणजीत तजा ने मुझ जा खत लिखा है उसमें उन्होंने बिल्कुल माफ लिखा है—यह खत 14 जून का है।

Let me confirm the meeting between Mr T N Kaul and me in London in September 1966

The Minister of Law (Shri Govinda Menon). Sir, I rise to a point of order. It is exactly this letter to the reading of which I objected on a previous occasion and the objection was upheld. I would submit Sir, that the reading out in the forum of Parliament of private correspondence particularly in a matter like this is objectionable and that was the point which I raised on the previous occasions. The reason is this. The State, i.e., the Government, has started prosecution against Mr and Mrs Teja. Now, they not being available in India extradition proceedings have been started. This extradition is a tricky business. It is a matter which falls under international law. The foreign court should be satisfied not only that there is a *prima facie* case but also that in the country to which extradition is ordered the party will get fair justice, natural justice

The Tejas are ferociously fighting against extradition in the American court and also in India. Recently, as has been made clear in the statement, they wanted to move the High Court. They have moved the High Court—it is pending—to quash the proceedings of extradition etc. In the meanwhile, they are building up a defence not only for the ultimate prosecution in India but also for extradition case which is pending in the American court.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour) It is all according to your plan.

Shri Govinda Menon I submit it is for that purpose that this private correspondence is being resorted to by the Tejas.

श्री बाबू करमचंद (बम्बई-दक्षिण) मन्त्री महोदय डा० लोहिया पर यह आरोप लगा रहे हैं कि वह तेजा का मदद कर रहे हैं। यह आरोप बिल्कुल गलत है।

Shri Govinda Menon I am not making any allegation against the hon. Member (Interruption).

श्री रवी राय (पुरा) और क्या कर रहे हैं।

श्री मधु लाल (मुंगेर) मन्त्री महोदय बताये कि डा० लोहिया किस नियम का उल्लंघन कर रहे हैं।

Mr Speaker I am hearing the Law Minister. Let us hear him.

श्री शशिभूषण बाजपेयी (खारगोन) यह सब कुछ इसा इरादे से किया जा रहा है कि धर्म तेजा और उनकी पत्नी को मदद की जाये।

Mr. Speaker The Law Minister is raising a point of order. Let us hear him, (Interruption).

श्री गजानन बाजपेयी : मंत्री महोदय का पायंट
बैक आर्डर किस नियम के अंतर्गत है ?

श्री शशिभूषण बाजपेयी : क्या हा-
रिडिथा की बकायत के लिए इनकी जफरत
जिना ? वह खुद अपनी बकायत कर
सकते हैं ।

श्री गजानन बाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं
सबसे पहला चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय किस
नियम के अंतर्गत पायंट आर्डर उठा
रहे हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: If so many hon. Mem-
bers are talking at the same time, it
becomes difficult I have allowed the
Law Minister to raise the point of
order. Let us hear him

श्री गजानन बाजपेयी : मैं यह जानना चाहता
हूँ कि किस नियम के अंतर्गत यह आक्षेप
कर रहे हैं ?

Mr. Speaker: I think he is capable
of pointing out the rule also Let us
hear him His objection is that the
letter should not be allowed to be read
out

Shri Govinda Menon: What I was
submitting was there is a pending case
and anything which will prejudice the
proper trial of a pending case is some-
thing which you, Sir, should not allow
to be raised on the floor of this House.
That is the sub judice rule. It be-
comes sub judice this way. It was
read out on the previous occasion also.
An examination will show that this is
an attempt to prejudice the American
court, and the court here later on, ulti-
mately, against the prosecution, build-
ing up the defence. As I said the
other day, Dr. Lohia, who appears to
be very anxious to see that extradition
is expedited, is really, without his
knowing it, becoming an agent in the
hands of the Tejas. Sir, I have
written to you in the morning with

respect to private correspondence of
this kind. In the other House, the
Chairman had occasion to give a
ruling ..

Mr. Speaker: That is a different case.

श्री गजानन बाजपेयी : वह हमारे ऊपर
बधनकारक नहीं है ।

Shri Govinda Menon: I do not say
that it is binding on this House. But
the reasoning there is binding on us
because after all, it was done in an-
other chamber of Parliament in Delhi.
Sir, I submit that you should void
references being made to anything
which will affect the trial of this case.
After all, the discussion sought for
under rule 193 is on the statement
made by the Minister of Shipping on
the previous occasion. Any reference
to anything outside that, parti-
cularly to private correspondence
between the accused party and any
member of this House is something
which should be avoided. That is the
point of order? ... (Interruptions)

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Under similar
circumstances, Shri Bimal Kanti
Ghosh's case, when it was sub judice,
when two cases were pending in a law
court in Bengal, allegations were made
by the Home Minister and things were
said here which should not have been
said, and, Sir, you allowed them So,
what right has he got now to raise this
point of order . (Interruptions)

श्री शशिभूषण बाजपेयी : वह धानरेबल
मेम्बर थे इस हाउस के । यह तो गैरकानून है

Mr. Speaker: I would request hon.
Members to address me If they ad-
dress among themselves, I will become
a helpless spectator

श्री शशिभूषण बाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय
मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हम देश का
मुक्तिजन हैं जो हम देश को खोना बेकर बर्बर
बला गया जिसके पीछे हिन्दुस्तान की मुक्ति
लगी हुई है उस मुक्तिजन की यहाँ बकायत
नहीं करना ही चाहती । ये उनकी बकायत
वहाँ नहीं कर सकते ।

Mr. Speaker: On the point raised by the Law Minister have you anything to say before I give my opinion about it?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक तो आप इसका ध्यान रखेंगा कि काफी समय ऐसे व्यवस्था इत्यादि के मामलों में खर्च होगा, इसलिए बहुत के लिए काफी समय आप को रखना पड़ेगा।

अब जो मंत्री महोदय ने पहले बयान दिया था उसका संछे 8 आप निकालिये, जो मंत्री महोदय राव साहब ने पिछला बार बयान दिया था। संछे 8 में लिखा हुआ है :

"Shri T. N. Kaul did not meet Mr. or Mrs. Teja in London in September, 1966 and had no occasion to give them any advice."

यह मंत्री महोदय कह रहे हैं। उसी सम्बन्ध में मैं बोल रहा था। तो मंत्री महोदय अपने बयान में जो बात कह सकते हैं वह तो बिना कुन स्पष्ट है कि उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं बात कह ही सकता हूँ। इसलिए यह तो बिल्कुल ही अपनी जगह पर ठीक है।

इसके अलावा मैं कुछ और बात कहना चाहता हूँ। हर बार स्वाधीनता, विचाराधीनता की बात कह दी जाती है। जो मामला इस समय विचाराधीन है वह केवल यह है कि क्या श्री तेजा और उनकी पत्नी ने देश को और जयश्री सिपिंग कम्पनी को कई तरह के छोटे दिये हैं, जाली दस्तावेज करके, कमीशन का दया मार कर के, कम्पनी की तरफ से जहाज खरीद कर के, और उसके ऊपर अपना कना, कन्टेनर के ऊपर दया बना कर के, इस तरह जो अदालत के सामने प्रश्न है चाहे अमेरिकी चाहे भारतीय वह तेजा जी और उनकी पत्नी की बोझिली जामसाजी वाली दस्तावेज इत्यादि का मामला है। केवल इतना ही मामला है। यह इन्फिलिज

विचाराधीन नहीं है कि तेजा और उनकी पत्नी का इस सरकार के मंत्रियों और इस सरकार की नौकरशाही से क्या क्या सम्बन्ध रहे हैं और उस संबंध को अगर यहाँ पर बंद कर दिया जाता है तो मुझे इस बात का डर है कि जिस तरह से यह मामला पिछले कई सालों से दबता और छिंता चला आया है उसी तरह से आगे भी दबता और छिंता चला जायगा। यह मामला बिल्कुल विचाराधीन नहीं है कि श्री तेजा का श्री चोराखी प्रवाण प्रवान मंत्री प्रवाण श्री राव प्रवाण श्री कौल से कोई संबंध थे या नहीं, मने या नहीं, सलाह उन्होंने क्या दी या नहीं दो और अमेरिका की अदालत किन किन बातों पर हंगरी वह तो बहुत भी बात आगे आ जायगी जो कि सबकुछ आपके लिये बहुत सोचने लायक है कि इस सरकार को आप अभी से दुस्त कर दें वरना यह मामला अमेरिका में हमारा हंसा उड़ाने वाला हो जायगा। अब रह जाता है सवाल इनका कि ये लोग दोषी हैं। ठीक है, यह दोषी है। और मेरा भी विभाग इसी तरफ जाता है कि इन्होंने दोष किये हैं। लेकिन मेरे विभाग में एक और अंश है कि इनके दोष के साथ साथ और भी दोषी हैं, इनके साथीदार हैं। जैसे इन्होंने अपने देश को और कम्पनी को लूटा है जालसाजी करके, उस दोष में इस सरकार के लोगों ने भी, मंत्रियों ने और नौकरशाही ने हिस्सा लिया है। तो इस संदर्भ के नामने की बात आ रही है वह यह नहीं है कि धर्म तेजा दोषी हैं या नहीं। उससे मुझे कोई क्या मतलब है? हुआ है। बल्कि मुझे मतलब इस बात से है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि एक दोषी को तो पकड़ लें और दूसरा दोषी हाथ छुड़ाकर भाग जाय। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब पकड़े जायें तो दोनों दोषी पकड़े जायें और हर हालत में साथ का यह पहला सिद्धांत है कि जब कहीं कोई दोषी हो तो उसकी बात सुनो। जो दोषी पर लटकाया जाने वाला है उसका भी बात सुनो। यह तो फाँसी बाने मौक़े

नहीं हैं। वह मामले तो कुछ ग़ौर है। इसलिए जो भाषन उठाये गये हैं वह कहीं किसी अवसर पर सामने हैं नहीं। वह केवल सचु के सामने हैं। वह भारत सरकार के राजकोष, भाषिक और व्यापार जीवन से सम्बन्ध रखता है। उस सम्बन्ध में क्या क्या बातें हुई हैं पिछले दस साल में और आप मुझ का मौका दें तो बहुत ही दस्तावेज किताब सामने लाया जायगा। इसलिए मैं चाहूँगा कि आप इस बहस को बिना किसी पूर्वज्ञान के चलने दें।

Mr. Speaker: The point is clear. There is nothing much for me to say. If some points are raised in the Minister's statement, if there is proof to contradict them, naturally they will have to make mention of it. About the letters I do not know what the letters contain and how they affect the court and all that. Therefore I am not able to say in advance whether they refer to matters that are *sub judice*.

I would suggest to Dr. Lohia that he may, if he wants to contradict any statement, do that. About the letters, I would suggest let the letters be handed over to me. The rule is that before they are placed on the Table of the House, they are handed over to the Speaker so that the Speaker could study them and the Minister could satisfy the Speaker that they pertain to the case. Therefore I suggest that these letters need not be read. He can make a speech or make points pertaining to this. Let the letters be handed over to me and I will see whether they actually belong to the case or not. I cannot say off-hand what the letters are, what the contents of the letters are, and all that. I will consult the Law Minister also and Dr. Lohia could also help me. If permissible, naturally I will have no objection to permitting them to be laid on the Table of the House.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kandamara): Will he quote any portions of the letters?

Mr. Speaker: Not now.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What you suggest is that if he wants to place them on the Table of the House, then, of course, hand them over to you and you, Sir, will study and decide whether it is a valid document to be accepted by you or not. But for the purpose of this discussion, he wants to quote some portions of the letters which may not be a *sub judice* matter.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever Dr. Rao has said in his statement are the facts, it is not about the case or anything of that sort. Without touching the case, if he can point out something, he can do so. But the actual correspondence should be given to the Speaker so that he can satisfy himself. I will consult the Law Minister also and then decide which are to be placed and which are not to be placed on the Table of the House. If there is anything pertaining to the statement of Dr. Rao, if there is anything to contradict, he can certainly do it.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham (Visaknapatnam): You were pleased to say that you will consult the Law Minister also. In this connection, I suggest that the Chair should have its own independent parliamentary counsel.

Mr. Speaker: I will consult Dr. Lohia and also the Law Minister. After all, the Law Minister belongs to all of us.

Shri Govinda Menon: Sir, I want to make one or two points here. Dr. Lohia was saying that not only the Tejas but others also are to be co-accused in this matter. I respectfully submit to you whether on the forum of Parliament we are going to debate the question whether all the accused in the matter have been challenged and whether others have to be challenged?

With respect to the other matter also, whether he met somebody, etc., I respectfully submit that this is a parliamentary debate and there is a prospect

[Shri Govinda Menon]

tion pending, certain persons are arraigned as accused parties in the prosecution, and to say on the forum of Parliament that these two 'A' and 'B' alone should not be prosecuted and that others also should come in something which is not to be raised here. That will be *sub judice* and that will be attacking the *bona fides* of the prosecution. If the statement is made by the Minister and the statement is whether some officer met or did not meet Mrs. Teja in London, or not, are we going to take evidence in the matter here? We are here concerned with the statement made by the Shipping Minister and the point raised by Dr. Lohia as to whether the extradition proceedings are being proceeded with all vigilance, I submit, would be *sub judice* and may amount to what is contemplated by way of defence in the criminal case. You know, in criminal cases, all sorts of things will be helpful to the defence. If it is sought to be made out that the prosecution has not been fair to the Tejas, etc., that is something which will affect the course of the prosecution both in America and here.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to understand this from the Law Minister. A statement has been made here by the hon. Minister and I am sure that the hon. Minister has not said anything here which will prejudice the case because he knows the details of the case, what is happening in America and what is happening in India. If somebody is to say that a point made in the statement, and not about the case, is not correct, should he not be allowed to say that? If somebody says that what is contained in the Minister's statement is not correct, as he was pointing out about the request of the Enforcement Directorate and about something else also, should he not mention at least that much, apart from the other things? I will allow him only to that extent. We are discussing the statement of the Minister and if somebody points out to the Minister

that what is stated there is not hundred per cent correct, to that extent at least, should we not allow it? Because none of us know what is happening in America, at what stage the case is, what are the charges, etc. About the letters, I have said that they may be given to the Speaker.

Now I would request Dr. Lohia to proceed cautiously.

Shri Govinda Menon: The Minister has made a statement, but contradiction is that respect is not to be made by private....

श्री मधु लिमये : अरे फिर खड़े हो गये ? बैठ जाइये, बहुत हद हो गई ।

Shri Govinda Menon:is not to be made by private correspondence between one of the accused parties and a Member, however exalted he may be. There should not be any contradiction by a private letter from one of the affected parties. That is my submission. (Interruptions).

श्री शशि भूषण बाजपेयी : जो पत्र आप के सामने रखवा जा रहा है वह मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूं और यह पिछली बार भी मैंने इस सदन में कहा था कि वहां मिसिज़ धर्मतेजा के दस्तखत नहीं हैं और जब तक आप वैरिफ़ाई न कर लें तब तक उस को आथैटिक मानने का कोई हक़ नहीं है.... (व्यवधान)

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): On a point of order. This is something very important. I should be allowed to raise it.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह काहे पर बोल रहे मुझे सख्त एतराज़ है । मैं इस तरह से उन्हें बीच में बोलने नहीं दूंगा ।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : अरे भाई परेशान क्यों हो गये ? अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा प्वाण्ट आफ़ आर्डर है ।

Mr. Speaker: All right. Just one minute.

Shri Randhir Singh: I will take at least three or four minutes. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. No, no.

Shri Randhir Singh: I have a right, Sir. My right should be protected. (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लमये : मेरा प्वाण्ट और आर्डर है . . .

Mr. Speaker: All the hon. members may please sit down.

Wherever there is a doubt, I am myself requesting the Law Minister to clarify that. Why should members get agitated on that? (Interruptions). It is not as though I presume that I know everything; I am trying to learn from the Law Minister on behalf of the Congress Party, on behalf of the Government, and on behalf of the House. The Law Minister is there and I am myself requesting him to clarify. I have pointed out to him this thing and have asked him as to what should I do if this happens; here is the statement and if that statement is contradicted somewhere, what am I to do and all that. I am trying to learn. I do not understand why the members are getting agitated. If they do not want a discussion on this, that is a different matter. The ruling Party has the majority and they can defeat it and all that. So, may I request all the members to be orderly? My difficulty is that the more they raise these things, the more it is getting delayed. They should know that by all these things they are not helping the debate. After all, the Congress Party has also got some speakers here and I will certainly allow one or two of them to speak.

Shri Randhir Singh: Let me say this . . .

Mr. Speaker: I am on my legs. His name is also here.

Shri Randhir Singh: Allow, be to speak, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Randhir Singh's name is also there in the list. I shall call him afterwards and he can also speak. He can certainly make whatever legal points he wants to make as a senior lawyer. I have no objection to calling him because his name is also there.

Now, may I seek the co-operation of all to permit me to proceed with the debate. Let not hon. Members talk across the tables because that is not going to help them.

Shri Randhir Singh may get ready with points and be prepared to speak on them when I call him.

श्री रणधीर सिंह : मैं तो आपका टाईम बचा रहा हूं, और कोई बात नहीं है ।

The Deputy Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): He is unnecessarily wasting the time of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Dr. Ram Monohar Lohia. I hope he will remember that the letters need not be read out but they may be handed over to me.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने अपने ब्यान में जो कहा था उस सम्बन्ध में अगर कोई उद्धरण उचित होता है और आप मुझे उस को सुनाने देते हैं तो मैं सुनाये देता हूं, वरना मैं अपनी तरफ से कहे देता हूं। वह तो एक ही बात है। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि श्री त्रिलोकी कौल श्री या श्रीमती दोनों तेजाओं से लन्दन में सितम्बर, 1966 में मिले नहीं और उन्हें किसी तरह की सलाह नहीं दी। इस सम्बन्ध में श्रीमती तेजा का कहना है कि :

Let me confirm the meeting between Mr. T. N. Kaul and me in London in early September, 1966 during which he had advised us to stay out of India....

Shri M. Y. Saleem (Nalgonda): What is the use of having raised the point of order earlier? The hon. Minister had also raised a point of order....

Mr. Speaker: I have asked him to read wherever it is relevant to the point made by the hon. Minister. I have not permitted him to read the whole of it. He will read out only that portion which is relevant to the point dealt with in the hon. Minister's statement.

Shri M. Y. Saleem: But he is reading out from the letter again....

Mr. Speaker: Probably the hon. Member did not hear me earlier. The hon. Law Minister had raised the point earlier. I had said that the hon. Member could point out only those things which pertained to the points made in the statement and should not read out the whole correspondence. If the hon. Member wants to contradict what has been stated by the hon. Minister in his statement, certainly he can contradict it. Now, will the hon. Member kindly resume his seat? I have heard the Law Minister and I have said that the letters ought not to be placed on the Table but wherever the statement contains anything, the hon. Member has also a right to reply to it and say that such and such a point is not correct, and only pertaining to that point, he can refer to the letter....

Shri N. K. P. Salve (Betul): He is reading out from the letter.

श्री एन. के. पी. सल्वे : मैं भी व्यवस्था के प्रश्न पर बोलना चाहता हूँ।

Shri N. K. P. Salve: On a point of order. You had already given a ruling that the letter sought to be refer-

red to should not be referred to. Are you going back upon that ruling? If you are not going back upon that ruling, then he cannot read out from the letter as he is doing now.

Mr. Speaker: Let him sit down now.

श्री एन. के. पी. सल्वे : अध्यक्ष महोदय आप समझ सकते हैं कि मैं व्यवस्था के प्रश्न पर ही बोल रहा हूँ जिस में कोई मुझे टोके नहीं। तो यह बिल्कुल सफा कहना है कि चुनाव तक वह हिन्दुस्तान में न आये। और इस के साथ साथ यह भी कहा है कि :

"I do not see any earthly reason why he would deny seeing me since there was a witness to the meeting."

अब विटनेस भी है। क्योंकि मैं ने पहले ही पूछ लिया था यहाँ लोग कहेंगे कि ऐसी कोई कार्रवाई हुई नहीं, इस लिये अब खुद वह बतला रहे हैं कि और भी कोई आदमी था, उस के सामने उन्होंने यह सलाह दी थी कि जब तक चुनाव खत्म न हो जाये तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में वापस न आओ। मंत्री महोदय का कहना है कि श्री कौल ने ऐसी कोई सलाह नहीं दी थी। लेकिन यह बहुत ही महत्व का सवाल हो जाता है कि चुनाव तक क्यों न इन दोनों को आने दिया जाये, अगर यह बात सही है। अगर यह बात गलत है और तेजा लोग इस बात को कह रहे हैं अपने आप को बचाने के लिये तो कोई सवाल रह ही नहीं जाता है। लेकिन अगर यह बात सही है कि सरकार की तरफ से उन को हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर रखा गया चुनाव तक, और अगर मैं सरकार के अपने व्यक्तियों, कामों और त.पि.कों से र.सि. कर पूं आप के सामने कि बिल्कुल यह बात सही है, तब तो आप जानेंगे कि यह मामला बड़ा ही गहरा है, क्योंकि आप देखेंगे कि खुद मंत्री महोदय ने अपने बयान में बताया है

अब मैं मंत्री महोदय का बयान पढ़ रहा हूँ।
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं किसी का खत नहीं पढ़
रहा हूँ। मंत्री माने राय साहब :

"After all the requisite materials
had been collected in this matter,
the Central Bureau of Investigation
filed a charge-sheet"—

Mind you, when?—

"on the 28th February 1967 in
the Court of the Sub-Divisional
Magistrate New Delhi ."

यह पाचवें सफे का आखिरी पंरा है।

का चलाक : खम हुए, अध्यक्ष
महोदय ?

श्री मधु लिखये सब मतदान 21
फरवरी को खत्म हुआ था।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सब
वोटिंग 21 फरवरी को खत्म हुई थी।
तो उन को सागे मामले की तहकीकात करने
में, सारी सामग्री इकट्ठी करने में उतने ही
दिन लगे जितने चुनाव खत्म करने में लगन
जरूरी थे, और जैसे ही चुनाव खत्म हुए
उस के चार, छ., सात दिनों के अन्दर वह
मामला उन्होंने अदालत में रखा। इस
सम्बन्ध में एक बड़ी विचित्र बात और
आती है कि एक तरफ सरकार का एक
अंग इन तेजा लोगों से कहता है कि तुम
अपनी मर्जी से हिन्दुस्तान में चले आओ
और दूसरा अंग कहता है कि नहीं, हम
तुम को अपनी इच्छा से वापस नहीं आने
देंगे। तुम को हम जबर्दस्ती लायेंगे। यह भी
एक बड़ी विचित्र चीज इस में हुई है क्योंकि
एक खत माननीय उपप्रधान मंत्री जी का
था या तेजा साहब के पास जिस में उन्होंने
कहा था यह भी मोरारजी देसाई का खत
है, इसमें वे दो पक्षों में कोई झगड़ा नहीं।
सब 24, 1967 की बात है;

"You have asked whether we do
not have faith in the US courts of
justice. If the cause of action has
arisen in India, there is no ques-
tion of seeking remedies in other
countries. You should have no ap-
prehension about the judiciary in
India. It would be much better if
you come to India voluntarily and
assist in the completion of the in-
quiries."

यह 24 अप्रैल, 1967 का खत है।
इसी के साथ अंत में आप को सरकार का हो
एक खत, उनका नहीं, सरकार का एक खत
पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ जो कि एक ज्वायंट मंत्रियों,
मिनिस्ट्री आफ ट्रांसपोर्ट एंड शिपिंग ने लिखा
है। वह 22-5-67 का इतना है 24
अप्रैल, 1967 का।

"I am to acknowledge the receipt
of your letter dated 24th May,
1967, addressed to Prof. V. K. R.
V. Rao, Minister of Transport and
Shipping.. and to say that since
the Government of India have in-
stituted extradition proceedings
against Dr. and Mrs. Teja, the
question of your being allowed to
voluntarily return to India now
does not arise".

भालूम होता है कि दो सरकारें हैं। एक तो
प्रधान मंत्री की और दूसरी उपप्रधान मंत्री
की। उपप्रधान मंत्री चाहते थे कि
वह अपनी इच्छा से यहां चले आये ताकि सारे
मामले को तहकीकात हो जाये और जो कुछ
भी कार्रवाई करनी हो यहां कर लो जाय।
इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक बात और कहनी है
कि शुरू में जे मामला तेजा के खिलाफ किया
गया था वह हिन्दुस्तान में फौजदारी कार्रवाई
का था।

Mr. Speaker: Use the English word
also in such cases.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं चाहता
हूँ कि जहां तक हो सके सुनिश्चित रखी जाये,

मार्गों की सुविधा एक धक्का थोड़ा जरूर होती है क्योंकि इनसे माचड़ कुछ मन की सुविधा भी आ पाये।

तो वह कौजदारों का मामला हो रहा था, और कौजदारी के साथ साथ एक सिविल मामला भी चल रहा था। वह मामला ऐसा नहीं था कि अदालत की अदालत में पहले नहीं चल रहा था। पहले से कहा चल रहा था, लेकिन फिर श्री श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने कहा कि वह मामले जो उन्होंने अमेरिका में बना रखे थे उनको वे छोड़ छाड़ दें, यहाँ चले आये और सब देख दाखल। और उस बात का अंतर पड़ता है तेजा लोगों के ऊपर। आखिर यह तो किया होगा कि सब चीज मोख विचार कर के अपना फैसला किया होगा। फिर जब उस बात का अंतर पड़ता है तब इस सरकार के दूसरे अंग का बात बला जाना है कि नहीं हम तुम्हें अपनी मर्जी में महा धाने देंगे, तुम्हें हम जबर्जस्ती लेकर आयेगे। अब आप ही बतलाइये कि जब अमेरिका का अदालत के मामले यह दोनो बात जाँचें तब इससे तलोजे क्या निकलेगे? वास्तव में मामला बड़ा खतरनाक है। खतरनाक यह है—अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे सोका बीजिये कि मैं अपना तरफ में एक बात आप को बतला दूँ।

".... the fifth largest non-public sector company in India, with the expectation that the company's books would reveal transactions involving Mrs Indira Gandhi."

Mr. Speaker: That has nothing to do with this.

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया यह बहुत ऊँची है। अब मैं अपना तरफ में बतला रहा हूँ।

Shri Govinda Menon: On a point of order. Your ruling was that with respect to specific allegations or statements in the Shipping Minister's statement, if a contradiction is required

and is contained in the letter, that sentence may be referred to.

Mr. Speaker: Please do not read.

Shri Govinda Menon: I wonder to what matter this is a contradiction. Let it not go on record.

Mr. Speaker: Please conclude.

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया मैं खन बगैर कुछ नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ। मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा कर अपनी राय दे रहा हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: Even then I gave you 15 minutes. There are so many of them to speak

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया बहुत समय इन लोगों ने व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा कर ले लिया। अध्यक्ष महोदय, बर्त जगह उन्होंने अपने बयान में जो लिखा है वह बतला रहा हूँ।

Mr Speaker: Please do not

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया
"Details of persons entertained by Dr Teja during his stay are not available with the Government, but it is certain that no officials of this ministry were entertained by Dr Teja."

यह मांगे उनसे अपने बयान है। और यहाँ भी है कि

"We are not aware that any warrants for the arrest of Dr Teja was issued on ."

बहुत जो तरफ का होता है एक लिखने लिखान का। जब वह लिख रहे हैं बार बार, और सरकार का, नीकरग्राहों का अथवा अन्वितों का दोना नेताओं का तरफ में कोई भी अधिनन्दन स्वागत समारोह नहीं हुआ, तब मुझे हक मिन जाना है आपके हो कर्मों के मुताबिक कि मैं इस को पढ़ कर सुनाऊँ। लेकिन मैं पढ़ भी नहीं रहा हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ आप को अपनी राय बतला रहा हूँ।

"Triloki Kaul certainly was apprehensive that such transactions if they existed and could be verified would injure Mrs. Gandhi's chances in the general elections. On the other hand, if the company were taken over with Dr. Nagendra Singh and C. P. Srivastava in command, all such evidence could be suppressed."

Mr. Speaker: This is what one party, the accused party says.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नहीं, यह मैं कह रहा हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तर्क कर रहे हैं।

Shri Govinda Menon: In continuation of my point of order, this is exactly what I said, that none of these things should go on record.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह तर्क के आधार पर कह रहे हैं। आप तर्क को काटिये।

Shri Govinda Menon: Don't raise your voice like that.

Mr. Speaker: The point is these points which they are saying are said on the floor of the House, it is their case.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपना राय दे रहा हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: This point is raised by them in a case in America or somewhere. By our supporting that, we will be strengthening their case. Therefore, may I request you to slip over that. You have read out the Deputy Prime Minister's letter. Nobody can take objection. You have read out our Government's letter. There also there can be no objection, because they are Government documents. You should not strengthen the point of view ex-

pressed by them, by the other party. Please conclude now.

Shri Govinda Menon: The Tejas are building up a case.

Mr. Speaker: I have objected to it.

Shri Govinda Menon: It should not go on record.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अगर आप समझते हैं कि मैं खत में से पढ़ रहा हूँ, तो मैं अब खत में से नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ। आप समझिये कि मैंने अपना भाषण तैयार किया है और भाषण के कुछ अंशों को मैंने लिख लिया है।

As a matter of fact Triloki Kaul has said that instructions had been sent to change the officers and destroy anything relating to the Prime Minister. He is certain about one person who knew of any dealings between the Tejas . . . (Interruptions).

Shri Muthyal Rao (Nagarkurnool): Sir, he is continuing to read from their defence, from that letter.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह कैसे मालूम हुआ है वह अपनी जिम्मेदारी पर कह रहे हैं।

Mr. Speaker: He says that it is his own speech and not any letter. Dr. Lohia should conclude now.

Shri M. Y. Saleem: It tantamounts to bypassing your ruling.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह बात साफ हो गई। मामला साफ है। मैं यह फाईल आप के पास भेज रहा हूँ ताकि अच्छी तरह से पढ़ें जायें।

Shri Muthyal Rao: He makes his speeches only in Hindi. It is not his speech.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : खैर कहने के लिये तो मेरे पास बहुत है लेकिन मैं खुद भी एक दबा हुआ आदमी हूँ। कहने को तो इतना था कि बीस वर्ष बाद अगर सारे मामलों

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

का निचोड़ निकाला जाय तो एक लाजवाब निचोड़ निकलेगा, इसमें कोई शक नहीं। चास तीर से जो यह तेजा वाला मामला है इसमें मैं आप से भविष्यवाणी किये देता हूँ कि हो सकता है कि मुझे इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा हो इसलिए कि तेजा अपने मामले को दुनिया के सामने अच्छी शकल में रख पाये। लेकिन मैं भी कोई इतना बच नहीं हूँ। मैं भी जानता हूँ कि अगर मुझ को किसी तरह से इन तेजा लोगो के पिछने बीस वर्षों के कुकर्मों, पापों और देश की शूट को साबित करने का मौका मिल जायगा, तो मैं जरूर उसका इस्तेमाल करूंगा। मैं चाहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान के नौकरशाह और हिन्दुस्तान के मन्त्री मेरा वाक्य सुन ले, क्योंकि विधि मन्त्री ने कहा था कि वह उनको अदालत में ले जाना चाहते हैं, तो अदालत में मामले को ले जाने का फायदा नहीं। आप जानते हैं कि अदालत के कटघरे में मन्त्रियों को नहीं खड़ा किया जा सकता। जहाँ तक मन्त्री लोगो का मामला है यह दोषी नहीं कहे जा सकते हैं। जहाँ तक विधि मन्त्री, प्रधान मन्त्री और दूसरे मन्त्रियों का मामला है, यह तो जब सरकार बदलेगी, और वह सरकार भी मामूली नहीं, कोई शक्तिशाली सरकार होगी, तब इन लोगो को अदालत के कटघरे में जाकर खड़ा करेगा, तब जाकर (व्यवधान)

आरम्भवार सिंह (रोहतक) अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह डा० तेजा इतना बदनाम आदमी है कि इस हाउस जैसे मानदार फोरम में अगर उसके बाबत डिस्कशन हो तो यह इस हाउस की तोहान है, और यह डिस्कशन भी ऐसा आदमी लाता है, ऐसा लाडल लाता है, जिसको मैं इज्जत करता हूँ। यह डा० लोहिया भी तोहान है कि तेजा का नाम उनके मुँह पर आता है।

मैं एक चीज पहले कहना चाहता हूँ कि अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका एहतियार करता हूँ, जब भी आप कहते हैं, मैं बैठ जाता हूँ, और

मुझे डर है अपने बिट्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर का, अपने विधु का और अपने लीडरों का। मेरी आवाज कई दफे पार्टी डिप्लिन्ड में बज जाती है, मैं उठ नहीं पाता। लेकिन जो बात मेरी ममता में नहीं आती, वह यह है कि डा० तेजा अपने लिये इस हाउस के धूँ एडिटेड क्रिएट कर रहे हैं। यह एक फेक्ट है जिसका कोई जवाब मेरे दोस्त के पास नहीं है।

वह आदमी जब ट्रिब्यूनल के सामने आया, जब यहाँ आया या दूसरी जगह आया तो उसकी बड़ी अकड़ होगी, वह एक बात कहेगा कि मैं तो एन जर्बरी आदमी हूँ। मेरा मामला एक मेम्बर की मार्फत पार्लियामेंट में उठ चुका है, उसका जिक्र हो चुका है। डा० लोहिया एक अच्छे आदमी हैं, भली बात भी करते हैं। लेकिन उनको मालूम होना चाहिये कि उनको डिफेंस विटनेस नम्बर एक पेश करेगा और डा० लोहिया स्वाम स्वाम पेश हो कर इस हाउस की भी एक तरह से बद-हुरमती करेंगे। यह मामला सबजुडिस है। इसकी हाउस के सामने पेश नहीं किया जाना चाहिए था। ऐसी बात नहीं है कि यह जबानी जमा खर्च की बात हो। लेकिन 352 दफा में बिल्कुल साफ इसके बारे में लिखा हुआ है कि कोई भी मामला, 35 (2) में जो मामला रीटिंग है और उस मामले में फस्ट इनफार्मेशन रिपोर्ट लाच हो चुकी है और उसमें जिस किसी आदमी का नाम लिखा हुआ है तो वह मुल्जिम की फेहरिस्त में आ जाता है और उसके बाद वह आदमी कोई बात करता है तो बतौर पेशबन्दी के करता है। इस चीज को ट्रिब्यूनल बैचिज की तरफ से आपके नोटिस में लाया जा चुका है और 1956 की इसके बारे में सुप्रीम कोर्ट की रूलिंग भी है और यही नहीं बल्कि मुल्तलिफ हार्ड काउंस की भी रूलिंग है, हरियाणा हार्ड कोर्ट की है, दिल्ली हार्ड कोर्ट की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सब मसाला डिफेंस के लिए तैयार हो रहा है।

मैं आपके नोटिस में यह लाना चाहता हूँ कि इस मामले को सदन के सामने अगर डा० लोहिया न लाते तो बड़ा अच्छा था। लेकिन चूंकि अब वह इस चीज को ले आये हैं और हाउस के बक्कार को भी धक्का लगा है तो मैं अब कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी डाकुमेंट या कोई भी रिकार्ड हाउस की टेबल पर किसी मेम्बर की मार्फत न रखने दिया जाये और न ही एक्ज्यूज्ड के बैनीफिट के लिए उसको इस्तेमाल करने की इजाजत दी जाए। इसके बारे में रूल है लेकिन मुझे उसका पता नहीं है।। कोई भी यहां की स्पीच या रिकार्ड या टेबल पर रखा गया कागज ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए जिसका मिस्यूज हो और कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि कां रिजॉलिंग, या का जो डिक्लेशन है वह जो ज्यूडिशल आफिसर है, जो प्रिजाडिंग आफिसर है, उसको इनप्लुएंस न कर सके ताकि वह प्रिजाडिंग आफिसर अफफर्ड अपना माइंड उसमें दे सके।

Mr. Speaker: Now, there are a number of Members who want to speak. At least a dozen of them are there. I wonder how we shall proceed now. If there is no objection, I can give chance to one or two, and then request the Minister to reply.

Shri Govinda Menon: I would like to say a few words about the merits of the matter.

श्री मधु लिमये: अब जो पांच पांच मिनिट दीजिये।

Mr. Speaker: I have got names of 12 Members with me. Even if I give five minutes to each of them, it would take an hour more. I wonder if the House is prepared to sit till 8. P.M. The main case has been made out by Dr. Lohia. I can understand that one or two Members may be permitted to speak. Naturally, we would like to hear the Government also. Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I will not take much time as

this matter has been discussed in this House many times before. About the sincerity of the Government, I very much doubt, because from the facts that we have before us, I doubt very much whether they are sincere in bringing Dr. Teja to book. The statement itself says.—I may read out only a portion of it—

"It is in the above circumstances that neither the Central Bureau of Investigation nor the Directorate of Enforcement could prevent the departure of Dr. Teja either on may 10 or on June 3, 1966".

He has described—the Minister—in his statement; how, although there are materials available with the Government in different departments, there was no sufficient evidence before them to arrest him. That is all what he says. He says that the material was not sufficient to start a criminal case; that means there was sufficient incriminatory material about the activities of Dr. Teja. The question is, one cannot say that till June 3, they had nothing in their possession and they allowed that person to leave this country. He tells us in the statement that an ordinance was issued on the 10th June to take over the management of the company. But I would like to know whether it is not a fact; on the 6th June, the Government passed orders to take over the company; on the 10th June, a notification was issued; it was taken over. On the 6th June, the order was passed. Then, necessarily, they had sufficient material before them—it may not be sufficient to start a criminal case—but to prevent this man either under the Preventive Detention Act or the Defence of India Rules; under these measures, they should have prevented this person from leaving this country. That has not been done, fully well knowing that he has come here, met officials and discussed with them. There is no denying the fact that when he was in the Inter-continental Hotel in May and June, he had contacted not only officers, but emissaries of some ministers also. A

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

minister had run with his file to him. During the days he was staying here, is it not a fact that a Minister of State went to the Home Minister, appealing to him that nothing should be done and somehow or other this man should leave the country? This is a fact which has to be denied or Government should come forward with a statement saying that it is not true.

Secondly, I would like to know whether there was some officer in the Prime Minister's Secretariat—I mean the late Prime Minister—Jawaharlal Nehru—who was appointed by this company on a fabulous salary and after this company was taken over, that person today happens to be P.A. or Confidential Secretary or is attached to some Cabinet Minister or not. If they say that there is no connection, I would like the minister to deny that there was a person in the Prime Minister's secretariat who was appointed by Dr. Teja in the Jayanti Shipping Company and after the company was taken over, he has left the company and is now employed with a Cabinet Minister.

Shri Madhu Limaye rose—

Mr. Speaker: Your leader has just spoken. If at all, I have to call somebody from some other party.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप तो जानते हैं कि कितनी मेहनत करके पचासों का इजाजत मंजे रखे हैं। मैं नहीं बोलूंगा इस मामले में तो कौन बोलिगा ?

Shri Govinda Menon: On the facts of the case, the Shipping Minister will speak. I would like to say something regarding one or two points of law. The subject-matter of the discussion is whether genuine interest exists on the part of the Government or not in the matter of extradition of Dr. Dharma Teja. Extradition itself is a very difficult matter. It is a matter of inter-

national law and the foreign court should be satisfied that the parties will get a fair trial on being extradited to India. I am sure every section of the House, including Dr. Lohia, is anxious to see that the extradition proceedings are completed and the parties are brought to India for standing their trial. If extradition is difficult, it has been rendered more difficult by this debate on the floor of this House. (Interruptions). Derisive laughter will not detract from the importance of the points I am raising. It is for that reason that from time to time, even to the point of annoying you—but I tried to avoid it—I wanted to raise those points of order. The statement made by Dr. Lohia is likely to create an impression that there is lack of bona fide on the part of Government and it may create difficulties.

18 hrs.

The second matter is regarding Dr. Teja and Mrs. Teja voluntarily coming to India. It has been directed that their passport should be impounded and it has been impounded. Thereafter, he has been writing letters to various ministers here and others, stating therein, "I am willing to come back voluntarily." It is in reply one or other of those letters that the Deputy Prime Minister would have written to him. If a man says that he is willing to come voluntarily, the first reaction would be to ask him to come voluntarily and submit to the process of the court here. But the difficulty is this. Mr. and Mrs. Teja are moving heaven and earth to see that the processes of the court are avoided and obstructed. You will be pleased to see that on the 3rd July there was a petition in the High Court in Delhi to quash the proceedings of extradition. The person who wanted to come voluntarily to India is moving the High Court of Delhi to quash the proceedings. I have letters here to show the anxiety with which Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao and the Prime Minister wanted

to see that that writ petition is dealt with properly by engaging the most competent advocates who would be available.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वः सव तरह से अपनी रक्षा कर रहा है। वह तो बेईमान है। इस वक्त तो इन लोगों के ईमान की बात है, उस के ईमान की नहीं।

Shri Govinda Menon: I may state here that my Ministry specially contacted the Solicitor-General who on account of vacation was at that time in Bombay and asked him to come down and appear for the State in the matter of the writ proceedings and see that the extradition proceedings are not quashed. It is those parties who wrote to the Deputy Prime Minister, the Shipping Minister and others "Why extradition, I am willing to come voluntarily". In order to enable him to come voluntarily...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। सरकार ने न्यूयार्क में जो एक्स्ट्राडीशन का मामला दाखल किया था, वह 28 मई को किया था और तेजा लोगों का वापस आने का खत 24 मई को लिख दिया गया था। तो उनके पास काफी वक्त था। यह जो बार-बार मेरे ऊपर कहना चाहते हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप मेहरबानी करके मेरे मामले को...

Mr. Speaker: The concerned Minister will reply. There is no point of order.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जिस तरह आप दूसरे सदस्यों के व्यवस्था के प्रश्न सुन चुके हैं, उसी तरह आप इस बात को भी सुन लीजिए कि इसमें मैं कहां तक आता हूँ, क्योंकि मैंने उनको लिख दिया था :

"I want you both to be as frank with me as you can be. I know that

nobody likes to implicate himself. But your case has now reached an interesting stage. Unless I know full details of your dealing with the Prime Minister and with other ministers of the Government together with such direct or circumstantial evidence that you can give me, I am handicapped."

श्री जति भूषण बाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह अपनी रफाई दे रहे हैं। वास्तव में यह उनसे मिले हुये हैं। यह उनकी वकालत कर रहे हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो कुछ मैं कह रहा हूँ, वह इस लिए जरूरी है कि मंत्री महोदय यह बताना चाहते हैं कि जैसे यह सिर्फ तेजा का मामला है, लेकिन असल में यह सिर्फ तेजा का ही मामला नहीं है, बल्कि यह इन लोगों का भी मामला है।

Shri Govinda Menon: The Indian passport of Mr. Teja was impounded. He has no passport now. If he wants to come voluntarily the passport will again have to be given to him. If he wants to come voluntarily he can come without the permission of the Government of India by approaching the appropriate authorities in the Embassy in America to get travel papers enabling him to come over to India. Therefore, there is no contradiction between the rest of the Government and the Deputy Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I want some guidance from the House. My Jan Sangh friend, the Member from CPI, Shri Jyotirmoy Basu, some Members from the Congress all want to speak on this. Shri Limaye says he has laboured so hard on this. I thought it was a joint labour between Dr. Lohia and Shri Limaye and there was no separate labour. If I allow him, then I will have to give a chance to the Jan Sangh. Then, a number of Members on the Congress side are also anxious to put questions. But I cannot

[Mr Speaker]

possibly give opportunity to all of them. (interruptions) Shri Rang suggest, that I should request the Minister to give a reply.

श्री हनुमन्त कल्याण (उज्जैन)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप हमे नो कुछ समय
दीजिए।

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Please allow us some time.

Mr. Speaker: All right, I will give them all opportunity to ask one question each. Now, Shri Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) अध्यक्ष
महोदय, मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार एन-
फोर्समेंट डायरेक्ट्रेट ने सुबूत होते हुए भी
फारेन एक्सचेंज रेगुलेशन एक्ट के मातहत
डा० तेजा को इस लिये गिरफ्तार नहीं किया
कि धाराद्विगनम सालिसिटर के मामले में
भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री, श्री शचीन्द्र चौधरी, ने
धारा० सी० दत्त के द्वारा उनको अनुचित
दण्ड से डटा था। इसी लिए उन्होंने पूछा
सी० बी० आई० अर्थात् गृह मंत्रालय से कि
क्या वह इस बारे में कुछ करेगा। मरा सवाल
यह है कि जिस तरह से सदन ने सलफर
के मामले को एक संसदीय कमेटी के सुपुर्व
किया है, क्या उसी तरह मेरे इस आरोप की
जांच करने के लिए कि एनफोर्समेंट डायरेक्ट्रेट
ने सुबूत होते हुए भी डा० तेजा को गिरफ्तार
नहीं किया, सी० बी० आई० से कुछ विशेष
कारणों को लेकर पूछा, मंत्री महोदय एक
संसदीय समिति के सामने आने के लिए
तैयार है उन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में दो तीन
मन्त्रियों की एक कमेटी तो बनाई। लेकिन
क्या वह एक संसदीय समिति की प्रस्थापना
के लिए तैयार है? मैं यह साबित करके
छोड़ेंगा कि इस मामले में सरकार का हाथ
था और उसने जान-बूझ कर डा० तेजा को
नहीं बकसा।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh
(Phabhan) Sir, on a point of order.
It is the normal parliamentary practice
that whenever a question as to the
formation of a parliamentary com-
mittee is raised, it is addressed to the
presiding officer and not to a member
of the Treasury Benches, because the
constitution of a parliamentary com-
mittee is solely within the purview of
the Speaker of the House

Mr Speaker: I know it Who objects
to it?

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: So,
the Minister cannot be expected to
reply to that question

Mr. Speaker: Every body accepts it
There is no point of order Now, if
Shri Jyotirmoy Basu wants, to ask a
question, I will allow him

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: I will take
only two minutes

Mr. Speaker No speech, please,
only a question

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: The Congress
is committing a fraud on the people
of the country (interruptions) My
question is whether it is a fact that a
Congress newspaper, the National
Herald, had demanded Rs 10 lakhs
from Dharma Teja as subscription If
he had paid this amount, all this
drama would not have been enacted
(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: These are the things
which will strengthen his hands in
the case in America He will say
"they asked me money, I did not give
them, therefore, they have brought
all this case against me .. (interrup-
tions) Whatever may be the truth, he
will quote this .. (Interruptions)."

When I am on my legs, other members, including those of the opposition should resume their seats

श्री मधु लिवये अध्यक्ष महोदय,
आप केस के नाम पर इन लोगों के हाथ तो
बन्धन न कीजिए।

Mr. Speaker: This is the thing which he will quote in America. He will say that the Government of India made a demand for Rs 10 lakhs. What a fine evidence will it be for him!

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: We are hearing fraud and scandal day after day. Yesterday we heard the Asoka Hotel fraud. (Interruptions)

श्री जयतिमय बासुजी अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप नेशनल इन्स्टिट्यूट को दृष्टि में रखते हुए माननीय सदस्य के इस वाक्य को एक्सपोज़ कर दीजिये। यह एक पोलिटिकल फ्राड है। सरकार को बदनाम करने के लिए जान-बूझ कर ये चीजें लाई जा रही हैं। ये सब वकालत हैं धर्म तेजा ने।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly sit down. I am not allowing anybody. Dr. Rao.

श्री हुस्न खन् कल्लाय आप मझे
मीका नहीं देने? सब को आप ने दिया।

Mr. Speaker: Now I will adjourn the House and go if you do not want to hear him.

The Minister of Transport and Shipping (Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that so much passion and heat has been brought into this particular question. I recognise that feelings are involved. There is some kind of a suspicion on the part of a number of hon. Members sitting in the opposite benches that somehow or other the Government had deliberately not wanted to take action against

Dr. Teja, even though they could have arrested him and should have arrested him they allowed him to go away, that when he was voluntarily wanting to come back they gave him advice through their emissaries not to come back, that they are anxious to see that the extradition proceedings are delayed, that they are not serious in their intention of getting him back—in fact the suspicion is that Government did not want Dr. and Shrimati Teja to return to India and face an Indian court for fear that the two accused may make some disclosures that might upset the stability of the Congress Government at the Centre. It seems to me that this is the suspicion that is behind not only the arguments and the techniques which have been adopted but also the passion that has been brought into this discussion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Not to upset you.

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I would very much like to request hon. Members to allow me to make my statement without interrupting me. Afterwards if there is anything I will reply.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think afterwards I am going to allow anything.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया देखी
प्रोफसर, जो भी दिया वह मिलेगा।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I have great respect for Dr. Lohia and I am glad that he has now called me a professor and not a chokra.

I would like to make the categorical statement—I said it last time and I say it again—that the Government of India are not in the least bothered about any charges that Dr. or Shrimati Teja may make in an Indian court of law. We are very anxious to have the Tejas back. Everything that I have done since I came and took charge of this Ministry—and I can prove it—has been to see that the utmost efficiency is exercised in the extradition of the Tejas.

[Dr V K R V Rao]

Then, Dr Lohia asked Is it not an odd coincidence that the extradition proceedings case was filed against Dr Teja on the 28th February, 1967, just a few days after the elections were over?

का० राम शर्मा हर लो० वि० अध्यक्ष
मोदय यह गलती कर रहे हैं। एक्स-
ट्रडीशन प्रोसीडिन्स नहीं।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao I will do full justice to Dr Lohia because I do not want to take refuge in any kind of debating technology

The question was why so much time was taken to collect material Let us go into the facts There is no doubt that beginning from 1966 lots of complaints were being made about the Tejas I have gone through the entire debate I have spent many man-hours studying it It appears that in the beginning when charges had been made against them I gathered an impression on reading some of the speeches that this was considered to be a charge made by some shipping interests against some other successful shipping interests That was in the beginning If you go through the debate, you will find that the suspicion was that some other shipping interests were jealous of Teja's success—Teja was all right he was a very successful man—and therefore they were making charges against him

Then Government started getting information about the Teja company Ships were being held up wages were not paid and so on Government got naturally worried because Government had guaranteed a loan All the ships were mortgaged to the Government Nevertheless the Government was interested In the mean while a number of anonymous letters were sent As you know documents were handed over

Mr. Speaker: Only eleven ships are mortgaged to the Government, the other things are not

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: The other things are not but the ships mortgaged are the biggest item The ships are mortgaged to us

Then, certain documents were handed over—the House knows it—and the documents first of all, were not signed and then denied You are familiar with these facts, the House is familiar with these facts I think, sometime under your distinguished Ministership within a few days of your taking charge of it, you took up this matter and discussed it with the Prime Minister and you immediately appointed a committee of inquiry to go into all these allegations and you also said that any document anonymous or otherwise containing charges against the Tejas should be sent to this committee for inquiry

Later on, I want to make it clear, there was a lot of suspicion that this man was mismanaging things and some took the view that he was swallowing money But there was no evidence of any kind The documents were not signed they were being denied Nevertheless the Government was making an investigation

Further there was a question to which a reference was made that certain documents were given to the Home Ministry I think, on the 7th of May and the Home Minister immediately got those documents investigated and examined by the C.B.I. The C.B.I. investigated the matter and they said that there was not sufficient material to enable them to register a case I think it is a healthy principle that we should not register a case against somebody unless the authorities who are supposed to have the power to do so are satisfied that there is a *prima facie* evidence for that.

Simultaneously, evidently, the same documents were handed over to the Enforcement Directorate of the Ministry of Finance. I am told some informant first gave information orally and then he was asked and he produced those documents. The Enforcement Directorate found that on the basis of these documents, they could not prosecute Dr. Teja. They had the powers to do so if they were satisfied.

Then, being moved by patriotic considerations and the feeling that though there was no evidence, evidently, there is something wrong—everybody has to function under the law—they wanted to know whether the C.B.I. could do anything to arrest this man. That was the purpose of the telephonic conversation that took place. They took it up with the Home Ministry. The documents were the same. The C.B.I. said, "We have already examined the documents and we have submitted the Report to the Home Minister."

A high-level Conference was held on the 15th May in which the Home Minister, the Minister of Transport and Shipping and some other people were present. On 19th May, a statement was made on the floor of the House by the then Home Minister, Mr. Nanda, and he said that this thing had been gone into and that there was absolutely no evidence to institute any criminal proceedings against Dr. Teja. That is a part of the record of the proceedings of the House.

Now, here comes the question when Dr. Teja came again on the 28th or 27th May and left on the 3rd June. The whole position was that nothing new had happened till the 3rd of June, indeed, till the 4th of August to make any branch of the Government of India to be in a position to register criminal proceedings against Dr. Teja. At the same time, if I may say so, I was not the Minister in-charge, I was not in the Government, and when I came here, I looked into all the files, the questions and answers in Parli-

ment and all that. I have gone into them thoroughly. Generally, the impression that I get is that there was a lot of bothering about, worrying about, as to what would happen to the Shipping Company that had enabled us to overfill the Third Plan target and that had earned a very good name—somehow we had to find the money to meet outstandings and somehow we had to save the good name of the Jayanti Shipping Company—and therefore, I think, the concerned people were not bothering so much about the person of Dr. Teja as about the entity of the Jayanti Shipping Company. This is the inference I draw..

श्री राज बनीहर लोहिया : पूरी बात बताओ—जो आप के दिमाग पर पूरा असर पड़ा ।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I am not saying that you must accept it. (Interruptions). I am not yielding. This is interrupting the trend of my thought. I have not written out my speech. I am not yielding.

This was the general impression that I got. Then till 3rd June, as I said, there was no evidence of any kind at all and Dr. Teja came and he left.

Now I should like to complete the story. I think, some reference was made about 8th June when the decision for take-over was said to be taken and on 10th June, orders were issued. I do not have before me the dates and all that, but it is my recollection that by 8th June Government had not decided anything; there were so many alternatives; Government were worried; a lot of discussions were going on as to how we should deal with the Jayanti Shipping Company; whether we should give loans to this company, or whether we should allow them to sell off some ships and allow him to pay off the debts or whether Government should take over the company. All these were discussed and ultimately out of the 7 alternatives, 4

[Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao]

were taken up, and then this was discussed, I believe, with yourself, who was then the Minister of Transport and Aviation, and the Minister of Finance and it was decided that the Cabinet should be advised that it should be taken over. This discussion took place on the 6th June, if I am not mistaken. In the evening of the 6th it was decided and on the 8th it was put to the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: The Law Minister was also there.

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: The Law Minister, the Transport Minister and the Finance Minister met and discussed and then came to the decision that there was no other alternative to take over and without losing any time, the Ordinance was passed and the company was taken over.

In fact, the Sukthankar Committee which had been asked to go into the details, themselves found that it was not possible to get any evidence; they were not getting any co-operation from the Jayanti Shipping Company officials and so on. They were also suspicious. Everybody was suspicious at that time, everybody was feeling that something was wrong; but nobody could lay his hands on what was wrong. After all, we are living under a rule of law and on a mere general suspicion it would be very difficult to take action against anybody. Then what happened? (Interruption) When the Sukthankar Committee made their report, they said that they were not in a position to charge Dr. Teja with anything criminal and that they would like a further probe to be made. We took over the Jayanti Shipping Company. I would like to take this opportunity to pay my personal tribute to Mr. Srivastava, who is the Chairman or the Managing Director of the Shipping Corporation. He is one of the most excellent officers that I

have come across. I am not prejudiced in favour of government officers because of my long background outside. I should say that he is one of the most efficient officers that I have met. After they took over the company, one by one they were able to get hold of the documents. As soon as they got enough documents, on the 25th July, they gave this information to the C.B.I.; they had now got information enough to file a case. Then we must remember that the various probes into the transactions of Dr. Teja, against whom a *prima facie* case has now been found by the New Delhi Magistrate, involved transactions in foreign countries. He had companies with headquarters in New York and in England and agents all over the place; he had offices all over the world and our CID officers had to go to several places abroad. This was what happened. Maybe, simultaneously elections were also going on and people's political fortunes were involved. You could not help it. Many unconnected things can happen during the same period of time. These people went round and collected all the information that was possible and came back. As soon as enough information was available, a case was filed. We should remember that we had to take evidence on commission. One of the cases which everybody knows is the Norwegian charter of a Jayanti ship. Here he was taking one shilling per tonne and was putting it in his pocket till we discovered it. We had to take evidence on commission, we did not know whether they will give evidence on Commission or not, whether they will come here or we have to send our officers. (Interruptions). All these things were to be resolved. Ultimately our officers went there and took the evidence and then the case was complete. Then the New Delhi Magistrate, I think, on the 27th April...

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया : प्राप को
इस कित्ते में प्रत्यक्ष मद्दोदय, क्या मन्ना था
रहा है।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: It will be useful because it brings down passions. It will be useful. It would take away the passions which have enveloped this particular case.

Mr. Speaker: Now, he should be very brief, because the time is very limited.

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: Yes, Sir. Now, I shall come to the points made by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia.

श्री शशिनूबर बाजपेयी अध्यक्ष
महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह एम० एम० अपना राय धर्म तथा के सिपिंग कम्पनी के डायरेक्टर समुक्त समाजवादी के मेम्बर है? उनको आप जानते हैं या नहीं।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is only encouraging others also to put questions.

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I am afraid I do not have any knowledge of it.

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia pointed out that there was some discrepancy between clause (b) and clause (c). In clause (b) it is said, the Enforcement Directorate did not have material to take action on their own. In clause (c), it has been stated that nevertheless, they rang up the Home Ministry to see if anything could be done.

I have already dealt with that point. It perhaps shows that besides people here, even in government service, there are officers who are anxious because they are bothered, because they think that he committed a crime and, therefore, the man must be caught, even though they themselves do not have the evidence to prove it. The discrepancy between (b) and (c) is completely rational, therefore, and in fact, there is no discrepancy at all really.

As regards (d), references has been made to the use of the word "specifically". I do not mind dropping that word. It is one of my faults that I use more adjectives than I should. I assure Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia that I come into trouble generally because I use more adjectives than I should. I hope he will be quite satisfied now.

श्री म. लु. लिखरे पालियामेटरी
कमटी हो जाय तो यह सब मामला माफ हो जायगा। पालियामेटरी कमटी के बारे में आप कहिये।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I am coming to that point.

I have nothing more to add regarding what I have said about Shri T. N. Kaul. As far as that is concerned, we have made inquiries, and our information is that Shri T. N. Kaul did not meet the Tejas nor was there any occasion for him to give them any advice.

An Hon. Member. Who told the hon. Minister that?

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I have nothing more to add to what I have stated already on this.

Then, I have already dealt with the point why the charge-sheet was filed on the 28th February.

About his voluntarily coming in, I have already referred to it, and the Law Minister also has referred to it.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया अध्यक्ष
महोदय, कुछ इन्टरनेशनल लेबोराएण्ड (अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय खेल छोकरे) जब मा, बाप पैसा छोड कर नहीं आते हैं तो यह इन्टरनेशनल लेबोराएण्ड अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय खेल छोकरे बड खतरनाक हो जाते हैं।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: Regarding his voluntarily coming here, I would like to say with all the deliberateness that I have that there is no question of this gentleman wanting to come voluntarily

Shri Ranga (Sri Kakulam) Why?

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I shall tell Shri Ranga the reason why I say so. The moment he went to the USA, he filed a petition in the USA for changing his temporary status into a permanent resident status. We came to know of it some time in January or February. Immediately we took action against that and we told the authorities concerned that we had already a case going on against him, a non-bailable warrant had been issued against him in October or so and therefore he could not be given a permanent resident status there and we wanted to get him back here. It was quite open for him to come back. In fact, he wrote a letter to me also. Somehow I think that that letter has not come to the notice of the hon. Member.

Mr. Speaker: His reply has come already. He had asked his Secretary to reply.

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: On the 24th April I got a letter, saying first of all how wonderful it was that I had become a Minister. If Dr. Teja had known what it was to be a Minister he would not have said it. He wrote to me saying how wonderful it was that I had been promoted and so on, and then he said that he wanted to come back voluntarily. When I got that letter,—and here I want the dates to be noted carefully.

उस रात मनोहर लोहिया ऐसा कह कर साबित कर रहे हैं कि बड़े चरमकाह है।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I want the dates to be noted. He wrote to me on the 24th April. I replied to him on the 6th May. The extradition proceedings were filed in the New York court, I think, on the 28th or 29th May. It was perfectly possible, I said, the whole case was sub-judice and I could not interfere into the conduct of the case and the course of the law. That was my letter. But certainly I said that it would be more dignified for him to come back voluntarily and face the charges rather than come as a result of extradition. I am quoting my very words.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why did he not tell him that he was going to be nominated to the Rajya Sabha?

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I do not know what he is saying. Nobody has offered me nomination in the Rajya Sabha.

Mr. Speaker: Not you, but to Dr. Teja.

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: Then he got my letter. He did not reply. He had every chance to come back voluntarily. Then he wrote to the Deputy Prime Minister. He also said: 'Certainly come back voluntarily'. But he did not want to come back voluntarily—nothing of the kind. He wrote about conditions. On 24th May, he wrote another letter saying, 'I will come back. But I must be a free man. I must have personal cognisance. I am prepared to assist in a civil inquiry'.

How on earth could I give him any such assurance when there was a non-bailable warrant against him and when already the court had said that he is prima facie guilty? So I sent it to the Secretary to ask the Joint Secretary to consult the Ministries concerned and send him a reply.

I say with all the deliberateness at my command that Dr and Mrs. Teja have no intention to return to this country voluntarily. If that were so, when the extradition case came, they would not have contested it. It was contested. They contested the legality of the documents. Our counsel had to argue on that and get the documents admitted. As the Law Minister has explained, he is now trying to get the proceedings here in a Delhi Court to get him back subverted and quashed.

As a matter of fact, it is perfectly possible even today, for Dr Teja to cut short the proceedings completely and say I have no questions to ask. I want to return to India. This was what happened when a case of extradition came in respect of an American sailor before a Madras Magistrate. The man said 'I do not want to ask any questions. I want to be extradited immediately, I want to go and face the judiciary in America.' There is nothing to prevent Dr Teja from cutting the proceedings short by saying that he wants to come back voluntarily. He has simply to say 'I do not want to ask any questions. I want to be sent back to my country as quickly as possible.'

We are very much prepared to hear him not only on A B C and D but on the entire Congress Party, on all the civil servants, may be even on the Members of the Opposition.

Therefore let us not take up a position which is going to make things difficult. I perfectly understand the feelings on this issue.

On the question of instituting a parliamentary committee, Government are not prepared to accept the institution of any parliamentary committee. The case is already under investigation before a New York Court and we hope to get him back very soon to face proceedings here under our law.

1573 (A) L.S.D.—11

श्री मधु लिमये : ठीक जबाब दीजिये। पालियामेन्टरी कमेटी भावे।

श्री रणबीर सिंह : पालियामेन्टरी कमेटी कैसे घा सकती है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : चोरो को पकड़ने के लिये। पालियामेंट का कटेम्प्ट कौन कर सकता है।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: I do not have all the very extensive and intensive knowledge of the Constitution and parliamentary practice that Shri Madhu Limaye has. I have great admiration for him. I wish I were younger so that I could acquire those things.

श्री मधु लिमये : तारीफ करके मार डालो।

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao: But as far as this is concerned, there is no problem. Charges have been made, evidence has been collected, there is *prima facie* guilt established, the New Delhi Magistrate has said so, we want to get him back here. When he comes, we want to try him according to Indian law.

Therefore, I would make this respectful appeal. I wish I could speak in my broken Hindi so as to get a hearing from Dr Lohia. Unfortunately I do not trust my Hindi sufficiently to make myself correctly understood.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : भागे से हिन्दी बोला वरे तो हम तेजा का नाम लेना बन्द कर देंगे।

डा० बी० के० आर० बी० राव : मैं हिन्दी में बात करने वाला हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: Is it a private bargain? gain?

डा० बी० के० भार० श्री० राम : मैं डा० लोहिया से बिनती कर रहा हूँ कि इस केस में हम सब लोगों को डा० तेजा और मिसेज तेजा को अपने देश वापिस लाना चाहिये और जब वह इंडियन प्रोर्ट पर आकर उतरें तो उसके बाद जो इंडियन ला की रिक्वायरमेंट्स हैं उनको पूरा करना चाहिये। उनको सभता है कि उनके यहां घाने से सरकार को बहुत तकलीफ होगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनके घाने से सरकार को कोई तकलीफ नहीं होगी बल्कि जो रिक्वायरमेंट्स आफ इंडियन

ला हैं वही पूरा किए जाती हैं। मैं डा० लोहिया से अपील करता हूँ कि हम सब को एक काम करना चाहिए। उनको हम यहां साने दें। फिर हम कोर्ट में जायेंगे। इस मामले पर यहां डिबेट करना ठीक नहीं है। इतना ही कह कर मैं खत्म करता हूँ।

18.36 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, July 26, 1987/Srawana 4, 1889 (Saka).