

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I am allowing Shri Gowda.

SHRI G. MADE GOWDA (Mandya): Sir, we—Karnataka MPs—have also given a notice under rule 193. We know that this is an important matter to be discussed. So, I request the Chair to take up and include the subject in the agenda on Monday or Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we cannot do like that.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Well, may I again repeat my request? This is the first day on which we have discussed the questions and then we have gone to other regular matters on the agenda. Our efforts are to see that we all get enough time to discuss important issues. All issues are important. But some issues are more important and some issues are less important.

May I request that let us take up more important issues and less important issues we can put aside for some time? Now, by doing this, we are not doing any injustice. We are not against any issues. But we are facilitating ourselves to see that more important issues are discussed. That is why my request is that probably in good judgment we had decided not to discuss these issues as we used to do previously. But now it seems that you are very keen to do that. We have done that also and more than half an hour is consumed in that.

I think, we should now take up the Confidence Motion. What you do today, what you do tomorrow, what you do day after tomorrow, is going to be very helpful in doing things in future also. That means curtailing the time for discussions on subjects which are less important and having more time on other important subjects.

I think, by and large, you have been able to ventilate your views on important issues. That is why I would request that let us not take up more time than what we have already consumed on this.

MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—
Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Now let us take up the issue of confidence motion on which also you can express your views. That is why I am requesting Mr. Advani. Probably he wants to speak on this topic. I think, the motion is moved and the hon. Prime Minister would reply to the motion. So, I request Mr. Advani to please speak.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please cooperate.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOBHANA DREESWARA RAO VADDE: Rules of Procedure are there and they should be observed. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is before this House. The motion is that House expresses its confidence in the Council of Ministers.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, this motion is there. The views will be expressed and reply will be given, and what is necessary to be done, will be done later on.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Speaker, Sir, will the Hon. Prime Minister let us know as to why he is seeking vote of confidence in the council of Ministers?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was under the impression that this question will not come up at all and the motion will be passed. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Before starting the discussion, can we know when is the voting going to take place on this motion? *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I can inform the hon. Members that it was decided in the leaders' meeting that we take up the discussions today.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We will discuss this issue here. An impression was that with no discussion or with very small discussion, the confidence motion will come up and will be disposed of over here. But then it was expressed by the Members and the leaders also that we may discuss it. Today is Friday—Private Members' day. So, the Private Members' business starts at 3.30. Very small time is available. It was decided that we will take it up on Monday also. So, we are taking up the discussion on Monday and voting also on Monday.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): Are we having lunch-hour also?

MR. SPEAKER: We will have lunch-hour.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: You know that on Friday, many MPs go back to their constituencies and come back on Monday. So, we would like to know whether voting will be before lunch-hour or after the lunch-hour on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: I would say, before lunch-hour.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Voting? *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I would say before lunch-hour possibly.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOBHANA DRESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): Sir, you please give the ruling regarding the procedural point which I have referred. Minister's Statement should be followed by Submissions. This is the convention. You please clarify it. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: (Madhubani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have permitted some of the Members to raise issues for next week's business.

MR. SPEAKER: It is all over now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOBHANA DRESWARA RAO VADDE: Sir, what is your ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: You come to my Chamber, we will discuss it.

We need a little more time on that.

Yes, Advani ji.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhi Nagar): Sir, I remember that whenever the Motion of Confidence has been moved in the last 20-21 months, I suggested—as the Prime Minister himself has just now stated—that this motion could be decided upon by the House without any elaborate debate. It is only when there is a minority Government, that the President of the Union asks the Prime Minister to prove his majority on the floor of the House within a specified period. If it were a majority Government this kind of situation and the need for such a Vote of Confidence would not have arisen at all. Only if someone wanted to move a Vote of No Confidence would a division in the House have taken place. But on all earlier occasions and I found on this occasion

also, when I informally broached the subject, several of my opposition colleagues were of the view that there should be a discussion, there should be a debate. There is one difference between the earlier occasions and this occasion. On all earlier occasions the Prime Minister also had made out a case as to why this House should express confidence in his Government. Today, the new Prime Minister himself, even after the request made by my senior colleague has not thought that necessary.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have got the debate and I have taken the cue from him.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: As far as I recall both Shri V. P. Singh and Chandra Shekhar ji had made certain brief observations at the outset though the reply was elaborate towards the end. Well, I don't object to it. I am merely recalling something. If I am wrong, I stand corrected.

Sir, I rise to oppose this Motion of Confidence and I would give briefly my reasons why I am opposing it.

Firstly, let us remember that this is the fifth minority Government in Indian political history and the third in the last 20 months. The first minority Government came up in 1969 when the Congress Party split and Mrs. Gandhi's Government secured support from the Communist Party at that time and ran her Government for some brief while.

Second minority Government came in 1979 when Chowdhary Charan Singh ji who did not have a majority in the House was supported by the Congress Party from outside. He was unable to form a majority Government and that minority Government did not face the Parliament at all.

Third minority Government came as a result of the electoral verdict in 1989. And, as today this Government also is a minority Government born out

of an electoral verdict. In 1989 Shri V. P. Singh formed his minority Government. The Left Front as well as the B.J.P. supported the Government from outside.

Fourth minority Government came in 1990 and that had no relation to the peoples' verdict. It was in fact in violation of the peoples' mandate that that Government was formed.

The Congress Party decided that that would be in the interest of the country. So it supported the Chandra Shekhar Government which had a total strength of I suppose around 54 in a House of 545 where even a Quorum is of 55. We have seen that Government which was a miniscule Government rather than a minority Government. Now, this is the fifth minority Government but in many respects it is the oddest of all. Firstly, it is not just a minority Government but it is a minority Government in a truncated House. The elections are not complete as yet. Thirtysix vacancies are still there which means that one out of every sixteen seats in this House is still vacant. Two States are totally un-represented in this House. One is Jammu & Kashmir and the other is Punjab. The Punjab vacancies would not have been there had it not been for a last minute decision about which some discussions took place in the morning, during Question Hour and some discussions are bound to take place subsequently. Because it is a decision that baffled everyone, including the Governor of that State, who said: "I have been through three Wars, I have been a General in the Wars, but I have never felt as defeated as I feel today after this announcement by the Election Commission that the Elections have been postponed." Thus, two States, namely, Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir are totally un-represented.

Then, there are a number of vacancies. five vacancies are there in Bihar, four vacancies are there in Uttar Pradesh and one vacancy each in Gujarat, in Delhi, in Maharashtra etc.

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

If you were to closely examine these vacancies anyone would come to the conclusion that if today the difference between the ruling party and non-Congress parties is 242 versus 267 when these vacancies are to be filled, the shortfall would become even larger. This is evident. It seems that this too has influenced that in this matter even the decision to put off Punjab elections. If this is so, it is extremely unfortunate. This morning, the then Prime Minister, pointedly affirmed that Government was not consulted in respect of the postponement. It is presumed that the Government about to take over was consulted after all, the Election results were out. This morning the Minister was not willing to say that also. He said: "I have not said that we were not consulted. I have not said that we were consulted." I wish the truncated nature of this House is always kept in mind. This imposes a limitation on the legitimacy of the Government. Let us now come to the second oddity of this Government. I am not looking at the legalities, I know what the rules are. In fact ours is the only Constitution in which there is a provision like that of Article 75(5) which provides that even though a person is not a Member of the House, he can be a Minister for a period of six months. When this was debated in the Constituent Assembly, several Members had objected to it. What is this provision, why has this provision been made, they asked.

Today, the situation is that three senior Ministers of this Government—not only the Prime Minister, but even the Finance Minister, and the Defence Minister—are not Members of Parliament. *(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a shame.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is not a matter of shame. *(Interruptions)* I am merely pointing out an oddity. I am not referring to the fact that two other senior Ministers who are higher in the hierarchy are not Members of this House. I have served the Rajya Sabha; I had served the other House and I respect it. And

I know that on one occasion when the Finance Minister was chosen from that House, an objection had been raised in this House as to whether a person who could not even vote for the Finance Bill—I think a Money Bill has to be passed by the Lok Sabha—was introducing the Budget. This was raised at that time when the Finance Minister, first of all, was chosen from the Rajya Sabha. I know the technicalities. Earlier it had been generally a practice of choosing a person from this House. More important than all is the third oddity, and that oddity I wish the Government always bears in mind when taking any decision: Unfortunately in the last few days that have elapsed they have not seemed conscious of this. In the case of the earlier four minority Governments, the Parties which were running the Government were in a minority. But their support in the Lok Sabha, in the House was committed majority support; whether it was in the case of Mrs. Gandhi's Government in which the Communist Party had decided to support the Mrs. Gandhi's Government, they had committed majority support. In the case of Chaudhary Charan Singh's Party, when the Congress Party said that they were going to support his Party, the Lok Dal, it had committed majority support. Similarly, in the case of Shri V. P. Singh's Government, when the Left Front and the BJP said that they were going to support that Government, the NF Govt. had committed majority support. Similar was the case with regard to Shri Chandra Shekhar's Government. It is only in the case of Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao's Government that till today no one knows what is the majority on the basis of which this Government is going to face the House. Has it any committed majority support? Sometimes anxious queries are being made from our quarters, from their quarters, from this quarters as to what is going to happen today. And I have always replied that my Party has decided to vote against you. But I am sure that your Government is not going to fall. *(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: : This is also an oddity! (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I have been very closely watching everything that is being said by various parties in the last 15-20 days. And it is those statements which make me conclude that. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: This support is from back door. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, everyone knows that B.J.P. does everything openly. Even on the issue of the election of the hon. Speaker and the hon. Deputy Speaker, a suggestion was made that we should do it secretly, after all what is the need of making any announcement. But my party made it quite clear that we will do everything openly. (*Interruptions*)

If on some occasion we feel that we should support this Government we will do that openly. But today this is not the position. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Advaniji, is there no *quid pro quo* on Deputy-Speakership? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: That I have answered already.

Sir, this I think is the biggest weakness of this Government. However, it thinks that it can continue to survive because of two factors. They are banking entirely upon those two factors which, no doubt are valid today. Factor Number one is, this country has been put to two general elections in the last twenty months: no person in this country wants a third general election so soon. Some people, or some parties may be keen to avoid a general election only because they think the general election may favour

this party or that party. But I think that every party must take into cognizance the people's will and the people would not like a general election. But that does not mean that because the people do not like a general election, therefore, every party and particularly a party which has been chosen to be in the Opposition—there is an obligation on that party—has to support the Government in spite of what it does, irrespective of what it does. It is, therefore, that my party decided to oppose this Government and oppose this Confidence Motion. Not that we are moving a No-Confidence Motion. No. That point may come later on. But today there is no reason either why my party should express its confidence in this Government.

I am trying to explain why my party has taken this stand. Now I come to the second factor. The first factor, as I said, which Govt. is banking on is that the people do not want a third general election, so soon. But another factor that you seem to be depending on is the fact that in the last general election or perhaps during the last six or eight months there has been considerable tension between my party and other parties of the Opposition. So, you think that it is feasible to be playing one against the other. When it is convenient join hands with us, when it is convenient join hands with the others, and thus, to maintain your party's Government. I would like to caution you that if anyone in the ruling party has this in mind, that approach would prove very myopic, very short-sighted. It would not be a right approach at all.

On the other hand, the limitations imposed by these three oddities, can prove a boon for Indian politics. Inasmuch as for a Govt. conscious of these limitations consensus would not be just a cliché. Trying to hammer out a national consensus on a particular issue would not mean merely mastering a numerical majority, in the Lok Sabha.

There is a non-official resolution for the afternoon, I notice. And some

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

persons may seem to think that if that Resolution is pushed through with the help of a majority it would be fine. I think that this would be very short-sighted, approach and can prove counter productive. I would like on this occasion to simply say that so far as a proper confidence vote is concerned, it should come only when the entire House is properly constituted. All those 36 vacancies or most of them have been filled. At least the principal States should be represented and, secondly, that there is a period of judging this Government as to how it has really performed. In the brief fortnight or three weeks that have passed, both on the political level as well as on the economic level the Government has not been able to instil confidence. Not that I am opposed to every step that you have taken. My friend referred to the kidnapping of Doraiswamy in Kashmir. I hope that you must be handling the Doraiswamy's kidnapping properly and doing whatever is needed.

I was going through your manifesto, the Congress Party's manifesto in which the National Front had been severely attacked.

13.00 hrs.

The National Front Government had been accused of compromising with terrorism. And the manifesto says:

"Beginning with the release of several hardcore terrorists the National Front Government continuously compromised with secessionists and terrorists in Punjab, Kashmir, Assam and Tamil Nadu."

I would not quarrel with this...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): They are continuing this policy in Assam...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes. I was surprised when I read the other day a decision to give general amnesty to all the LUFAs terrorists who have

been apprehended there. The general amnesty announcement was followed immediately by the killing of a Russian engineer. An even after that, the amnesty decision was implemented. It baffles me. In this situation, on a serious issue of this kind, the Saikia Government may have consulted the Centre. But I do not know whether the Central Government consulted any one of us here. There was no consultation. It was a very serious matter. The steps of this kind make me think...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We will come out with all the facts. But at this moment, Sir, may I submit that the decision to release most of those who were under detention had nothing to do with the kidnapping. It was taken as a positive decision on the part of the State Government, as a part of their overall strategy to meet the situation. I only want to dissociate these two facts. There could be differences of opinion, I agree. But the only thing is that this was not done as *quid pro quo* to some of these people having been kidnapped. This was done separately as a step in the right direction according to the State Government.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The answer complicates the position. I can understand, in a specific case even a *quid pro quo*. But in a situation of the kind that obtains in Assam or that obtains in Kashmir and Punjab, what is the signal that we are giving by announcing general amnesty at this time? The signal given is not merely to Assam, it is given to all throughout. And, therefore, it is still worse. The timing is bad: the manner of doing it is bad and above all, as I said, a Government of this kind that is presently there should have been extra wary. The National Front Government bungled badly on the Rubaiya issue. One of the reasons as to why they bungled was that the process of consultation was started ten days later. At that point of time, to the best of my knowledge, even the Left Front was not consulted. It was

a very bad lapse and that lapse cost us dearly in Kashmir. I have a feeling that what has happened in Assam today might cost us very dearly not only in Assam but in the whole country.

So far as the economic front is concerned, I remember the day when the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister had briefed all opposition leaders. I had strongly pleaded that the situation was such that it should be thoroughly debated after apprising us of full facts. I understand that this is a crisis situation. But you cannot go about taking decisions first of all and letting the whole country know later on. In certain matters, I can understand secrecy I disagree with the proposal to devalue and simultaneously to say that there will be no rise in prices and the weaker sections will not be affected. I remember, going to Bombay four days back, and there, Nana Chuda Sama puts up a slogan every week. Its last week's slogan was very telling. In a way it was recalling what the Finance Minister had said that prices cannot come down and prices are bound to increase whatever may have been said in the election manifesto. Whereas Nana Chuda Sama display said:

"A promise is a promise. In hundred days see how we have brought down the price of the rupee."

It was a telling quip. But I am not concerned with that so much as concerned with the fact that in this situation, inflation is going to increase so rapidly and so badly that I do not know how the people will be able to face it. Even while recognising the fact that the direction that the new Government has adopted is a direction with which my party does not quarrel. .. (Interruption) One of the basic reasons why India has come to the present pass is the fact that we have moved more and more and more and more rapidly in the direction of statist economics, and this has cost us very dearly. So there is a very clear case for removing the very many curbs

and hindrances on people's capacity to do for the country though the tendency to rely on foreign finances and multi-nationals, which seems to be growing by leaps and bounds, is a tendency which is disturbing.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: That is the crux.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No, that is not the crux because I have heard even the Finance Minister say that multi-nationals would not be permitted in the low technology areas. But in all these matters I would say that what has happened till now does not instil very great confidence. That is why I made a suggestion even on that day that there is urgent need to bring out a White Paper on all the aspects of the economic situation and to present to Parliament and to the country what are the options before the country which can be exercised.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: I do not want to interrupt the respected leader of BJP, Shri Advani. What I want to request him is that today is Friday and we have to go for the prayers. We do not want to miss his speech.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I am concluding.

This is not the occasion for any detailed analysis of the Government's performance because the performance is yet to come. As it is, today the BJP's stand on this issue follows from the mandate that has been given to us by the people. That mandate, I must say, makes us happy that our party has been able to make a major stride forward in the 1991 elections. Such a stride has made one of the leading British journals 'The London Economists' give a telling caption to its article on India's Poll verdict. The caption is 'Winner comes second'. This certainly imposes a responsibility on the BJP and which responsibility my party is determined to carry out viz. to act as a watchdog of the

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

people's interest and caution the Government whenever it goes wrong, to stop the Government whenever it is about to commit some folly and whenever need arises to be able to topple this Government and see that a new Government takes its place. All these functions have to be performed by us.

Today, all that I can say is that I would expect this Government to recognise its limitations and to function in a manner as to start a new chapter in Indian political history. I must compliment the Prime Minister and the party for the decision they took very boldly in respect of Speakership and Deputy-Speakership.... (*Interruptions*) I have great respect for the Prime Minister. He is a scholar and a thorough gentleman. In fact, I am tempted to say that he is a post-independence Congress man with pre-independence values though around him there are very many post-emergency Congressmen with post-emergency values, unfortunately. So, as I said, later on, some other occasion may arise when at some length we may discuss the performance of Government. As it is today, in carrying out the mandate that has been given to the party by the people, I oppose this motion.

13.12 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till fifteen minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

14.17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at seventeen minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[RAO RAM SINGH in the Chair]

MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, the House will now resume discussion on the Confidence Motion. I think Mr. Advani had just finished,

if I am right. Now Mr. George Fernandes.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES

(Muzaffarpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, first of all, I oppose the motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister. Besides this, I would like to submit that in spite of whatever the Congress Members may think about this confidence motion the masses of this country have no confidence in this Government. This party has come to power with only 36 per cent of the total votes polled and even its supporters are saying that the party could not have bagged even these 36 per cent votes, had the tragic assassination of Shri Rajiv Gandhi not taken place during the elections and they would have hardly secured less than 30 per cent votes. This is what your supporters are saying. This Government does not enjoy popular support and is a minority Government. Even then the Prime Minister wants to seek a vote of confidence for his Government. I would like to submit some points as to why we are not supporting this Government and not expressing our confidence in it. Although, I agree that no finger can be raised against the President's decision to invite Shri Narasimha Rao to form the Government. He acted according to the Parliamentary system and it was also according to this system that the Prime Minister has come to seek the vote of confidence in the House, but we had expected that he would give some reasons to enlist the support of the majority of the members of this House who are in opposition of this Government. He should have told the 70 per cent of the people of this country who exercised their franchise in favour of others and the 50 per cent who did not vote at all and who do not support either the Government or us, as to why they all should support the Government. This would have also enabled us to take decision about the future of this Government. Now when Government are seeking vote of confidence, a question comes before us whether this Government deserves our confidence or not and what have you

done to help us decide over this issue. Almost all the faces are the same. There is no change. If they are not here, their children are here. There is no change. There are no new faces, there are no new programmes. Then what is the difference? 18 months ago, the Congress party had enjoyed the support of three-fourth majority in this House. But later on their party was voted out of power. The question of confidence or no-confidence in the Congress was decided at that time. Now what has happened during these 18 months that has changed your thinking.

While concluding his speech, the leader of the opposition, Shri Lal K. Advani, hoped that the Government would be able to bring some new changes, etc. I could not understand on what basis he was saying so? Because in the country, Shri Advani has the same amount of political experience as the Members sitting on the treasury benches. So, what new changes have come in the country during the last 18 months that such expectations are being made from these people. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is beyond my comprehension. I would like to give an example in this regard. One of my questions was included in today's question list. It was question No. 5. But it was not expected to come up for discussion. I had based my question on the Congress manifesto. Today, I have brought this manifesto with me and I hope that the Members of the Congress party should have atleast read their own manifesto, if not anything else. The hon. Prime Minister should clearly explain his view-point regarding the implementation of their manifesto. In their manifesto, they had made a big promise to the people of this country regarding the control on prices. That promise was that in 100 days—

[English]

"In the first hundred days, the Congress Government will"

[Translation]

—mind you, 'will try' words have not been used—

[English]

"arrest price rise in essential commodities and in particular roll back prices to levels obtaining in July, 1990 in the case of—"

[Translation]

A number of articles have been listed Item No. 7 is cotton sarees, dhoties, 40 counts and below. Mr. Speaker, Sir, as per my habit, I did one thing. As soon as I received the summon, I sent my notices of questions and asked each and every Ministry as to what steps they were going to take to roll back the prices within 100 days? The answer to the question, I had raised regarding the implementation of the ruling party's promise to bring down the prices to the July 1990 level was laid on the Table of the House today morning and it is as follows:

[English]

"(a) to (c): In an economy like ours, the price levels are determined by a number of factors. The price level of any single commodity cannot be viewed in isolation."

[Translation]

Now all of them have become philosophers. At that time, they were making tall promises, now they have turned philosophers.

[English]

"Government was constantly reviewing the price levels of sarees and dhotis of 40 counts and below..."

[Translation]

21 days have passed since the Government assumed office. 20 days have elapsed since the Ministers were appointed and took oath of office.

[English]

And they have been constantly reviewing.

[Translation]

For the last twenty days, they have been doing this work only.

[Sh. George Fernandes]

[English]

And they have been 'constantly reviewing the prices of dhotis and sarrees of 40 counts and below. Government will take appropriate measures in this regard keeping in view the overall economic policies of the Government and also the critical economic situation the country is facing'.

[Translation]

It is all over. Where are the promises? What is the difference between that slogan of 1971 and these promises. We would like to listen to the Prime Minister's views on this matter. Although we said 'Congress Hatao' (Remove Congress), yet only one slogan was given by Congress in 1971, "They say 'Indira Hatao', but we say 'Garibi Hatao' (Remove poverty), now you decide". The people gave verdict in favour of the slogan 'Garibi Hatao'. The amount of work you have done in this direction is there before the whole country. It is clear from both your manifesto and the President's Address, which is indirectly a statement of your policies, as to which level poverty has reached. We want to know from the Government that after giving the slogan of 1970-71 what dent has been made by you in the poverty. What changes have taken place in your party, your thinking or your style of functioning, on the basis of which you are seeking a vote of confidence? I have read the manifesto of this party and in his address the President has broadly outlined the policies and programmes of this Government. They have made a mention about their poverty alleviation programme in just two sentences at page no. 14 of their election manifesto, which said:

[English]

"Poverty alleviation was the central priority of Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi Governments. More investments were made in poverty alleviation programme than ever before. The proportion of our population below the poverty line was halved from over

51 per cent at the time Indira's returned to the office in January 1980 to an all-time low of 25 per cent by the time Shri Rajiv Gandhi has demitted office in November 1989."

[Translation]

There cannot be a bigger untruth than this. I do not know, as to how many of you have heard the name of this organisation. The name of this organisation is Operation Research Group (ORG). The Prime Minister must have heard about it, as he is a person, who takes special interest in such matters. Operations Research Group is an Organisation, which has links with the country's top industrialists, Multi-National Corporations and also with many Government Departments. These three have collaboration with each other and on the basis of the research conducted by this group the information provided by them is considered the last word, not just by its clients in India, but also by those abroad. One of the latest reports of ORG, viz. 'Demographic-1989-90' was released by its President Dr. Bhaskar Rao on December 11, in the capital. The first page of the report begins with:

[English]

"Distribution of households and income into population strata."

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, you are aware that the proportion of our population living below the poverty line has reached an all time low of 25 per cent by 1989. Mr. Chairman, Sir, about this aspect, I can only tell you. In this regard they say "The household in India is 5.6 per cent." A household earning Rs. 750 per month is stated to be above the poverty line. This was published by them in the newspapers on 12th December. It can be easily quoted but to accept it publicly is difficult because some solution has to be found out. It is easy to make commitments but very difficult to fulfil them.

[English]

The total number of households earning less than Rs. 750 per month in the country is 52.9 per cent of our population.

[Translation]

53 per cent of the country's population is below the poverty line.

[English]

This is the report of the Operations Research Group to which the Government of India's various agencies are a party.

[Translation]

This is what they say. But it does not stop here and continues further. As per the report, the poverty line is 53 per cent, the percentage of rural household is 25.7 and that of urban is 17.1 and the total number of people is calculated, it works out to 20 crores what is their definition of the poorest of the poor?

[English]

A household having Rs. 350 or less income per month.

[Translation]

It means per capita expenditure is Rs. 2 per month and number of such people is 20 crores. This is the picture of poverty in India drawn by the Operation Research Group before the country on 11th December. If its findings are agreed to, it will create difficulties.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the date of publication of this report?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This report is for 1989-90 ending 31st of March, 1990. This report is for a period of three years. This is a research for three years and this was released on 11th December, 1990. The national press chose to suppress it excepting for one or two papers which carried a few paragraphs. The rest chose to suppress it.

[Translation]

Where the entire ideology is based on wrong concept and thinking, how can the situation be remedied. You have been in power for long but the position remains unchanged. You made many tall promises to the people of this country and ruled over this country for 40 years. You say with pride:

[English]

every congress Government has provided strong and stable Governance to ensure progress and development

[Translation]

These are your words. (*Interruptions*)

[English]

That is the fact. This is precisely the point I am making.

[Translation]

During these forty years, your strong governance and your concept of making progress and development has resulted in bringing 53 per cent of the population below the poverty line.

[English]

If this is your understanding of progress then God help you and why should we support you? Why should we help you if that is your concept of progress and development?

[Translation]

No progress in real terms took place during the said period rather it opened all avenues to aggravate poverty. In your manifesto, under the title of "tackling unemployment" you have made many tall claims and said that you will implement and carry out your plans within 100-300 days. This can be possible only if you remain in power for the said period, can you last for so many days? You are sadly mistaken ...(*Interruptions*)... you are living under a great illusion if you think that you will survive by bringing about this split ...(*Interruptions*)

[Sh. George Fernandes]

This is not possible. Those days are gone. A split is not possible in opposition parties. If it takes place, it will be in Congress(I). Don't misunderstand things.

(Interruptions)

We have been observing each other for years.

[English]

In the first 365 days, we shall create 10 million jobs every year. Already 21 days are over. So, they have been on the job of creating 10 million jobs.

[Translation]

Do you know how to count one crore jobs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not per day but per year.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not saying all this in a light vein but Hon. Prime Minister I am very serious about this. Because the people of this country are being befooled...

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): I am also not cracking a joke...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I never said so.....

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: This is not a day to day report. When we talk of a year, the plan is chalked out accordingly. It is not like this that you divide it by 24 hours and ask after 24 hours where are the jobs.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We are aware of it. There is no difference of opinion over it but the dispute is that here too you are beguiling us. *(Interruptions)*...This is the economic review or economic survey. The question is as to how true they are to their words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can ask about all these things after one year.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We shall start asking about it right from today. Right from the day a child is born the direction towards which he is heading is known. It is their commitment that they would create one crore jobs within a year. Who prevented them, just now you said with pride that you did the right thing and whatever was written was right. In that event who had prevented you from creating jobs? Neither we nor the poor, unemployed and land-labourers of this country had stopped you to generate more employment. Then what was the hurdle before you in doing so. What to talk of generating more employment, you have reduced the employment opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a Government document for 1989-90. This Economic Survey contains figures for five years. *(Interruptions)*.

[English]

This is the Economic Survey and the Finance Minister will certainly identify it even from a distance. This is a table at page S-48. It gives the total employment in the private sector industry.

In 1983, employment in the private sector, according to the Government statistics was 75.52 lakhs. In 1988, after 5 years of tremendous efforts of creating new jobs, the total job in the the private sector industry was 73.91 lakhs. The absolute decline in terms of number of jobs is 1.61 lakhs in five years. This is your achievement. But this is not more 1.6 lakh jobs reduction. In effect, you have reduced the jobs in the private sector by 10 lakhs.

[Translation]

You know, how it happened? Earlier, whatever the employment opportunities—it might be one lakh, one and half lakh, quarter to two lakh jobs—were being created every year, you have abolished them also. Besides abolishing the new opportunities of jobs you have reduced even

the existing opportunities of employment. In brief, this is the style of your functioning. It contains the figures from 1983 to 1988 only. The subsequent Economic Survey which was to be presented in February this year has not yet been presented, perhaps it may be laid in the next week.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, they have made a record of reducing 10 lakh jobs in the private sector within five years. In 1983, there were 1 crore, 64 lakh and 56 thousand jobs in the public sector which includes the Central Government, the State Governments, the local bodies, the quasi Government, and other such organisations. And this number went up to 1 crore, 83 lakh and 20 thousand in 1988. It means during a span of five years, they created 18 lakh 64 thousand job opportunities only and these jobs were generated in the public sector. The public sector means Government offices and the public sector undertakings and it includes jobs from peon to officers; it also includes the sweepers as well as the poor labourers working in the municipalities. You have been able to create only 18 lakh and 64 thousand jobs altogether and today you are making promises of creating one crore jobs in India within one year. But the question does arise as to where and in which sector you are going to do that? We are in a fix on the Government promises because the government at the present moment is seeking Vote of Confidence. while the government, neither from its words nor from its deeds is putting forward anything, which may be believed. After the formation of your government, you have brought before us the International Monetary Fund. The largest contribution of this government is its decision to pledge this country with I.M.F. There are a lot of controversies regarding the I.M.F., but we are much concerned about the steps taken by this government during the last few days; one such step is the despatch of gold to London. I recall the period of 1977 to 1979 when Shri Morarji Desai was the Prime Minister and in his government Lalji, Atalji

and we too were partners. It was propagated both inside and outside this House against us that we had sold the gold of the country whereas our government had neither sold nor despatched even a single ounce of gold outside the country. But the system as it exists in India, which did not allow our government to continue in 1977-79, once again came in the way of our government continuing in office. Though there was no tangible reason for disliking that government, yet the propaganda was made that we had sold the gold of our country. Now you are seeking vote of confidence although you have sold 25 tonnes of gold without taking the country into confidence. You are seeking the support of opposition and other parties but did you take anyone of them into confidence before selling gold. The Governor and the employees of the Reserve Bank as well as the Pilot and the other employees of the Air India were taken into confidence, but this House was ignored. The representatives of the people of this country have not been taken into confidence.

[English]

It had to be a hush-hush operation.

[Translation]

Of 25 tonnes of gold was sent out of the country.

AN HON. MEMBER: After gold they will sell the country now.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am worried about the I.M.F.'s present pressure on this government. That pressure is the main cause of concern for us. We are not realising to whom we are handing over this country? It is very difficult to realise it. I would like to ask some most relevant questions from the hon. Prime Minister regarding the I.M.F. The Council of the I.M.F. is not much concerned with the conditionalities it has put before the government but certainly the hands which control it are much concerned about this as they want our signatures on the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Government is

[Sh. George Fernandes]

being pressurised. We would like to know the extent of truth regarding this from the Hon. Prime Minister. Secondly, the I.M.F. is reported to have put a condition that the subsidy of Rs. 7000 on food and fertilizers, i.e., Rs. 2500 on food and Rs. 4500 on fertilizers, would be abolished or reduced. We would like to know the truth and the concrete proposal of the Government in this regard.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to tell you that there is neither any such pressure for NPT, nor we would like to come under such pressure. Neither it will happen nor it has happened. No such thing has taken place. But to say that we have been pressurized, is not correct. It is unjustified to say such thing about them and more unjust to us, if it is said that we are yielding to pressure.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I have asked a question. Now they are admitting that there is some substance in the matter of subsidy.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI BALRAM JAKHAR): It is credit worthy even to retrieve the country from the present difficult situation which you have put it into.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I will reply your second point later.

[English]

It does not mean that we are owning it. The only thing is I will take time to answer you in detail. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I request you to limit your time because the time is almost over?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We are deciding the future of the country. How can you limit my time? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think other people are also interested in making speeches.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The point is that this Government is to carry on this. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other people also seem to think that they are interested in the future of this country.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I don't think we can cut short the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You must allow me to make a few points.

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, is it a fact that the I.M.F. or the powers behind it, have asked the Government to cut or reduce our expenditure on defence. We would also like to know to what extent foreign investment is going to be allowed in this country. The I.M.F. is pressurizing the Government on this issue also. This is a serious matter, which is linked with the future of our country and we would like to know the details from the Hon. Prime Minister. I am happy that the Hon. Prime Minister has clarified the position in regard to N.P.T.

I have a doubt and there is a reason behind it. Prior to 1st of July, 1991, the day on which the rupee was devalued, the rupee had already undergone devaluation upto 45 per cent during the period from January 1990 to end of June, 1991. (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH): It was your Government in power.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: If I want to speak on my Government, I will have a lot of time for it. Because you are going to present the

Budget and we will have a discussion on all the financial policies. You should also not forget that you were the adviser to all the Governments on financial matters. So, at least you should not involve yourself in this matter. Let other people take part in it. (Interruptions) Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a doubt and it is necessary to get its answer from the hon. Prime Minister. When, in comparison to the American dollar, pound, sterling, Japanese Yen, and German DM, the rupee was devalued from 8 per cent to 9.7 per cent on 1st of July, the statement given by the Finance Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh and by the Reserve Bank Officials was that

[English]

"This move was a normal process of adjustment". I would like to quote the words again: ".....a normal process of adjustment done every day..."

[Translation]

From 1st of June to 1st of July.....

[English]

...total process of adjustment vary between Rs. 20 to a dollar.....20 point and odd to a dollar to 21 point and odd to a dollar. It averages about 21.2 or 21.3.

[Translation]

He directly brought the 21.3 to a dollar to Rs. 22. to a dollar by saying that

[English]

"This is a normal process of adjustment done everyday"

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the 2nd of July passes off. Then, on the 3rd of July, another normal process of adjustment took place and then the spokesman of Reserve Bank says:

[English]

This is sharply higher than normal.

[Translation]

The rupee was again devalued by 9-10 per cent and as per the information we have, the International Monetary Fund had said to the Government that the 45 per cent devaluation, which took place in the last 12-14 months was not enough and so the Government in an effort to satisfy them devalued the rupee by 9 per cent. They again said that it would not do and it should be devalued by another 10 per cent. So, it was again devalued and to escape the criticism, the Government said "this is a normal process of adjustment done every day" and we apprehend that the rupee may be devalued further.

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I do not understand what is he objecting to. Is it his point that it was not done on the next day but it is being done on every other day, every alternate day? Is it that he is objecting to?

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have our own doubts about the role played by the Government in regard to the International Monetary Fund and the Statement made by the Finance Minister that this has been going on for long. At least the Finance Minister should know more than this and he should not bring politics into this. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to quote figures of Government of India from a document of the Reserve Bank of India, viz.

[English]

'RBI's Report on Currency and Finance. Volume-I. Economic Review'. In this it is written that in 1985 India's external debt was Rs. 25,200 crores and by 1989 it had shot up to Rs. 69,681 crores. In 1990, it had reached upto Rs. 81,168 crores. This is excluding NRI's deposit.

[Sh. George Fernandes]

[Translation]

If NRI's deposit is also included, the figure will go up by Rs. 3,819 crore in 1985 and Rs. 17,821 crore in 1990 and the total amount of external debt to-day will be Rs. 1,00,000 crore. This drama was started in 1985 in the name of modernisation of India which catered to the demands of luxury, comfort, automobiles, etc. of the rich who constitute only two and a half per cent of the entire population and to bring their living standard at par with the people living in America, Europe, Germany and Japan. But what benefits of modernisation are going to accrue to for the poor, to the majority of the population of the country living in Bihar, Eastern Uttar Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Assam, Orissa, Konkan, Marathwada and islands. Yesterday, it was said in the President's Address, which is a document of the government,—the President:

[English]

A special crash programme to be named after Rajiv Gandhi, will be drawn up to provide drinking water to rural areas within five years.

[Translation]

Today we are talking of modernisation. We have been listening it since 1947, we have been listening to it since the first Address of 1952 that top priority would be given to the supply of drinking water to the rural people and now we are talking of modernisation, where is it?

SHRI G. DEVRAYA NAIK
(Kannara): Why did you not do it?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I fail to understand as to why you are so much worried about the government which was in power for eleven months only. I don't follow whether you are speaking in favour of it. It is beyond our comprehension. Have we assembled here today only to listen to such things. (Interruptions)

So, please don't say anything. On the one hand, you talk of providing

drinking water to rural areas within five years, while on the other hand, you incurred an external debt of Rs. 35,800 crore in the name of the so-called modernisation in 1985 and a sum of Rupees 69681 crore is to be added to it, and within a period of five years the burden of external debt has gone up to Rs. 14154 crore. This is the crux of the problem. What is the logic in putting the blame on the National Front Government which was in power for just 11 months, out of which two months were full of suspense. So you can not question us as to what we should have done. (Interruptions)

We waived the loans of farmers. Does it irritate you? (Interruptions)

We have waived the loans of poor agricultural labourers, artisans and weavers. It may be a matter of worry for you. Agriculturists have been exploited in the matter of prices of their produce both at national and international levels. We have waived farmers' debt to the tune of Rupees 8,500 crores.....(Interruptions) Where the loans have not been waived you may do so. We will give you full support in waiving the loans. Please don't impose the burden of the situation created by you on the poor farmers. I would like to know something regarding IMF from the Prime Minister. I.M.F. has put certain conditions which may lead to price-rise, unemployment, closure of industries, destruction of cottage and small industries and increasing tension in the social field and every other field. Has I.M.F. committed itself to provide you loan? Instead, I.M.F. is imposing conditions one after the other, even then you have no paper, no letter or communication conveying its willingness to provide you loan. You are taking one step after the other. Please understand our problem. Nobody had any faith in this Government when this party was in power. We can't trust this Government in any case. We have no faith on their character, because there are so many allegations against them. I would like to know from

the Prime Minister as to what is his contribution in regard to the issue of ensuring social justice. First of all, the recommendations of the Mandal Commission were implemented by us and we know the parties that opposed it. We also knew the present condition of the country. It is not an easy task to bring social change in India, especially providing justice to the downtrodden. The people, who have been striving to bring about a change in this country for thousands of years realise the uphill task. We are very much disturbed by this policy document and your declaration and we object to it. You have said:—

[English]

Government is committed to special measures in favour of socially and educationally backward classes.

[Translation]

You have not spelt it out.

[English]

Is committed to special measures.

[Translation]

Let me know since when is the Congress party committed to it. You are talking of commitment. There is no question of any commitment now. Why do you not go through the Indian Constitution? Why do the people who make such commitments not go through the Constitution? When the children and people of the country were being misled to burn themselves, we said that the self immolation of boys should be stopped. If you are so angry about the policy regarding the recommendations of Mandal Commission, you should burn the Constitution of India itself. Whatever we did is according to the Constitution of India. You should express your anger on it. You should go through Articles 340, 14 and 16 and then discuss this point. What kind of justice do you want to dispense to the socially backward and downtrodden people of India? It is said that preference will be given to the poorer sections.

12—9 LSS/ND/91

[English]

In Implementing these, preference will be given to the poorer sections among them. What do you mean by poorer sections? Who are the poorer sections?

[Translation]

Sixty to seventy per cent of Indian population is illiterate even now. Which poor class of people you are talking about? Who are the people who have been waiting for forty years to get justice? Should they not get justice? Why should they be denied justice? Implementation of the recommendations of Mandal Commission is very important. I would like to say with all force at my command that a resolution was passed by this House in August 1982, I don't

15.00 hrs.

remember the exact date. Prime Minister. Mrs. Indira Gandhi was present in the House. We fought for the implementation of the recommendations of Mandal Commission in almost every session of this House. In a sitting of this House, a consensus was evolved on 27th August, 1982 and a Resolution was passed that the recommendations of the Mandal Commission be implemented. From 1982 to 1990, they were not able to implement these and when we came to power we fulfilled our promise, but then our Government was thrown out of power by you.

I would like to raise one more concrete point. In India, we need financial, industrial or economic democracy alongwith social justice. We have certain expectations from the labourers of this country as to how much work they are doing and how much they don't do. The discussion in this regard goes on. In this regard, I would like to know whether the initiative taken by our Government to allow the labourers to participate in the management of industries has been pursued.

[Sh. George Fernandes]

[English]

Workers' participation in management both in the public and in the private sector.

[Translation]

What is your concrete thinking about that? What are your programmes to implement it? The questions raised by us regarding crores of ex-servicemen are to be taken care, and Shri Balram Jakhar should pay special attention to these matters. We would like to know the attitude you are going to adopt on the measures initiated by us? Finally, I would like to submit that in view of the past performance of the Congress Party during the last forty years as also in view of the complexion of the present Government and its promises and keeping in view the experience of the last 21 days, the Government does not deserve our trust and confidence. Our struggle is against the present Government, no doubt, inside the House. Our struggle against the Government will be more intense outside the House and we will launch a continuous struggle in the issues affecting the people. We want to give this assurance to this Government and country through you and I strongly oppose this motion.

[English]

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay-North Central): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Motion to express the confidence in the Council of Ministers has been before the House now. After the result of the General Elections, the President has invited Congress party which is the single largest party to form the Government, with the condition that within a period of one month, it should get this Motion passed by this House. Therefore, this Motion has been brought before this House today. It is unfortunate that both the opposition parties have chosen to oppose this Motion.

Sir, as far as the main recognised opposition party is concerned, it has

practically made it clear that it is merely opposing, for the sake of opposition. The Leader of Opposition has already stated, "I am sure that your Government is not going to fall, even if we oppose this Motion". Not only that; he has gone further and said, "Nobody wants General Elections at this stage". Therefore, it is clear that this opposition party is opposing practically for the sake of opposition and to put on record, that it is an opposition party, as far as this Government is concerned.

So far as the last speaker, Shri George Fernandes is concerned, he has converted this debate into a general debate, including the debate on the President's speech, debate on the anticipated budget and general debate on the Congress Government's performance for all these years. Really speaking, he could have spared this debate for a better occasion. There would have been good and better occasions to discuss in detail all these issues which would come before this House in one form or the other. Regarding President's speech also, there will be thanks-giving motion. The budget will be fully discussed. And there will be an occasion to criticise the Government on various issues, for example, taking of loan, from IMF and their conditionalities. All these points can be thoroughly discussed on a different and better occasion. On that occasion, we can go into all the details about the performance of the Congress Governments in the past, the manifesto and the direction or the indications of the policies given by this Government upto now. In that context, we can also discuss and go into all the details about the performance of the Janata Dal Government which was in power for eleven months. At that time, we can point out and compare the last 40 years of Congress rule, the indication of the policies of the present Government, the performance and the achievements of the Janata Dal as far as those eleven months are concerned. According to me, that would be the proper discussion.

At present, what I want to submit to this House is that there is a narrow issue. The narrow issue is that Rashtrapati invited the Congress Party to form the Government. The Government has been formed. According to my humble submission, as soon as this Government came into power, people heaved a sigh of relief that there would now be a stable Government, some stability, some policy, some experienced people handling the different political and economic issues of this country. Therefore, all this satisfaction has been expressed by the people on this Government's coming into power.

Then the charge which the hon. Member, Shri George Fernandes, has got. Firstly, he has always been saying all these years—whenever the Congress Party came into power—well, people have not given you the mandate because of such-and-such percentage of votes. When we got 40 per cent votes also, he said that no, no, you are elected but the people have not given you the mandate. When in 1985, 47 per cent votes were given, then also, they said, it is only 47 per cent; the majority of the people are against you. So, that is no argument as far as the parliamentary democracy is concerned. This is our Constitution. According to this Constitution, elections are held, parties get the majority. We must always admit that that party which is in majority, has a right to form the Government and it has a mandate of the people to form the Government and run the Government as far as this country is concerned. Therefore, it is no use going to that point again and again.

Similarly, all these years, the hon. Member, Shri George Fernandes, has been repeating that performance is bad, jobs are not there, unemployment has come. All these things are said. As I said, that 11 months' performance should be compared as far as the performance of the Congress Government is concerned. As far as the price rise is concerned, we can always show that the highest price rise was during the regime of this Gov-

ernment. These points are old points, and they do not become relevant as far as this resolution is concerned today.

Now the question is whether or not this Government should continue in power and run this country, as far as the present days are concerned. What is the alternative? No other party has staked its claim to form the Government and this is the largest party as far as this House is concerned. This party had been invited by the Rashtrapati to form the Government. Now, what are you going to do? Are you going to give another alternative or are you going to go again to the people and ask them to have elections again? I am sure that not a single person in this country now desires for the elections to be held within five years. As far as the people's will is concerned, we must take into account the poor voting that had taken place. People do not want frequent voting and frequent elections. They want a stable Government. They want a Government which will address itself to the issues before this country. There are problems like the political issues, the law and order situation, the deterioration of economic situation in this country and also problems relating to Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir and Assam. To solve these problems and improve the economic situation of this country, people desire that there should be some Government which will last, which will govern and form its policies and implement those policies for a considerable time. And then, if chance will be given, things can be improved and a better situation can be created. From this point of view, I will urge upon the political parties which are sitting in the Opposition to consider whether or not it is worthwhile opposing this Motion at all. It is because nobody wants elections today. People want a good Government and solutions to be found out as far as the economic and political situations are concerned. Therefore, I will urge upon the major political parties of the Opposition not to oppose this

[Sh. Sharad Dighe]

Motion. Otherwise, the result will be only to go to the polls. There is no other alternative as far as the present situation in the House is concerned. So, I feel and I am confident that wiser counsels will prevail and ultimately, this Motion will not be opposed by the parties of the Opposition. That is the requirement of the situation in which we are present today, i.e., this Government must continue and address itself to the various issues which are before this country. With these words, I support this Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The discussion on the Confidence Motion will now be taken up on Monday. Now, certain hon. Members have requested for making some submissions. I would request them not to take much time so that Private Members' Business can be taken up at 3.30 PM today.

15.10 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—*Contd.*

[*Translation*]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR (Bareilly): I request that the following item may be included in the next week's agenda:

Keeping in view the needs of Nawabganj and Mirganj in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, there is a long-standing demand for setting up of sugar mills there. In the last one year I have received several letters from the Prime Minister and other concerned Ministers that an early decision would be taken in this matter. During the past year letters of intent have been issued for setting up of sugar mills at several places, but no decision has been taken in case of Nawabganj and Mirganj even though the State Government has recommended that sugar mills be set up there.

I request that in view of the needs of the area, a letter of intent be issued in this session for setting up of sugar mill there.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): I request that the following item may be included in next week's agenda:

- (1) Matter regarding the delay in clearing river-water and other projects of national importance in Rajasthan by the Central Government.
- (2) Discussion on meeting the power shortage in Rajasthan by increasing the share to Rajasthan from inter-state power projects.

[*English*]

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): I request that the following item may be included in the next week's agenda:

Cult of violence is on the increase in our country. It adversely affects our body politic in as much as it is not possible to hold free and fair elections in some parts of the country. It has in fact become a slur on our democracy.

Thus a discussion is immediately called for as to how the cult of violence could be effectively arrested before long.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): I request that the following item may be included in the next week's agenda:

Taming, trimming and harnessing the rivers like Koshi, Kamla, Bagmati, Karnali, Pancheshwar and Mahananda which are flowing from Nepal through India in the mutual interests of both the countries through multi-purpose dams. There must be some political initiative in this regard.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay-North Central): I request that the following item may be included in the next week's agenda: